

Western “Capitals” of the Western Zhou Dynasty: Historical Reality and Its Reflections Until the Time of Sima Qian¹

Maria Khayutina (München)

According to Sima Qian’s 司馬遷 (ca. 145–90 BC) account in the “Basic Records of Zhou” (“Zhou benji” 周本記) chapter of the *Records of the Historiographer* (*Shi ji* 史記), the first kings of the Zhou dynasty (1046/1045–256 BC) removed their capital (*du* 都) from its original location in Zhou-under-Qi 岐周 (situated under Mount Qi 岐 on the edge of present-day counties Qishan 岐山 and Fufeng 扶風 in the west of Shaanxi 陝西 Province). First, on the eve of the war against the Shang state in the mid eleventh century BC, King Wen (?–1050 BC) relocated it to Feng-Hao 豐鎬 (situated in the valley of the Feng 豐 River in the outskirts of present-day Xi’an 西安, provincial capital of Shaanxi). Second, after the conquest of the Shang, King Cheng (1042/1035–1006) was about to relocate the capital again to Luoyi 洛邑 (situated in the valley of the Luo 洛 River in the place of present-day Luoyang 洛陽 in central Henan province). Shortly afterwards, he abandoned this newly built city for unknown reasons and returned to Feng-Hao. Sima Qian argued that Feng-Hao remained *the* capital of the Zhou state until it was invaded by the Quan-Rong 犬戎 in 771 BC and the court fled to Luoyi, which became the capital only after this date. Since then, Luoyi, or Luoyang, remained the capital until the end of the Zhou dynasty in 256 BC.²

With this account, Sima Qian opposed the general opinion of the contemporary scholars who insisted that Luoyang became *the* capital of the Zhou state soon after its construction and who suppressed the historical fact that after the reign of King Cheng, Zhou kings were still active in the west. The rehabilitation of the importance of the west in the history of the Zhou was indeed one of the great historiographical achievements of Sima Qian. Nevertheless, epigraphic documents from the Western Zhou epoch (1046/1045–771 BC) reveal that his reconstruction was still inaccurate in two respects: first, Zhou kings maintained not just a single capital, but a network of residences. Second, in their hierarchy, the old, pre-conquest residence under Mount Qi enjoyed the most prominent status and outshaded other residences in the valleys of Feng and Luo.

1 The initial stage of this investigation was supported by the Gerda Henkel Foundation. I express my gratefulness to Dr. Vera Dorofeeva-Lichtmann, Prof. Yuri Pines, Prof. Kai Vogelsang and Prof. Hans van Ess for their comments on my presentation “Did the first Kings of the Zhou Dynasty Relocate their Capital? The *Topos* of the ‘Central Place’ in Early China and its Historical Contexts” in the panel *Topoi of First and Last Rulers* at the XVII Conference of the European Association of Chinese Studies (6–10 August 2008, Lund, Sweden) on which the present paper is based. I also thank Prof. Thomas Höllmann for commenting on its previous version and Tatyana Gardner, M.A., for the proofreading of this draft. All remaining errors are my own responsibility.

2 Cf. Sima, *Shi ji*, [cit. after Sima Qian: *Shi ji* [Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1959, rpt. 1973], “Zhou ben ji” [4], 111–171. For western translations, cf., among others, William H. Nienhauser (trans., ed.) et al, *The Grand Scribe’s Records*. Volume I: *The Basic Annals of Pre-Han China* by Ssu-ma Ch’ien (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994); R.V. Vyatkin, V.S. Taskin (trans.), *Istoricheskie zapiski* [Historical records] (Moscow: Vostochnaya literatura, 1979, rpt. 2001).

When writing his account Sima Qian relied on literary sources available in late second century BC. By juxtaposing the data of epigraphic sources against reminiscences about of the past in received texts from several centuries up to the Western Han (206 BC – AD 9) period, the present paper aims to reveal how the “western period” of the Zhou dynasty was remembered, forgotten, and later reconstructed from pieces of memory. In order to do so, it considers the following questions:

- 1) How was the geopolitical constitution of the Zhou polity before 771 BC reflected in various literary texts:
 - in the *Poetry* and *Documents Classics*, possibly manifesting representations of the edge between the Western and Eastern Zhou periods;
 - in the *Zuo zhuan*, possibly manifesting representations of the Spring and Autumn period (770–403 BC);
 - in various texts of the Warring States period (403–221 BC)?
- 2) How was the early Zhou period remembered during the Western Han times and how were available memories about its “western period” selected, manipulated and integrated in Sima Qian’s *Records of the Historiographer*?

Surveying many sources of a heterogeneous nature and different origins, this paper makes some preliminary observations about alternative tendencies in the process of construction of the past in early China and tentatively discusses their possible political and social backgrounds.

1 Royal residences in Western Zhou bronze inscriptions

Epigraphic as well as archaeological sources available today corroborate that until the early eighth century BC, western regions, including both the area on the edge of Qishan and Fufeng Counties of Shaanxi Province, and, next to it, the area of Xi’an, hosted royal residences³ where Zhou kings regularly engaged in various political, administrative and religious activities. Bronze inscriptions reveal the names of the two main ones, Zhou 周 on the Zhou Plain (i.e. Zhou-under-Qi) and Zongzhou 宗周 (as generally agreed, corresponding to Hao, or to Feng-Hao as referred to in some literary texts and in Sima Qian’s account),⁴ as well as the names of few secondary residences, including Pangjing 旁京 (in the vicinity of either Zongzhou or Zhou-under-Qi)⁵ and Zheng 鄭 (in Wugong County of present-day Shaanxi Province).⁶ Recently, a

3 I am grateful to Prof. Thomas Höllman for his advice to define seats of the Western Zhou kings as “residences” (or Germ. “Residenzen”) instead of “capitals” (personal communication, January 2006).

4 Chen Mengjia and Zhang Guangzhi supposed that the name Zongzhou, i.e. “Clan’s Zhou,” referred to the place where most ancestral temples of deceased kings were located, i.e. to Zhou-under-Qi. Cf. Chen Mengjia 陳夢家, “Xi Zhou tong qi duandai” 西周銅器斷代, part I–II, *Kaogu xuebao* 9, 10 (1955) [rpt. in Wang Mengdan 王夢旦, ed. *Jinwen lunwen xuan* 金文論文選 (Hong Kong: Zhuda shudian, 1968): 53–126], 113–115; Zhang Guangzhi 張光直 (= Chang Kwang-chih), “Xia Shang Zhou san dai du zhi yu san dai wenhua yitong” 夏商周三代都制與三代文化異同, *Zhongguo yanjiusuo lishi yanjiu xuekan* 55.1 (1984): 51–71, esp. 59. However, most scholars identify Zongzhou with Feng-Hao. Cf. Li Feng, *Landscape and Power in Early China. The Crisis and Fall of the Western Zhou, 1045–771 BC* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 45–46.

5 Most scholars assume that Pangjing was located in the vicinity of Zongzhou in the Feng Valley. Cf. Guo Moruo, *Liang Zhou jinwen ci*, vol. VI, 32–33; Huang Shengzhang 黃盛璋, “Guan yu jinwen zhong de

new royal site in the vicinity of the Zhougongmiao in Feng County of Shaanxi province was discovered. It is still to establish how it was referred to in the bronze inscriptions.

Inscriptions also corroborate that already during the reign of King Cheng, the eastern royal residence Chengzhou 成周 (corresponding to Luoyi) was founded and that the Zhou kings visited it from time to time during several centuries. Despite the establishment of the new center in the east, the overweight of western place-references⁷ in inscriptions referring to Zhou kings from the late eleventh until the early eighth centuries BC corroborates that the definition “Western Zhou period” conveniently reflects the geopolitical situation of this epoch.

Having established a new residence, the Zhou kings did not abandon earlier ones, but perambulated within the residences’ network, possibly aiming for their personal omnipresence. Roughly three hundred inscriptions mentioning Zhou kings in their event notations are available today, and almost eighty per cent of them contain place-references. These references demonstrate that the kings also itinerated between their residences and a variety of other places within and beyond the limits of the territories under their direct control, stretching between western Shaanxi and central Henan, and referred to in post-Western Zhou sources as the “royal domain” (*wang ji* 王疇). In each of their residences, as well as during their travels, the kings offered receptions to various categories of people. This “royal hospitality” functioned as both a political institution and a mechanism of practical administration.⁸ However, although the Zhou political and administrative systems were centred on the king’s person, there was not just a single geographical “central place,” where kings received their loyal subjects as guests and effectuated government.

The analysis of place-references in bronze inscriptions reveals that geopolitical processes developed differently in the larger Zhou polity, embracing the possessions of regional lords (*zhubou* 諸侯), and in the royal domain. On the interregional level, meetings between Zhou kings and the *zhubou* had political, constitutive significance as they allowed to politically hold the larger Zhou polity together, which was not integrated economically and administratively. Without having scheduled all receptions of the *zhubou* in royal residences, and without having chosen one of them as *the* ultimate meeting point for the *zhubou*, early Zhou kings failed to establish *the* exclusive territorial geopolitical center, i.e. *the* political capital of the larger Western

‘Fangjing (Fang), Hao, Feng, Bang’ wenti bian cheng zheng” 關於金文中的‘冢(方), 蒿, 豐, 邦’問題辯稱正,” *Zhonghua wenxue lunjun*, 1981: 183–198, esp. 183–185; Hwang Ming-chong, “Ming Tang: Cosmology, Political Order and Monuments in Early China” [Harvard University, Ph.D. Dissertation], 263. For an alternative localization of Pangjing near Zhou-under-Qi, cf. Li Zhongcao 李仲操, “Pangjing kao” 冢考, *Renwen zazhi* 5 (1983): 118–121; Li Zhongcao, “Wang zuo gui yu mingwen jian shi” 王作歸孟銘文簡釋, *Kaogu yu wenwu* 1 (1998): 82–83; Lu Liancheng 盧連成, “Xi Zhou jinwen suo jian Pangjing ji xiangguan du yi taolun” 西周金文所見旁京及相關都邑討論, *Zhongguo lishi dili lunjun* 3 (1995): 97–127; Luo Xizhang 羅西章, “Xi Zhou wang yu kaojian lun Pangjing diwang” 西周王孟考兼論冢地望, *Kaogu yu wenwu* 1 (1998): 76–81.

6 Chang Zheng 常征, “Zhou du Nan Zheng yu Zheng Huan feng guo bian” 周都南鄭與鄭桓封國辨, *Zhongguo lishi bowuguan yanjiu* 3 (1981): 15–24.

7 On place-references as a means of documenting events, cf. my “The Royal Year-Count of the Western Zhou Dynasty (1045–771 BC) and its Use(s): a Sociological Perspective,” forthcoming in *Time and Ritual in Early China*, ed. by Xiaobing Wang-Riese et al. (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, in print).

8 For a detailed investigation, cf. my “Royal Hospitality and Geopolitical Constitution of Western Zhou Polity (1046/45–771 BC)” (forthcoming).

Zhou polity. The latter was organized virtually around the moving person of the king and the network of residences scattered around the royal domain. This territorial centerlessness, or, at best, polycentricity complicated the communication between the king and the *zhubou*. As a result, the kings seemed not to have been able to regularly summon them in any of their residences, and recurred to holding “ambulatory” receptions of *zhubou* and neighboring non-Zhou rulers on the territories of regional states. This situation suggests that the concentration of all political communication in one representative geographical point was not the guiding principle in the geopolitical constitution of the larger Western Zhou polity.

Unlike on the interregional level, in the royal domain, integrated – both politically and administratively – territorial centralization was underway. During the middle and late periods, receptions, especially those connected with administrative tasks, were most regularly held in Zhou-under-Qi, but relatively seldom in Zongzhou and Chengzhou. The quantitative preponderance of Zhou-under-Qi over other residences signals that it was gradually establishing itself as the main political and administrative center of the royal domain. Still, the kings continued offering receptions in various, sometimes quite removed locations. Thus, until the fall of the Western Zhou, even in the royal domain the process of geopolitical centralization had not been completed.⁹

The fact that the Western Zhou period did not only take place but was also terminated at some point can also be corroborated by epigraphic evidence. Inscribed bronzes found in Shaanxi and dating from later periods did not any longer report about royal receptions in western residences, but were instead associated with the State of Qin. In these respects, Sima Qian’s statements that the Zhou kings first resided in the west, abandoned it during the reign of King Ping, and only then made Chengzhou/ Luoyi their ultimate capital are supported by authentic sources from the Western Zhou period. Contrarily, the question “Where was the Western Zhou capital?” cannot be answered easily and unambiguously. As a result of the mobile way of the Zhou government, the larger Zhou polity did not have one single territorial geopolitical center. At the same time, within the royal domain, not Zongzhou/Feng-Hao but Zhou-under-Qi was gradually transforming into such a center. These observations reveal that Sima Qian erred when claiming that, until 771 BC, Feng-Hao was the ultimate Zhou “capital,” whereas other residences, including the oldest Zhou-under-Qi, were degraded.

2 Memories of western residences in the *Poetry and Documents Classics*

In order to retrace the roots of Sima Qian’s representation about the central role of the west, and, in particular, of Feng-Hao, in the early Zhou history, it is reasonable to begin with comparing the reflections of royal residences in the earliest literary texts of the Chinese tradition, the *Poetry* and the *Documents Classics*.

For each of the three main residences of the Western Zhou kings, Zhou, Zongzhou, and Chengzhou, their own “foundation texts” can be found in the earliest Chinese classics. However, the *Poetry Classic* only includes foundation texts dedicated to the two western residences, whereas in the *Documents Classic* only those dedicated to the foundation of the eastern residence are included. In their “foundation texts”, the residences are not called by their names as they were current during the Western Zhou period, but they are referred to in relation to their adjacent natural geographical markers. Zhou is defined by Mount Qi (i.e. “under-Qi” 岐下) and the Zhou

9 For a qualitative and quantitative analysis of the inscriptional data, cf. my “Royal Hospitality and Geopolitical Constitution of Western Zhou Polity (1046/45–771 BC),” forthcoming.

Plain (Zhouyuan 周原), Zongzhou by the Feng River and the place Hao 鎬, and Chengzhou by the Luo River. In parts of these two compendia dating to late Western Zhou or early post-Western Zhou time,¹⁰ any of the residences is denoted as “capital” (*du* 都).¹¹

Among the “foundation texts” in the *Poetry Classic*, one hymn and one “great” ode are dedicated to Zhou-under-Qi, whereas only one “great” ode is dedicated to Feng-Hao.¹²

The “foundation hymn” of Zhou-under-Qi (referred here simply as Qi), “Tian zuo” 天作, identifies two founders of Zhou-under Qi who created it anew (*zuo* 作),¹³ Heaven and the Great King (*tai wang* 大王), i.e. Patriarch Danfu 亶父:

天作高山	The Heaven made this High Mountain.
大王荒之	The Great King cultivated it.
彼作矣	Thus [he] made [it].
文王康之	King Wen [made it] prosperous,
彼徂矣	Thus [he] went [to it].
岐有夷之行	Qi has got even roads.
子孫保之	Sons and grandsons will protect it. ¹⁴

The last line of “Tian zuo” is similar to standard prayers in Western Zhou bronze inscriptions: “shall the sons and grandsons treasure/protect [it]” (*zǐ zǐ sun sun bao yong* 子子孫孫寶/保). Such ritual formulas concern the usage of ritual bronze vessels in rituals of ancestral worship. The commissioners of bronzes regarded their continuous usage and the uninterrupted per-

10 On a relative chronology of the sections of the *Poetry Classics*, cf. W.A.C.H. Dobson, *The Language of the Book of Songs* (Toronto: Toronto Univ. Press, 1968).

11 *Du* not necessarily signified “capital”. In the “Li zheng” 立政 chapter (“Establishing Government”) of *The Documents Classic*, *du* was employed in the sense of “large town” as distinguished from a small one, both governed by a *bo* 伯 (“lord,” or “the elder”). Cf. *Shang shu* [cit. after Qu Wanli 屈萬里 (ed.), *Shang shu shi yi* 尚書釋義 (Taipei: Huagang chubanshe, 1968)], “Li zheng,” 122–123. However, in late Western Zhou bronze inscriptions *du* already appears in the sense of “the residence of the ruler”. In particular, in the inscription on the *Zongzhou zhong*, commissioned by King Li, the commissioner claims that he conquered the *du* of his rival, the ruler of Fu. Cf. *Yin Zhou jimwen jicheng* 殷周金文集成 (hereafter referred to as *Jicheng*), 18 vols. (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1984–1994), # 260. In the Eastern Zhou “smaller” ode “Du ren shi” 都人士, *du* refers to the royal residence. Cf. *Shi jing* [II.VIII.1] (numbers according to James Legge (trans.), *The She King or the Book of Odes*, in *The Chinese Classics*, vol. IV, rpt. (Hong Kong University Press, 1960), cit. after Qu Wanli 屈萬里 (ed.), *Shi jing quan shi* 詩經詮釋, in *Qu Wanli xiansheng quanji* 屈萬里先生全集 (Taipei: Lianjing chuban she gongsi, 1983), 436.

12 The “smaller preface” relates “Qing miao” 清廟, the first of the “Zhou hymns,” to Luoyi. It explicates that its subject was an audience given by the Duke of Zhou to *zhubou* after the completion of the construction of Luoyi and was performed by King Cheng sacrificing to King Wen. Cf. *Shi jing* [IV.I.1], 555. However, “Qing miao” does not contain any recognizable toponym or name, which shows that the interpretation of the Mao school was speculative. An alternative interpretation, circulating during the early Han, located the “Clear Temple” *Qing Miao* in the state of Lu. Cf. Wang Xianqian 王先謙, *Shi san jia yi ji shu* 詩三家義集疏 (Xinhua shuju, 1987), 1000.

13 For a discussion of the meaning of *zuo* in pre-Warring-States texts, cf. Michael Puett, *The Ambivalence of Creation: Debates Concerning Innovation and Artifice in Early China* (Stanford: Stanford UP, 2001), 22–37, 217–224.

14 Cf. *Shi jing* [IV.I.5], 560. Cf. also Bernhard Karlgren (trans.), *The Book of Odes* (Stockholm: Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities, 1950), 241; Legge, *The She King*, 574.

formance of sacrifices as essential for the survival of their lineage. In this way, the life of material objects guaranteed the life of humans, and, therefore, humans took care of the objects, “treasuring” and “protecting” them. By analogy, this hymn, possibly making part of the liturgical repertory performed in the course of royal ancestral ceremonies during Western Zhou time,¹⁵ was conceived as an instrument of practical manipulation of the world order used to guarantee the perpetuation of both the royal house of Zhou and of the royal residence Zhou-under-Qi. It may be significant that, unlike Feng-Hao or Luoyi, Zhou-under-Qi was the only royal residence having its own hymn, which could be related to its status as the sacred center of the Zhou kings.

