

MARITAL ALLIANCES AND AFFINAL
RELATIVES (*SHENG* 甥 AND *HUNGOU* 婚媾)
IN THE SOCIETY AND POLITICS OF ZHOU
CHINA IN THE LIGHT OF BRONZE
INSCRIPTIONS

Maria Khayutina*

Abstract

Several hundred inscribed bronze objects dating from Western and Eastern Zhou periods were commissioned for or by married women. Several dozen inscriptions are known whose commissioners called themselves *sheng* 生 (甥) of a number of lineages. In pre-Qin Chinese, the term *sheng* 甥 designated several categories of affinal relatives: paternal aunts' sons, maternal uncles' sons, wives' brothers, sisters' husbands, and sons of sisters or daughters. The wide geographical and chronological spread of female- or *sheng*-related vessels, as well as dedications to “many affinal relatives” (*hungou* 婚媾) in bronze inscriptions point to the importance of marital ties in early Chinese society and politics.

Focusing on the inscriptions commissioned by *sheng*, the present article suggests that even when concluded at a considerable distance, marriages produced long-term mutual obligations for male members of the participating lineages or principalities. Affinal relationships represented social and political capital that could be converted in terms of individuals' careers and prestige or benefits for their whole lineages/states. In sum, starting from the early Western Zhou period, marital alliances represented a substantial integrative factor in early Chinese politics. On the one hand, marital alliances helped to consolidate the radial network of Zhou states centered on the Zhou king. On the other hand, they facilitated the construction of decentralized regional and interregional inter-state networks. The latter guaranteed the stability of the Zhou political system even

* Maria Khayutina, 夏玉婷, University of Munich; email: mkhayutina@sinit.com.

This article has been written under the auspices of the Graduiertenkolleg “Formen von Prestige in Kulturen des Altertums” at the University of Munich where I participated as post-doctoral fellow in 2007–2009. I wish to thank Hans van Ess, Thomas Höllmann, Edward Shaughnessy, Chen Zhaorong, Katheryn Linduff and Armin Selbitschka, as well as the anonymous readers for *Early China* for their remarks and suggestions at different stages of this research. All errors are my own responsibility.

when it had a weak center. As a result, the Zhou networks did not fall apart following crises in the Zhou royal house, but continued to expand by the inclusion of new members.

Several hundred inscribed ritual bronze vessels dating to the Western Zhou (1045–771 B.C.E.) and Spring and Autumn periods (770–403 B.C.E.) known up to today were made on the occasion of concluding marriage, and were usually commissioned by men for their daughters, sisters, or spouses. Besides, several dozen vessels are known that were commissioned by or mentioned persons whose designations include the word *sheng* 生 (甥) that identified several kinds of male relatives by marriage.¹ A smaller number of bronze vessels bear dedications to relatives by marriage (*hungou* 婚媾) in general. The wide geographical spread of vessels made on the occasion of marriage, or referring to existing marital relationships indicates the high relevance of marital alliances between aristocratic lineages² and principalities³ in Zhou

1. The kinship term *sheng* has no direct English equivalent and, therefore, will be rendered in transliteration in the following. Other kinship terms or titles making parts of persons' designations will be transliterated and translated at their first appearance. Transliterated kinship terms and titles will be emphasized by italic type in order to distinguish them from lineage or personal names.

2. The term "lineage" as used here corresponds to the Chinese *zongzu* 宗族, a "consanguineal kin group comprising persons who trace their common relationship through patrilineal links to a known ancestor" (Paul Chao, *The Chinese Kinship* (London: Kegan Paul International, 1983), 19). Robert Gassmann renders *zu* as German "Sippe," i.e. lineage, and *zong* as "Stamm," i.e. a higher-level lineage including several *zu* (see Robert Gassmann, *Verwandtschaft und Gesellschaft im alten China. Begriffe, Strukturen und Prozesse* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2006), 63, 173). Lineages had surnames *xing* 姓 which they retraced to divinized ancestors who allegedly lived centuries ago and were surrounded by legends. Associations of lineages sharing the same surname are often referred to as "clans" (see e.g. Edwin G. Pulleyblank, "Ji and Jiang: The Role of Exogamic Clans in the Organization of the Zhou Polity," *Early China* 25 (2000), 1–27; Lothar von Falkenhausen, *The Chinese Society in the Age of Confucius (1000–250 BC). The Archaeological Evidence* (Los Angeles: Cotsen Institute of Archaeology, University of Los Angeles, 2006), 23, 118, 169–203; Gassmann, above, 37). David Sena argues that "clans in the Western Zhou did not exist as social groups of people who ever convened or practiced any form of collective behavior" (David Sena, *Reproducing Society: Lineage and Kinship in Western Zhou China* (Ph.D. Diss., University of Chicago, 2005), 8). Although this extreme view may be challenged, this is not the objective of the present research and, for instance, I agree in not using the term "clan" but follow Robert Gassmann in assessing lineages of the same surname as "surname communities" ("Namensgemeinschaft," see Gassmann, above, 37–45).

3. It is difficult to define various agents of the political interaction during the Western Zhou period. Li Feng suggests distinguishing between metropolitan lineages

footnote continued on next page

China. The present article is based on the analysis of marriage-related inscriptions and offers some observations with regard to particular forms and geographical extension of marital alliances, as well as to their significance for the understanding of the socio-political organization of Zhou China.

The first section shows how marital alliances between Zhou and non-Zhou lineages or principalities are reflected in inscriptions dedicated to, made for, or made by females.⁴ The second section, based on the analysis of thirty-seven cases of *sheng* mentioned in bronze inscriptions included in the *Yin Zhou jinwen jicheng* 殷周金文集成,⁵ discusses how early Chinese elites instrumentalized their affinal relationships for enhancing their status, gaining prestige, concluding new marital alliances, communicating with third parties, or making war. The third and fourth sections are based on more recently discovered inscriptions and consider in detail individual cases of Diao *sheng* 媯生 and

who lived in territories under the direct control of the Zhou king and “regional states” (see Li Feng, *Landscape and Power in Early China: The Crisis and Fall of the Western Zhou, 1045–771 BC* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2006), 121–40). Li Feng recognizes that “regional states” were self-sufficient, but their rulers acted as “agents” of the Western Zhou state and the subordinates of the Zhou king (see Li Feng, *Bureaucracy and the State in Early China* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), esp. 270). I am not yet convinced that all geopolitical units in Early China, especially those that were not founded as colonies but either were in place already before the Zhou conquest or emerged in various places during the Western Zhou period, were subordinated to the Zhou king to the same degree and participated in the Western Zhou “state” in the same way. Notwithstanding possible differences in their relationships with the Zhou royal house, many units had similar authority structures: they were ruled by lineages whose heads were positioned as “princes” whose status was much elevated over every other member of the local society (this is particularly visible in the architecture and equipment of their tombs). Hence, such units will be defined in the following as “principalities.”

4. Under “non-Zhou” I understand socio- and geopolitical entities retaining their cultural specifics and existing outside of the Zhou political network centered on the Zhou king. From the Chinese perspective, they were perceived as “aliens,” often rated to *Rong* 戎, *Di* 狄, *Man* 蠻, and *Yi* 夷 groups of peoples, or called by individual names.

5. Zhongguo kexue yanjiuyuan kaogu yanjiusuo 中國科學研究院考古研究所, *Yin Zhou jinwen jicheng* 殷周金文集成 (hereafter *Jicheng*), 18 vols. (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1984–94); see also *Yin Zhou jinwen jicheng shiwen* 殷周金文集成釋文, 6 vols. (Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 2001); Zhang Yachu 張亞初, *Yin Zhou jinwen jicheng yinde* 殷周金文集成引得 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 2001); Chinese Ancient Texts Database CHANT powered by the Chinese University of Hong Kong (www.chant.org) and Digital Archives of Bronze Images and Inscriptions powered by the Academia Sinica, Taiwan (www.ihp.sinica.edu.tw/~bronze/). The *Jicheng* includes more than 12,000 rubbings of Shang and Zhou inscriptions published before 1980, of which 7,499 items are dated to Western Zhou and Spring and Autumn periods.

Rong *sheng* 戎生, shedding light on intra- and interlineage relationships, as well as on some of the political effects of marital alliances. The final section argues that marital alliances should be acknowledged as a major factor of political cooperation in Early China, starting from the early Western Zhou and during the Spring and Autumn periods.

Marital Alliances in the Light of Female-Related Inscriptions

Several hundred inscriptions listed in the *Jicheng* identify ritual bronze vessels as dedicated to, made for, or made by women. They include presents given to women as dowry by their parents or other relatives, wedding presents given to wives by husbands, vessels dedicated by sons to their (usually deceased) mothers, vessels made by women for themselves, for their ancestors, for their parents-in-law, or for other women (daughters, sisters, or other female relatives). Such inscriptions often, but not necessarily, identify a woman's surname (*xing*) that did not change after marriage. Among the inscriptions of the early Western Zhou period included in the *Jicheng*, 15 are commissioned for or by Ji 姬-surnamed, 15 by Si 姒-surnamed, 11 by Jiang 姜-surnamed, and 7 by Ji 姑-surnamed women.⁶ There are also many inscriptions dedicated to women whose surname is not indicated. The number of female-related inscriptions increased with the passage of time, following the wider access to bronze-casting technology and the spread of literacy.

There was no single format for recording lineage names (*shi*) of married women. They could be identified either by their husband's lineage, or by their native lineage depending on who was the speaker and whom he or she was addressing.⁷ Female-related inscriptions testify that during the Western Zhou period, the rule of surname exogamy was generally observed.⁸ The cases of its violation are attested

6. The Western Zhou period is conventionally subdivided into three subperiods: Early (King Wu to King Zhao, 1045–957 B.C.E), Middle (King Mu to King Yi, 956–858 B.C.E), and Late (King Li to King You, 857 to 771 B.C.E). The Spring and Autumn period is similarly subdivided in Early (c. eighth–mid-seventh centuries B.C.E), Middle (c. mid-seventh–mid-sixth centuries B.C.E) and late (c. mid-sixth–fifth centuries B.C.E).

7. For naming practices with regard to females see Falkenhausen, *The Chinese Society in the Age of Confucius*, 118; Gassmann, *Verwandtschaft und Gesellschaft*, 443–83; Mu Haiting 穆海亭, “Zhou dai jinwen zhong de fu ming” 周代金文中的婦名, *Wenbo* 2007.5, 54–55, 15.

8. On exogamy in the Yin and Zhou periods see Mihail Vasil'evič Krjukov, *Formy social'noj organizacii v drevnem Kitae* [Forms of social organization in Ancient China] (Moscow: Nauka, 1967), 128–54.

very seldom.⁹ The requirement to marry outside of even distant patri-kin and quasi-kin created the basic precondition for alliance-building across geographic space.

Most principalities established after the Zhou conquest of the Shang (c. 1045 B.C.E) were ruled by lineages of the Jī and Jiang surnames. During pre-kingly times, the Jī and the Jiang possibly represented two exogamic moieties that intermarried with each other endogamically.¹⁰ Inscriptions of the Western Zhou period testify to the existence of the preferential marital partnership between Jī-and Jiang 姜-surnamed lineages. Most striking is that Jiang-surnamed women seem to be married exclusively to Jī-surnamed men.¹¹ Several queens or concubines of Zhou kings were Jiang-surnamed women, including King's [Spouse Lady] Jiang 王姜, King's [Spouse] First-born [Lady] Jiang 王伯姜, and King's Spouse, the Elder [Daughter] of Jī, [Lady] Jiang 王婦曁(紀)孟姜.¹² Also rulers of Jī-surnamed principalities Wei 衛, Xing 邢, Guo 虢 and Jin 晉 had Jiang-surnamed consorts.¹³ At the same time, Zhou kings took spouses of various other surnames including

9. For violations during the Western Zhou period see Sena, *Reproducing Society*, 206 and 299–300; during Spring and Autumn period, see Melvin P. Thatcher, "Marriages of the Ruling Elite in the Spring and Autumn Period," in *Marriage and Inequality in Chinese Society*, ed. Rubie S. Watson and Patricia B. Ebrey (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1991), 28–57, esp. 37–39.

10. See Krjukov, *Formy social'noj organizacii*, 151; E. G. Pulleyblank, "The Chinese and Their Neighbors in Prehistoric and Early Historic Times," in *The Origins of the Chinese Civilization*, ed. David N. Keightley (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), 411–66, esp. 420–1; Pulleyblank, "Ji and Jiang," 4.

11. In all Western Zhou cases listed in the *Jicheng* where the lineage of Jiang women's husbands is recorded, it can be verified that the latter were members of the Jī surname community. Some inscriptions do not specify the men's principality or lineage, and therefore the possibility that some of them were non-Jī cannot be ruled out completely.

12. See *Zuoce Ze Ling gui* 作冊大令簋 (*Jicheng* 4301, Mangshan Mapo 邙山馬坡, Luoyang 洛陽市, Henan, Early Western Zhou; mentions King's Jiang); *Qi ding* 旗鼎 (*Jicheng* 2704, Yangjiacun 楊家村, Meixian 郟縣, Shaanxi, Early Western Zhou; mentions King's Jiang); *Wang bo Jiang ding* 王伯姜鼎 (*Jicheng* 2560, Wujiazhuang 吳家莊, Bei Guo 北郭, Qishan 岐山, Shaanxi, Late Western Zhou); *Wang zuo Zhong Jiang ding* 王作仲姜鼎 (*Jicheng* 2191, Meixian, Shaanxi, Middle Western Zhou); *Wang zuo Jiang shi gui* 王作姜氏簋 (*Jicheng* 3570, Zhouzhi 盩厔 County, Shaanxi, Late Western Zhou); *Wang fu Ji meng Jiang yi* 王婦紀孟姜彝 (*Jicheng* 10240, Late Western Zhou).

13. *Wei Wen-jun furen li* 衛文君夫人叔姜鬲 (*Jicheng* 595, Junxian Xin cun 濬縣辛村, Henan, Tomb M5, Late Western Zhou); *Xing Jiang dazai Si gui* 邢姜大宰己簋 (*Jicheng* 3896, Late Western Zhou); *Guo Jiang ding* 虢姜鼎 (*Jicheng* 2742, Late Western Zhou); *Jin Jiang ding* 晉姜鼎 (*Jicheng* 2826, Hancheng 韓城, Shaanxi, Early Spring and Autumn).

Ren 妊 (任), Ji 妃 (己), Ji 媯, or Gui 媯.¹⁴ Heads of various branches of the Guo 虢 lineage were married to women of Ji, Ji, Ying 嬴, and Yin 殷 surnames.¹⁵ It is noteworthy that women of the same surname could originate from different lineages.¹⁶

Inscriptions permit us to estimate the geographical extent of marital bonds (cf. [Map 1](#)). For instance, the occupant of the late Western Zhou Tomb 63 in the Jin cemetery at Tianma-Qucun 天馬—曲村, Houma 侯馬, Shanxi, identified by excavators as the spouse of a ruler of Jin, was a Ji-surnamed lady from Yang 楊 principality. Yang was located in Hongdong 洪洞 County of present-day Shanxi province, roughly 100 km to the north of the Jin capital.¹⁷ The early Spring and Autumn period's Tomb 1753 in the cemetery of Guo at Shangcunling, Sanmenxia, Henan, has yielded a tripod dedicated to the Daughter of Su 蘇子. Su was a Ji-surnamed principality in Wen 濫 County, Henan, roughly 200 km from Guo.¹⁸

Other inscribed bronzes provide testimonies to alliances concluded over a much greater distance. An early Western Zhou vessel discovered in the area of the royal center Zongzhou 宗周, was commissioned by Qi Jiang 齊姜, i.e. a woman of the Jiang-surnamed ruling lineage of Qi principality located in Shandong province.¹⁹ Another early Western

14. See *Wang Ren zuo gui* 王妊作簋 (*Jicheng* 3344, Luoyang, Henan, Early Western Zhou); *Wang zuo Feng Ren Shan he* 王作豐妊單盃 (*Jicheng* 9438, Lintong 臨潼 County, Shaanxi, Late Western Zhou); *Su gong gong gui* 蘇公簋 (*Jicheng* 3739, Late Western Zhou; dedicated to King's Ji 王妃); *Chen hou gui* 陳侯簋 (*Jicheng* 3815, Lintong 臨潼, Shaanxi, Late Western Zhou; dedicated to King's Gui 王媯).

15. See Sena, *Reproducing Society*, 200–207.

16. See *Qian shu Ji-fu xu* 遣叔吉父盃 (*Jicheng* 4416, Middle Western Zhou; dowry for Guo wang Ji 虢王媯) and *Shou shu Mian-fu xu* 魯叔免父盃 (Late Western Zhou) from the cemetery of Guo in Shangcunling identified as dowry for The Elder [Lady] Ji 孟媯 (see Henan sheng kaogu yanjiu suo, “Shangcunling Guo guo mudi M2006 de qingli” 上村虢國墓地 M2006 的清理, *Wenwu* 1995.1, 4–31). These women belonged to Qian and Shou lineages respectively.

17. Shanxi sheng kaogu yanjiusuo, Beijing daxue kaoguxue xi, “Tianma-Qucun Beizhao Jinhou mudi di si ci fajue” 天馬—曲村遺址北趙晉侯墓地第四次發掘, *Wenwu* 1994.8, 4–21. On the localization of Yang see Chen Pan 陳槃, *Chunqiu dashibiao lieguo juexing ji cummiebiao zhuan* 春秋大事表列國爵姓及存滅表譌異 (Taibei: Academia Sinica, 1969), 262–63.

18. See *Shu zuo Su-zi ding* 叔作蘇子鼎 (*Jicheng* 1926, Shangcunling 上村嶺, Sanmenxia, Henan, Tomb M1753, Early Spring and Autumn); for further evidence see *Su He dou* 蘇貉豆 (*Jicheng* 4659, Shangcunling, Sanmenxia, Henan, Tomb M1820, Early Spring and Autumn); *Su Zhi Ren pan* 蘇冶妊盤 (*Jicheng* 10118, Early Spring and Autumn; dedicated by Lady Ren of Su to her daughter Lady Ji of Guo). For the localization of Su, see Chen Pan, *Chunqiu dashibiao lieguo*, 294–98.

19. See *Qi Jiang ding* 齊姜鼎 (*Jicheng* 2148, Fengxi 禮西, Zhangjiapo 張家坡, Chang'an, Shaanxi, Early Western Zhou).

Zhou tripod found in the royal metropolitan center Zhou-under-Qi²⁰ was dedicated to Ji Mother 冀母, i.e. a woman from Ji 冀 (紀),²¹ another Jiang-surnamed principality located in Shandong, but even farther to the east.²² Ji provided also at least one late Western Zhou queen or a royal concubine, Elder [Daughter] of Ji, [Lady] Jiang 王婦冀 (紀)孟姜.²³ These women from Shandong travelled a distance of 1,200 and more kilometers from their native places in order to join their bridegrooms in lineages in metropolitan Zhou areas in Shaanxi. A lady from the Gui-surnamed Chen 陳, located in Huai River valley near Huaiyang 淮陽 in Henan, also had to overcome a distance of more than 900 kilometers in order to join another Zhou king during the late Western Zhou period.²⁴ Not only the royal house, but also ruling houses of other principalities took wives from far-away places. According to transmitted sources, Lord Mu of Jin 晉穆侯 (r. 811–785) married Lady Jiang from Qi 齊姜, the travel distance to which along ancient roads would constitute about 800 km.²⁵

During the Western Zhou period, the Zhou faced a variety of lineages that retained their autonomy and stayed outside of the Zhou political hierarchy. Some of them reached the same level of complexity as Zhou units conventionally defined as “principalities” in the present article. Their leaders identified themselves as *wang* 王 (“king”),²⁶ *gong*

20. The oldest royal residence, regularly used by the Zhou kings during the Western Zhou period, was located on the Zhou Plain in present-day Qishan and Fufeng Counties of Shaanxi Province. It was referred to in bronze inscriptions as Zhou and in received texts as Qi Zhou 岐周 (Zhou [under the Mount] Qi), Qixia 岐下 ([Zhou] under [the Mount] Qi), or Qiyi 岐邑 (Settlement [under the Mount] Qi). In order to distinguish the name of the residence from the name of the dynasty, I call it “Zhou-under-Qi.” For the discussion of royal residences and for further references see Maria Khayutina, “Royal Hospitality and Geopolitical Constitution of the Western Zhou Polity (1046/5–771 BC),” *T’oung Pao* 96.1–3 (2010), 1–73.

21. See *Ji mu ding* 冀母鼎 (*Jicheng* 2146, Huangdui 黃堆, Fufeng, Shaanxi, Early Western Zhou).

22. Ji was originally located in Shouguang 壽光, Shandong. Consequently, it incorporated territories in eastern Shandong (see Li, *Landscape and Power*, 308; 315–16 with further references).

23. See *Wang fu ji meng Jiang yi* 王婦紀孟姜彝 (*Jicheng* 10240, Late Western Zhou).

24. See *Chen hou gui* 陳侯簋 (*Jicheng* 3815). According to the Chinese tradition, Duke Hu of Chen 陳胡公 was the son-in-law of King Wu of Zhou (see Ban Gu 班固, *Han shu* 漢書 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1983), 28.1653 (“Di li zhi” 地理志)).

