

E in the *Zuozhuan* and the *Xinian*:

A New Understanding of the Eastward Evacuation of the Zhou Royal House

Jae-hoon Shim (Dankook University)

The recent publications of the Tsinghua Bamboo Slips 清華簡 shed new light on understanding the intellectual history of the Warring States period. It is especially intriguing to note that the *Xinian* 繫年 in the second volume of the series¹ provides a different understanding the contemporary Chu 楚 people may have had regarding the so-called eastward evacuation (*dongqian* 東遷) of the Zhou 周 royal house. As for the evacuation, the authoritative transmitted texts such as the *Shiji* 史記 and *Zhushu jinian* 竹書紀年 have for long established a paradigm of “the killing of King You 幽王 in 771 B.C. in the metropolitan Shaanxi and the following eastward movement of King Ping 平王 to the present-day Luoyang area in 770 B.C.” This has in turn inscribed the year 770 B.C. as the turning point between the Western Zhou and the Eastern Zhou periods. But what the newly uncovered bamboo text inform us is that the entire process of the evacuation was not that simple.

Introducing the controversial issues concerning the evacuation in the *Xinian*, this study will focus mostly on the problematic place name Shao E 少鄂, where, according to the text, King Ping is said to have stayed for a while until Lord Wen of Jin 晉文侯 brought him

¹ Qinghua daxue chutu wenxian yanjiu yu baohu zhongxin 清華大學出土文獻研究與保護中心 ed., *Qinghua daxue zang Zhanguo zhushu (er)* 清華大學藏戰國竹書(貳), (Shanghai: Zhongxi shuju, 2011).

back to the capital region and enthroned him there. This will on one hand lead us to have a new understanding of the eastward evacuation, while on the other illuminating how traditional Chinese historical geography often conflicts with that of the paleographic sources.

The *Xinian* is composed of 138 bamboo slips of Chu (*Chujian* 楚簡) among the total number of about 2,500 Tsinghua bamboo slips. Written from the perspective of the Chu people, the 23 chapters of the text narrate a brief annalistic history from the Western Zhou to the Warring States periods. Although the title is missing in the text, the compilers found similarities in the chronological arrangement with that of the *Zhushu jinian* and thus designated it with the title *Xinian* or Consecutive Annals. Because the last ruler mentioned in the 23rd chapter of the text is King Dao of Chu 楚悼王 (r. 401-381 B.C.), they suggest that the bamboo text was produced in the following reigns of either King Su 肅王 (r. 380-370 B.C.) or King Xuan 宣王 (r. 369-340 B.C.).² The radiocarbon date of the text, 305±30 B.C., also largely corresponds to this supposition.³

Unlike the compilers, however, some scholars pay attention to the topically arranged (*jishi benmo* 紀事本末) nature of the *Xinian*, in which, despite the perspective from the Chu, the history of other states is mentioned by subjects as well. Because the text also contains the narratives of many people, Chen Wei 陳偉 rather relates the text to the *Zuozhuan* 左傳 and the *Guoyu* 國語. He further notes its resemblance with the *Duoshi wei* 鐸氏微, the

² Qinghua daxue chutu wenxian yanjiu yu baohu zhongxin ed., *Qinghua daxue zang Zhanguo zhushu (er)*, p. 135.

³ Zhao Ping'an 趙平安, "Chuju de xingzhi zuozhe ji xiezuo niandai" 楚居的性質,作者及寫作年代, *Qinghua daxue xuebao* 清華大學學報 (zhexue shehuikexue ban) 4 (2011): 33.

abbreviated version of pre-Qin texts such as the *Zuozhuan*, mentioned in the “Shier zhuhou nianbiao” 十二諸侯年表 of the *Shiji* by Duo Jiao 鐸椒 for the sake of his sovereign, King Wei of Chu 楚威王 (r. 339-335 B.C.).⁴

The contents in the *Xinian* generally correspond to those in the transmitted texts such as the *Zhushu jinian*, the *Zuozhuan* and the *Guoyu*. But some of them never find any matching statements in those texts. The eastward evacuation in the *Xinian* is indeed such a case, so that we first need to discuss how the text describes the event differently, bringing about heated debates among scholars.

Two controversial issues in the *Xinian*'s eastward evacuation

While the first four chapters of the *Xinian* relate the history of the Western Zhou, focusing on the decline of the royal house and the rise of the feudal states, the next nineteen chapters describe the history of the Spring and Autumn and part of the Warring States periods highlighting the struggle between Chu and Jin 晉 for the hegemon. The fall of the Western Zhou and the following eastward evacuation mentioned in the second chapter reads as follows:

周幽王取妻于西繡(申), 生坪(平)王=(王. 王)或取(取)孚(褒)人之女, 是孚(褒)忒(姒), 生白(伯)盤. 孚(褒)忒(姒)辟(嬖)于王=(王. 王)與白(伯)盤達(逐)坪=王=(平王, 平王)走西繡(申). 幽王起白(師), 回(圍)坪(平)王于西繡=(申, 申)人弗(畀),

⁴ Chen Wei 陳偉, “Qinghua daxue zang zhushu *Xinian* de wenxianxue kaocha” 清華大學藏竹書繫年的文獻學考察, *Shilin* 史林 2013 (1): 47-48.

曾(繪)人乃降西戎，以攻幽=王=(幽王，幽王)及白(伯)盤乃滅，周乃亡。邦君者(諸)正乃立幽王之弟奢(余)臣于鄴(號)，是囑(攜)惠王。立廿=(二十)又一年，晉文侯戡(仇)乃殺惠王于鄴(號)。周亡王九年，邦君者(諸)侯亥(焉)訖(始)不朝于周，晉文侯乃逆坪(平)王于少鄂，立之于京白(師)。三年，乃東遷(徙)，止于成周。晉人亥(焉)訖(始)啓于京白(師)，奠(鄭)武公亦政(正)東方之者(諸)侯。

King You of Zhou took his wife from Western Shen and gave birth to King Ping. He also took a lady from Bao, Bao Si, and gave birth to Bo Pan. Bao Si gained the favor of the king; the king and Bo Pan expelled King Ping so that King Ping went into exile at Western Shen. King You raised an army and besieged King Ping at Western Shen. But the people of Shen never gave him back. The people of Zeng then allied with the Western Rong to attack King You. King You and Bo Pan were killed at that time and the Zhou came to an end. Bangjun and Zhuzheng then established the younger brother of King You, Yuchen, at Guo. He is King Xiehui. In his twenty-first year, Lord Wen of Jin, Chou, killed King (Xie) Hui at Guo. There was no king in Zhou for nine years (*Zhou wangwang jiunian*). Then, Bangjun and Zhuhou for the first time did not have audiences at the Zhou court. Lord Wen of Jin then escorted King Ping from Shao E to establish him at the capital region. Three years (after the enthronement), (the king) then moved eastward and settled in Chengzhou. At that time, the people of Jin for the first time advanced into the capital region and Wu Gong of Zheng also became the head of the lords in the east.

The first half of the quotation does not contradict the records of the transmitted texts such as the *Shiji* and *Zhushu jinian*, but rather supplements them. That is to say, King You first got married to his first wife, who was from Western Shen (the daughter of Lord Shen 申侯 in

the transmitted texts), and who gave birth to King Ping (Yijiu 宜臼, the heir apparent, in the transmitted texts). However, because the king loved his concubine, Bao Si, he and her son Bo Pan (Bo Fu 伯服 in transmitted texts) expelled the heir apparent. After they attacked Western Shen, where the heir apparent was exiled, they were counterattacked by the allied forces of Shen, Zeng and the Western Rong. King You and Bo Pan were killed by the allied forces and the Zhou collapsed. Then, many local rulers established the younger brother of King You, Yuchen, as King Xiehui at Guo. But Lord Wen of Jin killed the king at Guo in his twenty-first year.⁵

However, after the death of King Xiehui, possibly in 750 B.C., the *Xinian* relates a story unknown so far regarding the enthronement and the eastward evacuation of King Ping. Based on the records of the *Shiji* and *Jinben Zhushu jinian* 今本竹書紀年, it has been generally acknowledged that King Ping was escorted by Lord Wen of Jin, Wu Gong of Zheng 鄭武公, Xiang Gong of Qin 秦襄公 and Wu Gong of Wei 衛武公 in his move eastward to Chengzhou in 770 B.C.⁶ Although the *Shiji* mentions that many lords went to Lord Shen's place to establish King Ping,⁷ the *Zhuhu jinian*, both the Ancient and Current editions, specifies that before the evacuation Lord Shen, Lord Lu 魯侯, and Wen Gong of Xu 許文公

⁵ *Xinian*'s story about King Xiehui supplements the related record in the *Zuozhuan* (Zhao 26) which just mentions the arrogation of King Xie 攜王 and the replacement with the heir apparent by many lords; Yang Bojun 楊伯峻, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu* 春秋左傳注 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju 1981), p. 1476.

⁶ *Shiji*, "Qin benji" 秦本紀 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1959), 5.179, "Wei shijia" 衛世家, 37.1591; *Zhushu jinian*, Sibuyao edition, 2.11b.

⁷ *Shiji*, "Zhou benji" 周本紀, 4.149.

enthroned him at Shen 申 (not Western Shen) in 771 B.C.⁸ As appears in the above quotation, however, the *Xinian* begins with a highly debatable passage stating that “there was no king in Zhou for nine years” (*Zhou wangwang jiunian*) before the enthronement of King Ping. And after that, Lord Wen of Jin is said to have escorted King Ping from Shao E to the capital region, probably in the present-day Xi’an area. Again, three years after the enthronement, King Ping is said to have moved eastward to Chengzhou.

Like many scholars,⁹ I believe my understanding of the problematic passage, “no king in Zhou for nine years after the death of King Xiehui,” is the most reasonable interpretation suitable for the context of the text. But if we follow this interpretation, the year Lord Wen of Jin enthroned King Ping is 741 B.C., which contradicts his reign years, 780-746 B.C., in the generally accepted chronology of the “Shier zhuhou nianbiao” of the *Shiji*. Thus, the compilers led by Li Xueqin 李學勤 suggest the king in the passage could instead be

⁸ *Zhushu jinian*, 2.12a; *Guben Zhushu jinian jijiao* 古本竹書紀年輯校, in *Wang Guowei yishu* 王國維遺書 12 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1983), 10b-11a. In the Current edition, Zhengzi 鄭子 is included. Since Huan Gong of Zheng was killed by the allied force led by Shen in the same passage, this might be a scribal mistake of Zeng 曾(鄭).

⁹ Liu Guozhong 劉國忠, “Cong Qinghua jian *Xinian* kan Zhouwang dongqian de xiangguan shishi” 從清華簡繫年看周王東遷的相關史實, in *Jianbo Jingtian gushi guoji luntan* 簡帛, 經典, 古史國際論壇 November 30, 2011 (Hong Kong); Chen Jian 陳劍 (Fudan daxue chutu wenxian yu guwenzi zhongxin dushuhui 復旦大學出土文獻與古文字中心讀書會), “Qinghua(er) taolun jilu” 清華(二)討論記錄, *Fudan daxue chutu wenxian yu guwenzi zhongxin wangzhan* 復旦大學出土文獻與古文字中心網站 December 12, 2011; Huadong shifan daxue zhongwen xi Zhanguojian dushu xiaozu 華東師範大學中文系戰國簡讀書小組, “Du Qinghua daxue zang Zhanguo zhushu (er), *Xinian* shu hou (yi)” 讀清華大學藏戰國竹書(貳), 繫年書後(一), Wuhan daxue jianbo yanjiu zhongxin jianbo wang 武漢大學簡帛研究中心 簡帛網 December 29, 2011; Yoshimoto Michimasa 吉本道雅, “Seikakan keinenkō” 清華簡繫年考, *Kyōto daigaku bungakubu kenkyū kiyō* 京都大學文學部研究紀要 52 (2013): 15; Wang Hui 王暉, “Chunqiu zaoqi Zhou wangshi wangwei shixi bianju kaoyi: jianshuo Qinghua jian *Xinian* ‘Zhou wang wang jiunian’” 春秋早期周王室王位世系變局考異: 兼說清華簡繫年周無王九年, *Renwen zazhi* 人文雜誌 2013 (5): 77-79.