Unlike the “Tian zuo” hymn, possibly addressing royal ancestral spirits in order to ask them for new support, “foundation odes” are rather literary, commemorative texts, conceived to transmit the events of the past to present and future generations of men.¹⁶ The “foundation ode” of Zhou-under-Qi, “Mian” 綿, is the third text of the first ten of the “Great Odes” section of the *Poetry Classic*.¹⁷ It can be recognized as secondary and exegetical in relation to the earlier, archaic and unadorned “foundation hymn.”

周原膴膴	The Zhou Plain was rich and ample
董荼如飴	The <i>jin</i> and <i>tu</i> plants were like sweet cakes
爰始爰謀	Hence [Danfu] started, hence planned,
爰契我龜	Hence required agreement from our [divinatory] tortoise.
曰止曰時	[The turtle] said: “Stop [here]!” [It] said “It’s the time!”
築室于茲	Construct the home here!
迺慰迺止	So comforted [the people], and settled [them].
迺左迺右	To the left, to the right,
迺疆迺理	Laid out boundaries, established order,
迺宣迺畝	Took measures, laid out acres.
自西徂東	From the west heading east,
周爰執事	Zhou hence took all affairs in their hands.

The “Mian” represents Zhou-under-Qi as a designated home of the Zhou people and anticipates its future expansion from the west to the east. In the following stanzas, it reflects the conception of the royal residence as a place where the king receives his subjects. After having constructed houses (*shi jia* 室家) for the people on the Zhou Plain, Patriarch Danfu built the great ancestral temple there. As parts of the temple complex, he

迺立臬門	Erected the High Gate.
臬門有伉	The High Gate was lofty.
迺立應門	Erected the Gate of Response.
應門將將	The Gate of Response was grand.
迺立冢土	Erected the Grand Earth-Altar,
戎醜攸行	Where our multitudes are to line up.

As bronze inscriptions reflect, royal ancestral temples were used not only for the performance of sacrifices, but also for receptions. Therefore, it is not by chance that “Mian” highlights

15 On early Zhou hymns as liturgic texts, cf. Edward L. Shaughnessy, “From Liturgy to Literature: The Ritual Contexts of the Earliest Poems in the *Book of Poetry*,” in Edward L. Shaughnessy, *Before Confucius. Studies in the Creation of the Chinese Classics* (New York: SUNY Press, 1997), 165–196.

16 On the different functions of hymns and odes, cf. Shaughnessy, “From Liturgy to Literature”.

17 Cf. *Shijing* III.I.3, 459. Cf also Karlgren, *The Book of Odes*, 190; Legge, *The She King*, 439.

architectural components of the Zhou temple that were important inasmuch as they structured the ritual of receptions. In particular, one of its substantial elements was the instance of entering through the gate (*ru men* 入門),¹⁸ and hence is the emphasis of the ode on the two gates leading inside the temple courtyard complex. In the courtyard, where the Grand Earth-Altar, referred to in “Mian”, had to be located, participants of large royal receptions assumed prescribed positions, i.e. “lined up”.¹⁹ By depicting the Great Temple in this way, “Mian” signals that the royal residence had to be a place of royal hospitality through which the king staged himself as sovereign and lord over other people:

行道兌矣 Roads to go were cleared.²⁰

thus allowing to

文王蹶厥生	King Wen to rapidly move his live beings:
予曰有疏附	One says, some were distant, some were close;
予曰有先後	One says, some were first, some followed;
予曰有奔奏(走) ²¹	One says, some [began] running and walking;
予曰有禦侮	One says, some [began] protecting [Zhou] from insults.

18 Receptions were held in a number of royal temples (*miao*) located in Zhou-under-Qi, Zongzhou and Chengzhou. Besides, they were held in palaces (*gong*) which possibly included shrines of deceased kings. Both temples and palaces were courtyard compounds to which access was possible through the gate located in the middle of the frontal, southern wall. There could be more courtyards arranged from south to north and connected to each other by gates. For an example of an inscription highlighting the instances of entering and leaving the courtyard during a royal reception, cf. *Shi Song ding* 史頌鼎: “This was the third year, after the dying of brightness begun, on the day *jia-xu*. The King was in the Kang-Zhao-Palace in Zhou. At dawn, the King entered the Great Chamber. Assumed [his] position. The Master of Ceremonies Yin accompanied Song on his right-hand side. [They] entered the gate (*ru men*) [and] took the position in the middle yard. The Head of the Secretariat accepted the text of the King’s command. The King ordered Secretary Guo-sheng to [read aloud] the written command to Song ... Song bowed touching his head to the ground, accepted the bamboo strips [with the text of the] command, attached it to his girdle and went out. He returned and entered again (*ru*), holding the ceremonial jade scepter in his hands.” [*Jicheng* # 2827]

19 Cf. *Xiao Yu ding* 小盂鼎: “In the eighth month, the year-planet was in the day *jia-shen*. At dawn. Three on the left, three on the right. The many lords entered to be served with wine. As soon as there was light, the king installed himself in the Temple of Zhou. ... the guests came and took positions. The guests of countries-*bang* were served according to their regiments. Faced east. Yu, with many flags, girdles, Gui-fang’s ... entered through the Three Gates ...” [*Jicheng* # 2839]. Commenting on “Mian”, the Mao school understood *hang* 行 as being equivalent to *xing* 行 “to go”, “to leave”: “Zhongtu, the Great Earth-Altar. To start great affairs, to move great masses, it is necessary first to announce the said affairs at the Earth-Altar and depart thereafter. This is called ‘to approve’.” (塚土，大社也。起大事，動大眾，必先有事乎社而後出，謂之宜) Cf. Zheng Xuan 鄭玄 (comm.), *Maoshi* 毛詩, vol. III, *juan* 16, 6a. Thus, the Mao school regarded Zhou-under-Qi as the point from which the movement of the Zhou people had to be redirected outwards as to spread to further territories, i.e. the “starting point,” but not necessarily as a place to which the inhabitants of the expanding polity could be drawn. However, as it is now evident that Zhou-under-Qi also functioned as a reception center, the standard reading *hang* 行 “to arrange”, “to line up” seems preferable.

20 This line possibly explains a parallel line in “Tian Zuo”.

21 The Lu school’s version of the *Poetry* had 走 on this place. Cf. Wang Xianqian, *Shi san jia*, 842.

Both “Mian” and “Tian zuo” reflect Zhou-under-Qi as a sacred place. Besides, “Mian” characterizes it as a place from which Zhou people took off, i.e. a starting point, and as a meeting point to which people living nearby and far away could be drawn. In sum, this royal residence is represented as a communication knot for men and ancestors on the one hand, and for the king and his subjects on the other hand.

The “foundation ode” about Feng-Hao, “Wen wang you sheng” 文王有聲, is the last text of the first ten of the “Great Odes” section of the *Poetry Classic*.²² It attributes the “creation anew” (攸) of the settlement in Feng Valley to King Wen:

文王受命	King Wen received the Mandate
有此武功	[and] has got this military skill!
既伐于崇	After he had a battle at Chong,
作邑于豐	[he] created a Settlement at Feng –
文王烝哉	King Wen has arisen!

Similar to the decision of Patriarch Danfu to dwell in Zhou-under-Qi, as referred to in “Mian”, King Wu’s choice to reside in Hao was verified by scapulimancy:

考卜維王	It was examined by divination about the king:
宅是鎬京	“[Shall he] reside in this Hao-jing?”
維龜正之	The [oracle] tortoise confirmed this.
武王成之	King Wu accomplished this –
武王烝哉	King Wu has arisen!

Whereas “Mian” represents Zhou-under-Qi as a center of ancestral worship, “Wen wang you sheng” refers to the myth of the Earth’s regulation by Yu the Great and thus relates the place chosen for the new residence with a more ancient sacred history:

豐水東注	Feng River flows to the east
維禹之績	Through the footprints of Yu. ²³
四方攸同	This is the place where the Four Quarters converge!

22 Cf. *Shi jing* [III.1.10], 480. Cf. also Karlgren, *The Book of Odes*, 198; Legge, *The She King*, 460.

23 The *topos* of the “footprints of Yu” appears in two significant bronze inscriptions from early-to-mid-Spring and Autumn period: *Qin-gong gui* 秦公簋, commissioned by Duke Wu 武 of Qin 秦 (697–678 BC) (*Jicheng* # 4315), and *Shu Yi zhong* 叔尸鐘, commissioned a high officer of the State of Qi 齊 during the rule of Duke Ling 靈 (581–555 BC) (*Jicheng* # 276). Both commissioners claimed that their ancestors were given a Heavenly Mandate to reside (*zhuai* 宅, or *chu* 處 respectively) on the footprints of Yu (禹賁[蹟], or 禹之堵). As royal speeches rendered in Western Zhou bronze inscriptions demonstrate, the Zhou kings derived their authority only from Heaven, whereas the commissioners of the bronzes never dared to claim that their authority derived from someone other than the Zhou king. Therefore, the reference to Yu’s footprints in the “Wen wang you sheng” sounds odd. Other poems in the *Poetry Classic*, mentioning Yu, are traditionally dated to the reign of King Xuan 宣 at the earliest (“Han yi” 韓奕, “Xin Nan shan” 信南山), whereas others make part of the Shang 商 and Lu 魯 Hymns that were composed at a relatively late date (“Bi gong” 閟宮, “Chang fa” 長發, “Yin wu” 殷武). Both Eastern Zhou inscriptions and late Western Zhou and Eastern Zhou poems of the *Poetry Classic* employed the myth of the terrestrial organization by Yu the Great in order to legitimate the right of their protagonists to dwell in certain places. This discourse was unfamiliar for the earlier Western Zhou time. Therefore, it may be suggested that the “Wen wang you sheng” was composed either at the very end of the Western Zhou period, or later.

皇王維辟	The august king became the sovereign.
皇王烝哉	The august king has arisen!

In the same strophe, Feng is represented as the center amidst the Four Quarters. Further, Hao is also defined as the center relatively to the four cardinal directions:

鎬京辟廡	Hao-jing and the Circular Pond!
自西自東	From West, from East,
自南自北	From South, from North
無思不服	No one even dared to think [not to come to perform] the duty. ²⁴

Whereas “Mian” characterizes Zhou-under-Qi as the place where the Zhou multitudes had to “line up,” “Wen wang you sheng” represents Feng-Hao as the location where the people had to betake themselves to in order to *fu* 服 (“to perform duties,” or “to offer tribute”).²⁵ Thus, similar to Zhou-under-Qi, Feng-Hao is also defined as a meeting point and a communication knot. It is not clear whether this communication included a sacred component, as it is unlikely that Zhou people sacrificed to the spirit of Yu the Great. In any case, it was conceived as a place suitable to receive royal subjects.

A comparison with the *Documents Classic*²⁶ reveals that similar functions were also attributed by its “foundation documents” to the third royal residence, Luoyi/Chengzhou. Its chapters “Shao gao” 召誥 (“Announcement of the Duke of Shao”), “Luo gao” 洛誥 (“Announcement at Luo”), and “Duo shi” 多士 (“Many Officers”) altogether reflect the planning, establishment, and use of Luoyi. Besides, the “great gathering” of the people from the four quarters of the world in the “eastern state of Luo” was referred to in the introductory lines of the “Kang gao” 康誥 chapter, dedicated to the investiture of King Cheng’s uncle Kang-shu Feng as the ruler of Wei. Plausibly, these lines originally did not belong to this chapter, but were taken from somewhere else.²⁷ Table I analytically juxtaposes “portrays” of Zhou-under-Qi and Feng-Hao in the *Poetry* with that of Luoyi in its “foundation documents” in the *Documents Classic*:

Both “foundation odes” and “foundation documents” associate two or more founders with each royal residence: Zhou-under-Qi was founded by Heaven and the Great King, or by the Great King and King Wen, i.e. by grandfather and grandson; Feng-Hao was founded by Kings Wen and Wu, i.e. by father and son, whereas Luoyi was founded by King Cheng, and the Duke of Zhou, i.e. by two brothers. The representation of the joint efforts of members of consequent

24 Zi, “from”, indicates that the verb *fu* 服 (“to perform the duty”) involves motion and can be translated as “to come to perform the duty”.

25 The construction “from west ... to serve” (自西...服) makes clear that *fu* also implied motion and should be understood as “to come to serve”.

26 On the authenticity and chronological layers of the *Documents Classic*, cf. Shaughnessy, “Shang shu” in Michael Loewe (ed.), *Early Chinese Texts: A Bibliographical Guide* (Berkeley: The Society for the Study of Early China, 1993), 376–389, esp. 378–379; Michael Nylan, *The Fine “Confucian” Classics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 133–136.

27 Cf. James Legge (trans.), *The Shoo King or the Book of Historical Documents*, in *The Chinese Classics*, vol. III, rpt. (Hong Kong University Press, 1960), 382; Bernhard Karlgren (trans.), *The Book of Documents* (Stockholm: Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities, 1974), 41; Qu Wanli, *Shang shu shi yi*, 76–77. The discovery of the *Kang-hou gui* (Jicheng # 4059) confirms that the first ruler of Wei was invested not in Luoyi, but somewhere on the territory of the future Wei state. Cf. my *Royal hospitality and geopolitical constitution* (forthcoming).

generations, or of a king and a head of a branch lineage, possibly, implies continuity and durability of both royal house and royal residences. In connection to the foundation of each residence, a divination confirming that the decision to build it was favorable is mentioned. With regard to their functions, all the three residences are presented as meeting points where communication between the king and royal subjects could take place. As far as bronze inscriptions from the Western Zhou time corroborate that Zhou, Zongzhou and Chengzhou were alternatively used in this capacity, the memories about them in the *Poetry* and the *Documents Classics* in this respect seem adequate.

	Zhou/Qi Zhou/ Qiyi 周 / 岐周 / 岐邑	Feng-Hao/Zongzhou 豐鎬 / 宗周	Luoyi/ Chengzhou 洛邑 / 成周
Founder I	Heaven (TZ) ²⁸ / Great King (M)	King Wen	King Wu
Founder II	Great King (TZ)/ King Wen (M)	King Wu	King Cheng
Foundation	作 created (TZ)	作 created	作 created (SG, DS)
Legitimation	契我龜 required agreement from our tortoise (M)	龜正之 tortoise confirmed this	卜 Performed scapulimancy (SG, LG)
Type of settlement	室家 homes (M)	邑 <i>yi</i> settlement	大邑 <i>yi</i> Great settlement (SG, LG, DS)
King's Residence	室 <i>shi</i> home (M)	宅 <i>zhai</i> residence	宅 <i>zhai</i> residence (SG, LG)
Functions	戎醜攸行 ... where our multitudes are to line up (M)	四方攸同 ... where the Four Quarters converge 服 ... [come to perform] duties	四方罔攸賓(攢) ... among the Four Quarters, there will be no one who will be treated inhospitably (DS) ²⁹ 四方民大和會 ... the people of the Four Quarters gathered in the Great Harmony (KG)
Cardinal orientations	自西徂東 from the west heading east (M)	自西自東，自南自北 from west, from east, from south, from north	于土中 in the middle of the earth (SG)

Table I: The three royal residences according to their “foundation odes” or “documents”

The representation of Zhou-under-Qi only in one respect differs from those of both Feng-Hao and Luoyi. Each of the latter residences, backed alternatively by their “foundation texts” in the

28 TZ – “Tian zuo,” M – “Mian,” KG – “Kang gao,” SG – “Shao gao,” LG – “Luo gao,” DS – “Duo shi”.

29 *Shang shu*, “Duo shi,” 431. Cf. also Legge, *The Shoo King*, 463. Karlgren read *bin* 賓 as 攢: “In the four quarters there I have none whom I reject.” Cf. Karlgren, *The Book of Documents*, 56.

Poetry or the *Documents Classic*, is represented as the geographical “center” of the world.³⁰ Feng-Hao is defined as the “place where the four quarters converge,” i.e. as the “center” relatively to the cardinal directions, whereas the location of Luoyi is directly identified in the “Shao gao” as “the center of the earth”. Such an explicit notion of geographical centrality can neither be found in the “foundation saga” about Zhou-under-Qi nor in its “foundation hymn”. It was merely represented as the point from which the movement of the Zhou people and the king could be directed “from west to east” and to which visitors could be drawn from “nearby and far away”.

The absence of explicit centralist concepts in both “Tian zuo” and “Mian” should not be surprising considering the fact that Zhou Kings itinerated between their residences, starting in Zhou-under-Qi as the westernmost amongst them, and returning there after having visited Chengzhou or Zongzhou. However, both “Wen wang you sheng” and the “Shao gao” possibly represented each of the latter residences as a center not just because they were better accessible to royal subjects heading to meet the king than Zhou-under-Qi. Rather, they promoted centralism as a more preferable form of geopolitical constitution in comparison to the network.

The shift from the toleration of polycentrism in favour of monocentrism could manifest itself as a new trend in representations of some elite circles starting from the middle Western Zhou period, when geopolitical centralization about Zhou-under-Qi was progressively underway in the royal domain. Chengzhou/Luoyi’s elevation to the status of the ultimate royal center caused by force of circumstances during 771/770 BC logically provided the ground for this trend to become an official ideology. Regardless of whether individual texts in the *Poetry* and *Documents Classic* propagating centralism were composed before or after 771 BC,³¹ the editors of both compendia were already guided by monocentric considerations. At the same time, it can be observed that their perspectives on the early Zhou history did not fully overlap.

By not giving space for a “foundation ode” about Chengzhou, the compilers of the *Poetry Classic* possibly implied that the eastern residence could not compete in majesty with the western ones, established by charismatic patriarchs and kings. Contrarily, by including a series of “foundation documents” about Chengzhou/ Luoyi, but anything comparable about Zhou-under-Qi or Zongzhou, the editors of the *Documents Classic* built up the legitimacy and substantiated the superiority of the eastern royal residence.