25. See Sima Qian, *Shi ji*, 39.1637–41 (“Jin shi jia” 晉世家).

26. For evidence of the usage of the royal title by non-Zhou rulers, see *Ze wang fang ding* 矢王方鼎 (*Jicheng* 2149, Early Western Zhou); *Rong X wang you* 戎□王卣 (*Jicheng* 5324, Fendong 豐東 Doumenzhen 斗門鎮, Chang’an, Shaanxi, Early Western Zhou); *Feng wang fu* 豐王斧 (*Jicheng* 11774, Yixian 易縣, Hebei, Early Western Zhou); *Sui*

footnote continued on next page

公 (“duke” or “patriarch”), or *bo* 伯 (“first-born” or “eldest”),²⁷ e.g. King of Ze 矢王, Duke of Chu 楚公, and the First-born of Yu 彌伯.²⁸ The usage of the title “king” by the ruler of Ze identifies Ze as an autonomous political unit, since in the Zhou hierarchy there could be but one king.²⁹ However, the significance of titles should not be over-emphasized. Otherwise, principalities whose rulers did not claim kingship and who used Chinese titles or birth ranks to identify themselves can easily be confused with regular members of the Zhou network, which is counterproductive for revealing the political complexity of

wang he 王盂 (*Jicheng* 9411, Middle Western Zhou); *Mai wang you* 買王卣 (*Jicheng* 5252, Late Western Zhou); *Lü wang li* 呂王鬲 (*Jicheng* 635, Late Western Zhou); *Kunni wang zhong* 昆泥王鐘 (*Jicheng* 46, Late Western Zhou); *Guai bo gui* 乖伯簋, *Jicheng* 4331, Late Western Zhou; dedicated to *Guai wang* 乖王).

27. The terms *bo* 伯, *zhong* 仲, *shu* 叔, *ji* 季 are usually understood as seniority ranks distinguishing siblings in a family according to their birth sequence. They can be translated as “First-born,” “Second-born,” “Third-born,” and “Junior,” respectively. A family with more than four sons could include several *zhong* or *shu*. E.g., Zhou King Wen had several *shu* sons (see Sima Qian 司馬遷, *Shi ji* 史記 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1959), 4.126 (“Zhou ben ji” 周本記)). This system of birth ranks was referred to as *paihang* 排行 (“arranging the rows”) in later literature. Within a lineage structure, branches could be also referred to as *zhong*, *shu*, or *ji* depending on the birth rank of their founders (see Gassmann, *Verwandtschaft und Gesellschaft*, 198–206).

28. See *Ze wang fang ding* 矢王方鼎 (*Jicheng* 2149, Early Western Zhou); *Chu gong Ni zhong* 楚公逆鐘 (*Jicheng* 106, Wuchang 武昌, Hubei, Late Western Zhou); *Yu bo li* 魚伯鬲 (*Jicheng* 507, Rujiazhuang 茹家莊, Baoji 寶雞, Shaanxi, Middle Western Zhou).

29. The political autonomy was not necessarily coupled with cultural or ethnic foreignness. There are indications that Ze in bronze inscriptions corresponds to Yu 虞 in transmitted texts (see Ch'en Chao-jung, “On the Possibility That the Two Western Zhou States Yu and Rui Were Originally Located in the Qian River Valley,” in *Imprints of Kinship: Studies of Recently Discovered Bronze Inscriptions from Ancient China*, ed. Edward L. Shaughnessy (Hong Kong: The Chinese University of Hong Kong Press, forthcoming)). Yu was founded by King Wen’s uncle, who was his father’s elder brother. The usage of the royal title by the rulers of Ze/Yu is plausibly related to their elevated status in the hierarchy of Ji-surnamed lineages (see Maria Khayutina, “King Wen, a Settler of Disputes or Judge? The “Yu-Rui case” in Sima Qian’s Historical Records and Its Historical Background,” forthcoming). In one bronze inscription the ruler of Guo was referred to as “king of Guo” (see *Qian shu Ji-fu xu* 遣叔吉父盥 (*Jicheng* 4416, dedicated to *Guo wang Ji* 虢王姑, Middle Western Zhou). This may also be related to the fact that the Guo lineage was founded by King Wen’s brother. However, this inscription was commissioned not by the ruler of Guo, but by Guo’s marital partner. Hence, it is not clear whether Guo’s rulers openly used the royal title within their domain. On the other hand, there is much evidence that members of the Guo lineage subordinated themselves to Zhou kings.

Early China.³⁰ For example, the First-born of Yu 彌伯 could mistakenly be identified as the head of a regular Zhou lineage. But non-Zhou features in the archaeological complex of Yu discovered near Baoji 寶雞, Shaanxi, and the splendor of its funerary equipment of the tombs of Yu's rulers suggest that it was a culturally idiosyncratic entity with considerable resources and competing for prestige with neighboring influential Zhou lineages.³¹ At the same time, evidence of Yu's subordination to the Zhou royal house is lacking. The location in a strategically favorable place and connections to other non-Zhou units in the west allowed Yu to retain autonomy during several generations of its rulers. Hence, Yu can be assessed as a non-Zhou principality. During the last decade, cemeteries of other geopolitical entities presumably

30. Unlike *wang* ("king") and *hou* 侯 ("lord"), which were specific political terms, the terms *gong* and *bo*, often translated as "duke" and "earl," were embedded in the system of patrilineal kinship relationships. The position of a *bo*, the First-born, defined a person's hereditary rights to represent his lineage as a political body. As far as non-Zhou rulers succeeded to power by hereditary descent, they naturally also used the Chinese term "First-born" to refer to themselves. Many commissioners of bronzes calling themselves *bo* dedicated inscriptions to their deceased fathers whom they addressed as *gong*. Li Feng suggests that heads of lineages referred to as *bo* controlled territorial units *bang* 邦 subordinated to the Zhou king and not qualifying as more autonomous *guo* 國, i.e. "regional states," or principalities, ruled by *hou* (see Li, *Landscape and Power*, 47–48). However, I doubt that the Zhou political terminology was that systematic (for a similar view see Leonard Sergeevič Vasil'ev, *Drevnij Kitaj. Tom I. Predistorija, Shan-in', Zapadnoe Čžou (do VIII v. do n. e.)* [Ancient China. Vol. I. Prehistory, Shang-Yin, Western Zhou (up to the eighth century B.C.E)] (Moscow: Vostochnaya Literatura, 1995). The term *bang* was applied both to Zhou and non-Zhou political units with various degrees of autonomy (for references see Khayutina, "Royal Hospitality and Geopolitical Constitution," 29, fn. 67). In some cases, heads of one lineage could be referred to alternatively as *bo* and *gong*, or as *hou* and *gong* and *bo* (cf. *Rui bo hu* 芮伯壺, *Jicheng* 9585, Middle Western Zhou; *Rui gong hu* 芮公壺, *Jicheng* 9586, Late Western Zhou; *Ying gong ding* 應公鼎, *Jicheng* 2553, Early Western Zhou; *Ying hou gui* 應侯簋, *Jicheng* 3860, Middle Western Zhou; *Ying bo xu* 應伯鬯, Pingdingshan M95, Late Western Zhou, in Henan sheng wenwu yanjiusuo, "Pingdingshan Ying guo mudi jushiwu hao mu de fajue" 平頂山應國墓地九十五號墓的發掘, *Huaxia kaogu* 1992.3, 92–103). In these cases the titles *bo*, *hou* and *gong* most plausibly identified various roles of the heads of ruling lineages within and outside their principalities.

31. On the material culture and epigraphic heritage of Yu see Lu Liancheng 盧連成, *Hu Zhisheng* 胡智生, *Baoji Yu guo mudi* 寶雞魚國墓地 (Beijing: Wenwu, 1988); Li Feng, "Literacy Crossing Cultural Borders: Evidence from the Bronze Inscriptions of the Western Zhou Periods (1045–771 BC)," *Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Art* 74 (2002), 210–42, esp. 231–36; Sun Yan reveals Yu lineage's strategy to construct its identity by "preserving and expanding their distinctive cultural traditions" in Sun Yan, "Material Culture and Social Identities in Western Zhou's Frontier: Case Studies of the Yu and Peng Lineages," *Asian Archaeology* 1 (2012), 52–72, esp. 52–62, 69.

established by non-Zhou peoples have been discovered, including the Kui-surnamed Peng 棚, residing near to Hengshui 橫水 in the Yuncheng 運城 region in south-eastern Shanxi and Ba of unknown surname near Yicheng 翼城 in central Shanxi.³² These cemeteries focused on the large and splendidly equipped tombs of their leaders who also identified themselves as “First-borns.” Judging by the funerary equipment of these tombs, rulers of Peng and Ba attempted to compete in size and wealth against the neighboring Ji-surnamed Jin during a certain period of time. Possibly, other non-Zhou groups such as Ji-surnamed E 噩 in northern Hubei,³³ or Ying-surnamed Xú 徐 located on the edge of present-day Henan, Anhui, Jiangsu, and Shandong provinces,³⁴ also represented lineage-based principalities.

Members of the Zhou political hierarchy from the bottom to the very top could engage in marital alliances with non-Zhou principalities. They included Zhou kings, rulers of Zhou principalities and heads of aristocratic lineages not qualifying as a principality, as well as other members of their lineages. In particular, one queen of the early Western Zhou period was a woman of Yun 員 surname from an unknown principality,³⁵ whereas during the late Western Zhou, Zhou

32. See Shanxi sheng kaoguxue yanjiusuo *et al.*, “Shanxi Jiang xian Hengshui Xi Zhou mu di” 山西絳縣橫水西周墓地, *Kaogu* 2006.7, 16–21; Shanxi sheng kaoguxue yanjiusuo *et al.*, “Shanxi Jiang xian Hengshui Xi Zhou mudi fajue jianbao” 山西絳縣橫水西周墓發掘簡報, *Wenwu* 2006.8, 4–18; Shanxi sheng kaogu yanjiusuo Dahekou mudi lianhe kaogudui, “Shanxi Yicheng xian dahekou Xi Zhou mudi” 山西翼城縣大河口西周墓地, *Kaogu* 2011.7, 9–18. See also Maria Khayutina, “The Tombs of the Rulers of Peng and Relationships between Zhou and Northern Non-Zhou Lineages (until the Early Ninth Century B.C.),” forthcoming in Shaughnessy, ed., *Imprints of Kinship*; Sun, “Material Culture and Social Identities,” 63–69.

33. In 2004 vessels made by the Lord of E and the Second-Born of E dated around the edge of the early and middle Western Zhou periods have been found in a tomb at Yangzishan 羊子山 near Suizhou 隨州 in Hubei (see Zhang Changping 張昌平, “Lun Suizhou xin chu E guo qingtongqi” 論隨州羊子山新出噩國青銅器 in *Wenwu* 2011.11, 87–94). For the relationships between Zhou and E, suggesting its non-Zhou status see Herrlee Glessner Creel, *The Origins of Statecraft in China. Volume 1: The Western Zhou Empire* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1970), 237–38; Edward L. Shaughnessy, “Western Zhou History,” in *The Cambridge History of Ancient China*, ed. Michael Loewe and Edward Shaughnessy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 292–352, esp. 330–31; Li, “Literacy Crossing Cultural Borders,” 222–30; Li, *Landscape and Power*, 330–31.

34. According to various transmitted sources, during the Western Zhou period Xú was ruled by a king and was able to threaten the Zhou (see Fan Ye, *Hou Han shu*, 2808; Wang Guowei, *Jin ben Zhushu jinian shu zheng*, 278). Archaeological corroboration for the early history of Xu is still lacking.

35. See *Gong shu gui* 琿叔簋 (*Jicheng* 3950, 3951, Fengdong 禮東, Chang’an, Shaanxi, Middle Western Zhou).

kings were allied with women from Ji-surnamed E³⁶ and Ji-surnamed Fan 番 located near Xinyang 信陽 in southern Henan.³⁷ It is not clear whether Zhou kings also married out their daughters to non-Zhou rulers. On lower levels, brides were exchanged in both directions. For example, a woman from the Ji-surnamed Jing 井 lineage was married to the First-born of Yu,³⁸ whereas the Third-born of Jing was married to a woman from Man 曼-surnamed Deng 鄧 in Dan 丹 River Valley.³⁹ The Second-born of Peng married his daughter to the Ji-surnamed Bi 畢 lineage residing near Xi'an in Shaanxi, whereas Bi provided the spouse for the First-born of Peng.⁴⁰

Zhou and non-Zhou concluded both short- and long-distance marital alliances. Kings of Ze and the rulers of Yu exchanged brides with lineages from the Zhou royal centers Zhou-under-Qi and Zongzhou,⁴¹ i.e. within reach by a journey of several days. On the other hand, Jing lineage's marital partner Deng resided more than 200 kilometers to the south on the other side of the Qinling 秦嶺 Mountains. Deng, in its turn, intermarried with the Ji-surnamed principality Ying 應 located at Pingdingshan 平頂山, Henan, 270 km to the north-east along the modern road.⁴² The royal house of Zhou's marital partner Fan was located more than 700 kilometers away, in Huai River Valley. Fan, in its turn, was involved in a marital alliance with another branch of the royal Ji community, the ruling lineage of Lu principality located 600 km to the east in Qufu 曲阜, Shandong.⁴³ Ji-surnamed Yan, located near present-day Beijing, intermarried with

36. See *E hou gui* 噩侯簋 (*Jicheng* 3928, Late Western Zhou; dedicated to King's [Spouse Lady] Ji 王姑).

37. See *Wang li* 王鬲 (*Jicheng* 645, Late Western Zhou; dedicated by the king to Fan Ji 番妃). The character 妃 in the woman's name should be read not as *fei* ("concubine"), but Ji 己, where the graph "woman" identified the gender of the recipient.

38. See Yu Jiang, "Ritual Practice, Status, and Gender Identity: Western Zhou Tombs at Baoji," in *Gender and Chinese Archaeology*, ed. Kathryn Linduff and Yan Sun (Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press, 2004), 117–36, esp. 122; Falkenhausen, *Chinese Society*, 118; Sena, *Reproducing Society*, 295–96.

39. See *Deng zhong xizun* 鄧仲犧尊 (*Jicheng* 5852, Fengxi, Zhangjiapo, Chang'an, Shaanxi, Middle Western Zhou).

40. See *Peng zhong ding* 棚仲鼎 (*Jicheng* 2462, Middle Western Zhou; dowry present for Bi Kui 畢媿). For bronzes commissioned for Bi Ji 畢姬 (late Middle Western Zhou) see Shanxi sheng kaogu yanjiusuo, "Shanxi Jiang xian Hengshui Xi Zhou mu fajue jianbao", 4–18.

41. See *Ze wang gui* 矢王簋 (*Jicheng* 3871, Early Western Zhou; dedicated to Zheng Jiang 鄭姜) and *San bo gui* 散伯簋 (*Jicheng* 3778, Late Western Zhou; dedicated to Ze Ji 矢姬).

42. See *Deng gong gui* 鄧公簋 (*Jicheng* 3775, Pingdingshan, Henan, Late Western Zhou; dowry present for Ying Man 應嬭).

43. See *Lu hou li* 魯侯鬲 (*Jicheng* 545, Late Western Zhou; dedicated to Ji Fan 姬番).

Ba, to which a c. 900-km-long road led across the Taihang 太行 Mountains in Shanxi.⁴⁴ Thus, the Zhou not only accepted the “aliens” with whom they lived side by side, but also purposely selected partners, even if they lived at a greater distance.

Various rationales can be suggested behind the institution of interstate marriages. Most obviously, marriages across the borders of a principality guaranteed the highest possible level of nobility to the offspring resulting from them, and thus supported the prestige of ruling lineages.⁴⁵ Short-distance alliances enhanced security, preventing, for instance, territorial disputes with neighbors. Long-distance alliances could prevent competition among potential marital partners from neighboring principalities for the right of establishing the “first lady” and their interference in internal politics. Both short- and long-distance marital alliances allowed large principalities to extend their sphere of influence effectively or symbolically. To small principalities, they promised the support of marital partners in critical situations. As the following recently published inscription illustrates, these alliances were of substantial assistance in the organization of defense:

唯十月初吉壬申。馭戎大出于櫓。害搏戎，執訊，獲馘。櫓候釐害馬四匹，臣一家，貝五朋。害揚櫓候休，用作櫓中好(子)寶。

It was the tenth month, first auspicious day *ren-shen*. The Rong driving chariots came out in Kai in great [numbers]. Hai fought the Rong, captured and interrogated [them] and collected the ears [cut off from the heads of dead enemies]. The Lord of Kai made to Hai a gift of four horses, one family of servants, and five strings of cowries. Hai responded to the beneficence of the Lord of Kai, and used this opportunity to make a treasure for Second-born Lady Zi of Kai.⁴⁶

The inscription suggests that Lady Zi of Kai was Hai’s wife or mother. Hence, Hai was an affinal relative of the Zi-surnamed Kai lineage, which he came to rescue at a time of danger.

44. One bronze vessel discovered in the cemetery of Ba was commissioned by Lord Zhi of Yan 燕侯旨 and dedicated to his “aunt and sister” 姊妹 (see Shanxi sheng kaogu yanjiusuo Dahekou mudi lianhe kaogudui, “Shanxi Yicheng xian dahekou Xi Zhou mudi,” 12).

45. Constance Cook has suggested regarding women transferred in the result of marriage as “inalienable goods,” which, among others, contributed to prestige of the recipients (see Constance C. Cook, “Wealth and the Western Zhou,” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 60.2 (1997), 253–94, esp. 256).

46. *Hai gui* 害簋, Middle Western Zhou, in Liu Yu, *Jin chu Yin Zhou jinwen jilu er bian*, Nr. 425.

Some non-Zhou principalities involved in marital relationships with the Zhou had previously participated in wars against them. E headed a coalition of the Yi of Huai River in their joint campaign against the Zhou. This war plausibly took place during the reign of King Li 厲 (857–842/828 B.C.E.).⁴⁷ Two bronze tureens are known that were made by the Lord of E for King Li's Lady Ji.⁴⁸ Judging from their appearance, they date to the late Western Zhou period and, therefore, most probably were made after this war. In this case marriage could serve to appease the former enemies. Transmitted sources support the view that marriage was conceivable as a means of concluding peace. For instance, the marriage of Zhou King You 幽 (r. 781–771 B.C.E.) and Lady Si 姒 of Bao 褒 located in the upper course of Han River in the south of Shaanxi was concluded immediately after a war.⁴⁹ Bao Si's case demonstrates that women given in marriage to winners enjoyed high status and their sons could even become pretenders to the throne (which, however, resulted in the rebellion organized by the king's father-in-law and was sharply disapproved of in subsequent historical memory). In this case, a marital alliance between the former rivals signified the establishment of partnership and not just subjugation of the vanquished, which would have been accompanied by women's servitude.⁵⁰ Hence, marital alliances with former enemies helped to maintain peace in Zhou China.

Sheng and *hungou* in Bronze Inscriptions

Inscriptions commissioned by or mentioning *sheng* 生 date from early Western Zhou to the late Spring and Autumn period (see Table 1).⁵¹

47. On the war against Lord Yufang of E cf. *Yu ding* 禹鼎 (*Jicheng* 2833, Late Western Zhou).

48. *E hou gui* 鄂侯簋 (*Jicheng* 3828, 3829).

49. On variants in Bao Si's legend, see Li, *Landscape and Power*, 198–202. More examples of marriages following a war during the Spring and Autumn period can be found in the *Zuo zhuan* (see Kai Vogelsang, "Mit den Waffen der Frauen ... Allianzen und Mésallianzen in der Chun qiu-Zeit," in *Die Frau im Alten China. Bild und Wirklichkeit*, ed. Dennis Shilling and Jianfei Krallé (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2001), 1–23, esp. 3–10).

50. The inscription on the *E hou gui* shows that the marriage of the E princess with the Zhou king was concluded according to the normal marital custom, i.e. with a dowry provided by her father, and not waiving this custom, as would be expected in a case of marriage by capture (see Arnold van Gennep, *The Rites of Passage* (1909), trans. from French by Monika Vizedom et al. (London: Routledge, 1960), 123–26).

51. Early, Middle, and Late Western Zhou periods are abbreviated in Table 1 as EWZ, MWZ, and LWZ, and Early, Middle, and Late Spring and Autumn periods

footnote continued on next page

Table 1. Sheng in Bronze Inscriptions from Western Zhou and Spring and Autumn Periods

Nr.	Designation, Jicheng number, date	Location and context (Tomb/T; Hoard/H; unclear (U))	Lineage(s) specified in the designation	Inscription's content
1	<i>Xiaozi sheng</i> 小子生 6001, EWZ.		n/a (possibly a relative of the Zhou royal house).	Was commanded by Zhou king to control the affairs of an unspecified ducal lineage 公宗.
2	<i>Peng sheng</i> 彭生 2483, EWZ.		Peng 彭, possibly, Jiang-surnamed, near Xuzhou 徐州, Jiangsu.	Dedication to elder brothers.
3	<i>Sheng</i> Secretary 生史 4100, 4101, MWZ.	Huangdui 黄堆, Fufeng 扶風, Shaanxi (T).	n/a	Was commanded by Shao <i>bo</i> 召白 to go on a mission in Chu 楚. Dedicated vessels to grandfather Ri Ding 日丁 and Ri Wu 日戊.
4	<i>Qi sheng</i> Lu 齊生魯 9896, MWZ.	Liulongzui 流龍嘴, Qishan, Shaanxi (U).	1) Qi 齊, Jiang-surnamed, Shandong; 2) possibly, Lu 魯, Ji-surnamed, Qufu, Shandong.	“Started to exchange generosity with many Ying” (貯休多贏). Dedication to ancestors.
5	<i>Kang sheng</i> 康生 4685, MWZ.	Shanxi, unknown place.	Kang 康, non-Ji, in Ying 潁 River valley near Yuzhou 禹州, in central Henan.	Dedication to deceased father Gui <i>gong</i> 癸公.