King You (781-771 B.C.).¹⁰ If that is the case, the nine years after the King You's death, 762 B.C., match the reign years of Lord Wen of Jin.

However, the year 759 deduced from the alternative interpretation for the eastward movement in the *Xinian* still challenges the chronology of the *Shiji*, which puts it in 770 B.C. Thus, Wang Hongliang 王紅亮 takes the *wangwang* in the passage not as “no king” (*wuwang* 無王) but as “the ruined king” (*wangguo zhi jun* 亡國之君), which he believes is King You.¹¹ Because the ninth year of King You was 773 B.C., the eastward movement three years after the enthronement mentioned in the *Xinian* accords well with the 770 B.C. in the *Shiji* and *Zhushu jinian*.

Nevertheless, it is still difficult to accept the two alternative interpretations, which do not seem to be possible without interrupting the context of the text. The issue appears to have become a riddle among scholars who dare not suspect the legitimacy of the “Shier zhuhou nianbiao.” Whatever the real history of the transitional period was, however, it would be possible for the author(s) of the *Xinian* to have a different chronological understanding from that of the *Shiji*. If we follow the first interpretation, a new scenario for the evacuation could be proposed as follows: Due to King You's favor for Bao Si's son, Bo Pan, King Ping, the heir apparent, fled to his maternal grandfather's place, the Western Shen. Under the chaotic situation resulting from the killing of King You and Bo Pan by the allied forces led by Shen,

¹⁰ Qinghua daxue chutu wenxian yanjiu yu baohu zhongxin ed., *Qinghua daxue zang Zhanguo zhushu (yi)*, p.139; Li Xueqin 李學勤, “You Qinghuajian *Xinian* lun Wenhou zhi ming” 由清華簡繫年論文侯之命, *Yangzhou daxue xuebao* 揚州大學學報 (Renwen shihuikexue ban) 2013 (3): 50.

¹¹ Wang Hongliang 王紅亮, “Qinghuajian *Xinian* zhong Zhou Pingwang dongqian de xiangguan niandai kao” 清華簡繫年中周平王東遷的相關年代考, *Shixue shi yanjiu* 史學史研究 2012 (4): 103.

probably in 771 B.C. or later, King Ping sought another asylum and moved to an unknown place named Shao E. After the death of King You, many local rulers established the younger brother of King You, Yuchen, as King Xiehui at Guo, possibly the present-day Sanmenxia 三門峽 area, in 770 B.C. After the death of King Xiehui in 750 B.C., there was no king in Zhou for nine years. Thus, Lord Wen of Jin brought King Ping back from Shao E to the capital region in Shaanxi to enthrone him in 741 B.C. With the support from Lord Wen of Jin and Wu Gong of Zheng, the king eventually moved to the eastern capital, Chengzhou, in 738 B.C.

Needless to say, the sheer conflict with the chronology in the “Shier zhuhou nianbiao” makes it difficult for any scholars, including myself, to accept the new scenario without hesitation.¹² By the same token however, I wonder if Sima Qian’s chronology of the early Spring and Autumn period is indeed implicitly reliable. If one looks into the records in the *Shiji* about the reign of King Ping (770-720 B.C.), one can easily find it as a period of historiographical vacuum both in the “Zhou benji” 周本紀 and the “Shijia” 世家 of many feudal states. Although I do not and cannot solve the chronological disagreement between the *Shiji* and *Xinian* in this article, I do not think the inexplicability could depreciate the historiographical value of the eastward evacuation in the *Xinian*.

In this regard, I believe the newly occurred place name, Shao E, in the *Xinian* has significant implications in arguing that, in spite of the chronological discrepancy, the bamboo text does not necessarily contradict, but rather supplements (and compromises with) the transmitted texts such as the *Shiji* and *Zhushu jinian*. I further hope that King Ping’s stay at

¹² Wang Hui is the only scholar who accepts the chronology of the *Xinian* without hesitation. He proposes the following revised reign years after King You: King Xiehui (770-750 B.C.), Interregnum (749-741 B.C.), and King Ping (740-720 B.C.).

Shao E before his enthronement in the capital region may provide a clue for the chronological conflict as well.

However, there is no agreement about the location of Shao E. While most Chinese scholars accept the compiler's location of Xiangning prefecture 鄉寧縣, Shanxi 山西, about 130km northwest from the capital of Lord Wen of Jin at the Quwo 曲沃-Yicheng 翼城 area,¹³ there are a few scholars such as Yoshimoto Michimasa 吉本道雅 who try to situate it in the Nanyang 南陽 area, southern Henan 河南.¹⁴ In the following two chapters, I will provide a lengthy argument supporting the latter. This will not only discuss the unnoticed significance of the Nanyang region during the late Western Zhou and early Spring and Autumn periods, but also resolve the inconsistencies inherent in the transmitted texts such as the *Shiji* and the *Zhushu jinian* regarding the eastward evacuation. Let's begin with the record of the *Zuozhuan* that has been utilized by historians as the evidence of E 鄂 in the Xiangning area since the seventh century A.D.

E and Sui in the *Zuozhuan*

The *Zuozhuan*, *Shiji* and *Zhushu jinian* document the process of the sixty-seven year civil war (745-679 B.C.) in Jin following the death of Lord Wen, which was fought between the main lineage at Yi 翼 and the junior branch at Quwo 曲沃 (present-day Wenxi 聞喜).

¹³ Qinghua daxue chutu wenxian yanjiu yu baohu zhongxin ed., Qinghua daxue zang Zhanguo zhushu (yi), p. 139.

¹⁴ Yoshimoto, "Seikakan keinenkō," pp. 15-16; Laomen 老悶, "Xinian suo jian zhi Liang Zhou zhi ji 繫年所見之兩周之際, January 22, 2012, http://blog.sina.com.cn/s/blog_7108b3660100xlqp.html (accessed July 26, 2014).

The junior branch, originating from Huan Shu 桓叔 (Chengshi 成師), the younger brother of Lord Wen, dominated over the ruling house of Yi. Nevertheless, in the effort to maintain the order of the so-called *zongfa* 宗法, the nobility of Jin (*jinren* 晉人), with the help from the Zhou royal house, continuously supported the descendants of Lord Wen until King Li 釐王 (r. 681-671 B.C.) could not help but recognize the usurpation of the junior branch in 679 B.C.¹⁵

In the process of describing this power struggle, the name E 鄂 appears for the first time in the *Zuo zhuan*. In the second year of Huan Gong 桓公, the text says “in the 45th year of (Lu 魯) Hui (Gong) 惠公 (724 B.C.), Quwo Zhuang Bo 曲沃莊伯 attacked Yi and killed Xiao Hou 孝侯. The people of Yi established the younger brother (of Xiao Hou), E Hou 鄂侯.”¹⁶ Both the “Jin sjijia” 晉世家 of the *Shiji* and the *Zhushu jinian* also record the same incident in 724 B.C.¹⁷ It is safe to presume that a new lord posthumously titled E Hou was established in the ruling house of Jin at that time. Moreover, in 718 and 717 B.C., the *Zuo zhuan* records the two important place names, Sui 隨 and E, as follows:

[A] In the spring, Quwo Zhuang Bo together with the peoples of Zheng 鄭人 and Xing 邢人 attacked Yi. The King sent Yinshi 尹氏 and Wushi 武氏 to assist Yi,¹⁸

¹⁵ For the detailed process of the civil war based on the three texts, see Jae-hoon Shim, “The Early Development of the State of Jin: From Its Enfeoffment to the Hegemony of Wen Gong (r. 636-628 B.C.),” (Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Chicago, 1998), pp. 176-89.

¹⁶ Yang Bojun, *Chunqiu Zuo zhuan zhu*, p. 95.

¹⁷ *Shiji*, 39.1638; *Zhushu jinian* 2.13b.

¹⁸ Most scholars including Yang Bojun take the object the king assists (*zu zhi* 助之) in the previous sentence

and the lord of Yi fled to Sui. In the sixth month, Quwo rebelled against the king. In the autumn, the king commanded Guo Gong 虢公 to attack Quwo in order to establish Ai Hou 哀侯 at Yi (Yin 5, 718 B.C.).¹⁹

[B] In the spring, Jiafu 嘉父, the son of Qingfu 頃父 who was one of the nine ducal clans and five ministers of Yi, went to meet the lord of Jin at Sui and escorted him to E. The people of Jin called him E Hou (Yin 6, 717 B.C.).²⁰

In the [A], the junior branch at Quwo allied with Zheng and Xing in order to attack the main lineage at Yi, causing King Huan 桓王 (r. 719-697 B.C.) to send his subjects to assist the lord of Yi (E Hou enthroned in 724 B.C. following Xiao Hou). But E Hou could not help but flee to a place named Sui, probably with the help from the king. Faced with the rebellion of the Quwo branch, possibly due to his help for Yi, the king commanded Guo Gong to attack Quwo and established Ai Hou in the interregal ruling house of Yi. Ai Hou is said to have been the son of E Hou in the “Jin shijia” and *Zhushu jinian* (see note 17). Because the king had already established Ai Hou at Yi, [B] says that in the next year, Jiafu, an aristocrat of Yi

not as Yi but as Quwo Zhuang Bo with the peoples of Zheng and Xing. They seem to believe the pronoun *zhi* should be indicative of the subject of the previous sentence. I suspect this interpretation does not correspond with the contemporary historical situation, because King Huan, only two years after the death of King Ping, seems not to have supported the junior branch’s attack against the descendant of Lord Wen. Moreover, among about ten usages of *zhu zhi* in the *Zuozhuan*, at least the following case (Ai 11) is indicative of the object of the previous sentence: “In the battle at Ailing 艾陵 in 484 B.C., Guozi 國子 defeated Xumen Chao 胥門巢. Thus, the king’s army *zhu zhi*.” Yang Bojun takes Xumen Chao as the indicative of *zhu zhi* (*Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, p. 1663). Takeuchi Teruo 竹内照夫 is one of the few scholars I know of who propose the same interpretation with me; see his *Shunjū Sashi den* 春秋左氏傳, Zenshaku kanbun taikai 全釋漢文大系 (Tokyo: Shūeisha, 1983), p. 41.

¹⁹ Yang Bojun, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, p. 44-45.

²⁰ Yang Bojun, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, p. 49.

or perhaps the close associate of E Hou, visited Sui, the asylum of E Hou, to escort him to another place named E. Because the lord stayed at E for a while simultaneously with another lord, his son Ai Hou at Yi, the people of Jin called him E Hou.

As for the two place names, Sui and E, in the above citations, Du Yu 杜預 (222-284 A.D.) was the first who commented on “Jin’s area” (*jindi* 晉地) and “a separate town of Jin” (*Jin bieyi* 晉別邑), respectively.²¹ Since then, traditional Chinese scholars have tried to find the two places mostly in the Jin’s domain in southwestern Shanxi and concluded that they are two locations in present-day Jiexiu 介休, in the Fen River 汾河 valley and in present-day Xiangning 鄉寧 to the west of the Fen River, respectively (see notes 19, 20). This no doubt is what had led most Chinese scholars to situate the Shao E of the *Xinian* in Xiangning as well.

However, considering that Du Yu himself could not specify the two locations, as will be discussed in detail in the next chapter, it is doubtful we can accept as certainty the speculations traditional commentators have made for the whereabouts. It is in this regard interesting to note that both the “Jin shijia” and *Zhushu jinian* rather mention E Hou’s death in 718 B.C. instead of the exile to Sui.²² The relocation from Sui to E in the next year is also missing in the two texts. This may on the one hand reflect that the two texts relied on different sources from those of the *Zuozhuan*. However, because the *Shiji* cites the same

²¹ *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhengyi* 春秋左傳正義, Shisanjin zhushu 十三經注疏 edition, (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1980), 3.1727, 4.1731.

