

head of all the nobles, large and small, within the state. Local feudal lords (zhu hou 諸侯) were the supreme rulers and clan heads of the nobles within the territory under his command. Within the clan the clan head combined political and familial authority in his one person. The commoners and slaves were ruled.

The Shang cemetery system reflected the relations of class, rank, and blood ties within the patriarchal slave society of the Shang kingdom.

The Shang king, being the supreme ruler of the state, had his separate burial site in the Xibeigang area of the Yin Ruins, as well as his own particular style of tomb and of burial rites. There was a separate burial area for the king's consorts. All others within the area of direct control of the Shang king, regardless of rank, status, or wealth, were buried in their clan cemeteries. However nobles had their own family burial area within the clan cemetery; the style of their tombs, of grave goods, and of burial rites all differed from those of commoners and of other family members. Local feudal lords also had their own separate burial areas within their own territories, while all others were buried in their clan cemeteries. Slaves were buried in ash pits or layers of ash close to residential areas.

28. TU CHENG-SHENG (Institute of History and Philology, Taipei)  
SOME PROBLEMS CONCERNING THE SO-CALLED SURVIVORS OF THE YIN DYNASTY

ABSTRACT:

The basic error in Hu Shi's 胡適 "An Exposition on Confucians" lay in discussing the basic nature of the Confucian school on the basis of the "tragic fate and miserable status of the survivors of the Shang"; for half a century this mistaken premise has been accepted by most historians as proven. On the basis of an analysis of pre-Qin literary sources, this paper first proves that there was no "tragedy of the defeated state"; on the contrary, the Yin survivors continued to possess considerable political power and quite high social status. Second, on the basis of newly unearthed Shang and Zhou inscriptions, the fate and status of the Shang survivors is set forth from three sides: (1) The history of the Wei Shi 微史 clan and Lu Sheng 魯盛 clan of the Guanzhong 關中 region, for which genealogies of seven-eight or six-seven generations exist, is reconstructed on the basis of, for the former, the Ding bronze horde newly unearthed from Fufeng Zhuangbai, 扶風庄白 and, for the latter, the inscriptions on already known as well as recently unearthed bronze vessels from the same area. Both clans were survivors from the Shang and close relatives of the Shang king;

they possessed cities, subjects, and official positions, as well as holding offices in charge of troops. (2) The same conclusion may be reached in individual cases in various other kingdoms, such as for Mo Situ 沫司徒送 of the state of Wei 衛, and Dong Hefu 董和復 of the state of Yan 燕. As for the Ling Shi 令矢, Chen 臣辰, and Deng 聃 of Cheng Zhou 成周, Cheng Zhou is the ancient home of the Shang survivors, yet they seem not to have been the object of any special restriction or suppression. This section is based solely on inscriptions; the conclusions reached, however, are completely in agreement with those derived from literary evidence in the previous section. Finally an attempt is made to explain why the survivors of the Shang had land, subjects, offices, and power. We believe that it was due to a political and social structure with the clan as the primary unit. A complete explication of this question awaits a detailed study of oracle-bone and archaeological source material.

#### DISCUSSION:

Tu Cheng-sheng had a few additional points of clarification to make, namely: (1) As to who was included in the phrase "the Survivors of Yin" 殷遺民, he was referring mainly to aristocrats, since it was about them that most historical material has been preserved. (2) The fact that the Zhou were generous to the Shang does not necessarily mean that there was an entirely peaceful transition. (3) Tu's present argument had been preceded by many others to some extent, e.g., by Zhang Zhenglang and Shirakawa Shizuka. Only the part of Hu Shi's theory that dealt with the treatment of the Shang people by the conquering Zhou was to be refuted. (4) A new article by Xu Zhongshu (in 四川大学學術論叢, 第九輯, May 1982) had just come to Tu's attention. In this article, the character 𠄎 雞 in the Zhou yuan oracle bones was equated with the character 𠄎 箕; and it was speculated that the oracle bone might be referring to Ji Zi 箕子 of Shang, who, according to historical sources, was treated as ke 客 (a high-ranking guest) by the Zhou king. This line of argument, if accepted, would reconfirm Tu's notion that at least some aristocrats were well treated by the Zhou.

Qiu Xigui thought Tu's emphasis on the aristocracy was overdone, and it was shaky to say that the "Yin survivors" were only or mostly aristocrats. The "Shang rendering service to Zhou" occurring in the Shi jing could not in Qiu's opinion easily be placed in the social hierarchy. Tu agreed; he said he did not contend that the "Yin Survivors" merged with the Zhou ruling class. The persons mentioned in the Shi jing, however, judging from context, did seem to him to be of rather high social status.

Qiu also remarked that the clan inscriptions were a precarious source of information when trying to determine whether some one was a "Yin survivor" or a member of the new establishment. He and Zhang Zhenglang had for a long time suspected that the reality was far more complicated than Tu seemed to assume: some clans that served both Shang and Zhou in succession might have identified with neither of the two! Also, identical clan names in different time periods might have designated different families altogether. Or, one branch of a clan might have been faithful to the ancien régime, whereas another was an unwavering supporter of the newcomers. Tu agreed with these possibilities, but still found it feasible to link up persons with identical clan names from both dynasties at least tentatively.

There was some discussion among Qiu Xigui, Tu Cheng-sheng, and Virginia Kane on the bronze vessels excavated in Fufeng in 1975 (published in Wenwu 1976:6) which, on the basis of the names in their inscriptions, have been connected by Tu (following Kuo Mo-jo) with another vessel (now lost) commissioned by a person of the same clan name. Whereas Qiu agreed with Li Xueqin that there was probably no family relationship between the patrons of the two vessels, because the ancestors in the inscriptions were incompatible and even of different social class, Tu held that they were contemporary and by the same man. Kane said that she agreed with both to a certain extent -- that the vessels were not contemporaneous (the excavated vessels belonging to the reign of Mu-wang and the lost vessel to that of Hsuan-wang), but that they still could have been commissioned by members of the same ongoing clan. Kane further indicated that she thought a Zhou date should be assigned to all of the vessels from the Fufeng hoard discovered in 1976, including the so-called Shang gui, which in her opinion, could not convincingly be interpreted as dedicated to Wenwu Ding of Shang. Tu was not positive about this suggestion, quoting his art-historian wife's non-committal attitude as to the stylistic date of the bronzes in question.

Qiu Xigui and Tu Cheng-sheng also discussed Xu Zhongshu's above-mentioned article. Qiu stressed that the character ji 其 was nowhere attested in the oracle inscriptions, and that Xu Zhongshu's reading of 維 as 箕 has been questioned.

Kane still said that the inscription on p. 7 in Tu's Chinese text had been authoritatively dated by Akatsuka Kiyoshi, who confirmed that the inscription in question did not contain an ancestor dedication to a Shang king; Tu countered that nevertheless, the name of Wu Yi was mentioned in the inscription, which perhaps, accepting a Zhou date for the vessel, meant that there was a notion of descent even beyond the end of the Shang dynasty.