Continued

Table 1. Continued

Nr.	Designation, Jicheng number, date	Location and context (Tomb/T; Hoard/H; unclear (U))	Lineage(s) specified in the designation	Inscription's content
6	Yi <i>sheng</i> 伊生 3631, MWZ.		Yi 伊, surname unknown, in Shangluo 上洛, Henan (cf. 4323).	Dedication to <i>Gong nü</i> 公女 (either father and mother, or father- and mother-in-law).
7	Cheng Guo Qian <i>sheng</i> 城虢遣生 3866, M-LWZ.		1) Guo 虢, Ji-surnamed, in Sanmenxia 三門峽, Henan; 2) Qian 遣, Ji-surnamed, in Yinyangluo 陰陽洛, south-western Henan (cf. 10322; 4323).	Statement of making a vessel; dedication to descendants.
8	Secretary Guo <i>sheng</i> 史虢生 4324, LWZ.		Guo, as in Nr. 7.	Was mentioned as an assistant at a royal reception ceremony in Zhou-under-Qi (supposedly, reign of King Xuan, 825 BC).
9	Fan <i>sheng</i> 番生 4326, LWZ.		1) Fan 番, Ji-surnamed, in Pingqiao 平橋 near Xinyang 信陽, Henan.	Commanded by the Zhou king "to administer the ducal lineage(s), ministers and secretaries" 司公族、卿事、大史寮.
10	Fan Ju <i>sheng</i> 番菊生 9705, LWZ.		1) Fan, as in Nr. 9; 2) Ju 菊, surname unknown.	Made a vessel for his elder daughter [Lady] Ji of Guai 乖姑.

11	Liao <i>sheng</i> 廖生 4459, LWZ.		Liao 廖 (廖, 颺), Ji-surnamed, in Huyang 湖陽, Nanyang 南陽, Henan.	Followed the king in a campaign against southern Huai Yi. Commissioned a tureen together with Great [Lady] Yun 大嬪.
12	Zhou Ji <i>sheng</i> 周棘生 3915, LWZ.		1) Zhou royal house, Ji-surnamed; 2) Ji 棘 lineage, possibly, in southern Henan.	Made a dowry present for [Lady] Yun of Kai 楷嬪.
13	Han Fei <i>sheng</i> 函/函弗(費)生, 887, LWZ.	Xianyang 咸陽, Shaanxi (U).	1) Han 函/函, possibly, Yun-surnamed; near Xinzheng 新鄭, Henan; 2) Fei 弗/費, surname unknown, near Yanshi 偃師, Henan.	Statement of making a vessel.
14	Diao <i>sheng</i> 凋生 744, 4292, 4293, LWZ.	Fufeng, Shaanxi (U); two other vessels recently found in a hoard (H).	Diao 凋, surname unknown, in Fufeng, Shaanxi.	Negotiated rights to land property with the head of Shao lineage; made a dedication for the Duke of Shao 召公.
15	Zhou <i>sheng</i> 周生 4682–83, LWZ-SA.	Gaoquan 高泉, Baoji, Shaanxi (T).	Zhou royal house, Ji-surnamed.	Made a vessel for sacrifices in ancestral temple (<i>zong shi</i> 宗室).
16	Zhou <i>sheng</i> 周生 4682–83, LWZ-SA.	Gaoquan 高泉, Baoji, Shaanxi (T).	Zhou royal house, Ji-surnamed.	Made a vessel for sacrifices in ancestral temple (<i>zong shi</i> 宗室).
17	Peng <i>sheng</i> 棚生 4262, MWZ.		Peng, Kui 媿-surnamed, near Yuncheng 運城, Shanxi.	Purchased lands from First-born of Ge 格白. Possibly, member of the Zhou royal house (“Zhou” emblem at the end of the inscription).

Continued

Table 1. Continued

Nr.	Designation, Jicheng number, date	Location and context (Tomb/T; Hoard/H; unclear (U))	Lineage(s) specified in the designation	Inscription's content
18	Peng <i>sheng</i> 棚生 6511, MWZ.		Peng, as in Nr. 17.	The vessel was made by Second-born of Ji 紀仲 (cf. Nr. 20:2) for Peng <i>sheng</i> . Longevity prayer.
19	Peng X <i>sheng</i> 棚□生 2524, LWZ-ESA.	Taozhuang 桃莊, Qixia 棲霞, Shandong (U).	1) Peng, as in Nr. 17; 2) not identified.	Made a dowry present for [Lady] Kui of Cheng 成媿.
20	Cheng <i>bo</i> Ji <i>sheng</i> 成伯冀(紀)生 9615, LWZ.	Henan	1) Cheng 成(郟), Ji-surnamed, western Shandong; 2) Ji 紀, Jiang-surnamed, eastern Shandong.	Statement of making a vessel.
21	X Cai <i>sheng</i> Y □ 蔡生□ 2518, LWZ.		Cai 蔡, Ji-surnamed, in Shangcai 上蔡, Henan.	Statement of making a vessel; dedication to descendants.
22	Shan <i>bo</i> Yi <i>sheng</i> 單伯嬰生 82, LWZ.		1) Shan 單, possibly, Ji-surnamed, Meixian 眉縣, Shaanxi; 2) Yi 嬰 (?), possibly, Ji-surnamed (cf. 4352), Shaanxi.	Claimed that his ancestors joined former Zhou kings and he started following their example.
23	Shan Yi <i>sheng</i> 單嬰生 4672, LWZ.			Made a vessel for offerings.

24	Yi sheng 罍生 104, 105, LWZ.	Chang'an 長安, Shaanxi (U).	Yi, as in Nr. 22–23.	Received an appointment from the Zhou king. Dedicated the bells to his ancestor Mu <i>gong</i> 穆公.
25	X sheng Y 生 3935, LWZ.		Unknown lineage.	Statement of making a vessel; dedication to descendants.
26	Shu X sheng 受生 4010, LWZ.		Unknown lineage.	Dedication to [Lady] Jí of Yi 伊姑.
27	Zhong shengfu 仲生父 729, LWZ.	Xiangyueyu 湘樂玉, Ningxian 寧縣, Gansu (T).	Lineage not specified.	Dedication to [Lady] Elder Jī of Jing 井孟姬.
28	Chen sheng Y 陳生 2468, LWZ-ESA.		Chen 陳, Gui 媯-surnamed, in Huaiyang 淮陽, Henan.	Statement of making a vessel; dedication to descendants.
29	Lü zhong sheng Y 呂仲生 10243, LWZ-SA.		Lü 呂, Jiang-surnamed, in Nanyang 南陽, Henan.	Statement of making a vessel; dedication to descendants.
30	You bo jun Jin sheng 有伯君堇生 10262, LWZ-ESA.		1) You 有, near to Lu 魯; 2) Jin 堇, possibly, in the same area (cf. 2156, 2774).	Statement of making a vessel; dedication to descendants.
31	Yang Shi sheng 陽飢(食)生 3984, 10227, LWZ.	Wangcheng 王城, Ziyang 棗陽, Hubei (U).	1) Yang 陽 lineage, location and surname unclear; 2) Shi or Si lineage (cf. 4427), location unknown.	Statement of making a vessel; dedication to descendants.
32	Shi sheng zouma Gu 食生走馬谷 4095, LWZ-ESA.		Shi, as in Nr. 31.	Statement of making a vessel; dedication to descendants.

Continued

Table 1. Continued

Nr.	Designation, Jicheng number, date	Location and context (Tomb/T; Hoard/H; unclear (U))	Lineage(s) specified in the designation	Inscription's content
33	Gongwu <i>ji sheng</i> 攻敵季生 10212 LSA.	Jiupu 舊舖, Xuchi 盱眙, Jiangsu (U).	1) Wu 吳 (Gongwu 工敵), Jī 姬-surnamed, in Jiangsu.	Statement of making a vessel.
34	Xu Duo Lu <i>sheng</i> 許參魯生 2605, SA.		1) Xǔ 許, Jiang-surnamed, in Xuchang 許昌, Henan; 2) Lu 魯, Jī-surnamed, Qufu 曲阜, Shandong.	Made a dowry present for Shou Mu 壽母 (daughter or spouse).
35	Lu <i>nei xiaochen Wei</i> <i>sheng</i> 魯內小臣厓生 2354, LWZ-ESA.		1) Lu, as in Nr. 31; 2) Wei (?), unknown.	Statement of making a vessel.
36	Jiang <i>xiao zhong mu</i> <i>sheng</i> 江小仲母生 2391, SA.	Taipu 太僕, Jia 郊 County, Henan (H).	Jiang 江, Ying 嬴-surnamed, in Queshan 確山 or Zhengyang 正陽 Counties in Henan.	Statement of making a vessel.
37	Wu <i>sheng</i> X 武生□ 2522, LWZ-ESA.		Unknown lineage.	Statement of making a vessel; dedication to descendants.

Names of the royal Zhou house and major principalities of Ji surname (Guo, Lu, Cai 蔡, Cheng 鄭, Gongwu 攻敵, i.e. Wu 吳) and Jiang surname (Qi, Ji, Lü 呂, Xǔ 許) can be seen among their designations. Other *sheng* designations include the names of smaller principalities or lineages of Gui surname (Chen), Ji surname (Fan and Liao 蓼), Kui surname (Peng), or whose surnames are hypothetical or unclear (Han 函, Diao 瑯, Qian 遣, Yi 伊, You 有). The number of identifiable cases is sufficient to demonstrate that *sheng* was not just a popular personal name, but a specific term indicating the relationship between the designated individual and socio-political entities—lineages or principalities. Scholars agree that in the epigraphic texts of the Shang and Zhou periods the word *sheng* stands for the kinship term written with the determinative *nan* 男 (“male”) as *sheng* 甥 and used in persons’ designations with names of lineages or principalities in the *Shi jing*, *Chunqiu*, *Zuo zhuan*, and other pre-Qin literary texts.⁵²

Personal names of the *sheng* were indicated very seldom. In this respect, *sheng* designations were similar to designations of women indicating the lineages of their fathers or husbands, but not their personal names. Some *sheng* designations include the names of two lineages. Inscriptions of Shan *bo Yi sheng* 單伯睪生 (T1:22), Cheng *bo Ji sheng* 鄭伯翼生 (T1:20), or You *bo jun Jin sheng* 有伯君堯生 (T1:30) were commissioned by First-borns, i.e. effective or designated heads of the lineages identified as on the first position. After their birth rank *bo*, the name of the second lineage is indicated. Other designations, e.g. Han Fei *sheng* 函弗/費生 (T1:13) or Fan Ju *sheng* 番翊生 (T1:10), do not identify the persons’ positions in their lineages, but give the

as ESA, MSA, and LSA. If the estimate date is on the edge of the two periods, it is designated as, e.g., M-LWZ. If the date within the Spring and Autumn epoch is uncertain, it is referred to as SA.

52. For the meaning of *sheng* 生 as 甥 in Shang oracle bone inscriptions see Chen Mengjia 陳夢家, *Yinxu buci zongshu* 殷虛卜辭綜述 (Beijing: Kexue, 1956), 485; David N. Keightley, “At the Beginning: The Status of Women in Neolithic and Shang China,” *Nan nü* 1999.1, 48–50. For the same meaning in Zhou bronze inscriptions see Mihail Vasil’evič Krjukov, *Sistema rodstva kitajcev* [The Kinship System of the Chinese] (Moscow: Nauka, 1972), 167; Lin Yun 林滢, “Diao sheng gui xin kao” 瑯生簋新考, *Guwenzi yanjiu* 1980.3, 120–34, esp. 120–21; Zhang Yachu 張亞初, “Liang Zhou mingwen suo jian mou sheng kao” 兩周銘文所見某生考, *Kaogu yu wenwu* 1983.5, 83–89, esp. 83; Pulleyblank, “Ji and Jiang,” 12–13; Chen Xie 陳絮, *Shang Zhou xingshi zhidu yanjiu* 商周姓氏制度研究 (Beijing: Shangwu yinshuaguan, 2007), 89–111. For investigations of the term *sheng* 甥 in pre-Qin literature see Rui Yifu 芮逸夫, “Shi sheng zhi chengwei” 釋甥之稱謂, *Zhongyan yanjiuyuan lishi yuyan yanjiusuo jikan* 16 (1947), 273–84; Rui Yifu, “Shi jiu sheng zhi guo jian lun Zhongguo gudai sheng jiu de chengwei” 釋舅甥之國兼論中國古代甥舅的稱謂, *Zhongyan yanjiuyuan lishi yuyan yanjiusuo jikan* 30 (1959), 237–58.

name of the second lineage straight after the name of the first one. Their birth rank could be other than *bo*, although it is also possible that designations Shan *bo Yi sheng* 單伯睪生 (T1:22) and Shan *Yi sheng* 單伯睪生 (T1:23) referred to the same person, but in the second case the birth rank was omitted. The reference to a second lineage in the designation of an individual suggests a permanent bond between them, which, in these cases, was clearly different from the patrilineal kinship.

Many designations, such as Chen *sheng* 陳生 (T1:28), Fan *sheng* 番生 (T1:9), or Zhou *sheng* 周生 (T1:15, 16), include the name of only one lineage. Many scholars assume that these should be their mother's lineages. They rely on the interpretation of *sheng* 甥 in the "Shi qinshu" ("Explaining kinship categories" 釋親屬) section of the *Shi ming* ("Explaining names" 釋名) glossary composed by Liu Xi 劉熙 in the second century C.E. Accordingly, "jiu (here: maternal uncle—M. Kh.) calls a son of his elder or younger sisters *sheng*" (舅謂姊妹之子曰甥).⁵³ However, the interpretation of *sheng* in the *Shi ming* as meaning exclusively sororal nephew (ZS)⁵⁴ is relatively late. The early Chinese terminology of kinship went through many changes between the Zhou and the Han periods, reflecting substantial changes in the social organization.⁵⁵ Therefore, earlier reference materials should be given priority over later ones when interpreting the terms used during the Western Zhou and Spring and Autumn periods. The *Er ya* 爾雅 glossary composed around the third century B.C.E, demonstrates that in the pre-Qin terminology of kinship, the term *sheng* was polyvalent.⁵⁶ In the "Shi qin" ("Explaining relatives" 釋親) section *sheng* is glossed twice—once under the "Qi dang" ("Wife's group" 妻黨) and once under "Hun yin" ("Affinal relatives" 婚姻) sections. The "Qi dang" section states the following:

姑之子 · 為甥 · 舅之子 · 為甥 · 妻之舅弟 · 為甥 · 姊妹之夫 · 為甥 ·

53. See Zhang Yachu, "Liang Zhou mingwen mou sheng kao," 87; for this meaning of *sheng* see Feng Han-yi, "The Chinese Kinship System," *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 2 (1937), 141–275, esp. 149.

54. Abbreviated definitions of kinship relationships in brackets are given according to the standard European system of kinship terms used in anthropological scholarship: F = father, M = mother, B = brother, Z = sister, H = husband, W = wife, S = son, D = daughter, P = parent, G = sibling, E = spouse, C = child.

55. See Krjukov, *Sistema rodstva kitajcev*, 136–244, English summary 301–4.

56. For the dating of the core glosses of the *Er ya*, see W. South Coblin, "Erh ya," in *Early Chinese Texts*, 94–99. The received text possibly contains interpolations from later periods. According to Krjukov, the kinship terminology explained in the "Shi qin" chapter was current during the eighth–fifth centuries B.C.E. (see Krjukov, *Sistema rodstva kitajcev*, 73 with further references).

“A child of one’s paternal aunt is [called] *sheng*. A child of one’s maternal uncle is [called] *sheng*. Elder and younger brothers of one’s wife are [called] *sheng*. A husband of one’s elder or younger sister is [called] *sheng*.”

The “Hun yin” section adds:

謂我舅者 · 吾謂之甥也

“[If] one calls me *jiu*, I call him *sheng*.”⁵⁷

The *Er ya* thus identifies as *sheng* several kinds of male relatives, in two consequent generations, including an Ego’s own and one descending generation, including cross-cousin (FZS, MBS), brother-in-law (WB, ZH), and sororal nephew (ZS).⁵⁸ In terms of biological kinship, it was applied to both consanguine and affinal relatives.⁵⁹ This should be no surprise, since in the early Chinese kinship terminology terms *jiu* 舅 (“uncle”) and *gu* 姑 (“aunt”) also designated both consanguine and affinal relatives.⁶⁰ According to Mikhail Krjukov, “a kinship system of Yin-Zhou type could emerge only under conditions when two exogamous kinship groups were related to each other by bonds of the obligatory cross-cousin marriage.”⁶¹ As has been noted above in the present article, the *Ji* and the *Jiang* plausibly originally represented such groups, and therefore the emergence of the polyvalent term *sheng* in Zhou China is explainable.⁶²

The *Er ya* does not fully reflect the state of the Chinese kinship system during the Western Zhou and Spring and Autumn periods. Both bronze inscriptions and transmitted literature further attest the meaning of *sheng* including an Ego’s daughter’s son, i.e. a relative in the second

57. See Xu Chaohua 徐朝華 (comm.), *Er ya jin zhu* 爾雅今注 (Shanghai: Guji, 1987), 155–65 (“Shi qin” 釋親).

58. In anthropological investigations of the world’s systems of kinship, the technical term “Ego” designates an individual serving as a reference point for genealogical reckoning (for the first usage see Morgan, Henry Lewis, *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1871), 4).

59. See Feng Han-yi, “The Chinese Kinship System,” 185–91; Krjukov, *Sistema rodstva kitajcev*, 152.

60. Krjukov, *Sistema rodstva kitajcev*, 158.

61. Krjukov, *Sistema rodstva kitajcev*, 162. See also Feng Han-yi, “The Chinese Kinship System,” 185.

62. For *sheng jiu zhi guo* 甥舅之國 during the Spring and Autumn period see Rui Yifu 芮逸夫, “Shi jiu sheng zhi guo jian lun Zhongguo gudai sheng jiu de chengwei” 釋舅甥之國兼論中國古代甥舅的稱謂, *Zhongyan yanjiuyuan lishi yuyan yanjiusuo jikan* 30 (1959): 237–58; see also Gassmann, *Verwandschaft und Gesellschaft*, 541–54).

descending generation.⁶³ Moreover, one case reflected in the *Shi jing* indicates that during the Western Zhou period, *sheng* could be applied also to females.⁶⁴ Up to the time of the *Er ya*'s compilation this, originally even more general, term had already dropped some of its connotations.

The definition of *sheng* in the "Hun yin" gloss seems to be equal to that in the *Shi ming*, i.e. sororal nephew (ZS). However, this similarity is superficial. In the context of the "Hun yin," explaining terminology applied to relatives by marriage, the term *jiu* referred not to maternal uncles of males (MB), but to fathers-in-law of females (HF). A male Ego's father-in-law (WF) was distinguished as *wai* 外, "external," *jiu*. Thus, in the context of "Hun yin" *sheng* should be understood as daughter's husband (DH). In sum, in all cases considered above, all *sheng* fall into the affinal category in terms of socially defined, patrilineal kinship.⁶⁵ It designated various categories of affinal relatives of an Ego in his own generation, as well as in the first and the second descending generations. Similarly to the designations of females, designations reflecting relationships established via females could be constructed in different ways depending on the speaker's perspective on the person referred to (even if these overlapped) and on the persons to whom the message was addressed. It is likely that a speaker would identify himself as a member of his patrilineal lineage and an affinal relative of the second lineage when addressing an external audience, especially in official contexts. Addressing his patrilineal relatives or those who were well informed about his origin, he would omit the name of his patrilineal lineage and identify himself as the *sheng* of the second, external lineage. On the other hand, addressing members of the lineage of his mother, wife, or brother-in-law, he would omit the name of their lineage and identify only his patrilineal lineage. Because of the specific features of Chinese language, a *sheng* "of" a lineage cannot be distinguished from a *sheng* "from" a lineage.

63. Yang Bojun 楊伯峻, *Chunqiu Zuo zhuan zhu* 春秋左傳注 (Xinhua shudian, 1981), 1590 (Ding: 13). See also the dedication to "the children of my lineage and one hundred *sheng*" 我宗子于百生(甥) in *Shan ding* 善鼎 (*Jicheng* 2820, Middle Western Zhou).

64. In the "Han yi" ode of the *Shi jing*, a woman was referred to as "*sheng* of the King of Fen, child of Jue-fu" 汾王之甥·蹇父之子 (see "Han yi," Mao 261; Krjukov, *Sistema rodstva kitajcev*, 150–53; Li, *Landscape and Power*, 139). The *Er ya* leaves open the possibility that *sheng* could designate females, because the term *zi* "child" could be applied to persons of both sexes.

65. For the discussion of the unilineal kinship see Morton H. Fried, "The Classification of Corporate Unilineal Descent Groups," *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* 87.1 (1957), 1–29, esp. 19.

The participants of the communication in which such designations were used knew who was related to whom and in which way, but we have to accept that it is hardly possible to clarify more precisely in what kind of relationships individual *sheng* were involved.