²² *Shiji* 39.1639; *Zhushu jinian*.

passages documented in the *Zuozhuan* many times,²³ Sima Qian might have been aware of the story about the exile of E Hou at Sui and E. However, given that the two place names documented in the *Shiji* are mostly located in the Hubei 湖北 area near the Chu state, Sima Qian, who like Du Yu understood the incident occurred only in the Jin's domain, may have purposely disregarded the sources on the exile.

However, there are two questions about the locations in Shanxi. First, whether Sui and E were indeed located in Shanxi in 718-717 B.C. or not, and whether it is possible to consider the present-day Jiexiu and Xiangning areas, about 200km and 130km respectively from the Jin's base in the Quwo-Yicheng area, as part of Jin during the period. In the wars against Tiao 條 and Qianmu 千畝, both of which are also commentated as "Jin's area" by Du Yu, during the late Western Zhou period,²⁴ it was still not Mu Hou of Jin 晉穆侯 but King Xuan 宣王 who had the initial command for the battles in Shanxi. It was not until the early to middle seventh century B.C., and only after the usurpation of the Quwo junior branch, that the state of Jin began to expand its territory in southwestern Shanxi.²⁵ Du Yu's comments of "Jin's area" thus must have been made retrospectively. There is just no clear evidence of Xiangning and Jiexiu being controlled by or having friendly relations with the state of Jin during the time of E Hou's exile.

Second, the attack of Quwo against the main lineage at Yi in 718 B.C. mentioned in the above quotation of the *Zuozhuan* seems to have been more than just a civil war. If the

²³ Jin Dejian 金德建, *Sima Qian suo jian shu kao*, 司馬遷所見書考 (Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chubanshe, 1963), pp. 106-11.

²⁴ *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhengyi*, 5.1743; Yang Bojun, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, pp. 91-92.

²⁵ Shim, "The Early Development of the State of Jin," pp. 211-16.

peoples of Zheng and Xing who supported the Quwo branch were from the states of Zheng and Xing, they moved from present-day Xinzheng 新鄭, Henan and Xingtai 邢臺, Hebei, respectively, to the Quwo-Yicheng area. The distance between Xinzheng and Quwo-Yicheng is more than 350km; between Xingtai and Quwo-Yicheng it is even longer, more than 500km. The king's associates, Yinshi and Wushi, also moved at least 250km from the Luoyang area to support the ruling house of Yi. These alliances indicate that the scope contemporary polities could travel was much broader than generally assumed.

Several bronze inscriptions of the state of Jin also support this supposition. In the *Wei yan* 鞞 甗, reconstructed from the fragments recovered in the earliest tomb (M114) in the Beizhao 北趙 cemetery of the Jin lord, a Zhou king, possibly King Zhao 昭王, commands Wei to visit Fan 繁 to perform his duty.²⁶ Two inscriptions of the early Spring and Autumn period, the *Jinjiang ding* 晉姜鼎 and the *Rongsheng bianzhong* 戎生編鐘, also mention the military campaigns the two Jin people, Jin Jiang and Rongsheng, led against Fangtang 繁湯 or Fanyang 繁陽, possibly the same place Wei visited in the early Western Zhou period. There is no disagreement about the location of Fanyang in present-day Xincai 新蔡, southern Henan, on the north bank of the Ru River 汝水, which was on an important route between the Central Plain and southern states such as Chu.²⁷ The distance between the

²⁶ Sun Qingwei 孫慶偉, “Cong xinchu Weiyan kan Zhaowang nanzheng yu Jinhou Xiefu,” 從新出 鞞 甗看昭王南征與晉侯燮父, *Wenwu* 文物 2007 (1), pp. 64-68; Li Xueqin 李學勤, “Lun Weiyan ming ji Zhou Zhaowang nanzheng 論 鞞 甗銘及周昭王南征,” *Tongxiang wenming zhi lu* 通向文明之路 (Beijing: Shangwu yinshuguan, 2010), pp. 108-11.

²⁷ Sim Chaehun 沈載勳 (Jae-hoon Shim), “Yungsaeng p’yŏnjong kwa Chingangiŏng myŏngmun mit kŭ yŏksajŏk ūiui” 戎生編鐘斗 晉姜鼎 銘文 및 그 歷史的 意義, *Dongyang sahak yŏn’gu* 東洋史學研究 87 (2004): 26-28.

Quwo-Yicheng area to Xincal is more than 600km. The Jinhou Su *bianzhong* 晉侯蘇編鐘 and the Jinhou *tongren* 晉侯銅人 inscriptions also document the long-distance military expeditions led by Jin lords during the late Western Zhou period against the enemies in northwestern Shandong and the Huai River 淮水 valley, respectively.²⁸

Therefore, it is difficult to restrict discussion of the places of E Hou's exile, Sui and E, to only those in the Shanxi area. That all the occurrences of Sui as a place or polity name in the *Zuo zhuan*, except for that of the E Hou's exile, must have been situated in the Suizhou 隨州 area, Hubei, leads me to argue another possibility. In the next chapter, examining the origins of the Shanxi locations, we will see how groundless is the traditional commentators' search for Sui and E in Shanxi.

The problems of the Xiangning location and a new possibility

Scholars in the historical geography of early China have paid attention to the following two important points: First, certain place names in the transmitted texts can be identified with those in the paleographic sources; and second, a place name somehow could have traditionally been located in several different regions. As for the problematic place names, Sui and E, I will also focus on these two points. Because Sui does not have enough

²⁸ Jaehoon Shim, "The Jinhou Su *Bianzhong* Inscription and Its Significance," *Early China* 22 (1997): 48-58; Su Fanshu 蘇芳淑 and Li Ling 李零, "Jieshao yi jian youming de Jihou tongren" 介紹一件有銘的晉侯銅人, in Shanghai bowuguan ed, *Jinhou mudi chutu qingtongqi guoji xueshu yantaohui lunwenji* 晉侯墓地出土青銅器國際學術研討會論文集 (Shanghai: Shanghai shuhua chubanshe, 2002), pp. 411-13; Li Xueqin, "Jinhou tongren kaozheng" 晉侯銅人考證, *Zhongguo gudai wenming yanjiu* 中國古代文明研究 (Shanghai: Huadong shifan daxue chubanshe, 2005), pp. 120-21.

usages in the paleographic sources such as oracle bone and bronze inscriptions,²⁹ it is first necessary to examine the E 鄂(噩) that is identified in several bronze inscriptions of the Zhou period unearthed from the Suizhou area in Hubei and the Nanyang area in Henan. As many transmitted texts such as the “Chu shijia” 楚世家 of the *Shiji*, the “Dili zhi” 地理志 of the *Hanshu* 漢書, the “Jiangshui” 江水 of the *Suijing zhu* 水經注, etc. also mention the same place name in Hubei or Henan, it is in fact impossible to prove other locations either from textual or archaeological evidence. This might be the reason Du Yu in the third century could not specify the location of E in Shanxi, annotating it instead as “a separate town of Jin.”

It was the later commentators to the “Jin shijia” of the *Shiji* who began to specify the location of E in Shanxi. In the *Jijie* 集解 commentary, Pei Yin 裴駰 in the fifth century for the first time associates E with Tang 唐 by quoting the *Shiben* 世本 as “(Tang Shuyu 唐叔虞, the founder of Jin) resided in E (*ju E* 居鄂).” Tang is known as the place of the Shuyu’s enfeoffment. Pei Yin further cites Song Zhong 宋忠 (?-219) for his source in stating that “E was located in present-day Daxia 大夏.”³⁰ Because the place name Daxia is controversial (see below), even Pei Yin, a native of Wenxi, Shanxi, may still have not had a clear idea about the location of E in Shanxi. It was Zhang Shoujie 張守節 who eventually specified the Shanxi location during the late seventh century. In the *Zhengyi* 正義 commentary to the

²⁹ Recently, a bronze dagger with the inscription of “Sui da Sima” 隨大司馬 was unearthed from a cemetery of Zeng 曾 at Wenfengta 文峰塔, Suizhou (Hubeisheng wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo 湖北省文物考古研究所, “Hubei Suizhou wenfengta mudi kaogu fajue de zhuyao shouhuo 湖北隨州文峰塔墓地考古發掘的主要收穫 Jiang Han kaogu 江漢考古 2013 [1]: 5). This is the first paleographic evidence for the Sui during the Eastern Zhou period.

³⁰ *Shiji*, 39.1636.

location of Tang, he for the first time identifies E with Xiangning by quoting *Kuodi zhi* 括地志 as the “ancient wall of E 故鄂城 is at two kilometers to the east from Changning xian 昌寧縣 (present-day Xiangning), Cizhou 慈州.” Zhang further finds the alleged remains of mythical Yu’s 禹 capital Anyi 安邑 in the neighboring Xia xian 夏縣 so that he could accept the location of E in Daxia as well (see note 30). In the early eighth century Sima Zhen 司馬貞 even expands the idea in the *Suoyin* 索隱 commentary by saying that “Tang, originally a descendant of Yao 堯, was enfeoffed in the ruin of Xia 夏墟; its capital E was in present-day Daxia.”³¹

Therefore, after the *Shiben* for the first time associates E with Tang, Song Zhong locates the E in the Daxia area during the third century. Since then, following the *Kuodi zhi*’s location of E in Xiangning, the commentators of the Tang dynasty established the following framework: “E=the capital of Tang Yao=Daxia=Xiangning.” Historical geographers of the Qing dynasty such as Gao Shiqi 高士奇 (1645-1704) and Jiang Yong 江永 (1681-1762) also followed this identification.³²

However, the two key texts for the Shanxi location, the *Shiben* and *Kuodi zhi*, were lost a long time ago, so that it is difficult to trace the authenticity of the locations. Especially, as regards the *Shiben*, generally known as a text of the late Warring States period, it is important to note that Sima Qian never mentions anything about it in the *Shiji*. It was only the “Sima Qian zhuan” 司馬遷傳 of the *Hanshu* 漢書 that for the first time relates his

³¹ *Shiji*, 39.1635.

³² *Chunqiu diming kaolie* 春秋地名考略, Qinding siku quanshu 欽定四庫全書 edition, 4.6a; *Chunqiu dili kaoshi* 春秋地理考實, Qinding siku quanshu edition, 1.10b.

connection to the text as follows: “Sima Qian relied on the *Zuozhuan* and *Guoyu* and selected from the *Shiben* and *Zhaguo ce* 戰國策 to write the *Chu Han Chunqiu*.”³³ Although many scholars utilize this quotation to prove Sima Qian’s reliance on the *Shiben*, Qiao Zhizhong 喬治忠 and Tong Jie 童杰, understanding it from the perspective of the author, propose that the *Shiben* in the quotation is a text that did not yet exist in Sima Qian’s time but only later in Ban Gu’s 班固 (32-92 A.D.). Like the *Zhanguo ce*, which was produced through the compilation of Liu Xiang 劉向 (77-6 B.C.), they believe that Liu Xiang, based on the extant sources mentioned in the *Shiji* such as the *Dieji* 諫記, the *Lipu die* 曆譜諫 and the *Wudi xidie* 五帝世諫, created the *Shiben* as a newly edited collection of genealogical sources. However, due to its late composition, the value of the text as a historical source is not that high. Qiao and Tong point out that while the genealogies of the Shang and Zhou periods and thereafter are generally reliable, the so-called *dixi* 帝系, the genealogies of Huangdi 黃帝, Yao 堯 and Xun 舜, cannot be considered as trustworthy.³⁴

If the *Shiben* was indeed produced at the end of the Former Han dynasty, I suspect the dependability of the association of Tang, a descendant of Yao, with the capital E mentioned for the first time in the text.³⁵ It is in this regard interesting to note another Tang in the Suizhou area, Hubei during the Spring and Autumn period. According to the *Zuozhuan*

³³ *Hanshu*, 62.2737.

