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This thesis focuses on three areas of problems in the studies of Zhouyuan oracle-bone inscriptions: the interpretations of inscriptions, identities of kings and the origins of four pieces of Zhouyuan oracle bones. Why these three are chosen is that in order to read the inscriptions correctly, we first have to understand the meanings of words. If the word “king” appears in the inscriptions, it is ideal that we know the time period to which these oracle bones belong, so the information from the inscriptions can be used correctly from historical perspective. The origins of four Zhouyuan oracle bones are discussed because the identities of the kings mentioned are important; if they were Shang kings, they were from the Shang; otherwise, from the Zhou, though other possibilities are not excluded.

In Chapter One I give a general introduction to the features of the Zhou oracle bones and inscriptions, so the readers will have background information for the remainder of the thesis. The readers will see some of the problems facing the scholars of the oracle-bone studies.

In Chapter Two I attempt to determine who the kings were on fourteen pieces of Zhou oracle bone, so that these oracle bones, as historical artifacts, can be periodized properly; also in Chapter Two, I provide interpretations on the functions and meanings of the words that some of the characters represent on these fourteen pieces, in order that the inscriptions can be fully understood.

In Chapter Three, I seek to ascertain the origins of four pieces of
Zhou oracle bones which have caused controversy: by identifying who the kings were on these four pieces, we will thus be able see whether they belonged to the Shang or the Zhou.

Chapter Four is the conclusion of this thesis.

Appendix One details the discoveries of Zhou oracle bones in various locations in China through the years.

Appendix Two is my response to K. Takashima’s recent article on the modal and aspectual particle 甚 and whether it is applicable to the use of 甚 in the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions. I conclude that his theory is generally applicable: 甚 functions as a modal and an aspectual particle; it also indicates that the diviners wanted, for the most part, the contemplated charges to be acceptable to the spirits.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract ii
Table of Contents iv
Lists of Figures viii
List of Abbreviations x
Acknowledgment xi

CHAPTER ONE  GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE CHARACTERISTICS OF ZHOU ORACLE BONES AND INSCRIPTIONS

1.1 Introduction 1

1.2 General Characteristics of Zhou Oracle Bones

1.2.1 Grouping of Hollows 7
1.2.2 Treatment on Plastrons 7
1.2.3 Cracks and Characters on Plastrons 8
1.2.4 Hollows on Plastrons 8
1.2.5 Treatment on Scapulas 9
1.2.6 Hollows on Scapulas 10
1.2.7 Other Features 11

1.3 General Characteristics of Zhou Oracle-Bone Inscriptions

1.3.1 Minute Size of Characters 11
CHAPTER THREE  THE ORIGINS OF FOUR ORACLE BONES

3.1 Introduction  78
3.2 Shang Origin  80
3.3 Zhou Origin  86
3.4 Shang Origin and by Zhou Specialists Working in the Shang  96
3.5 Conclusion  106

CHAPTER FOUR  CONCLUSIONS  107

BIBLIOGRAPHY  115

APPENDIX ONE  DISCOVERIES OF ZHOU ORACLE BONES

1.1 Introduction  129
1.2 Bin 埕 County, 1951  130
1.3 Loyang 洛陽, 1952  130
1.4 Fangdui 坊堆, 1954  131
1.5 Zhangjiapo 張家坡, 1956  132
1.6 Caoyanzhuang 曹演莊, 1956-1957  132
1.7 Fengxi 滄西, 1955-1957  133
1.8 Maojiaju 毛家咀, 1958  134
1.9 Mawangcun 馬王村, 1959-1960  134
1.10 Niucun 牛村, 1960-1961  134
1.11 Baifu 白浮, 1975  134
1.12 Fengchu 城故, 1977
1.13 Qijiacun 齐家村, 1979
1.14 Xiaotun 小屯, 1982
1.15 Liutaizi 劉台子, 1982
1.16 Loyang 洛阳, 1983
1.17 Xingtai 邢台, 1991
1.18 Other Locations
1.19 Conclusions

APPENDIX TWO  APPLICATION OF TAKASHIMA'S QI THEORY ON ZHOU
ORACLE-BONE INSCRIPTIONS
### LIST OF FIGURES

1. The Overall View of a Zhou Oracle Plastron .................................................. 8
2. The Overall View of the Zhou Oracle Scapula ................................................. 10
3. H11:1 ............................................................................................................. 18
4. H11:3 ............................................................................................................. 32
5. Locations of Different States in the Shang Period. ........................................ 41
6. H11:11 ......................................................................................................... 43
7. H11:38 ......................................................................................................... 45
8. H11:48 ......................................................................................................... 48
9. H11:80 ......................................................................................................... 50
10. H11:82 ........................................................................................................ 52
11. H11:113 ...................................................................................................... 59
12. H11:133 ...................................................................................................... 61
13. H11:134 ...................................................................................................... 62
14. H11:136 ...................................................................................................... 63
15. NH1[3]:1 ...................................................................................................... 64
16. *Caiji* 94 .................................................................................................... 67
17. QFF:7 .......................................................................................................... 68
18. H11:14  65
19. H11:61  65
20. H11:72  65
21. H11:75+126  66
22. H11:84  66
23. H11:100  66
24. H11:112  67
25. H11:132  67
27. H11:174  68
28. H11:189  68
29. H11:191  68
30. H11:210  69
31. H11:233  69
32. H11:246  69
33. H11:261  69
# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HY</td>
<td><em>Harvard-Yenching Sinological Index Series</em> by William Hung et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luyi</td>
<td><em>Shang Zhou Jinwen Luyi</em> 商周金文錄迤 by Yu Xingwu 于省吾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSCQ</td>
<td><em>A Concordance to the Lü-shi Ch’un-ch’iu</em> by Michael F. Carson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandai</td>
<td><em>Sandai Jijin Wencun</em> 三代吉金文存 by Luo Zhenyu 羅振玉</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSTJ</td>
<td><em>Shangshu Tongjian</em> 尚書通檢 by Gu Jiegang 颱頳剛</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td><em>Shuowen Jiezizhu</em> 說文解字注 by Duan Yucai 段玉裁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yin</td>
<td><em>Oracle Bone Collection in Great Britain</em> 英國所藏甲骨集 by Li Xueqin 李學勤, Qi Wenxin 齊文心, and Sarah Allan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In preparing this thesis, I would like to thank many people for their kindness and patience, particularly, Colin Hawes and Brittani Faulkes for their willingness to proofread my thesis; Robert Stephenson and Sun Jingtao for offering valuable criticism. I would also like to thank my friends from the International Buddhist Progress Society in Richmond for constantly encouraging me to finish my thesis. Last, but not least, I should like to thank Professor D. Overmyer and, particularly, my supervisor, Professor K. Takashima, for their detailed comments and criticism. I am also grateful to two other members of my final M.A. examination, Professors C. Swatek and R. King, who asked penetrating questions. All these individuals contributed greatly to the final form of my thesis.
CHAPTER ONE

GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE CHARACTERISTICS OF ZHOU ORACLE BONES AND INSCRIPTIONS

1.1 Introduction

From the first discovery of a Zhou oracle bone in Bin County, Shaanxi to the present time, there have been more than ten discoveries of scapulas and turtle plastrons at various Zhou ruins. Right now not only can we study Zhou history from the Bamboo Annals, Book of Poetry, Book of Documents, Shiji, Zhou bronze inscriptions, but also from the newest materials, the oracle-bone inscriptions written by the Zhou. At this moment the studies on the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions are still at an early stage, and the reason for this will become apparent as the thesis unfolds at the end of this thesis. While examining these Zhou oracle bones, we must pay attention to the possibility that not all of them are from the Western Zhou period, because several locations where these bones were discovered belonged to the Eastern-Zhou period, as I will show in Appendix One. Since there were also Zhou oracle bones found outside Zhouyuan, I use in this thesis “Zhou oracle bones,” as a generic term to refer to all of the oracle bones found in all of the Zhou ruins, regardless of where they were found and to which period they might belong.

Before I continue, I shall explain the significance of Zhouyuan. This

---

1Readers can access Appendix One of this thesis which details the discoveries of Zhou oracle bones in various sites throughout the years.
place is in the province of Shaanxi 陕西省, one hundred kilometers west of the city of Xian 西安, and is located between the counties of Qishan 岐山 and Fufong 抚风. A Zhou ancestor, Gugong Danfu 古公亶父, moved the Zhou people to this place from Bin 邐, and they stayed until his grandson King Wen moved the capital to Feng 豐. Before the Zhou people arrived here, several ancient cultural remains are also there: Yangshao Wenhua 仰韶文化, Shaanxi Longshan Wenhua 陕西龙山文化 and Qijia Wenhua 齐家文化. Because of the fertile soil of Zhouyuan, the Zhou were able to increase their population and went to wars. Even after the capital had been moved, the Zhou kings and his ministers would still return to the ancestral temples in Zhouyuan for rituals and decision-makings. The archaeological teams were usually able to discover many Early and Western Zhou artifacts from this area, especially the discovery of an Early-Zhou palace and oracle bones in Fengchu 凤雏, Qishan 岐山 County, suggesting that Zhouyuan was once the political and economical centre in the Pre-Zhou period.²

After reading all the secondary material on the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions, I discovered that these publications focused on four aspects: interpretations of inscriptions, identities of kings in these inscriptions, the origins of four pieces of Zhouyuan oracle bones, and the bagua 八卦 numbers. I decided the first three to be the focus in this thesis, because on the one hand, I have not studied the significance of the bagua numbers and their use in the Yijing 易經. On the other hand, in order for one to comprehend the contents of these inscriptions, it is necessary to understand the meanings of some words that are problematic; after the

---

problems are resolved, then we can understand the contents of the inscriptions and might even be able to extract information we did not know before. Second, these inscriptions are our first-hand material, besides the early Zhou bronze inscriptions, for us to understand the early Zhou civilization, so it is necessary to know to which king each word “king” referred, and they would be periodized correctly; we can also determine which pieces came from the same king, discovering the relationship among them. And any information from them can then be used accordingly. For example, if we are to examine how the styles of characters changed over a period of time, we first need to know which style belonged to an early period and a later period; that is, we have to know the periods of these oracle bones (e.g., find out the identities of kings). We can even discover new information that we did not know before. Third, in relation to the second problem I just discussed, four pieces of Zhouyuan oracle bones contain the names of Shang ancestors, so whether these four pieces originated from the Zhou or the Shang (and hence whether it was the Shang or Zhou king conducting the sacrifice on each piece) should also be studied. If they were from the Shang, why were they discovered in Zhouyuan, and why are there Zhou features in the inscriptions and hollows? If they were from the Zhou, why are there Shang ancestors mentioned on them? Could inter-group sacrifices take place in that period? Questions like these are important if we want to use the inscriptions to understand the early Zhou period.

There are four chapters and two appendices in this thesis. Chapter One gives a general introduction to the characteristics of Zhou oracle bones and the inscriptions, so the readers can have background understanding on these oracle bones and inscriptions, and will understand the existence of
some problems that will be discussed in Chapter Two; also, we will also use some of these features to determine the origins of four pieces in Chapter Three.

Chapter Two is a study on the references of the word wang 王 “king” as it occurs on fourteen pieces of Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions. There are thirty pieces in total that have this word, but because many of them either have discrepancies with respect to the styles of several characters both in Wang Yuxin’s 王宇信 Xizhou Jiagu Tanlun 西周甲骨探論 and Xu Xitai’s 徐錫臺 Zhouyuan Jiaguwen Zongshu 周原甲骨文綜述, the two major books on the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions; or they only have two or three characters and do not contribute any useful information. Therefore, only fourteen pieces are chosen for this chapter. The studies attempt to identify to which Shang king or Zhou king each “king” referred. If such a reference cannot be established, hopefully we can still assign a period for that piece of bone. Since there are only two scholars (Xu Xitai 徐錫臺 and Wang Yuxin 王宇信) who have studied this problem on all these pieces while other scholars simply give the identities of the kings without stating any reason, we will evaluate both scholars’ theories. In some instances, Xu’s theory is more appropriate than Wang’s, and is adopted; sometimes it is Wang’s theory that is more acceptable and is thus followed; but at other times neither scholar proposes a theory, so I offer my theory (e.g., on p.67 where I propose that the “king” on QFF:7 belonged to Ji Li’s late period or King Wen’s early period). Apart from this, I hope to resolve the different interpretations of some inscriptions on these pieces. Since there are many

---

3Chen Quanfang’s 陳全方 book, Zhouyuan yu Zhou Wenhua 周原與周文化, as far as I know, is the only book that displays the photographs of all of the Zhouyuan oracle bones. However, I did not use the photographs from this book because many of them with the word “wang” are unclear and difficult to see. Hence many characters on these bones are impossible to determine.
scholars studying the inscriptions, there are disagreements regarding the meanings of some words. I use a comparative method by examining the theories on the meanings of some of the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions and sometimes of the bronze inscriptions and the classics, in order to clarify the disagreements upon meaning.

In relation to Chapter Two, Chapter Three focuses upon the problem of the origins of four pieces of Zhou oracle bones. These four were discovered in Zhouyuan, but the names of some Shang ancestors appear on them, a few of whom also received the sacrifice. Therefore, the problem is whether these four pieces came from the Shang or the Zhou. If they were from the Zhou (hence the “king” referred to the Zhou king), why did some Shang ancestors, being from another group of people, receive the sacrifice? If the bones were from the Shang (the “king” referred to the Shang king), why were they discovered in Zhouyuan? There are three camps of scholars discussing the issue: Shang origin (without indicating who worked on these oracle bones); Zhou origin, because of the Zhou features in writing and chiselling hollows; and also Shang origin, but with inscriptions and hollows done by the Zhou people working in the Shang court. Evidence from the classics, historical texts, and the inscriptions backs up my conclusion that two pieces were from the Shang court, but the origins of the other two are still unclear to us. However, the inscriptions and the hollows on these four pieces were the work of Zhou specialists.

The last chapter is the conclusion of this M.A. thesis, in which the conclusion from each chapter is stated. I also raise problems and values in the studies of Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions.

Appendix One details the discoveries of Zhou oracle bones in various locations throughout the years. In Appendix Two, I respond to K.
Takashima’s recent article on the meaning and the function of the modal and aspectual qi in the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions. Takashima proposes that qi had three different functions: one being a modal particle, with the controllability of the following verb determining the modality to be measured in the scale of “certainty/possibility,” of “intention/wish” and of “necessity/obligation” on which qi moved. If the verb is controllable, qi moves on the “intention/wish” or the “necessity/obligation” scale; otherwise, the “certainty/possibility” scale. Another function of qi was as an aspectual particle, translated as “to be going to,” which suggests a prospective or anticipative event or action. And thirdly, in combination with the “desirable-right” with “undesirable-left” theory, which holds that desirable charges are generally inscribed on the right and undesirable charges on the left-hand side of a plastron, qi responds to the presupposition of the diviner or king who cast the charge. Qi in the desirable charge reflects the presupposition that the diviners wanted the charge to be materialized; in the undesirable charge, qi reflects that the diviner would like the charge to be rejected by spirits. Since there are also qi in the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions, I apply Takashima’s theory to the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions to examine whether his theory is applicable. The conclusion is that his theory is generally compatible with the usage of qi in the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions. The Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions are often seen as single charges, so that which side of a plastron (with the centre line being in the middle) or the right or the left scapula cannot be determined, but for the most part we are able to determine the desirability of the charge by examining the content of the charge.

1.2 Characteristics of the Zhou Oracle Bones
1.2.1 Grouping of Hollows

The first characteristic of Zhou oracle bones is that on a piece of turtle shell, every three hollows from the same row form a group. This is because the distance between hollows in the same row is shorter than the distance between hollows in the same column, which makes the hollows appear to form a group of three from the same row. Since hollows on the scapulas are bored in random order, the grouping does not exist on scapulas.

1.2.2 Treatment on Plastrons

The treatment on the Zhou plastrons is different from those on the Shang plastrons, in that the gular section is dug clean and the thick surrounding at the edge is left out, as one can see in fig. 1 below. Li Xueqin 李學勤 notes that H3[2]:1 from Qijia is the most complete turtle shell and a perfect example: the gular section is completely dug away and a thick edge is left out. The half piece of the turtle shell from the Mt. Tai Temple in Loyang, Henan, discovered in 1952, also displays the same treatment in the gular section, and there is a shallow round hollow in the centre of the gular section.

---

5 Ibid.
7 Ibid., 8.
1.2.3 Cracks and Characters on Plastrons

The transverse cracks point towards the central axis. The inscriptions are carved next to the cracks with which they are associated (shouzhao守兆), and they follow the directions of these transverse cracks, thus traveling horizontally towards the central axis. Such a feature is never seen among the Shang plastrons and inscriptions.\(^8\)

1.2.4 Hollows on Plastrons

Most turtle plastrons from Fengchu 鳳雏, Shaanxi, have rectangular hollows--only a few of them have round hollows. A hollow is made of a

\(^8\)Ibid.
rectangular hollow and a square hollow, as we can observe in fig. 1 above. The hollows on the plastrons are organized as in fig. 1: on the left side of the back of the plastron, the rectangular hollows (in white) are to the left of the square hollows (in black). The situation is reverse on the opposite side: on the right side the rectangular hollows are to the right of the square hollows, so that the transverse cracks appearing on the obverse side point towards the central axis.\(^9\)

The circular hollows are in the shape of \(\bigcirc\); the edge of the hollow touches the circle. The cross-section view of the hollow is that of a triangle. The floor of this circular hollow is a segment of circle. The diameter of the circular hollow is around eleven millimeters.\(^10\)

1.2.5 Treatments on Scapulas

Sometimes half of the socket on a scapula was cut away and the spine was chipped away; then the round hollows were bored, not so much in an organized manner, but randomly.\(^11\) Also, the polishings of Zhou scapulas are simple and crude.\(^12\)


\(^{10}\)Chen Quanfang, *Zhouyuan yu Zhouwenhua* 周原與周文化 (Shanghai: Shanghai Renmin chubanshe 上海人民出版社, 1988), 102. Chen also indicates the figures of some pieces on which the circular hollows appear (pp.105 and 106 of his book), but I do not see any small round hollows next to the larger ones, like the one I quote here.

\(^{11}\)Gao, 77.

1.2.6 Hollows on Scapulas

All scapulas have round hollows, as one can see in fig. 2 above. The wall of a hollow is either flat or rough; the floor is either flat or slightly concave. The walls and the floors are in the three forms of $\frac{1}{3}$, $\frac{1}{2}$, and $\frac{2}{3}$. Located at about 1/3 of the diameter from the edge is a narrow groove on the floor of the hollow, and the cross-section view is $\frac{1}{3}$. The width of this narrow groove is around 0.15 millimeters. The diameter of the hollow is usually from 0.7 to 1.2 millimeters.\textsuperscript{13} The top view of round hollows on scapulas looks like $\bigcirc$ or $\bigcirc$. The narrow groove has the same function as it does on a plastron--to control the vertical cracks.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{13}Chen Quanfang, Zhouyuan, 102.

\textsuperscript{14}Gao, 77.
1.2.7 Other Features

Another characteristic of the Zhou scapulas is that the socket points downwards, so the sockets are considered as the bottom, as we can see in fig. 2 above, a situation quite opposite to the Shang scapulas in which the sockets are considered as the top. Also, there are cases in which one line of characters travels along the length of the scapula, while the other line of characters travels along the width of the scapula. When a Zhou scribe wanted to carve characters that ran along the width of the scapula, he held the socket area with his left hand, and carved the characters with his right hand. As for the scapula with characters running along its length, its socket is considered as the bottom.

1.3 Characteristics of Zhou Oracle-Bone Inscriptions

1.3.1 Minute Size of Characters

A characteristic of these inscriptions is their minute size. They are as small as a grain of millet, and a magnifying glass with five-times magnification power is required to see them properly. Xu Xitai states that a large character like “shu 叔” is about ten millimeters long and five millimeters wide; a small character like “gui 兌” is one millimeter long and wide—these exemplify the smallness of these characters. Therefore, there are only hand-drawn illustrations and photographs of these oracle-

---

16Cai, 70.
bone inscriptions currently available, and no rubbings have yet been produced.

1.3.2 Directions of Inscriptions

There are four types of directions in which the inscriptions travel. In Type I the inscriptions travel from top to bottom then from left to right. For example,

癸巳彝文武帝乙宗貞王其{{祭}}成唐齋御反二姜其彝血抖三豕三
田有正。\textsuperscript{19}

On the \textit{guisi} day, holding the \textit{Yi} sacrifice at the Wenwu Di Yi’s temple, tested: the king will be going to hold the \textit{X} ritual to Cheng Tang [with?] the food [cooked in the cauldron], exorcise with two captive Qiang people, and will be going to hold \textit{Yi} sacrifice [and?] bleeding rams amounting to three and pigs amounting to three. These will be correct.

In Type II, the inscriptions travel from top to bottom then from right to left. For example,

辛未王其逐虐翌 (?) \ldots \亡咎。\textsuperscript{19}

On the \textit{xinwei} day, the king will be going to chase after wild boars and next(?) there will be no disasters.

In Type III there is only one sentence on the oracle bone, and the inscriptions travel from top to bottom in a straight line. For example,

巳王其乎更卒 (= 茕)父卑 \ldots .\textsuperscript{19}

[On the \textit{x-}si day, the king will be going to call upon Geng with his father to ascend \ldots .

\textsuperscript{19}The illustrations of these oracle bones can be seen in Chapter Two. See Section 2.2 for H11:1; Section 2.9 for H11:113; Section 2.4 for H11:11, and Section 2.10 for H11:133.
Type IV is for right-angled patterned inscriptions: one sentence travels from top to bottom, and there is another sentence travelling from right to left, forming a right angle with the former. The other three types mentioned above can also be seen among the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions, but not this type:

...三牢.  
...辛卯王在....  
...three penned cattle.

On the xinmao day, the king was (will be?) at ....

We do not know why this type is different from the other three types—was it used for a different purpose than the other three types, or was it used in the same manner as the other three? It is possible that this is a Zhou invention, because there are several inscriptions with such a pattern: H11:8, H11:15, H11:51, H11:87, and H11:232, and such a pattern is not seen among the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions.

1.4 Conclusion

The Zhou oracle bones have features not seen among the Shang oracle bones. On the scapulas, the inscriptions not only run along the length, but also along the width of the scapula. The sockets are considered as the bottom. The scapulas were usually not polished, so they have rough surfaces. The hollows are round in shape, and the narrow grooves are located close to one side of the round hollow.

The surface of carapace or plastron was also usually not treated. The bored rectangular hollow replaces the oval one in the Shang plastron, and a chiseled square hollow replaces the half-circle hollow appearing in the Shang plastron. On the obverse side, the cracks point toward the central
axis. The inscriptions travel along the transverse cracks toward the central axis.

These inscriptions are different from their Shang counterparts in several ways. One is that these characters are smaller than the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions. The second is that among the Zhou inscriptions, there are four types of directions: Type I is from top to bottom, then from left to right; Type II is from top to bottom, then from right to left; Type III inscriptions have only one straight line from top to bottom; and Type IV have two sentences forming a ninety degree angle--one has to rotate the scapula ninety degrees to the right or left in order to read one of these sentences.

These features of the Zhou oracle bones and inscriptions are unique in their own way that we can use them to determine whether other oracle bones discovered in the future originated from the Zhou. With the understanding these features, we will be able to realize some of the problems that will be discussed in Chapter Two, and we will also use some of these features to determine the origins of four pieces of oracle bones in Chapter Three.
CHAPTER TWO

PROBLEMS WITH THE IDENTITIES OF "WANG"

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents analyses on the identities of wang 王 “king” on fourteen pieces of Zhou oracle bones: attempts to ascertain whether a Shang king (or kings) or a Zhou king (or kings) was being referred to, and possibly even to determine the identity of the king. If there is not enough evidence to positively identify the king, then it is our hope to at least be able to provide periodization for these oracle bones. Apart from this, proposals for the meanings of some words that the characters represent on the same oracle bones will also be presented, hopefully resolving the arguments surrounding their interpretations. In attempting to understand the meanings of these words, I use a comparative method with regard to usage and meaning by examining these characters in the light of their counterparts in the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions, and sometimes the bronze inscriptions and the classics. Such comparisons will allow us to determine what these words mean in the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions.