Giving preference to one or another residence, both compendia do not ignore the existence of the others, but understate their significance. The *Poetry Classic* includes only a few odes dedicated to the eastern residence. Pleading for “cherishing this Central State in order to pacify the Four Quarters” (惠此中國以綏四方), the “great” ode “Min lao” 民勞 represents this as a response to the decay of the royal house, thus alluding to some events of the end of the Western Zhou epoch or perhaps even later.³² “Zhan bi Luo yi” 瞻彼洛矣, prognosticating

30 For a discussion of the idea of centrality in connection to the foundation of Luoyi, cf. Wang Aihe, *Cosmology and Political Culture*, 63–74.

31 Beside the already mentioned features of the “Wen wang you sheng,” a number of factors indicate that the *Documents* related to the foundation of Luoyi also do not date to the early, but rather to the late Western Zhou period or an even later time. Cf. Vassili Kryukov, *Tekst i ritual. Opyt interpretatsii drevnekitaiskoy epigrafiki epohi Yin-Zhou* [Text and Ritual. An Attempt of Interpretation of Early Chinese Epigraphy of Yin-Zhou epoch] (Moscow: Pamyatniki istoricheskoi mysli, 2000), 296–328; Kai Vogelsang, “Inscriptions and Proclamations: On the Authenticity of the ‘gao’ Chapters in the *Book of Documents*,” *BMF EA* 74 (2002): 138–209.

32 Cf. *Shi jing* [III.II.9], 504. The Mao school attributed its authorship to Duke Mu of Shao who wrote it to criticize King Li.

blessings resulting from the coming to the banks of Luo,³³ is devoid of historical context, unimpressive, and, being placed in the “Smaller Odes” section, less authoritative. Thus, even recognizing the centrality of Chengzhou, already irreversible during their own lifetime, the compilers of the *Poetry Classic* acknowledged the shift of the center from west to east much later than the reign of King Cheng and, moreover, loaded it with negative associations.

The *Documents Classic* mentions several times the western residences Zhou, Feng and Zongzhou.³⁴ These references suggest that its compilers recognized that during the reigns of King Wu and King Cheng, there were several residences in the west. The earliest chronological layer of the *Documents Classic* also included the “Wu cheng” 武成 chapter that possibly was sorted out by its Confucian editors during the Warring States period. Plausibly, this text survived as the “Shi fu” 世俘 chapter of the “apocryphal” *Book of Zhou*.³⁵ “Shi fu” states that after the conquest, King Wu returned to Zhou, i.e. Zhou-under-Qi, and sacrificed in the Zhou Temple.³⁶ This indicates that the first editors of the *Documents* possibly recognized that during the early days of the dynasty, Zhou-under-Qi was the sacred center of the Zhou kings and enjoyed a higher status than Feng or Zongzhou. Nevertheless, although the “Luo gao” chapter confesses that after the construction of Luoyi, King Cheng “retreated in order to be the sovereign in Zhou, having commanded the Duke of Zhou to stay behind” (退即辟于周, 命公後) in the New City, texts of this compendium reflecting posterior epochs do not locate any important events after the reign of King Cheng in the west.³⁷ The emphasis of the *Documents Classic* on the foundation of Luoyi indicates that its compilers regarded this event as terminating the era of polycentrism.

Both representations of the *Poetry* and *Documents Classics* are indeed ahistorical and do not even pretend otherwise, as they are indifferent to the eventual history of the royal residences after the time of their foundation until the moment of their destruction. The attitude of both compendia towards the events of 771 BC is also indicative of their overall perspectives on the Zhou history.

One would assume that the regicide and the loss of the western territories should have been a major trauma for the Zhou people. However, there are different ways to deal with traumatic experiences: they can be worked with, or they can be suppressed. The second strategy of dealing with the painful past seems to have dominated in early China. The murder of the king and the flight of the court from west to east were not explicitly referred to in any Eastern Zhou texts of both *Poetry* and *Documents Classics*. The “Wen-hou zhi ming” 文侯之命 chapter of the *Documents*,

33 Cf. *Shi jing* [III.IV.9], 414.

34 Cf. *Shang shu*, “Shao gao,” 91, “Duo fang” 多方, 116.

35 On the identification of “Shi fu” with “Wu cheng” cf. Edward Shaughnessy, “New Evidence of the Zhou Conquest”, in Shaughnessy, *Before Confucius*, 31–68), 38.

36 Cf. *Yi Zhou shu* [cit. after Zhu Youzeng 朱右曾 (ed.), *Yi Zhou shu jixun jiaoshi* 逸周書集訓校釋 (Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuaguan, 1931)], “Shi fu” [40], 53–58). Since, from a linguistic perspective, “Shi fu” could plausibly be a Western Zhou text, there is no doubt that Zhou referred to Zhou-under-Qi, similarly as in contemporary bronze inscriptions. Interestingly, the forged “Wu cheng” chapter in the Ancient Script *Documents Classic* similarly located the celebration of King Wu’s victory in the “Great city of Zhou”. Cf. *Shang shu*, “Wu cheng,” 184–185.

37 In the “Gu Ming” 顧命 chapter, reflecting the funeral of King Cheng conducted in a royal temple, no location was specified. Cf. *Shang shu*, “Gu ming,” 126–134. The speech of King Mu rendered in the “Lü xing” 呂邢 chapter needed not to be pronounced in a royal residence. Cf. *Shang shu*, “Lü xing,” 136–144.

rendering the written command issued by King Ping (770–720 BC) to Lord Wen of Jin (who was one of the main sponsors of the reestablishment of the Zhou dynasty in the east), did not contain any statement about the precedent events except for a mention of some “difficulties” (艱).³⁸ This text, if authentic, signals that the Eastern Zhou court preferred to draw a veil over the unpleasant subject of the eastward relocation. The editors of the *Documents Classic* were either not in the position or did not wish to uncover the truth.

Only the *Poetry Classic* transmitted some vague memories about the loss of the western residences. Many of its critical poems were later related by the Mao school to the decay of the Zhou dynasty during the reign of the last “western” ruler, King You 幽 (781–771 BC), and dated to this very time. Some of them may have been composed before, or, in most cases, after this period. Alluding to Western Zhou matters, both negative and positive, Eastern Zhou poems possibly did so in order to express discontent with the actual political situation. “Zheng yue” 正月, a “smaller” ode, most likely concerned with a situation well after 771 BC, recurred to the example from the past as to warn contemporaries:

今茲之正	This government of nowadays!
胡然厲矣	How oppressive it is!
燎之方揚	The spreading of the blaze,
寧或滅之	It is possible to stop or extinguish it. ³⁹
赫赫宗周	Brilliant-bright Zongzhou!
褒姒威之	Bao Si exterminated it. ⁴⁰

In this text, King You is directly alluded to. His extravagance and his alliance with Bao Si are pointed out as the reasons of his fall. With the overall context of this ode reprimanding power holders for their lust for luxury, the royal residence Zongzhou seems to be critically assessed as an incorporation of pomp and glare.

Another “smaller” ode, “Du ren shi” 都人士, bewailed

彼都人士	... these noblemen, men of the capital!
狐裘黃黃	Their fox coats are yellow, so yellow!
其容不改	Their appearance has not been changed!
出言有章	When they deliver speeches, they are so brilliant!
行歸于周	To go, to return to Zhou,
萬民所望	This is what the ten thousand people aspire! ⁴¹

The protagonist of this text seems to be nostalgic about the past, disappointed with the present, and desperately dreaming of getting back to the old Zhou heartland.⁴² Contrarily to the previous example, a western residence is represented as an unattainable “promised land”. This

38 Cf. *Shang shu*, “Wen-hou zhi ming,” 144–146.

39 This line can also be translated “the spread of blazes [can secure] peace or [lead to] its extinguishment”. Possibly, it alludes to the legend according to which Bao Si required that King You ordered to emblaze signal fires on beak towers as to produce a false alarm and thus make the *zhubou* come to his capital without need. Or, vice versa, this line could provide the ground for this legend to emerge afterwards.

40 Cf. *Shi jing* [III.IV.8], 352.

41 Cf. *Shi jing*, [II.VIII.1], 436.

42 This apparent meaning of this ode was completely ignored by the Mao school of the *Poetry Classic* that saw in it a criticism against improper ways of dressing. Cf. the discussion in Legge, *The She King*, 409–410.

is the first time that the word *du* was applied in the sense of a “residence city”, or even “capital” in the *Poetry Classic*.

In sum, the *Poetry Classic* mostly remembers the western residences at the moments of their foundation and collapse, whereas the *Documents Classic* includes a few reminiscences about their usage shortly after the conquest of the Shang and during the reign of King Cheng. Although the *Poetry Classic* possibly assumed that until the reign of King You, the Zhou polity was centered around the west, it did not articulate this view explicitly. Besides, it did not unambiguously indicate which of the western residences, Feng-Hao or Zhou-under-Qi, had the higher status. If this compendium was ever used to transmit memories about the west, this could hardly be done effectively by simply circulating texts composed during the Western Zhou time where some western landmarks were mentioned. After the abandonment of the territories in present-day Shaanxi, most of them could not even be correctly localized by Eastern Zhou readers not acquainted with the geographical toponymy of the west. At the same time, the *Documents Classic* purportedly disregarded the western royal residences and propagated Chengzhou/Luoyi as the ultimate center of the Zhou kings. Moreover, it suppressed the memories about the loss of the west and about the flight of the court to the east. Considering that today, the simultaneous usage of several residences by Zhou kings, as well as their devotion to the west are established facts, it is intriguing to ask who could stay behind the two visions of the early Zhou time. Some insights into their political and social backgrounds can be gained from a reading of the *Zuo zhuan*.

3 Memories of western residences in the *Zuo zhuan*

The *Zuo zhuan*, presumably partly preserving pieces of texts dating to the Spring and Autumn period, serves as a major “mirror of the contemporary thought” of this epoch.⁴³ Considering the heterogeneous nature of this chronicle, compiled about IV c. BC and including a hardly measurable mass of post-Spring and Autumn interpolations, I admit that in comparison to speeches pronounced in private, quotations from official written documents or speeches delivered in public were possibly more likely to be authentic and to date to the years under which they were recorded. Although private speeches could also be transmitted from mouth to mouth and finally reach the ears of the compilers of the *Zuo zhuan*, this type of data should be handled with particular care. If some of these speeches can be accepted as rendering Spring and Autumn views, commentaries of the chronicle’s compiler(s) should indeed be classified as textual evidences of the early Warring States period.

Memories about the Western Zhou epoch and its end, represented in the *Zuo zhuan*, were not necessarily congruent with each other. Presumably, contemporary interests and political concepts affected what should be remembered and what had to be forgotten about the epoch before 770 BC. This can be seen from the example of the references to King Ping’s “move to the east” (東遷), mentioned thrice in the *Zuo zhuan*. The first reference dates to 718 BC, the second year after the accession to the throne of King Huan 桓王 (719–697), the son of King Ping. His uncle or brother, Duke Huan 桓 of Zhou, allegedly dared to remind the king about propriety rules with respect to the rulers of the State of Zheng 鄭, which, together with the

43 Cf. Yuri Pines, *Foundations of Confucian Thought. Intellectual Life in the Chunqiu Period, 722–453 B.C.E.* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2002), 206. For an overview of various opinions on the authenticity and date of the *Zuo zhuan*, cf. Anne Cheng, “Ch’un ch’ü,” in Loewe, *Early Chinese Texts*, 67–76, esp. 69–71.

State of Jin, supported King Ping during his “move to the east”.⁴⁴ Notably, the king ignored Duke Huan’s argument. Whether this conversation ever actually took place or whether it was invented by the compilers of the *Zuo zhuan*, the king’s actions against the ruler of Zheng signalled that the king’s unwillingness to maintain liabilities towards his powerful vassal rulers of regional states who previously rescued the royal house from extermination, might have been one of the reasons why the Eastern Zhou court preferred to forget about the “move”.

The theme of King Ping’s flight seems to have been barred from open discussion during many years. For the first and last time, the “move to the east” was publicly referred to in 563 BC in a court hearing in connection with a quarrel between two courtiers of King Ling 靈王 (571–545): a royal relative by the name of Wang-shu Chen-sheng 王叔陳生 and a certain Bo Yu 伯輿, the king’s favourite and a descendant of an aristocratic lineage that relocated to the east when accompanying King Ping. Bo Yu’s advocate *taiju* Xia Qin 瑕禽 said:

昔平王東遷·吾七姓從王·牲用備具·王賴之·而賜之駢旄之盟·曰·世世無失職·若
 篳門閭竇·其能來東底乎·且王何賴焉·⁴⁵

Formerly, when King Ping moved to the east, our seven families accompanied the king. [We took care] of his equipment used in sacrifices. The king depended on us, and offered us a covenant [concluded with a sacrifice of] a red ox-tail, saying. “From generation to generation, [you] will not lose [your] offices! If we were such slum-dwellers, how could we come to the east, and how could the King depend on us?”

Regardless of whether the minutes of this hearing were taken so that they later became available to the view of the compilers of the *Zuo zhuan* or whether this account merely relied on an oral transmission, this example suggests that there may have been further political and social reasons of handling the past in different ways. Lineages of Zhou officers who left their residences on the Zhou Plain or in the valley of the Feng River in a haste, leaving behind their treasures that gladden archaeologists of our days, and went with King Ping to Chengzhou, were indeed the greatest losers of the west-east shift. As it can be seen from Western Zhou bronze inscriptions, lands around Chengzhou were since long ago distributed among local administrators and military officers. Eastern Zhou kings, enclosed within the narrow limits of their remaining domain, were not able to adequately recompense their western retinue for service with land possessions and goods. As a result, westerners turned into “slum dwellers,” while cultivating good manners (as alluded to by the “Du ren shi” ode), remembering the glory of the Western Zhou days, and hoping for the engagement by the king was all that remained to them. It is tempting to suggest that descendants of the old western nobility might have been responsible not only for writing individual poems bewailing the loss of the west, but also for the compilation of sections of the “Odes” of the *Poetry Classic* with their pro-western paradigm of the early Zhou history. Unfortunately, sources available today do not allow for verifying this assumption. At the same time, it is not unlikely that the impoverished westerners were disregarded by those who were well established in the east. Ignoring the Western Zhou and representing Chengzhou as the everlasting, never challenged capital of the Zhou kings provided an ideological base suitable to deny the aspirations of ambitious migrants. Thus, the policy of forgetting the past that answered the interests of the Zhou kings could also find support in larger circles rotating about the royal court.

44 Cf. *Zuo zhuan* [cit. after Yang Bojun 楊伯峻, *Chunqiu Zuo zhuan* 春秋左傳注 (Xinhua shudian, 1981)], Yin 隱 6 (51).

45 Cf. *Zuo zhuan*, Xiang 襄 10 [563 BC] (983).

Beyond the limits of the royal domain, other parties interested in the propagation of the pro-eastern, monocentric concepts can be suggested about. The forced anchorage of the Eastern Zhou kings in Chengzhou served the interest of most of the rulers of regional states. First, the king, staying permanently in this easily accessible place, could be rapidly contacted, e.g. in order to oversee a dispute among *zhubou* (although starting from VII c. BC, this function was transferred to hegemons). Second, without his western source base, the king could be rapidly disempowered politically and become dependent on regional lords (which indeed happened very soon). Eulogizing the sagacious plan of the Duke of Zhou to establish the capital in the east helped to legitimize the actions of the *zhubou* who crowned King Ping in Chengzhou and, not unlikely, impelled him to give away the western regions.

The third and last reference to the “move to the east” in the *Zuo zhuan* represents the compilers’ commentary to the entry for 717 BC and thus should be considered as a Warring States material.⁴⁶ It indicates that the compilers, possibly natives of the State of Lu 魯 in the east of the present-day Shandong province,⁴⁷ for some reasons did not wish the fall of the Western Zhou to be forgotten. By doing so, they possibly opposed the official view propagated by the Eastern Zhou court, as it is manifested in the only official document of the Zhou court touching upon the territorial aspects of the early Zhou history and quoted in the *Zuo zhuan*. In a written note addressed to Duke Ping 平 of Jin (557–530 BC) in 533 BC, King Jing 景 (544–520 BC) represents the historical geography of Zhou as follows:

我自夏以后稷·魏·駘·芮·岐·畢·吾西土也·及武王克商·蒲姑·商奄·吾東土也·巴濮·楚鄧·吾南土也·肅慎·燕·亳·吾北土也·吾何邇封之有·文武成康之建母弟·以蕃屏周...先王居禱机于四裔·以禦魑魅·故允姓之姁·居于瓜州·伯父惠公歸自秦·而誘以來·使偪我諸姬·入我郊甸·則戎焉取之·戎有中國·誰之咎也·⁴⁸

Since the time of the Xia dynasty until Hou Ji, Wei, Tai, Rui, Qi, [and] Bi were our lands in the west. At the time when King Wu conquered Shang, Pugu [and] Yan of Shang became our lands in the east. Pu of Ba [and] Deng of Chu are our lands in the south. Sushen, Yan, [and] Bo are our lands in the north. Which of our borders are near to us? [Kings] Wen, Wu, Cheng, and Kang established their younger full brothers [there], so that they act as fences and screens to Zhou... The past kings settled Taowu in [one of the] four farthest corners in order to resist evil spirits. Therefore, the villains of the Yun surname dwelt in Guazhou. Then [our] uncle, Duke Hui [of Jin] (650–637 BC. – M. Kh.), returned from Qin, he brought them here, so that [they started] to press upon [the territories of] all our Ji-[lineages], entered in our suburbs, and then the Rong took them over. That the Rong have [seized] the Central States, whose fault was this?