³⁴ Qiao Zhizhong 喬治忠 and Tong Jie 童杰, “Shiben chengshu niandai wenti kaolun” 世本成書年代問題考論, *Shixue jikan* 史學集刊 2010 (5): 39-45.

³⁵ Although in the “Dili zhi” of the *Hanshu* Hedong jun 河東郡, present-day southwestern Shanxi, is said to have been “Tang Yao’s 唐堯 original place” (*Hanshu*, 28xia.1648), the text never mention the association of E 鄂 with Tang 唐.

(Xuan 12, 597 B.C.), Hui Hou 惠侯 of the Tang state allied with King Zhuang 莊王 of Chu and participated in the war against the state of Jin.³⁶ In the “Zhengyu” 鄭語 of the *Guoyu*, Sui and Tang are mentioned together among the southern polities regarding the question about the putative asylums at the time of the Zhou disaster, the eastward evacuation.³⁷ There is no disagreement about the location of the southern Tang at Tangchengzhen 唐城鎮 near Suizhou.³⁸ As signified by many E related bronze vessels unearthed from Yangzishan 羊子山 and others (see below), E must have been one of the representative powers in the Suizhou area from the Western Zhou period.

This leads me to deduce a possibility that the association of Tang with E in the *Shiben* may have been derived from the neighboring Tang and E in the Suizhou area. Considering another ancient Tang state traditionally known as Tang xian 唐縣 of Dingzhou 定州 (present-day Hebei 河北),³⁹ there have been at least three ancient Tangs supposed so far, all of which are coincidentally related with Yao. However, in pursuit of the so-called the great unified (*dayitong* 大一統) genealogical system that emerged after the late Warring States period,⁴⁰ the association of Yao, Tang and E may have been mistakenly entangled.

³⁶ Yang Bojun, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, pp. 739-40.

³⁷ *Guoyu*, (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1988), 16.507.

³⁸ Chen Pan 陳槃, *Chunqiu dashibiao lieguo juexing ji cunmiebiao zhuanyi* 春秋大史表列國作姓及存滅表撰異, (Taipei: Academia Sinica, 1969), pp. 404-6.

³⁹ This Tang is considered as the first enfeoffment of Yao Di 堯帝 in the *Yuanhe junxian zhi* 元和郡縣志 (Qingdi Siku quanshu edition, 22.1b, 4b).

⁴⁰ Guo Yongbing 郭永秉, *Dixi xinyan: Chudi chutu Zhanguo wenxian zhong de chuanshuo shidai gudiwang xitong yanjiu* 帝系新研: 楚地出土戰國文獻中的傳說時代古帝王系統研究 (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2008), p. 163.

Thus, the contemporary authors of the genealogies or the *Shiben* may have proposed the existence of E in Shanxi because it was somehow supposed to be one of the legendary places of Yao and his descendant, Tang. This misconception could have led later scholars, such as the compilers of the *Kuodi zhi* in the early seventh century, to speculate that an ancient remain in the present-day Xiangning area was the site of E.⁴¹ In this respect, it is interesting to note that Zhang Shoujie, who first introduces the above *Kouidi zhi*'s location, on the other hand also points out the inconsistency of the association of Tang with E. He pays attention to the fact that in the “Jin shijia” Sima Qian locates Tang not to the west of the Fen River, where E (Xiangning) is situated, but to the east (see note 31). This indicates that *Kouidi zhi*'s location of E in Xiangning could not be accepted by contemporary scholars without hesitation.

It is coincidental to find that another important geographical text of the Tang dynasty, *Yuanhe junxian zhi* 元和郡縣志 by Li Jifu 李吉甫 (758-814), which must have relied on the *Kuodi zhi*, never mentions anything about E in the Changning xian of the Cizhou part. The history of Xiangning begins with “originally in Linfen xian 臨汾縣 in the Han,” suggesting it had been empty or unnoticed for the preceding periods. It just mentions the temple of Yu 禹廟 located 105 *li* 里 to the southwest of the prefecture.⁴² The earliest history even in the entire Cizhou part could be traceable to the seventh century B.C., when Yiwu 夷吾, a son of Jin Xian Gong 晉獻公 (676-651 B.C.), resided at Quyi 屈邑.⁴³ It goes without saying that nowhere in the *Yuanhe junxian zhi* is Shanxi associated with the

⁴¹ In the “Dili zhi” of the *Suishu* 隋書, which was compiled about the same time with the *Kuodi zhi* in 621, a mountain named Eshan 嵒山 began to appear in Changning xian (*Suishu*, Zhonghua shuju edition, 25.851).

⁴² *Yuanhe junxian zhi*, 15.11a-11b.

⁴³ *Yuanhe junxian zhi*, 15.8a.

place name E. Yue Shi's 樂史 (930-1007) *Taiping huanyu ji* 太平寰宇記, another geographical text of the Northern Song dynasty, also does not mention anything about E in Xiangning xian or for that matter in the entire Shanxi part as well.⁴⁴

Therefore, the authors of the two most important geographical texts representative of the Tang and Northern Song periods surely did not accept the earlier identification of E with Xiangning.⁴⁵ This leads me to suspect that the association established from the time of the *Shiben* to that of the *Kuodi zhi* should now be considered groundless. Kong Yingda's 孔穎達 (574-648) following comment about the *Shiben* is supportive of this idea: "Because the current *Shiben* is different from what Sima Qian says and has many fallacies, I cannot trust the authenticity of the text."⁴⁶ A contemporary with the authors of the *Kuodi zhi* and an authoritative scholar of the Tang period, Kong must have had a different understanding regarding the *Shiben* from those of the later commentators to the *Shiji*.

If my criticism about the Tang scholars' identification of E with Xiangning is acceptable, how do we understand the idea of Song Zhong concerning the location of E in Daxia? I suppose that the association of Xia 夏 with Shanxi could also have been established after the Han period. Of course, in the *Zuozhuan* (Zhao 1), Daxia appears once in connection with a story of Tang's connection to a legendary figure, Gaoxin shi 高辛氏. Because the relationship between Gaoxin shi's two sons was bad, Hou Di 后帝 moved the

⁴⁴ *Taiping huanyu zhi* 太平寰宇記, Qinding siku quanshu edition, juan 48-50.

⁴⁵ In the Zhengyi commentary to Tang, Zhang Shoujie quotes *Kuodi zhi* as "The ancient wall of Tang was located to the 20 *li* west from Yicheng xian 翼城縣, Jiangzhou 絳州, where the descendant of Yao was enfeoffed." Li Jifu rather accepts this location (*Yuanhe jinxian zhi*, 14.16a).

⁴⁶ *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhengyi*, 52.2126.

second son, Shichen 實沈, to Daxia to oversee the San 參 constellation there. Thus, the people of Tang could serve Xia and Shang, and its last generation was called the Tang Shuyu.⁴⁷ Although Du Yu tried to locate the Daxia in the present-day Taiyuan 太原 area, identifying Gaoxin shi with Di Ku 帝嚳 and Hou Di with Yao 堯, I wonder how much we can give credit to the mythical genealogy constructed from the late Warring States period as well as the historicity of the related place names.

It is in this respect significant to note that the “Dili zhi” of the *Hanshu*, published about 200 years earlier than Du Yu’s commentary on the *Zuozhuan*, rarely mentions the vestiges of Xia, Yu, Yao, etc. in Shanxi. Among the 24 prefectures under Hedong jun 河東郡, only Pufan xian 蒲反縣 is said to have Yaoshan 堯山. Among the 21 prefectures under Taiyuan jun 太原郡, again only Jinyang xian 晉陽縣 is identified with the ancient Tang state 故唐國.⁴⁸ This indicates that, whether the above recognitions are correct or not, in the Han period the tales of the legendary figures or states in Shanxi were not yet settled. Ying Shao 應邵 (153?-196), the commentator to the *Hanshu*, also lists only one more addition, Pingyang xian 平陽縣 of Hedong jun, as the capital of Yao 堯都.⁴⁹

However, by the Tang period, more places in the Fen River valley of Shanxi had become connected with the legendary figures and states. The *Yuanhe junxian zhi* mentions that the following nine prefectures had become associated with Yao, Xun 舜, Yu (Xia), etc.:

⁴⁷ Yang Bojun, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, p. 1218.

⁴⁸ *Hanshu*, 28 shang.1550-52.

⁴⁹ *Hanshu*, 28 shang.1551.

- (1) Hedong xian 河東縣 (Pufan in the Han period): Temple of Xun 舜廟; house of Xun 舜宅; ancient wall of Yao 故堯城
- (2) Baoding xian 寶鼎縣: Grave of Yin Tang 殷湯陵
- (3) Yicheng xian 翼城縣: Ancient wall of Tang 故唐城
- (4) Longmen xian 龍門縣: Capital of Zu Yi 祖乙都; shrine of Da Yu 大禹祠⁵⁰
- (5) Linfen xian 臨汾縣 (Pingyang in the Han period): Temple of Yao 堯廟
- (6) Changing xian 昌寧縣: Temple of Yu 禹廟⁵¹
- (7) Xia xian 夏縣: Ancient wall of An town 安邑故城 (capital of Xia Yu 夏禹都)
- (8) Anyi xian 安邑縣: Old capital of Xia 夏舊都; ancient Mingtiaomo 古鳴條陌, the battlefield between Jie 桀 and Tang 湯⁵²
- (9) Jinyang xian 晉陽縣: Ancient wall of Tang 故唐城, which was built by Yao and the son of Tang Shuyu, Xie fu 燮父, transferred to as his capital; shrine of Tang Shuyu; tomb of Tang Shuyu⁵³

The history of implanting these legendary entities in Shanxi and probably many other areas in China seems to be a promising topic for the future. The incorporation of Yao, Xun, Yu, Xia,

⁵⁰ *Yuanhe junxian zhi*, 14.

⁵¹ *Yuanhe junxian zhi*, 15,

⁵² *Yuanhe junxian zhi*, 7.7b.

⁵³ *Yuanhe junxian zhi*, 16.

Tang, etc. with nine different places in the Fen River valley especially fits very well with Gu Jiegang's "stratigraphic" theory of early Chinese textual sources, wherein the later the texts, the more additions there had been to the contents. By the Tang period, Shanxi seems to have been transformed into a region manifested with the tales of the legendary heroes and states. This might lead scholars to propose at least three different locations of the problematic Daxia: Taiyuan (Du Yu), Xiangning (*Shanxi tongzhi*)⁵⁴ and Xia xian (Zhang Shoujie). Thus, assuming that Xia xian (Daxia?) is close to Xiangning (E?), Zhang Shoujie could accept Song Zhong's location of E in Daxia. But the distance from Xiangning to Xia xian is not short, about 200km. It was only after the Han period that the Xia xian area began to be associated with Yu's capital Anyi, as documented in transmitted texts such as "Xia benji" 夏本紀 of the *Shiji*. Ban Gu's commentary to Anyi xian of Hedong jun in the "Dili zhi" still never mentions anything predating the Eastern Zhou period, only stating "Wei Gang 魏綱 (?-552 B.C.) moved here from Wei and King Hui 惠王 moved to Daliang 大梁 (in 361 B.C.)."⁵⁵ The ancient wall known as the city of King Yu 禹王城 in the region is in fact the early capital of the Wei state in the Warring States period.⁵⁶ Moreover, it was not until 494 (the 18th year of Taihe 太和, Northern Wei) that the place name Anyi was changed into Xia xian, establishing probably its connection to the Xia dynasty.⁵⁷

Therefore, although the distance from Taiyuan to Xia xian is about 400km long,

⁵⁴ *Shanxi tongzhi* 山西通志, by Wang Xuan 王軒 et al. (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1990), 26.2350.