Why these two problems are chosen is that these oracle bones are our first-hand material for supplementing our understanding of the Western-Zhou period, so in order to use these oracle bones properly, we have to understand the inscriptions and periodize the bones. In order to understand the contents of these inscriptions, we have to understand the meaning of each word; then, we can comprehend the meaning of the
whole inscriptions, and any other information (i.e., historical, religious, etc.) will also be obtained by understanding the inscriptions. On the other hand, it is also important to discover the identities of these kings, so these bones can be periodized, and we can discover the relationship among these bones. Then, information from the inscriptions can be applied correctly from the historical, religious, and other perspectives. For example, we can study the changing styles of the same characters, or identify information not available in the classics.

One piece of oracle bone will be studied in one section, and for practical purpose the layout of these sections is based solely on the excavation numbers that have been assigned to these oracle bones. For example, the section for the piece numbered H11:1 precedes the section for H11:3.¹

For the benefit of the reader, I also include an illustration of each oracle bone. These illustrations, unless otherwise specified, are from the back of Wang Yuxin’s Xi Zhou Jiagu Tanlun西周甲骨探論, and the page numbers are also provided, so these illustrations can be easily located in Wang’s book. I also provide my own translation for each inscription. The examples from the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions, unless otherwise specified, are from the Jiaguwen Heji甲骨文合集, with my own translation and the numbers represented the bones in this collection. Examples from the bronze inscriptions are identified with the names of the vessels and

¹There is a total of thirty pieces of Zhou oracle bones that have the character “wang” on them, but two types of bones are excluded, so only fourteen pieces are chosen for this chapter. The first type includes bones with characters being written differently in Wang Yuxin’s book, Xi Zhou Jiagu Tanlun and Xu Xitai Zhouyuan Jiaguwen Zongshu; the differences prevent us from studying their styles, functions and meanings in relation to other words on the same piece. The second type includes those bones having only two or three characters, since they do not add any useful information. The first type is included in Section 2.16 of this chapter.
the sources where they can be located. Examples from the classics are identified with reference to the Harvard-Yenching Sinological Index Series (HY for short). Thus, an example from the Book of Poetry is identified by Shijing HY, followed by number where that example can be located in the concordance for the Book of Poetry (so-called “Moa 毛 number”). In the case of archaic Chinese phonological representations, I adopt the reconstructions in Chou Fa-gao’s 周法高, A Pronouncing Dictionary of Chinese Characters in Archaic & Ancient Chinese, Mandarin & Cantonese 漢字古今音彙, because I do not know of any other most recent work on the reconstructions of archaic Chinese pronunciations; also, this work contains the reconstructions by Dong Zuobin 董作賓 and Bernhard Karlgren.

2.2 H11:1

癸巳彝^{1}文武帝乙宗貞^{2}王^{3}其^{4}妃^{5}祭^{6}成唐酋^{8}御反二女其彝血穂三豕三田^{8}有正．

On the guisi day, holding the Yi ritual at Wenwu Di Yi’s temple, tested: the king will be going to hold the X ritual to sacrifice to Cheng Tang [with?] food [cooked in] the tripod, hold the exorcism ritual with the two captive women, and will be going to hold the Yi ritual [and?] the blood ritual [with] the rams amounting to three and pigs amounting to three. [These] are correct.
1. Graphically, *yi* 鼓 depicts two hands lifting up the headless body of a sacrificial victim whose two hands are bound behind. Gao Ming 高明 proposes that this word means “to live” in the first appearance and “to butcher” in the second appearance, but Li Xueqin 李學勤 and Wang Yuxin 王宇信 propose “to live” in its first occurrence and “to hold the *yi* sacrifice” in the second occurrence;² such proposals are not acceptable due to their inconsistency in meaning. In the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions, this character is used to stand for a verb of sacrifice, as in the following examples:

(1) 乙午卜大貞王其舞亡尤九月

Divining on the *gengwu* day, Da tested: the king will be going to hold the *yi* ritual, [and then] there will be no disasters. [In the] ninth month.

(2) 甲戌卜乙亥王其舞于祖乙宗

Divined on the *jiaxu* day: on the *yihai* day the king will be going to hold the *yi* ritual at Ancestor Yi's temple.

Unfortunately, just like other examples of 舞 in the Heji, these two do not show us what was involved with this activity, such as what kind of animals and how many of them were used, and also how these sacrificial victims were killed (were they beheaded, chopped to small pieces, split in half, etc), so it might be that nothing is sacrificed during this activity, but the appearance of this character later in the same sentence (其舞血 “will hold the *yi* ritual [and?] blood sacrifice”) suggests that during the ritual the sacrificial victims were made to bleed, if 血 was a part of the sacrifice, but we need more inscriptions with the similar pattern to support that.

2. There are few occurrences of this character *zhēn* 贞 “to test.”

The following are from the rest of the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions: 甲, 乙 (H11:13), 丙 (H11:10), 丁 (H3[2]:1), 戊 (H11:84), 己 (H11:112), and 庚 (H11:174), while the Shang style is either 甲 or 乙, or the *bu* 卜 grapheme appearing on the top of every grapheme 甲 or 乙. *ding* 鼎

---


“cauldron” in the Zhou form. There are two possible explanations for this way of writing 貞. It is possible that this new style of zhen 貞 is a hewen 合文, so the 貞 in the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions should be viewed as two separate words, bu 卜 and zhen 貞/贞, and each should be read independently. Or it is even possible that this is a new style of zhen, and since this style is only found among the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions and also in two Zhou bronze-inscription examples (_formatter: from San pan 散盘 and 貞 from the Chongzi ding 沣子鼎), it is likely that writing “zhen” with the additional bu 卜 grapheme is a feature of the Zhou written language.

In the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions, there are two styles of this character: 卦 and 卦. It is interesting to note that the appearance of the former on H11:1, H11:84 and H11:112 coincides with the appearance of the Shang ancestors’ names on the same pieces (tongban 同版), while the latter does not.

3. This piece, H11:1, is one of four pieces (the other three being H11:82, H11:84, and H11:112) that have generated much debate as to which Shang or Zhou king the word “wang 王” referred. The debate is primarily generated by the mention of Shang ancestors on these oracle bones (Di Yi 帝乙 and Cheng Tang 成唐 on H11:1, Da Jia 大甲 on H11:84, and Wenwu 文武 on H11:82 and H11:112), so scholars are attempting to determine whether these four pieces were products of the Shang or of the Zhou. Due to the limited nature of the evidence, the following analysis will conclude

---


7There is one occurrence of this character with the bu element (鐵45.2) in the Jiazuwenbian 甲子文編 (3.29/148), so this might just be an accident, but I do not have any explanation for this.

8The term 文武 is incomplete, so we do not know whether it refers to Wen Ding 文丁 or Di Yi 帝乙.
that this piece belonged to Di Xin's 帝辛 period, but the "wang" could refer to either Di Xin or King Wen.9

Let us first examine evidence put forward by the pro-Shang group.10 The first reason is that Ji Li 季历, father of King Wen 文王 of Zhou, was killed by Wen Ding 文丁,11 father of Di Yi 帝乙, so it is difficult to accept that King Wen, having hatred towards the Shang, could make sacrifices to the ancestors of his father's murderer. Secondly, the Zhou and the Shang were two different group of people, because they had different surnames (Zi 子 for the Shang and Ji 姬 for the Zhou), and sacrificing to someone else's ancestors was thus impossible to take place. Why it was considered so is that there are passages in Zuozhuan 佐傳 stating that sacrificing to a spirit who is not one's own ancestor would not benefit the spirit or the worshipper, and the practice was inappropriate, and King Wen thus could not have sacrificed to Shang ancestors: "鬼神非其族類, 不歆其祀" (Spirits do not accept the sacrifices of those who are not of their own line)12 and "神不歆非類, 民不祀非族" (The Spirits of the dead do not enjoy the sacrifices of those who are not of their kindred, and that people only sacrifice to those who were of the same ancestry as themselves).13 There

9 Appendix Two of this thesis primarily deals with who produced these four pieces and also who wrote the inscriptions, so I will only concentrate on which king the wang referred to in this chapter.

10 As I stated earlier on p.2, there are three groups: Shang origin (without indicating who wrote the inscriptions), Zhou origin, and Shang origin with the inscriptions written by the Zhou specialists working in the Shang court. Since there are numerous arguments, it is impossible to list all the arguments in this chapter. Cf. Chapter Three for the individual argument.

11 Xu Wenjing 徐文靖, Zhushu linian Tongjian 竹書紀年統箋 (Reprint, Taipei: Yiwen yinshuguan 藝文印書館, 1966), 270.


13 Ibid., 104/僖 10/附; Legge, 1: 157. The italics are Legge's.
is also one passage in the twelfth year of Duke Xiang 襄公 in the Zuozhuan stating that one’s lineage and surname governed one’s position during the funeral, “凡諸侯之喪,異姓臨于外,同姓於宗廟,同宗於祖廟,同族於祖廟”14

On occasion of the decease of any prince, if he were of a different surname from the duke, he was wailed for outside on the city wall. If he were of the same surname, the wailing took place in the ancestral (i.e., the Chow) temple; if he were descended from the same individual who bore the surname, in the temple of that [common] ancestor; if he were of some common branch family from that ancestor, in the paternal temple.15

According to this passage, a feudal lord with a different surname could not enter another feudal lord’s temple for mourning. Therefore, based on these pieces of evidence, King Wen, who had a different surname from the Shang royalty and had hatred towards the Shang, could not have sacrificed to any Shang ancestor or even enter a Shang temple to carry out such a service. But there are several questions which can not be ignored. First, although these passages from the Zuozhuan indicate that sacrificing to others’ ancestors was inappropriate, that does not mean that such practice was prohibited--King Wen could still sacrifice to Shang ancestors. We can argue that what happened in the Spring-Autumn period belonged to a different time and government; King Wen’s time was around 274 or 278 years earlier,16 and it was still during the Shang dynasty--with its

14 Zuozhuan HY 275/襄12/4左.

15 Legge, the Ch’un Ts’ew, 2: 455. The brackets and parenthesis are Legge’s.

16 The exact time of beginning and the end of the Shang and the Zhou dynasties are still problematic, and there are no affirmative periods of reigns for the kings in these periods, either. I derive the numbers from Shaughnessy’s Proposed Chronology of the Western Zhou Dynasty in his Sources of Western Zhou History (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1991), xix. Shaughnessy states that King Wu took over from King Wen in either 1049 or 1045, and King You, the last king of Western Zhou, died in 771, so the period between King Wen’s time and beginning of the
different customs and government—so it was possible for King Wen to
carry out the sacrifices. There is an interesting passage in the “Kanggao”康
詔 Chapter of the Book of Documents stating, “...紹聞衣德言,往敷求于殷
先哲王,用保乂民.汝丕遠惟商育大人,宅心知訓”

... do you carry out his virtuous words which you have heard, and
clothe yourself with them. Moreover, when you go, seek out
extensively among the traces of the former wise kings of Yin, what
you may use in protecting and regulating their people. Again, you
must more remotely study the old accomplished men of Shang, that
you may establish your heart, and know how to instruct the
people.\textsuperscript{17}

This passage clearly indicates that although the Zhou vanquished the
Shang, the Zhou king still respected the Shang virtuous ancestors and wise
men, and would seek their wisdom to govern. Then, it became possible for
King Wen to sacrifice to these virtuous Shang ancestors, including Cheng
Tang, for advice. Also, King Wen had a share of the Shang royal bloodline,
as pointed out by Shaughnessy, a pro-Zhou scholar, using evidence from
the \Book of Poetry, “摚仲氏任,自彼殷裔” (Jin, the second of the princesses
of Che, [f]rom [the domain of] Yin-shang),\textsuperscript{18} depicting the wife of Jili 季歷
as coming from the Shang—King Wen was thus related to the Shang royalty
and could sacrifice to his maternal ancestors. Furthermore, there is also a
line in the “Guimei”歸妹 section in the \Zhouyi 周易, “帝乙歸妹” (Di Yi
sends his daughter in marriage),\textsuperscript{19} indicating that it was a marriage
between Di Yi’s daughter and King Wen in Shaughnessy’s opinion, so Wen

\footnotesize{Spring-Autumn period is either 278 years or 274 years.}

\textsuperscript{17}\textit{SSTI} 29/0173; Legge, \textit{the Chinese Classics}, vol.3, \textit{the Shoo King, or the Book
of Historical Documents} (London: Trübner & Co., 1865), 386. The italics are Legge’s.

\textsuperscript{18}\textit{Shijing HY} 59/236; Legge, \textit{the Chinese Classics}, vol. 4, \textit{the She King, or the

\textsuperscript{19}\textit{Yijing HY} 33/54/五; Edward Shaughnessy, “Zhouyuan Oracle-Bone
Inscriptions: Are They Entering the Research Stage?,” 162.
Ding was King Wen’s maternal grandfather, and Di Yi was his father-in-law. Then, why could King Wen not sacrifice to Shang ancestors, and in this case, to Cheng Tang? In connection to this, there also comes a question of whether during the Shang period, there was any custom of sacrificing to one’s maternal ancestors (if they made such a distinction between the paternal and maternal ancestries, and in this case, Cheng Tang was King Wen’s maternal ancestor), and if there was, was it strictly a Shang custom, or a widespread custom in the region? But again we do not have answers for these questions. On the other hand, the general theory put forward by the pro-Zhou group is that since these inscriptions were inscribed by Zhou specialists, the kings on all four pieces referred to the Zhou king, King Wen. However, we must realize that the king on this piece could equally refer to Di Xin, son of Di Yi, and it was possible that the fleeing Shang officials brought this piece to Zhouyuan, and we can not discount that possibility.

In the Shiji, King Wu went to a Shang temple to receive the mandate to govern after he had conquered the Shang, and in Tian Changwu’s opinion, the “king” on H11:1 referred to King Wu. However, that passage does not detail any sacrificial event carried out by King Wu; neither is there any such description in the Book of Documents nor in the Bamboo Annals, so Tian’s idea can not stand.

The answer to who the king was on this piece can not be easily determined. However, since the sacrifice was carried out in Di Yi’s temple, the king had to be contemporary with Di Xin’s time, so it could be Di Xin or

---


King Wen.

4. The character qi has been a problem for scholars in the oracle-bone studies, because qi seems to have more than one function and meaning when we study its usages in the oracle-bone inscriptions and the classics. Joining the debate is Takashima's recent article on the function and the meaning of qi in the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions. He proposes that the functions of qi are threefold: a modal particle, an aspectual particle, and a conveyance of presupposition of the charges. As a modal particle it can move along one of the three scales: "possibility/certainty," "wish/intention," and "necessity/obligation." If the following verb is uncontrollable, qi moves on the "possibility/certainty" scale; otherwise, the "intention/wish" or "necessity/obligation" scale. At the same time, qi also functions as an aspectual particle, indicating some contemplated action or event is or is not going to take place at some future point. Its appearance also involves the theory of presupposition of the diviners and the theory of the desirable-right and the undesirable-left placement of the charges (cf. p.6). When the diviners cast the charges, they had certain presuppositions, such that the statements on the desirable-right side would be materialized, while those on the undesirable-left side would not, and qi in either charge reflects such an underlying presupposition.

On this piece, the verb (血) following qi is controllable, because it is a verb for sacrifice, and conducting a sacrifice is humanly controllable, so qi moves most likely on along the "intention/wish" scale, and at the same

---

23 Ken-ichi Takashima, "The Modal and Aspectual Particle Qi in Shang Chinese," Papers of the First International Congress on Pre-Qin Chinese Grammar held in University of Zurich, Switzerland 21-25 February 1994, ed. Robert H. Gassman and He Leshi (Changsha, Hunan: Yuela shushe, 1994), 479-565. Due to the limited nature of this chapter, I can only present my summary of Takashima's article on qi in this section; the readers are referred to Appendix Two of my thesis for a detailed examination of Takashima's article.
time it also carries the aspectual meaning of “to be going to,” indicating the future. Although on this piece there is only one charge, and we do not know whether it is located on the desirable-right side or the undesirable-left side; however, we can determine the desirability of this charge by examining the content of the charge. The statement “田有正” (these are correct) reflects the presupposition of the diviner that the sacrificial activity proposed would be correct and the charge itself would unfold all in a proper fashion. Therefore, this charge with qi  was considered desirable.

5. Many scholars have proposed a definition for this word, and there does not seem to be an overall agreement. Some say that it is zhao 昭 “to respect” or a type of sacrifice, shao 尉 “to continue,” or even yu 禁 “exorcism ritual.”24 This character can only be properly analyzed if a similar character can be discovered, and the photography of this piece is reproduced in a better quality.

6. This character is ji 崇 “to sacrifice; a sacrifice,” showing what is perhaps a person before an altar. In the Shang inscriptions, the same

24Lian Shaoming 連邵名, “Du Zhouyuan Chutu de Jiagu Keci” 周原出土的甲骨刻辭, Guwenzi Yanjiu 古文字研究 13 (1986): 163 says that “西周甲骨文及銅器銘文中昭, 明, 盟, 龟等字的用法與殷墟卜辭中的「賀」字相同” (Zhao 昭, ming 明, meng 盟, gong 龟 and other words in the Western Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions and the bronze inscriptions have the same usage as the word bin 賀 in the Yinxu inscriptions); after some examples, he continues to say, “「賀」者, 敬也” (“Bin” meant “to respect”) (ibid.), and he concludes, “西周卜辭中的昭字, 含義與用法都與殷墟卜辭中的賀字相同” (Therefore, the word zhao in the Western Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions had the same definition and usage as the word bin in the Yinxu oracle-bone inscriptions) (164). Xu Xitai 徐錫泰, Zhouyuan Jiaguwen Zongshu 周原甲骨文綜述 (N.p.: Sanqin chubanshe 三秦出版社, 1987), 12 suggests “「賀」卽邵字, 適昭字. 關於祭名” (“Shao” is shao, and is interchangeable with zhao. It belongs to a ritual [=it is a ritual]). Sun Binlai 孫斌來, “Dui Lianpian Zhouyuan Buci de Shidu—Jianlu Xibo Changchengwang de Xenti” 對兩篇周原卜辭的釋讀—兼論西伯昌稱王的問題, Kaogu yu Wenwu 考古與文物 2 (1986): 62 suggests that “shao” is defined in SW, “Shao means ‘to continue.’”, and finally, Zhang Congdong 張聰東, “Zhouyuan Buci Shishibian Jianlun Qilaiyuan” 周原卜辭試釋兼論其來源, photocopy of ms., Frankfurt University, Germany, p. 2 states that this word has two meanings; one is to exorcise against ghosts’ or ancestors’ curses, and one is to defend against foreign assault.
character is written as \( \text{Heji 1652} \) and \( \text{Heji 22220} \), showing a hand holding a piece of meat or a hand raised before the ancestral tablet or altar. The Zhou style on this piece is similar to the latter form, except that there is a vertical line attached to the right of the “hand” element, making the whole character look like a person raising his hand in front of the ancestral tablet.

7. This character \( \text{shang} \) consists of the grapheme \( \text{ding} \) at the bottom, with some lines above it. In the Shang inscriptions, this same character is written as \( \text{ding} \), \( \text{ding} \), or \( \text{ding} \), with the first two showing the graphemes of a meat stand and a tripod, and the third graph showing a spoon-knife instead of a meat stand.

In the “Shihunli” Chapter of \( \text{Yili} \) 奠禮, it says, “舉鼎，入陳于阼階南，西南匕俎從設” (The tripod was raised, brought in, and placed to the south of the stairs [where the host was standing]; at the southwest the spoon-knife and the meat stand were followed and were [thus] placed).

Zheng Xuan 鄭玄 comments on this by stating, “匕所以別出牲體也，俎所以載也.” (The spoon-knife was used to split and to scoop the bodies of sacrificial victims. The meat stand was used to place [them]). Wang Guowei 王國維 proposes that having a knife and meat in a tripod represents the sense of “to offer,” so this word thus has the meaning of “to offer,” and the tripod was thus named “shang”; it is not that there is another type of tripod named \( \text{shang} \).

---


26ibid. The following translation is mine.

The same meaning is expressed by the word *jiang* 將 in the Book of Poetry; for example, in the second stanza of “Chuci” 楚茨 in the “Xiaoya” 小雅 Section, “或肆或將” (Some arranged [the meat]; some adjusted [the piece of it]), and in “Wojiang” 我將 in the “Zhou Song” 周頌 Section, “我將我享” (We presented our offerings). In these two examples, it functions as a verb, meaning “to offer, present.” For the first example, Ling Tingkan (1757-1809), whose explanation is clearer than Zheng Xuan’s 鄭玄, states, “第二章云：或剝或亨，或肆或將。案少牢上篇：司馬剝牛，司士擊豕，所謂「剝」也。熟牲蓇於雍餮，所謂「亨」也；升牲蓇於鼎，即詩所謂「肆」也；載牲蓇於俎即所謂「將」也；皆言正祭禮也” (Chapter Two says, “Some bo [them] and some heng [them]; some si [them] and some jiang [them].” The first chapter of “Shaolao” Section says, “Sima slaughters the cattle and Sishi strikes the pigs,” and this is called “bo.” Cooking the sacrificial victims in the cooking stove is called “heng.” Lifting the animal bodies from the tripod is called ‘si’ in the Book of Poetry. Putting the sacrifices on the meat stand is called “jiang.” All these are said to be correct rituals). What Ling considers is that 將 represented the action of carrying the victim’s body on meat stands during the ritual, and the tripod that was involved was thus called “shang.”

Based on these examples, the meaning of this word is “to offer food that is prepared in the shang tripod,” and this may explain the presence of the graphemes of meat stand, knife, and meat: to offer on the meat stand.

---

28 Shijing HY 5/209/2; Legge, 2:369.
29 Ibid., 74/272. The translation is mine.
the meat that is cooked in a tripod, with the knife grapheme suggesting the action of raising the meat onto the meat stand in readiness for offering. The following are some examples of this character in the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions:

(1) 鬲兹祖丁鼐受祐 27288
It should be this Ancestor Ding [to whom we] offer [the food] and we will receive blessings.

(2) 尋鼐隹伊受祐 Ibid.
[We will] hold the xie ritual [with] offering [food], and it is Yi who receives the blessings.

8. This character is si 宙 (=思/斯) “an introductory particle” (發語詞). There are some scholars who consider this character same as 西 xi 西 “west.” But by observing the usages of 西 and 西 in the inscriptions, we can see that 西 graph is not 西. The following are examples for 西:

(1) 甲午卜噩貞西土受年. 9743正
Divined on the jiawu day, X tested: the western land will receive harvest.

(2) ...西貞王噩西方征. 33093
Divined on x-you day: it should be the western country that the king rectifies.

(3) 西方受禾. 33244
The west country will receive crops.

The character 西 in the examples above is written either as 西, 西, or 西.

---

For example, Xu Zhongshu, “Zhouyuan Jiagu Chulun” 周原甲骨初論, Sichuan Daxue Xuebao Congkan 四川大學學報叢刊 10 (1982): 5, simply transcribes this graph to xi, and does not give any reason for doing so. Also, Xu Xitai, “Zhouyuan Buci Shipian Xuanshi ji Duandai” 周原卜辭選釋及斷代, Guwenzi Yanjiu 古文字研究 6 (1981): 404 takes this graph as 西 (xi 西), but later (p.407) takes the same graph as si 宙.
and none of them is in any way written as 坨 (si). In the following are examples of 坨:

(4) ...写御三宰周妣庚.
... [we will] exorcise with three penned sheep to Ancestress Geng of Zhou(?)

(5) 乙卯卜由御用.
Divined on the yimao day: [we] will perform the exorcism ritual. (This charge was) used.

(6) 用危方由于妣庚王賓.
[We] will use Weifang to Ancestress Geng [whom] the king will treat as a guest.

(7) 羲方由其用王受有祐.
[It is] Qiangfang [whom we] will be going to use [in the sacrifice and] the king will receive abundant blessings.

Si 坨 in these four examples is written as 镜 or 鏏; none of them is written as 鑼 or any graph that is similar to this one, so 镜 is not a character for 西; besides, if we attempted to transcribe 镜 in Example (4) to (7) as 西, these examples would have odd meanings. Therefore, 镜 and 鑼 are two distinct characters, with the former being 坨 and the latter being 西.