In this note, the king refers to mount Qi as a marker of Zhou-under-Qi and to the locality Bi in the vicinity of Zongzhou as the marker of the latter.⁴⁹ However, this was not the only case in which things were not called by their names in this text. Ignoring the contemporary “multi-state” geopolitical realities, King Jing claims the territorial integrity of the Zhou polity and the royal sovereignty over its whole space. In his representation, Zhou never suffered any losses. The disagreeable truth that King Ping had to flee from the west is not mentioned, whereas the transfer of the Zhou heartlands to the ruler of Qin 秦 is silently disguised as a part of the original plan

46 Cf. *Zuo zhuan*, Xi 僖 22 [638 BC] (393).

47 For the arguments about the Lu origin of the *Zuo zhuan*, cf. Pines, *Foundations of Confucian Thought*, 29.

48 Cf. *Zuo zhuan*, Zhao 9 (1307–1309).

49 That the toponym Bi pointed at Feng-Hao/ Zongzhou becomes clear from some Warring States texts that will be discussed in the next section. On Bi and Hao, cf. also Sima, *Shi ji*, “Zhou ben ji” [4], 170.

of creating regional states as “fences and screens” to protect Zhou. Besides, reprehending the ducal house of Jin for being responsible for triggering the migration of the Rong in the lands traditionally occupied by Zhou and its regional states in the seventh century BC, the king draws a veil over the major confrontation between the Zhou and the Rong, which caused the relocation of the royal house to Chengzhou in 771–770 BC. If this text, incorporated in the *Zuo zhuan*, is an authentic document of the Spring and Autumn period, it demonstrates that in the official version of the Zhou history propagated by the royal house in the sixth century BC, the “Western Zhou period” had no place. Few other passages in the *Zuo zhuan* support the observation that the court regarded Chengzhou as the permanent royal capital starting from the reign of King Cheng. It attributes its construction to King Cheng alone, without any reference to the Duke of Zhou. Notably, the “Shao gao” and “Luo gao” chapters of the *Documents Classic*, stressing the Duke’s participation and disclosing that King Cheng returned to the west, were never quoted in the *Zuo zhuan*.⁵⁰ Similarly, speakers in the *Zuo zhuan* never quote the “foundation” odes of the *Poetry Classic* glorifying the western residences. “Kang gao,” possibly already collated with its introductory lines glorifying the “great gathering” in Luoyi, was the only widely distributed “foundation document” and a standard source of reference on ancient history.⁵¹ Other “foundation texts,” if they existed before or at the beginning of the Spring and Autumn, might have been kept in royal archives and have come to the surface by accident.⁵²

Whilst the Zhou court preferred to ignore that the political center of gravity of the Zhou once was in the west, in the pluralist political order of the Spring and Autumn period it was not able to prescribe its views on history to everyone. The western landmarks of Zhou were once again mentioned in the *Zuo zhuan* in a conversation between King Ling 靈 of Chu, eager to become a new hegemon, and his counsellor Jiao Ju 椒舉 in 538 BC. Jiao Ju said:

臣聞諸侯無歸·禮以為歸·今君始得諸侯·其慎禮矣·霸之濟否·在此會也·夏啟有鈞臺之享·商湯有景亳之命·周武有孟津之誓·成有岐陽之蒐·康有鄴宮之朝·穆有塗山之會·齊桓有召陵之師·晉文有踐土之盟·君其何用·⁵³

Your servant heard that if the *zhubou* do not come back, the [appropriate] ritual [can be used] in order to make them come back. Now the Lord is starting to attract the *zhubou*. So, he has to be cautious about rituals. Whether being hegemon will be beneficent or not depends on this meeting. Qi of the

50 In a speech, dated to 510 BC and related to the plan to repair the walls of Chengzhou, King Jing 敬 (519–476 BC) says: “In the past, King Cheng gathered the *zhubou* in order to build the walls of Chengzhou, as to make it the Eastern Capital [and] worship [there] the enlightened virtue (var.: virtue of [King] Wen). Today, I wish to pray for blessings [and] felicitate the spirit of King Cheng, [and, for this purpose,] to repair the walls of Chengzhou!” (昔成王合諸侯·城成周·以為東都·崇文德焉·今我欲徵福假靈于成王·脩成周之城). Cf. *Zuo zhuan*, Zhao 32 (1517). Besides, in the famous speech of Fu Chen 富辰, a counsellor of King Xiang (651–619 BC), enumerating all regional states whose ruling houses descended from King Wen, King Wu, and the Duke of Zhou, Chengzhou was represented as the place where Duke Mu of Shao (2nd half of IX c. BC) gathered all the *zhubou* (possibly in order to re-establish the dynasty after the *gong-be* interregnum – M. Kh.). Cf. *Zuo zhuan*, Xi 24 [636 BC] (420–423).

51 Cf. *Zuo zhuan*, Xuan 6, Cheng 2, 8, 16, Zhao 8.

52 One likely instance would be 516 BC, when Wang-zi Zhao 王子朝, brother of King Jing and usurper to the royal throne during 520–516 BC, fled to Chu “carrying along the records of Zhou” (王子朝...奉周之典籍·以奔楚). Cf. *Zuo zhuan*, Zhao 26 (1475). It is noteworthy that Wang-zi Zhao demonstrated a profound knowledge of Western Zhou history, discussing individual qualities of many earlier kings.

53 Cf. *Zuo zhuan*, Zhao 4 [538 BC] (1251–1252).

Xia [dynasty] had a Feast at Jun Platform; Tang of the Shang [dynasty] had the Command in Bo-under-Jing [Mountain]; [King] Wu of Zhou [dynasty] had an Oath at Meng Ford; [King] Cheng had a Hunt on the Southern [slope of Mount] Qi; [King] Kang had an Audience at the Palace of Feng; [King Mu] had a Meeting on Mount Tu; [Duke] Huan of Qi had the [joint] Army at Shaoling, [Duke] Wen of Jin made a Covenant at Jiantu. Which [of these rituals] will the Lord use?

Unlike the official Eastern Zhou version of history, this account locates the most important meeting conducted by King Cheng not, as it could be expected, in Chengzhou/Luoyi, but on Mount Qi. It also acknowledges the importance of western territories during the reign of King Kang. On the other hand, it remains unclear whether the speaker knew that Qi, i.e. Zhou-under-Qi, and Feng, i.e. Feng-Hao/Zongzhou, were royal residences similar to Luoyi or even more important, or he regarded them merely as some meeting points on the periphery.⁵⁴

The further reading of the *Zuo zhuan* makes one doubt whether all its Spring and Autumn period's speakers and even its compilers had a clear idea of the historical geography of the Western Zhou. The *Zuo zhuan*'s compilers certainly knew the “Wen wang yu sheng” ode where Feng and Hao were associated with Kings Wen and Wu.⁵⁵ They may also have realized that the toponyms Qi and Bi, or Qi and Feng mentioned in the two entries quoted above in connection with early Zhou kings referred to royal residences.⁵⁶ At the same time, they were not necessarily aware that during the Western Zhou period, these residences were called Zhou and Zongzhou respectively. The *Zuo zhuan* indicates that during the Spring and Autumn period, the binomial *zong zhou* 宗周 was no longer used as a toponym, but employed in the sense of “The Honored [House of] Zhou”.⁵⁷ A speech recorded in the entry for 533 BC demonstrates that, during that time, the term *zong zhou* was indeed applied with respect to purely Eastern Zhou matters:

54 Starting with the first two meetings, organized by the founders of the Xia and Shang dynasties in their capitals, it also mentions meetings at Meng Ford and at Mount Tu, i.e. distant external locations, and, finally, passes to the meetings organized by hegemon of the Spring and Autumn period, who did not summon other *zhubou* to their own capitals. It is not clear whether in this sequence Qi and Feng stood closer to the capitals of Xia and Shang or to other, external locations of meetings.

55 Cf. *Zuo zhuan*, Wen 文 3 (530). The quotation from this ode makes part of the compilers' commentary and does not shed light on the historio-geographical representations in the *Zuo zhuan*.

56 Cf. *Zuo zhuan*, Zhao 4 [538 BC] (1251–1252); Zhao 9 (1307–1309).

57 Wang Yinglin 王應麟 (1223–1296) in his *Shi dili kao* 詩地理攷 (“Investigation of the Geography of the *Book of Odes*”) wrote: “Kong [Ango] 孔安國 said in his commentary to the 正月 ‘Zheng yue’ ode: ‘The honored Zhou was said about Haojing.’ Later King Ping [moved] his residence to Luoyi, [and since then] ‘Zongzhou’ was said about Luoyi. The ‘Ji tong’ chapter of the *Book of Rituals* records: ‘[Cheng-gong ordered Zhuang-shu to] enter Zongzhou.’ [This] was said about Luoyi. Lü-shi [Lü Zuqian 呂祖謙 (1137–1181)] said: ‘The capital of the king is that what the All-under-Heaven reveres (*zong*).’ Therefore, after the relocation of the capital to Luo in the East, [people started] to call it ‘Zongzhou.’ The inscription on the tripod of Kong Kui of Wei reads: ‘... entered the palace in Zongzhou.’ At the time [when it was written, Zongzhou] was Hao. Since the enfeoffment of Qin [in the old Zhou heartlands, [the name] Zongzhou was probably applied to Luo. Therefore, “Zongzhou” initially was not a fixed [place]-name. This name was applied to where the king had his *du*.” Cf. Wang Yinglin: *Shi dili kao*, in *Bai bu cong-shu* (Taipei: Yiwen yinshuaguan, 1965), *juan* 2.

叔向謂宣子曰·文之伯也·豈能改物·翼戴天子·而加之以共·自文以來·世有衰德·而暴滅宗周·⁵⁸

Shu Xiang said to Xuan-zi: “When [Duke] Wen [of Jin] (636–638 BC – M. Kh.) was hegemon, how could he change the order of things? He assisted and supported the Son of Heaven, and contributed as to [make everybody] to abide [by King’s orders]. Since [the time of Duke] Wen [of Jin], [next] generations had degraded virtue, and were cruelly destroying the Honored Zhou.”

Several other speeches in the *Zuo zhuan* demonstrate that Zhou and Zongzhou were used not as particular toponyms but as more general concepts.⁵⁹ The borrowing of *zongzhou* as designation for the Eastern Zhou royal house as well as the persistence of the name Zhou as the name of the dynasty, no longer related to a particular place in the west, may also have been reasons why the western residences of early Zhou kings were not referred to by their ancient names in the already discussed official note of King Jing. As the next section will demonstrate, this change in the use of the Western Zhou toponymy caused further distortions of memories about the past during the Warring States period.

In sum, the above proposed reading of the *Zuo zhuan* reveals that during the Spring and Autumn period, memories about the Western Zhou period were very feeble and may even have been intentionally suppressed. The court denied the loss of the western territories and represented their transfer into the hands of the regional house of Qin as a prearranged action of erecting “fences and screens” in the borderlands. The western toponyms Zhou and Zongzhou were detached from their concrete historical-geographical contexts and redefined as designations of the reigning royal house. The public memory possibly preserved that, after the reign of King You, the royal line was interrupted and a certain break took place. However, speakers of the Spring and Autumn period recalling the fall of Zhou or Zongzhou and quoting from the *Poetry Classic* did not necessarily know that they in fact bewailed not the decay in general, but, concretely, the loss of the western royal residences. Still, the Western Zhou was not completely forgotten. In particular, the memories about it could be cherished among the descendants of the former western elites migrated to the east, and also could be transmitted in various regional states.

4 Memories of the western residences in Warring States’ texts

A comparison of various texts of the Warring States period reveals that the general historical interest was directed only to a few instances of the Western Zhou history, especially the overturn of the Shang dynasty and the foundation of the Zhou state by King Cheng. In this section, these two issues will be considered in reverse order to clarify the following questions:

58 Cf. *Zuo zhuan*, Zhao 1 (1208). I suppose that 而加之以共 parallels with the expression 用龔王命 in some late Western Zhou and Eastern Zhou bronze inscriptions.

59 These speeches compare the situation during the reigns of King Jing and his son King Jing (519–476) to the events after the reign of King You. In this connection, they quote the *Poetry* odes bewailing the fall of Zhou and the extinguishing of Zongzhou. Cf. *Zuo zhuan*, Zhao 1, 9, 16, 23. These are the “smaller” odes “Zheng yue” 正月 and “Yu wu zheng”, both interpreted by the Mao school as criticizing King You. Cf. Zhao 1 (1208) and Zhao 9 (1309). In the last entry, the “smaller” ode “Shi yue zhi jiao” 十月之交 (*Shijing* [II.V.9], 358), is not verbally quoted, but possibly alluded to. Cf. *Zuo zhuan*, Zhao 23 (1446). As all of these speeches had a “private” character, their authenticity and sixth-century date are problematic. Some of their other features that cannot be discussed here extensively seem to signal that these speeches were, if not invented, at least significantly modified by the compilers of the *Zuo zhuan*. Therefore, they can rather be regarded as data that should be associated with the Warring States period.

- How did various Warring States texts represent the geopolitical organization of the Zhou polity at about the time of the conquest?
- Did they acknowledge that the Zhou kings still resided in the west after the foundation of Chengzhou/Luoyi?
- How and in which context did Feng-Hao become emphasized as having a higher significance in the hierarchy of western royal residences and how was its preponderance limited in time?

During the Spring and Autumn and Warring States period, the corpus of the *Documents Classic* focusing on these two issues was continuously extending. Inasmuch as many chapters known before the loss of this compendium during the rule of the Qin Empire (220–207 BC) have not been preserved, it is not possible to verify when it took the shape reflected in the *Preface to the Documents* (*Shu xu* 書序), where in a chronological order all individual texts selected by its Confucian editors are arranged to become part of the canon. According to the *Preface*, after the foundation of Luoyi,

成王歸自奄·在宗周·誥庶邦·作多方·...成王既黜殷命·滅淮夷·還歸在豐·作周官·...成王在豐·將沒·欲葬成周·公薨·成王葬于畢·告周公·作亳姑·周公既沒·命君陳分正東郊成周·作君陳·...康王命作冊畢·分居里·成周郊·作畢命·⁶⁰

King Cheng returned from Yan. In Zongzhou, [he] made an announcement to [rulers of] many states. Composed the “Duo fang” (“The many countries”) ... King Cheng annulled the Mandate of the Yin, extinguished the Yi of Huai [River], and returned to Feng. Composed the “Zhou guan” (“The offices of Zhou”) ... King Cheng was in Feng. [The Duke of Zhou] was about to expire. [He expressed his] wish to be buried in Chengzhou. The Duke passed away. King Cheng buried him in Bi. [He] instructed the [new] Duke of Zhou. Composed the Bogu.⁶¹ ... The Duke of Zhou had already expired. [King Cheng] ordered to Lord Chen to divide and put in order the eastern periphery Chengzhou. Composed the “Jun Chen” (“The Lord Chen”) ... King Kang issued the command to the Maker of Documents Bi. Allotted residences and villages. Established the peripheries of Zhou. Composed the “Bi ming” (“The Command to Bi”).

Except for “Duo fang” (referring rather to the events preceding Luoyi’s foundation), all other chapters referred to here were lost. Three of them were forged at a later time and became known as parts of the “Ancient script” *Documents Classic*. The *Preface* indicates that the editors of the *Documents* represented King Cheng ambivalently: on the one hand as one who acted on advice of the Duke of Zhou and constructed Luoyi, and, on the other hand, as a stubborn westerner who disapproved the centralizing program in his heart even to the extent that he broke the Duke’s last will to be buried in Chengzhou. Possibly, it considered that King Kang returned to the Duke’s plan and finally made Chengzhou the capital of the state.⁶²

The version of the Zhou history regarding the foundation of the capital in the east as one of the greatest achievements of the kings-founders of the Zhou state and treating the western core territories on which the dynasty emerged as its periphery was most consequently trans-

60 Cf. *Shu xu* in Qu Wanli, *Shang shu shi yi*, 169.

61 This chapter was not preserved. It is unlikely that its title signified “The aunt from Bo,” where Bo referred to the capital of Cheng Tang. Bogu was also different from Pugu 蒲姑, conquered by king Cheng and already used as a title of another lost chapter, referred to in the *Preface*.

62 The wordplay in the summaries of the “Jun Chen” and “Bi ming” chapters may indicate that King Kang was regarded as one who rejected the policy of treating Chengzhou as a periphery (郊成周) and constituted anew the peripheries (成周郊) around Chengzhou as the center.

mitted in the “apocryphal” *Book of Zhou* (*Yi Zhou shu* 逸周書). Most scholars assume that its transmitted text was copied from a fourth century BC bamboo manuscript discovered in a tomb of the Wei 魏 State in Ji 汲 County of Henan province in 279 AD.⁶³ However, it may also have been transmitted in another way, as copies of some of its chapters were certainly available during the Western Han period, when it was simply known as the *Book of Zhou*.⁶⁴

In comparison to the *Documents Classic*, the *Book of Zhou* pays more attention to the reigns of King Wen and Wu before the campaign against the Shang. In its representation, the area of present-day Xi’an is attributed great importance. First, it states that King Wen resided (*zhai* 宅) in Cheng 程 for at least three years.⁶⁵ Cheng possibly corresponded to Bi in King Jing’s official note to Duke Ping of Jin, quoted above, and to Bi Cheng 畢程, or Cheng-at-Bi, referred to in the *Bamboo Annals* (*Zhusbu jinian* 竹書記年), another Warring States’ manuscript from the Ji Tomb.⁶⁶ Second, the *Book of Zhou* locates another seat of King Wen in Feng 豐.⁶⁷ It locates one conversation between King Wen and King Wu in Hao 鄩,⁶⁸ but regards Feng as the place where King Wu resided before he started the campaign against the Shang.⁶⁹ Third, its “Shi fu” chapter, reintegrated from the *Documents Classic*, states that after the conquest, King Wu returned to Zhou, i.e. Zhou-under-Qi, and sacrificed in the Zhou Temple.⁷⁰ Its “Zuo Luo” 作雒 chapter states that King Wu died at Hao, was preliminarily inhumed in Zhou-under-Qi (at this point unambiguously defining it as Qi Zhou 岐周), and was later re-buried in Bi.⁷¹ Thus, the compilers of the *Book of Zhou* acknowledged that at the beginning of the Zhou dynasty, Zhou-under-Qi on the Zhou Plain and a number of places in the area of Xi’an were used simultaneously. However, they stressed the necessity to terminate the era of polycentrism and to relocate the political center from west to east after the conquest. The “Qi fu” 器服 postface, summarizing the contents of its individual chapters, states that the plan to establish the new capital was already conceived by King Wu, whereas the Duke of Zhou, following his will, “established the capital” on the conjunction of Rivers Yi and Luo and personally composed

63 Until recently, it was suggested that the person buried in this tomb was King Xiang 襄 of Wei (318–296 BC). Edward Shaughnessy convincingly argues that the buried person was with certainty not the king himself, since the *Bamboo Annals* that were found in the same tomb end with 299 BC, possibly the year of the burial. Cf. Edward L. Shaughnessy, *Rewriting Early Chinese Texts* (State University of New York Press, 2006), 137.

64 On the date and transmission of the “apocryphal” *Book of Zhou*, cf. Edward L. Shaughnessy, “I Chou shu (Chou shu),” in Loewe, *Early Chinese Texts*, 229–233; Shaughnessy, *Rewriting Early Chinese Texts*, 178.