Sheng was not necessarily a stable component of a person's designation. Indeed, each male person could be related as a *sheng* to one or several lineages. The fact that *sheng* designations occur relatively seldom suggests that this status was explicitly emphasized in certain specific contexts, in other words, when affinal connections were especially significant for the social and political standing of particular individuals or relevant to the success of some particular projects. The analysis of the anthroponymy and contents of *sheng*-related inscriptions sheds some light on such situations.

Inscriptions of the *sheng* usually are very short and only include statements connected with the making of the vessel and dedications to ancestors. However, their significance for these who commissioned them should be not underestimated. In most (unfortunately, yet very rare) cases in which the archaeological context of the finds of the *sheng*'s vessels with such short inscriptions is known, they belonged to inventories of tombs. Moreover, they were often the only objects bearing inscriptions in the tomb. As such, they were intimately related to the person of the deceased, serving his "calling card" on the threshold of the afterlife and facing the world of ancestors. This also points to the fact that being the *sheng* of a certain lineage was also especially important for this person during his lifetime.

Both the anthroponymy reflected by inscriptions on vessels of unknown provenance of certain *sheng* and their exquisite quality, including some real masterpieces, indicate that persons who designated themselves as *sheng* often belonged to the highest elites. Archaeological finds corroborate this estimation. For instance, a person who was identified as *sheng* Secretary by inscriptions on two *gui* vessels was buried in a large tomb of the middle Western Zhou period in the Huangdui 黄堆 cemetery on the Zhou plain (cf. T1:3). Although the tomb was looted, its location, size, architecture and other remaining burial items, such as parts of a dismembered chariot, one bronze *ding* tripod, and one bell point to the fact that the occupant was a member of the top-level nobility closely related to the Zhou royal house.⁶⁶ Although other bronzes in the tomb were finely made, they do not bear any inscriptions. Hence,

66. See Shaanxi Zhouyuan kaogudui, "Fufeng Huangdui Xi Zhou mudi zhantan qingli jianbao" 扶風黃堆西周墓地勘探清理簡報, *Wenwu* 1986:8, 56–68, esp. 59–65. The whole Huangdui cemetery contains large and middle-sized tombs, but no small tombs, and is considered to be an elite cemetery.

only the official position as a secretary and his status as a *sheng* identified the deceased. The inscription further stated that the First-born of Shao 召伯, the head of the powerful metropolitan Shao lineage and a high royal official, sent him on a mission to Chu 楚 (召白令生史事于楚). The name of the lineage to which he was related as a *sheng* was not specified. This could be due to the fact that this was either the royal house or the Shao lineage. Being a *sheng* could be relevant to his appointment, wealth and prestige.

Other inscriptions show that several persons referred to as *sheng* rotated around the Zhou royal court at various times. An early Western Zhou inscription states that “during the King’s southern campaign, the king commanded to a *sheng* to allocate duties to young men of the duke’s lineage (or ducal lineages)” (王令生辨事〔于〕公宗小子). During the late mid-Western Zhou, Fan *sheng* 番生 was appointed by the Zhou king “to administer ducal lineages, ministerial officials and officials of the Great Secretariat” (司公族、卿事、大史寮). Li Feng regards this not as “a specific administrative duty, but ... the authority over the entire Zhou government.”⁶⁷ It should be remembered that, as noted above, Fan once provided a royal spouse. Therefore, it is worth considering the possibility that Fan *sheng* could somehow be related to the Fan lady married to the Zhou king. Her son who was not a royal heir could be identified as a *sheng* of Fan lineage. He could also be a son of her sister married to another member of the royal house. The close kin relationship with the king and the personal influence of the Fan lady at the court might be among the reasons why Fan *sheng* was entrusted with such comprehensive responsibilities. Also *sheng* of influential metropolitan lineages, such as Secretary Guo *sheng* 史虢生, an affinal relative of Guo lineage, active during the reign of King Xuan 宣 (827/25–782 B.C.E), held offices at the Zhou court.

Archaeology further testifies to the high relevance of affinal relationships on the level of ruling elites of principalities. In the recently excavated late Western-Zhou-period tomb Nr. 1016 in the cemetery of Peng, supposedly occupied by one generation’s ruler, an inscribed vessel identified the latter as Bo Jin *sheng* 伯晉生, i.e. the *sheng* of the ruling lineage of Jin principality.⁶⁸ Jin was the closest neighbor of Peng and the most important political force in the present-day Shanxi province during this epoch. This inscription points to the fact that the marital alliance with Jin was very significant for Peng politically, and, besides, was possibly a matter of prestige for the whole ruling lineage and its ruler personally.

67. See Li, *Bureaucracy and the State*, 66.

68. Sun, “Material Culture and Social Identities,” 68.

Considerations of prestige could stand behind the choice of bronze objects for the burial equipment of an early Spring-and-Autumn-period tomb at Xigaoquan 西高泉 in the vicinity of Baoji in Shaanxi.⁶⁹ During the early seventh century B.C.E, one of several consequent capitals of Qin 秦 principality was located in this area. The tomb, occupied by a member of the Qin nobility, contained a *dou*-basin on a tall ring foot with a design of roundels and scales. It bears the inscription “*sheng* of Zhou made [this] reverent *dou* for using it for offerings in the ancestral chamber” (周生乍作尊豆用享于宗, T1:15).⁷⁰ Besides, in the tomb there was also a bronze *hu* flask without inscription. Excavators suppose that both bronzes may date from the Western Zhou period. If so, it is not clear how they came into the possession of the tomb’s occupant.⁷¹ It is worth considering that the same area yielded the set of bronze bells made in the classical Western Zhou manner and commissioned by Duke Wu of Qin 秦武公 (697–678 B.C.E) and his spouse Lady Jī of Zhou.⁷² The inscription on the bells demonstrates that this Qin ruler was proud of being a marital relative of the royal house, even if he did not go so far as to identify himself as a “*sheng* of Zhou.” His bells closely imitated bells cast in royal workshops before 771 B.C.E.⁷³ By analogy, it is understandable that another Qin noble would boast of being a “*sheng* of Zhou” through maternal descent, marriage, or just by virtue of having in his possession an inscribed vessel, and thus falsifying an affinal relationship that possibly did not exist. Amazingly, another *dou* with a fully identical inscription was found elsewhere (cf. T1:16). Unfortunately, its current whereabouts are not known, but the rubbing still exists.⁷⁴ A comparison shows that

69. See Baoji shi bowuguan, Baoji xian tuboguan, “Baoji xian Xigouquan cun Chunqiu mu fajue ji” 寶雞縣西高泉村春秋墓發掘記, *Wenwu* 1980.9, 1–9.

70. *Zhou sheng dou* 周生豆 (*Jicheng* 4682, Late Western Zhou–Early Spring and Autumn, Xigaoquan 西高泉, Yangjiagou 楊家溝, Baoji, Shaanxi).

71. The argumentation is however based on the assumption that Zhou *sheng* was the same person as Diao *sheng* whose inscriptions will be discussed in the third section of the present article. This is unfounded. Nevertheless, *Zhou sheng dou* may be a remnant from the Western Zhou period.

72. See Baoji shi bowuguan, Lu Liangcheng 盧連成 *et al.*, “Shaanxi Baoji xian Taigongmiao cun faxian Qin gong zhong, Qin gong bo” 陝西寶雞縣太公廟村發現秦公鐘, 秦公罇, *Wenwu* 1978.11, 1–5; *Qin gong zhong* 秦公鐘, *Jicheng* 262, Taigongmiao 太公廟, Yangjiagou 楊家溝, Baoji, Shaanxi, Early Spring and Autumn).

73. The shapes of the three splendid *bo*-bells with cast openwork decorations can be compared with bells of royal official *Shanfu* Ke who was active during the reign of King Xuan (see Maria Khayutina, “Povar ili ministr: dragocennyye trenožniki Dobrogo Muža Ke” [Cook or Minister: the Good-Man Ke’s Treasured Tripods], in *Kasus* 2004 (Moscow), 15–98, esp. 40.

74. *Zhou sheng dou* 周生豆 (*Jicheng* 4683, Late Western Zhou).

the calligraphy of the Xigaoquan inscription is less clear and some characters are written differently or even with errors. Obviously, different craftsmen prepared clay models for the inscriptions, and, possibly, the Xigaoquan *dou* was a Qin copy of a Zhou original. In the absence of the second vessel it cannot be verified whether only the inscription was copied, or also the shape. One cannot avoid questioning whether such vessels with inscriptions testifying to the standing of some persons as *sheng* of Zhou might not have been produced by the Zhou royal house in a larger number as presents for various affinal relatives.

Already existing affinal connections were relevant when concluding new marriages. This is supported by several inscriptions on dowry and wedding presents for women whose commissioners identified themselves as *sheng* (cf. *Liao sheng xu* 蓼生盥 (T1:11), *Fan Ju sheng hu* 番菊生壺 (T1:10), *Zhou Ji sheng pan* 周棘生盤 (T1:12), *Peng X sheng ding* 棚生鼎 (T1:19), *Ji X sheng gui* 及生簋 (T1:28)).

Common affinal connections with third lineages could facilitate communication between lineages/principalities not necessarily already involved in a marital alliance themselves. In particular, Peng X *sheng* (T1:19) from the Kui-surnamed Peng principality in southern Shanxi gave a dowry present to his daughter Lady Kui, married to a member of the Ji-surnamed Cheng in western Shandong. Amazingly enough, this bronze was found near Qixia 棲霞 city in the east of Shandong, i.e. more than 500 km from Cheng. This surprising find can be explained, because Cheng was, in its turn, related by marital alliance to the Jiang-surnamed Ji in eastern Shandong, as is displayed in the name of Cheng *bo Ji sheng* 成伯翼生 (T1:20). Whereas Cheng was a member of the Ji community, both Peng and Ji were related to it as affinal relatives. It is not clear whether Peng and Ji principalities had a marital alliance between themselves. In any case, they were aware of and communicated with each other, as is suggested by an inscription on a present given by the Second-born of Ji to Peng *sheng* (T1:18).

Sheng-related inscriptions provide additional information about the geographical dimension of marital alliances (cf. Map 1). The Ji-surnamed Shan 單, a prominent lineage closely related to the Zhou court, resided c. 50 km to the south from the royal center Zhou-under-Qi in Meixian 眉縣 in Shaanxi.⁷⁵ It intermarried with Yi 睪,

75. For the inscriptions of the Shan lineage on bronzes discovered in Meixian in 2003 see Tian Shuai 田率, "Shaanxi Meixian qingtongqi jiaozang yu Xi Zhou Dan Lai jiazhu" 陝西眉縣青銅器窖藏與西周單迷家族, *Zhongguo lishi wenwu*, 4 (2008), 82–88. For the surname identification see Sena, *Reproducing Society*, 117.

of unknown surname, possibly residing in the vicinity of the royal residence Zongzhou in Shaanxi, i.e. c. 130 km from Shan (cf. T1:22, 23).⁷⁶ Zhou kings and their officials regularly commuted between Zhou-under-Qi and Zongzhou for administrative purposes. Inter-marriages between lineages residing near these two royal centers facilitated solidarity between metropolitan elites. *Sheng*-related inscriptions witness cooperation between neighboring principalities by means of marital alliances. Peng and Jin were located c. 40 km from one another in southwestern Shanxi. Han and Fei, whose alliance is documented by the inscription of Han Fei *sheng* 函弗/費生 (T1:13) were located c. 50 km from one another in central Henan.⁷⁷ *Sheng*-related inscriptions also document several long-distance marital alliances. The inscription of Xǔ Duo Lu *sheng* 許麥魯生 (T1:34) witnesses an alliance between Xǔ in southeastern Henan and Lu in western Shandong, removed from one another by about 400 km. Cheng and Jì, located in western and eastern Shandong respectively were separated from one another by c. 500 km. These cases demonstrate that both short- and long-distance alliances could be converted into benefits by their participants, either in their own native lineages/principalities or externally.

It is noteworthy that many *sheng* designations were associated with persons from central and southern Henan and further east (cf. Map 1). Principalities to which these *sheng* were related included a non-Ji-surnamed Kang 康 in Yǐng 潁 River Valley near Yuzhou 禹州 in central Henan (cf. T1:5);⁷⁸ Han 函/函, supposedly Yun 嬭 (妘)-surnamed, in central Henan (cf. T1:13); Jí-surnamed Qian in the upper course of the Luo River in western Henan or southern Shaanxi (cf. T1:7);⁷⁹ Yi 伊, of unknown surname, possibly, located in the Yi 伊

76. The location of Yi is suggested by the inscription on the *Yi sheng zhong* (T1:24) discovered in Chang'an. It records the Zhou king's command in which the king addresses the commissioner as *Yi sheng*. He could be a *sheng* of the royal house married to a royal sister, cousin, or daughter and residing in the area of the royal residence Zongzhou.

77. For the location of Han see below in the present article, for the location of Fei see Shao Bingjun 邵炳軍, "Chunqiu Hua guo xingmie ji diwang kao—Chunqiu Jin guo shi ge chuanzuo lishi wenhua beijing yanjiu zhi si" 春秋滑國興滅暨地望考——春秋晉國詩歌創作歷史文化背景研究之四, *Henan shifan daxue xuebao*, 2002.2, 59–63, esp. 62.

78. For the location of Kang see Cai Yunzhang 蔡運章, "Kang bo hu gai ba" 康伯壺蓋跋, in *Henan sheng wenwu kaogu xuehui, Henan wenwu kaogu lunji* 河南文物考古論集 (Zhengzhou: Henan renmin chubanshe, 1996), 328–30.

79. For the location of Qian see Liu Shegang 劉社剛, Wang Yanmin 王延敏, "Qian, Qian shi yu Guo shi guanxi kao" 遣, 遣氏與虢氏關係考, *Wenbo* 2008.1, 32–35.

River Valley (cf. T1:6);⁸⁰ Jiang-surnamed Lü was near Nanyang 南陽; Ji-surnamed Liao (cf. T1:11) and Fan (cf. T1:9) were located near Huyang 湖陽 and Xinyang 信陽 in southwestern Henan respectively;⁸¹ Ji 棘 of an unknown surname was possibly in southern Henan (cf. T1:12);⁸² Ji-surnamed Cai 蔡 was in Shangcai 上蔡 in southern Henan (cf. T1:21);⁸³ Ying 贏-surnamed Jiang 江 was either in Queshan 確山 or Zhengyang 正陽 in southern Henan (cf. T1:36);⁸⁴ Gui-surnamed Chen was near Huaiyang 淮陽 in southeastern Henan (cf. T1:28);⁸⁵ You 有 of unknown surname was located somewhere in southwestern Shandong (T1:30);⁸⁶ and Peng 彭, possibly, Jiang-surnamed, was near Xuzhou 徐州 in Jiangsu (cf. T1:2).⁸⁷ In these areas interaction between the Zhou and various non-Zhou peoples was especially intensive and often hostile. The local population residing in the mountainous or marshy regions were able to defend their autonomy and endanger Zhou colonists starting to settle there from the beginning of the Western Zhou period. Cooperation among the lineages of Zhou colonists themselves, as well as with friendly non-Zhou neighbors, represented an indispensable factor for maintaining peace. The *sheng*-related inscriptions signal that this cooperation was facilitated by intermarriages.

Some *sheng*-related inscriptions show that this cooperation sometimes took the form of joint military action. Liao *sheng* followed the Zhou king in a campaign against southern Huai Yi 南淮夷. Liao, in a similar way to that of Fan, was a Ji-surnamed Yi 夷 principality in Huyang, Henan. Liao *sheng*, similarly to Fan *sheng*, could be the son of a Liao woman married to a member of the Zhou ruling house and

80. For the location of Shangluo see Yu Wei 于薇, "Huai Han zhengzhi quyue de xingcheng yu Huaihe zuo wei nan bei zhengzhi fenjie xian de qiyuan" 淮汉政治區域的形成与淮河作為南北政治分界線的起源, *Gudai wenming*, 2010.4/1, 38–52, esp. 49.

81. For the location of Liao see Chen Pan, *Chunqiu dashibiao lieguo*, p. 242. For localization of Fan see Falkenhausen, "The Waning of the Bronze Age," 505–6 with further references.

82. The *Zuo zhuan* mentions toponyms including Shang Ji 上棘, Hanging Ji 垂棘, Great Ji 大棘, and Red Ji 赤棘. They were located in the belt stretching from southern Henan to Shandong.

83. For the location of Cai see Li, *Landscape and Power*, 74 with further references.

84. For the location of Jiang see Chen Pan, *Chunqiu dashibiao lieguo*, 286–87.

85. For the location of Chen see Ma Yilong 馬義龍, "Chen guo de guodu yu mudi kao" 陳國的國都與墓地考, *Zhoukou shizhuan xuebao*, 1996.6, 52–54.

86. For the location of You see Chen Peifen 陳佩芬, *Xia Shang Zhou qingtongqi yanjiu* 夏商周青銅器研究 (Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2004), Vol. 4, 562–63.

87. For the location of Peng see Zhu Cunming 朱存明; Huang Hui 黃暉, "Huai Hai diqu de gudai fanguo kaolue" 淮海地區古代方國考略, *Xuzhou shifan daxue xuebao* 3 (2001), 118–22.

raised at the royal court. Or, vice versa, he could be a member of the Liao lineage, whose aunt or sister was married to a member of the Zhou royal house. In both cases, as affinal relatives of the Zhou king, the Liao lineage had reason to support him in a war. The inscription of Rong *sheng* discussed below in the present article provides another example of military cooperation between marital relatives.

Considering that marital relations could bring diverse benefits, it is natural that Zhou elites demonstrated respect to their in-laws on various occasions as this is reflected in the following passage of the *Zuo zhuan*:

凡君即位·好舅甥·脩婚姻·娶元妃以奉粢盛·孝也

When a ruler ascends to the throne, he expresses his love to his elder and younger male affinal relatives (*jiu* and *sheng*), arranges [new] marriages, and takes his principal wife to make offerings in grain vessels [in his ancestral temple], thus implementing his filial piety.⁸⁸

Inscriptions confirm that, during the late Western Zhou period at the latest, relationships of both females and males with regard to their parents-in-law were defined in terms of filial piety (*xiao* 孝).⁸⁹ Women participated in sacrificial ceremonies dedicated to their husbands' ancestors and continued performing sacrifices to the ancestors of their own lineages.⁹⁰ This explains in turn why so many sacrificial bronze objects were made for or made by women. Religious practice whereby married women were assigned their own substantial roles helped to strengthen interlineage ties.

Affinal relatives were referred to in inscriptions collectively as *hungou* 婚媾. This term consists of the words *hun* 婚, "to marry, to take a wife, marriage" and *gou* 媾, "to wed."⁹¹ Dedications to *hungou* occasionally

88. See *Zuo zhuan*, 526–27 (Wen: 2). In this context, *jiu* referred to affinal relatives of the elder generation, *sheng* to relatives of the Ego's generation and lower, while *hunying* were relatives-to-be.

89. In an inscription on the *Hu shu Hu Ji gui* 夔叔夔姬簋, a dowry present, parents required their daughter to exercise filial piety (*xiao*) towards her parents-in-law (Jicheng 4066, Renbei 任北, Sufang 蘇坊, Wugong 武功, Shaanxi, Middle to Late Western Zhou). A certain *Xi-fu* 遲父 married Lady Jiang of Qi and commissioned several bronzes in order to "feast and to exercise filial piety (*xiao*) to his mother-and father-in-law" (*Xi xü* 遲盨, Jicheng 4436, Late Western Zhou; *Xi-fu zhong* 遲父鐘, Jicheng 103, Late Western Zhou).

90. See Falkenhausen, *The Chinese Society in the Age of Confucius*, 119.

91. *Gou* is attested in the sense "to request wedding" in *Man ding* 鬲鼎 (Jicheng 2765, Jinyicun 晉義村, Changzi 長子, Shanxi, Middle Western Zhou). The term *hungou* partly parallels the term *hun yin* as it is used in certain odes of the *Shi jing* where it signifies "affinal relatives" (see *Shi jing*, "Wo xing qi ye" 我行其野, Mao

footnote continued on next page

occur in inscriptions starting from the middle Western Zhou period.⁹² For instance, *X ji liangfu* commissioned a flask with the following inscription:

□季良父乍□(絞)始(姒)尊壺。用盛旨酒。用享孝于兄弟、婚媾、者老。...

X ji liangfu made this sacrificial flask for [Lady] Si of Jiao. May it be used for containing sweet beer! May it be used to feast and to [to express] filial piety to elder and younger brothers, relatives by marriage, and all the elders! ...⁹³

Interestingly, the word *hun* 婚 in this and some other inscriptions is spelled with an additional graph *er* 耳, “ear,” as [昏女] or 昏. In some inscriptions, the same character stands for the word *wen* 聞, “to hear, to be heard,” with a derivative meaning “fame.” For example, an early Spring and Autumn inscription on the bell commissioned by a prince of Xú reads:

徐王子旃擇其吉金。自乍穌鐘。以敬明祀。以樂嘉賓。邇友。者臣。兼以父兄。庶士。以宴以喜。中瀚且[音易]。元鳴孔皇。其音攸攸。[昏女](聞)于四方。...