Now that we know that the bone form of 西 and 坨 are different, how could 坨 be either 坨 or 西? There are also many occurrences of this character in the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions, and one in the bronze inscriptions, as in the following instances:

(8) ...祠自裔于夏由亡鲁.
... ancestral shrine from Hao to Zhu, and [there] will be without

32For example, the meaning of Example (7) would become, “It is Qiangfang [whom the west?] will use, and the king will receive abundant blessings.”
calamities.

(9) 曰呉田克事. Announce: “You will accomplish the affair.”

(10) 未亡咎. ... [there] will be without disasters.

(11) 小告于天未亡咎. ... small announcement ceremony to the Heaven, and [there] will be without disasters.

(12) 田正 (=足?) ...受有祐. ... [it] will be correct (=sufficient?) ... will receive abundant blessings.

(13) 詢其萬田年, 子子孫孫永寶用. ... Xun’s tens of thousands of years(?), and the sons and grandsons will forever valuably use [the vessel].

Based on these examples, we can see that si 田 appears before a verb like yu 御 “to exorcise” in Example (4) or ke 克 “to accomplish” in Example (9), or a verb phrase 其用 “will be going to use” in Example (7); before a prepositional phrase 于妣庚 “to Ancestress Geng” in Example (6); before a noun like 年 “year” in Example (13) and 御 in (5), and before other phrases like 亡咎 “without disasters,” 正 “correct,” and 亡咎 “without calamities.”

Based on these structures, 田 seems to introduce a contrastive item. For example, in Example (6), it appears before “于妣庚,” so the focus was to give the sacrifice to Ancestress Geng, not other ancestresses. In Example (10), the focus is on “without disasters” after they had carried out a certain activity. In Example (13), the focus is on the noun “year,” so Xu, the owner of this vessel, would be doing something metaphorically for thousands of

---

33Li and Wang, 250.
years (unfortunately, the verb is not inscribed), and because of this example, 田 could not be other than a particle, and nor could it be 西 (the term 西年 [western year] is a strange expression). Li and Wang point out that “其萬年” in Example (13) is the same as “於萬年” “for ten thousands of years” in the Book of Poetry, so 田 is思 or 斯。34 One interesting thing is that expressions like “亡咎,” “正,” and “亡省” are, as Li and Shaughnessy suggest, statements of diviners’ desires requested towards the spirits, so they are not questions as we normally see them.35

2.3 H11:3

衣[=殷] 王 田 至 于 帛 3 王 佳 4 田.

The Yi[=Yin] king will hunt until [he reaches] Bo, and the king will hunt.

Fig. 4. P.290.

34Li and Wang, 251.
1. This character is yi 衣, which is usually interpreted to stand for the word yin 殷 “another name for the Shang” by phonetic resemblance (*jər for 衣 and *jən for 殷) or “large.” In some classics the Shang dynasty is referred to as the “Yin” by the Zhou people, as in the “Kanggao” 康誥 Chapter of the Book of Documents, “天乃大命文王殪攸殷” (the Heaven then greatly commanded King Wen to destroy the Great Yin [=Shang]), and in the “Jiugao” 酒誥 Chapter, there is “今惟殷墾厥命” (now it is Yin [=Shang] that has lost its mandate). We also have “殷[=商]篡子” (Jizi of Yin [=Shang]) on the Zhou oracle bone H31:2, showing again how the Zhou people referred to the Shang people.

As I stated earlier, 殷 could also have the meaning of da 大, as defined in the “Shiyan” 釋言 Chapter of Erva, “眾也盛也大也多也”38 (“numerous,” “abundant,” “large; great,” “many”). However, in this sentence, 殷 has to mean “Yin,” not “great,” as we can exemplify from the Book of Documents:

(1) 自成湯至于帝乙,罔不明德恤祀,亦惟天丕建,保乂有殷,殷王亦罔敢失帝....39

From T’ang the Successful down to the emperor Yih, every sovereign sought to make his virtue illustrious, and duly attended to the sacrifices. And thus it was that while Heaven exerted a great establishing influence, preserving and regulating the house of Yin, its sovereigns on their part were

36SST 29/0121. The following translation is mine.
37Ibid., 30/0526. The following translation is mine.
39SST 34/0174.
humbly careful not to lose the favour of God . . . .

(2) 周公曰: 自殷王中宗及高宗及祖甲及我周文王兹四人迪哲。The Duke of Chow said, “Oh! those kings of Yin, Chung-tsung, Kaou-tsung, and Tsoo-kea, with king Wan of our Chow, -- these four men carried their knowledge into practice.”

These two examples clearly indicate that the word yin cannot be the adjective “great,” especially in the second example in which 殷王 and 周王 form a contrast, again demonstrating that yin has to be the other name of the Shang dynasty, and that it is used in such a way by the Zhou.

2. The term “Yinwang” is the reference to the Shang king, so the “wang” referred to a Shang king, but which king in particular was it referring to? Among all the articles and books on the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions, there are two scholars, Xu Xitai and Wang Yuxin, who have studied the problem of references with the word “wang” on each Zhou oracle-bone inscription. Xu marks the boundaries of these Zhouyuan oracle bones with the artifacts from the same pits. He states that the artifacts (乳形袋足鬲, 素面磨光黑色盆, and 尊殘陶片) from the pits H11 and H31 came from the early Zhou period. The vessel, 乳形袋足鬲, is similar to ones that were discovered in the ruins of Keshengzhuang 克省莊, Changan 長安 County, and also in the pit numbered 11 in Mawangcun 马王村 (both places are in Shaanxi 陝西), and this type of li belonged to King Wen’s late period to King Wu’s early period; also, the black basin 素面磨光黑色盆 is a fragment of pottery jar.

---

40Legge, 2: 456-457.
41SSTI 35/0481.
42Legge, 2: 472.
43Xu Xitai, Zhongyuan liaguwen Zongshu 周原甲骨文綜述 (N.p.: Sanqin chubanshe 三秦出版社, 1987), 8. 乳形袋足鬲 is a li-typed vessel with sac-like legs. 素面磨光黑色盆 is a black basin without any pattern on the surface, and 尊殘陶片 is a fragment of pottery jar.
is considered to be an early Zhou (早周) item.\textsuperscript{44} Therefore, he concludes that the oracle bones from these two pits can be divided into two periods: from Ji Li’s late period to King Wen’s mid period, and from King Wen’s later period to the Duke of Zhou’s 周公 regency period,\textsuperscript{45} that is, from the period of Ji Li to that of the Duke of Zhou.

Xu divides the styles of “wang” in the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions as in the following list:

Type Ia, \( \textcircled{1} \); Ji Li’s late period/King Wen’s early period, or the Shang Third and Fourth periods (=Lin Xin 稲辛, Kang Ding 康丁, Wu Yi 武乙). Includes: H11:3, H11:11, H11:113, H11:134, H11:261, and \textit{Caiji} 採集 94.\textsuperscript{46}

Type Ib, \( \textcircled{2} \); King Wen’s early to mid periods. Includes: H11:80, H11:133, and H11:136.

Type II, \( \textcircled{3} \); King Wen’s mid period, or Wenwu Ding 文武丁 and Di Yi’s periods.\textsuperscript{47}

Type III, \( \textcircled{4} \); Di Xin, or King Wen’s late and King Wu’s early periods. Includes: H11:1, H11:38, H11:48, H11:82 and NH1[3]:1.

The difference between Type Ib and Type II is that in Type Ib, “there is a split from the middle of the second horizontal line and touches the third horizontal line,” and in the Type II, “near the spot where the vertical line touches the bottom line, the vertical line has a tiny split that also touches

\textsuperscript{44}\textit{Ibid.}, 171.

\textsuperscript{45}\textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{46}The list here summarizes Xu’s conclusion on p.155 and the table “Qishan Fengchucun yu Fufeng Qijiacun Xizhou Jiaguwen zhu ‘wang’ zixing” 峇山鳳雞村與扶風齊家村西周甲骨文諸“王”字型 on the following pages in his book.

\textsuperscript{47}The “wang” on the oracle bones in this category do not constitute part of this chapter, mainly because the inscriptions on these pieces do not contribute any useful information, and some of the “wang”s are written differently in Wang’s and Xu’s books, so they are not listed here.
the bottom line.”48 In Xu’s theory, the style of “wang” on H11:3 belongs to his Type Ia and is similar to the ones on Yicun 104 (_KHR) and Jia 甲 426 (_KHR), both of which belonged to Shang’s Period Three and Four, or Ji Li’s late period to King Wen’s early period.49 By examining the content of the inscriptions, Xu states that this piece probably recorded Wu Yi’s hunting in the vicinity of the Yellow River and the Wei River.50 Xu may be correct to put this piece in that period (and thus including other pieces with this style of “wang”), because at that time, the Shang was still in power, and the Zhou could still refer to the Shang ruler with the term “Yinwang.”

Another major study on the periodizations of “wang” is by Wang Yuxin in the last section of Chapter Three and the whole of Chapter Four in his Xizhou Jiagu Tanlun. Here is the summary list of his periodizations:

- Type Ia, ᵃ, King Wen’s pre-mandated period, but the “king” referred to Di Yi or Di Xin. Includes: H11:1 and H11:82.51
- Type Ib, ᵃ, King Wen’s pre-mandated period, but the “king” referred to King Wen himself. Includes: H11:38 and H11:48.
- Type IIa, ᵄ, King Wen’s mandate period.52
- Type IIb, ᵄ, King Wen’s mandate period. Includes: H11:80 and H11:136.

48 Xu, Xizhou Jiaguwen, 155. In Xu’s original words, he says, “從第二橫中間分叉, 交於略斜的第三橫” for Type Ib and “與第三橫交差處微有分叉” for Type II.
49 Ibid.
50 Ibid., 160.
51 The list is comprised of the Wang’s studies in the last section of Chapter Three and the whole Chapter Four of his book.
52 I do not list any oracle bone here for the same reason I gave in fn.47.
Type IV, 鉅, King Zhao and Mu. Includes: NH1[3]:1 and Caiji 94. Wang states that the pit H11 is below the 3B, a stratum of soil from the late Western Zhou period, so H11 should be earlier than that period, implying that the oracle bones from H11 should also be earlier than that period. For the period of H11:3, Wang suggests that the style of “wang” is similar to the one on H11:132, so they should belong to the same period. He proposes that the king on H11:132 referred to King Cheng, because the event on H11:132 might have referred to the same event that was also recorded on a Zhou bronze vessel Ran fangding，in which is recorded the Duke of Zhou's return from an expedition. The event happened in King Cheng's time, so the king on H11:132 might refer to King Cheng. Since the style of “wang” on H11:3 is similar to that on H11:132, H11:3 should also belong to the same period.

The styles of “wang” on these two pieces are similar, so there is no doubt that both pieces can be considered from the same period, but whether the event recorded on H11:132 was the same as the one on Ran fangding is questionable. The reason is that the last two characters on H11:132 are not clear enough to be deciphered; besides, these two characters are not even written in the same way in both Wang's and Xu's books. Furthermore, there is the term “Yinwang” on H11:3 which could not occur during the periods of King Cheng or even Kang, since the Shang was already destroyed, and there was no Shang king in that period, so this piece and other pieces with this style of “wang” should come from the time when the Shang was still in power. In any event, Xu's theory of putting

53Wang, Xizhou jiagu Tanlun, 190-191.
54The illustrations of H11:132 are on p.70 in this chapter.
55Wang, Xizhou jiagu Tanlun, 191.
this style in the pre-Zhou period is more appropriate than Wang's theory, and hence, all the pieces with this style should at least be considered from the same period.

Unfortunately, there is a theory that can render the above archaeological evidence useless. Chen Quanfang states that the artifacts and the oracle bones from H11 were mixed with red burnt soil and grayish-brown soil, both of which exist in the upper strata closer to the ground, and are hence later in time than the pits; besides, the artifacts were placed in random order in the pit, so he suspects that the pit was dug after the palace was abandoned, which could explain the existence of soil from the upper strata. Actually, the first person who brought up this idea was Yin Shengping in 1981, who described that the majority of these oracle bones were burnt to a greenish gray colour; based on the view of the palace ruins, the building was also destroyed by fire. Yin states that oracle bones and some clam-like sticks were probably also burnt at the same time, and were thrown into the pit after the palace was destroyed. If Yin and Cheng are correct, that means that these artifacts, though they were found together with the oracle bones, were not from the same period as these oracle bones. Thus these artifacts, though dated from the pre-Zhou and early Zhou periods, could not be used as evidence for marking the periods of these oracle bones, and Xu Xitai's and Wang Yuxin's periodizations have lost much of their foundation. This also means that we have to periodize based only on the inscriptions themselves, especially

____________________


with the style of "wang" since there are hardly any other characters that appear as frequently as "wang"; besides, we do not know the periods of styles of these characters, so it is impossible to periodize based on other characters.  

There is also one important question: could there be only one style of "wang" in one period, or was it possible to have more styles in the same period? Shaughnessy suggests that it is possible for the latter to exist because in the bronze inscriptions, there are bronze vessels that are considered to be in the same period but have different styles of wang; also, on two vessels (e.g., He zun 高尊 and Zhe zun 折尊), the styles of two "wang"s on each vessel are not the same. In other words, it is possible to have more than one style of a single character existing in the same period, and one must keep that in mind when periodizing these Zhou oracle bones.

3. There are several proposals regarding the whereabouts of Bo. In the "Shicao" Chapter of Erya 經雅, it states, “帛似帛, 布似布, 華山有之” (Silk is similar to the silk-like bo plant, and fabric is similar to the cloth-like bu plant; it exists in Mount Hua), and Guo Pu 郭璞 comments upon this by stating, “草葉有象布帛者,因以名云, 生華山中” (Of the grass and leaves there are these plants resembling silk and cloth, based on which they are named; they grow in Mount Hua).

Another theory is based on the Shuijingzhu 水經注, “陳留風俗傳曰:

---

58 Wang Yuxin, Xizhou Jiagu Tanlun, 243.
59 Shaughnessy, "Zhouyuan," 152-153. Shaughnessy makes a list of different styles of the character "wang" from various bronze vessels on p.153 in his article to support his theory.
60 Hao Yixing, 414: 70.
(In Chen Liu’s *Commentaries on Customs* it says, “In the Fugou County there are Bo Village and Bo Pavilion”), and Bo Village is about eight to nine hundred kilometers away from Zhouyuan. However, this theory is not probable, since this Bo is too far away from Zhouyuan. There is also Shima Kunio who suggests that Bo was located eight days from 亜 and one day from 亜, as one can see in the following map:

---

61 *Shuijingzhu HY* 22/38a.
Fig. 5. Locations of Different States in the Shang period. Source: Shima Kunio 島邦男, Inkyo Bokuji Kenkyū 殷墟卜辭研究 (Hirosaki: Chūgokugaku Kenkyūkai 中國學研究會, 1958), 383.
Based on this map, Bo is located in Jiangsu province, and this again is too far away from Zhouyuan, so this Bo could not be the Bo in this charge.

It has also been theorized that Bo is the river Baishui, originating northeast of Yao County, Shaanxi, and flowing eastwards through Dali County (now Dali County in the same province) to the northeast of Baishui County where it then enters the Yellow River.

Among all these theories, it was possible that Bo could be near Mount Hua, which is about 180 kilometers from Zhouyuan; or it is also possible that Bo is the Baishui river because of the phonological similarity (*brwak for both characters), and this river is about 163 kilometers from Zhouyuan.

4. This character depicts a short-tailed bird with three short lines protruding out of the vertical line, | . There are many suggestions as to what this character stands for. Yan Yiping, Li Xueqin and Wang Yuxin all state that it is *wei, an emphatic particle that appears many times in the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions, and in the bronze inscriptions, and Xu Xitai says that it is *huo “to catch.” This character could not be *huo because the Shang oracle-bone form for this word is usually written as or , depicting a “hand” element below the “bird” element, while the grapheme below the “bird” grapheme is , resembling the “foot” of a bird. There are also some styles of *wei written as , showing the “foot”

---

65 Yan Yiping, 163. Li Xueqin and Wang Yuxin, 252.
67 The oracle-bone form is taken from Sun Haipo, Jiaguwenbian 甲骨文編 (Reprint, Taibie: Dahua shuju 大化書局, 1982), 4.8/172, and the bronze form is taken from Rong Geng, 4.10/201.
grapheme, so this Zhou form should be considered as \textit{wei}佳.

2.4 H11:11

... 己王其乎更卌 (厥)父陟... 

[On the \textit{x}-si] day, the king will be going to call upon Geng with his father to ascend...

1. The style is similar to the one on H11:3, so it too belongs to Xu's Type la, and thus belonged to the Shang Periods Three to Four, or Ji Li's late period to King Wen's early period.

2. Graphically this character, \textit{}, consists of two graphemes of \textit{bing} 丙, and beneath them is one hand holding a club. Among the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions, this character is usually written as \textit{}, showing one grapheme of \textit{bing} 丙 (e.g., Heji 10380, 10951, 10952, 18673, and 20118), while the same character in the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions, as well as in the Zhou bronze inscriptions, is written with two graphemes of \textit{bing} 丙.
revealing that the Zhou people wrote the same character differently from the Shang, and writing this character with two graphemes of "bing" is a feature of Zhou written language. In this sentence it functions as a proper noun, a personal name. My reason is that it appears following the verb "hu" "to call upon"; this verb may be followed by a noun which is the agent of the subsequent verb phrase, so this word "geng" functions as a noun.

There are not many examples of this character in the Heji, and in the following are the three that clearly show that "geng" is used as a noun:

1. 秉午卜更陷擒. 允擒二 ... 二月. 10951
   Divined on the wuwu day: Geng will set traps to catch. He indeed caught two ... [in] the second month.

2. 秉午卜更陷弗其擒.  Ibid.
   Divined on the wuwu day: Geng will set traps [but] might not be going to catch.

3. 丁酉卜更來 ... 尋弗其在 .... 19361
   Divined on the gengyou day: Geng [will] come ... the pigs might not exist in ....

3. Graphically this character shows a ladder on the left, and two graphemes "foot" on the right, suggesting the action of climbing. One could say that this word means "to climb; to ascend" in the Book of Poetry ("文王陟降, 在帝左右" [King Wen ascended and descended at the Di's left and right]) and the Book of Documents ("亦越成湯陟, 丕釐上帝之勑命" [After him [=Jie 桀] there was T'ang the Successful, who, rising to the throne, greatly administered the bright ordinance of God]).

\[68\] Shijing HY 58/235/1.  
\[69\] SSTI 39/0135.  
\[70\] Legge, 2: 512. The insertion is mine.
one example from the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions in which陟 functions with this meaning:

(1) 壬申卜王陟山 乙酉易日。 20271
Divined on the renshen day: the king will climb the mountain X, and on the guiyou it will be sunny.

2.5 H11:38

王卜... The king divined....

Fig. 7. P.288.

1. In Wang’s opinion, this style belongs to his Type Ib, and thus referred to King Wen and belonged to King Wen’s pre-mandated period, or Period Five of Di Yi and Di Xin. Wang considers this piece belonging to King Wen’s period, because King Wen was called by the title “king,” as described in the Shiji.\(^{71}\) On the other hand, Xu places this in his Type III, Di Xin’s period, or King Wen’s late period to King Wu’s early period.\(^{72}\) Xu’s reason is that the style here is similar to the one on two bronze vessels, Li gui利簋 and Da

---

\(^{71}\)Wang, Xizhou Jiagu Tanlun, 189.

\(^{72}\)Xu, Zhouyuan Jiaguwen Zongshu, 158.
Feng gui, which he believes to be from the late-Shang/early-Zhou period.

After examining the illustrations of the oracle bones that are considered by each scholar to be in the same period as this piece, it is doubtful that the style on this piece is the same as the one on H11:1, H11:82, nor NH1[3]:1 as Xu has put it. The one on H11:1 is $\square$ and $\square$ on H11:82, and the one on NH1[3]:1 is not clear enough to be determined. These two styles on H11: and H11:82 do not have the left tip of the bottom line lower than the line itself, which is shown on this piece ($\square$); but the fact that styles on H11:38 and H11:48 are more similar to the ones on H11:1 and H11:82 than other styles indicates a close relationship between the two styles. So Wang's periodization is slightly more appropriate than Xu's since he creates a sub-type, Ib, for this style, to indicate a close relationship between the two.

2. This sentence is one of several Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions containing the word bu “to divine.” Other Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions having this character are as follows:

(1) ...其乎豜卜曰....
    ... will be going to call upon Bao to divine and to announce ....
    H11:62

(2) ...弗用兹卜.
    ... did not employ this crack.
    H11:65

(3) 在旃爾卜曰南宮誼其乍 (=酢?).
    Divined at Zhan, Er said: Nangong X will be going to make (or: treat with wine?).
    H31:2

(4) 八月辛卯卜曰其 取.  
    In the eighth month, divined on the xinmao day, announce:
    Ibid.

73 Ibid., 155.
“[we] will be going (?).”

(5) 。。卜。。

。。。divined。。。

(6) 王以我牧單馬豕卜。

The king will lead us (or: the Wo) to pasture horses and pigs at Dan, and will divine.

(7) 卜曰其衣車馬田有噼。

[One] divined and announce: “[we] will surely be going to cover(?) the carriage and the horse, and [it] will be X.”

Most examples show the co-occurrences of 卜 and 曰. Since the diviners would “state” the charges to the turtle shells or the scapulas, what appears after the 曰 is the content of the charge. However, since the verb is yue, not zhen 賢 that usually appears in the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions, we do not know whether the charge was verified, tested, or corrected.

2.6 H11:48

王其所乎....

漁(?)魚既吉兹用。

The king will be going to call upon ....

[The king?] will fish(?) fish. It (the crack?) is already auspicious.

[We] used [this crack].

---

74 It is difficult to make out what the last character of this sentence really is. Xu Xitai transcribes it as sha 蒗, a piece of cloth used in carriages to block the wind and the dust (Zhousyuan Jiaguwen Zongshu, 122). Li Xueqin, on the other hand, suggests it to be 蒗, synonym of yu 巖, “to encounter” (“Xizhou Jiagu de Jidian Yanju 西周甲骨的幾點研究,” Wenwu 文物 9 [1981]: 8). One can compare the drawings of this character in Xu Xitai, Zhousyuan Jiaguwen Zongshu, 122, and Wang Yuxin, Xizhou Jiagu Tanlun, 347.
1. Although the character is incomplete, we can still observe its lower half. Based on the illustration, it is similar as that on H11:38, and we can consider it to be from the same period as H11:38. Wang transcribes the bone graph 甲$ as Wei 浦, the Wei River in central China, and he further equates this piece as evidence for King Wen's fishing on the Wei River and meeting Jiang Shang 姜尚; therefore, this style belongs to his Type I, King Wen's period, and the “wang” referred to King Wen.\textsuperscript{75} As my analysis will show in the next section that is not decipherable, Wang's transcription of this character into wei 伟 can not be substantiated. We can only state that the style of “wang” is similar to the previous one, H11:38, and they were possibly from the same period. Xu probably misses this piece, because he does not periodize it.

2. Xu Xitai transcribes this character as sa/xi 酒 “to wash; to sprinkle water onto the ground,” which he equates with xian 銀 “bright, shining metal,” a homophone of xian 鮮 “fresh.” Thus, sayu 酒魚 is also xianyu 鮮

\textsuperscript{75}Wang, Xizhou Jiagu Tanlun, 209.
Xu may be correct because of the *ser, *sen and *ser for 酒 and *sen for 銜). Chen Quanfang, on the other hand, suggests the same character to be wei 濱, standing for the Wei 濱 River in this sentence, and the next character is yu 漁 “to fish.” Thus, in his opinion, this piece of bone records the event when King Wen of Zhou went hunting at the Wei River and encountered Jiang Taigong 姜太公 at the Wei River, as described in the “Qi Taigong Shijia” 齊太公世家 Chapter of the Shiji. It is very interesting to note that this character is also transcribed as wei 鰤 “tuna,” but this theory is not appropriate because tuna is a sea fish. This character is another one of those requiring a better photographic reproduction of the bone, so that the character can be accurately studied.