⁵⁵ *Hanshu*, 28 shang.1550.

⁵⁶ Liu Xu 劉緒, *Jin Wenhua* 晉文化 (Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe, 2007), pp. 47-49.

⁵⁷ *Shanxi tongzhi*, 27.2402.

implanting many legends in the region after the Han period may have created an anachronistic understanding that southwestern Shanxi was the home of the Xia dynasty as well as of Yao and Xun. This ambiguity in turn leads me to hesitate to accept Song Zhong's location of E in Daxia as being in Shanxi. I would rather like to associate his location in Daxia with the following citation from the "Dili zhi" of the *Hanshu*: "Yingchuan 潁川 (jun) and Nanyang 南陽 (jun) were originally the state of Xia Yu 夏禹."⁵⁸ Because, unlike southwestern Shanxi, the Nanyang area was already recognized as part of Xia by the Han period, it was possible for Song Zhong, a native Nanyang, to consider the region as Daxia. That Xi E xian 西鄂縣 is a part of Nanyang jun in the "Dili zhi"⁵⁹ coincidentally supports this supposition.

As discussed so far, it is difficult to accept both traditional and modern Chinese scholars' location of E in Xiangning. However, another problematic place name, Sui 隨, must have been under Jin's control during the Spring and Autumn period, because in the *Guoyu* Shihui 士會, a noble of Jin, is said to have received Sui and Fan 范 as his fiefs from the Jin rulers sometime between the late seventh and the early sixth century B.C.⁶⁰ Thus, Shihui is also called Suihui 隨會 or Fanhui 范會 in the *Zuozhuan* and *Shiji*. Identifying Sui, a place of E Hou's exile mentioned above, with one of the fiefs of Shihui, Chinese scholars have located it in Jiexiu xian 介休縣 in the upper Fen River valley.

However, the identification of Sui with Jiexiu does not seem to have been introduced

⁵⁸ *Hanshu*, 28 xia.1654

⁵⁹ *Hanshu*, 28 shang.1564.

⁶⁰ *Guoyu*, 14. 458-59.

before the Qing period. As Du Yu could not specify the location, circumscribing it instead as “Jin’s area,” the *Yuanhe junxian zhi* never mentions anything about Sui in the history of Jiexiu xian.⁶¹ And in the *Taiping huanyu ji* as well, no place in Shanxi is associated with Sui. It was not until the late seventeenth century that two Qing scholars began to note the connection of Sui with Jiexiu. According to the *Chunqiu diming kaolie* compiled by Gao Shiqi in 1685, “Sui was a fief of Jin Shihui. There was a Suicheng 隨城 to the east of Jiexiu xian.”⁶² Jiang Yong further follows the association by quoting the following passage in the *Chunqiu chuanshuo huizuan* 春秋傳說彙纂 by Wang Yan 王揆 and Zhang Dingyu 張廷玉 in 1699: “There is the ancient Suicheng in present-day Jiexiu xian.”⁶³

Because the late initiation of the Jiexiu location triggers suspicions about the authenticity, not all Qing scholars have accepted the location. Noting that Du Yu’s comments on the place names in the *Zuozhuan* are mostly specific but ambiguous in the case of Sui (“Jin’s area”), Qi Shaonan 齊召南 (1703-1768) rather proposes that Sui, a place of E Hou’s exile and later a fief given to Shihui, could be identified with the indisputable Sui in the south, present-day Suizhou, neighboring the Chu state.⁶⁴ It is regrettable that he provided only the short comment, which in turn seems to have been almost completely ignored.

However, considering the contemporary historical context in which Shihui received Sui as his fief, we cannot easily rule out Qi’s suggestion. According to the *Zuozhuan*, the Ji-

⁶¹ *Yuanhe junxian zhi*, 17.4a-5a.

⁶² *Chunqiu diming kaolie*, 4.6b.

⁶³ *Chunqiu chuanshuo huizuan*, Qinding siku quanshu edition, 2.26a; *Chunqiu dili kaoshi*, 1.10a.

⁶⁴ *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhushu* 春秋左傳注疏, Qinding siku quanshu edition, 2 kaozheng. 4b.

surnamed 姬姓 state of Sui was one of the strong polities in the south that were able to stand against the expansion of Chu from the late eighth century B.C. (see note 83). In 640 B.C. the Sui state led many lords east of the Han River 漢水 to rebel against the Chu. But they were rather suppressed by the Chu, eventually seeking a peace treaty.⁶⁵ At that time Shuihui (660?-583 B.C.) was about 20 years old, still too young to receive a fief. But Shihui is for the first time referred to as Suihui 隨會 in the *Zuo zhuan* (Wen 13, 614 B.C), which mentions his sojourn in Qin 秦.⁶⁶ If the above date of the *Zuo zhuan* is reliable, he must have received Sui as his fief before 614 B.C. The reason he could not come back to Jin at that time related to his failed attempt to enthrone Yong 雍, a stepbrother of Xiang Gong 襄公 (r. 627-621 B.C.) who had remained in Qin, against Ling Gong 靈公 (r. 620-607 B.C.). Thus, it is impossible for Shihui to receive Sui from Ling Gong, who competed with Yong. This in turn means that the only Jin rulers who could have granted Sui to Shihui must have been Wen Gong (r. 636-628 B.C.) or Xiang Gong. It was about the end of the battle at Chengpu 城濮 in 632 B.C. when Shihui for the first time appears in the *Zuo zhuan*. Wen Gong commanded Shihui to replace Zhouzhiqiao 舟之僑, who had rebelled against the ruler, to assume the right wing of his chariot.⁶⁷ This indicates that Shihui may have made a significant contribution to the victory of the battle in his late twenties. There is no question that the expansion of the Chu was halted after their defeat in the battle of Chengpu. It thus might have been natural for the Ji-surnamed Sui state to get away from the control of the Chu at that time and rather to accept

⁶⁵ Yang Bojun, *Chunqiu Zuo zhuan zhu*, pp. 386-87.

⁶⁶ Yang Bojun, *Chunqiu Zuo zhuan zhu*, p. 594.

⁶⁷ Yang Bojun, *Chunqiu Zuo zhuan zhu*, p. 471.

protection from the state of Jin. In this context, we cannot ignore the possibility that Shihui received Sui or part of the Sui as his fief from Wen Gong. But he does not seem to have kept the area for long, because, after the death of Xiang Gong, King Zhuang 莊王 of Chu (r. 613-591 B.C.), the new hegemon, may have recovered control of the Sui. This may explain why the name Suihui only rarely appears in the *Zuozhuan* and *Guoyu*, instead calling the family of Shihui commonly not as Suishi 隨氏 but as Fanshi 范氏.⁶⁸

Therefore, if both Sui and E cannot be properly located in Shanxi during the early Spring and Autumn period, we must open our eyes to other places. I believe the only region that embraces both places during the time is the Nanyang-Suizhou area.⁶⁹ Suizhou is famous for the abundant Western Zhou bronze vessels unearthed from the various sites in the region. Especially, the recent excavation in Yejiashan 葉家山 clearly shows the development of the Zeng 曾 state there from the early Western Zhou period.⁷⁰ Although it is still difficult to conclude whether the Zeng could be identified with the Ji-surnamed Sui mentioned above or not,⁷¹ the bronzes of the typical Zhou style indicate that the polities in the region maintained a good relationship with the Zhou royal house as well with as the Ji-surnamed Jin. Another recent excavation at Yangzishan 羊子山 also proves the existence of the E 鄂(噩) state

⁶⁸ Ma Baochun 馬保春, *Jinguo lishi dili yanjiu* 晉國歷史地理研究 (Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe, 2007), pp. 188-93.

⁶⁹ Although the two cities, about 200km away, are now incorporated into two different provinces, Sui was one of the 36 prefectures under Nanyang jun during the Han period (*Hanshu*, 28 shang.1564).

⁷⁰ Hubei sheng wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo 湖北省文物考古研究所 et al., “Hubei Suizhou Yejiashan Xizhou mudi fajue jianbao” 湖北隨州葉家山西周墓地發掘簡報 *Wenwu* 2011 (11): 4-60.

⁷¹ Li Xueqin, “Zengguo zhi mi” 曾國之謎, *Xinchu qingtongqi yanjiu* 新出青銅器研究 (Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe, 1990), pp. 146-50.

about 30km to the west from the Yejiashan site.⁷² Especially, the inscriptions of the Zhong yan 中鬲 (JC 949) and Jing fangding 靜方鼎 (JL 357) document that by the mid-Western Zhou period both E and Zeng played important roles as the bases for the southern expansion of the Zhou kings.⁷³

However, the Yu ding 禹鼎 (JC 2833) inscription in the late Western Zhou period records a transition the E state may have brought upon itself. Faced with the rebellion led by E Hou 鄂侯 with many neighboring polities, the Zhou king, probably King Li, commands Yu to devastate the E state, and Yu indeed successfully performs his duty. Whereas the E state in the Yu ding inscription was generally located in the Nanyang⁷⁴ or Ezhou 鄂州⁷⁵ areas in the past, the excavation in the Yanzishan site safely resolved the debates. After the suppression, the E in the Suizhou area may have left their base to move somewhere else. As for the new place the E state transferred to, scholars still note the so-called Eastern E 東鄂 in the E xian 鄂縣 (present-day Ezhou, Hubei) of Jiangxia jun 江夏郡 in the “Dili zhi” of the *Hanshu*.⁷⁶ However, no Chu-related archaeological remains dated earlier than the middle

⁷² Zhang Changping 張昌平, “Lun Suizhou Yanzishan xinchu Eguo qingtongqi” 論隨州羊子山新出噩國青銅器, *Wenwu* 2011 (11): 87-94.

⁷³ Li Xueqin, “You xinjian qingtongqi kan Xizhou zaoqi de E,Zeng,Chu” 由新見青銅器看西周早期的鄂,曾,楚, *Wenwu* 2010 (1): 41-42.

⁷⁴ Xu Shaohua 徐少華, *Zhoudai nantu lishi dili yu wenhua* 周代南土歷史地理與文化 (Wuhan: Wuhan daxue chubanshe, 1994), p. 25; Edward L. Shaughnessy, “Western Zhou Bronze Inscriptions,” in Shaughnessy ed. *New Sources of Early Chinese History: An Introduction to the Reading of Inscriptions and Manuscripts* (Berkeley: The Society for the Study of Early China, 1997), pp. 81-84.

⁷⁵ Li Xueqin, “Jing fangding yu Zhou Zhaowang liri” 靜方鼎與周昭王曆日, *Xia Shang Zhou niandaixue chaji* 夏商周年代學札記 (Shenyang: Liaoning daxue chubanshe, 1999), p. 25.

⁷⁶ *Hanshu*, 28 shang.1567; Da Haobo 笱浩波, “Cong jinian chutu xin cailiao kan Chuguo zaoqi zhongxin quyue”

Spring and Autumn period have been discovered in the Ezhou area as of yet,⁷⁷ not to mention the lack of paleographic sources supporting the existence of E in the region. Instead, the recent excavation of the E related bronzes from Xiexiangpu 夏響鋪 in the Nanyang area suggests another possibility. Most of the vessels cast by E Hou and his wife are dated to the late Western Zhou or early Spring and Autumn periods.⁷⁸ That very few E related bronzes unearthed in the Suizhou area are dated later than the late Western Zhou suggests that the E moved to the Nanyang area during the late Western Zhou period. This further corresponds with the so-called Western E, Xi E xian of Nanyang jun in the “Dili zhi.”⁷⁹

As introduced above the different understanding Qi Shaonan proposed on the location of Sui in the Suizhou area, a scholar in the Southern Song, Luo Bi 羅泌 (1131-1189), also suggested the association of Jin E Hou 晉鄂侯 with the E shi 鄂氏 in the Nanyang region. In the “Guoming zhi 國名記 6” of the *Lushi* 路史, he mentions that “there was E shi in the so-called Daxia 大夏 of Nanyang.” He himself further annotates that “according to the *Xingshu* 姓書, (the E shi) came from Jin E Hou.”⁸⁰ It is first significant to note that, as Ban Gu identified the connection of Nanyang with the state of Xia Yu (see note 58), there must have been a recognition by the Southern Song that, in addition to the

從近年出土新材料看楚國早期中心區域, *Wenwu* 2012 (2): 59.