Zhan, the son of the King of Xu, chose his auspicious metal, and made [this] harmonious bell for himself in order to reverently bring clear [ancestral] offerings, in order to enjoy luck-bringing guests, friends, all officials, together with fathers and elder brothers, and all [noble] men; to feast, to please! Accurate, vast and gentle, [its] superb voice [is] grand and magnificent, its sound is *you-you* [and it is] heard in the four quarters of the world....⁹⁴

In archaic Chinese, *hun* and *wen* sounded closely to each other.⁹⁵ The substitution could be just a phonetical loan. Nevertheless, it is worth

188; “Zheng yue” 正月, Mao 192; “Jiao gong” 角弓, Mao 223). In the *Er ya*, the term *hun yin* designates affinal relatives in general. At the same time, *hun* and *yin* are applied differentiatedly to kin relatives of a female or male marital partner respectively. With respect to a male, such kin categories as SWP, WP, and WG were defined as *hun*; with respect to a female DHP, HP, and HG were designated as *yin* (see *Er ya*, 161–65 (“Shi qin”). There is no evidence indicating that by analogy, terms *hun* and *gou* were applied separately in the same way.

92. See *Peng you* 壹卣 (*Jicheng* 5401, Mengzhou 孟州, Henan, Early to Middle Western Zhou); *Guai bo gui* 乖伯簋 (*Jicheng* 4331, Late Western Zhou), *Shanfu Ke xu* 膳夫克盃 (*Jicheng* 4465, Renjia 任家, Fufeng, Shaanxi, Late Western Zhou).

93. See *X ji liang-fu hu* □季良父壺 (*Jicheng* 9713, Late Western Zhou).

94. See *Xu wang zi Zhan hu* 徐王子旃鐘 (*Jicheng* 182, Late Spring and Autumn).

95. 婚 *xwan/hmq^n* → 聞 *mjan/mqn* (see Axel Schuessler, *A Dictionary of Early Zhou Chinese* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1987) and Axel Schuessler, *Minimal Old Chinese and Later Han Chinese: A Companion to Grammata Serica Recensa* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press 2009)).

considering the possibility that the resulting wordplay could be intentional.⁹⁶ In a sense, “being heard” increased the chance to “get married” to women from the four quarters, whereas brilliant marital alliances contributed to one’s fame. Other inscriptions’ commissioners boasted of having “one hundred *hungou*”⁹⁷ or “one hundred *sheng*,”⁹⁸ thus supporting the notion that having many affinal relatives was both a factor of political strength and of prestige.

On this point, it should be noted that some inscriptions explicitly express a wish to have both male and female descendants.⁹⁹ Such statements make one reconsider whether the ubiquitous address to *zi zi sun sun* 子子孫孫 in bronze inscriptions is correctly understood as referring exclusively to male “sons and grandsons,” but not to children of both sexes. Evidently, without having enough daughters, a lineage had less potential for constructing social and political networks. Therefore, valuing only sons and neglecting daughters would signify only political blindness. Wishes of abundant progeny, especially when placed on dowry presents commissioned by a bride’s father or brother, very likely concerned the offspring of both sexes, since the female children could potentially “return” to their mother’s native lineage.

In sum, even if the concrete type of affinal relationship of particular *sheng* to the lineages referred to in their designations cannot be revealed, these inscriptions represent a valuable historical source. They demonstrate that being a *sheng* of a certain, even distantly located lineage represented a permanent, status-relevant relationship that was recognized and respected in the aristocratic society of the Western Zhou and Spring and Autumn periods. They indicate that not only married women personally acted as agents between the lineages of their fathers and husbands, but also that men recognized their obligations to their affinal relatives, from which both lineages could mutually benefit. They document marital alliances between particular lineages/principalities on both regional and interregional levels,

96. For similar expressions see, e.g., *Ju shu zhi zhong zi Ping zhong* 管叔之仲子平鐘 (Jicheng 172, Junan Dadian 莒南大店, Shandong, Late Spring and Autumn); *Zhu Jian zhong* 者減鐘 (Jicheng 197, Jiangsu, Spring and Autumn).

97. See *Xi you* 壺卣 (Jicheng 5401, Mengzhou 孟州, Henan, Early Western Zhou); *Guai bo gui* 乖伯簋 (Jicheng 4331, Late Western Zhou).

98. See *Shan ding* 善鼎 (Jicheng 2820, Middle Western Zhou).

99. Cf. wishes for “one hundred sons, one hundred daughters, one thousand grandchildren” 百子百女千孫 in *Liao sheng gui* (Jicheng 4459, Late Western Zhou), or “male and female [offspring] without termination” 男女無期 (*Qi hou dun, pan* 齊侯敦, 盤, Jicheng 4645, 10159, Yizhou 易州, Hebei, Late Spring and Autumn; *Qing shu yi* 慶叔匜, Jicheng 10280, Spring and Autumn).

thus expanding the pool of data constituted by female-related inscriptions. In combination with the *sheng*-related inscriptions, general dedications to *hungou* or dedications to individual affinal relatives testify to the importance of marital bonds between lineages and principalities in Zhou China. In these processes, connections established via mothers, wives, or sisters represented a “capital” that could be converted into wealth, standing, and prestige of particular persons and their whole lineages, or into solidarity and cooperation between lineages and principalities that could have consequences on the scale of the whole Zhou world.

The cases of Diao *sheng* and Rong *sheng* discussed in the next two sections in detail give a deeper insight into relationships within patrilineal lineages and between them and their marital relatives during the late Western Zhou and early Spring and Autumn periods.

The Case of Diao *sheng*

Inscriptions commissioned by a person identifying himself as Diao *sheng* include four texts. Two tureens with lengthy, informative inscriptions, the fifth-year *Diao sheng gui* and the sixth-year *Diao sheng gui*, are kept in the Hobart and Edward Small Moore Memorial Collection in the Yale University Art Gallery and in the Chinese Historical Museum in Beijing respectively.¹⁰⁰ Their provenance is unclear. A *li*-tripod with a short, undated dedication by Diao *sheng* to his deceased father was found several decades ago in Fufeng County of Shaanxi province, but the precise place of discovery is unclear. In 2006, two very unusual, massive large-mouthed *zun* 尊 vessels commissioned by Diao *sheng* and dated to the fifth year have been discovered in a hoard in Wujun 五郡, Fufeng, Shaanxi.¹⁰¹ The dates indicated in Diao *sheng*'s inscriptions correspond to the fifth and sixth years of King Li (853 and 852) respectively. Another inscription commissioned by someone else informs us that during the reign of King Li, Diao *sheng* held the office of the royal superintendent *zai* 宰.¹⁰² All three lengthy texts of Diao *sheng* are concerned with the negotiation of property rights between Diao *sheng* and Shao *bo* Hu 召伯虎.

100. *Diao sheng gui* are often erroneously referred to as “*Shao bo gui*” (see Guo Moruo 郭沫若, *Liang Zhou jinwen ci daxi* 兩周金文辭大系 [1932] (Beijing, 1957), Vol. 7, 142–45; “*Shao bo Hu gui*” in the *Jicheng* 4292, 4293).

101. See Baoji shi kaogu yanjiusuo, Fufeng xian bowuguan, “Shaanxi Fufeng Wujun cun Xi Zhou qingtongqi jiaocang fajue jianbao” 陝西扶風五郡西村西周青銅器窖藏發掘簡報, *Wenwu* 2007.8, 4–27.

102. See *Shi Li gui* 師鬲 (Jicheng 4324, Late Western Zhou) dated to the eleventh year of King Li, 847 B.C.E. (see Shaughnessy, *Sources of Western Zhou History*, 283).

Shao was a prominent Ji-surnamed lineage intimately associated with the royal house. During the Zhou conquest of the Shang in the mid-eleventh century B.C.E., Duke Great Protector Shao Shi 太保召公奭 was one of the closest assistants of King Wu. Shi's elder son Ke 克 was enfeoffed in Yan 燕 near present-day Beijing. The main branch of the Shao lineage remained in the metropolitan area. Duke Kang of Shao 召康公 held the office of Superintendent *zai* during the reign of King Cheng 成 (r. 1042/35–1006 B.C.E.).¹⁰³ Duke Kang's late descendant, Duke Mu of Shao 召穆公, was a counselor of King Li. After the insurrection raised by the metropolitan elites against the king in 841 B.C.E., Duke Mu raised the royal heir Jing 靖 in his house. In 827 B.C.E., Duke Mu of Shao together with Duke Ding of Zhou 周定公 installed him as King Xuan on the Zhou throne. While the king was still young, both dukes assisted him in the affairs of government.¹⁰⁴ At the beginning of King Xuan's reign, Duke Mu led a military campaign against the Yi of Huai River 淮夷, for which he was praised in the "Jiang Han" 江漢 ode of the *Shi jing* (Mao 262). This text reveals his personal name Hu 虎.¹⁰⁵ Most scholars agree that the First-born Hu of Shao referred to in the inscriptions of Diao *sheng* was Duke Mu of Shao.¹⁰⁶

Unlike Shao, Diao was never mentioned in transmitted sources.¹⁰⁷ Other inscriptions indicate that the Diao resided in the area of the royal center Zhou-under-Qi.¹⁰⁸ A very rich find of bronze vessels,

103. See *Zhushu jinian*, 271–74 (Cheng: 7, 19, 33; Kang: 1, 24).

104. See *Zhushu jinian*, 285–87 (Li: 12, 26, Xuan: 1).

105. See also *Zhushu jinian*, 288 (Xuan: 6).

106. See Li Xueqin 李學勤, "Diao sheng zhu qi mingwen liandu yanjiu" 凋生諸器銘文聯讀研究, *Wenwu* 2008.7, 71–75.

107. The character *diao* ("to carve", "carved") consists of the phonetic element *zhou* and determinative *yu* 玉, jade (see *Shuowen jiezi*, 8; cf. also homonyms with identical meaning "to carve" include *diao* 彫 and *diao* 雕). In archaic Chinese *diao* 凋 (Pulleyblank *təw*, Schuessler **tiaw*) and *zhou* 周 (Pulleyblank *tʃuw*, Schuessler **tʃaw*) were very close to each other phonetically. The lineage's name Diao can be related to carving stone or wood as a professional occupation. Other Western Zhou inscriptions indicate that at times artisans residing in Zhou-under-Qi, such as the fur-maker Qiu Wei 裘衛, could accumulate considerable wealth, including landed property, and enjoyed many favors from Zhou kings (see Constance A. Cook, "Scribes, Cooks, and Artisans: Breaking Zhou Tradition," *Early China* 20 (1995), 241–77). By analogy, a renowned court jeweler or wood carver enhancing royal palaces could have a noble rank bestowed on him by the king, a lineage name deriving from his professional occupation, and a piece of land on which to construct his residence and ancestral temple. That Diao *sheng* used many jade objects as gifts to various persons can also be related to the fact that he belonged to a family of jewelers.

108. Three tureens commissioned by Diao Fa-fu 凋伐父 were discovered in a hoard in 1963 in Qijia 齊家, Fufeng, Shaanxi (see *Diao Fa-fu gui* 凋伐父簋 (*Jicheng* 4048–50, Qijia, Fufeng, Shaanxi, Late Western Zhou)). Another hoard discovered in Qijia in

footnote continued on next page

including eleven *ding*-tripods, eight *gui*-tureens, two *lei* and two *hu* flasks commissioned by August Father of Han 函(函)皇父 for Lady Yun of Diao 瑯嬪 was found in Kangjia 康家, Fufeng, Shaanxi.¹⁰⁹ By the number of sacrificial vessels, the dowry of this woman overshadows most representative sets of ritual utensils commissioned by high royal officials. This signals the ability of her father and husband to compete openly with the local aristocracy in prestige, which suggests that the position of the Diao lineage at the court about the second half of the ninth century B.C.E. was secure.

The three lengthy texts of Diao *sheng* are arranged here in chronological order.¹¹⁰

1960 contained bronzes commissioned by individuals whose designations included no lineage names but only birth ranks: *Bo Bang Fu* 伯邦父, *Zhong You Fu* 仲友父, *Zhong Wo Fu* 仲我父, *Zhong Yi Fu* 仲義父, *Zhong Fa-fu* 仲伐父, and *Shu X Fu* 叔父. Possibly, *Zhong Fa-fu* corresponded to Diao *Fa-fu*, and all the persons who donated bronze vessels to the hoard were siblings of the Diao family. *Zhong Fa-fu* 仲伐父 dedicated a vessel to Ji Shang *mu* 姬尚母, his spouse or mother (see *Zhong Fa-fu yan* 仲伐父顛 (*Jicheng* 931, Qijia, Fufeng, Shaanxi, Late Western Zhou). This conforms to the information that Diao was a non-Ji-surnamed lineage that intermarried with the Ji.

109. E.g. *Han Huangfu ding* 函皇父鼎 (*Jicheng* 2548 and 2745, Kangjia, Fufeng, Shaanxi, Late Western Zhou). Some scholars identify Han *huangfu* with “Minister *Huangfu*” 皇父卿士 and “Great Commander *Huangfu*” 太師皇父, mentioned in the “*Shi yue zhi jiao*” 十月之交 and “*Chang wu*” 常武 odes in the *Shijing* (Mao 193 and 263; see also Zhu Fenghan, *Shang Zhou jiazhu xingtai yanjiu*, 347–48; Li, *Landscape and Power*, 203–12). However, other inscriptions show that *huangfu*, or “August Father,” could be used as self-designation by a head of a lineage or a lineage’s branch, whereas his wife could be referred to as “August Mother” *huangmu* 皇母 (see *Xin shu huangfu gui* 辛叔皇父簋 (*Jicheng* 3859, Late Western Zhou; *Xin zhong ji huangmu ding* 辛仲姬皇母鼎, *Jicheng* 2582, Late Western Zhou). The burial site of Han (Han *ling* 函陵) was known during the Spring and Autumn period near to the capital of Zheng 鄭 principality in present-day Xinzheng 新鄭 in Henan province (*Zuo zhuan*, 479 (Xi: 30)). Zheng was established during the reign of King Xuan on the place of the Yun-surnamed Kuai 檜. Besides the vessels commissioned by Han *huangfu* for Lady Yun of Diao, the Kangjia hoard included a *ding*-tureen commissioned by Lady Yun of Kuai 檜 (檜嬪 (*Kuai Yun ding* 檜嬪鼎 (*Jicheng* 2516, Kangjia, Fufeng, Shaanxi, Late Western Zhou)). This reveals that Han and Kuai, both belonging to the Yun surname community, were related to each other. Han may correspond to the Yun-surnamed Han 寒 lineage mentioned in the *Shi ben* 世本 (see Song Zhong 宋衷, *Shi ben ba zhong* 世本八種 (Shanghai: Shangwu, 1957), “*Shi xing pian*” 氏姓篇, 22–24)).

110. For investigations of Diao *sheng*’s inscriptions see Wang Zhankui 王占奎, “Diao sheng san qi mingwen kaoshi” 瑯生三器銘文考試, *Kaogu yu wenwu* 2007.5, 105–8; Chen Zhaorong 陳昭容, Junko Uchida 內田純子 *et al.*, “Xin chutu qingtongqi Diao sheng zun ji chuantong Diao sheng gui duidu—Xi Zhou shiqi da zhaimen tudi jiufen xietiao shijian shimo” 新出土青銅器「瑯生尊」及傳世「瑯生簋」對讀—西周時期大宅門土地糾紛協調事件始末, in *Gujin lunheng* 16 (2007), 32–52; Wu Zhenfeng 吳鎮烽, “Diao sheng zun mingwen de jidian kaoshi” 瑯生尊銘文的幾點考釋, *Kaogu*

footnote continued on next page

1. The fifth-year *Diao sheng gui*:

隗五年正月己丑。珣生有事。召來合事。余獻婦氏以壺，告曰：「以君氏令！」曰：「余考之。公僕羣(庸)、土田多刺。式伯氏從許。公宥其參。汝則宥其貳。公宥其貳。汝則宥其一」。余□于君氏大章。報婦氏帛束璜。召伯虎曰。「余既訊。𠄎我考我母令。余弗敢亂。余或致我考我母令」。珣生則墓圭。

It was the fifth year, the regulated month, day *ji-chou*. *Diao sheng* had a matter [with Shao]. Shao came to settle the matter.

I made a donation to [the Shao *bo*'s] spouse with the *hu*-flasks. [I] announced, saying:

"[Let it be] according to [her] Lordship's command!"

[The command] sounded:

"I have investigated this. There are many disputes concerning the Duke's servants and commoners, lands and fields.¹¹¹ [Let] the First-borns to arrive at a regulation:

If the Duke's [share] will be set as three [parts], your [share] will be set as two [parts];

If the Duke's [share] will be set as two [parts], your [share] will be set as one [part]."

I, [*Diao sheng*], offer a large jade scepter to [her] Lordship. I respond to the [Shao *bo*'s] spouse with bundled silk [and] a jade pendant.

Shao *bo* Hu said: "I already interrogated. According to the command of my deceased father and my mother, I do not dare to cause disorder. I will obey the command of my deceased father and my mother to the utmost."

Diao sheng then [responded to this by] a ceremonial jade scepter.¹¹²

yu wenwu 2007.5, 103-4, 111; Li Xueqin, "Diao sheng zhu qi mingwen liandu yanjiu"; Xin Yihua 辛怡華, Liu Dong 劉棟, "Wu nian Diao sheng zun kaoshi" 五年珣生尊銘文考釋, *Wenwu* 2008.7, 76-80; Wang Jinfeng 王進鋒, "Xin chu 'Wu nian Diao sheng zun' yu Diao sheng zhu qi xin shi" 新出《五年珣生尊》與珣生諸器新釋, *Lishi jiaoxue* 2008.6, 87-92. For English translations of the Fifth- and Sixth-years *gui* cf. also Laura Skosey, *The Legal System and Legal Tradition of the Western Zhou (ca. 1045-771. B.C.E.)* (Ph.D. Diss., University of Chicago, 1996), 400-408.

111. Some scholars interpret this collocation as *fuyong* 附庸, "attached settlements." However, *Diao sheng zun* inscription (see below) rather supports the reading 仆庸 "servants and commoners" (see Xin Yihua and Liu Dong, "Wu nian Diao sheng zun kaoshi," 77). Skosey interprets *yong* as a category of servants, see Skosey, *The Legal System*, 402).

112. *Diao sheng gui* 珣生簋 (*Jicheng* 4292, Late Western Zhou).

2. *Diao sheng zun*:

唯五年九月初吉，召姜以珣生□五□、壺兩，以君氏命曰：「余考之。我僕章(庸)、土田多刺，式許，勿使散亡。余宥其叁，汝宥其貳。其兄公，其弟乃。」余惠大璋，報婦氏帛束、璜一。有司眾罍兩璧。珣生對揚朕宗君休，用作召公尊藍(鑑)。用祈通祿、孚純、靈終，子子孫孫永寶用之。其有敢變茲命曰：「汝事召人，公則明殛！」

It was the fifth year, the ninth month, the first auspicious day. Lady Jiang of Shao, [upon receipt] of five [designation of an object and a counting word] [and] a pair of *hu*-flasks, by the command of [her] Lordship, pronounced: "I have investigated this. There were many disputes concerning the Duke's servants and commoners, lands and fields. Let it be regulated, so as not to cause [the people] to scatter and disappear:

'I will occupy three, you will occupy two [parts of the lands].

The elder brother regulates, the younger brother follows.'

I, [Diao sheng, respond to this] beneficence by a great jade scepter. I respond to the spouse [of Shao bo] with bundled silk [and] one jade pendant. The office-holders [receive] many water [vessels] and two jade discs.

[I], Diao sheng, extol in response the mercy of my lineage's Lordship. [I] use [this occasion] to make these sacrificial *jian*-vases for the Duke of Shao. [I will] use them in order to pray for thorough prosperity, sincerity and immaculacy, [and] divine [transformation at the] end.

May my children and grandchildren use these [vessels] for offerings.

If they dare to change this command, [I] say: "You serve the men of Shao. [Otherwise] the Duke will detect and kill you."¹¹³

3. The sixth-year *Diao sheng gui*:

隹六年四月甲子王才葦。召伯虎告曰：「余告慶」。曰：「公厥稟貝，用獄諫，為伯又祗(直)又成。亦我考幽伯幽姜令，余告慶。余以邑訊有司。余典：勿敢封。今余既訊」。有司曰：「戾令。今余既一名典」。獻。伯氏則報璧。珣生對揚朕宗君其休，用乍朕烈祖召公嘗簋。其萬年子孫寶用享于宗。

113. Cf. Li Xueqin, "Diao sheng zhu qi mingwen liandu yanjiu," 72; Wang Zhankui 王占奎, "Diao sheng san qi mingwen kaoshi," 105; Chen Zhaorong, Junko Uchida et al., "Xin chutu qingtongqi *Diao sheng zun*," 41.

It was the sixth year, the fourth month, day *jia-zi*, the King was in Pang.¹¹⁴ Shao *bo* Hu made an announcement, saying:

“I announce a rejoicing matter!” [He] said: “The Duke has already received the cowry-shells [and] used them to settle the lawsuit with the *bo*. This is righteous, this is accomplished, [and] also according to the command of my deceased father You *bo* [and my mother] You Jiang.

I announce a rejoicing matter! In all the settlements, I interrogated office-holders. I certify in writing: ‘do not dare to [change (?)] the markers of the boundaries!’ Today, I finished interrogating.” The office-holder said: “According to the command, I already made a record today.”

[He] offered [it to Diao *sheng*].