3. The word ji 既 usually means “already,” so jiji 既吉 means “something is already auspicious,” but Chen Quanfang proposes that it has the same meaning as the term chuji 初吉, a term for one of the lunar phases. His theory is not acceptable because in the bronze inscriptions there are plenty of appearances of the term chuji, with chu being written as 丘 quite different from 既/既. Also, there are no phonological similarities between them (*ts’iay for 初 and *kjar for 既).

---

76 Xu Xitai, Zhouyuan Jiaguwen Zongshu, 44.
79 Chen says, “『既吉』,當與初吉同義” (“Jiji” should have the same meaning as chuji), “Shaanxi Qishan,” 333.
2.7 H11:80

The king will surely be going to Mount Mi and lift . . . .

Fig. 9. P.289.

1. The style shows a short splitting line coming out of the vertical line, and it belongs to Wang’s Type IIb (King Wen’s mandated period). Wang’s reason is that King Wen’s attacking the state of Mi happened two years after he had received the mandate from Di Xin to be the Earl of West (西伯). He further quotes a commentary to the Book of Poetry that states, “文王九十七而終，終時受命九年，則受命之元年八十九也” (King Wen died when he was ninety seven years old. When he died, he had the mandate for nine years; then, the year when he received the mandate was when he was eighty nine years old). He was ninety one years old when he attacked Mi. Wang may be correct because of the historical record. On the other hand, Xu considers it to be his Type Ib (King Wen’s early to mid period), but he could be wrong, because his Type Ib is usually written as 亻, showing the other vertical line coming out of the spot where the main vertical line intersects the second horizontal line, but the one here is not, as we can see from the illustration. Also, Xu transcribes incorrectly as

---

80 Wang, Xizhou Jiagu Tanlun, 216-217.
di (?) 宸, because the graph has two graphemes of ge 戈.

2. Chen Quanfang is the only person who proposes the whereabouts of Mount Mi. There is 密山 in the “Zhongshanjing” 中山經 Chapter of Shanhaijing 山海經 (“又西七十二里，曰密山”) [Also, seventy-two li to the west [there is a mountain] called the Mi Mountain]), and the location of this mountain is described as being in the Xinan 新安 County of Henan 河南. However, another way of locating this mountain is to view it as one of the mountains in the state of Mi, which also appears in H11:136 (Sect. 2.12). In “Huangyi” 皇矣 of the “Daya” Section of the Book of Poetry, there is “密人不恭，敢距大邦” (People of Mi did not respect [us], and dared to resist the Great State). This Mi was in Yinmi 阴密 County in Anding 安定郡, as described in the Hanshu 漢書, and Xu Zhongshu 許仲舒 suggests that Mi is west of Lingtai 靈臺 County, Gansu 甘肅. Therefore, the location of Mount Mi in this sentence is difficult to determine in this case.

3. The top portion of this character is 坐, similar to the grapheme 西 “west” in the oracle-bone inscriptions. There is a similar character in the Jinwenbian 金文, but the top grapheme of this character is 坐, zì 坐. What this character should be is 㝦, “舉也” (to lift/give). Its Small-Seal

[^81]: Lau D.C. 劉殿爵 and Chen Fong Ching 陳方正 eds., Concordances to the Shanhaijing/Mutianzizhuan/Yandanzi 山海經/穆天子傳/于丹子索引. Ancient Chinese Texts Concordance Series 先秦兩漢古籍索引叢刊, Historical works No.9/Historical works No.10/Philosophical works No.11 (Hong Kong: the Commercial Press [Hong Kong] Ltd., 1994), 33.

[^82]: Chen Quanfang, “Zhouyuan Xinchutu Bujia Yanjiu,” 296.

[^83]: Shijing HY 61/241/5. The following translation is mine.


[^85]: Dun Yucai, 3a.36/104.
form is 静, similar to the one in this sentence. There is one example of its usage in the Zuozhuan, “晉人或以廣隊不能進，楚人惎之脫扃”86 (Some people from the Jin had [their] carriages stuck [in the ground], and the people of Chu lifted them and removed the bolts).

2.8 H11:82

...文武...王其即帝...典爵周方伯...田正(足?)亡左5...王受有祐.

...[in the temple of] the Wenwu ... the king will surely be going to hold the shao ritual to Di ... [present] the tablet and will pierce (mock?) the Elder of Zhoufang ... [we] hope that it will be correct (sufficient?) and not go against ... the king will receive abundant blessings.

Fig. 10. P.288.

1. The style here is slightly similar to the one in H11:1, with the top two horizontal lines parallel to each other; the left tip of the third line is slightly raised, and the vertical line goes straight through these lines, so

86 Zuozhuan HY 199 (5). Footnote #5 on the same page states, “惎一作㋡” (Ji惎 is sometimes written as bi睥).
the wang could refer to Di Xin or Di Yi. Moreover, there is also "Zhoufangbo 周方伯" on the same piece, so the references of "wang" and "Zhoufangbo" can not be the same individual, and "wang" referred to Di Yi or Di Xin,\(^{87}\) and "Zhoufangbo" referred to King Wen. The co-occurrences of these two terms suggest that this piece belonged to the Shang court. This theory agrees with Xu’s Type III (Di Xin’s period) and Wang’s Type Ia (Di Yi’s to Di Xin’s periods).

2. This character is zhao 那 (= 昭) written in the same way as in the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions. During the Shang period, this character had several usages, and one was a type of sacrifice:

(1) 乎子命(?)那父乙. 709正
[We will] call upon Zi Ming(?) to hold the zhao ritual to Father Yi.

(2) 貞勿乎子命那父乙. Ibid.
[We] should not call upon Zi Ming to hold the zhao ritual to Father Yi.

(3) 貞乎于命那父乙世反是(?)劉宰. Ibid.
Tested: [we will] call upon Zi Ming to hold the zhao ritual to Father Yi [and?] stabbing captive group(?) and cutting open penned sheep.

In some cases it was also used as a noun, meaning “those invited”:

(4) ...羊什于那若. 32571
... [offer] sheep amounting to twenty to those invited, and [it will] be agreeable.

(5) 甲戌卜燎羊什于那. 35174
Divined on the jaixu day: [we will] burn sheep amounting to

\(^{87}\)Wang, Xizhou Jiagu Tanlun, 211.
twenty to those invited.

The word *zhao* 昭 in the classics is used with the meanings of “graceful; high; excellent.” From these examples we know that *zhao* in the Shang period was sometimes used as a verb of ritual and sometimes as the noun representing those invited, but as to how such ritual was conducted is not clear. Hopefully we can find more examples to clarify its usages.

3. Graphically it depicts a tablet over a mouth or a basket, and it is possible to be either *shan* 刪 “to chop” by Yu Xingwu 于省吾 or *ci* 杞 (=刺) by Takashima, but not *ce* 試 “to inform” in *SW*. If it were *ce* 試, such a definition is inappropriate in the following examples:

(1) 乙卯卜穀貞御婦好于父乙 PageSize14 羊又豕芻十窄.

*Divined on the *yimao* day, Que tested: [we] will hold the exorcism ritual on Lady Hao to Father Yi by chopping sheep and in addition, pigs, and informing about ten penned sheep.

(2) 貞世妣庚十反劉十窄.

*Tested: [we] will inform Ancestress Geng about ten captives and will cut open ten penned sheep.

(3) ..晁噩稱冊世酉方...王從下上若受祐.

*... Zhijia [will] raise a tablet and inform about Gongfang... [if] the king follows, [the spirits] below and above will favour and [the king] will receive blessings.

From the examples above, we are certain of two things. The first point is that when it involves sacrificial victims (as in Examples [1] and [2]), other means of sacrifice (劉 and 豬) are used and sometimes the recipients of the sacrifice are mentioned. Therefore, 賦 should also be a verb of

---

88 Dun Yucai, 5a.28/202. For example, Xu Xitai ("Zhouyuan Chutu Buci Xuanshi," *Kaogu yu Wenwu* 3 [1982]: 63) and Xu Zhongshu ("Zhouyuan Jiagu Chulun," *Sichuan Daxue Xuebao Congkan* 10 [1982]: 6) take 試 as 試, "to announce."
sacrifice, but with a different way of killing the victims. Besides, 輯 and 㗟 are extrovertive verbs, meaning that their direct objects are affected by the actions of these verbs, so 㗟 was probably an extrovertive verb as well.

According to Takashima, the syntactic structure involving 㗟 is as follows:

(A) 㗟 + Indirect Object (Recipient of Sacrifice) + Direct Object (Victims)

(B) 于 + Indirect Object (Recipient of Sacrifice) + 㗟 + Direct Object (Victims) 89

What happens here is that the direct object of 㗟 is affected by such action, and if 㗟 means “to announce,” the direct object becomes the content of “announcement,” and is unaffected by such action, instead of being the “patient” or the receiver of the action of 㗟. 90

The second point is its frequent appearance in the inscriptions with the X-fangs (Examples [3]), who were enemies of the Shang. Also, the term “稱冊” appears, so 㗟 also had the sense of “attacking” in a manner that is similar to the method used in the killing of sacrificial victims. 91


90Takashima, “A Study of the Bone Graph,” 4-5.

91Since the literal meaning of 称冊 is “to raise the tablet,” its usages in the sentences relating to warfare perhaps involve more than just “to raise the tablet,” but more like “to raise a written declaration of war” to declare war.” Yu Xingwu proposes that 㗟 means shu 述 “to inform,” as in the eighth section of the “Jinyu” chapter of the Guoyu 国語, “其知不足稱也. 仏: 称述也.” (“His wisdom is not sufficient [enough] to [be] mentioned. The comment states, ‘Cheng is ‘to inform; to mention.’”). Therefore, Yu considers that 称冊 has the same sense as 冊命, “written command.” Shuangjianchi Yingji Pianzhi Xubian 雙劍誇殷契鵠校續編 (N.p., 1941), 31. Here is one example:

...争貞兹мер稱冊王従伐土方. 　 　Yin 英 545正

... Zheng tested: Zhijia [will] raise the declaration of war (=declare war;
Let us examine Yu Xingwu's "省吾" proposal first. Yu is the first to point out that treating 菱 as 有 is a mistake, since “有 + X-fangs” and “有 + sacrificial victims” can not be “announce to the X-fang” nor “announce the sacrificial victims” respectively, when this verb is “to kill” in a certain manner. He suggests that since 菱 takes ce/*ts’rek 冊 as the phonetic determiner, it should be pronounced in the same way as shan/*sran 删, which, according to his theory, can be glossed as kan 砍 “to chop off.” Yu suggests that 菱 had two different readings, and he takes 菱 as the evidence to show 菱 as 删.

Takashima, on the other hand, takes a phonological approach: the meaning of 菱 is ci/*tsjie 菱 (=刺) “to stab; to pierce through.” There is (刺) 菱 in the oracle bones, and we are able to see that some examples are used in a similar way as 菱:

(4) 庚申卜至婦禰母庚牢束小室.
Divined on the gengshen day: [until we?] reach, the lady will hold the exorcism ritual to Mother Geng [with] penned cattle and stab small penned sheep.

(5) 嫒庚牢束羊豕.
[To] Ancestress Geng penned sheep and stab sheep and pigs.

It is very interesting to note that 刺 never appears with any X-fang, so it was probably not used as a verb of attack.

In some of the classics, however, ci 刺 does not mean “to stab physically” but is used with a different sense: “to stab someone psychologically>to mock; to rebuke”; for example, “是以為刺” ([w]hich

or: read the order from the document?) and the king will follow to attack Tufang.

Yu Xingwu 于省吾, liaguwenzi Shilin 甲骨文字釋林 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju 中華書局, 1979), 173.
makes him a subject for satire),⁹³ and “天何以剌” ([w]hy is it that Heaven is [thus] reproving [you]?).⁹⁴ Although “to mock” and “to rebuke” have different meanings, both of them in essence are to inflict psychological injury. In the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions, there does not seem to be any example in which the leader like 周方伯 is the target of 世, so how exactly was this person “ce-ed” (stabbed, chopped, or mocked) is not certain.

4. Among all the excavated Zhou oracle bones, we can divide the style of this character into two types: 射 and 射. The first type is clearly distinct from the second type in that the former has the additional kou “mouth” element. The oracle bones having the first type are H11:82 and H11:84, and the ones having the second type are H11:31, H11:104, and H11:117. Very interestingly, inscriptions on H11:82 and H11:84 both mention that the “Elder of Zhoufang” would be ce-ed by the Shang king.

These two types of 射 have one thing in common: they do not have dots like their counterparts among the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions.⁹⁵ It might be that having dots is a feature of this character in the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions.

There is a question concerning what this character originally represented graphically. In SW this character is “密也” (compact), and Duan comments upon this by saying, “左傳晏子曰: 清濁, 小大, 短長, 疾徐, 哀樂, 銳柔, 遲速, 高下, 出入, 周疏, 以相濟也”⁹⁶ (In the Zuozhuan, Yanzi

---

⁹³Shijing HY 22/107/2; Legge, 1: 164. The brackets are Legge’s.
⁹⁴Shijing HY, 73/264/5; Legge, 2: 562. The brackets are Legge’s.
⁹⁵Sun Haipo, 43 contains a list of this character in various styles. All of them have dots in them but not the “mouth” grapheme, which is quite a contrast to the occurrences of this character in the Zhou bones, in which none of the forms have the dots -- some forms include the “mouth” grapheme, while some do not.
⁹⁶Dun, 2a.21/58. The sentence quoted from the Zuozhuan is from Zuozhuan HY
says, ‘clear and muddy; small and large; short and long; fast and slow; sad and happy; strong and soft; slow and fast; high and low; out and in; compact and loose; all complement each other). The passage from the Zuozhuan suggests that the word “zhou” in the Spring-Autumn period had already acquired the meaning of “compact.” The earlier meaning of this character could be what Katō Joken 加藤常賢 theorizes, “思うに田にあるものは禾であって，四畫の中に禾が整然とあるのが「茁」の字の意であると思われるから，私は「茁」は「穂」字であると思う”97 (I think that they are grain in the field, and because the orderly placement of grain in the four strokes [=the box] can be considered to have [represented] the [graphic] significance “茁”, I think that “茁” represented the word “穂”). Thus, “「田中に穂が稠密して生えている」意であると思う”98 ([this word] had the meaning of “the grains are growing densely in the fields”). When the “mouth” grapheme was later attached to this graph, the new element implied “…堅く口をつぐんで発言しない意である”99 (the meaning of “closing one’s mouth tightly and not talking”). Katō may be on the right track, since the example from the Zuozhuan shows us that 周 in the Spring-Autumn period meant “compact,” and this character might originally represent the meaning of “compact.”

5. This character is graphically a representation of one’s left hand. In the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions, there is also another graph, 箇, representing one’s right hand and meaning “blessings.” 箇 had the meaning, “to oppose,” opposite to the meaning of 箇. Although one can

403/昭20/附6(二), and the following translation is mine.


98Ibid., 514.

99Ibid.
theorize \( \neq \) to be *zuo* 佐 “to assist,” the sentence on this piece (. . . [we] hope it will be correct [or enough?] and will not assist . . . and the king will have blessing[?]) and the one on H11:84 (. . . is not assisting the king, and there will be blessing[?]) would be odd. Below are other examples:

(1) 丁卯卜争貞王往于敦不左.

Divined on the *dingmao* day, Zheng tested: The king will go to Dun; [it] will not go against [the wishes of the spirit].

(2) 甲午卜殺貞王奏茲玉成弗左.

Divined on the *jiawu* day, Que tested: The king will present this jade to Cheng [Tang], [who will] not oppose [the king].

(3) 壬子卜争貞我其作邑帝弗左若. 三月.

Divined on the *renzi* day, Zheng tested: We will be going to construct a city, and Di will not oppose [it but] it will meet the approval. [In] the third month.

2.9 H11:113

辛未王^{1}其逐虜^{2}翌(^?)^{3}亡魯.

On the *xinwei* day, the king will be going to chase after wild boars and next(^?) there will be no disasters.

Fig.11. P.291.
1. This style is similar to the one on H11:3, so it too belongs to Xu’s Type Ia (Shang Period Three or Four, or Ji Li’s late period or King Wen’s early period).

2. This character consists of the graphemes hu 虎 “tiger” and dou 豆 “a type of vessel,” and Xu Xitai suggests it is xi 犭,100 which in the liyun 集韻 is defined as “獸, 戲, 家屬, 或從犬”101 (ie 犭 and 戲 are suidaes;102 sometimes [the characters] have ‘dog’ [as the signifc]). In the Guangyun it is defined as “獸名又曰豕也”103 (Name of animal, and it is also called shi “pig; boar”).

3. There are many proposals regarding this character, due to the different hand-drawings scholars provide. For example, Xu Xitai theorizes that it is the character yi 翌, as in 翌日 “next day,”104 but when we compare this graph with the various forms of 翌 in the Jiaguwenbian 甲骨文编, we notice that 翌 is written 翌, or 翌, and none of these forms seems similar to the graph on this piece, so Xu’s proposal may not be correct.105

2.10 H11:133

三牢.

100Xu Xitai, Zhouyuan Jiaguwen Zongshu, 73.

101Ding Du 丁度 et al., Jiyun 集韻 (Reprint, Shanghai: Shanghai Guji chubanshe 上海古籍出版社, 1983), 1: 19a.

102The word “suidae” is defined as “a family of nonruminant artiodactylous mammals consisting of the wild and domestic swine but in modern classifications excluding the peccaries.” In Webster’s Third New International Dictionary, Springfield, Mass.: G.&C. Merriam Company, 1976.

103Chen Pengnian et al., 44.

104Xu Xitai, Zhouyuan Jiaguwen Zongshu, 73.

105Sun Haipo, 4.7/169-170. The Jinwenbian does not include this graph, so I am unable to show the readers how this graph looks in the bronze form.
... three penned cattle. 

On the *xinmao* day, the king was (will be?) at ....

![Fig. 12. P.292.](image)

1. In Wang's proposal, the style here belongs to his Type III, and is similar to the styles in H11:3, H11:11, H11:113, and H11:134, and belonged to either King Wu, Cheng, or Kang. Xu considers it the Type Ib style, King Wen's early to mid period. Xu is correct, because the bottom line of this character is a straight line, not the slightly curved one that appears among the ones Wang indicates, so this piece should belong to King Wen's early to mid period.

2.11 H11:134

王^{1}^{\#2} ...勿祀.

The king will open(?) ... should not conduct a ritual.

---

1. The style on this piece is similar to the one on H11:3, so it too belongs to Xu's Type Ia (Shang Period Three or Four, or Ji Li's late period or King Wen's early period).

2. This is a very interesting character, and it does not seem to exist in the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions or in the bronze inscriptions. Xu Xitai suspects it to be bi “to close,” because it is similar to the word 非, meaning “to close a door” in the Guangyun. He may be correct mainly due to the similarity between the two. We hope for appearance of this character on other pieces, so we can discover more details about this character.

2.12 H11:136

今秋(?)

[In] this fall(?) the king will conquer [those who?] go to Mi.

---

107Xu Xitai, Zhouyuan Jiaguwen Zongshu, 82. In the Guangyun (p.335), it says, “开,閉户 . 非, 上同” (Dian means ‘to close door.’ 非 has the same meaning).
1. This character is considered by many scholars to be *qiu* 秋 "fall." However, if we look at H11:14 (p.69) where there is also a character (⿰) being transcribed as *qiu*, we can ascertain that these two characters are too different to be viewed as the same, and they do not even seem to be alternate forms of the same character. The identity of this character could be discovered with a better photograph of this oracle bone.

2. The style here is similar to the one on H11:80, and the event is also regarding the state of Mi, so it too belonged to King Wen's late period.\textsuperscript{108}

\begin{center}
2.13 NH1[3]:1
\end{center}

王１以我牧單２馬豕卜．
The king leads us (or: the Wo) to pasture horses and pigs at Dan, and divine.

\textsuperscript{108}Wang, *Xizhou Jiagu Tanlun*, 216.
1. Xu considers the style of “wang” to be 甲, while Wang considers it to be 乙. Their disagreement originates from the inability of both scholars to clearly see the style of “wang” from the illustration. The article on the discovery of the Zhou oracle bones in the Qijia Village, Fufeng County, Shaanxi, where this piece and the following piece (Caiji 採集 94) were discovered, states that the Strata Three and Four of the gray pit, north of the Qijia Village, belonged to mid Western Zhou period, and this pit was where this piece was discovered. Therefore, this piece should be no later than the mid Western Zhou period. The author of the article continues to describe that the lower half of “wang” has two parallel lines and short lines between the two to represent that the bottom line is thick, and this is similar to the style of the “wang” in the early bronze inscriptions in having the same thick lines. Therefore, this piece of bone

109Xu, Zhouyuan Jiaguwen Zongshu, 155; Wang, Xizhou Jiagu Tanlun, 206.


111Ibid., 7.
should not be later than King Mu’s period, and this also corresponds to the archaeological information on the strata where this piece was found.\(^{112}\)

2. Xu Xitai suggests this character to be \textit{she} “to shoot,”\(^ {113}\) but most examples from the oracle-bone inscriptions point to one definition, a place-name, as in the following examples, while examples from the bronze inscriptions tend to point to a personal name (小臣 “small subject, Dan” from Xiao Chen Dan \textit{zhi} 小臣單) or the name of state (單伯 “Earl of Dan” from Danbo Yuanfu \textit{li} 單伯原父鬲).\(^ {114}\) Therefore, this character could be a place-name in this sentence, as in the following examples:

(1) 步于單. 8303反

[The king will] walk to Dan.

(2) 己辰貳癸未蜃西單田受有年十三月. 9572

Tested on the \textit{gengchen} day: on the next \textit{guiwei} day, [we will] fertilize the field of West Dan, and there will be a plentiful harvest. [In] the thirteenth month.

2.14 \textit{Caiji} 采集 94

入麗.\(^ {115}\)

卯...王其曰.

伐曰祀.

...乙.\(^ {115}\)

\(^{112}\) \textit{Ibid.}, 6. The original sentence is, “王字下作雙勾填劃以示肥大，與早期金文中的王字作肥筆的作風一致.”\(^ {113}\)


\(^{114}\) \textit{Sandai} 14.55 and \textit{Sandai} 5.43, respectively.

\(^{115}\) As to exactly how these sentences should be organized is a problem, because based on the illustration, they are the only sentences on this scapula, and there does not seem to be any missing character among them. Also, since each sentence has at
Bring in black horses.

[On the x-]mao [day] . . . the king will be going to say.

. . . yi.

most four characters, it is difficult to ascertain the relationships among these units: whether they are parts of one single sentence, or whether they are independent from each other. Xu Xitai, Zhouyuan Jiaguwen Zongshu, 123, proposes the inscriptions should be read as follows:

. . . 乙 . . 日 (祀) . . 卯 . . 賢王其曰入驄.
. . . yi . . . day, ritual . . mao . . . tested: the king will be going to say, 'Bring in the black horses.'

On the other hand, Wang Yuxin, Zhouyuan Jiagu Tanlun, 155 and Chen Quanfang, Zhouyuan yu Zhou Wenhua, 123 propose the following:

. . .乙
. . .伐 (?) 日 (祀)
. . . 卯 . . 賢, 王其曰:
 驄
 . . . yi
. . . attack (?) [and] say, 'si.'
. . . mao . . . tested, the king will be going to say,
 '[Bring in?] black horses.

We should also pay attention to the way the characters run. They do not go from top to bottom, like their Shang counterparts, but more likely from the central axis to either the right or the left side of the scapula. Not only that, the orientation of characters points towards the right or the left side, too. So in order to read them, we have to turn the right or the left side towards us. Such a feature does not occur among the Shang counterparts, so it is possible that these are Zhou features of oracle-bone inscriptions. Other scapulae do not have the same features as described, so maybe the features were restricted to a certain time (mid-Western Zhou) or/and location (扶風縣齊家村). Lee Xueqin in “Xingtai Xinfaxian de Xizhou Jiaguwen” 邢台新發現的西周甲骨文, Zhongguo Wenwubao, March 7, 1993, also shows that the illustration of the piece found in Xingtai, Hebei 河北 , exhibits a similar feature: the bottoms of most characters point towards the left side of scapula, so we have to turn the left side towards us to read them.
1. Graphically this character is composed of that of 马 “horse” and that of 鹿 “deer.” The protrusions on the top of 鹿 are probably the horns, since the horns of a deer can be written like 鹿 in Sun Haipo’s Jiaguwenbian, and the 鹿 is probably the Zhou way of expressing it.