65 Cf. *Yi Zhou shu*, “Da kuang” 大匡 [11], 21.

66 Cf. *Jinben Zhusbu jinian*: Wu Yi 武乙: 24, 259. The chapter “Shi ji” 史記 [61] of the “apocryphal” *Book of Zhou* also mentions the [head of] Bi Cheng-clan 畢程氏. Cf. *Yi Zhou shu*, “Shi ji,” 129. Bi Cheng can be understood as a composite toponym similar to Qi Zhou, where Bi could be a more prominent geographical marker, while Cheng was a name of a smaller site in its area.

67 Cf. *Yi Zhou shu*, “Feng bao” 豐保 [21], 27; “Da kai” 大開 [22], 30.

68 Cf. *Yi Zhou shu*, “Wen zhuan” 文傳 [25], 34.

69 Cf. *Yi Zhou shu*, “Da Kai wu” 大開武 [28], 37; “Feng mou” 豐謀 [30], 43

70 Cf. *Yi Zhou shu*, “Shi fu” [37], 54–55.

71 Cf. *Yi Zhou shu*, “Zuo Luo” [48], 76–79. The pre-Qin date of the “Zuo Luo” is sometimes questioned. Cf. Shaughnessy, “I Chou shu,” 230.

the “Zuo Luo” (乃述武王之志，建都伊雒，作雒).⁷² According to the “Zuo Luo,” the Duke of Zhou said to young King Cheng:

予畏周室不延，俾中天下，及將致政，乃作大邑成周于土中。⁷³

“I fear that the House of Zhou will not last long. [I wish to] make it central in the All-under-Heaven, and then I will retire from government.” Thus, [he] built the Great City Chengzhou in the center of the Earth.

Unlike the *Documents Classic*, rendering the memory about King Cheng’s withdrawal from the newly established Luoyi to the west and thus acknowledging at least a short “western” period of the post-conquest Zhou history, the *Book of Zhou* suppressed it this memory completely. Moreover, following the trend already diagnosed above in some speeches in the *Zuo zhuan*, it deliberately confused the toponyms Zongzhou and Chengzhou, applying both of them to the eastern capital.⁷⁴ Another manuscript found together with a copy of the *Book of Zhou* in the Ji tomb, the *Tradition of the Son of Heaven Mu* (*Mu Tianzi zhuan* 穆天子傳), narrating the deeds of King Mu of Zhou, corroborates that this confusion was typical for Warring States texts. It explicitly locates Zongzhou to the east of the river Chan 澗 in Henan Province, i.e. in Chengzhou.⁷⁵ This toponymic muddle, possibly deriving from the usage of the designation “Honored Zhou” referring to the royal house during the Spring and Autumn period, helped to minimize the contradiction between the traces of Western Zhou memories and the current version of the Zhou history, possibly propagated by the royal court and representing Chengzhou/ Luoyi as the single and everlasting capital.

The *Book of Zhou* contains one chapter linking the history of the royal house of Zhou and of the regional State of Jin 晉 and referring to Eastern Zhou matters.⁷⁶ Its presence may explain why it came to be buried in a tomb of a high official of the State of Wei, one of the successors of the State of Jin on the territory of present-day Henan. There are no other signs that would point to a possible origin of the whole compendium in Jin or Wei. Besides, the *Book of Zhou* was evidently consulted by the compilers of the *Bamboo Annals*, making part of the same underground library, as a text of authority. Some parts of it were also considered by the compilers of the *Zuo zhuan*.⁷⁷ Moreover, if the manuscript, buried in 299 BC and identified

72 Cf. *Yi Zhou shu*, “Qi fu” [70], 158.

73 Cf. *Yi Zhou shu*, “Zuo Luo” [48], 76–79.

74 Its “Ming Tang” 明堂 chapter states that six years after King Wu’s death, King Cheng “gathered all the *zhubou* from the countries and states in Zongzhou. At the great audience, the *zhubou* took their positions in the Hall of Light” 會方國諸侯于宗周，大朝諸侯明堂之位。 Cf. *Yi Zhou shu*. “Ming tang” [55]. According to the “Zuo Luo,” the Hall of Light *Ming Tang* was erected in Zongzhou. Cf. *Yi Zhou shu*. “Zuo Luo” [48], 79.

75 Cf. *Mu Tianzi zhuan* [4]. I am very grateful to the late Professor Ulrich Unger, who drew my attention to the localization of Zongzhou in the *Mu Tianzi zhuan* (personal communication, 2003).

76 Cf. *Yi Zhou shu*, “Taizi Jin” 大子晉 [64], 141–144.

77 The “Ke Yin” 克殷 [36] and “Zuo Luo” chapters were possibly among them. In the *Zuo zhuan*, there is only a single instance where the eastern capital is not called Chengzhou or “capital garrison” Jing shi 京師 (both designations current during the Western Zhou and Spring and Autumn periods), but is referred to as Luoyi 雒邑 (note the orthography of Luo 雒 instead of Luo 洛). In an entry for 710 BC, Luoyi was mentioned in connection with the installation of a trophy “great tripod of Gao” in the ancestral temple of Lu. Cf. *Zuo zhuan*, Huan 桓 2 (86). Criticizing this action, a certain Zang Ai-bo 臧哀伯 recalls King Wu’s removal of the “nine tripods” from the conquered Yin to Luoyi, which was also not

by its investigators in 279 AD as the *Book of Zhou*, corresponds to the “apocryphal” *Book of Zhou* known today, this was the text that Sima Qian used while working on the “Basic Records of Zhou” in the late second century BC. These facts suggest that the *Book of Zhou* was widely known beyond the borders of the State of Wei. It is not unlikely that some texts of this compendium, labelled as “apocryphal” when, centuries later, the *Documents Classic* acquired the status of a state-sponsored canon, not only reflected the official version of the Zhou history as propagated by the Zhou court, but may even have been composed by Zhou royal historiographers and then transmitted to regional elites. Its wide distribution during the Warring States period guaranteed that some of its copies survived into the Han period.

The *Bamboo Annals*,⁷⁸ another manuscript from the Ji Tomb, represents a Warring States’ compilation of chronologically ordered references from various texts related to the history of the royal houses of Zhou and previous dynasties as well as of the ruling houses of the states of Jin and Wei. Its compilers used both the *Documents Classic* and the *Book of Zhou* as sources, and also drew on the *Poetry Classic*.⁷⁹ The “Modern text” *Bamboo Annals* represent Bi Cheng as King

supported by some “righteous persons” (武王克商·遷九鼎于維也·義士猶或非之). This speech appears spurious not only because Zang Ai-bo was not mentioned in any other entry of the *Zuo zhuan*. The representation that the royal power can be symbolized by the number of ritual bronze vessels could hardly have emerged before the so-called “ritual reform” of the mid-Western Zhou period, in the course of which the number of ritual utensils used in ancestral sacrifices was brought into correspondence with aristocratic ranks. Cf. Jessica Rawson, “Western Zhou Archaeology,” in *The Cambridge History of Ancient China: From the Origins of Civilization to 221 BC* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), edited by Michael Loewe and Edward L. Shaughnessy, 352–449; Lothar von Falkenhausen, *Chinese Society in the Age of Confucius (1000–250 BC). The Archaeological Evidence* (Los Angeles: Costen Institute of Archaeology, University of Los Angeles, 2006), 29–64. The mythology of the “nine tripods” used for the royal sacrifices to Heaven or to ghosts and spirits and transferred from Xia to Shang and, after its fall, to the Zhou, spread during the Warring States period, when the original functions of ritual bronzes became toned down, whereas their functions as markers of status, power, and prestige stepped to the foreground. I have already discussed this in my article “Sacred Space of an Aristocratic Clan in Ancient China under Transformation,” in: Dorofeeva-Lichtmann Vera, Dickhard, Michael (eds.): *Creating and Representing Sacred Spaces. Göttinger Beiträge zur Asienforschung (Monograph Series)*, Heft 2–3 (Göttingen: Peust & Gutschmidt, 2003), 113–144. Interestingly, another entry in the *Zuo zhuan* referring to the Zhou tripods (606 BC) was identified by Yuri Pines as an Early Han interpolation. Cf. Pines 2002, 222 and 304 n. 9. Among the texts of the *Documents Classic*, only the original “Wu cheng,” i.e. the “Shi fu” of the “apocryphal” *Book of Zhou* mentions that King Wu captured the tripods of the Shang king. However, it does not indicate their number. Cf. *Yi Zhou shu*, “Shi fu” [37], 55. Only the “Ke Yin” chapter of the “apocryphal” *Book of Zhou*, which, unlike “Shi fu,” was certainly not a Western Zhou, but rather a text of the Warring States period, claims that after the conquest, King Wu ordered to “remove the nine tripods and three divinatory devices” (遷九鼎三巫), although it does not state where they had to be transferred to. Cf. *Yi Zhou shu*. “Ke Yin” [36], 53.

78 For a thorough investigation of the *Bamboo Annals*, cf. Shaughnessy, *Rewriting Early Chinese Texts*, 185–264. Cf also Wang Guowei 王國維, *Jin ben Zhushu jinian shu zheng* 今本竹書紀年疏證, in Fang Shiming 方詩銘, Wang Xiuling 王修齡 (eds.), *Gu ben Zhushu jinian jizheng* 古本竹書紀年輯證 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1981), 217–329; David S. Nivison, “Chu shu chi nien”, in Loewe, *Early Chinese Texts*, 39–47; Mark Ulyanov et al, *Bambukovye annaly: Drevniĭ tekst (Gu ben zhu shu ji nian)* [The Bamboo Annals: The Ancient Text] (Moscow: Vostochnaya literatura, 2005).

79 For an identification of individual entries in the “Modern text” *Bamboo Annals*, cf. Wang Guowei, *Jin ben Zhushu jinian shu zheng*, passim.

Wen's base and as a training camp for Zhou troops, but attribute its foundation already to King Wen's father Ji Li 季歷.⁸⁰ They state that King Wen “moved from Cheng to Feng” (自程遷于豐) seventeen years before the war against the Shang,⁸¹ and that one year later he sent his son Fa to build Hao (使世子發營鎬).⁸² It remains unclear whether Feng and Hao are regarded as two different places or Hao as a part of Feng. Feng is referred to as King Wu's base before the conquest of the Shang and as the place where he returned to afterwards.⁸³ The latter reference suggests that the compilers of the *Bamboo Annals* either did not read the “Shi fu” chapter of the current “apocryphal” *Book of Zhou*⁸⁴ and dedicated to the celebration of the victory in the Zhou temple, or that they believed that the Zhou temple was located in Feng. Although this chronicle often mentions Zhou 周 in connection with Kings Wen and Wu, it is uncertain whether it referred to the place Zhou-under-Qi, to the ruling house of Zhou, or to the Zhou people in general.⁸⁵ Considering the heterogeneous nature of the *Bamboo Annals*, borrowing information from contradicting sources, it is difficult to ascertain whether its authors thought that the first Zhou kings used Feng, Hao, and Zhou-under-Qi simultaneously or that they concentrated all preparations for the war in the area of Xi'an.

However, with regard to the post-conquest history, the authors of the *Bamboo Annals* assume a distinctively polycentric perspective. They call Chengzhou “the Eastern Capital” (東都) and record that Chengzhou was built by King Cheng, walled by Duke Wen 文 of Zhou (i.e. “the Duke of Zhou” of other texts), and thereafter administered by his son Duke Ping 平 of Zhou.⁸⁶ Thus, their compilers rejected the conception of the immediate relocation to the west expressed in the *Book of Zhou* and acknowledged that King Cheng did not permanently settle in Chengzhou, but delegated the control over it to his representatives. Moreover, unlike the authors of most Warring States' texts, they were not satisfied with the representation of the *Documents Classic*, limiting the western period only to the reign of King Cheng. Thus, they represent Feng as a place where King Kang summoned *zhubou* to an audience and where King Mu issued an order to one of his subordinates.⁸⁷ They do not mention Hao in connection to any other king after King Wu, although once, during the reign of King Yih, they register an

80 Cf. *Jinben Zhushu jinian* [cit. after Wang Guowei, *Jin ben Zhushu jinian shu zheng*, in Fang Shimin, 217–329], Wen Ding 5 (228); Di Xin 6, 29, 31 (230–231).

81 Cf. *Jinben Zhushu jinian*: Di Xin 35 (231).

82 Cf. *Jinben Zhushu jinian*: Di Xin 36 (231). The opening entry of its lower *juan*, stating that from the reign of King Wu on Hao was the capital of Zhou, was completely copied from the chapter “Fu rui zhi” 符瑞志 of the *Song shu* 宋書. Cf. Wang Guowei, *Jin ben Zhushu jinian shu zheng*, 234–236. Therefore, some editions do not include it.

83 Cf. *Jinben Zhushu jinian*: Wu wang 武王 12 (236).

84 This would support the argument advanced by Edward Shaughnessy that the current “apocryphal” *Book of Zhou* was not necessarily identical to the manuscript from the Ji Tomb.

85 For example, an entry between the statement about the move of King Wen to Feng and that about King Wu's foundation of Hao reads: 諸侯朝于周, which can be understood either as “the *zhubou* had an audience in Zhou-[under-Qi],” or “the *zhubou* had an audience with [a] Zhou [ruler],” which could take place anywhere.

86 Cf. *Jinben Zhushu jinian*: Cheng wang 成王 5, 7, 11 (271–273).

87 Cf. *Jinben Zhushu jinian*, Cheng wang 7, 11 (239–240); Kang wang 康王 1 (242); Mu wang 穆王 51 (247).

attack of Western Rong on Hao.⁸⁸ They state that King Mu transferred the capital to Zheng 鄭⁸⁹ and that King Yi 懿 “moved from Zongzhou 宗周 to Huaili 槐里”.⁹⁰ They mention Zongzhou as the point to which Kings Cheng and Mu returned from their military tours and where King You was killed, in each case relying on the *Documents Classic*, the *Tradition of the Son of Heaven Mu*, and the *Poetry Classic*, respectively, and not taking note that these sources located Zongzhou in different places.⁹¹ Finally, the *Bamboo Annals* state that, in his first year, King Ping “moved to Luoyi in the east” (王東徙洛邑). The rulers of Jin, Wei, Zheng, and Qin “with their armies accompanied the king and entered Chengzhou” (以師從王入于成周). In the successive year, “the fields at Bin and Qi” (邠、岐之田) were granted to the states of Jin and Qin.⁹² In general, although the authors of the *Bamboo Annals* managed to recover information about some actions performed in western residences by the Zhou kings after King Cheng, they failed to make clear how the royal sites were related to one another and whether or not one of them had a higher status in the network of residences.

The *Bamboo Annals* used as its source some texts also reproduced in the collection of anecdotes *Discourses of the States* (*Guo yu* 國語), compiled during the Warring States period. Although most of the stories contained there concern the Spring and Autumn period, it also includes several texts mentioning Western Zhou kings. Their compilers considered that, until the death of King You, the Zhou kings resided in the west. Few anecdotes from the “Discourses of Zhou” and “Discourses of Jin” sections mention a covenant concluded by King Cheng on Mount Qi, King Gong’s travel along the River Jing, King Xuan’s mysterious assassination in Hao, the desiccation of the “three rivers of the Western Zhou” and the crash of Mount Qi during the reign of King You, interpreted as natural omens of the approaching end, and, finally, the Zhou’s “move to the east” (周東遷).⁹³ The compilers of the *Bamboo Annals* selectively integrated the information of the *Discourses of the States* into their own account, rejecting some data, like the legend about the murder of King Xuan,⁹⁴ and elaborating on others, like in the case of the three western rivers, which they referred to by name.⁹⁵

88 Cf. *Jinben Zhushu jinian*, Yi wang 懿王 7 (248); Xuan wang 宣王 30 (256).

89 Southern Zheng, or Western Zheng according to the *Old Text* or the *Modern Text Bamboo Annals*, respectively. Cf. Fang Shimin, *Gu ben Zhushu jinian jizheng*, 245. As Chang Zheng has argued, this Zheng may have been located in the Wugong district of Shaanxi Province. Cf. Chang Zheng 1981, 15–24.

90 Cf. *Jinben Zhushu jinian*, Yi wang 15 (249).

91 Cf. *Jinben Zhushu jinian*, Cheng wang 19, 33 (241–242); Mu wang 13 (246); You wang 11 (260).

92 Cf. *Jinben Zhushu jinian*, Ping wang 1, 2 (296).

93 Cf. *Guo yu* [cit. after Shanghai Shifan daxue guji zhengli zu 上海師範大學古籍整理組: *Guo yu* 國語 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1978)], “Jin yu” 晉語 [8:12], 466; “Zhou yu” 周語 [1:2], 27; [1: 12], 32; [1: 10], 27.

94 The story referred to in the *Discourses of the States* about the apparition of the spirit of the Lord of Du 杜, who had previously been unjustly killed by King Xuan, possibly had its source in the “Ming gui” 明鬼 chapter of the *Mozzi*. The latter stated that, as the king “hunted in a park” (田圃) with the *zhubou*, the spirit of Du-bo, clothed in red, approached the king on a chariot driven by white horses, shot a bow and deadly injured the monarch. Cf. *Mozzi*, “Ming gui” 明鬼 [8:31] [cit. after Li Yushu 李漁叔 (comm, ed.), *Mozzi jin zhubu jin yi* 墨子今註今譯 (Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuaguan, 1984)], 220. This is one of the core chapters of the compendium, dated to the first half of the Warring States period. Cf. Graham, A.C.: “Mo tzu,” in Loewe, *Early Chinese Texts*, 336–341. The *Mozzi* does not specify where “the park” was located, but in the *Discourses of the States* it is said: “Before the rise of Zhou, phoenixes sang at Mount Qi;

In answer to the first question raised at the beginning of this section, it can be demonstrated that a number of Warring States period's texts acknowledge the political polycentrism of the west about the time of the conquest and consider both Zhou-under-Qi and the area of Xi'an as royal centers that were being used simultaneously. On this place it should be noted that although, during the Warring States period, Feng and Hao were recalled from time to time as toponyms associated with the first Zhou kings, these sites were not necessarily remembered in a unitary way. A recently discovered manuscript, *Rong Cheng shi* 容成氏, represents them as two polities that opposed King Wen when he was still an officer of the last king of Shang (see the translation in Appendix I). It emphasizes the non-violent surrender of Feng and Hao as King Wen's last and highest achievement, but still only as an intermediary step on the way of the Zhou conquest of the All-under-Heaven, which is the last event mentioned in this manuscript. The *Rong Cheng shi* does not claim that King Wen established Feng or Hao as his own residences. This indicates that the pre-Qin literature left enough space for a variety of concurrent traditions about the first Western Zhou kings and their respective places. Some of them recognized the significance of Feng and Hao in the conquest history, whereas others ignored it completely.