The First-born [i.e. Diao *sheng*] therefore responded with a jade disc.

[I], Diao *sheng*, extol in response the beneficence of my lineage’s Lordship. [I] use this occasion to make a *gui*-tureen for feasting my illustrious ancestor the Duke of Shao. Let it be ten thousand years! May the children and grandchildren use it for offerings in the ancestral temple!¹¹⁵

In the last inscription, Diao *sheng* explicitly called the Duke of Shao his ancestor and dedicated to him his sacrificial tureen. This makes clear that he was a member of Shao and an affinal relative of Diao lineage. The relationships in the Shao lineage can be reconstructed as follows.

Diao *sheng*’s grandfather was a certain Duke of Shao, the head of the Shao lineage. His first-born son (posthumously entitled You *bo* 幽伯, Gloomy First-born) became his heir. You *bo* married Lady Jiang, who gave birth to Shao *bo* Hu. The Duke of Shao’s second-born son (posthumously entitled X *zhong* 寃仲) founded a new branch of Shao.¹¹⁶ Shao *bo* Hu and Diao *sheng* were first-born sons

114. The reference to the king’s location represents a part of the dating formula and does not mean that the king was involved in the case (see Maria Khayutina, “The Royal Year-count of the Western Zhou Dynasty (1045–771 BC) and Its Use(r)s: A Sociological Perspective,” in *Time and Ritual in Early China*, ed. Xiaobing Wang-Riese and Thomas Höllmann (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2009), 127–54).

115. *Diao sheng gui* 凋生簋 (*Jicheng* 4293, Late Western Zhou).

116. *Diao sheng li* 凋生鬲 (*Jicheng* 744, found on the edge of Fufeng, Linyou 麟游, and Yongshou 永壽 Counties, Shaanxi, Late Western Zhou). This posthumous title

footnote continued on next page

of You *bo* and X *zhong* respectively, and therefore both of them were referred to as a *bo*, “the First-born.”¹¹⁷ They were related to each other as parallel cousins.

By the will of You *bo*, some parts of the lineage’s property were allocated to X *zhong*. Later on, they could be inherited by his first-born son and legitimate heir, i.e. Diao *sheng*. However, after the death of his father, Diao *sheng*’s rights to this property were put into question by some of his patrilineal relatives, which resulted in the “disputes concerning the servants and commoners, lands and fields.” At this point, Diao *sheng*’s relationships with the Diao lineage became relevant enough to be explicitly pointed to in negotiations.

Lin Yun and Zhang Yachu both suggest that Diao *sheng* was the son of a woman from the Diao lineage. Although this is only one of several possible options, it seems the most plausible in this case, considering that Diao *sheng*’s membership in the Shao lineage is evident. In the internal hierarchy of a lineage, especially under the conditions of polygamy, males were distinguished not only by their birth seniority, but also by the status of their mothers. The latter could be relevant in questions of inheritance. Possibly, Diao *sheng*’s father X *zhong* married several women simultaneously or successively. By referring to the name of his mother, Diao *sheng* pointed to his rights resulting from her status in the hierarchy of spouses of his father, or even of all spouses of the lineage.

Diao *sheng*’s inscriptions also show that Shao represented a classical Ji-surnamed lineage with Jiang-surnamed spouses by the side of the lineage’s heads. During 853–852 B.C.E. the First-born Hu, whose greatest military achievements took place during 820s B.C.E., would have been relatively young and have only recently become head of the Shao lineage. After his father, referred to as Gloomy First-born, passed away, Lady Jiang, the Dowager Duchess of Shao, referred to, after

consisting of the graphs *gong* “palace” and *jiu* “9,” is often seen in bronze inscriptions. Possibly, it had something to do with the foundation of a new palace by the head of a new branch of a lineage. The expression “the elder brother the Duke, and the younger brother” 其兄公, 其弟乃 in the inscription on the *zun*-vases refers to the fathers of Shao *bo* and Diao *sheng*. The fact that Diao *sheng* dedicated the sixth-year’s *gui*-tureen to the Duke of Shao over the head of Shao *bo*, who, as the current lineage’s elder, was entitled to sacrifice for elder ancestors, implies the autonomy of Diao *sheng*’s sublineage.

117. By analogy with the naming practice in Guo lineage, Diao *sheng* could otherwise be identified as Shao *zhong bo* 召仲伯. The absence of a distinct name for this sublineage could result from the fact that its splitting off was regulated privately, whereas, as transmitted sources acclaim, lineage names were granted by the king.

the posthumous title of her husband, as Gloomy Jiang and “her Lordship” *jun shi* 君氏, retained control over the lineage’s affairs.¹¹⁸ This was possibly not least due to the fact that as spouse and widow, she was backed by a network of Jiang-surnamed relatives who, in their turn, were affinal relatives of the Zhou royal house. Similarly, the currently elevated standing of the Diao lineage among the local elites could be relevant for the decision concerning Diao *sheng*’s share in Shao’s property. The second woman referred to in the inscription as *fu shi* 婦氏,¹¹⁹ “the Spouse,” also played an active role in the decision-making process. Probably, she was Shao *bo*’s wife. Her surname and lineage affiliation cannot be revealed. It is also noteworthy that, during late Western Zhou periods, although Zhou kings already established officials responsible for resolving private lawsuits, this case was not brought before an external judge, but was regulated within the lineage.¹²⁰ This demonstrates that even in the Zhou metropolitan region, lineages of the highest aristocracy that did not qualify as principalities on the level of external politics represented internally “states within the state.” Involved in marital alliances, they wove a tight tissue of social connections that shaped the life of the inhabitants of metropolitan Zhou.

The Case of Rong *sheng*

The set of eight bells commissioned by Rong *sheng* was purchased by the Beijing Poli Museum in the late 1990s in Hong Kong. Each bell bears part of a continuous inscription with a total length of 153 characters, executed in bold, clearly legible characters:¹²¹

118. Widows of deceased rulers in principalities of the Spring and Autumn period also retained authority over their sons (see Gassmann, *Verwandtschaft und Gesellschaft*, 476).

119. I accept Li Xueqin’s suggestion that *fu shi* referred to Shao *bo*’s spouse (see Li Xueqin, “Diao sheng zhu qi,” 73). Several other scholars suggest that designations *fu shi* and *jun shi* were applied to the same person (Wang Zhankui, “Diao sheng san qi mingwen kaoshi,” 108; Xin Yihua and Liu Dong, “Wu nian Diao sheng zun kaoshi” 77; Wang Jinfeng, “Xin chu ‘Wu nian Diao sheng zun’” 88).

120. For an overview of the Western Zhou administration of law and a remark about private jurisdiction in Diao-*sheng*’s case see Scosey, *The Legal System*, 162–74.

121. For the first publication, transcriptions, and investigations of the inscriptions see “Rong sheng bianzhong” 戎生編鐘 in He Ping 賀平 ed., *Baoli cangjin* 暴利藏金 (Guangzhou: Lingnan meishu, 1999), 117–28; Ma Chengyuan 馬承源, “Rong sheng zhong mingwen de tantao” 戎生鐘銘文的探討, in *Baoli cang jin*, 361–64; Qu Xigui 裘錫圭, “Rong sheng bianzhong mingwen kaoshi” 戎生編鐘銘文考釋, in *Baoli cangjin*, 365–74; Li Xueqin 李學勤, “Rong sheng bianzhong lun shi,” 戎生編鐘論釋, in *Baoli cang jin*, 375–78.

惟十月乙亥。戎生曰：「休辟皇祖憲公！桓桓翼翼，啟厥明心，廣經其猷，趨再穆天子羨(?)靈(靈)，用建于茲外土，適司蠻戎，用鞅不庭方。至于辟皇考邵(昭)伯。遠= (還=) 穆=，懿□不替(僭)，紹(昭)匹(配)晉侯，用龔(恭)王命。今余弗假廢其顯光」！對揚其大福。嘉遺滄積，俾譖(僭)征繁湯，取厥吉金，用作寶協鐘。厥音雖=、鎗=、鏞=、積=、鵠=、即蘇且淑。余用邵追孝于皇祖皇考，用祈綽眉壽。戎生其萬年無疆，黃耇又耄俊(俊)保。其子孫永寶用。

It was the 11th month, day *yi-hai*. Rong *sheng* said: "Blessed was my august ancestor Duke Xian! Martial and reverent, [he] opened up his enlightened heart. Far-reaching and thorough were his plans. [He] greatly relied on the surpassing (?) blessing¹²² of the Son of Heaven Mu in order to establish [his state] in this external land, to administer Man [and] Rong and to deal with the countries that do not [come to] court. It came [to the time of] my august deceased father Zhao *bo*. Dexterous [and] reverent, admirably ... [and] not going beyond what is proper, [my father] glorified and accompanied my Lord of Jin in order to make [everybody] abide by the king's orders.¹²³ Now I do not neglectedly dissipate his illustrious shine [and] respond to his great blessing! [I have been] luckily granted salt gathering. [I] captured and punished Fantang, took their auspicious metal [and] used [it] to make this treasured chime of bells. Their sounds are *yong-yong, cang-cang, cong-cong, ai-ai, zhu-zhu*, very harmonious and fine! I use them to welcome [and to] express piety to [my] august ancestors [and my] august father, [and] to pray for great longevity. May Rong *sheng* last ten thousand years without limit [until] yellow-skinned old age and older, [and] long be protected [by ancestors]. May [my] sons and grandsons eternally use and treasure [these bells].

Rong *sheng's* inscription partly overlaps with the inscription on the *Jin Jiang ding* 晉姜鼎 discovered in Hancheng 韓城, Shaanxi, and reproduced in Lü Dalin's 呂大臨 (1044–1091) *Kaogu tu* 考古圖:

122. Expression "using [a superior's] *ling* in order to [achieve something]" occurs in many speeches in the *Zuo zhuan* (e.g. *Zuo zhuan*, 740 (Xuan: 12)). Yang Bojun glosses *ling* 靈 (originally, "spirit," "divine power") as *hu* 祐 ("blessing").

123. The word *gong* 龔 in combination with the word "king" is often misunderstood as the posthumous title of King Gong 共 (917/15–900), which often results in erroneous dating of inscriptions. As Ulrich Unger pointed out, in such clauses as "用龔王+object" it represented a verb and should be read as *gong* 恭 "to respect"/ "to make one respect" (see Ulrich Unger, "Zur Person des shan-fu K'eh" (Part 3), in *Hao-ku. Sinologische Rundbriefe* (Münster) No. 9 (1982), 54–55). The expression *gong ming*, "to respect the command" or "to obey by the order" often occurs in the *Shang shu*, e.g. 恭承民命 "to obey by the command to take the responsibility for the people" (see Sun Xingyan 孫星衍, *Shang shu jin gu wen zhu shu* 尚書今古文注疏 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1936, repr. 1986), 6.240 ("Pan Geng" 盤庚)).

佳王九月乙亥。晉姜曰：「余佳司(嗣)朕先姑君晉邦。余不假妄寧，經雍明德，宣□我猷，用

紹(昭)匹(配)辟辟，每揚厥光刺，虔不墜，魯譫京師，又我萬民」。嘉遣我易(賜)鹵責(積)千兩。勿廢文侯顯命，卑貫通弘僭征繁湯鼈，取厥吉金用作寶尊鼎。用康柔妥懷遠邇君子。晉姜用祈綽縮眉壽。作寔為極。萬年無疆。用享用德。吹保其孫子。三壽是利。

In the ninth month of the King, day *yi-hai*, [Lady] Jiang of Jin said: "I succeeded my former aunt as the Lordess of the Principality of Jin. I do not stay in leisure and reckless tranquility. I adjusted and harmonized my illustrious virtue, and propagated ... my plans in order to glorify and to accompany my lord. Every [day I] promote his glorious merits. [I am] pious [and] do not retreat. [I] wisely (?) hold the Capital Garrison [and] rule over our ten thousand peoples.

[I] have been luckily granted salt gathering [in the amount of] one thousand *liang*.¹²⁴ [I did] not neglect Lord Wen's shiny mandate. [I] went through [and] greatly punished the Yun of Fantang. [I took] their auspicious metal [and] used it to make [this] treasured sacrificial tripod. [I will] use it to [make] peace: gently receive and take care of [various] lords far away and nearby.

[Lady] Jiang of Jin [will] use [it] to pray for everlasting longevity, to multiply until the extreme. Ten thousand years without limit! Use to sacrifice, use to [manifest] virtue! Long protect my grandchildren and children! The three ages of longevity are beneficial!¹²⁵

The *Jin Jiang ding* tripod's shape and decorations are similar to these of tripods discovered in late Western Zhou to early Spring and Autumn period tombs of Jin rulers and their spouses.¹²⁶ Lady Jiang referred to her husband by his posthumous name, Lord Wen of Jin 晉文侯 (r. 780–746 B.C.E.). This makes clear that the *Jin Jiang ding* was made

124. The *liang* ("a pair") unit of the Western Zhou period is unknown. Some authors suppose that this may be a measure word for carts on which salt could be transported (i.e. a pair of wheels).

125. *Jin Jiang ding* (*Jicheng* 2826); see also Ma Chengyuan 馬承源, *Shang-Zhou qingtongqi mingwen xuan* 商周青銅器銘文選 (Beijing: Wenwu, 1986–88), Vol. I, 585–86.

126. Cf. *Jian Jiang ding* in *Dongshutang chongxiu xuanhe bogu tulu* 東書堂重修宣和博古圖錄, 2:6; 2, and a tripod from Tomb M93 at Beizhao in Shanxi sheng kaogu yanjiu-suo, Beijing daxue kaoguxue xi, "Tianma-Qucun yizhi Beizhao Jin hou mudi di wu ci fajue" 天馬——曲村遺址北趙晉侯墓地第五次發掘, *Wenwu* 1995.7, 4–39, esp. fig. 28, M93: 37.

after 746 B.C.E., most likely, during the reign of Lord Zhao of Jin 晉昭侯 (r. 745–739 B.C.E.).¹²⁷

Lady Jiang and Rong *sheng* mentioned in their inscriptions the same circumstances, including the grant of salt and a war against Fantang. Both texts use some similar expressions that, on the other hand, do not belong to the typical repertory of formulas used in bronze inscriptions.¹²⁸ The characters display common orthography and calligraphy.¹²⁹ Rong *sheng bianzhong*'s shape and decorations are similar to those of bells excavated from the tombs of Jin rulers of the late Western Zhou to early Spring and Autumn periods.¹³⁰ Considering that Rong *sheng* mentioned his service to the Lord of Jin, Rong *sheng*'s bells were most plausibly made in Jin about the same time as the *Jin Jiang ding*.¹³¹ But how was Rong *sheng* related to the ruling house of Jin and what do *sheng* and "Rong" signify in his case?

Li Xueqin suggests that Rong *sheng* was a son of a woman who belonged to the Rong group of non-Zhou peoples and was married to a Jin official.¹³² Ma Chengyuan argued that he was a member of the Rong group of peoples, possibly a leader of a Rong polity.¹³³ In view of the polyvalent meaning of the kinship term *sheng*, Rong could represent his mother's, father's or even spouse's group. Several factors indicate that Rong *sheng* was a child of a leader of an autonomous polity and a marital relative of the ruling house of Jin.

127. See Li Xueqin, "Rong *sheng bianzhong lun shi*," in *Baoli cang jin*, 377.

128. Compare "luckily granted salt gathering" 嘉遣灑積 with "luckily granted salt gathering [in the amount of] one thousand *liang*" 嘉遣我易(賜)鹵責(積)千兩, or "do not neglectedly dissipate his illustrious shine" 弗假廢其顯光 with "do not neglect Lord Wen's illustrious mandate" 勿廢文侯顯命. Both inscriptions use the possessive personal pronoun *ci* 辭, "my," in place of the common *zhen* 朕 or *wo* 我.

129. I discussed the language and paleography of the inscriptions and the artistic features of the bronzes in my conference paper "Localizing the Recently Discovered Bells of Rong *sheng* in Space and Time," *Third Tomb Texts Workshop* of the European Association for the Study of Chinese Manuscripts, 26–29 June 2008, Zurich.

130. For the evolution of shank bells' appearance see Lothar von Falkenhausen, *Suspended Music: Chime-Bells in the Culture of Bronze Age China* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993), 158–68; Jenny So, *Eastern Zhou Ritual Bronzes from the Arthur M. Sackler Collections* (New York: Arthur M. Sackler Foundation, 1995), Vol. 3, 436, 444–47.

131. Li Xueqin argues that the dates "ninth month, day *yi-hai* 乙亥" in the *Jin Jiang ding* and "eleventh month, day *yi-hai* 乙亥" in the Rong *sheng bianzhong* very likely occurred during the same year and argues that this should be 740 B.C.E., the sixth and the last year of Lord Zhao of Jin (Li Xueqin, "Rong *sheng bianzhong lun shi*," in *Baoli cang jin*, 377).

132. See Li Xueqin, "Rong *sheng bianzhong lun shi*," 376.

133. See Ma Chengyuan, "Rong *sheng zhong de tantao*," 363.

It is remarkable that Rong *sheng* owned a set of bells consisting of eight pieces. As with the number of tripods and tureens, the number of bells in chimes owned by individuals served as identifier of their status.¹³⁴ In cemeteries of principalities of the early Spring and Autumn period, including Jin, Guo, Qin, and Rui, sets of eight bells have been found exclusively in tombs of rulers.¹³⁵ Therefore, Rong *sheng's* status was comparable with that of the rulers of principalities' rulers. Since his bells were very likely cast in a Jin foundry, Rong *sheng's* status was recognized in Jin. Information about his ancestors in the inscription makes clear that he was not a member of the Jin ruling house. Rong *sheng's* father was referred to in the inscription under his temple name Zhao *bo*, or Zhao the First-born. As has been noted above, the title First-born was often used by leaders of non-Zhou polities. Rong *sheng's* more remote ancestor Xian *gong* 憲公 was said to "to establish [the state] in this external land" (*jian yu zi wai tu* 建于茲外土). This also supports the view that Rong *sheng's* family ruled an autonomous principality that cooperated first with the royal house of Zhou and, second, with the ruling house of Jin.

According to the inscription, Zhao *bo* "glorified" (*shao* 紹/ *zhao* 昭) and "accompanied" (*pi* 匹/ *pei* 配) the ruler of Jin in order to "make [everybody] abide by the king's orders." That Rong *sheng* calls this ruler of Jin "my Lord of Jin" suggests that he and his father both dealt with the same ruler of Jin, i.e. Lord Wen, who was on the throne for thirty-four years. Lady Jiang states in her inscription that she also "glorified and accompanied" the Lord of Jin. The word *pi* 匹, used in both inscriptions as a verb and translated as "to accompany," signifies "pair," "companion," "equal," "mate," "sexual partner" as a noun. *Pi* possibly corresponds to *pei* 配, "to pair," "to accompany," "to marry," "to match," "to be equal," "to assist." In Lady Jiang's case, *pi/pei* very likely pointed to her position as the spouse of Lord Wen of Jin. In the other case, *pi/pei* could refer just to a political alliance but, because of its sexual connotations, it could also refer to a marital alliance between Jin and Zhao *bo's* polity. If Zhao *bo* gave his sister as a spouse to Lord Wen of Jin, or if he married the latter's sister, his son would be related to the current ruler of Jin, Lord Zhao, as a

134. See Falkenhausen, *Suspended Music*, 98.

135. See Shanxi sheng kaogu yanjiusuo *et al.*, "Tianma-Qucun yizhi Beizhao Jin hou mudi di wu ci fajue", fig. 28, M93: 67, 72; Henan sheng wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo, Sanmenxia shi wenwu gongzuo dui, *Sanmenxia Guo guo mu* 三門峽虢國墓 (Beijing: Wenwu, 1999), 73–77; M2001: 45–50; Shaanxi sheng kaogu yanjiuyuan, "Shaanxi Hancheng Liangdaicun yizhi M27 fajue jianbao" 陝西韓城梁帶村遺址 M27 發掘間報, *Kaogu yu wenwu* 2007.6, 3–22; Baoji shi bowuguan, "Shaanxi Baoji xian Taigongmiao cun faxian *Qin gong zhong, Qin gong bo*," 1.

sheng. Lord Wen and Zhao *bo* could arrange a marriage between their children. As Lord Zhao's sister's husband, Zhao *bo*'s son would also be defined as Lord Zhao's *sheng*.

Comparing the cases of Rong *sheng* and Diao *sheng*, some similarities can be noted. In both cases, the inscriptions are unusually long and detailed. In Diao *sheng*'s case the main subject of the inscriptions are clearly rights on the landed property of the Shao lineage. In Rong *sheng*'s case the negotiations of property rights stay in the background, but can be revealed through the comparison with Lady Jiang's inscription. Rong *sheng* was "luckily granted salt gathering" *jia qian lu ji* 嘉遣 滷積. Lady Jiang of Jin was also "luckily granted salt gathering" in the amount of one thousand *liang*. Spring salt (lu 滷) had been collected since the Neolithic period in the Salt Lake area of the Yuncheng basin in southwestern Shanxi near to the Great Bend of the Yellow River.¹³⁶ According to the inscriptions, either Lord Wen or Lord Zhao of Jin granted rights of gathering salt (which was indeed a great source of wealth) to his affinal relative Rong *sheng*. At the same time, he granted Lady Jiang the right to gather a certain limited amount of salt. Both commissioners of bronze vessels documented these grants in their inscriptions in order to guarantee their rights.