2. Xu considers this piece to be his Type Ia, and it belonged to Shang third and fourth periods, or Ji Li’s late period to King Wen’s early periods. However, Wang proposes that this piece should belong to the period from King Zhao to King Mu, and his reason, being more appropriate than Xu’s, is that the style of “wang” on this piece is the same as the one on NH1[3]:1, which was shown in the previous section to be from the mid Western-Zhou period, so this piece should also belong to the mid Western-Zhou period.

2.15 OFF:7

王其皇....

The king will be going to combine with....

\[116\] Xu, Zhouyuan Jiaguwen Zhongshu, 156.

\[117\] Wang, Xizhou Jiagu Tanlun, 191-192. The excavation report of these two pieces can be seen on: Shaanxi Zhouyuan Kaogudui, “Fufengxian Qijiacun Xizhou Jiagu Fajue Jianbao,” Wenwu 9, 1981. However, the report does not mention anything about the site where this piece was excavated, so at this moment I do not have any evidence to support or counter Wang’s theory.
1. This piece is included in Xu’s book, but he does not mention anything, including the period, about it. Wang does not include the illustration of this piece in his book, probably because he does not know of its existence. But based on the style, it is similar to the one on H11:3, and it should be Xu’s Type 1a, belonging to Ji Li’s late period or King Wen’s early period.

2.16 Other Oracle Bones

The following are illustrations of same oracle bones that show discrepancies, or do not add any useful information to the studies due to the small number of characters on them.

118Luo Xizhang and Wang Junxian, “Zhouyuan Fufeng Diqu chutu Xizhou Jiagu de Chubu Renshi” 周原扶風地區出土西周甲骨的初步認識, Wenwu 文物 2 (1987): 19, has a very short paragraph on this piece. It is a fragment of scapula, near the socket area. It is seven millimeters long and three millimeters wide. There are five hollows in two lines on the back, and three characters next to the crack at the front.
Fig. 18. H11:14. *Left*, Wang, Xizhou Jiagu Tanlun, 290; *right*, Xu, Zhouruan Jiaguwen Zongshu, 23. Note the different writing of the same character below “to come.”

Fig. 19. H11:61. Wang, 292.

Fig. 20. H11:72. *Ibid.*, P.288.
Fig. 21. H11:75+126. Left, Wang, p.292; right, Xu, p.54. Please notice the two different styles of wang: there is a split of the vertical line near the bottom line in Wang’s illustration but not in Xu’s.

Fig. 22. H11:84. Left, Wang, p.287; right, Xu, p.59. Please notice the different writing of the same character below 「earl」.

Fig. 23. H11:100. Left, Wang, p.292; right, Xu, p.67. Please notice the
slightly concaved bottom line in the character wang in Wang's and the straight bottom line in Xu's illustrations.

Fig. 24. H11:112. Left, Wang, p.286; right, Xu, p.72. Please notice the different style of wang: the one in Wang's has the raised left tip at the bottom line (王), while the one in Xu's has the raised right tip (王).

Fig. 25. H11:132. Left, Wang, p.290; right, Xu, p.80. Please notice the different style of wang and the last character in both illustrations.

Fig. 26. H11:167. Wang, p.289.
Fig. 27. H11:174.  *Left,* Wang, p.286;  *right,* Xu, p.91. Please notice the raised left end of the bottom line in the character *wang* in Wang’s illustration and the convex bottom line in Xu’s illustration.

Fig. 28. H11:189.  *Left,* Wang, p.289;  *right,* Xu, p.95. The *wang* in Wang’s illustration has the lower right end of the bottom line, which does not appear in Xu’s illustration.

Fig. 29. H11:191.  *Left,* Wang, p.289;  *right,* Xu, p.95.
2.17 Conclusion

H11 has the most pieces that have the character "wang," and the majority of these oracle bones belonged to King Wen's period. The original number of pieces from all the excavations that have the character "wang" is thirty, but largely due to the problem of the inconsistency of handwriting of the same characters, and also to the problem of too many
fragments with only two or three characters not being enough to shed more light on these inscriptions, only fourteen pieces were chosen for this study.

Among these fourteen pieces of Zhou oracle bones, due to the different styles of "wang," not all of them refer to the same king, and thus all the oracle bones came from different periods: from Ji Li’s late period to King Mu, but they all belonged to the Western-Zhou period. H11:1 came from Di Xin’s time, but "wang" could be either Di Xin or King Wen. H11:3, H11:11, H11:113, H11:134, H11:261, and QFF:7 came from Ji Li’s late period to King Wen’s early period. H11:38 and H11:48 came from King Wen’s pre-mandated period and referred to King Wen. H11:80 and H11:136 came from King Wen’s mandated period, or his later life. H11:82 also came from the period of Di Yi to Di Xin, and the "wang" referred to either Shang king, and "Zhoufangbo" referred to King Wen. H11:133 came from King Wen’s early to mid period and referred to him. And NH1[3]:1 and Caiji 94 came from the period of King Zhao to King Mu.

Bronze inscriptions usually recorded Zhou kings presiding over ceremonies and granting gifts to their subjects, but most of these bone inscriptions, being from King Wen’s time, show that King Wen was a hunter, warrior, diviner, and also conducted the sacrifices. NH1[3]:1 also shows that the king led a group of people to pasture and divined. So can we say similar things about other Zhou kings? Only if we can find inscriptions from their periods.

Studying the Zhou inscriptions also allows us to discover several problems that require serious attention. The first one is the inconsistency of hand-drawing for the characters on several illustrations, as we can observe several pieces of bones requiring illustrations from Wang’s and
Xu's books in Section 2.16. This inconsistency prevents us from determining whose illustration is correct, and also what characters they should be. The second problem is the insufficient number of characters, preventing us from studying the usages and the meanings of characters in the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions, and whether the characters have different usages and meanings in the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions, in comparison with their Shang counterparts. The third problem is that of periodization of these oracle bones. With the same archaeological evidence, there are two different results for several oracle bones. With the suggestion that the archaeological evidence is unreliable, theories on the periods of these oracle bones based only on the inscriptions are rather weak. The fourth problem surrounds the interpretations of graphs that do not seem to exist in the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions nor the bronze inscriptions (i.e., \( \text{\textsuperscript{\textcircled{1}}p} \) in Section 2.11), and neither is there any related form in these inscriptions. Without any other related graphs to compare with, we do not have any evidence to put forward a theory regarding the meanings and the functions of these characters. The fifth problem is that too many fragments abound, so the complete sentences and characters were scattered amongst them, blocking our effort to study the relationship among characters, functions and meanings of these words, and also the syntax of Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions. When we take a look at Wang's book, we can observe many fragments with what seems to be a character, but without rejoining these fragments together in their proper place, we are unable to do anything about them.

Studying the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions also allows us to identify the positive aspects about it. One is that we are able to reaffirm some of the records in the classics. For example, H11:80 and H11:136 record King
Wen’s going to the state of Mi. Although this is the only information we are able to obtain by reading the inscriptions, at least we know that the state of Mi did exist in King Wen’s time, and it became possible for Zhou to attack Mi in King Wen’s time, as recorded in “Huangyi” in the Book of Poetry and Shiji.\(^{119}\)

Second, with the appearance of H11:1 there comes the possibility of King Wen’s sacrificing to Cheng Tang. Zuozhuan records that there was the custom of only sacrificing to one’s own ancestors in the Spring-Autumn period, but with the appearances of H11:1 and H11:112, we have to seriously entertain the question whether the same custom existed in the Shang period and also whether the Zhou practiced it. If the Zhou practiced sacrificing to maternal ancestors or someone else’s ancestors, it could allow us to take a different view on the sacrificial and ancestral-worship system in that period and theorize how this system functioned.

Third, studying the inscriptions allows us to take a view on how the Zhou inscriptions are different from the Shang inscriptions. For example, we can quite a few examples of 目 followed by a statement of desire (有正, 亡咎 and 亡眚), a combination never seen among the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions. We can also observe different styles of characters in the Zhou inscriptions. For example, 資 is written either 目 or 目, while the Shang style is 目 or 目, without the extra 一字 grapheme.

Fourth, as I have detailed in Chapter One the characteristics of Zhou oracle bones and the inscriptions, we can use the information to determine the origin of any oracle bone found in the future, so we can determine whether the piece originated from the Shang, from the Zhou, or even from another state.

\(^{119}\text{Cf. Shijing HY 61/241 and Takigawa, juan 4, p.13.}\)
Fifth, we now know that not only the Shang kings carried out the practice of plastromancy, but the Zhou kings also carried out the same practice, and we can assume that this practice was not only widespread but also well into the later period of Zhou dynasty. In relation to the fifth value I just discussed above, we might be able to discover oracle bones produced by other states in the vicinities of Zhouyuan and Shang proper.

We can only hope for a better mechanical-reproduction of photographs of these oracle bones, which will allow us to clearly observe what characters there are on these oracle bones and also if they are different in styles from the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions and the Zhou bronze inscriptions. Also, we hope for more discoveries of Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions, either in Zhouyuan or elsewhere, so we can make comparisons and discover how these characters were used by the Zhou people. And lastly, but not the least, we hope for more archaeological evidence and more inscriptions that can assist us to periodize these oracle bones.
3.1 Introduction

As the Zhou oracle bones are gradually discovered in several parts of China, scholars become excited about the new discovery, because now they can study the oracle-bone inscriptions from the Zhou people and compare them with the Yinxu殷墟 inscriptions to see how the two are similar or different from each other. However, four pieces from Zhouyuan (H11:1, H11:82, H11:84 and H11:112) have generated much debate. These debates arise because there are names of several Shang ancestors on the bones, while the bones and inscriptions retain much of the Zhou features, so this in turn tempts scholars to argue the zushu族属 problem of these bones: whether these four pieces were the products of the Zhou court or of the Shang court. If they were from the Shang, why were they unearthed in Zhouyuan? Furthermore, why were the oracle bones chiseled and the inscriptions inscribed by the Zhou people? On the other hand, if they were from the Zhou, why were there some Shang ancestors mentioned and why did a few of them receive the sacrifice? Or more precisely, were the

1The illustrations of H11:84 and H11:112 are on p.70 and 71, respectively. The transcription and the translation of H11:84 are: 貞王其幸又大甲周方伯正不左于受有祐 (Tested: the king will be going to seek blessing [from] Da Jia, stab (or mock) the Earl of Zhoufang [with?] ; [these] are correct, [and] does not oppose Shou [=Di Xin]; [there] will have blessings. The transcription and the translation of H11:112 are: 韟文武祿 (?) 貞王者日乙酉其幸中…武豊 (?) …卯…左王 (Holding the Yi ritual in the Wenwu Room(?), tested: on the next day, yiyou, the king will be going to seek x [by?] setting up flags … wu feng … mao … oppose the king).
rituals mentioned on these four pieces conducted by the Zhou kings or the Shang kings? If they were conducted by the Shang kings, were they done so in Shang proper or in Zhouyuan? If the rituals were carried out in Shang proper, why were these four pieces uncovered in Zhouyuan, and who brought them to Zhouyuan, since they were not processed in Zhouyuan? On the other hand, if the rituals were carried out in Zhouyuan, why would the Shang kings conduct the rituals in Zhouyuan, and why were there Shang ancestral temples in Zhouyuan? On the other hand, if the rituals were carried out by the Zhou leaders, why would they sacrifice to the Shang ancestors, since the Shang and the Zhou were different groups of people, and finally, why should there be Shang temples in Zhouyuan?

There are currently three camps of scholars debating these issues. The first camp suggests that these four pieces were from the Shang but without stating who produced them. The second camp suggests Zhou origin because they were done by Zhou specialists, and the third camp also suggests Shang origin, but these four pieces were handled and inscribed by Zhou specialists working in the Shang court. In this chapter each section is devoted to evaluating the arguments from each camp while developing my own theory, and at the end a proposal will be put forward to suggest that H11:82 and H11:84 were from the Shang, and were processed by the Zhou specialists working in the Shang court. The origins of H11:1 and H11:112 are not certain, but were also processed by Zhou specialists. But how these oracle bones were found in Zhouyuan is unclear, and we definitely need more evidence (i.e., Shang potteries, vessels, or items that can point

\[2\text{In Section 2.1, H11:1 has been shown to have an uncertain origin, and in Section 2.7, H11:82 has been shown to be from the Shang court, so my studies on these two pieces will not be repeated here in this chapter. Instead, the other two pieces will be the focus in this chapter.}\]
to Shang origin) to explain their appearance in Zhouyuan.

3.2 Shang Origin

One camp of scholars (Wang Yuzhe 王玉哲 and Zhang Congdong 張聰東) propose that these four pieces came from the Shang court. Wang claims that there are several reasons why these four oracle bones belonged to the Shang. First, after Ji Li 季歷 of Zhou was killed by Wen Ding 文丁 of Shang, the Zhou harbored hatred towards the Shang. However, the Zhou were weak at that time, so while on the surface they still served the Shang, underneath they were planning to overpower them in revenge. Therefore, King Wen could not have worshipped the ancestors of his father's murderer, and the “king” on both H11:1 and 84 did not refer to King Wen.

His second reason is that in the funerals and the sacrifices, there were restrictions based on the participants' lineage and the clan, determining who was allowed to enter the temples, so King Wen could not have sacrificed to Shang ancestors; for example, in a passage from the twelfth year of Duke Xiang 襄公 in the Zuozhuan 左傳, “凡諸侯之喪,異姓臨于外,同姓於宗廟,同宗於祖廟,同族於祠廟.”

On occasion of the decease of any prince, if he were of a different surname from the duke, he was wailed for outside on the city wall. If he were of the same surname, the wailing took place in the ancestral (i.e., the Chow) temple; if he were descended from the same individual who bore the surname, in the temple of that [common] ancestor; if he were of some common branch family from

---

3 Xu Wenjing, 270.
5 Zuozhuan HY 275/襄12/4左.
that ancestor, in the paternal temple.\footnote{Legge, the Ch’un \textit{Ts’}ew, 2: 455. The brackets and parenthesis are Legge’s.}

There was also a restriction on sacrificing to ancestors, as in the following example, “衛成公夢康叔曰，‘相奪予享．’公命祀相，甯武子不可，曰，‘鬼神非其族類，不歆其祀．’”\footnote{Zuozhuan HY 140/僖31/7左．}

... he dreamt that K’ang-shuh, [the 1st marquis of Wei], said to him that Sēang took away from him the supplies of his offerings. The marquis on this gave orders to sacrifice also to Sēang; but the officer Ning Woo objected, saying, “Spirits do not accept the sacrifices of those who are not of their own line.”\footnote{Legge, the Ch’un \textit{Ts’}ew, 1: 219. The italics and the square brackets are Legge’s.}

Therefore, there was already a custom of restriction on participating in the mourning and the sacrifices carried out in a temple, depending on one’s lineage and clan during the Spring-Autumn period, and any attempt to sacrifice to someone else’s ancestors would not bring blessings to oneself or benefit the spirits, so King Wen could not have worshipped any Shang ancestor.\footnote{Wang Yuzhe, 102.} Another reason is that, in Wang’s opinion, because 戢 meant “to chop,” it could not have been King Wen who chopped the Elder of Zhoufang, also himself!\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, 103.}

As for how these oracle bones appeared in Zhouyuan, Wang proposes that Zhouyuan was not a spot for producing the turtle shells; besides, the influence of Zhou before conquering the Shang was weak, so the states on the southeast coast would not send in any turtle to the Zhou, unlike their tributes of turtle shells to the Shang.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}} Therefore, the majority of the
turtle shells excavated in Zhouyuan originated from the Shang proper, not from Zhouyuan. He claims that these shells were moved to Zhouyuan by the Shang diviners before the downfall of the Shang, and he enlists two relevant cases. In the “Xianzhilan” 先知篤 章ter chapter of the Lüshi Chunqiu Lü氏春秋, we find “殷内史向拏見紘之愈亂迷惑也, 于是載其圖法, 出亡之周” (The Royal Secretary of the Yin, Xiang Qi, saw Zhou’s further chaos and delusion, so [he] carried his diagrams and law documents and fled to the Zhou). In the “Zhoubenji” 周本紀 chapter of Shiji we also find, “二年, 間紘昏亂暴虐滋甚, 殺王子比干, 囚箕子。太師疵, 少師彥, 抱其樂器而奔周” (Two years [later], [they] heard that Zhou’s delusions and tyranny were extreme. [He] killed Bi Gang, son of the [former] king and jailed Ji Zi. The Grand Preceptor Bi and the Junior Preceptor Jiang held their musical instruments and fled to the Zhou). These examples indicate that when these nobles and officials fled to Zhouyuan, they did not go there empty-handed, but took the items they were in charge of and presented them to the Zhou leader. Thus, these oracle bones appeared in Zhouyuan because of the Shang diviners who fled there.14

Wang is correct to point out many important things, such as the co-occurrences of “wang” and “Zhoufangbo” 周方伯 on H11:82 and H11:84. There are also Shang oracle-bone inscriptions with similar content, in which “king” and “X-fang” appear together; for example,

(1) ...沚戛函冊世吾方...王従下上若受我.... 6160
... Zhi Jia will lift the documents and pierce through Gongfang. 
... the king follows, [the spirits] below and above will favour

12LSCO 668.
14Wang Yuzhe, 104.
and grant us....

(2) 丁乙王卜貞...世人方余...受佑不...在禍.王占.... 36498
The king divined on the *dingsi* day, tested: ... pierce through
Renfang, and I... receive blessings, and will not... be at Huo.

The king interpreted the cracks....

In Example (1), “wang” referred to the Shang king and “Gongfang” referred
to a group of people, and similarly in Example (2), “wang” also referred to
the Shang king, and “Renfang” referred to a group of people, so there is no
doubt that the references of “Gongfang” and that of “Renfang” could not be
the Shang people. Otherwise, these two sentences would have very odd
meanings. Since the “kings” referred to the Shang kings, these two
two examples show us that the inscriptions were written from the Shang
perspective and thus belonged to the Shang, regardless of the origins of the
diviners and scribes.

These scribes and diviners knew that the “king”s in the inscriptions
referred only to the Shang kings, because they were working on behalf of
the Shang kings, and were thus divining and writing the inscriptions from
the kings' perspective, and there was no need to attach the word “Shang”
王 to modify the “王”; nor do we see any Yinxu inscriptions with the
expression “Shangwang” 王 王 appearing. But in the Zhou oracle-bone
inscriptions, we can see expressions like “殷王” (H11:3) and “殷箕子”
(H31:2) because they were written from the Zhou perspective, and the
terms referred to the Shang people, so the Zhou scribes attached the
character “Yin” 殷 to the following nouns to show that those people were
not from the Zhou but from the Shang. Similar patterns can also be found
in the Book of Poetry and the Book of Documents (Section 2.2, Commentary
1), so they will not be repeated here.
Attaching the word “殷” or “商” to the following noun may also suggest one important theory. With an expression like “殷王” or “商王” appearing in the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions and also in some of the classics, there is the connotation that the Zhou people might also refer to their own leader with only “王,” the same way that the Shang people referred to their own king, so the Zhou people in their writings needed to attach “殷” or “商” to indicate that they were referring to the king of Shang, not their own king. In H11:82 and H11:84 we do not see the appearance of either “殷” or “商” before “王,” but there is also the appearance of “周方伯” on the same pieces—similar to the two examples earlier on p.82 that indicate they were products of the Shang and were written from the Shang kings’ perspective—so H11:82 and H11:84 were also written from the Shang kings’ perspective and therefore belonged to the Shang, with “wang” on each piece referred to a Shang king. Then, what can we say about H11:112? By following my observation above, this piece should belong the Zhou, with the “wang” referring to a Zhou king, but when we compare the styles of “wang,” “wer” 文, “wu” 武, and “zhen” 賢 or other characters appearing among all these four pieces, this piece should be of Shang origin because of the similar style. However, this piece is similar to H11:1: with its mention of the name of a Shang ancestor, and there are no other clues available for supporting or opposing any theory, so we can only state that its origin is uncertain, just like that of H11:1.

Whether the majority of the turtle shells were from the Shang as Wang states is questionable. My concern is that as far as we know, there is no report on what type of material these oracle bones are made from, so we do not know which piece of Zhouyuan oracle bone is a plastron, carapace, scapula, or other type of material. Nor do we know the origins of
these materials: Shang origin, Zhou origin, or others. Nor is there any article on the species of the turtles plastrons and bones found in Zhouyuan and elsewhere, meaning that we do not know what type of turtles or tortoises they were, and even more importantly, where these turtles originated (outside of Zhouyuan or in Zhouyuan). Without this knowledge, it is inappropriate for Wang to state that the majority of the plastrons were from the Shang.

Zhang Congdong suggests that H11:1 and H11:84 belonged to Di Xin 帝辛 but without stating one single reason. He proposes that Di Xin attacked Zhouyuan and occupied the palace. When he was there, he buried the oracle bones he had been carrying with him in a pit underneath the palace, and when he left, he brought King Wen with him and jailed him in Youli.15 Zhang further states that Di Xin also burned the palace, so that most of the oracle bones were burnt into the colour of greenish gray.16

Zhang's idea is speculative, because he does not give any reason for his theory; nor is there any record of Di Xin attacking the Zhou, burying these oracle bones and burning the palace. His claim of Di Xin burying these bones in Zhouyuan is not possible, and the reason is that, as Fan Yuzhou 范毓周 has pointed out, in Shang divinations, there were divinations occurred outside Shang proper, but the discoveries of these


16Ding Yi 丁乙, “Zhouyuan Jianzhu Yicun he Tongqi Jiaocang” 周原建築遺存和銅器窖藏, Kaogu 考古 4 (1982): 401, quoted in Zhang Congdong, 5. Actually, Ding Yi quotes this paragraph from Yin Shengping 尹盛平, “Zhouyuan Xizhou Gongshi Zhidu Chutan” 周原西周宮室制度初探, Wenwu 文物 9 (1981): 13. Yin (p.13) says that “從遺址面貌看, 甲組建築是毀於火的, 石棒飾物和甲骨很可能同時被燒, 後來扔進了晚期的窖穴” (From the appearance of the ruins, the building in the jia section was destroyed by fire. The clams and the stick-like ornaments and the oracle bones were probably also burnt at the same time, and were thrown later into the pits that belong to the later period).
oracle bones in Yinxu indicates that the Shang brought home the oracle bones they had divined elsewhere. The following are examples Fan uses (including his own translations):

1. 

(1) 癸未卜在 甸忈王旬亡災.

On guiwei (day 20), crack-making in 甸忈, divined: “The king will have no disaster.” On guisi (day 30), crack-making in 甸忈, divined: “The king will have no disaster.”

2. 

(2) 丁未卜在 甸忈王步亡災.

On yiwei (day 32), crack-making in 甸忈, divined: “The king goes [on foot]; there will no disaster.”

3. 

(3) 唐[sic]戍卜在喪貞今日步于香亡災.

On gengxu (day 47), the king crack-making in Sang, divined: “Today I shall go [on foot] to Xiang; there will be no disaster.”

Examples like these indicate that the Shang brought home the oracle bones they had used for divinations outside Shang proper, so Di Xin’s burying them in Zhouyuan is unlikely.

3.3 Zhou Origin

The second camp of scholars (Xu Zhongshu 徐中舒, Chen Quanfang 陳全方, Edward Shaughnessy, Fan Yuzhou 范毓周, Wu Junkui 伍君魁, Gao Ming 高明, and Tian Changwu 田昌五), being the largest camp, propose that these four pieces originate from the Zhou court. Xu Zhongshu simply says that the Temple of Wenwu Di Yi appearing on H11:1 was constructed by King Wen in Zhouyuan, and Chen Quanfang suggests that the

---

inscriptions on these four pieces of bones are evidence of the Zhou king's worship of Shang ancestors. Neither does not give any justification for his theories, so their theories are without any solid ground.