In answer to the second question, it can be argued that, during the Warring States period, the opinion prevailed that after the conquest of the Shang and the foundation of Chengzhou/Luoyi the political center of the Zhou state was shifted in the east within one or two reigns. Only a few texts of lesser authority or distributed only on a local level, such as the *Discourses of the States* or the "Modern text" *Bamboo Annals*, albeit without being consequent and

before its fall [the spirit] of the Lord of Du shot at the king in Hao. All these [omina] were [caused by] the will of sage spirits." Cf. *Guo yu*: "Zhou yu" [1: 12], 32. The "Modern text" *Bamboo Annals* record that King Xuan killed the Lord of Du in his 43rd year, i.e. three years before his own death. However, they did not incorporate the legend about the revengeful spirits, did not mention any western landmarks in connection to King Xuan, but state that, in his 9th year, he gathered *zhubou* for an assembly in the eastern capital and went on a hunt with them in Fu (狩于甫). Cf. *Jinben Zhushu jianian*, Xuan wang 9, 43 (289). Fu 甫 could easily be confused with "the park" 圃, which may indicate that the narrator of the anecdote of the *Discourses of the States* may have mixed up several stories about King Xuan.

- 95 The "three rivers" were also mentioned in a "private" dialogue quoted in the *Zuo zhuan* in the entry for 519 BC and identified by some of its features as having been invented by the compilers. Its speaker states that "as Zhou was about to perish, its three rivers were jolted by quakes" (周之亡也·其三川震). Cf. *Zuo zhuan*, Zhao 23 (1446). The *Discourses of the States* explicitly state that, in the second year of King You, "three rivers of Western Zhou" (*Xi Zhou san chuan* 西周三川) desiccated and caused the collapse of Mount Qi. Cf. *Guo yu*: *Zhou yu* [1:10], 26. The "Modern Text" *Bamboo Annals* specify that Jing 涇, Wei 渭, and Luo 洛 (the left influx of Wei) dried up and Mount Qi collapsed during the second year of King You. Cf. *Jinben Zhushu jianian*, You wang 幽王 2 (293). Although these three texts seem to complement one another, this impression may be illusive. Their authors were probably drawing on the "Shi yue zhi jiao" 十月之交, a "Smaller Ode," associated by the Mao School with the reign of King You, but in fact possibly referring to the reign of King Li or Xuan. Cf. Liu Qiyi 劉启益, "Xi Zhou Li wang shiqi tongqi zu 'Shi yue zhi jiao' de shidai" 西周厲王世其銅器與十月之交的時代, *Kaogu yu wenwu* 1 (1980): 80–85. It renders a dramatic picture of an earthquake without mentioning any particular details of the landscape, but related this natural catastrophe to the decay of the government. Whilst the authors of the *Zuo zhuan* were cautious about locating this image in space and time, the authors of the *Discourses of the States* went a step further, providing a date and localizing the earthquake in the west, as they were aware of King Ping's "move to the east". The authors of the *Bamboo Annals* even dared to undertake some guesswork as to the concrete geographical frame of the event.

precise, recognize that also after the foundation of Chengzhou, the Zhou polity did not have a single capital, but a network of residences of individual kings in the west and the east.

Whereas the *Documents Classic*, the *Book of Zhou*, or the “Modern Text” *Bamboo Annals* purported to provide a more or less consequent representation of the initial stage of the Zhou history, possibly, legitimating the rule of the royal dynasty, political-philosophical treatises addressed to the era of the conquest in connection to the question of the day: whether it was possible to overturn the royal ruling house and what the sufficient conditions would be with which a ruler of one polity could hope to subdue all others and become a ruler of the All-under-Heaven. In these cases, historical retrospects were intended to legitimate change. Anticipating the events of 221 BC, rulers and their political advisors revisited the two known precedents when a regional ruler overturned a reigning royal dynasty: the conquest of the Xia dynasty by Cheng Tang and the conquest of the Shang by Kings Wen and Wu. Representative of this discourse, the “Gung-sun Chou” 公孫丑 chapter of the *Mengzi* states:

孟子曰：「以力假仁者霸，霸必有大國，以德行仁者王，王不待大。湯以七十里，文王以百里。以力服人者，非心服也，力不贍也；以德服人者，中心悅而誠服也，如七十子之服孔子也。詩云：「自西自東，自南自北，無思不服。」此之謂也。⁹⁶

Mengzi said: “One who acts by force and abandons humanity is a hegemon. In order to become a hegemon, it is necessary to have a large state. One who acts by virtue and promotes humanity is the king. To become the king, [the state] does not have to be large. [Cheng] Tang [became king] with [a state of only] seventy *li* square. [The same was true for] King Wen with [a state of only] one hundred *li* square. When one uses force to make people perform their duties, it is not in their hearts that they submit, [but] their strength is not sufficient [to resist]. When one uses virtue to make people perform their duties, they are pleased in the core of their hearts and sincerely submit, like the seventy disciples submitted themselves to Confucius. This is illustrated by what is said in the *Poetry*: ‘From the west, from the east, from the south, from the north, there were none who [even dared to] think [not to come to perform their] duty.’ This is said about this.”

This text possibly represents the earliest case in which a quotation from the “Wen wang you sheng” ode was drawn to in order to illustrate how the true sovereign manifests himself by attracting people from the four quarters of the world. The Warring States period’s listeners of persuasions were certainly eager to know more details about the countries of the successful conquerors of the All-under-Heaven than were provided in *Mengzi* in order to estimate their own chances. In particular, they wished to see them pinpointed on the map. However, although Meng Ke 孟克 (ca. 372–289 BC), a native of the State of Zou 鄒, located in the west of the present-day Shandong province, was an expert of the *Poetry Classic* and knew “Wen wang you sheng”, he probably had his doubts about the actual importance of Feng and Hao with regard to the conquest of the Shang. Rather, he considered that King Wen had his base in Zhou-under-Qi.⁹⁷ Among the Warring States texts, the *Mozzi* 墨子, *Shangjunshu* 商君書, *Liushi chunqiu* 呂氏春秋 and *Zhuangzi* 莊子 share the opinion that Kings Wen and Wu resided in Zhou-under-Qi, that rulers of other polities came to visit them there to express their loyalty, and that from there, they proceeded to conquer the Shang (see the translation of relevant passages in Appendix II).⁹⁸ It is noteworthy that two of these texts, *Shangjunshu* and *Liushi*

96 Cf. *Mengzi* [cit. after Shen Wenzhuo 沈文偉 (ed.), Jiao Xun 焦循 (comm.), *Mengzi zhengyi* 孟子正義 (Beijing: Xinhua shuju, 1987)], “Gongsun Chou” [2.1.3] (221–222).

97 Cf. *Mengzi*, “Liang Hui-wang” 梁惠王 [1.2.5] (133). See the translation in Appendix I.

98 For translations of relevant passages and bibliographic references, cf. Appendix I.

chinqin, were produced in the State of Qin, the successor of the Western Zhou in the lands of Shaanxi. This demonstrates that this was not a locally transmitted tradition that assigned a higher significance to the Feng River valley in comparison to the Zhou Plain.

The toponym Hao began to be emphasized as a symbolic landmark related to the conquest of the Shang and the rise to power of Zhou in the teaching of Xun Kuang 荀况 (ca. 313 – ca. 238 BC), a native of the State of Zhao 趙, located on the territory of the present-day Shanxi 山西 province. The “Wen wang you sheng” was one of the poems most frequently quoted throughout the *Xunzi* in order to illustrate theories about the “True King” and the “Master of Men”.⁹⁹ Contributing to the above-mentioned discussion whether a ruler of a small state can obtain the whole All-under-Heaven, it is stated in the “Wang ba” 王霸 chapter of the *Xunzi*:

湯以亳，武王以鄗，皆百里之地也，天下為一，諸侯為臣，通達之屬，莫不從服。¹⁰⁰
 “[Cheng] Tang 湯 with his base in Bo 亳, King Wu with his base in Hao 鄗, both [countries having] a territory of less than one hundred *li* square, unified the All-under-Heaven. They made *zhubou* their servants, so that wherever news of them penetrated, there was no one who did not follow them or did not perform his duties.”

Whereas the *Mengzi*, the *Mozi* and even the *Shangjunshu* praise King Wen as the architect of the Zhou victory, the *Xunzi* emphasizes King Wu as the one who brought this plan to accomplishment. Being mainly interested in political and not in historio-geographical issues,¹⁰¹ Xun Kuang adopted information about Hao from the “Wen wang you sheng” in order to provide his idealized figure of King Wu with a material foothold, and, possibly, also to distinguish his own vision of the beginning of the Zhou from those of his opponents. Among the political persuaders of the Warring States period, Xun Kuang’s views only found resonance with his pupil Han Fei 韓非 (288–233 BC), a prince of the State of Han 韓, located in the present-day Henan province. In his “Wu du” 五蠹 treaty, he identified the place of King Wen’s residence “between Feng and Hao” (see translations of passages from the *Xunzi* and *Hanfeizi* in Appendix III).¹⁰²

99 Cf. *Xunzi*: “Ru xiao” 儒效 [8] [cit. after Li Tiaosheng 李滌生 (ed.): *Xunzi jishi* 荀子集釋 (Taipei: Taiwan xuesheng shuju, 1981)], 130; “Wang ba” 王霸 [11], 231, 250.

100 Cf. *Xunzi*, “Wang ba” [11], 231. This chapter is generally regarded as authentic. Cf. Michael Loewe, “Hsün tzu,” in Loewe, *Early Chinese Texts: 178–188*, esp. 180. The “Yi bin” 議兵 chapter of the *Xunzi* reproduces the same statement, but with an altered spelling of geographical names. Thus, the name of Tang’s capital is rendered as Bo 薄, while the name of King Wen’s capital is transcribed as Hao 滹. Cf. *Xunzi*, “Yi bin” 議兵 [15], 338. This misspelling reveals two different hands that put the words of the teacher down on bamboo. It also demonstrates that this was one of the most favourite topics of the philosophers. This statement was reproduced with slight alteration in an anecdote from the *Zhanguo ce*, a late Warring States or Early Han text (湯以亳，武王以鄗，皆不過百里以有天下). Cf. *Zhanguo ce* [cit. after Zhu Zugeng 諸祖耿 (ed.), *Zhanguo ce ji zhu hui kao* 戰國策集注彙考 (Yangzhou: Jiangsu guji chubanshe, 1985)] [17:4], 839.

101 Xunzi cared little about the physical localization of events in the landscape. As he expressed it in the “Wang ba” chapter, “by saying to ‘place the state in the right position’, I do not refer to the physical location of the actual fief but to what model of laws it adopts and to which masters are associated with it.” Cf. *Xunzi* “Wang ba” [11], 235 [cit. after John Knoblock (trans.), *Xunzi* (Changsha: Hunan renmin chubanshe, 1999), 325].

102 *Hanfeizi*: “Wu du” [19: 49] [cit. after Wang Xianshen 王先慎 (ed.): *Hanfeizi jiji* 韓非子集解, (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1998)], 1041.

Summarizing the review of representations of the conquest of the Shang, two dominating alternative versions can be distinguished. One of them, represented in *Mozǐ*, *Shangjūn shū*, *Zhuangzǐ*, *Lǐshì chūnqīn*, and, possibly, *Mengzǐ*, locates its starting point in Zhou-under-Qi and does not pay attention to interim stations of King Wen and Wu in the area of Xi’an. Another version, represented in the *Poetry Classic*, the *Book of Zhou*, the *Preface to the Documents*, and in the “Modern text” Bamboo Annals, recognizes the importance of the area of Xi’an where early Zhou kings constructed residences and took final preparations for the war against the Shang. Drawing on the second version, *Xunzǐ* and *Hanfeizǐ* emphasize the area of Xi’an over the elder center Zhou-under-Qi during the reigns of Kings Wen and Wu. However, none of the texts representing the second version considers that Feng-Hao remained *the* center of the Zhou state after the foundation of Chengzhou/Luoyi. The *Rong Cheng shi* represents the third, intermediate version, hesitating whether Feng and Hao were negligible or significant.

Considering the relative vicinity of the Zhou Plain and Xi’an, the contradiction between these alternative versions does not seem very dramatic. In the representation of the post-conquest history, the disagreement between those who ignored the Western Zhou and those who recognized it was much more perceptible. Although the first version was erroneous, it was more influential, and it was indeed *the* version of the Zhou history that was accepted by most connoisseurs of antiquity during the Western Han time before Sima Qian.

5 The Western Han ignorance and Sima Qian’s project of recovering the memories about the west

In 202 BC, the founder of the Han dynasty, Liu Bang 劉邦, proclaimed himself emperor and chose Luoyang as the capital of the new Empire. According to Sima Qian, a certain Lou Jing 婁敬, a native of the State of Qi, came to ask the Emperor whether he did so in order to “compete in grandeur with the royal House of Zhou” (與周室比隆) and received an affirmative reply.¹⁰³ Lou Jing then pronounced a speech in which he provided a brief account of the Zhou history (see full translation in Appendix IV). Accordingly, Luoyi immediately replaced the first Zhou residence in Zhou-under-Qi. Not only King Cheng, who was unanimously considered as the founder of Luoyi, was represented as having his base there, but also King Kang. Therefore, in Lou Jing’s representation, since King Cheng’s reign, Luoyi always remained the capital.¹⁰⁴ Thus, Lou Jing’s account corresponds to the view that has been tentatively identified above as the official version of history propagated by the Eastern Zhou court and accepted with some slight alterations also by scholars relying on the *Documents Classic* in the form that was common during the Warring States period. Unlike as it is now known to every student of China, in this version of the Zhou history, there was no place for the “western” period stretching from the beginning of the dynasty until the early eighth century BC.

Lou Jing persuaded Liu Bang not to imitate the Zhou kings, but to make use of the Qin fortifications near present-day Xi’an instead. Relating this area to Qin alone, Lou Jing completely ignored its significance during the Zhou epoch. Liu Bang’s decision to withdraw from Luoyang and to constitute the capital Chang’an in the west displeased his ministers who ar-

103 Cf. Sima, *Shi jǐ*, “Gao-zu ben jì” 高祖本記 [8], 381; Ban Gu 班固, *Han shū* 漢書 (Beijing: Zhonghua shūjū, 1983), “Gao-di ben jì” 高帝本記 [1.2], 58.

104 Lou Jing distinguished between the Western and Eastern Zhou (although without naming them) not as between periods before and after 771 BC, but as between two branches of the royal house separated from one another in 315 BC.

gued that “Zhou lasted many hundreds years, whereas Qin was destroyed after two generations,” and, therefore, that it was better to retain the capital at Luoyang.¹⁰⁵ Their arguments demonstrate that on the edge of the third to the second century BC, the representation about the eight hundred years old capital Chengzhou/Luoyi/Luoyang was widely accepted.

Sima Qian underlined that all these critical ministers “were men from the areas to the east of the Mountains,”¹⁰⁶ a fact that, possibly, not simply explained their historical ignorance but implicated new reasons to forget the Western Zhou. As the easterners had to follow the Emperor to the west, they may have had an interest in labeling local people as descendants of Qin and not as inhabitants of the ancient metropolis. This policy of forgetting was not challenged until Sima Qian’s own time, as otherwise he would not have to complain in his afterword to the “Basic Records of Zhou”:

太史公曰：學者皆稱周伐紂，居洛邑，綜其實不然。武王營之，成王使召公卜居，居九鼎焉，而周復都豐、鎬。至犬戎敗幽王，周乃東徙于洛邑。¹⁰⁷

“Lord Grand Scribe said: “The scholars all state that since the Zhou vanquished [the Shang King] Zhou-[Xin], [they] resided in the Settlement on Luo. [As I have] collected all the evidence, [I found out that this] was not the case. King Wu aspired this, King Cheng sent the Duke of Shao to divine about the residence, [he] stored the nine tripods there, but the Zhou returned and had their capital(s) in Feng [and] Hao (or Feng-Hao) until the Quanrong defeated King You, [and] therefore, the Zhou moved eastwards to the Settlement on Luo.

This text makes transparent that Sima Qian did not transmit the common knowledge of the day, simply illustrating it by quotations from various texts, but struggled his way against the general opinion through the mass of pre-Qin literature that mostly obscured rather than clarified the historical reality. Possibly, his own western identity¹⁰⁸ turned the recovery of the truth about the west into an affair of honour.

Sima Qian considered the rehabilitation of Feng-Hao as the historical Zhou capital as his own important achievement. This can be seen from his autobiographic chapter in the *Records of the Historiographer*, in which he summarizes the most significant events described in individual subdivisions of his narrative:

維篤作稷	Sincere was the Maker of Millet (i.e. Lord-Millet Hou Ji)!
德盛西伯	Virtuous and flourishing was the Lord of the West!
武王牧野	King Wen’s [victory at] Muye
實撫天下	Truly comforted the All-under-Heaven.
幽厲昏亂	[Kings] You [and] Li were obscure and disorderly
既喪豐鎬	They lost Feng-Hao.
陵遲至赧	The decadence lasted until King Nan.
洛邑不祀	In Luoyi, there were no more sacrifices.
作周本紀第四 ¹⁰⁹	[This] forms the “Basic Annals of Zhou,” the fourth [chapter].

Although Sima Qian emphasised the west as the center of the early Zhou state and Feng-Hao as the center of the west, his arguments were only weakly supported by written evidences. The

105 Cf. Sima, *Shi ji*, “Liu Jing Shusun Tong lie zhuan” [99], 2717.

106 Ibid.

107 Sima, *Shi ji*, “Zhou ben ji” [4], 170.

108 Cf. Sima, *Shi ji*, “Taishigong zi xu” 太史公自序 [130], 3293.

109 Cf. Sima, *Shi ji*, “Taishigong zi xu” [130], 3301–3302.

reading of the “Basic Annals of Zhou” demonstrates that Sima Qian had at his disposal the same pre-Qin texts that are available today and have been discussed above (or even less, as he obviously did not see the *Bamboo Annals*, which, possibly, were unknown outside the State of Wei).¹¹⁰ In his reconstruction of the pre-conquest period of the history of Zhou, he relied on the “Great Odes” of the *Poetry Classic*.¹¹¹ He assumed that King Wen “moved the capital from the [Zhou]-under-Qi to Feng (自岐下而徙都豐).” Possibly, he concluded this upon the comparison of various texts relating Feng to King Wen, including the *Poetry Classic*, the *Documents Classic*, and the *Book of Zhou*.¹¹² He wrote the history of the conquest by basing himself both on the *Documents Classic* and the *Book of Zhou*. He admitted that already King Wu “planned to establish the residence of Zhou in the Settlement on Luo [River]” (營周居于雒邑), but “afterwards he left it” (而後去), thus relying on the *Book of Zhou*.¹¹³ From the same source he gathered that Luoyi was suitable “to [permanently] store the nine tripods” (居九鼎). Further he stated that the choice of the place was confirmed by a divination performed by order of King Cheng, this time drawing on the *Documents Classic*. Although both *Documents Classic* and the *Book of Zhou* suggested that Luoyi was the geographical “center of the All-under-Heaven,” he quoted from neither of these two texts, but instead referred to the speech of Lou Jing:

此天下之中，四方入貢道里均。¹¹⁴

Here, the center of the All-under-Heaven is located. When the four quarters of the World come with tribute, the distance they have to go is equal.