In both cases the events referred to in the inscription took place shortly after the death of the former head of the lineage or principality. During this time, the position of the newly established head was as yet instable, or possibly he was restraining himself from certain activities while fulfilling his obligations of filial piety towards his deceased father, whereas the former head's widow enjoyed maximal power. In both cases we see a widow of the former head who continued managing the affairs of her husband's family and principality. At the same time, the new head's wives and their relatives found themselves on the way towards greater privileges and prosperity. It is understandable that during such transitional periods property rights and standings of persons within lineages and principalities could be negotiated and redefined. Persons whose rights and standings were modified or confirmed as the result of negotiations commissioned lengthy, detailed inscriptions in which they made clear their relationships with the lineage in question, either as a member of a lineage's branch as in the case of Diao *sheng*, or as a marital relative as in the case of Rong *sheng*, and claimed their rights.

The Rong *sheng bianzhong* inscription not only provides information about property rights of spouses and affinal relatives of patrilineal

¹³⁶ Liu Li, and Chen Xingcan, *State Formation in Early China* (London: Duckworth, 2003), 45.

lineages' heads, but also sheds light on cooperation between Zhou principalities and non-Zhou peoples during the eighth century B.C.E., the period of early Chinese history on which least light has been cast.

The designation Rong, making part of Rong *sheng's* designation, is best known as a label in the four-part scheme in which foreign peoples residing in the four cardinal directions were referred to as Rong (West), Di 狄 (North), Yi 夷 (East) and Man (South). This cosmological scheme became established during the Warring States period (403–221 B.C.E.),¹³⁷ but these four designations were already in use long before. Li Feng argues that during the Western Zhou period “the term ‘Rong’ meant something like ‘warlike foreigners’ and the term ‘Yi’ came very close to ‘foreign conquerable,’ whereas the distinction between them was ‘more political than cultural or ethnic.’”¹³⁸ This suggests that Rong and Yi were *etic* terms used by the Zhou to classify their neighbors, perhaps even according to the current state of political affairs. However, the situation is more complicated. Zhou principalities often were seriously threatened by and suffered losses from the Yi, so that the Yi were also “warlike” and not really “conquerable.” On the other hand, the Zhou not only led wars but also cast alliances with the Rong. In the *Rong sheng bianzhong* the word “Rong” appears both as a part of the commissioner’s self-designation and as a term referring to a non-Zhou people’s group. Rong *sheng's* ancestor Xian *gong* 憲公 was entrusted by King Mu of Zhou to control Man and Rong. In bronze inscriptions of the Western Zhou and early Spring and Autumn periods, the term Man 蠻 was often used as a general designation for foreign peoples (e.g. in the expression “hundred Man” (*bai man* 百蠻) or was applied to individual groups of foreign peoples.¹³⁹ The Duke of Qin, who commissioned the *Qin gong gui* 秦公簋 tureen during the mid-Spring and Autumn period, claimed that his ancestors received the Heavenly Mandate “to rule

137. See Poo Mu-chou, *Enemies of Civilization. Attitudes toward Foreigners in Ancient Mesopotamia, Egypt, and China* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005), 46.

138. Li, *Landscape and Power*, 286. This interpretation seem to be supported by the meanings of words *rong* (“belligerent,” “warrior”) and *yi* (“flat,” “peaceful”).

139. They did not necessarily reside in the south, as not only Southern Huaiyi 南淮夷, but also northern Xianyun 獫狁, Guifang 鬼方 or the neighbors of the western principality Qin could be referred to as Man (see *Shi Qiang pan* 史牆盤 (Jicheng 10175, Zhuangbai 莊白, Fufeng, Shaanxi, late Middle Western Zhou); *Guo ji zibo pan* 虢季子白盤 (Jicheng 10173, Guozhen 虢鎮, Baoji, Shaanxi, LWJ); *Xi Jia pan* 兮甲盤 (Jicheng 10174, Late Western Zhou); *Qin gong zhong* 秦公鐘 (Jicheng 262, Taigongmiao 太公廟, Yangjiagou 楊家溝, Baoji, Shaanxi, Early Spring and Autumn); *Liang bo ge* 梁伯戈 (Jicheng 11346, Early Spring and Autumn); *Jin gong pen* 晉公益 (Jicheng 10343, Middle Spring and Autumn).

over the Man [and] the Xia” 事蠻夏。The Xia, i.e. the Chinese, were the group to which the Duke of Qin counted himself as belonging.¹⁴⁰ By analogy, in the expression “to administer the Man and the Rong” 司蠻戎, in Rong *sheng*’s inscription Rong would be Xian *gong*’s own group and the Man would be other foreign peoples. King Mu’s policies of making friends with the Rong, or of approximating non-Zhou rulers in order to keep the others calm, are reflected in later transmitted sources.¹⁴¹ Xian *gong* might be one such foreign ally. Hence, in Rong *sheng*’s inscription the term “Rong” was used twice *emically* by a person who belonged to this group.¹⁴²

As has been pointed out above, Zhou elites intermarried with various neighboring peoples. The ruling house of Jin was no exception. Finds of bronze or ceramic vessels in tombs of Jin-rulers’ spouses dating from the early to late Western Zhou point to the non-Zhou origin of these women.¹⁴³ As mentioned above, the ruling house of Jin intermarried with the ruling house of Peng, a neighboring polity of non-Zhou origin.¹⁴⁴ Later on, Duke Xian of Jin 晉獻公 (r. 676–651 B.C.E.) married four women from two different Rong groups.¹⁴⁵ Hence, it is plausible that Lord Wen or Lord Zhao of Jin also took a wife from a Rong peoples’ group.

It is worth considering the possibility that Rong *sheng* could be a kin relative of Lady Jiang of Jin. Transmitted sources inform us that some groups of the Rong adopted Chinese surnames. Some Jiang-surnamed Rong defeated royal troops during the reign of King Xuan.¹⁴⁶ Thereupon these Rong were driven back by Lord Mu of Jin

140. See *Qin gong gui* 秦公簋 (Jicheng 4315, Xichui 西垂, Lixian 禮縣, Gansu province, Middle Spring and Autumn).

141. During the reign of King Mu, the King of Xu 徐 led a joint army of several polities of Huai Yi peoples in a war against the Zhou. In order to split the enemies, King Mu recognized the ruler of Xu as the “chief” (*zhu* 主) or the “elder” (*bo* 伯) over the rest of them (see Wang Guowei, *Jin ben Zhushu jinian shu zheng*, 278; Fan Ye, *Hou Han shu*, 2808).

142. Another case of an emic usage of “Rong” as a definition of the speaker’s group is reflected in *Zuo zhuan*, 1007 (Xiang: 14).

143. See Chen Fangmei 陳芳妹, “*Jin hou mudi qingtongqi suo jian xingbie yanjiu de xin xiansuo*” 晉侯墓地青銅器所見性別研究的新線索, in Shanghai bowuguan ed., *Jin hou mudi chutu qingtongqi guoji xueshu taolunhui lunwenji* 晉侯墓地出土青銅器國際學術討論會論文集 (Shanghai: Shanghai shuhua, 2002), 157–96; Falkenhausen, *The Chinese Society in the Age of Confucius*, 212; Khayutina, “The Tombs of the Rulers of Peng,” forthcoming.

144. See Sun, “Material Culture and Social Identities,” 68.

145. These groups were Hu Rong 狐戎 and Li Rong 驪戎, see *Zuo zhuan*, 239 (Zhuang: 28).

146. See Xu Yuan 徐元 *et al.*, *Guo yu ji jie* 國語集解 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2002), 15 (“Xuan wang ji wei, bu ji qian mu” 宣王及位·不籍千畝).

in 801 B.C.E.¹⁴⁷ Another or, perhaps, even the same Jiang-surnamed Rong group was displaced by the forces of the Qin principality and moved to the mountainous region in the south of Jin during the mid-seventh century B.C.E. It is not clear where both these groups of the Rong resided.¹⁴⁸ Considering various historical-geographical factors, a possible place of residence could be somewhere to the west or southwest of the Great Bend of the Yellow River on the edge of the present-day Shaanxi and Henan provinces.¹⁴⁹ Starting from the reign of Duke Wen of Jin 晉文公 (r. 636–628 B.C.E.), the latter group of the Jiang-surnamed Rong continuously acted as Jin allies in various military campaigns at least until the mid-6th century B.C.E.¹⁵⁰ Although the *Zuo zhuan* informs us about their relationships only during the seventh to sixth centuries B.C.E., this alliance could well be much older. If it was held together by intermarriages, this could also be the reason why the Jin principality offered protection and asylum to the Jiang-surnamed Rong.

Unfortunately, the native lineage of Lady Jiang is unknown and this hypothesis cannot be verified. Besides Qi, where the spouse of Lord Mu of Jin came from, Ji and Xiang 向 in Shandong, Shen and Xü in Henan, and some other smaller Zhou principalities all belonged to the Jiang surname community. Rong *sheng's* lineage could be connected to the ruling house of Jin through another spouse, a sister, or a daughter of Lord Wen of Jin. In any case, affinal relationships between Jin and his polity represented an important political factor.

Lord Wen of Jin was mainly responsible for the restoration of the Zhou dynasty with King Ping (r. 770–720 B.C.E.) in the eastern capital Luoyang in 770 B.C.E. Jin was supported by several other principalities, including Shen 申, Lu, Xü, Zheng, and Qin.¹⁵¹ That Rong *sheng's* father

147. See Sima Qian, *Shi ji*, 1637 (“Jin shijia” 晉世家), 1780 (“Zhao shijia” 趙世家).

148. According to the *Guo yu*, King Xuan and the Rong had a battle on the “field of one thousand acres” (*qian mu* 千畝). Some authors try to localize the toponym Qianmu, but this is not convincing. The *Zuo zhuan* states that the Jiang Rong resided in Guazhou 瓜州, or “pumpkin region.” Many centuries later, the toponym Guazhou was applied to an area in Gansu province near Dunhuang. Localizing the Jiang Rong in Gansu is not realistic in view of c. 2000 km distance between these places.

149. Various non-Zhou groups resided in Shaanxi province. As Duke Mu of Qin 秦穆公 (r. 659–621 B.C.E.) started to expand towards the Yellow River, some of such groups could have been displaced and sought the protection of the neighboring Jin.

150. See *Zuo zhuan*, 1007 (Xiang: 14).

151. See Shang shu jin gu wen zhu shu, 28.543–548 (‘Wen hou zhi ming’ 文侯之命); *Jin ben zhushu jinian*, 262–83 (You: 11 and Ping: 1); Li Xueqin 李學勤 *et al.* (eds.), *Xi nian xian*, in *Qinghua daxue cang Zhanguo zhujian* (2) 清華大學藏戰國竹簡(貳) (Shanghai: Shanghai Wenyi, 2010), Vol. 2, 2.138.

Zhao *bo* “glorified and accompanied the Lord of Jin in order to make everyone abide by the king’s orders” most probably means that he was involved in these events on behalf of his polity too. Indeed, the Rong (specifically, the Hound-Rong, Quanrong 犬戎) are often blamed for the murder of the last Western Zhou king, You.¹⁵² It should be remembered that the Quanrong were drawn into the succession quarrel within the Zhou royal family by Kin You’s father-in-law, Jiang-surnamed ruler of Shen.¹⁵³ That other groups of the Rong joined the rulers of Zhou principalities so as to restore order, sheds a new light on the intercultural relationships in Early China.

Later on, Zhao *bo*’s son Rong *sheng* was appointed, together with Lord Wen’s spouse (or already widow) Lady Jiang of Jin, to be in charge of the campaign against Fantang, a non-Zhou polity, possibly located near Xuchang 許昌 in Ying River Valley.¹⁵⁴ This joint appointment was most likely related to the fact that they were both close marital relatives of the ruling house of Jin and enjoyed great trust. Their abilities to mobilize their own native lineages, and perhaps also their connections to other, external lineages could be relevant for the success of this undertaking.

Discussion: Marital Alliances as a Factor of Integration in the Western Zhou Network

The Western Zhou political system was laid out as a network of colonies stretching from Shaanxi to Hebei and Shandong provinces. Besides the Ji-surnamed royal lineage, allied non-Ji lineages, especially those connected with the Ji by marital ties (such as the Jiang-surnamed Qi), also founded new colonies.¹⁵⁵ The Zhou kings directly controlled their metropolitan areas in Shaanxi and central Henan province. The colonies in more distant places were ruled by hereditary princes,

152. See *Shi ji*, 4.147–49; *Jin ben zhu shu ji nian*, 262 (You: 11).

153. For the reconstruction of the historical-geographical background of the cooperation between Shen principality and Quanrong see Li, *Landscape and Power*, 227–32.

154. See Li Daoyuan 酈道元, *Shui jing zhu shu* 水經注述, ed. Yang Shoujin 楊守敬 (Nanjing: Jiangsu guji, 1989), 22.1813; for the discussion of Fantang’s localization and further references see Lothar von Falkenhausen, “The E jun Qi Metal Tallies,” in *Text and Ritual in Early China*, ed. Martin Kern (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 2005), 79–123, esp. 115.

155. Pulleyblank reasonably underlines that the strength of the founder of Qi was due to the fact that he was “an important blood relative on the female side, the senior member of the Jiang clan, with which the royal Ji clan had regularly intermarried in the past and with which it continued to intermarry thereafter” (Pulleyblank, “Ji and Jiang”, 8).

zhuhou 諸侯, who were subordinated to the Zhou king. In the space between and around Zhou principalities resided old lineages that were already extant during the Shang time.¹⁵⁶ Chinese historians traditionally maintain that, from the time of its foundation and throughout the Zhou period, relationships between the royal house and Ji-surnamed principalities were regulated by the so-called “lineage order” (*zong fa* 宗法).¹⁵⁷ Considering that this organizing principle could be effective only within patrilineal kinship structures, some authors argue that, complementing the *zong fa*, principalities ruled by lineages of other surnames were included in the Zhou geopolitical structure by means of marital alliances.¹⁵⁸ However, these assumptions are usually supported by examples in the *Chunqiu* and *Zuo zhuan*. These texts provide abundant evidence corroborating that during the Spring and Autumn period marital alliances were regularly concluded between ruling lineages of principalities and represented an important political factor.¹⁵⁹ Although transmitted texts contain very little

156. See Krjukov, *Formy social'noj organizacii*, 60–69 with further references, also Creel, *The Origins of Statecraft*, 303.

157. In Early China, patrilineal lineages represented conical structures, with the line of direct descendants of the lineage's founder as the “trunk” and the lines founded by the founder's brothers or by other lineage members in the next generations as “branches.” The head of the “trunk” acted as the chief sacrificer in rituals dedicated to their oldest common ancestors on behalf of the whole structure. Accordingly, in terms of ritual, the “branches” were subordinated to the “trunk.” This principle of the regulation of hierarchical relationships within lineages is referred to as *zong fa*. The ritual authority of the lineage's head legitimated his political authority. Thus, lineages/principalities taking their source in the Zhou royal house were subordinated to the king as the head of their “trunk” both ritually and politically.

158. E.g. Wang Guowei 王國維, “Yin Zhou zhidu yanjiu” 殷周制度研究 in *Wang Guowei xiansheng quanji* 王國維先生全集 (Taibei: Datong, 1976), 449–78; Li Yanong 李亞農, *Zhou zu de shizu zhi yu Toba zu de qian fengjian zhi* 周族的氏族制與拓跋族的前封建制 (Shanghai: Huadong renmin, 1954); Yang Kuan 楊寬, *Gu shi xin tan* 古史新探 (Beijing: Zhonghua, 1964), 166–96; Xu Zhuoyun 許卓允, *Xi Zhou shi* 西周史 (Taibei: Lianjing, 1984), 110, 152–59; Qian Zongfan 錢宗范, *Zhou dai zong fa zhidu yanjiu* 周代宗法制度研究, esp. 355–65; Yang Kuan 楊寬, *Xi Zhou shi* 西周史 (Shanghai: Shanghai renmin, 1999), 426–52; Ge Zhiyi 葛志毅, *Zhou dai fen feng yhidu yanjiu* 周代分封制度研究 (Haerbing: Heilongjiang renmin, 2004), 64–68; Zhang Guangzhi 張廣志, *Xi Zhou shi yu Xi Zhou wenming* 西周史與西周文明, ed. Meng Shikai 孟世凱 and Li Xueqin 李學勤 (Shanghai: Shanghai kexue jishu wenxian, 2007), 145–56; Cui Mingde 崔明德, *Xian Qin zhengzhi hunyin shi* 先親政治婚姻史 (Jinan: Shandong daxue, 2004).

159. For investigations into political marriage during the Spring and Autumn period Marcel Granet, *La polygamie sororale et le sororat dans la Chine féodale. Étude sur les formes anciennes de la polygamie chinoise* (Paris: Leroux, 1920); Thatcher, “Marriages of the Ruling Elite”; Vogelsang, “Mit den Waffen der Frauen”; Xu

footnote continued on next page

information about marital alliances during the Western Zhou period, the situation in the Spring and Autumn period is often simply projected onto the past. Considering this methodological flaw, Western publications manifest more reserved attitudes to kinship and marriage as constituents of the Western Zhou political system. Especially, Herrlee G. Creel explicitly warned against transferring the Spring and Autumn example to the Western Zhou period, for which, in his view, there is not enough evidence of the importance of the “extended family,” *zong fa*, and of intermarriages between ruling houses of principalities.¹⁶⁰ Instead, Creel supported the feudal interpretation of Zhou China, which long remained dominant in Western scholarship.¹⁶¹ According to the “feudalist” model, the rulers, including both members and non-members of the Ji surname community, accepted the terms of subordination to the king in the course of investiture ceremonies, and entered into a kind of personal contract with the king, similar to the oath of fealty in medieval Europe. Other scholars suggest that in Zhou China, feudalism was not an alternative to, but incorporated the *zong fa*.¹⁶² As Hsu and Linduff have argued, “the combination of contractual and personal bonds through family ties between the *zong fa* units was peculiar to the Zhou version” of feudalism.¹⁶³ However, ceremonies reflected in Western Zhou bronze inscriptions, regarded by earlier scholars as investitures of feudal lords, in most cases have been later recognized as appointments of officials in the Zhou metropolitan areas, whereas inscriptions testifying about appointments of principalities’ rulers are extremely scarce.¹⁶⁴ The

Jieling 徐傑令, *Chunqiu bangjiao yanjiu* 春秋邦交研究 (Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue, 2004), 198–221 with further references on p. 11; Xu Jieling 徐傑令, “Chunqiu shiqi lianyin dui bangjiao yingxiang” 春秋时期聯姻对邦交的影響, *Dongbei Shida Xuebao* (zhexue shehui kexue ban) 2004.1, 56–62.

160. See Creel, *The Origins of Statecraft in China*, 346, 375–83, 209–11.

161. For “feudal” interpretations, see Otto Franke, “Zur Beurteilung des chinesischen Lehenswesens,” *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 31 (1927), 359–77; Marcel Granet, *La féodalité chinoise* (Oslo: H. Aschehoug & Co., 1952), 1–64; Henri Maspero, “Le régime féodal et la propriété foncière dans la Chine antique,” in *Mélanges posthumes sur les religions et l’histoire de la Chine III* (Paris: Musée Guimet, 1950), 114–16; Wolfram Eberhard, *History of China* (Abingdon: Routledge, 1950), 24–26; Creel, *The Origins of Statecraft*, 317–87; Hsu Cho-yun and Katheryn M. Linduff, *Western Chou Civilization* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988), 147–85; Vasil’ev, *Dreivnij Kitaj. Tom I*, 257–67.

162. See Vasil’ev, *Dreivnij Kitaj. Tom I*, 268–71; Hsu and Linduff, *Western Chou Civilization*, 185.

163. See Hsu and Linduff, *Western Chou Civilization*, 185.

164. See Virginia C. Kane, “Aspects of Western Chou Appointment Inscriptions: The Charge, the Gifts, and the Response,” *Early China* 8 (1982–83), 14–28.

latter were commissioned by Ji-surnamed *zhuhou*, which speaks for the existence of the *zong fa*, but is not sufficient to corroborate “feudalism.” As Li Feng rightly notes, these inscriptions do not document anything comparable to the oath of fealty, and, therefore, a “feudo-vassalic institution” was lacking in Early China.¹⁶⁵ Sharply rejecting the “feudal” interpretation of Zhou China,¹⁶⁶ Li Feng acknowledges kinship, the ancestral cult, and the *zong fa* order as organizing principles in Zhou society, and suggests understanding the Western Zhou political organization as a “delegatory kin-ordered settlement state.”¹⁶⁷

Acknowledging patrilineal kinship, ancestral worship, and *zong fa* as main factors of integration leaves open the question as to how the Zhou kings regulated their relationships with members of their network that did not belong to their patrilineal kin.¹⁶⁸

Both “feudalists” and their critics believe that the ability of the Zhou king to apply violence guaranteed the integrity of the Zhou network. Many scholars regard the fourteen *shi* 師 mentioned in a number of inscriptions as royal “standing armies.” Some authors assume that the *shi*, located in the royal metropolitan areas in Shaanxi and Henan provinces, represented a major force that protected principalities from external threats.¹⁶⁹ Others suppose that the *shi* were capable of suppressing any disobedience of the network’s members.¹⁷⁰ However, it is doubtful whether or not, in the absence of a system of regular taxation, large standing armies could be properly supported. The designation *shi shi* 師氏, “captains’ lineages,” appearing in many inscriptions, indicates that the *shi* were in fact lineages entrusted with defence of the Zhou

165. Ulrich Lau has suggested avoiding the term “feudalism” because of its haziness and ambiguity, at the same time recognizing the existence of “Lehen” (fief, or feud) as a form of land transfer (see Ulrich Lau, *Quellenstudien zur Landübergabe und Bodenübertragung in der westlichen Zhou-Dynastie (1045?–771 v. Chr.)*, Monumenta Serica Monograph Series 41 (Sankt Augustin: Monumenta Serica, 1999), 42–43). For other arguments against “feudalism” see Cook, “Wealth and the Western Zhou,” 282–90.