Shaughnessy suggests evidence in the Book of Poetry shows that both Ji Li and King Wen married Shang princesses, so the Shang royalty and the Zhou royalty were thus related, and it was possible for King Wen to build temples for Shang ancestors and to worship them.

"Daming" in the "Daya" Section praises Da Ren, wife of Ji Li and the mother of King Wen:

Jin, the second of the princesses of Che,
From [the domain of] Yin-shang,
Came to be married to the prince of Chow,
And became his wife in his capital.
Both she and king Ke,
Were entirely virtuous.
[Then] T'ae-jin became pregnant,
And gave birth to our king Wan.

The same poem continues to praise King Wen's wife:

The favouring appointment was from Heaven,
Giving the throne to our king Wan,


19 Shijing HY 59/236.

20 Legge, The She King, 2: 433. The square brackets are Legge's.

21 Shijing HY 59/236.
In the capital of Chow.  
The lady-successor was from Sin,  
Its eldest daughter, who came to marry him.  
She was blessed to give birth to king Woo,  
Woo was preserved, and helped, and received also the appointment,  
And in accordance with it smote the great Shang.22

Shaughnessy notes that a passage from the “Guimei” in the Zhouyi 周易 provides confirmation that the bride was the daughter of Di Yi to King Wen: “帝乙歸妹”23 (Di Yi sends his daughter in marriage). In light of these examples, the Shang and the Zhou were related by marriage, and it was possible for King Wen to set up temples to Wen Ding, his maternal grandfather, and to Di Yi, his father-in-law.24 Shaughnessy also states that because in the Eastern Han dynasty, the Southern Xiongnu tribe who submitted themselves to the Han dynasty did sacrifice to the Han emperor’s ancestors, it was possible for King Wen to sacrifice to Shang ancestors.25

Shaughnessy is making a general comment about all these four pieces of oracle bones, so he considers the “king”s on all four pieces as referring to King Wen. I have shown earlier on p.82 why the “king”s on H11:82 and H11:84 could not have been King Wen but Shang kings, thus, Shaughnessy’s theory (and others’ as well) of suggesting the “wang”s on H11:82 and H11:84 to be King Wen is incorrect. I have shown that the “wang”s on H11:1 and H11:112 can not be identified, but Shaughnessy’s idea is possible.

Fan Yuzhou also believes that these four pieces originated from the

22Legge, The She King, 2: 435.  
23Yijing HY 33/54/五.  
24Shaughnessy, “Zhouyuan Oracle-Bone Inscriptions,” 162.  
25Ibid., 160-161.
Zhou. He says H11:1 is a record of King Wen worshipping Cheng Tang in Di Yi's temple but without indicating why he believes so.\textsuperscript{26} The Zhouyuan inscriptions

\ldots are characterized by the minuteness of their graphs, which were as small as millet seeds, and by their fineness of line, which was careless and weak; their calligraphy differs greatly from that of the royal Shang inscriptions found at Yinxu. In addition, the structure and arrangement of the inscriptions at Zhouyuan and Yinxu is as different as chalk and cheese. Further, with regard to the shapes of the hollows (zuanzuo 鑛鑉), the square hollows seen on the Zhouyuan oracle bones did not appear at Yinxu. That these Zhouyuan records were brought to Zhouyuan by the Shang diviners who went to Zhou during the reign of the last Shang king is merely a conjecture.\textsuperscript{27}

With regard to Wang Yuxin's theory that these oracle bones (also including H11:174) were those of Shang, Fan counters that it is dubious to accept the “㝒周方伯” as being “a Shang counterattack against the invading Zhou in the second year of Di Yi” as proposed by Wang, because there are also many examples in which this word is used as a verb of sacrifice, and it is difficult to determine that it was related to warfare. Also, the shape of 王 (王) on these bones never appears in the Yinxu inscriptions.\textsuperscript{28} Fan considers H11:84 was a record of a Shang king sacrificing to a Zhou ancestor, Zhou 騁, and he gave a Sumerian example in which a Sumerian king, Mesilim, sacrificed to Ningirsu, the god of Lagash, a submitted city.\textsuperscript{29} This shows a dominant force sacrificing to a god of its subordinate.

Fan is correct to point out that many features of these four pieces


\textsuperscript{28}Ibid., 178-179.

\textsuperscript{29}Ibid., 180.
were those of Zhou, and one is the minute size of these characters. As can be seen from Yang Shengnan’s idea later on p.104, the Dui 自 Group inscriptions are small but are still visible to the naked eye, but they are not as small as the inscriptions on these four pieces. We can also tell by examining Chapter Six of Wang Yuxin’s book, where we can see that the illustration of H11:1 is enlarged twenty-seven times, and those of H11:82, H11:84, and H11:112 are five times larger. Why these illustrations (and many others as well in Wang’s book) are enlarged is simply because the graphs on these oracle bones are too small for us to see properly. Therefore, characters on these four pieces were not written by the Shang, but by the Zhou scribes.

The character he transcribes as 鼬 is questionable, mainly because of the inconsistent hand-drawings of this character among various publications. He claims that he saw the photograph of H11:84 taken by Xu Xitai, and that was how he came out with this character, but the same character in Wang Yuxin’s book is different, and even Xu himself has a different transcription for this character, so whose transcription should we adopt? Also, since Fan considers that these were Zhou inscriptions, why would he not also consider this piece being from the Zhou too, with “wang” referring to the Zhou leader? He agrees “with Shaughnessy that mature research of these Zhouyuan records must depend upon clear mechanical reproduction of the inscriptions.” So he is implying that the current

---

30Wang, Xizhou Jiagu Tanlun, 287. The actual magnification of the photograph of H11:1 in Li Xueqin’s article is not indicated, so I chose the hand-drawn illustration as the example.

31Ibid., 286-287, 288.

32Ibid.

33Ibid.
research (including his own) is on shaky ground. Then, we can question the reliability of his transcription of *zhou* and his use of the Sumerian example.

Fan claims that the style of “*wang*” ( wang ) never appears in the Yinxu inscriptions, but Sun Haipo has a list of various styles of “*wang*” (i.e., wang , Qianbian 1.20.4; wang , Qianbian 1.20.7, and wang , Yicun 426), and they are similar to the styles on these four pieces, so Fan’s objection is not valid.

Wu Junkui states that H11:82 and 84 are records of King Wen seeking blessings from the Shang ancestors. His reason is that in the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions, the terms “殷王” and “殷王” are references used by the Zhou people, so the Zhou inscriptions with only “王” are evidence proving that the Zhou people were referring to their king. Similarly, there is not one appearance of “殷王” or “殷王” (only “王”) among the Yinxu inscriptions, because anyone who read the inscriptions during that period would recognize that the “*wang*” only referred to the Shang king. Thus, the scribes and the diviners used only “king,” and there was no need to append the word “商” in front of it. Wu explains that both “king” and “Earl of Zhoufang” appear because to the Zhou diviners who were there during the divinations, King Wen was their king, thus only “king” was carved; at the same time, to the Shang ancestors, King Wen was the “Elder of the Zhoufang,” so “Zhoufangbo” was carved.

Wu brings out one very important detail: among the Yinxu oracle-
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bone inscriptions, we do not see any occurrence of “Yinwang” nor “Shangwang” because the diviners and scribes knew who the “king”s were, and there was no need to attach “Yin” nor “Shang” to “wang.” We can use the same logic to assume that the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions with only “wang” referred to the Zhou kings, and “Yinwang” in the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions indicate that the terms were used by Zhou diviners and scribes to refer to the Shang kings. But the evidence why H11:82 and H11:84 could not come from the Zhou but only from the Shang is given in one of the two examples on p.82 earlier; also, if both pieces had come from the Zhou, the appearance of “Zhoufangbo” would be out of place, since the “wang”s had already referred to the Zhou leaders; moreover, it would be strange to see the Zhou leader (王) stabbing himself (周方伯)!

Gao Ming feels that these so-called Di Xin’s oracle bones all have square hollows, a feature of Zhou oracle bones. Besides the fact that there are names of Shang ancestors on these bones, there are no other ways to prove these bones belonged to the Shang, so these four pieces belonged to the Zhou. In his opinion, these four pieces were divined by King Wen when he was jailed by King Zhou in Di Yi’s temple in Youli 萬里, and they were then brought back by King Wen when he was released from the Shang.

Gao is correct to state that the hollows and the inscriptions were the work of the Zhou specialists, but there is still some evidence of Shang features. Why “king”s on H11:82 and H11:84 referred to the Shang kings and “Earl of Zhoufang” referred to the Zhou leader was stated earlier on p.82, therefore these inscriptions were Shang kings’ divinations, not Zhou’s.
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as Gao puts it. Who the “king”s were on H11:1 and H11:112 are uncertain.

Tian Changwu proposes that since these oracle bones were found in Zhouyuan, and have the Zhou style of divinations and characters, they belonged to the Zhou, just like those found in the Yinxu belonged to the Shang. Otherwise, in his opinion, since there are some Yinxu inscriptions with the Zhou as topics of divination, why were these oracle bones still in Yinxu and not taken back by the Zhou to Zhouyuan after the downfall of the Shang? However, he later suggests that these were records of the Shang king’s divination, but they were written by the Zhou, who thus informed their ancestors. The records were then stored as records by the Zhou.41

Tian states that these oracle bones were originally stored as records, which might be true, because Yin Shengping states in p.85, fn. 11 that all the Zhouyuan oracle bones had been burnt to the colour of greenish gray, and they were later thrown into the H11 and H31. Then, the broken fragments were created due to fire burning these oracle bones.

H11:82 has both “wang” and “Zhoufangbo,” and Tian states correctly that the “wang” was a Shang king and the subject of 王, and “Zhoufangbo” was the Zhou leader and the object, so this was a Shang king’s divination which was recorded by the Zhou. He suggests that 王 originally meant “to announce” (告訴), so “ce Zhoufangbo” means to “confer a title (冊命) to the Earl of Zhoufang.” Besides, he adds, this piece has the phrase “田正亡左,” a feature of Zhou language usage, so it was a Zhou oracle bone.42 If “ce Zhoufangbo” were “to attack the Zhoufangbo,” in his opinion, it does not match well with the historical texts. Among the Zhou ancestors, only King
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Wen was the Earl of the West, so “Zhoufangbo” was King Wen.\textsuperscript{43} HI 1:84 is similar to HI 1:82 with respect to the content, because of the importance of conferring the title to the Zhoufangbo.\textsuperscript{44}

According to Tian, HI 1:112 is a record of the ceremony in which Di Xin granted a title to the Earl of Zhoufang because of the term “chengqi.” This term and the term “jinzhang” appear in the vessel Wei he 衛盉. According to the inscriptions in the Song ding 頌鼎 and Shanfu Shan ding 膳夫善鼎, jinzhang was a ceremonial jade given to the king by a subject to whom the king conferred a title. Accordingly, King Wen was conferred to be the “Earl of the West” in HI 1:112.\textsuperscript{45} As for HI 1:1, Tian states that it was divined by King Wu in the Yinxu after he conquered the Shang, and it was brought back with him.\textsuperscript{46} In his opinion, King Wu presented a sacrificial vessel to Cheng Tang, implying that from that moment on, the Zhou took over heaven’s mandate from the Shang. If King Wu had not done so, it would be improper for King Wu to announce his ascending to the throne at a Shang temple, as described in the “Zhoubenji” chapter of Shiji.\textsuperscript{47}

Sanyisheng, Tai Dian, and Hongyao all carried swords to protect King

\textsuperscript{43}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{44}Ibid., 39.
\textsuperscript{45}Ibid., 40-41.
\textsuperscript{46}Ibid., 43.
\textsuperscript{47}Ibid., 43-44.
\textsuperscript{48}Takigawa, \textit{juan} 4: 28. The following translation is mine.
Wu. [After they] had entered [the Shang palace, they] stood south of the altar... Yinyi said by [reading] from the document, “The last grandson of the Yin, Ji Zhou, wiped out and abandoned the prominent virtue of former kings; [he also] insulted the gods and did not sacrifice [to the former kings]; [he] was insensitive and violent [against] the commoners in the city of Shang; [these] are clearly known and well heard by the Heavenly August God.” Therefore, King Wu prostrated again and bowed his head and said, “[I now have] undertaken further the great command [by] eliminating the Yin and receive the heavenly prominent command.” [He] once again prostrated and bowed his head, and then exited.

The major point of this passage is that King Wu went into a Shang temple to receive heaven’s mandate, and since King Wu had held the ceremony in order to appoint himself as the new king, in Tian’s opinion, why could he not offer a ritual to Cheng Tang to announce that he was the new king and declare the end of Shang? If this was improper, was the announcement by King Wu in a Shang temple as described in the Shiji proper? King Wu did this because he wanted to show to the Shang people that a new era had arrived, and they would be living under a new rule, so that they should submit themselves to the new government. If King Wu had not done this, he would still be recognizing the rule and the dominion of the Shang, and he could not claim to have “received heaven’s mandate,” and would not be able to be a king at all.49

Tian is correct to point out that “king” referred to a Shang king in H11:82 and H11:84, and both inscriptions were recorded by the Zhou. However, the character ce 副 meant “to stab; to mock,” as it has been shown in Section 2.7, Commentary#3, so “ce Zhoufangbo” meant “to stab or mock the Earl of Zhoufang,” and it had nothing to do with conferring the title of “Earl of West” 西伯 to the Earl of Zhoufang. If King Wen had been
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conferred a title, why would the title not have been mentioned in the inscriptions? Although on H11:112 there is a term “chenqi” 節旗, but we must realize that H11:112 does not mention “the Earl of Zhoufang”; nor does it have the word 節 (“to announce,” in Tian’s theory); furthermore, “setting up banners” only indicates that something important was going to take place, and nothing else in the inscriptions indicates that the conferring ceremony was going to take place. Moreover, the term “jinzhang” does not appear on this piece, so it is incorrect to assume that H11:112 was a record of conferring the title to King Wen. If we examine the inscriptions carefully, there is no sigh of conferring anything to anyone, so the inscriptions had nothing to do with the Earl of Zhoufang, nor the action of conferring.

Tian is the only scholar suggesting that H11:1 was divined by King Wu after he had conquered the Shang. This is a very interesting theory, especially since there is a passage from the “Zhoubenji” Chapter of the Shiji which indicates that King Wu did go to a Shang temple and receive the mandate to govern. However, the same record does not describe any sacrificial event carried out by King Wu towards any Shang ancestor. Also, H11:1 is a fragment of a plastron, and we do not know what the other inscriptions (if there are others) on the rest of the plastron are; if we can find them, they would either support or oppose Tian’s idea.

3.4 Shang Origin and by Zhou Specialists Working in the Shang

The third camp of scholars (Wang Yuxin 王宇信, Li Xueqin 李學勤, and Yang Shengnan 楊升南) also suggest Shang origin, just like the first camp of scholars do, but they propose in addition that these four pieces were processed by the Zhou specialists working in the Shang court.
Li Xueqin says that the inscriptions discovered in Fengchu, Zhouyuan, can be divided into two types: one is small and regular (小而規整) from King Wen’s period, which, in his opinion, the four pieces belonged to; the other is large and loose (大而疏散), from King Wu’s to King Mu’s period, and we require a magnifying glass to see clearly the former type.\textsuperscript{50} He further states that the structures of the characters such as “王,” “癸,” “帝,” “其,” “或,” and also the phrases like “亡左...王受有祤” on these four pieces are very similar to the ones found among the Huang Group divinations (黃組卜辭) of Period Five.

Those Zhou oracle bones have square hollows, not round hollows, so in his opinion, they were processed by the Zhou people.\textsuperscript{51} Furthermore, since the terms “wang” and “Zhoufangbo” appear together on H11:82 and H11:84, the terms refer to two different individuals: the “wang”s referred to Di Xin, and the “Zhoufangbo”s referred to King Wen.\textsuperscript{52}

According to Li, these four pieces were probably divined at around the same time because the styles of characters and also the contents on these four are the same.\textsuperscript{53} H11:112 contains “on the next \textit{yiyou} 乙酉 day (day 22),” so this piece was divined on the \textit{jiashen} 甲申 day (day 21). H11:112 has the term “稱”, meaning “to set up a banner,” and he has the same idea as Tian on p.94 that “setting up a banner” was for the “conferral of appointments.”\textsuperscript{54} Li states that “\textit{称}” meant “to announce,” so the content
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of H11:112 is “to report to heaven and to the former king Tai Jia about the Earl of Zhoufang should which indicate that this is the conferral of an appointment.”\(^{55}\) H11:1 was done on the \textit{guisi} day (day 30), nine days after the \textit{jiashen} day, so in Li’s opinion, the ritual on H11:1 was probably related to the conferral of appointment recorded in H11:82 and H11:84. All these described above mean that the four inscriptions are related to a single event: Di Xin probably conferring a title to the Earl of Zhoufang.\(^{56}\)

Li says that he is not certain whether this is the conferral of the title “西伯” (Earl of the West) to King Wen, even though there was a conferral of this title in the “Zhoubenji” chapter of the \textit{Shiji}. However, since King Wen was being conferred, it was natural for King Wen’s diviners to participate in the ceremony. After the ceremony, the diviner brought these four pieces back to Zhouyuan, so they “are inscriptions made by the Zhou in the last years of the Shang dynasty.”\(^{57}\)

When we see the illustrations of these four pieces in Wang’s book, we can notice one thing: the illustrations do not represent the original sizes; the one for H11:1 is magnified twenty seven times, and the ones for H11:82, H11:84, and H11:112 are all five times. So their original sizes are very small, and as Li says, we need a magnifying glass in order to see the characters clearly. Not only are the characters on these four pieces small, the characters on other Zhou pieces are also small. So the minute size of characters is a sign of Zhou features in oracle-bone inscriptions, and the Zhou scribes wrote the inscriptions on these four pieces. Also, as Li points out, the hollows on the backs of these four pieces are the square type, not
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the oval type appearing among the Yinxu oracle bones, so the Zhou specialists also bored the hollows. Third, Li also raises the fact that the co-occurrences of the two terms, “wang” and “Zhoufangbo,” on both H11:82 and H11:84 could not refer to the same person; therefore, “wang” could only refer to a Shang king, and these two pieces were the Shang king’s divinations. The origins of the other two can not be determined.

However, whether these four were divined at around the same time is questionable. H11:112 was on the jiashen day (day 21), and H11:1 was done on the guisi day (day 30), but there are no days recorded on H11:82 and H11:84, so strictly speaking, the days of the last two pieces are unknown, and we can not state that the latter two belonged to the same set as the former two. But with respect to the content, H11:82 and H11:84 are related because of the similar content (ce Zhoufangbo), and we can consider them to be within the same set. The content of H11:1 is on sacrificing to Cheng Tang, and the one of H11:112 is to set up a banner. The two pieces lack similar content, so they can not be considered as a set.

If we look at these four illustrations in both Wang’s and Xu’s book, we are not certain that these four were inscribed by the same person, because they do not look the same; besides, we are looking at the illustrations done by Wang and Xu, not the original rubbings. Li also takes on the idea that “chengqi” was involved with the conferral of a title to King Wen. As was stated earlier on p.96, was not related to the conferral; even if meant “to confer,” it does not occur on H11:112, and neither does the term “Zhoufangbo,” so how can we state that H11:112 is a record of conferring a title to the Earl of Zhoufang? We can only say that it indicated an important event was about to happen, nothing more.

Wang Yuxin also has a similar, but slightly different idea: the
inscriptions on H11:82, H11:84, and H11:112 are quite alike, so they were possibly done by the same person, and should be treated as one set. Since they are related to the event in which the Zhou attacked the Shang in the second year of Di Yi's reign, they should belong to Di Yi's time. As for H11:1, its content and the inscriptions indicate that it belongs to Di Xin's time. Wang says that since these oracle bones were divined in the hands of the Zhou diviners working in the Shang, they naturally have the features of Zhou divinations. After the Zhou destroyed the Shang, these Zhou diviners then presented these four pieces, which were subsequently brought back to Zhouyuan. That is why they appeared in Zhouyuan and have the features of Zhou divinations, but still retain the Shang direction of inscriptions which run from left to right, different from the Zhou way of running from right to left.

Wang further quotes a passage from the "Jiaotesheng" 邦特性 chapter of the Liji 禮記 to support his view on why the Zhou king could not have sacrificed to the Shang ancestors:

諸侯不敢祖天子, 大夫不敢祖諸侯, 鄭氏曰, “... 魯以周公之故立文王廟...” 愚謂, “... 左傳, 魯為諸姬, 臨于周廟, 為sprites, 凡, 荖, 中, 祭, 臨于周公之廟.’ 周廟, 文王之廟也, 魯以周公為大祖, 文王之廟, 蓋別立之.”
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Feudal lords do not dare to worship the son of heaven, and the grand masters do not dare to worship the feudal lords. Zheng said, “... Lu [was able to] build a temple for King Wen because of the Duke of Zhou...” I would say, “... in the Zuozhuan, it says, ‘Lu mourned at the Temple of Zhou for all the Ji clans, and the Temple of the Duke of Zhou for the states of Xing, Fan, Jiang, Mao, Zuo, and Ji.’ The Temple of Zhou was a temple to King Wen. [For] Lu, it considered the Duke of Zhou to be the first ancestor, and a temple of King Wen was built separately.”

The theme of this passage is that since the state of Lu came from Duke Dan of Zhou, who was a son of King Wen, the state of Lu was able to construct a temple for King Wen; similarly, because the state of Zheng came from King Li, the state of Zheng was able to build a temple for the king. Other feudal lords were prohibited to do so, so the Zhou people could not have a temple for Di Yi in their homeland either. Wang also adopts Yu Xingwu’s theory that 亅 means “chop,” so it is impossible to consider the diviner to be King Wen, who was also being considered “chopped” at the same time!

There are some problems with Wang’s theory. We are not certain whether H11:82, H11:84, and H11:112 were inscribed by the same person, as my argument has shown earlier. Wang probably was referring to the originals, but all we can see are illustrations by Wang and Xu. If we look at the illustrations in Wang’s book, we do not see characters like 王, 周, 方 that are common among the three as being inscribed by the same person. We must remember that they are illustrations by Wang himself, not the originals. Even Wang states that because of the small sizes of these characters, the illustrations were all enlarged, but the enlargements were not the same; furthermore, he was unable to see the originals, so he has to

---
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publish these illustrations in Chapter Six of his book for the reader to see how these oracle bones look like. But the inconsistent enlargement of illustrations prohibits readers from making comparisons of the styles of the same characters. Secondly, there is a problem with the hand-tracing of characters. The "wang" on H11:136 was traced three times in three different publications, and each time the style is slightly different. This is not the only one case. In other words, Wang admits that there are still major problems with the illustrations, so his claim of characters on these three pieces being similar is not acceptable. But Wang states correctly that these oracle bones were handled by the Zhou specialists, so there are square hollows on the backs of the bones.

Wang's claim that the Shang inscriptions only travel from left to right is wrong, because there are Shang oracle-bone inscriptions also travelling from right to left (i.e., Heji 26 and Heji 858IE). There are other examples like these two, so Wang's claim is invalid. But he is correct to suggest that "wang" was a Shang king, and "Zhoufangbo" was King Wen.

Yang Shengnan also suggests that there is evidence to prove that these four form a set, and further, belonged to the Shang. From the writing style, the characters seem to come from the same scribe, especially from the fact that the "wang"s are all written with one vertical line going through the three horizontal lines, and the left tip of the bottom line is slightly raised, so they could be from approximately the same time.

Second, the term "Wenwu Di Yi" in H11:1 could also be abbreviated as "Wenwu," and the appearance of this term in H11:82 and H11:112 could refer to Di Yi. This being the case, all four could have been divined at
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around the same time on the same affair. H11:1 has "Wenwu Di Yi zong," so the "king" had to be Di Xin and the "Zhoufangbo" was King Wen.

Yang says that "ff has many usages, and it can not mean "to declare war," which was one of its meanings. His reason is that these oracle bones belonged to Di Xin, and furthermore, according to the texts (Yang probably refers to the Shi ji), the Zhou’s attack on the Shang was in the second year of Di Yi's reign, not in Di Xin’s time. Also, the Zhou took the initiative of attacking, so it should be the Zhou declaring war against the Shang (ff商), not the Shang declaring war on the Zhou. Besides, how could the Zhou people know what kind of ritual activities the Shang would hold when the Shang heard of the Zhou’s attack? Then, ce means "to confer the title" (册封册命), same as the term “册命” in the bronze inscriptions, and “ce Zhoufangbo” means to “confer the leader of Zhoufang to be the elder of Zhoufang.”