This indirect reference to this Western Han figure points out that the “Basic Annals of Zhou” chapter was not simply a descriptive text, but, to a great extent, a polemic one.¹¹⁵ Although Sima knew the arguments of those who saw the center of Zhou in Luoyi, he sought to destroy their theory. Disappointingly, in absence of inscriptions on Western Zhou bronze vessels that are available today, he could only make use of very little written material to support his views. Thus, he could not do better than cite the *Preface to the Documents* mentioning King Cheng’s arrival to Zongzhou and to Feng as well as the burial of the Duke of Zhou at Bi.¹¹⁶ With regard to the consequent reigns, Sima Qian was only able to specify external destinations of the kings’ travels, or, in the case of King Li, of his exile, drawing on the *Discourses of the States*. In search for memories of the end of the Western Zhou, he turned to anecdotes about super-

110 The “Basic Annals of Zhou” contain extremely little, and only marginal, references that cannot be retraced to any of the known pre-Qin texts.

111 Cf. “Gong Liu” 公劉 (*Shi jing* [III.II.6], 496), “Mian” 緜 (*Shi jing* [III.I.3], 459).

112 Sima, “Zhou ben ji” [4], 118.

113 Sima, “Zhou ben ji” [4], 129.

114 Sima, “Zhou ben ji” [4], 133.

115 For several recent critical studies of Sima Qian’s writings in the context of the contemporary political situation, cf. Hans van Ess, „Die geheimen Worte des Su-ma Ch’ien,“ *Oriens Extremus* 36 (1993): 5–28; Stephen W. Durrant, *The Cloudy Mirror. Tension and Conflict in the Writings of Sima Qian* (New York: State University of New York, 1995); Dorothee Schaab-Hanke, “The Power of an Alleged Tradition: A Prophecy Flattering Han Emperor Wu and its Relation to the Sima Clan,” *BMFEA* 74 (2002): 243–290; Yuri Pines, “Biases and Their Sources : Qin History in the *Shiji*,” *Oriens Extremus* 45 (2005/06): 10–34.

116 Sima, *Shi ji*, “Zhou ben ji” [4], 133, 170.

natural omens of the nearing collapse, quoting verbatim the “Discourses of Zhou” of the *Discourses of the States*, or relying on the “Smaller odes” of the *Poetry Classic* charging Bao Si for the loss of Zongzhou.¹¹⁷

By performing the painstaking task of historical reconstruction, Sima Qian earned the reputation of an earnest scholar. However, realizing that his search for evidence against falsification met its limits, he did not hesitate to grasp the weapon of his opponents and to recur to clever trickery. Trying to substitute the lacking memories about Feng-Hao as the “royal capital,” he ascribed convenient statements to figures of high authority or power. One of these figures was Confucius himself. In an anecdote included in the “Hereditary House of Confucius” (“Kongzi shijia 孔子世家”) of the *Records of the Historiographer*, Confucius supported a certain Gongshan Buniu, a minister residing in his hereditary domain Fei and planning to rebel against the ducal house of Lu. Allegedly, Confucius regarded this case as an opportunity to apply his governmental talents and, therefore, he said:

蓋周文武起豐鎬而王，今費雖小，儻庶幾乎！」一欲往。

As a matter of fact, Wen and Wu of Zhou rose in Feng-Hao and became kings. Today, although Fei is small, why not suppose that it could happen like this?

His pupil Zi Lu opposed Confucius’ decision and tried to hold him back, to which the latter said:

夫召我者豈徒哉？如用我，其為東周乎？¹¹⁸

That they summon me, how could this be without reason? If [they] employ me, [would I not be able to] establish the Eastern Zhou?

This anecdote represents a modified quotation of the following entry from the Confucian *Analects* (*Lun yu* 論語):

公山弗擾以費畔，召，欲往。子路不說，曰：「末之也已，何必公山氏之之也。」子曰：「夫召我者而豈徒哉？如有用我者，吾其為東周乎？」¹¹⁹

Gongshan Furai, relying on his border [city] Fei, [called [for Confucius]. The Master wished to go. Zi Lu did not approve. He said: “After having refused many times, why must you [accept the invitation] of the Gongshan lineage?” The Master said: “It cannot be without reason that he called for me. If there were someone who could employ me, would I not [be able to] establish the Eastern Zhou?”

By adding the reference about Feng-Hao to the original text of the *Lun yu*, Sima Qian brought Confucius, who never cared about historical-geographical aspects of the Zhou state, forward in time so as to join the discussion of the fourth to third centuries BC of how to become king with minimal material resources. By making Confucius talk about Feng and Hao, Sima Qian did not inexcusably wrench the tradition, as he transplanted the statements from the *Xunzi* and spoke out what the *Mengzi* possibly did not dare to say when discussing the potential of Confucius to be the king as manifested through his ability to attract people from the four quarters of the world. However, by doing so, Sima not only intended to show that Confucius

117 Cf. Sima, *Shi ji*, “Zhou ben ji” [4], 146.

118 Cf. Sima, *Shi ji*, “Kongzi shijia” 孔子世家 [47], 1914.

119 Cf. *Lun yu* [cit. After Qian Mu 錢穆 (ed., trans.), *Lunyu xinjie* 論語新解 (Xianggang: Xinya yanjiusuo, 1964)] [17:5], 592. Cf. also Arthur Waley (trans.), *The Analects of Confucius* (New York: Vintage Books, 1989), 210. Presumably, Confucius hoped that the head of the Gongshan lineage would restore the power of the legitimate ruler of the State of Lu, who was a descendant of the Duke of Zhou.

regarded himself in one line with Kings Wen and Wu, but also that he and his contemporaries regarded Feng-Hao as the Western Zhou capital.¹²⁰

The last, but massive, anchor of memory about the capital Feng-Hao in the *Records of the Historiographer* was placed nowhere else than in the “Basic Records of the First Emperor of Qin” (“Qin Shihuang benji”). Accordingly, in 212 BC, Qin Shihuang considered the courtyard of the old palace of Qin dukes and kings in the Qin capital Xianyang too small to host all the attendants of imperial receptions. Therefore, he decided to build a new palace outside the capital to the south of the Wei River in Shanglin 上林. He explained the choice of this place as follows:

吾聞周文王都豐，武王都鎬，豐鎬之間，帝王之都也。¹²¹

I have heard that King Wen’s capital was in Feng, King Wu’s capital was in Hao. A place between Feng and Hao [seems suitable to be] a capital of Emperors and Kings.

As I have already noticed above, this was not a local tradition of the State of Qin that remembered Feng-Hao as a place of greater importance in comparison with Zhou-under-Qi. It is also unlikely that Qin Shihuang attentively read the *Poetry Classic*. Possibly, he could learn about Feng and Hao from Han Fei’s “Wu du” treaty already mentioned above.¹²² He also may have heard about them from Li Si, who also studied with Xun Kuang. Either the reading or the personal discussions with Xun Kuang’s pupils may have impregnated the king’s mind with the idea to compete with the first kings of the Zhou dynasty and to receive the All-under-Heaven at audiences at the place of their capital. The construction of a reception space, incomparable in size to anything built before,¹²³ made part of the First Emperor’s project of turning the Qin capital into the ultimate “central place” and “meeting point” of the Qin Empire. However, it is impossible to verify whether Qin Shihuang, when planning his construction program, actually thought about Feng and Hao, or if his statement was invented by Sima Qian like the anecdotes about Confucius or the very story about the burning down of the said palace, of which, as archaeology reveals, only the earthen platform, but no wooden architectural structures, was erected until the end of the Qin rule.

Such manipulations of historical memories reveal that Sima Qian was not certain whether Kings Wen and Wu really removed their political center from Zhou-under-Qi and made Feng-Hao *the* capital on the eve of the contest.

120 Another anecdote in Confucius’ biography in the “Records of the Historiographer” states that Confucius did not receive a fief from the King of Chu because a minister of the latter said: “King Wen was in Feng, King Wu was in Hao. They were rulers of a state of one hundred *li* square and became Kings of the All-under-Heaven. If today Confucius will occupy such a land and his wise pupils will support him, this will not be favorable for the State of Chu.” Cf. Sima, *Shi ji*, “Kongzi shijia” [47], 1932.

121 Cf. Sima, *Shi ji*, “Qin Shihuang benji” 秦始皇本記 [6], 256.

122 Cf. Sima, *Shi ji*, “Laozi Han Fei lie zhuan” 老子韓非列傳 [63], 2155.

123 Cf. Sima, *Shi ji*, “Qin Shihuang benji” [6], 256. This decision looked especially extravagant only one year after the famous ban of the *Poetry* and *Documents Classics* as well as of other books reflecting the past from private libraries, the extermination of local archives, and repressions against Confucian scholars in 213 BC. However, the timing of these events was not accidental.

6 Concluding remarks

In comparison with epigraphic materials from the late eleventh to the early eighth century BC, this overview of references to the western residences of Zhou kings in pre-Han literary texts demonstrates that these two categories of sources reflect the history of this period with different intensity and varying adequacy. Seen against the historical record reconstructed on the base of inscriptions, reflections of the Western Zhou period in early Chinese received texts are disappointingly fragmentary and arbitrary. The *Documents Classic* regarded the foundation of Luoyi/Chengzhou as one of the greatest establishments of the Zhou state and represented it as the central spot from which the polity could best be ruled, the ultimate meeting point where all loyal subjects could meet the king and where the kings performed investitures of regional lords. As the *Preface to the Documents* indicates, it critically assessed King Cheng's retreat to the west and, possibly, limited the western period of the Zhou history to the end of his very reign. The official view propagated by the Eastern Zhou royal court was even more radical. Eastern Zhou kings claimed that from the reign of King Cheng onwards, Chengzhou on Luo River was the capital of the Zhou state, whereas the western territories in present-day Shaanxi were just its peripheral "fences and screens." In this way, the court hoped to disguise the dramatic loss of the better part of the royal domain to the regional house of Qin. Beside the court, various other political and social actors could contribute to the process of intended forgetting of the Western Zhou.

This perspective, ignoring the significance of the west and representing Chengzhou as *the* capital of the Zhou from the early days of the dynasty, possibly generated during the Spring and Autumn period, dominated also during the Warring States period. The *Book of Zhou*, probably sponsored by the Eastern Zhou court, represents a view not even considering King Cheng's temporary return to the west. As the speech of an early Han scholar Lou Jing rendered in the *Records of the Historiographer* by Sima Qian demonstrates, on the edge of the third to the second century BC both Kings Cheng and Kang were praised for making Luoyang the great Zhou capital, which lasted for eight hundred years.

Nevertheless, the memory about the Western Zhou period was not wiped out without a trace. During the Spring and Autumn and the Warring States periods, meetings of *zhubou* performed in the west by Kings Cheng and Kang were still remembered in some regional states. Similarly, the controversial "move to the east" of King Ping could be recalled on various occasions. However, although some authors of Eastern Zhou texts acknowledged that the Zhou kings used to reside in the west, they did not necessarily know exactly where. Thus, none of the pre-Qin texts known during the Western Han period mentioned any western residence in connection with any king between King Kang and King Xuan.

In spite of other written evidence, only the *Poetry Classic* may have played some role in the transmission of memories about the Western Zhou. It reminded that the first Zhou kings arose in the west and commemorated their residences where their authority was first manifested. By denying a place for a foundation ode dedicated to the eastern residence, and by including texts referring to it in connection to relatively late and, especially, negative events, the *Poetry Classic* as a whole represented a monocentric, "pro-western" perspective on the early Zhou history. However, the *Poetry Classic* did not contain texts explicitly related to their consequent use by Zhou kings. Thus, on the base of the *Poetry Classic*, the western memories could be transmitted through the Spring and Autumn and Warring States only by means of oral exegetical traditions. It has been noted that oral traditions tend to repeatedly redefine themselves and to

adapt to contemporary changes.¹²⁴ A number of reasons might have caused that, during the third century BC, some commentatorial schools started to praise Feng-Hao, relying on the “Wen wang you sheng” ode, as *the* capital of Kings Wen and Wu and, consequently, to underestimate the elder royal residence Zhou-under-Qi. First, living under the condition of the centralized states, readers of the Warring States period were better prepared to accept monocentric rather than polycentric geopolitical concepts. Second, within the western center, Feng-Hao could be attributed a more central role than Zhou-under-Qi, because the *topos* of the central place was manifested so illustratively in the “Wen wang you sheng” ode. The absence of monocentric concepts in the foundation texts of Zhou-under-Qi allowed assessing it as a starting point, but not necessarily as the center to which the “Four Quarters” could “come back.” Third, Feng-Hao could be distinguished from the traditional, sacred center as a newly created stronghold of the militant kings, thus probably projecting back the Warring States views on war and political innovations. Last, but not least, from the mid-fourth century BC on, the area of Xi’an became the capital of the rapidly growing geopolitical power, the Kingdom of Qin. Emphasizing the role of Feng-Hao in the raise of Zhou, some observers living during the Warring States period might have anticipated the future expansion of Qin. Nevertheless, even if some Warring States’ and early imperial readers of the *Poetry Classic* believed that Kings Wen and Wu made Feng-Hao their capital, they did not leave any written note that they also considered it *the* capital of Zhou until 771 BC. Until it was written down by Sima Qian, this view can only have been transmitted orally.

In sum, Sima Qian’s argument that the Zhou kings did not move to the east until the reign of King Ping contradicted the contemporary general opinion and was supported by only little literary texts transmitted from pre-Qin times. Nevertheless, later, it could be corroborated by bronze inscriptions from the Western Zhou epoch. For his second argument about Feng-Hao as *the* capital of the Zhou state from the reign of Kings Wen and Wu until 771 BC, any written evidence was available. It cannot be verified whether Sima Qian drew on an oral tradition related or not to the exegesis of the *Poetry Classic*, or he simply made a guess. In any case, in view of inscriptional data available today, this claim should now be reconsidered as unreliable.

This overview of reflections of geopolitical aspects of Western Zhou history has provided an insight into the process of production of memories about the past in early China. Of course, it is no wonder that not all historical realities of the late eleventh to the early eighth century BC were accurately remembered during the following epochs. However, as this survey has indicated, they were not just remembered selectively with only little occasional gaps, but plausibly underwent a process of deliberate accommodation to the contemporary political and ideological needs, possibly partly sponsored by the Eastern Zhou state or other interested parties. Although it is also not surprising that such sponsors did not shrink from the falsification of historical documents, it could be demonstrated that even those who, like Sima Qian, aimed to contest such sophistications, from time to time recurred to the same methods, e.g. ascribing convenient statements to persons of high authority, such as Confucius, or of high power, such as the First Emperor of Qin.

Considering these features of early Chinese historiography, the suggestion may be allowed that in the twenty-first century AD, scholars of early China should recognize the priority of excavated, non-systematizing sources over the data of received texts, and to feel free from

124 On the flexibility and improvisation in oral traditions, cf. Aleida und Jan Assmann, „Schrift und Gedächtnis,” in Aleida und Jan Assmann, Christof Hardmeier (eds.), *Schrift und Gedächtnis. Beiträge zur Archäologie der literarischen Kommunikation* (München: Wilhelm Frank Verlag, 1983), 265–284, esp. 272.

trying to accommodate the results of archaeological and epigraphical investigations to the still “standard” history of the Zhou epoch formulated in the “Basic Records of Zhou”.

Appendix I: Feng and Hao in the *Rong Cheng shi*

紂不述其先王之道。…於是乎九邦叛之，豐、鎬、舟、□、于、鹿、耆、崇、密須氏。文王聞之，曰：“雖君無道，臣敢勿事乎？雖父無道，子敢勿事乎？孰天子而可反？”紂聞之，乃出文王於夏臺之下而問焉，曰：“九邦者其可來乎？”文王曰：“可。”文王於是乎素端□裳以行九邦，七邦來服，豐、鎬不服。文王乃起師以嚮豐、鎬，三鼓而進之，三鼓而退之，曰：“吾所知多鷹，一人爲無道，百姓其何罪？”豐、鎬之民聞之，乃降文王。文王持故時而教民時，高下肥瘠之利盡知之，知天之道，知地之利，思民不疾。昔者文王之佐紂也，如是狀也。¹²⁵

[The Shang king] Zhou did not follow the way of the former kings [of the Shang dynasty] ... At this time nine countries rebelled [against him]. [These were] Feng, Hao, Zhou, X, Yu, Lu, Lao, Chong and Mixu. King Wen heard about this and said: “Although the lord does not follow the way, [does it mean] that the servants should not serve him? Although the father does not follow the way, [does it mean] that his sons should not obey him? What is the reason that one can oppose the Son of Heaven?” [King] Zhou heard this, released King Wu from the [prison below the] Tower of Xia,¹²⁶ and asked him: “Is it possible to make the nine countries come [back]?” King Wen said: “Yes, it is.”

Then King Wen put on a simple short robe and went to the nine countries. Seven countries came to [perform their] duties, but Feng and Hao [still] did not [perform their] duties.

Then King Wen raised his troops in order to face Feng and Hao [in a battle]. Three times he drummed [his drums] and advanced, three times he drummed [his drums] and retired, saying: “Many times I acknowledged that when one person does not follow the way, [it does not mean] that the hundred families [also have] to become criminals.”

The people of Feng and Hao heard this and surrendered to King Wu.

At the time when King Wen used this occasion in order to instruct people, [he demonstrated that] he thoroughly understood the advantages of being up and being down, of [bird’s] fat and feather. [He] knew the way of Heaven; [he] knew the advantage of Earth. He thought about the people without hate.