166. Li Feng, “‘Feudalism’ and Western Zhou China: A Criticism,” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 63 (2003), 115–44, esp. 122–24 and 142.

167. See Li, *Bureaucracy and the State*, 294–98.

168. Li Feng has agreed that mutual visits and marriage relationships “were above all significant probably as a strategy adopted by the Zhou court to reassert influence over peripheral regions” (see Li, *Landscape and Power*, 111–13, 138). Unfortunately, no particular evidence in support of the abovementioned arguments has been discussed in this book. In his next book, Li does not discuss interstate marital alliances as a means of political regulation (see Li, *Bureaucracy and the State*).

169. See Vasil’ev, *Dreivnj Kitaj. Tom I*, 264.

170. See Creel, *The Origins of Statecraft*, 101, 301, 305–10; Li, “‘Feudalism’ and Western Zhou China,” 136–39.

metropolitan areas.¹⁷¹ The size and the might of the *shi* represent hypothetical values and are possibly overestimated.¹⁷² Even if the metropolitan *shi*, controlled by the king, sometimes participated in campaigns in distant regions, Zhou principalities recruited their own warriors. They supported the king in military campaigns or, as the example in the *Hai gui* quoted above demonstrates, led such campaigns on their own.¹⁷³ Zhou kings relied heavily on the cooperation of principalities' rulers, and would have hardly been able to quash any ruler's rebellion by setting forth the royal *shi* without support from other principalities.¹⁷⁴

If the king's own forces were limited, the network of patrilineally related Ji-principalities could, theoretically, jointly exercise pressure on non-Ji members of the Zhou network. It is noteworthy that Jiang-surnamed Qi, Ji, Xu, and Shen, Zi 子-surnamed Song 宋, and Gui-surnamed Chen neighbored Ji-surnamed principalities Lu, Cheng, Ying,

171. See Khayutina, "The Tombs of the Rulers of Peng," forthcoming.

172. For criticism see Raimund Theodor Kolb, *Die Infanterie im Alten China. Ein Beitrag zur militärgeschichte der Vor-Zhan-Guo-Zeit* (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1991), 141–43.

173. See Krjukov, *Formy social'noj organizacii*, 73–74; Lau, *Quellenstudien*, 161; Lewis, *Sanctioned Violence*, 35; Li, *Bureaucracy and the State*, 264–68.

174. Edward Shaughnessy and Li Feng regard the *Shi Shi gui* 師史簋 (*Jicheng* 4218, Zhangjiapo, Fengxi, Shaanxi, Middle to Late Western Zhou) as evidence of a punitive campaign launched by a Zhou king (supposedly King Yi) into the territory of a Qi principality (see Shaughnessy, "Western Zhou History," 329; Li, *Landscape and Power*, 98–99). This inscription records a king's command to Shi Shi "to pursue in Qi" (追于齊), but not to "attack Qi." The construction *zhui yu*, "to pursue in" suggests that Qi is a place name, but not the object of pursuit, which would be introduced by the verb *zhui* without a preposition (compare with 公追戎于濟西 in the *Chun qiu*). Similar constructions appear in bronze inscriptions (e.g. 王令我羞追于西, "the king commanded us to humiliate [the enemies] and to pursue [them] in the west"). In the latter example, a previous sentence makes clear that the action was directed against the Xianyun 玁狁 who attacked Western Yu 西俞, whereas the object of pursuit in the *Shi Shi gui* remains unclear (which is not untypical for bronze inscriptions that often suggest the readers' context awareness). Possibly, it is related to the *Shi Yuan gui* 師袁簋 (*Jicheng* 4313, Middle to Late Western Zhou), according to which Yi of Huai River attacked eastern principalities (*dong guo* 東國). The king commanded Shi Yuan to lead the royal *huchen* 虎臣 warriors with whom he had to reinforce the defence of Qi garrison (*Qi shi* 齊師), as well as of Ji and of three other Shandong principalities. Possibly, Shi Shi had to join the same party. In any case, the evidence for the king's attack on Qi is too thin. In another case, recorded in the *Bamboo Annals*, King Yi boiled alive Lord Ai of Qi 齊哀侯 for an unknown reason. However, this happened as the king gathered the rulers of principalities (王致諸侯, see *Jin ben zhu shu ji nian*, Yi: 3, p. 254). This example demonstrates that the king was able to apply violence against another ruler, but it appears that the king acted on his own territory and, most likely, given the agreement of other rulers.

and Cai respectively. Still, the Jī did not necessarily always dictate conditions to the rulers of Jiang-surnamed principalities. If the *zong fa* was an organizing principle not only within the Jī, but also in other surname communities, Jiang-surnamed principalities located at a close distance from one another in Shandong and in Henan could cooperate in order to defend their common interests.¹⁷⁵ In cases of tenseness, peripheral non-Jī principalities could forge a friendship with non-Zhou peoples and rebel against the Zhou, as actually happened in 771 B.C. E., when the ruler of Shen rebelled and borrowed support from the Quanrong, who finally crushed the Western Zhou dynasty. This demonstrates how fragile the stability of Zhou peace was. Coercion could not suffice to keep non-Jī-surnamed principalities within the Zhou political network. Rather, the latter remained with the Jī not because of fear of punishment, but because of benefits from cooperation.

As an alternative to coercion, gift-giving, especially donations of prestige objects by the Zhou king, is sometimes regarded as a significant factor in integration in Western Zhou society and politics.¹⁷⁶ Indeed, inscriptions commemorate royal gifts more often than the military achievements of their commissioners. Attempting a general theory of the development of “archaic states,” political anthropologist Stephan Breuer classifies Western Zhou together with a number of other ancient political systems under the category of “prestige-goods” states, which he regards as an evolutionary stage between “conical clan” and “urban territorial” states. According to Breuer, in “conical clan states” members of one kinship group monopolized power; in “prestige goods states,” the privileged lineage opened the way for political participation to non-kin associates by the use of gifts, including insignia and luxury items, as a kind of “political currency” that could be converted into status, alliances, and loyalty.¹⁷⁷ Breuer’s concept of the “prestige goods state” is applicable to the territories in Shaanxi and

175. The *Shi Yuan gui* reflects a case of military cooperation between Qi and Ji (Jicheng 4313, Middle to Late Western Zhou). The *Chunqiu* records a number of meetings organized by Qi in which Xū participated. Possibly, cooperation between Qi, Ji, and Xu was based on their membership in the Jiang *zong fa* structure.

176. See Vasilij Mikhajlovich Krjukov, *Ritualnaja komunikacija v drevnem Kitae* [Ritual Communication in Ancient China] (Moscow-Taibei: Institut Vostokovedenija RAN, 1997), esp. 252–58. Cf. also Cook, “Wealth and the Western Zhou.”

177. See Stefan Breuer, *Der archaische Staat. Zur Soziologie charismatischer Herrschaft* (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, 1990), 160 with ref. to Chang Kwang-chih, *Art, Myth and Ritual: The Path to Political Authority in Ancient China* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983).

central Henan under the direct rule of the Zhou king, but not for the Western Zhou political network as a whole.

Elsewhere I have suggested analytically distinguishing between the royal metropolitan territories as the “smaller Zhou kingdom,” on one hand, and the “larger Zhou polity” including principalities, on the other hand (cf. [Map 1](#)).¹⁷⁸ The former was gradually consolidating territorially, politically and administratively, thus heading towards a centralized state (although this process was not accomplished until the crisis of 771 B.C.E.). I’m not yet convinced whether the latter was even conceived as a centralized state, as most evidence supporting the existence of such a concept at the beginning of the Western Zhou period is based either on post-Western Zhou transmitted literature, or on interpretations of the rhetoric of some of the bronze inscriptions. Not qualifying as a “state,” the “larger Zhou polity,” or, better put, political network, nevertheless existed as a political agglomeration centered on the Zhou king. Within the “smaller kingdom,” the power of the king was strong and he was recognized as the sovereign. There, royal officials gathered power in their hands, and royal gifts were used as practical instruments for recruiting people into service, rewarding them for their loyalty, and encouraging competition for closer access to the king.¹⁷⁹ Inscriptions from principalities confirm that on the local level, dominated by local rulers, the situation was similar.¹⁸⁰ However, only very few inscriptions commissioned by rulers of principalities commemorate royal gifts, and, just as in the case of “investiture” inscriptions, their commissioners belonged to the Ji surname community.¹⁸¹ Even if some inscribed vessels made by rulers of major non-Ji-surnamed principalities, such as Qi and Ji, have been found, they do not

178. These territories were referred to in traditional historiography as the “royal domain” *wang ji* 王畿. For the discussion see Khayutina, “Royal Hospitality and Geopolitical Constitution,” 37–38.

179. Cf. Krjukov, *Ritualnaja komunikacija*; Cook, “Wealth and the Western Zhou;” Kane, “Aspects of Western Chou Appointment Inscriptions;” Li Feng, “Succession and Promotion: Elite Mobility during the Western Zhou,” *Monumenta Serica* 52 (2004): 1–35.

180. This is manifested in inscriptions commemorating gifts donated by local rulers to their subordinates, e.g. in Xing (*Mai yi* 麥彝, *Jicheng* 9893, Early Western Zhou), or Ji (*Ji hou di ding* 紀侯弟鼎, *Jicheng* 2638, Late Western Zhou).

181. See e.g. *Mai zun* 麥尊 (*Jicheng* 6015, Early Western Zhou); *Ying hou Shigong zhong* 應侯視工鐘 (*Jicheng* 107, Late Western Zhou); *Guo ji Zibo pan* 虢季子白盤 (*Jicheng* 10173, Guochuan 虢川, Baoji, Shaanxi, Late Western Zhou). The standard example of the investiture of a regional lord accompanied by gifts, the Ode “Han yi” 韓奕 in the *Shi jing*, also reflects the relationship between the Zhou king and a Ji-surnamed regional lord (see *Shi jing quan shi*, “Han yi,” 537–40).

mention royal gifts. Marcel Granet, who emphasized prestige as “the principle of feudal cohesion” in his study of “Chinese feudalism,” warned that there was no universal standard with which “prestige goods” could be evaluated, but only local and temporary ones. He underlined that the value of things depended on the virtue of their donor or owner, and that things changed their value as a result of the transfer.¹⁸² The absence of commemorations of royal gifts in inscriptions of non-Jī-surnamed rulers indicates that they did not volunteer to adjust their own prestige on the scale established by the king. Therefore, royal gifts were not universally valid as a “political currency” in the frame of the Western Zhou political network, and Breuer’s interpretation of the latter as a “prestige-goods state” does not hold.

Both models regarding coercion or distribution of prestige goods as factors of integration in the Western Zhou network presume that as long as the Zhou royal house was strong, it functioned as a node to which all members of its geopolitical network were radially connected. Later on, the weakness of the central power, unable to dispatch armies or to bestow gifts, caused the disintegration of this radial network. The new situation called forth the intensification of both violence and diplomatic exchange among individual principalities, which now organized themselves in decentralized, concurrent networks. However, the loss of military strength by the king in 771 B.C.E. did not cause the collapse of the whole political system, and it was quickly restored with a new Zhou king at its center. Also, the limitation on the king’s ability to distribute gifts after the loss of his material base in Shaanxi did not change much in his relationships with rulers of principalities. These facts signal that the Zhou kings’ ability to apply coercion or to distribute gifts were not the main integrative factors in the Western Zhou political network, and, moreover, that the strength of the royal house was not alone responsible for holding together the Zhou political system. Therefore, it is necessary to look more closely at other factors of integration in the Zhou geopolitical network. As both inscriptional evidence discussed in this article and archaeological investigations of several past decades demonstrate, marital alliances between ruling elites of principalities played a greater role than previously acknowledged in Western scholarship and represented an important integrative factor in Zhou China.

Excavations of tombs in cemeteries of principalities attest to the privileged status of rulers’ spouses as “tokens of interlineage association”

182. See Granet, *La féodalité chinoise*, 11, 105.

starting from the early Western Zhou period.¹⁸³ Most inscriptions on bronze vessels commissioned by rulers of principalities either identified themselves as rulers, or were made for their wives or daughters, and, therefore, also served to strengthen interlineage associations. The cases of Diao *sheng* and Rong *sheng* demonstrate that spouses of lineage heads or principality rulers, possibly backed by their patrilineal relatives, could actively interfere in the affairs of their husbands' houses. The cases of Liao *sheng*, Hai, and Rong *sheng* show that affinal relatives provided military or political assistance to each other. In general, the numerous female- and *sheng*-related inscriptions in the *Jicheng* corroborate that, starting from the early Western Zhou period, marital alliances represented a substantial form of cooperation between the Zhou royal house and Zhou principalities, between principalities among themselves, and between the Zhou and various non-Zhou groups. Marital ties bound together the Western Zhou political network much more smoothly and effectively than the strength of arms or the splendor of royal gifts.

Inscriptions demonstrate that Zhou kings married outside of the smaller Zhou kingdom to women from other Zhou and non-Zhou principalities. This practice certainly had political effects. Successful marital policies allowed Zhou kings to secure their status as leaders in the Ji community and in their political network constructed across the borders of surname communities. By taking wives from such distant principalities as Qi, Ji, or Chen, they inhibited the "drifting-away"¹⁸⁴ of principalities, once defined as parts of the "larger Zhou polity" through conquest and colonization, but not bound to the center by administration or economy. Marrying women from "alien," non-Zhou principalities was, possibly, the most reliable means of securing peace on the Zhou borders. Attracting women from Zhou and non-Zhou principalities, Zhou kings constructed the king-centered network of marital relationships.¹⁸⁵ Married to members of the royal house and other aristocratic lineages in the western metropolitan area, women from distant and "alien" principalities embodied by their presence the coherence of the Zhou political network and harmony in its relationships with its environment. The organization of a betrothal, the passage of the bridal convoy through the territories of other principalities lying along its itinerary, the marriage ceremony in the royal palace and, possibly, subsequent visits by spouses to their native families offered many

183. See Falkenhausen, *The Chinese Society in the Age of Confucius*, 74–126.

184. For "drifting-away" of "regional states" see Li, *Landscape and Power*, 116–19.

185. For a graphic model of the king-centered network see Hsu and Linduff, *Western Chou Civilization*, 159.

opportunities for displaying royal authority and prestige and for controlling the fidelity of both Jī and non-Jī subordinates. To some extent, marital alliances between the Zhou royal house and the non-Zhou anticipated the institution of *he qin* 和親, “harmonious affinal relationships” of later epochs, adopted, in particular, by the Han 漢 Empire (202 B.C.E.–220 C.E.) in order to achieve peaceful coexistence with the Xiongnu 匈奴.¹⁸⁶

It is often assumed that rulers of principalities intermarried mostly with local elites within principalities, thus contributing to the political and cultural unity within the latter.¹⁸⁷ Inscriptions demonstrate that already during the Western Zhou period, marital alliances were established across the borders between the ruling lineages of individual Zhou principalities, and between the latter and various non-Zhou principalities without mediation of the king. As a result, various decentralized networks of affinal relationships were created. The king-centered and the decentralized marital networks complemented each other over a long period of time. The fact that the Zhou commonwealth did not fall apart after the crisis experienced by the Zhou royal house in 771 B.C.E. points to the substantial significance of decentralized networks constructed, among others, by means of interstate marriages for the stability of the Zhou political system. During the Spring and Autumn period, ruling houses of principalities did not need to invent a new strategy to withstand the political collapse resulting from the weakening of the royal house, but maintained the already long established policy.

Re-acknowledgment of the significance of interstate, trans-regional marital alliances in early Chinese geopolitical processes also invites us to reconsider the significance of affinal relationships between lineages below the level of principalities. Although the organization of Chinese lineages was based on the principles of patrilineality and patriarchy, the explicit designations of members of high elites as *sheng* show that benefitting from affinal relationships received social approval. Each new marriage signified not only the recruitment of women as sexual partners, mothers, educators of children, labor force, assistants in the ancestral cult, etc., but also the establishment of durable interlineage relationships where men connected through women could engage in various common enterprises. Shifting the focus from *the* lineage to a network of lineages connected to each other by affinal ties and mutually reproducing, or connected through

186. On the *he qin* policies, see Yang Mingzhu 閻明恕, *Zhongguo gudai he qin shi* 中國古代和親史 (Guizhou: Guizhou minzu, 2003).

187. See Hsu and Linduff, *Western Chou Civilization*, 159; Vasil'ev, *Drevnij Kitaj. Tom I.*, 265, 270–71.

each other to third parties may be productive for studying interactions in early Chinese society.¹⁸⁸ For instance, horizontal ties between metropolitan lineages in the small Zhou kingdom, strengthened by intermarriages, facilitated cooperation within the local aristocracy, but also split it into different factions and allowed some groups to place themselves in opposition to the royal power. Not by chance, in 841 B.C.E., only ten years after the events referred to in Diao *sheng's* inscriptions, the metropolitan nobility was able to unite and to expel King Li. Similar processes also took place in principalities during the Spring and Autumn period.

As inscriptions commissioned by *sheng* demonstrate, being an affinal relative of the royal Zhou, large principalities, or of strong metropolitan lineages was associated with considerable prestige, especially for members of weaker or peripheral principalities and lineages. Vice versa, for the aristocracy from the metropolitan areas or Zhou principalities, having marital connections with distant and exotic non-Zhou aliens was also a matter of prestige. This means that the standing of individuals or their lineages was not fixed by patrilineal descent alone, but could be negotiated and modified through, among other ways, marital relationships with other lineages. It is important to recognize that there was neither a single source (e.g. Zhou king) nor a single standard of prestige. Various representations of prestige were possibly behind different marital policies practiced by lineages or principalities. In particular, bronze inscriptions show that the Zhou royal house and other Ji-surnamed lineages favored diversity and constructed wide, inclusive affinal networks. In contrast, Jiang-surnamed lineages maintained preferential partnership with the Ji, probably seeking to preserve the aristocratic purity of their line and hoping for better marriage chances for their daughters. With the passage of time, the choice of marital policy, possibly, decided whose kinship network would achieve political domination. The exclusive policy of the Jiang brought them expected results in Shandong, where the ruling house of Qi was able to regularly establish principal wives in Lu and, finally, achieved domination over Lu and other Ji-surnamed neighbors during the Spring and Autumn period. The same policy was less

188. For case studies see Edward L. Shaughnessy, "Toward a Social Geography of the Zhouyuan during the Western Zhou Dynasty. The Jing and Zhong Lineages of Fufeng County," in *Political Frontiers, Ethnic Boundaries, and Human Geographies in Chinese History*, ed. Nicolas Di Cosmo and Don J. Wyatt (London and New York: Routledge, 2003), 16–34; Chen Zhaorong 陳昭容, "Cong qingtongqi mingwen kan liang Zhou Han-Huai diqu hunyin guanxi" 從青銅器銘文看漢淮地區婚姻關係, *Lishi yuyan yanjiusuo jikan* 75.4 (2004), 635–97.

successful in other places where Ji lineages had a greater number of neighbors with different surnames, and where the Jiang were not continuously able to place their daughters as principal wives. Avoiding giving their daughters to non-Ji-surnamed lineages, the Jiang had fewer opportunities to recruit new allies from other surname communities, and, therefore, they cemented their secondary role in the Zhou network.

金文所見婚姻聯盟與婚戚(甥與婚購)及其在周代社會政治中之地位

夏玉婷

摘要

兩周數百件帶銘文的青銅器是為或被婦女訂鑄的。此外，數十件銘文的鑄造者自稱某族的“生”（“甥”）。先秦文獻裡的“甥”字表銘以下數種姻親關係：姑之子、舅之子、妻之舅（弟）、姊妹之夫、姊妹之子或女兒之子等。與婦女或某甥有關銘文的出現時間甚長、其地理的分布甚廣，可見婚姻聯繫在中國古代社會和政治中具有重要性。專為“婚購”而鑄造的銅器銘文也指出此事實。

本文以與某甥有關的銘文為中心，建議婚姻關係可以激發雙方氏族或邦國間男性成員間的相互義務。因此姻戚關係成為社會與政治的資本，可用以提高個人事業成就及聲譽，並可增進其氏族邦國之福利。總之，筆者認為邦國之間的聯昏制度為古代中國政治系統中的基本因素之一。自西周初起，婚姻聯盟一方面有助於鞏固以周王為中心的“星形政治網絡”，另一方面也有利于“分散政治網絡”的建設。後者可以——儘管中心的虛弱——保證全系統的穩定性，使得周朝可以通過許多危機，而周系政治網絡不但未崩潰、反而繼續擴張。

Keywords: Zhou China, marital alliances, political networks, bronze inscriptions

周代, 婚姻聯盟, 政治網絡, 青銅器銘文