⁷⁷ Zhu Jiping 朱繼平, ““E wangcheng” kao” 鄂王城考, *Zhongguo lishi wenwu* 中國歷史文物 2006 (5): 34.

⁷⁸ Henan sheng Nanyang shi wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo 河南省南陽市文物考古研究所, “Nanshui beidiao zhongxian gongcheng Nanyang Xiexiangpu Eguo guizu mudi fajue chengguo” 南水北調中線工程南陽夏響鋪鄂國貴族墓地發掘成果, *Zhongguo wenwu bao* 中國文物報, January 4, 2013.

⁷⁹ *Hanshu*, 28 shang.1564.

⁸⁰ *Lu shi*, Qinding siku quanshu edition, 29.37b.

southwestern part of Shanxi, Nanyang was also considered as Daxia. Second, the *Xingshu* quoted in the annotation is the *Yuanhe xingzuan* 元和姓纂 by Lin Bao 林寶 in 812, in which the surname E 鄂姓 is said to have been originated from Jin E Hou.⁸¹ Based on that understanding, Luo Bi further associates the E Hou with the E shi in the Nanyang area. Although he himself introduces the location of Jin E Hou's exile in Shanxi as well,⁸² it is evident that by the Southern Song the Nanyang location was also recognized among scholars.

These opinions on the location of Sui and E in Suizhou and Nanyang, unnoticed so far, further support my argument about Jin E Hou's exile not being in Shanxi but rather in the Nanyang-Suizhou area. Based on the new locations, I would like to propose a new scenario about the exile of Jin E Hou as follows: Faced with the strong confederated attack of the Quwo junior branch with Zheng and Xing in 718 B.C., the lord of the main lineage at Yi, posthumously titled as E Hou, could not help but seek a safe place for his exile. Under the protection of King Huan, he found a southern Ji-surnamed state, Sui, in the present-day Suizhou area, more than 600km away from his base, for the haven. Because King Huan enthroned his son Ai Hou in Jin several months later, he could not return to his home country. Thus, in the next year, a noble of Jin, Jaifu, was dispatched to meet the lord at Sui, and escorted him to E in the present-day Nanyang area, which is closer to Jin. Given that both *Shiji* and *Zhushu jinian* note his death in 718 B.C., the rest of his life at E was not that long. The people of Jin so sympathized with his misfortune at E that they provided him with the posthumous title, E Hou.

⁸¹ *Yuanhe xingzuan* 元和姓纂, Qinding siku quanshu edition, 10.51.

⁸² *Lushi*, 28.21b.

Of course, except for the locations of Sui and E, there is no other direct evidence for this bold speculation. But the independent position the Ji-surnamed Sui state pursued against the pressure from the Chu from the late eighth to the early seventh century B.C. may have made it possible for it to provide the Jin lord with a haven for a while.⁸³ Moreover, as will be discussed in the next chapter, this supposition corresponds well with the new possibility that under the chaotic collapse of King You about 50 years previously, King Ping, who received the critical support from Lord Wen of Jin, also sought refuge in the same E of the Nanyang region.

Unknown but compromising

Although the unexpected occurrence of Shao E in the *Xinian* in the context of the eastward evacuation has provoked some controversy among current scholars, E must have been a familiar place name for the people of Chu during the Warring States period. In addition to the *Xinian*, three more contemporary paleographic sources mention E. According to the *Chuju* 楚居 in volume 1 of the Tsinghua Bamboo Slips, the Chu state moved its

⁸³ Following the stories regarding E Hou's exile into Sui in 718 B.C. and the subsequent transfer to E in 717 B.C., the *Zuozhuan* mentions the attack against Sui by King Wu 武王 (r. 740-690 B.C.) of Chu in 706 B.C. (Huan 6). Because Lord Sui 隨侯 coped with the attack well, the state of Chu could not conquer the polity. At that time, Dou Bo Bi 鬬伯比, who supervised the peace treaty for the Chu, advised the Chu king to treat cautiously the Sui polity, the strongest power to the east of the Han River (Yang Bojun, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, pp. 109-112). Two years later (Huan 8), the Sui did not participate in the conference led by the Chu king and were attacked again (Yang Bojun, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, pp. 121-22). In 701 B.C. (Huan 11), the Sui rather gathered neighboring polities to attack the Chu in order to help the Yuan 郟 polity (Yang Bojun, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, p. 130). But again the polity received an attack by the Chu and made a covenant in 690 B.C. (Zhuang 4) (Yang Bojun, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, pp. 163-64). Fifty years later, in 640 B.C. (Xi 20), the Sui rallied the neighboring polities once again to rebel against the Chu but failed (Yang Bojun, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, p. 387). Since then, there are no more records regarding the Sui in the *Zuozhuan*.

capital more than fourteen times between the reigns of King Wu 武王 (r. 741-690 B.C.) and King Dao 悼王 (r. 402-381 B.C.). Eying 鶯(鄂)郢⁸⁴ is one of the capitals, which is said to have been moved from Meiyang 嫩(美)郢 during King Zhao's 昭王 reign (515-489 B.C.).⁸⁵ Another bamboo text of Chu from Baoshan 包山楚簡 documents the lawsuits Prince E 噩(鄂)君 was involved in during the early reign years of King Hui 懷王 (r. 328-299 B.C.).⁸⁶ The bronze inscriptions of the E Jun Qi jie 鄂君啓節 (JC 12110~3), unearthed from Shou xian 壽縣, Anhui in 1957, further contain very important information on the location of E. In the tally passes issued by King Hui to Prince E, probably the same prince in the Baoshan slips, in 323 B.C.,⁸⁷ E is a starting point to go through several places all the way down to the capital Ying both by the sea and land routes.

As for the location of E, especially that of the E Jun Qi jie, Chinese scholars first noted the so-called Eastern E in the Ezhou area, Hubei.⁸⁸ But, following Funakoshi Akiko's

⁸⁴ All the fourteen capitals in the bamboo text are suffixed with the character *ying* 郢 which seems to have been a general name designating the contemporary Chu capitals (187).

⁸⁵ Qinghua daxue chutu wenxian yanjiu yu baohu zhongxin ed., *Qinghua daxue zang Zhanguo zhushu (yi)* 清華大學藏戰國竹書(壹), (Shanghai: Zhongxi shuju, 2011), p.190.

⁸⁶ Hubei sheng Xingsha lielu kaogudui 湖北省荊沙鐵路考古隊, *Baoshan Chujian* 包山楚簡, (Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe, 1991), p. 21, 29..

⁸⁷ Wu Liangbao 吳良寶, *Zhanguo Chujian diming jizheng* 戰國楚簡地名輯證 (Wuhan: Wuhan daxue chubanshe, 2010), p. 81.

⁸⁸ Guo Moruo 郭沫若, "Guanyu E Jun Qi jie de yanjiu" 關於鄂君啓節的研究, *Wenwu cankao ziliao* 文物參考資料 1958 (4): 4; Yu Shengwu 于省吾, "E Jun Qi jie kaoshi" 鄂君啓節考釋, *Kaogu* 考古 1963 (8): 444; Tan Qixiang 譚其驤, "Zai lun E Jun Qi jie dili da Huang Shengzhang tongzhi" 再論鄂君啓節地理答黃盛璋同志, *Changshu ji* 長水集 xia (Beijing: Renmin chubanshe, 2011), p. 215; Huang Shengzhang 黃盛璋, "Zai lun E Jun Qi jie jiaotong luxian fuyuan yu dili wenti" 再論鄂君啓節交通路線復原與地理問題, *Anhui shixue* 安徽史學 1988 (2): pp.16-19.

船越昭生 study,⁸⁹ Chen Wei's meticulous analysis on the tally inscriptions concluded that some place names close to the starting point, E, should not be in the Ezhou (Eastern E) area at all but rather in the Nanyang (Western E) region.⁹⁰ As the commentators of the *Chuju* seem to follow Chen's study, taking Eying as Western E, more scholars now accept the Nanyang location.⁹¹ This may lead one to suspect that the Shao E mentioned in the *Xinian* could also be associated with the E in the three contemporary inscriptions of the Chu state mentioned above.

However, we still need to clarify two important questions in order to conclude the location of *Xinian*'s Shao E in the Nanyang region. First, since many scholars still follow the location of the so-called Eastern E,⁹² is it possible to postulate the identification of Shao E with the so-called Western E in Nanyang without elucidating the disputes regarding the two Es? Second, how can the new location of Shao E in Nanyang be incorporated into the entire context of the eastward evacuation?

The answer to the first question begins with the prefix *shao* 少 in the problematic place name of the *Xinian*. There must have been some reasons why, unlike the other three contemporary inscriptions, the author(s) or scribe(s) of the *Xinian* added the prefix for the place name. It might be possible for them to have used the prefix to distinguish the E in the

⁸⁹ Funakoshi Akiko 船越昭生, "Gakkunkeisetsu ni tsuite" 鄂君啓節について, *Tōhō Gakuhō* 東方學報 43 (1972): .

⁹⁰ Chen Wei 陳偉, "E Jun Qi jie zhi E di tantao" 鄂君啓節之鄂地探討, *Jiang Han kaogu* 江漢考古 1986 (2): 88-90.

⁹¹ Wu Liangbao, *Zhanguo Chuqian diming jizheng*, pp. 81-82.

⁹² Zhang Houquan 張后銓, "E Jun Qi jie jiazhi yu Dong E diwang kaolüe" 鄂君啓節價值與東鄂地理考略, *Ezhou daxue xuebao* 鄂州大學學報 12.2 (2005): 51-56; Da Haobo, "Cong jinian chutu xin cailiao kan Chuguo zaoqi zhongxin quyū," pp.57-60.

Xinian from those in the domain of Chu in Nanyang or Ezhou. Otherwise, the prefix may have marked the difference between the two Es in the Chu area. This conceivably assumes the existence of Da E 大鄂. Because I already criticized the Xiangning location of E in the previous chapter, I suspect the latter could be the case.

In this regard, the reading group at East China Normal University reminds us of the following conventional Chinese naming that distinguishes the same old and new place names for mountains, cities, and streets: While shao or xiao 小 means “old,” da 大 signifies “new.” A good example for this is the capital of the Wei 魏 state, Da Liang 大梁 (present-day Kaifeng 開封) during the Warring States period, which was differentiated from another old Liang, Shao Liang 少梁, in the present-day Hancheng 韓城 area, Shaanxi.⁹³ Thus, the reading group suggests taking Shao E in the *Xinian* as “Old E 舊鄂” or “Original E 初鄂.”⁹⁴ Because in the *Baoshan Chujian* the place name Da Liang as the capital of the Wei state appears,⁹⁵ the contemporary Chu intellectuals may have recognized the convention.

Then, given that the existence of the so-called Western E in the Nanyang area after the late Western Zhou has been proven archaeologically, how do we understand the so-called Eastern E in Ezhou that many scholars still believe the antiquity? According to the “Chu shijia” of the *Shiji*, Xiong Ju 熊渠, the ruler of Chu during the reign of Zhou King Yi 夷王 (r. 865-858 B.C.), attacked some polities in the Jiang Han region and occupied E in order to

⁹³ Wei Songshan 魏嵩山 ed., *Zhongghu Lishi diming dacidian* 中國歷史地名大辭典 (Guangzhou: Guangdong jiaoyu chubanshe, 1995), p.51, 148.