In the past, King Wen served [King] Zhou like this.

Appendix II: Zhou-under-Qi in Warring States texts

1 *Mengzi*, “Liang Hui-wang” 梁惠王:

昔者文王之治岐也·耕者九一·¹²⁷

Formerly, King Wen governed Qi [as follows]: [only] one ninth [of the land] was cultivated [by people for his use].

125 Cf. Li Ling 李零 (ed.), *Rong Cheng Shi* 容成氏, in Ma Chengyuan 马承源, *Shanghai boniguan zang Zhan-guo Chu zhusu* 上海博物館藏戰國楚竹書 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2002), 247–293, esp., 284–288.

126 According to traditional sources, Xiatai was the prison of Cheng Tang, whereas King Wen was kept in Jiuli.

127 *Mengzi*, “Liang Hui-wang” [1.2.5], 133.

2 *Mozǐ*, “Fei ming” 非命:

子墨子曰：「古者湯封於亳，絕長繼短，方地百里，與其百姓兼相愛，交相利，移則分。率其百姓，以上尊天事鬼，是以天鬼富之，諸侯與之，百姓親之，賢士歸之，未歿其世，而王天下，政諸侯。昔者文王封於岐周，絕長繼短，方地百里，與其百姓兼相愛、交相利，則，是以近者安其政，遠者歸其德。聞文王者，皆起而趨之。...是以天鬼富之，諸侯與之，百姓親之，賢士歸之，未歿其世，而王天下，政諸侯。¹²⁸

In ancient times, [Cheng] Tang had his possessions in Bo亳. [He] cut the lengthy and extended the short. [His] lands [only occupied a space of] one hundred *li* square, [but] he cultivated universal, reciprocal love with the hundred families, so that their relations were mutually profitable. He resettled and divided them. He presided over the hundred families in order to show his reverence to Heaven and to serve the spirits on high. Therefore, Heaven and the spirits blessed him, *zhubou* were on good terms with him, the hundred families treated him as their kin, and wise men [came to him as if] returning [home]. His age had not yet come to an end, but he [already] became king over the All-under-Heaven and ruled over the *zhubou*.

[Again], in former times, King Wen had his possessions in Zhou-under-Qi. [He] cut the lengthy and extended the short. [His] lands [only occupied a space of] one hundred *li* square, [but] he cultivated universal, reciprocal love among the hundred families, so that their relations were mutually profitable. Therefore, those who lived nearby were pacified by his government, those who lived at a distance came back to him, [were attracted by] his virtue ... Therefore Heaven and the spirits blessed him, the *zhubou* were on good terms with him, the hundred families treated him as their kin, and wise men [came to him as if] returning [home]. His age had not yet come to an end, but he [already] became the king over the All-under-Heaven and ruled over the *zhubou*.

3 *Shangjun shu* 商君書, “Shang xing” 賞刑:

昔湯封於贊茅，文王封於岐周，方百里。湯與桀戰於鳴條之野，武王與紂戰於牧野之中，大破九軍，卒裂土封諸侯，士卒坐陳者里有書社，車休息不乘，從馬華山之陽，從牛於農澤，從之老而不收，此湯武之賞也。故曰：贊茅岐周之粟，以賞天下之人，不人得一升；以其錢賞天下之人，不人得一錢。故曰：百里之君，而封侯其臣，大其舊。自士卒坐陳者，里有書社。賞之所加，寬於牛馬者，何也？善因天下之貨，以賞天下之人。¹²⁹

Formerly, [Cheng Tang] had his possessions in Zangmao, King Wen had his possessions in Zhou-under-Qi. [Both lands occupied the space of] one hundred square *li*. Tang fought Jie [of the Xia dynasty] on the Mingtiao field, King Wu fought Zhou [of Shang dynasty] at Muye. [He] smashed nine armies and distributed the lands [of the conquered in order to] enfeoff the *zhubou* ... Thus it was said: “If everybody in the All-under-Heaven would have had to be rewarded with products of Zangmao and Qi Zhou, anyone would not even have received a single measure [of crops]. If all the money [accumulated within these possessions] would be distributed among all inhabitants of the All-under-Heaven, anyone would not even get a single coin.” Therefore it is said: “when a lord with possessions amounting to one hundred *li* makes *bou* his servants through enfeoffing them, he can increase his original [lands] ... [This means] skillful usage of the products of the [whole] All-under-Heaven in order to award the people of the All-under-Heaven.

128 *Mozǐ*, “Fei ming” [9:35], 255. Worthy to note is that, despite the obvious parallelism in descriptions of Cheng Tang’s and King Wen’s activities, only the former one is said to have “resettled and divided” his people. This omission was probably not accidental.

129 Cf. *Shangjun shu* [cit. after Gao Heng 高亨 (ed.), *Shangjun shu zhu yi* 商君書注譯 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1974)], “Shang xing” [17], vol. 3, 343.

4 *Lǐshì Chunqiu*, “Gu yue” 古樂:

周文王處岐，諸侯去殷三淫而翼文王。¹³⁰

King Wen of Zhou resided in Qi. *Zhubou*, refusing to [tolerate] the three evils of Yin, took the side of King Wen.

5 *Lǐshì chunqiu*, “Shen shi” 慎勢:

湯其無郛，武其無岐，賢雖十全，不能成功。¹³¹

If [Cheng] Tang did not have Wei¹³², and King Wu did not have Qi, even if their wisdom were ten times greater, they would not achieve any success.

6. *Lǐshì chunqiu*, “Gui yin” 貴因:

武王使人候殷，反報岐周曰：「殷其亂矣。」¹³³

King Wu sent someone to investigate the state of affairs in Yin. He came back to Zhou-under-Qi and reported: “Yin is in disorder.”

7 *Lǐshì chunqiu*, “Cheng lian” 誠廉:

昔周之將興也，有士二人，處於孤竹，曰伯夷、叔齊。二人相謂曰：「吾聞西方有偏伯焉，似將有道者，今吾奚為處乎此哉？」二子西行如周，至於岐陽，則文王已歿矣。武王即位。¹³⁴

Formerly, when Zhou was about to rise, there were two men who lived in Guzhu: Bo Yi and Shu Qi. [These] two men said to each other: “We have heard that in the western country there is a lord [of a] border [state] who appears to start gaining those who possess *dao*. Why shall we not go along with him?” The two men traveled to the west and went to Zhou. When they reached the southern slope of Mount Qi, King Wen had already died, and King Wu had assumed the throne.

8 *Zhuangzi* 莊子, “Rang wang” 讓王:

昔周之興，有士二人，處於孤竹，曰伯夷、叔齊。二人相謂曰：「吾聞西方有人，似有道者，試往觀焉。」至於岐陽，武王聞之，使叔旦往見之。¹³⁵

Formerly, at the rise of Zhou, there were two men who lived in Guzhu: Bo Yi and Shu Qi. [These] two men said to each other: “we have heard that in the western country there is a lord [of a] border [state] who appears to be gaining those who possess *dao*. Let us try to go and meet him!” When they arrived to the south of Mount Qi, King Wu heard about this and sent his younger brother Dan (i.e. the Duke of Zhou – M. Kh.) to see them.

130 *Lǐshì chunqiu* [cf. after Chen Qiyou 陳奇猷 (ed.), *Lǐshì chunqiu xiao shi* 呂氏春秋校釋 (Shanghai: Xuclin chubanshe, 1984)], “Gu yue” [5.5], 286.

131 Cf. *Lǐshì chunqiu*. “Shen shi” [17:6], 1109; cf. John Knoblock and Jeffrey Riegel (trans). *The Annals of Lü Buwei: A Complete Translation and Study* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000), 429–430.

132 The locality where the Cheng Tang capital Bo (亳, sometimes rendered as 薄) was situated.

133 Cf. *Lǐshì chunqiu*, “Gui yin” [15:7], 926.

134 *Lǐshì chunqiu*, “Cheng Lian” [12:4], 633. According to the “Basic records of Zhou,” these gentlemen met King Wen when he was still alive (interestingly, the place of their meeting was not indicated, cf. *Zhou ben jī*, 116).

135 *Zhuangzi* [cit. after Guo Qingfan 郭慶藩 (ed.), *Zhuangzi ji shi* 莊子集釋 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1961)], “Rang wang” [9:28], 987.

Appendix III: Reading of the “Wen wang you sheng” in the School of Xun Kuang

1 *Xunzi*, “Wang ba” 王霸:

甲兵不勞而天下服。故湯以亳，文王¹³⁶以鄘，皆百里之地也，天下為一，諸侯為臣，通達之屬，莫不從服。¹³⁷

Armour and weaponry have not to work, but the All-under-Heaven [performs its] duties. Hence Tang relied on Bo, King Wen relied on Hao, both having territories of one hundred *li*. [Nevertheless], the All-under-heaven was unified, the *zhubou* became their servants, for wherever their reputation penetrated, none failed to follow them and to perform their duties.

2 *Xunzi*, “Zheng lun” 正論:

世俗之為說者曰：「湯武不善禁令。」曰：「是何也？」曰：「楚越不受制。」是不然。湯武者、至天下之善禁令者也。湯居亳，武居鄘，皆百里之地也，天下為一，諸侯為臣，通達之屬，莫不振動從服以化順之，曷為楚越獨不受制也！¹³⁸

Those who speak about habits of [old] epochs say: “Tang and Wu did not favor prohibitions.” [They] say: “Why was it so?” [They] say: “Chu and Yue were not put under control!”. This is not true. Tang resided in Bo, Wu resided in Hao, both having territories of one hundred *li*. The All-under-heaven was unified, *zhubou* became their servants, for wherever their reputation penetrated, none failed to follow them and to perform their duties as to transform themselves and to obey them. How could it be that Chu and Yue were not put under control!?

3 *Xunzi*, “Wang ba” 王霸:

百里之地，可以取天下。...百里之地，其等位爵服，足以容天下之賢士矣；其官職事業，足以容天下之能士矣；循其舊法，擇其善者而明用之，足以順服好利之人矣。賢士一焉，能士官焉，好利之人服焉，三者具而天下盡，無有是其外矣。故百里之地，足以竭矣。致忠信，箸仁義，足以竭人矣。兩者合而天下取，諸侯後同者先危。詩曰：「自西自東，自南自北，無思不服。」一人之謂也。¹³⁹

[Even a lord of a country with] a territory of [only] one hundred *li* can obtain the All-under-Heaven. ... [Even in a country with] a territory of [only] one hundred *li*, there are enough distinctions of rank and status to accommodate sage men of the All-under-Heaven; there are enough governmental positions and occupations to accommodate all able men of the All-under-Heaven; following its old rules, choosing those who are good and cleverly using them, is enough to make people who love profit obey and perform their duties. Sage men unite, able men obtain official positions, [and] profit-loving people perform duties, – [if] these three [tasks] will be achieved, the All-under-Heaven will endeavour its best efforts, and there will be none who alienate themselves. Hence, a territory of a hundred *li* square is sufficient to achieve the utmost result. Encouraging loyalty and trustworthiness, manifesting humaneness and righteousness is enough to make people rise. Combining these two principles, it is possible to obtain the All-under-Heaven, [and these] *zhubou* who are the last to join will be the first endangered. As the *Ode* says, “From the east, from the west, from the north, from the south, there will be no one who will dare not to [come] to perform the duties.” This is said about the unification of mankind.

136 Should be 武王.

137 Cf. *Xunzi*, “Wang ba,” [11], 250.

138 Cf. *Xunzi*, “Zheng lun” [18], 395.

139 *Xunzi*, “Wang ba” [11], 244–245; Cf. a similar passage in *Xunzi*, “Yi bing” [15], 326.

4 *Hanfeizi*, “Wu du” 五蠹:

古者文王處豐、鎬之間，地方百里，行仁義而懷西戎，遂王天下。徐偃王處漢東，地方五百里，行仁義，割地而朝者三十有六國。荊文王恐其害己也。舉兵伐徐，遂滅之。故文王行仁義而王天下，偃王行仁義而喪其國，是仁義用於古不用於今也。故曰：世異則事異。¹⁴⁰

In the ancient times, King Wen dwelt between Feng and Hao. His lands [occupied only] one hundred *li* square; [he] acted [relying on] humaneness and righteousness, attracted the Western Rong, and succeeded to become the King of the All-under-Heaven. King Yan of Xu dwelt to the east of the Han River. His lands [also occupied] five hundred *li* square. He cut [parts of his] lands, [gave them] to thirty six states, and [received their rulers at] audiences.¹⁴¹ This made King Wen of Jing (i.e. Chu – M. Kh.) anxious about his own security. He raised troops against Xu and extinguished it. Thus King Wen [of Zhou] practiced humaneness and righteousness and became the king of the All-under-Heaven, while King Yan of Xu practiced humaneness and righteousness and ruined his state. This means that despite humaneness and righteousness were applicable in the past, they are not any longer applicable today. Therefore it is said: “times are different, things are different.”

Appendix IV: The speech of Lou Jing

陛下取天下與周室異。周之先后稷，堯封之邠，積德累善十有餘世。公劉避桀居豳。太王以狄伐故，去豳，杖馬箠居岐，國人爭隨之。及文王為西伯，斷虞芮之訟，始受命，呂望、伯夷自海濱來歸之。武王伐紂，不期而會孟津之上八百諸侯，皆曰紂可伐矣，遂滅殷。成王傳位，周公之屬傅相焉，迺營成周洛邑，以此為天下之中也，諸侯四方納貢職，道里均矣，有德則易以王，無德則易以亡。凡居此者，欲令周務以德致人，不欲依阻險，令後世驕奢以虐民也。及周之盛時，天下和洽，四夷鄉風，慕義懷德，附離而並事天子，不屯一卒，不戰一士，八夷大國之民莫不賓服，效其貢職。及周之衰也，分而為兩，天下莫朝，周不能制也。非其德薄也，而形勢弱也。今陛下起豐沛，收卒三千人，以之徑往而卷蜀漢，定三秦，與項羽戰滎陽，爭成皋之口，大戰七十，小戰四十，使天下之民肝腦塗地，父子暴骨中野，不可勝數，哭泣之聲未絕，傷痍者未起，而欲比隆於成康之時，臣竊以為不侔也。且夫秦地被山帶河，四塞以為固，卒然有急，百萬之紅可具也。因秦之故，資甚美膏腴之地，此所謂天府[七]者也。陛下入關而都之，山東雖亂，秦之故地可全而有也。夫與人崗，不搯其亢，拊其背，未能全其勝也。今陛下入關而都，案秦之故地，此亦搯天下之亢而拊其背也。¹⁴²

Your Majesty obtained the All-under-Heaven in a way that is different from that of the House of Zhou. Zhou descended from King Millet. Yao bestowed him with Tai.¹⁴³ [After this, the Zhou] accumulated virtues and worked hard to improve themselves during more than ten generations. Patriarch Liu, hiding from Jie¹⁴⁴, resided in Bin¹⁴⁵. The Great King abandoned Bin because of the attacks of the Di people, and, speeding his horses with a whip, came to reside [under Mount] Qi. The men of the state (i.e. the Zhou people) disagreed to follow him. As King Wen was appointed as the Lord of the West, he settled the dispute between the rulers of Yu and Rui and started to receive Com-

140 *Hanfeizi*, “Wu du” [19: 49], 1041.

141 This means that he conquered them and turned their rulers into his subordinates.

142 Cf. Sima, *Shi ji*, “Liu Jing Shusun Tong lie zhuan” 劉敬叔孫通列傳 [99], 2715.

143 In present-day Wugong County of Shaanxi Province.

144 The last, vicious ruler of the Xia dynasty.

145 In the valley of Jing River in Shaanxi Province.

mands [from Heaven], then Lü Wang and Bo Yi from the seaside adhered to him. As King Wen was about to attack Zhou [Xin],¹⁴⁶ he did not make any appointment, but he met eight hundred other rulers of polities at the Meng Ford. All of them said: “It is possible to attack Zhou [Xin]”, and thus they destroyed [the Shang capital] Yin. As King Cheng ascended the throne, the Duke of Zhou and others were his instructors and advisers. Thus, they built Chengzhou-Luoyi as to make it the center of the All-under-Heaven, so that, when *zhubou* from the four quarters of the world came to bring tribute and perform duties, the distance that they had to cover was equal.

If one possesses virtue, it is easy to become king. If one does not possess virtue, it is easy to perish. Those who resided here (i.e. Zhou Kings) strove to accomplish the task of Zhou to attract people by virtue. They did not wish, relying on fortification, to make later generations arrogant and extravagant, so that they will mistreat the people. At the time of Zhou’s prosperity, the All-under-Heaven was in harmony, foreign peoples of the four directions admired righteousness and cherished virtues in their customs, [everybody] was drawn closer to one another and equally served the Son of Heaven. Every village had [to recruit] at least one soldier, in every battle at least one warrior [had to combat]. Among the population of the Great States and of the eight foreign peoples, nobody refused to perform the duties of guests, but rendered their tributes and services. At the time of Zhou’s degeneration, it spited in two,¹⁴⁷ in the All-under-Heaven nobody [came to royal] audiences, and Zhou could not govern. It is not that its virtue weakened, but its situation became feeble.

Now Your Majesty arose in Feng and Pei, gathered three thousand soldiers, with which you proceeded forward and coiled up Shu and Han, calmed up the three Qin, fought Xian Yu at Rongyang, won away the Mouth of Chenggao-Pass. [You conducted] seventy great battles and forty smaller battles, you made the people of the All-under-Heaven to soil the earth with their livers and brains. Fathers and sons bulk up their bones amidst the fields, it is not possible to count them. The sound of wailing does not cease, the injured and crippled cannot get up, but you want to compete in grandeur with the epoch of Kings Cheng and Kang!

Your servant’s humble opinion is that they are not alike.

At the same time, the lands of Qin are backed by mountains and belted by the River, the four strategic passes make it secure, in the case of emergency it can provide one million soldiers. The reason why one should rely on Qin is that it is endowed by very beautiful, fruitful earth. This is what is called “the Storehouse of Heaven”. If Your Majesty enters through the Pass and establishes the capital there, even if there will be confusion to the east of the Mountains, it will be possible to have it [settled] relying on the old land of Qin. When fighting with someone, if one does not seize his throat and throw him on his back, it is not possible to subdue him completely. If Your Majesty enters the Pass and establishes the capital in the old land of Qin, this will be like seizing the throat of the All-under-Heaven and throwing it down on its back.

146 The last ruler of the Shang.

147 I.e. in Western and Eastern Zhou in 315 BC.