Yang’s fourth piece of evidence is the various features of these oracle bones. These four pieces have the features of Shang divinations. The prefaces of H11:1 and H11:84 contain the time and the location of divinations, just like the Period Five inscriptions. In terms of word usages, we can see “王其祈又大甲,” “ff X,” and “on the next such-and-such date”--all of which are common among the Shang inscriptions. There are also the various rituals: 又祭, 彝祭, 卿祭, 畜祭, 卯, 血 that are also common in the
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Shang inscriptions.69 At the same time, these four pieces also have the features of the Zhou divinations and inscriptions. First, in H11:1, the preface is “癸己彝文帝乙宗貞,” lacking the “卜” that exists in the Shang Period-Five inscriptions. Second, there is also the appearance of “田” followed by a short statement, a combination not seen among the Shang inscriptions. Third, although the 自 Group inscriptions are small, they are not as small as these Zhou inscriptions.70 Fourth, these four pieces have square hollows, a Zhou feature—not the oval ones occurring on the Shang oracle bones. In summary, these oracle bones have a mixture of both Shang and Zhou features, and they are the inscriptions of the Shang king conferring a title to the Earl of Zhoufang, King Wen. When King Wen was released from Youli and conferred by Di Xin, that was a major event for the Zhou, so the Zhou diviners also participated in the event and recorded the whole affair. Because they recorded Shang divinations, the styles, word usages, ritual names, and some other Shang features were also employed, but at the same time, since the scribes were from the Zhou, the hollows and the character styles, and some other Zhou features were also added.71

In response to Yang’s theory, we should note that the styles of “wang” on these four pieces are similar: the vertical line goes through three horizontal lines without any split from the vertical line, but the “wang”s do not seem to be written by the same individual—that is my conclusion by observing the hand-drawn illustrations, not the originals. Furthermore, even Wang Yuxin himself also has questions on the reliability of these illustrations, as I quoted earlier. So it is doubtful that all four were
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inscribed by the same individual. There are no days recorded on H11:82 and H11:84, so they should not be considered to be from the same time period as H11:1 and H11:112. But H11:82 and H11:84 may be considered to be from around the same time mostly due to the similar content (ce Zhoufangbo). The contents of H11:1 and H11:112 are not the same, so we can not assume them to be from the same period, either. The character ce 世 does not mean “to confer,” so King Wen was not being conferred any title.

“Wenwu Di Yi” could not be abbreviated as “Wenwu,” because that would create confusion with Wen Ding. One can assume “Wenwu” on H11:112 referred to Wen Ding because the following character is bi 㝢 (＝ 祀) “chamber for worshipping,” and that referred to the chamber for worshipping Wen Ding, but the inscriptions on H11:82 are incomplete; some characters are missing following “wu” 武, so we do not know which ancestor the term referred to.

Yang is correct to raise the issue that in these inscriptions, there are several Shang word usages, such as “the king seeks blessing,” “on the next so-and-so day,” and also several sacrifices like, 上, 禘, 筈, and 血 that are common among the Shang inscriptions. At the same time, there are also Zhou word usages like 田有正, which does not appear among the Shang inscriptions but is common among the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions. Furthermore, as Yang points out, the Group inscriptions are not as small as the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions. The small size of these characters is a sign of Zhou features. Fourth, these oracle bones have square hollows, another Zhou feature. In summary, the “wang”s on H11:82 and H11:84 referred to Shang kings and “Zhoufangbo” referred to the Earl of Zhoufang, so they were Shang kings’ divinations, and the inscriptions and the hollows
were done by the Zhou people in the Shang court. Which king the "wang"s on H11:1 and H11:112 referred to is not certain, but the inscriptions and the hollows were also done by the Zhou.

But there still remains a major question: why were they discovered in Zhouyuan? It is possible that these diviners or the Shang officials escaping to Zhouyuan also brought these pieces with them. It was not Di Xin who brought them and buried them in Zhouyuan.

3.5 Conclusion

The hollows on these four pieces were chiseled by the Zhou specialists working in the Shang court, and likewise the characters were written by the Zhou scribes. The divinations on H11:82 and H11:84 were carried out on behalf of the Shang kings, so they belonged to the Shang. Who the kings were on H11:1 and H11:112 is not certain. The appearance of these four pieces in Zhouyuan was probably due to the fleeing of Shang officials who brought them to Zhouyuan.
CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSIONS

The "wang"s on the fourteen pieces of oracle bones that were studied in Chapter Two did not belong to the same period, so not all of them referred to the same king. H11:1 belonged to Di Xin's time, because the sacrifice took place in Di Yi's temple, the king who conducted the sacrifice had to be later than Di Yi and contemporary with the period of Di Xin, Di Yi's son. If this piece had been discovered in Yinxu, then we could have assumed that "wang" was Di Xin, but because this piece was discovered in Zhouyuan, the possibility of King Wen sacrificing to his maternal ancestor, Cheng Tang, has also been raised. But whether or not it was King Wen sacrificing to Cheng Tang can not be ascertained because we do not know whether there was such a custom of worshipping one's maternal ancestors in that period, so we do not have any concrete reason to reject the idea of it was King Wen, and who the king was on this piece can not be determined beyond doubt. The styles of "wang" on H11:3, H11:11, H11:113, H11:134, H11:261, and QFF:7 are similar, so we can assume that they originated from the same period, Ji Li's later period to King Wen's early period. The main reason is that on H11:3 there is a term, "Yinwang," referring to the Shang king, and this term could only appear when the Shang was still in power; secondly, the style is similar to the ones on Yicun 佚存 104 and Jia 甲 426, which belonged to Shang's Period Three and Four, so these Zhou bones should also belong to that period as well. The styles of
“wang” on H11:38 and H11:48 suggest that both pieces came from the same period. This factor also indicates that the style is more closely related to that of H11:1, H11:82, H11:84 and H11:112 than other styles, and their similarity could mean that they were at least not far apart in time, and thus belonged to King Wen’s pre-mandated period. H11:80 and H11:136 mention the state of Mi, and the styles of “wang” are similar, so we can suggest that they came from the same period. King Wen destroyed the state of Mi in his later years, so both pieces belonged to that period. The style on H11:82 is similar to the one on H11:1, so we can consider it to be from the same period, or close to the period. On this piece, there is also a term “Zhoudangbo,” a reference to the leader of Zhoudang, so this term suggests that this piece originated from the Shang court, with “wang” referring to the Shang king, who could be either Di Yi or Di Xin. The style on H11:133 is similar to the ones on H11:3, H11:11, H11:113, H11:134, and H11:261, except that the one on H11:133 has the straight bottom line, not the concave one of these other pieces, so both styles could be close to each other with respect to time, and possibly belonged to King Wen’s early to mid period. The styles of “wang” on NH1[3]:1 and Caiji 94 are similar to the early bronze style; also, the location where these two pieces were discovered was a mid Western-Zhou period site, so these two pieces belonged to the period of King Zhao to King Mu.

All these pieces, except the last two, were uncovered in the same pit H11 in Zhouyuan. Scholars like Wang Yuxin and Xu Xitai base their periodizations in part on the artifacts that were also discovered together with these bones in the same pit, but they arrive at two different results for several bones. To make the matter worse, it has also been suggested that these bones and the artifacts were thrown into the pit after the palace
was destroyed by fire, indicating that their periodizations, including any other periodizations based on the archaeological survey of the area, have no solid ground. Except for the bones with people's names and events that we can refer to in the classics, other pieces (including some of the ones above) can only be periodized based on the information from the inscriptions (the styles of characters, for example), and any theory derived from that is rather shaky.

H11:1, H11:82, H11:84, and H11:112 are four pieces dug up in Zhouyuan with Shang ancestors' names mentioned on them, and hence, many scholars have theorized the origins of these four pieces: either Shang or Zhou. In conclusion, H11:82 and H11:84 were Shang kings' divinations. There are similar Shang inscriptions like these two in which the "wang's referred to Shang kings, and "X-fang's referred to a group of non-Shang people. Their co-occurrences indicate that both terms could not refer to the same individual. Although on H11:82 and H11:84 it is "Earl of Zhoufang" not "Zhoufang" being mentioned, we can safely assume that "earl" and "king" could not point to the same individual; hence, "wang" referred to the Shang king and "Zhoufangbo" referred to the Earl of Zhoufang. However, the fact that some features do not appear among the Shang oracle bones and the inscriptions but in the Zhou bones and inscriptions indicates that hollows were drilled and the inscriptions were inscribed by the Zhou specialists working in the Shang court.

Who the kings were on H11:1 and H11:112 is not certain, because on both pieces they only have "wang"s appearing, so they could either be Shang kings or Zhou leaders. Secondly, although the Shang and the Zhou were two different groups of people, there is not enough evidence to suggest that inter-group ancestral sacrifices (i.e., the Zhou leaders
sacrificing to Shang ancestors) could not have taken place in that period, especially when King Wen was related by blood to the Shang royalty. We do not know whether there was a custom of sacrificing to one's maternal ancestors; even if there was, we still do not know whether the Zhou practiced it because there is no evidence to suggest so. Therefore, we are unable to state whether it was King Wen or the Shang kings appearing on H11:1 and H11:112. However, the inscriptions and the hollows were still carried out by the Zhou specialists.

There are also some problems that still await solutions in the studies of the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions. Since there are no rubbings of these Zhou oracle bones available, we have to rely solely on the hand-drawn illustrations of these oracle bones from Wang Yuxin's Xizhou Jiagu Tanlun, and sometimes also from Xu Xitai's Zhouyuan Jiaguwen Zongshu, as the sources of illustrations for these oracle bones. However, as one might have noticed in reading Chapter Two, we require illustrations from both books for quite a number of oracle bones, because some characters are written differently in each book. Thus, we do not know what these characters should be, and we do not know whose illustration is correct.

The discrepancies between these two books are due primarily to the minute size of these characters. It is possible that when Wang Yuxin and Xu Xitai attempted to write these characters while observing the oracle bones themselves or by looking at the photographs of these oracle bones, they perhaps mistakenly took the cracks as parts of graphs and added them to the graphs; or in other cases they were unable to clearly discern what these graphs were due to their small sizes, resulting in their omissions of one or several lines from the illustrations. Without viewing the original pieces, we have no means of identifying what these characters
should actually look like, but the originals are not large enough, so we need a good view of these graphs from high-quality photographs.

The second problem is that the majority of these Zhou oracle bones are fragmented into smaller pieces, so many individual sentences and characters are scattered amongst these fragments, making their study difficult. Since it is best to view the whole inscriptions in order for one to clearly examine the meaning, the styles, and the usages of words, and also the syntax, it is necessary to rejoin these fragments in their proper places.

The third problem is constituted by the new graphs that do not seem to have related forms in the bronze or the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions. For instance, there is a graph ( rpt) in Section 2.11 that we can not identify, and this is the only appearance of this character in the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions. The difficulty is further compounded when this character does not seem to have any form relevant or similar in the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions nor in the bronze inscriptions, making its meaning and function impossible to determine. If one examines the illustrations in Wang’s book, one can discover that there are several such graphs; for example, 从 H11:66 on p.331 and 从 H11:106 on p.333. There is not a theory on what each graph represents. Some of them may just be cracks, but in order to know whether they actually are, we have to rejoin these fragments, and we will be able to see complete pictures of these oracle bones.

The last problem is the insufficient number of graphs to enable us to conduct a better study on some of the graphs, including those without related forms in the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions or in the bronze inscriptions. Wang Yuxin’s book lists 303 pieces of Zhou oracle bones that have inscriptions on them, but when we compare this number to that of
Shang oracle bones (there are 41956 pieces in the Heiji), we realize how small is the total of Zhou oracle bones with characters on them. Even if we disregard the number of bones and examine the total number of inscriptions, still there are definitely far more Shang oracle-bone inscriptions than Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions.

We must remind ourselves that we are studying the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions, an early form of Zhou language. We thus need more Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions in order to clearly identify the features of the inscriptions, to determine the meanings and functions of the words these characters represent, to examine the syntax of the inscriptions, to make comparisons between the writing styles of same characters in the oracle-bone inscriptions and the bronze inscriptions, to periodize these oracle bones, to study the bagua 八卦 numbers appearing on them, and other important research--like what scholars have been doing with the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions for decades. These scholars are able to do so mostly due to the enormous amount of the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions that are at their disposal.

Studying the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions not only allow us to realize the problems we face, but we are able to observe the positive aspect about it. One is that we are able to reaffirm some of the records in the classics. For example, H11:80 and H11:136 record King Wen’s going to the state of Mi. Although this is the only information we are able to obtain by reading the inscriptions, at least we know that the state of Mi did exist in King Wen’s time, and it became possible for Zhou to attack Mi in King Wen’s time, as recorded in “Huangyi” 皇矣 in the Book of Poetry and Shiji.72

72Shijing HY 61/241 and Takigawa, juan 4, p.13.
Second, with the appearance of H11:1 there comes the possibility of King Wen’s sacrificing to Cheng Tang. Zuozhuan 佐傳 records that there was the custom of only sacrificing to one’s own ancestors in the Spring-Autumn period, but with the appearances of H11:1 and H11:112, we have to seriously entertain the question whether the same custom existed in the Shang period and also whether the Zhou practiced it. If the Zhou practiced sacrificing to maternal ancestors or someone else’s ancestors, it could allow us to take a different view on the sacrificial and ancestral-worship system in that period and theorize how this system functioned.

Third, studying the inscriptions allows us to take a view on how the Zhou inscriptions are similar or different from the Shang inscriptions. For example, we can quite a few examples of 田 followed by a statement of desire (有正,亡咎 and 亡眚), a combination never seen among the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions. We can also observe different styles of characters in the Zhou inscriptions. For example, 前 is written either 前 or 前, while the Shang style is 前 or 前, without the extra 亻 grapheme.

Fourth, there is a five-rank system (公, 侯, 伯, 子, and 男) recorded in the 周礼, and we are able to see four of them in the Zhou inscriptions: 燕公 (H11:45), 燕侯 (H11:232), 虫伯 (H11:22), and 楚子 (H11:83). The inscriptions indicate that the system did exist in the Zhou time, as described in the 周礼.

Fifth, we are able to begin to work out the Zhou method of dating. For example, we can find “jipto”既魄 on H11:13, but whether “jijii” 既吉 in H11:26 and 54 is equivalent to “chujii” 初吉 in the bronze inscriptions can not be determined. We also have “隹十曰既死…” on H11:55 and this might refer to “jisiba” 既死霸 in the bronze inscriptions. On H11:2 we have “三月月”; the second “yue” character is represented by 二, indicating the
repetition of the previous character. If we can find more inscriptions like this one, we may establish the fact that the intercalary month in Zhou times was inserted near the beginning of a year.

Sixth, we are able to study the bagua 八卦 numbers appearing on some other pieces, and how they evolve from the Zhou inscriptions, represented by numbers, to the system we now know, represented by short and long lines.

Seventh, as I have detailed in Chapter One the characteristics of Zhou oracle bones and the inscriptions, we can use these information to determine the origin of any oracle bone found in the future. We can determine whether the piece originated from the Shang, from the Zhou, or even from another state.

Eighth, now we know that not only the Shang kings practiced the custom of plastronmany, but the Zhou kings also carried out the custom well into the later period of the Zhou period. The practice could be widespread, and we could find oracle bones from other states.

After the discoveries of Zhou oracle bones, it is very pleasing to see that a new sub field of oracle bone studies has been established--that of the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions--and many scholars have spent much time and energy to understand the nature of the Zhou oracle bones and the inscriptions, and have published a large amount of important research. However, due to several major problems that still await solutions, the study of the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions still has a long way to go.
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APPENDIX ONE
VARIOUS SITES OF THE ZHOU ORACLE-BONE DISCOVERIES

1.1 Introduction

After the Shang oracle bones were discovered, they inspired a new wave of studies on the ancient Chinese language, the studies on the oracle-bone inscriptions, to give us insight into the world of Shang society, especially the Shang royalty. Questions were also raised on whether there were oracle bones from people other than the Shang, or even whether there were also Shang oracle bones earlier than the ones we have. He Tianxing 何天形 in Volume One of Xueshu 学术 in 1940 predicted that there should be oracle bones in locations other than Anyang 安陽, and his prediction was based on two reasons. First, in the poem “Mian” 綿 in the “Daya” 大雅 Section in the Book of Poetry, there is a passage, “周原膴膴, 董荼如飴, 爱始愛謀, 爱契我龜” (the plain of Chow looked beautiful and rich, with its violets and sowthistles [sweet] as dumplings. There he began consulting [his followers]; there he singed the tortoise-shell, [and divined]), indicating that the Zhou was also using the turtle shells in divinations, so there should be oracle bones from the Zhou, too; his second piece of evidence is in the Shuijingzhu 水經注, where there is a passage about a turtle “背文負八卦古字” (carrying bagua numbers and ancient characters) found in Kaoling 高陵 County (in Xian 西安, Shaanxi 陝西), and in the poem “Wen Wang You Sheng” 文王有聲 in the Daya Section in the Book of Poetry there is “考卜維王, 宅是築京, 維龜正之, 武王成之” (he examined and divined, did the king, about settling in the capital of Haou. The tortoise-shell decided the site, and king Woo completed the city), suggesting the possibility of uncovering Zhou oracle bones in Xian 西安. It was not until the discovery of a scapula in Zhou ruins in Fangdui 坊堆, Shanxi 山西, that scholars realized the existence of Zhou oracle bones and


2Shijing HY 59/237/3; Legge, The She King, 2: 438.

3Shijing HY 62/244/7; Legge, 2: 463.
and became excited at the prospect of uncovering more Zhou bones in the future. Gradually there were more discoveries of Zhou bones in other parts of China, raising the studies of oracle bones (especially the Zhou bones) to a new height.

In this appendix, I would like to list the discoveries of Zhou oracle bones in various locations in chronological order.

### 1.2 Bin County, 1951

In 1951 there was a discovery of the top portion of a scapula in Bin County, Shaanxi 陕西. Its socket is not sawn off. The scapula is trimmed thin, and there are nine hollows and nine cracks on this scapula. However, this scapula is considered to be from Beiyin 北殷 tribe in the Shang dynasty.⁴

### 1.3 Loyang 洛阳, 1952

In 1952 there appeared a piece of turtle shell in the eastern suburb of Loyang 洛阳.⁵ Its back has orderly square hollows that are very close to each other; a characteristic is that the bored square hollow and a chiseled rectangular hollow form a shallow square. The chiseled hollows are deeper than the bored ones. Near the top of the shell there is a round, shallow hollow but it is not bored through the shell.⁶ This was certainly a new discovery, because the shape of hollows suggested a different tradition of divination was also being used, possibly by non-Shang people. However, it is also suggested that after King Wu of Zhou had destroyed the Shang, Duke Zhou and King Cheng moved the Shang people to Chengzhou 郑州, so in the suburb of Chengzhou, near Loyang today, there should be ruins of Yin people from the early Western Zhou period. These ruins could contain the items from the Yin and also items from the early Western

---


Chen was not certain which people this turtle shell belonged to, but clearly from the shapes of hollows, we can theorize that the hollows cannot be the Shang tradition, since all the hollows on the Anyang turtle shells are oval and semi-circular combined together.

1.4 Fangdui 坊堆, 1954

In 1954, there was a discovery of a right half and a left half of scapulae in the Zhou ruins in Fangdui 坊堆, Shanxi 山西, and only the left half is complete with eight characters. This inspired many scholars towards the prospect of uncovering more Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions. At the bottom of the obverse side is a shallow round hollow. The surfaces on both sides are rough and untreated. At the back side near the socket area are sixteen round hollows, randomly forming three to four columns, and at the lower left area are another five round hollows forming one column. The characters are located at the lower right area at the obverse side:

北宮的三趾有疾貞

Beigong x's third toe is afflicted with ailment, and [he] tested. (Or: the third leg of the x in the North Palace has a problem, and [we will] test.

The hollows on this scapula are different from those of Anyang bones, but they are very similar to those from Feng County 凤县 (from the Warring States period) in Shaanxi 陕西 and from the ruins of Fengqiao 滬橋 in Xi'an 西安, Shaanxi (from the Western Zhou period). Also, it is suggested that the styles of those characters are different from that of the characters on the Anyang bones, but similar to that of bronze inscriptions from the Spring-Autumn and the Warring-States Periods. Furthermore, a quarter-moon shaped ornament that was found together with the scapulae is an

---

7 Ibid., 6-7.
imitation of a late-Zhou jade ornament. Therefore, this scapula could belong to the Spring-Autumn Period or later. However, Li Xueqin suggests that the character ji ‘sick’ on this bone still retains the grapheme ren人 in the writing. Also, the grapheme ding 鼎 as a part of the character zhen 贜 ‘to test’ had not been completely changed to the later form that we translate as bei 貝 ‘cowrie shell,’ and is very similar to the character zhen ‘to test’ in Sanshi pan 散氏盤, so this bone should belong to the Western Zhou.

1.5 Zhangjiapo 張家坡, 1956

In 1956 in the Western Zhou ruins in Zhangjiapo 張家坡, Changan 長安, there was another discovery of a bovid scapula with two lines of characters on it. There are three round hollows at the lower left area at the back side. The walls of the hollows are straight, and the floors of the hollows are flat. There is a very narrow and long groove running along the length of the scapula. One line of characters is carved along the length of the scapula:

五一一六八一
Five; one; one; six; eight; one.

The other line of characters is carved along the width of the scapula:

六八一一五ー
Six; eight; one; one; five; one.

1.6 Caoyanzhuang 曹演莊, 1956-1957

From 1956 to 1957, there was a discovery of three strata of cultural remains, with the top being the Warring States, where an unspecified

______________

10Ibid.


number of turtle shells were found. A few turtle shells have only chiseled hollows and burnt marks, while most have bored and chiseled hollows and burnt marks.

1.7 Fengxi, 1955-1957

Again from 1955 to 1957 there were more discoveries of bones and plastrons in the west bank of Feng River in Changan County, Shaanxi. The locations were Keshengzhuang and Zhangjiapo. In Keshengzhuang nine pieces of bone and one plastron were discovered, and on the bones there are round hollows with square or round chiseled hollows. The plastron has square hollows.

Again in Zhangjiapo they found twenty five more bovid scapulas and five plastrons of some type of turtle and five plastrons of fresh-water turtles (Bie or Trionys sinenis). On some scapulas, the sockets, the spines, and the thick areas on both sides were sawn away and polished; some have the thick areas left untouched, while some have the sockets left untouched. The hollows on these scapulas can be categorized into three types. The first type has round hollows, and the narrow grooves at the floors of the hollows are about one-quarter of the diameter away from the edge of the hollows. The second type has only nearly-square hollows on some scapulas. The corners of these hollows are round, making the hollows almost square. The cross-section view of these hollows looks like the letter “V.” The third type consists of scapulas without hollows where fire was directly scorched on the scapulas. On one scapula (T313:2:3), there is a record of bagua numbers. On the other hand, the plastrons have square hollows. There are rectangular hollows near the edge of the floors. There is only one plastron without a hollow, and so the fire was

---


14 Ibid., 50.


16 Ibid., 111.
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 scorched onto the front of plastron.19

1.8 Maojiaju 毛家咀，1958

There were an unidentified number of turtle shells and bones found in Maojiaju, Hubei 湖北 in 1958. On these oracle bones there are semi-circular and oval hollows.20

1.9 Mawangcun 馬王村，1959-1960

There was a discovery of an unidentified number of bones and turtle shells in Mawangcun, southwest of Xian in 1959 to 1960.21

1.10 Niucun 牛村，1960-1961

In 1960 to 1961, there was a discovery of an unidentified number of turtle shells in Eastern-Zhou ruins, south of Niucun, Houma 侯馬, Shanxi 山西. They have square hollows but without any burnt mark.22

1.11 Baifu 自浮，1975

In 1975 in a tomb from the state of Yen 燕 from the early Western Zhou period uncovered in Baifu Village 白浮村, Beijing, there was also a discovery of several bones and turtle shells that are polished and also have the square hollows. The shells are fragmented, and some of them have

19 Ibid.


21 Ibid., “Shanxi Changan Huxian Diaocha yu Shijue Jianbao” 陝西長安鄠縣調查與試掘簡報, Kaogu 考古 6 (1962): 309. Unfortunately, there is no description of the number of these oracle bones, nor of the hollows on them, so I am unable to describe the necessary details.

characters. The scapulas, on the other hand, have chiseled marks but no characters.²³

1.12 Fengchu 凤雏, 1977

In the history of discoveries of Zhou oracle bones, the largest discovery occurred in the ruins of a Western-Zhou palace, southwest of Fengchu 凤雏, Shaanxi 陕西省 in 1977: more than seventeen thousand fragments of bones and turtle shells, and among them one hundred and ninety pieces of plastrons that have characters on them.²⁴ Most turtle shells have rectangular hollows, while a few have round ones. At one end of each rectangular hollow there is a narrow hollow. For the rectangular hollows at the left of the back side, each narrow hollow is to the left of each rectangular hollow; in contrast, the narrow hollow is to the right of rectangular hollow at the right half of the shells. Therefore, all the transverse cracks appearing at the obverse side point towards the central axis. The depth of the rectangular hollow varies, depending on the thickness of the shell: the thicker the shell, the deeper the hollow.²⁵

The scapulae, on the other hand, all have round hollows. There is a narrow groove at the floor of each hollow, and it is close to the side of round hollow.²⁶ The cracks also point towards the central axis.