⁹⁴ Huadong shifan daxue zhongwen xi Zhanguojian dushu xiaozu, “Du Qinghua daxue zang Zhanguo zhushu (er), *Xinian shu hou (yi)*,” Wuhan daxue jianbo yanjiu zhongxin jianbo wang December 29, 2011.

⁹⁵ Hubei sheng Xingsha lielu kaogudui, *Baoshan Chujian*, jian 157, p.29, 51.

establish his second son, Hong 紅, as the king of E. Both the *Jijie* and *Zhengyi* commentaries to the *Shiji* located the E in contemporary Wuchang xian 武昌縣 (present-day Ezhou),⁹⁶ with the result that many traditional and modern scholars have assumed the existence of the so-called Eastern E by the mid-Western Zhou period.

However, it was not until the time of Li Daoyuan's 酈道元 (ca. 470-517) *Shuijing zhu* 水經注 that the association of Hong's E with Ezhou was first proposed.⁹⁷ Moreover, the ancient walls of Daye xian 大冶縣 in the Ezhou area, traditionally known as E wangcheng 鄂王城, generally date to the Warring States period. No other remains in the region can be traced back to the mid-Western Zhou period. Thus, believing that the Chu state could not have expanded into the Ezhou region by the Western Zhou period, Zhu Jiping 朱繼平 rather proposes the so-called Western E in Nanyang as the place of Hong's kingship.⁹⁸ But it is regrettable that Zhu wrote the article before the excavation from the cemetery of the E ruling house at Yangzishan, Suizhou in 2007, in which many E Hou 鄂侯 related bronze vessels in the early Western Zhou were unearthed. If the above record of the "Chu shijia" is reliable, the E given to Xiong Ju's second son should be placed more properly in the Yangzishan area of Suizhou.⁹⁹

⁹⁶ *Shiji* 1692-3.

⁹⁷ Chen Qiaoyi 陳橋驛, *Shuijing zhu jiaoshi* 水經注校釋, (Hangzhou: Hangzhou daxue chubanshe, 1999), p.607. The "Dili zhi" of the *Hanshu* also never mentions this connection yet in 鄂縣 of Jiangxia jun 江夏郡, present-day Ezhou (*Hanshu*, 28 shang.1567).

⁹⁸ Zhu Jiping, "'E wangcheng" kao," p. 35.

⁹⁹ Li Xueqin, "You xinjian qingtongqi kan Xizhou zaoqide E,Zeng,Chu," p.42; Zhang Changping, "Lun Suizhou Yangzishan xinchu Eguo qingtongqi," pp. 87-94; Da Haobo, "Cong jinian chutu xin cailiao kan Chuguo zaoqi zhongxin quyue," pp. 59-60.

All the same, Zhu Jiping suggests an interesting interpretation about the beginning of the so-called Eastern E in the Ezhou area. It was in the battle of Chuisha 垂沙 near Biyang 泌陽, about 100km to the southeast from Nanyang, in 301 B.C. that the joint attacks of Qi, Wei, Han and Qin devastated the northern bases of the Chu state, including the Nanyang region. Especially, in several chapters of the *Shiji*, such as the “Han shijia” 韓世家 and “Qin benji” 秦本紀, it is stated that after the defeat parts of the Nanyang area, including Wan 宛 and Ye 葉, are said to have been occupied, in the beginning by the Han state and then again by the Qin from 291 B.C.¹⁰⁰ The so-called Western E in the region must not have been the exception for the power shift so that the people of E found their new base in the Ezhou area to the south at that time.¹⁰¹ This coincides with the dates of the archaeological remains in the region as well.

If Zhu’s argument about the beginning of the so-called Eastern E is reliable, the later commentators, who did not have any information about the early E in the Suizhou area, seem to have mistakenly speculated about the antiquity of the later E in the Ezhou area. Likewise, as no textual sources note the early E in the Suizhou area, the old place may have even been forgotten by the time the *Xinian* came out. It is likely that, perhaps after the defeat in the battle of Chuisha, the author(s) or scribe(s) of the *Xinian* intentionally added the prefix *shao* to distinguish the old E in the Nanyang region from the new one in the southeast. One may of course point out that the *terminus post quem* of the *Xinian* in the reigns of King Su (r. 380-370 B.C.) or King Xuan (r. 369-340 B.C.) is earlier than that of the proposed southward

¹⁰⁰ Xu Shaohua, *Zhoudai nantu lishi dili yu wenhua*, pp. 341-347.

¹⁰¹ Zhu Jiping, ““E wangcheng” kao,” p. 35.

movement of E in the early third century B.C. However, because the *Xinian* at our disposal is not necessarily the original copy,¹⁰² we must consider the possibility that the later scribe may have added the prefix for the distinction. The radiocarbon date of the text, 305±30 B.C., rather tends to support the supposition.

Therefore, one important problem for the location of Shao E in the Nanyang area could be resolved. Then, how can the unexpected placement be reconciled in the entire context of the eastward evacuation? I believe the new location rather tends to compromise and supplement the records in the transmitted texts. Regarding the collapse of the Western Zhou and the following eastward evacuation, the records of the transmitted texts are inconsistent, and this has also produced several different ideas in reconstructing the entire process, especially regarding the role of the feudal lords as well as the date of the evacuation. It is thus necessary to survey the two controversial issues inherent in the transmitted texts.

First, both the “Zhou benji” and the *Jinben Zhushu jinian* mention the alliance between Shen and the Western Rong for the purpose of attacking King You and Bo Ban (Fu). Since Cui Shu 崔述 (1740-1816) first raised questions about the locations of the alliance, which he thought were situated very far away in Nanyang and western Shaanxi, respectively,¹⁰³ many scholars have paid attention to the contradiction.¹⁰⁴ However, the

¹⁰² Cf. Edward L. Shaughnessy, *Rewriting Early Chinese Texts* (Albany: State University of New York, 2006), pp. 259-61.

¹⁰³ *Cui Dongbi yishu* 崔東壁遺書 7, edited by Gu Jiegang (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1983), pp. 246-47.

¹⁰⁴ Qian Mu 錢穆, “Xizhou Rong huo kao” 西周戎禍考, *Yugong* 禹貢 2.4 (1934): 127; Meng Wengtong 蒙文通, *Zhou Qin shaoshu minzu yanjiu* 周秦少數民族研究 (Shanghai: Rongmen lianhe shuju, 1958), p. 21; Wang Yuzhe 王玉哲, “Zhou Pingwang dongqian nai bi Qin fei Quanrong shuo” 平王東遷乃避秦非避犬戎說, *Tianjin shehui kexue* 天津社會科學 1986 (3): 49; Song Xinchao, “Lishan zhi yi ji Pingwang dongqian lishi kaoshu” 驪山之役及平王東遷歷史考述, *Renwen zazhi* 人文雜誌 1989 (4): 75-76.

Guben Zhushu jinian 古本竹書紀年 designates the Shen, where the heir apparent Yijiu went into exile, as Western Shen 西申. In this regard, Li Feng, noting the “Mountain of the fountainhead of the Shen River” (Shenshou zhi shan 申首之山) in the *Shanhai jing* 山海經, argues that in addition to the so-called Southern Shen 南申 in the Nanyang region (see below), Western Shen was indeed located in the upper Jing River 涇水 valley of northwestern Shaanxi. He further suggests the Shaanxi location of the Lü 呂 polity during the Western Zhou, based on the provenances of two Lü bronzes of the Western Zhou, Lü Jijiang *hu* 呂季姜壺 (JC 9610) and Lü Jiang *gui* 呂姜簋 (JC 3348), in the Fenghao 豐鎬 site near Xi’an and Lingtai 靈臺 in the upper Jing River region, respectively. A polity located in the Nanyang region as well since the end of the Western Zhou,¹⁰⁵ Lü is said to have been allied with Shen in order to defend the attack from King You in the “Zhengyu” 鄭語 of the *Guoyu*.¹⁰⁶ That the *Xinian* also mentions that King Ping’s (Yijiu) first exile to Western Shen, possibly in northwestern Shaanxi, certainly brings to an end the debates over the alliance between Shen and the Western Rong.

Nevertheless, another important question regarding the enthronement of King Ping still remains. While the *Shiji* mentions that many lords went to Lord Shen to establish King Ping, the *Zhuhu jinian*, both the Ancient and Current editions, specifies that Lord Shen, Lord Lu, and Wen Gong of Xu established him at Shen (not Western Shen) in 771 B.C. (see notes 7 and 8). Perhaps Lord Lu and Xu Wen Gong in the *Zhushu jinian* should be included among

¹⁰⁵ Li Feng, *Landscape and Power in Early China: The Crisis and Fall of the Western Zhou, 1045-771 B.C.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 221-31.

¹⁰⁶ Xu Shaohua, *Zhoudai nantu lishi dili yu wenhua*, p. 41.

the feudal lords who in the *Shiji* are said to have gone to Lord Shen's place and jointly established King Ping. Most scholars believe that this establishment occurred in the Shen of northwestern Shaanxi in 771 B.C. just before the eastward evacuation in 770 B.C. However, as Yoshimoto properly points out,¹⁰⁷ this cannot explain how and why the two states in Qufu 曲阜, Shandong (Lu) and Xuchang 許昌, Henan (Xu), both of which are closer to Nanyang, could join the Shen in the very far northwest for the enthronement. Despite its silence about the enthronement at Shen, the *Xinian* instead says a different story of King Ping's sojourn, possibly the second asylum, at Shao E before his enthronement in the capital area.

Second, unlike the fact that the above establishment of King Ping at Shen has gone unnoticed, it is well known from the records of the *Zuo zhuan* (Yin 6) and the *Guoyu* ("Zhouyu zhong") that "at the time of the eastward evacuation the royal Zhou house depended on Jin and Zheng." The *Jinben Zhushu jinian* is more specific about the military role played by Lord Wen of Jin, Zheng Bo 鄭伯, Lord Wei 衛侯 and Qin Bo 秦伯 at that time. The *Shiji* further records Xiang Gong of Qin 秦襄公 (r. 777-766 B.C.) and Wu Gong of Wei 衛武公 (r. 812-758 B.C.) as having also participated in escorting the king at that time (see note 6). Not to mention the discrepancy between the supporters for the enthronement (Shen, Lu, Xu) and the movement (Jin, Zheng, Qin, Wei),¹⁰⁸ it is interesting to note the inconsistency among the records of the participants themselves regarding the eastward evacuation. Especially, according to the *Jinben Zhushu jinian*, in 770 B.C. Zheng

¹⁰⁷ Yoshimoto Michimasa 吉本道雅, "Shūsitsu Tōsenkō" 周室東遷考, *Tōyo gakuho* 東洋學報 71 (1990): 39-43; Yoshimoto, "Seikakan keinenkō," p.12.

¹⁰⁸ Cao Fulin 兆福林, "Lun Pingwang dongqian" 論平王東遷, *Lishi yanjiu* 歷史研究 1991 (6): 8-23; Wang Leisheng 王雷生, "Pingwang dongqian niandai xintan: Zhou Pingwang dongqian jiyuanqian 747 nian shuo" 平王東遷年代新探: 周平王東遷紀元前747年說, *Renwen zazhi* 1997 (3): 62-66; Yoshimoto, "Shūsitsu Tōsenkō," pp. 33-55.