1.13 Qijiacun 齊家, 1979

In Qijia 齊家 in Fufeng 扶风 County, Shaanxi 陕西省 in 1979, around twenty two pieces of bones and plastrons were discovered, five of which have characters on them. The pit where these bones and turtle shells were found also has artifacts that the excavation team suggests to be no later than the middle period of Western Zhou.²⁷ The most important discovery


²⁵Chen Quanfang, Zhouyuan, 101.

²⁶Ibid., 102.

²⁷Shanxi Zhouyuan Kaogudui 陝西周原考古隊, “Fufengxian Qijiacun Xi Zhou
was also during this excavation, because an almost complete piece of plastron (H3[2]:1) was unearthed that allows us to observe more clearly an example of Western-Zhou oracle plastrons. As for the bones, the socket and parts of the spine are sawn off, and the round hollows are bored at the back side. At the floor of each hollow there is a narrow groove close to the edge of the hollow,\(^ {28}\) and the structure of the hollows is the same as those on the bones from Fengchu.

Most inscriptions are carved on the front side and are next to the cracks they belong to (\textit{shouzhou} 寶兆), but some are not: they are either along the width of the scapula or along the length (towards the socket that points downwards).\(^ {29}\)

On the plastrons, each narrow groove was carved first along the length of the plastron; then, the square hollow was chiseled next to each groove. The transverse cracks all point towards the central axis, as in previous cases. The inscriptions, very interestingly, follow the transverse cracks, and run away from the central axis.

The burn marks on the scapulas are light brown, and the ones on the plastrons are blackish. The reason is that the scapulas are thin enough that they cracked immediately upon encountering fire, while the plastrons are so thick that it takes a longer time to crack them.\(^ {30}\)

1.14 Xiaotun 小屯, 1982

In 1982 in the ruins of an Eastern-Zhou royal palace, now east of Xiaotun 小屯, two pieces of plastrons and three pieces of carapaces were uncovered. These shells are considered to be from the Eastern Zhou period, because several broken pieces of Eastern Zhou potteries were also uncovered together with the shells.\(^ {31}\) The surfaces of the plastrons are polished. On the plastrons there are orderly bored square hollows. The walls of the hollows are straight. The floors of these hollows are so thin that when we hold them against the light, it can pass through them. The rectangular hollows are chiseled at the floors of the square hollows. All

---

\(^{28}\) Chen Quanfang, \textit{Zhouyuan}, 107.

\(^{29}\) \textit{Ibid.}, 107.

\(^{30}\) \textit{Ibid.}

\(^{31}\) \textit{Ibid.}, 375.
the transverse cracks on the plastrons point towards the central axis. The cracks on the carapaces also point towards the central axis, and all aspects of the carapaces (shapes of hollows, etc.) are the same as those of the plastrons. The square hollows were bored first before the narrow rectangular hollows. This seems to be a modification from the earlier method of boring hollows in Western Zhou; that is, by moving the rectangular hollows from the outside of the square hollows to the inside of the square hollows.

1.15 Liutaizi 刘臺子, 1982

There was a discovery of a piece of bovid scapula in a Western Zhou tomb in Liutaizi, Shandong 山東 in 1982. The socket and the top portion of this scapula are lost. Both sides of the scapula are smoothed and flat. There are twenty one hollows at the front side. At the back side there are also hollows; six form a column at the top of a supraspinous fossa, and another six are near the bottom of the supraspinous fossa; seven hollows are on the spine.

On this scapula there are none of the usual round hollows that appear on other Zhou scapulas; instead, at the front side, there are oval-shaped hollows to the right of semi-circular hollows, so the transverse cracks point towards the spine; however, since only a hand-drawn picture of the scapula is provided, we do not know how exactly the cracks appear. At the back side the hollows are round. An interesting characteristic is that the lower-right corner is chipped away with knife, and the bottom is also smoothed with a sharp tool.

There are three of what seem to be marks on the front side of the scapula. There is a located below the first and second columns of hollows from the right. Then, there is an “X” near the top spine area and

32 Ibid., 376.
33 Ibid., 377.
34 Ibid., 379.
36 Ibid., 54-55.
37 Ibid., 55.
an “H” at the bottom of scapula.\textsuperscript{38}

1.16 Loyang 洛陽, 1983

Again in Loyang, 1983, there was another discovery of total of thirty-five pieces of plastrons and bovid scapulas in the ruins of a Western Zhou bronze foundry, but there are no characters on these oracle bones. It is suggested that there are two different time periods in this ruin, the first period being probably from the beginning of the Western Zhou to Kings Cheng and Kang, and the second period from Kings Zhao and Mu. Most scapulas and plastrons are from the first period, with a few of them from the second period.\textsuperscript{39} Among them, T25H238:1 is a very interesting piece of plastron. The narrow rectangular hollows are carved diagonally inside the square hollows, as opposed to outside the square hollows as always seen in other Zhou plastrons, so the transverse cracks point diagonally towards the edges of the plastron.\textsuperscript{40} Then, there are T3H83:11, the upper portion of the left half of a carapace, and T3H83:12, the upper portion of the right half of the same carapace, and the cracks on these two pieces also point towards the edges. The rectangular hollows are longer and deeper than the square hollows, and the cross section of the former is in the “V” shape.\textsuperscript{41} T3H90:1, a plastron, T3H83:16, a bridge section, and the bridge sections of T3H83:14+T3H90:3+T3H83:8 all have small holes, through which cords might be used to bind the plastrons together.\textsuperscript{42}

On the other hand, the bovid scapulas found in the same area also have the same round hollows, like the scapulas found in other locations. The narrow rectangular grooves are bored at the floors and are located to one side of the round hollows, so the transverse cracks point to the central axis of the scapula.\textsuperscript{43}

On the turtle shells, the rectangular hollows were chiseled first; then, to one side of the hollow a square hollow was bored. The length of the square hollow is shorter than that of the rectangular hollow, and a

\textsuperscript{38}Ibid.


\textsuperscript{40}Ibid., 372.

\textsuperscript{41}Ibid., 373.

\textsuperscript{42}Ibid., 378.

\textsuperscript{43}Ibid., 373.
rectangular hollow with the cross-section in a “V” shape is deeper than the square hollow. The hollows from the both sides form a mirror symmetry. The transverse cracks point towards the central axis of the plastron. As for the carapaces, there are two situations; on the whole piece of carapace, the transverse cracks point towards the central axis, while if one carapace is separated into two pieces, the transverse cracks point towards the outer edges, instead of the central axis. The hollows on the scapulas are laid out randomly. The floors are flat, and the rectangular grooves are chiseled inside the round hollows and close to the edges of the scapulas, so the transverse cracks point to the central axis of the scapula.44

1.17 Xingtai 邢台, 1991

In Nanxiaowang 南小汪, northwest of Xingtai, Hebei 河北, from June to September, 1991, there was a discovery of a piece of Western Zhou scapula with characters on it. It is the remains of a right bovid scapula; there are round hollows at the back, and at the floors of these hollows (about one-third from the edge) are very narrow grooves.45

1.18 Other Locations

There have also been discoveries in Shilibao 十里堡 in Henan 河南; Chen Village 陈村 and Nangko Village 南口村 in Shaanxi 陕西, and Sanlidun 三里墳 in Jiangsu 江蘇.46

1.19 Conclusion

These discoveries indicate that the practice of plastronmancy was well into the Eastern Zhou period and was also widespread, but many of them do not have inscriptions. Generally speaking, the oracle bones

44Ibid, 378.

45Li Xueqin, “Xingtai Xinfaxian de Xizhou Jiaguwen” 邢台新發現的西周甲骨文, Zhongguo Wenwubao 中國文物報 7 March 1993.

46Xiao Liangqiong, 280. I am unable to verify the sources for all the discoveries in these three places, so they are listed here as an unidentifiable group. However, I did check Wenwu 文物 9 (1962): 495 for the discoveries in Chen Village and Nanko Village, which Xiao indicates, but there is no page numbered 495, and nor is there any article in that issue on the archaeological activity in these two villages.
uncovered in these areas all exhibit the similar characteristics: rough surfaces, square hollows, characters running along the width and the length of scapulas and along the width of plastrons (along the transverse cracks), etc., suggesting that the custom originated from the common source.
APPENDIX TWO

APPLICATION OF TAKASHIMA'S NEW THEORY ON Qi
IN
ZHOU ORACLE-BONE INSCRIPTIONS

The word qi has been a problem in the studies of Shang oracle-bone inscriptions for a long time, because it seems to have different usages and meanings in the inscriptions and also in the classics, which has puzzled scholars when interpreting in the inscriptions. Qi also appears in the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions, and this appendix is to determine whether qi has the same function in both the Shang and the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions by examining Takashima's theory, published in December, 1994, on the function of qi in the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions. He lists chronologically other scholars' views (and also his own past theories) on this word, and analyzes their theories against his own. He concludes that qi functions as a modal and an aspectual particle. As a modal particle, it moves mostly on one of two scales, "possibility/certainty" or "intention/wish," as well as on another, less frequently used, scale of "necessity/obligation." By moving along these scales, qi

\[ \ldots \text{could convey a dubitative sense of "perhaps," an assertive one like "definitely," or anything in between, so long as it is "modal." It could also convey the intentionality of a "will, shall," while in other cases having an optative sense, "may, would that..."} \]

The controllability of the following verb determines the movement of qi on either modal scale. If the verb is controllable, qi moves along the scale of "intention/wish" and, sometimes, "necessity/obligation"; otherwise, along that of "possibility/certainty." At the same time, qi also functions as a prospectively aspectual particle, indicating a future event. But

2Ibid., 539.
3Ibid.
4Ibid.
whether this futurity aspect is immediate, or days, weeks, or even months later into the future is not certain in some of the inscriptions, as the actual date or time for the event to take place is not written down; sometimes, the date or the time indicated does not convey the sense of the immediate future. In English, we can use “to be going to,” “to be about to,” etc., to express the future, but “to be about to” marks the immediate future, so “to be going to” is suitable to express the future that qi indicates, regardless of the time when the event would happen.\(^5\)

The appearance of qi in the charges also indicates the diviner’s presupposition. If the charge is desirable, qi for the most part represents the presupposition that the particular charge in which qi appears would be accepted and materialized; for example, the charge 寔其來見王 (Fou will be going to come to have audience with the king)\(^6\) that Takashima uses as an example is desirable, and qi represents the diviner’s presupposition that Fou would come to have audience with the king. If the charge is undesirable, the presupposition would be that the charge would be rejected; for example, the counterpart of the previous charge, 寔不其來見王 (Fou will not be going to come to have audience with the king) is undesirable, and qi represents the presupposition that this charge would not be materialized, and Fou would still come to meet the king.\(^7\)

Is his theory applicable to the usages of qi in the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions? On the whole we can answer in the affirmative and the following analysis will explain why. The following are from the Zhou inscriptions:

(1) 彌文武帝乙宗貞王其 uy 祭成唐爨屋反二女其彝血丂三豕三田有正.  
H11:1

Holding the yi ritual at the temple of Wenwu Di Yi, [one] tested: the king will be going to hold the x ritual to Cheng Tang with a shang cauldron, exorcise with two captive women, and will be going to hold the yi ritual by bleeding the rams amounting to three and pigs amounting to three, and [all] are correct.

(2) 其寳(?)楚 ....  
H11:4

\(^5\)Ibid., 510.

\(^6\)This and the following translation are mine.

\(^7\)Takashima, “The Modal and Aspectual,” 531.
The Wei(?) [and] Chu ....

(3) 召曰其卭 .... H11:5
Shao will announce, “[one] might (or will) probably be going to x...”

(4) ...已王其乎父父隣 .... H11:11
... [on the x]-si day, the king will be going to call upon Geng’s father to ascend....

(5) ...其又(有?) 大作其(腏?) .... H11:12
... will be going to offer(have?) Da to produce a sieve(?) ....

(6) 楚(?)*伯迄今秋(?)來ophile王其則(=側?) H11:14
The Earl of Chu(?) will at last come this fall(?) to ? to king’s side(?).

(7) ...族其于 .... H11:17
... the clan will be going to ....

(8) ...其... 于 .... H11:30
... might (or will) be going to ... to ....

(9) ...唐曰其 .... H11:36
...? said, “X might (or will) be going to ...”

(10) 王其乎 .... H11:48
... The king will be going to call ....

(11) ...天作其生九裔 .... H11:59
... Tian (=Heaven?) will make the ? nine ? ....

(12) ...其 .... H11:60

(13) ...其 .... H11:69

(14) ... 春白 陸其 .... H11:70
... together with Bai x might (or will) be going to ....

(15) 王其往密山卑. H11:80
The king will be going to go to Mount Mi and enjoy.

(16) ...文武...王其卽帝...典世周方伯...田正亡左...王受有祐.

[On the temple of] Wenwu ... the king will be going to hold the shao ritual to Di ... tablets and stab the earl of Zhoufang ... will be correct and there will not be nothing going against ... the king will receive abundant blessings.

(17) 貞王其幸又大甲世周方伯鑫正不左于受有祐.

Tested: the king will be going to seek blessings [from] Da Jia, stab the earl of Zhoufang, and hold the qi cauldron, and it will be correct and no consequences to Shou, and there will be abundant blessings.

(18) 七六六七一八曰其 ...既魚....

Seven, six, six, seven, one, eight. Announce that qi ... already fish(?) ....

(19) ...其受(授?)異鼎....

... will be going to receive (give?) Yi (?) cauldron ....

(20) ...其從王....

... will be going to follow the king ....

(21) ...其 ....

(22) ...九其 ..... 

... nine qi ....

(23) ...其 ....

(24) 菜文武祕貞王翌日乙酉其幸稱中...武豐...畿卯...左王.

*Based on the illustration provided by Wang's book (p.312), this graph is connected with the following graph ding 鼎, so whether we should see this whole thing as one single character (transcribed as 鼎) or as two characters forming a hewen 合文, and read them as two characters is something we are unable to determine.
While holding the *yi* ritual at the sacred room of Wenwu [Ding], tested: the king on the next day, *yiyou*, will be going to seek [by?] setting up flags . . . Wu the feng ritual . . . smear the blood and cut up . . . against the king.

(25) 辛未王其逐虐翌(?)(亡)咎.

On the *xinwei* day, the king will be going to chase after boars and next(?) there will be no troubles.

(26) . . . 弭祀其若反田正(=足?).

. . . should not sacrifice and it will be going to meet with approval, and the captive will be correct (= sufficient?).

(27) . . . 商(=賞?)其害若.

. . . bestow(?) the residence and it will be favourable.

(28) . . . 其三牢 . . .

. . . the three penned cattle . . .

(29) 其麗.

It [is?] number(?).

(30) . . . 其 . . .

(31) 庚子逐其四 . . .

On the *gengzi* day, [the king?] will chase the four . . .

(32) 貞王其 用胃尊卑胃乎奏受由不(=丕?)妥王.

Tested: the king will be going to x, use the helmet, and it should be ? helmet, call to seek to receive, and it will not (= greatly?) comfort the king.

(33) . . . 曰吉. 其五 . . . 正王受 . . .

. . . announce, “Auspicious.” The five . . . correct and the king will receive . . .
(34) ...己(=祀?)其小从 (?) 

... [on the x-]si day (or: perform ritual?) the small will follow (?) 

(35) ...其五匈 

... its five 

(36) ...其于伐獉 

... it (?) to attack Hu (?) 

(37) ...其王.

... the king. 

(38) ...其 

(39) ...其(?). 

(40A)唯衣(殷)雞(箕)子來降其執臥蓆使. 

It should be Jizi from Yi(Yin) who will come to surrender, and (we) might be going to seize [him?] together with his emissary.

(40B)在旃爾卜曰南宮 XSS (=酢 ?). 

Ibid. 

At Zhan, Er divined and said, “Nangong X will be going to make (=pour wine?) 

(41A)隻其五十人往由亡咎. 

[We?] will catch these fifty people and go, and there will be without mishaps. 

(41B)八月辛卯卜曰其鼐受. 

Ibid. 

Divined on the xinmao day in the eighth day, one says, “[One] will be going to x receive. 

(42) ...卯...貞王其曰。 

... mao ... tested: the king will be going to say.

Wang in his book considers this graph to be qi (p.326), but Xu in his book considers it to be bu (p.104).
Divined and said, "[One] will be going to cover (?) the cart and horses and it will have x."

Based on these examples, we can categorize the meaning and the function of $qi$ into five groups. In the first group, it appears before the controllable verbs: 祭 and 禮 in Example (1), 乎 in (4) and (10), 往 in (15), 邁 in (16), 壽 in (17) and (24), 從 in (20), 逐 in (25), 作 in (40B), 曰 in (42), and 衣 in (43). Therefore, $qi$ moves along the "intention/wish" scale, implying that the diviners or the kings intended to complete these charges.

In the second group, $qi$ appears before a noun or a number such as 側 in (6), 舍 in (27), 三牢 in (28), 麗 in (29), 四 in (31), 五 in (33) and (35), 小 in (34), 王 in (37), and 五十人 in (41A). In this group, $qi$ can not be a modal and aspectual particle because if it were the particle, the syntactic structure would be: 其 (the modal and aspectual particle) + noun/number, with a noun immediately following the particle and without a verb in between to indicate the action, and such a structure would make the sentences odd, since we do not know what action (=verb) is intended in each sentence. In these examples, $qi$ should function as a modifier, such as a demonstrative "the," "its," these," or "those," modifying the following noun. This function of $qi$ is out of topic, so it will not be discussed further.

In the third group, it appears before the preposition 于 in (7) and (36). Since the inscriptions are incomplete, exactly how $qi$ functions is not clear.

In the fourth group, what follows $qi$ is either unknown or missing, like examples (2), (3), (5), (8), (9), (11), (12), (13), (14), (18), (21), (22), (23), (30), (32), (38), (39), and (41B). In Example (5), the character that is transcribed as 又/有 is 又, and we do not know whether this character should be 又/有. 又 "to offer" is a controllable verb, while 有 "to have" is neutral: sometimes, with its sense of "to get," a controllable— at least, thought of as controllable verb, sometimes, an uncontrollable verb, so the use of $qi$ in this example is included in this group. In other examples, we do not know whether the following word is a noun or a verb, so we do not know how $qi$ functions.

Finally in the last category, the following verb is uncontrollable, like 受(授?) in (19), 若 in (26), and 執 in (40A). Therefore, $qi$ moves along the "possibility/certainty" scale. In (19), whether the receiver or the giver of the cauldron desired to have the event taking place is not clear to us, because the sentence is incomplete, so we do not know what other choice is
there for the diviner (such as to give a different type of cauldron); hence, we do not know about the presupposition, either. In (26), again due to the incomplete sentence, we do not know whether the charge was desirable or not, and nor do we know exactly what was the diviner's presupposition. But if (26) is translated correctly, it gives the sense that the diviner did not wish to perform a sacrifice. In (40A), although the charge is complete, whether the event would take place was uncertain, because the diviner did not know whether they would be able to seize those people (whether they would be successful in seizing these people is not controllable). In the Shang examples, such a case is usually solved by having other charges presented as counterparts to clarify the situation, so we would know which is desirable, but not here. (40B) appears on the same piece of bone as (40A) but is not related to (40A), because in the illustration there is a line separating the two, indicating that (40B) is not relevant to (40A), and belongs to another group of inscriptions.

Why it was suggested earlier that Takashima's proposal is generally applicable to the Zhou bones is that most examples above are single, positive charges. Qi in the first and the fifth categories functions as a modal and an aspectual particle. Although the Zhou oracle bones on which the inscriptions appear are fragmented, and we do not know whether they appear on the desirable or the undesirable side of a plastron, by examining the contents of these inscriptions, we can determine the desirability of each charge. For example, in Example (1), the phrase 有正 suggests the diviner's desire was that these sacrificial activities proposed were correct and would be accepted by the spirit. On the other hand, if we see a hypothetical charge, 万方其 我史 (Tufang will be going to attack our emissary), and this is a fragment of oracle bone without other charges appearing together, just like these Zhou oracle bones, we can determine that the diviner in this case did not want this event to happen, so this charge was considered undesirable, and qi reflected it. In other words, we can usually determine the desirability of a charge by examining the content of the charge, and in Group One and Five from above, we can determine the desirability of each charge.

There are also other scholars' viewpoints on qi. For example, Keightley's view is that qi represents the desire of Di 帝, and he translates qi as "shall," claiming that charges which do not have qi expressed, instead, the desire of Shang kings. And here is one example he uses to illustrate

his point:

(44) 乙亥殷翌丙子帝其令雨.

Crack-making on yihai (day 12), Que (divined): ‘On the next day, bingzi (day 13), Di shall (qi) order rain. (Keightley’s translation).\(^{11}\)

Unfortunately, such a theory is not acceptable, and the reason is that if \(qi\) represents Di’s desire, then why would the word \(di\) also be present? Does it become redundant to have both Di and qi present together? Also, if we adopt his theory, Example (1) would be: “... the king shall (= qi, Di’s desire) hold the x ritual....” when in fact it was the king who was going to hold the ritual, and it had no relation with Di. Similarly, in Example (15), it was the king who was going to Mount Mi, and the desire of Di could not be involved. Two examples that Takashima uses to counter Keightley’s are:

(45) 寶其來見王.\(^{12}\)

Fou will be going to come to have audience with the king.

(46) 寶不其來見王.

Fou will not be going to come to have audience with the king.

Following Keightley’s proposal, Di’s desire appears in both charges, but here it contradicts with his own view of “\(qi\) as a marker of the subjunctive mood that expressed the will of Di, which, because the modally-marked charges represented undesirable outcomes, the Shang considered contrary to the wishes of the king.”\(^{13}\) Then, we have Di’s desire in (46) going against his own in (47),\(^{14}\) a rather strange thing to appear.

In summary, \(qi\) functions as a modal and an aspectual particle in both the Shang and the Zhou oracle-bone inscriptions. In the examples seen in this thesis, it moved along one of the two scales: possibility/certainty or intention/wish, depending on the controllability of the following verb. If the verb is controllable, \(qi\) moves along the intention/wish scale; if not, the possibility/certainty scale. \(Qi\) also conveys

---

\(^{11}\)Keightley, 17; quoted in Takashima, 529.

\(^{12}\)Takashima, 530.

\(^{13}\)Keightley, 18; quoted in Takashima, 530.

\(^{14}\)Takashima, “The Modal and Aspectual,” 530.
the future sense, best translated as “to be going to.” Furthermore, *qi*
represents diviners’ presuppositions. In Shang oracle-bone inscriptions,
the presuppositions in the desirable charges indicate that the diviners
wanted the charges to be accepted; in the undesirable charges, the
presuppositions indicated that the charges be rejected. And *qi* in the Zhou
oracle-bone inscriptions reflects the same sort of linguistic features.