Huan Gong 鄭桓公 (r. 806-770 B.C.) is said to have been killed with King You by the people of Shen 申人, the people of Zeng 鄭人 and Quan Rong 犬戎. But at the time of King Ping's eastward movement in the next year, Zheng Bo, possibly Wu Gong 武公 (r. 770-744 B.C.) and the son of Huan Gong, is listed as one of the four feudal lords who escorted King Ping to Chengzhou. It seems to have been unreasonable for Wu Gong to help the movement of King Ping, who had provided the fundamental cause for his father's death. Since both the *Zuozhuan* and *Guoyu* note the crucial position of Jin and Zheng, it is difficult to deny the role played by Zheng Wu Gong at that time. Then, was this turning around of the state of Zheng possible without the political transition which must have been required for a considerable time?¹⁰⁹

Therefore, some traditional and modern scholars have suspected that after his establishment at Shen in 770 B.C. King Ping needed at least several years to pacify the chaotic situation and eventually to move eastward to Luoyi. A Qing scholar, Liang Yusheng 梁玉繩 (1716-1792), in this respect speculated that the first year (*yuannian* 元年) of King Ping, 771 B.C., in the “Shier zhuhou nianbiao” might be a scribal mistake that should be the fifth year (*wunian* 五年).¹¹⁰ Assuming that the eastward evacuation was not made until the killing of King Xie 攜王 by Lord Wen of Jin, modern scholars have also suggested the following revised years for the movement: 760 B.C. (Cao Fulin), 747 B.C. (Wang Leisheng), 738 B.C. (Yoshimoto), etc. Although it is difficult to accept the proposed dates, it is

¹⁰⁹ Wang Yuzhe 王玉哲 points out another similar case in the “Qin benji” of the *Shiji*, in which Xiang Gong played important roles both in defending King You and in escorting King Ping in a year (Wang Yuzhe, “Zhou Pingwang dongqian nai bi Qin fei Quanrong shuo,” p. 50).

¹¹⁰ *Shiji zhiyi* 史記志疑 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1980), p. 309.

significant to remark that they understood the eastward evacuation not as a single event but as a long process. This fits well with the recognition in the *Xinian*, in which King Ping is said to have undergone several different stages for his final movement to Chengzhou.

In this regard, Yoshimoto's insightful study in 1990, though unnoticed at that time, deserves to be reviewed here.¹¹¹ He first points out that the three occurrences of the term *dongqian* in the *Zuo zhuan* (Yin 6, Xi 22 and Xiang 10) do not necessarily specify King Ping's movement to Luoyang but rather cover the general movements from Guanzhong 關中 to the Central Plain at the end of the Western Zhou and in the beginning of the Spring and Autumn periods (see below). Like many Chinese scholars, he accepts King Ping's first exile at Western Shen in northwestern Shaanxi. But he proposes a different idea about the enthronement of King Ping, which he places not in Shaanxi but in the Nanyang region, resolving the contradictions regarding the locations of Shen (not Western Shen) and the supporting polities (Shen, Lu and Xu) in the *Zhushu jinian* mentioned above. This is what he calls the first stage of the eastward evacuation in 771 B.C. That this Shen was in the Nanyang area at that time is proven by both textual and archaeological evidence. In the "Song Gao" 崧高 of the *Shijing* 詩經, King Xuan 宣王 (r. 827-782 B.C.) enfeoffed Shen Bo 申伯 at Xie 謝 (present-day Nanyang area) in the hope of protecting against attacks from southern enemies.¹¹² A branch of Shen from the northwest, this polity was called the Southern Shen 南申 in the inscription of the "Zhongqing Fu *gui*" 仲冨父簋 (JC 4189) excavated at

¹¹¹ Yoshimoto, "Shūsitsu Tōsenkō," pp. 33-55.

¹¹² *Maoshi zhengyi* 毛詩正義, Shisan jing zhushu edition, 18-3.565-67.

Nanyang in 1981.¹¹³ And then, his second stage is King Ping's movement from Nanyang to Luoyang after the killing of King Xie by Lord Wen of Jin in 760 B.C. Lord Wen of Jin and Wu Gong of Zheng no doubt played a critical role at that time.

Although Yoshimoto's reconstruction about twenty-five years ago is not free from criticism, the discovery of the *Xinian* nicely supplements the shortcomings. According to the *Xinian*, after his first exile into Western Shen, King Ping (the heir apparent Yijiu) faced a chaotic situation, in which the allied forces of Shen, Zeng, and the Western Rong killed King You in 771 B.C. and many local rulers established the younger brother of King You, Yuchen, as King Xiehui at Guo in 770 B.C. Under this circumstance, King Ping sought another asylum at Shao E, possibly in the Nanyang region, where the other branch of his maternal Shen polity (Southern Shen) was located. This corresponds with Yoshimoto's first stage of the eastward evacuation. However, unlike the *Zhushu jinian*, which notes King Ping's enthronement at Shen at that time, the *Xinian* does not mention anything about that. This difference seems to reflect that, as the posthumous title hui 惠 (grace) has a positive connotation, the author(s) of the *Xinian* acknowledged the legitimacy of King Xiehui rather than King Ping.¹¹⁴

Yoshimoto's second stage appears to be unreasonable, since the movement from Nanyang to Luoyang is not eastward but northward. However, the *Xinian* clearly reconciles the idea, adding one more important stage of the movement. After killing King Xiehui in 750

¹¹³ Cui Qingming 崔慶明, "Nanyang shi beijiao chutu yibi Shenguo qingtongqi" 南陽市北郊出土一批申國青銅器, *Zhongyuan wenwu* 中原文物 1984 (4): 13-16; Xu Shaohua, "Cong Shu Jiang pu xi gu Shenguo lishi yu wenhu de youguan wenti" 從叔姜簠析古申國歷史與文化的有關問題, *Wenwu* 2005 (3): 67.

¹¹⁴ Zhu Fenghan 朱鳳瀚, "Qinghua jian *Xinian* shuji Xizhou shishi kao" 清華簡繫年所記西周史事考, *Di sijie guoji hanxue xuehui* 第四屆國際漢學會議, *Academia Sinica*, June 20-22 (2012); Wang Hui 王暉, "Chunqiu zaoqi Zhou wangshi wangwei shixi bianju kaoyi: jianshuo Qinghua jian *Xinian* 'Zhou mangwang jinian'" 春秋早期周王室王位世系變局考異: 兼說清華簡繫年周無王九年, *Renwen zazhi* 2013 (5): 77.

B.C. and again after the nine year interregnal period, Lord Wen of Jin brought King Ping back to the capital area in Shaanxi from Shao E of Nanyang and enthroned him there in 741 B.C. Three years after the enthronement, King Ping finally moved eastward to Luoyang. As the *Xinian* also notes the achievements Jin and Zheng made, the two states must have played a crucial role in the final stage of the movement.¹¹⁵

Therefore, locating Shao E in Nanyang provides us with an important clue to understanding the entire process of the eastward evacuation, bringing to an end the debates regarding the location of King Ping's enthronement at Shen in the *Zhushu jinian*. Of course, it is very difficult to find the direct evidence for the movement from northwestern Shaanxi to Nanyang. As Yoshimoto already pointed out, however, there may have been different kinds of *dongqian* in the *Zuozhuan*. First, the dependence of the Zhou royal house on Jin and Zheng at the time of *dongqian* (Yin 6) no doubt indicates the eastward movement to Luoyang. Second, the following comment by Xia Qin 瑕禽 about the power struggle among the nobles in the Zhou court in 563 B.C. (Xiang 10) might thus have a different connotation:

When formerly King Ping moved toward the east (*dongqian*), our seven families followed him and provided the victims (the king used for rituals). The king relied on the victims (we provided) and thus granted us a covenant of a red bull, saying “from generation to generation you will never lose the position.”¹¹⁶

Although in the past the two cases are both considered to have happened in 770 B.C., the long process the *Xinian* newly informs us of might support Yoshimoto's differentiation. Since the former relying on Jin and Zheng is the final stage of the movement to Luoyang

¹¹⁵ Of course, as I mentioned earlier, it is still difficult to accept the chronology the *Xinian* suggests.

¹¹⁶ Yang Bojun, *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu*, p.983.

after settling the chaotic situation, it seems to have been safe and stable. But in the latter King Ping must have been in a very poor situation to the extent that he depended on the noble families for the sacrificial offerings. This may have been rather associated with the first stage of the movement that happened abruptly from Western Shen in northwestern Shaanxi to Shao E (*Xinian*) or (Southern) Shen (*Zhushu jinian*) in the Nanyang region.¹¹⁷

Finally, the possible existence of the ancient route by the late Western Zhou between Xi'an (Guanzhong) and Nanyang (Jiang Han) following the so-called Wuguan Passage 武關道¹¹⁸ also supports the movement. The recent archaeological reports for the cities following the Dan River 丹江 basin, such as Shangluo 商洛, Danfeng 丹鳳 and Shangnan 商南, note several Western Zhou sites in the route.¹¹⁹ In addition to a bronze adze (*ben* 鏹) excavated from the Fangman 房灣 site in 1981, two bronzes, a *ding* and *yongzhong*, collected in Shangzhou Museum are dated to the Western Zhou.¹²⁰ Another Western Zhou bronze *ding*, discovered in the Dan River area near Fenglouzhen 風樓鎮, Shangnan in the 1980s shows the local development as different from that of metropolitan Shaanxi.¹²¹ The remains clearly show that southeastern Shaanxi was not a region isolated from the capital area during the Western Zhou period. Given that many local rulers supported King Xiehui at

¹¹⁷ Because the *Xinian* does not mention when King Ping (the heir apparent Yijiu) moved to Shao E, it would be possible for him to move (Southern) Shen first and, like E Hou of Jin, later move to Shao E in the same region.

¹¹⁸ Xu Shaohua, *Zhoudai nantu lishi dili yu wenhua*, p. 26.

¹¹⁹ Shaanxi sheng wenwuju 陝西省文物局, *Shangzhou wenwu* 商州文物 (Xi'an: Shaanxi lüyou chubanshe, 2012), p.14, 17; Shaanxi sheng wenwuju, *Danfeng wenwu* 丹鳳文物 (Xi'an: Shaanxi lüyou chubanshe, 2012), pp.13-14; Shaanxi sheng wenwuju, *Shangnan wenwu* 商南文物 (Xi'an: Shaanxi lüyou chubanshe, 2012), pp.13-14.

¹²⁰ Shaanxi sheng wenwuju, *Shangzhou wenwu*, p.84. The *ding* vessel is not introduced in the report.

¹²¹ Shaanxi sheng wenwuju, *Danfeng wenwu*, pp.46-47.

Guo, possibly in the Sanmenxia area on the route to Luoyang, King Ping might not have any other choice but to take the ancient Wuguan Passage to the Nanyang region for his new haven.

Conclusion

The discovery of the *Xinian* has provoked disputes about the process and the date of the eastward evacuation of King Ping. This on the one hand provides us with a new possibility of rewriting early Chinese history, but on the other raises a difficult question regarding the compatibility between the transmitted and unearthed texts on the other. It goes without saying that the histories written in the transmitted texts such as the *Shiji* and *Zhushu jinian* could not be free from contemporary historical recognition. Likewise, the histories in the Warring States bamboo slips such as the *Xinian* must have been the products of the contemporary historical context. Thus, none of the texts at our disposal could be considered complete historical sources.

Nevertheless, if one cannot deny the authenticity of the bamboo texts, the description of the eastward evacuation in the *Xinian* no doubt reflects the understandings the Chu people may have had about the important transition during the late Warring States period. Although part of the history such as the chronology is not compatible with that of the transmitted texts, this must not depreciate the historical value of the bamboo text.

Criticizing the later commentators' identification of E in the *Zuozhuan* with Xiangning, Shanxi, this article argues that the E and Shao E in the *Xinian* should be more properly located in the Nanyang region. This relocation shows that the narrative on the eastward evacuation of King Ping in the *Xinian* does not necessarily contradict that of the transmitted texts, but rather tends to resolve some inconsistencies inherent in those texts.

If it is possible to accept the long process with several different stages the *Xinian* proposes for the evacuation, we must reconsider the simple paradigm of “the killing of King You in 771 B.C. and the following eastward movement of King Ping in 770 B.C.” Although it is still impossible to resolve the riddle of the new chronology in the *Xinian*, the year 770 B.C inscribed for so long as the turning point between the Western Zhou and the Eastern Zhou periods should be problematic as well. This in turn may lead us to review the chronology of the “Shier zhuhou nianbiao,” rarely suspicious so far, for the early Spring and Autumn period.