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Fig. 1. The elephant, one of the prey animals hunted, kept captive, and also buried along with its mahout in the sacrificial pits at the royal Shang center at Anyang, here depicted on a Shang ritual bronze (gu) in the collections of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities. Compare the previous publication in Bernhard Karlgren, "Elephant and rhinoceros in ancient north China," in Bengt Lyberg et al., ed. Festschrift tillägnad Carl Kempe 80 år: 1884–1964 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1964), 634–35, figs. 1–2. Photo Erik Cornelius © The Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities.

Rising From Blood-Stained Fields: Royal Hunting and State Formation in Shang China

by

Magnus Fiskesjö

...my taste for these violent pleasures has greatly abated. Even here in Tibur, however, the sudden bark of a stag in the brush is enough to set trembling within me an impulse deeper than all the rest, and by virtue of which I feel myself leopard as well as emperor.¹

1. Introduction, with an overview of sources

The obsession with hunting on the part of the Shang dynasty kings, famously reported from ancient Chinese history, has long been explained, and condemned, as decadent luxury. The purpose of this article is to challenge this long-standing, still widely accepted but really fundamentally flawed traditional view, by investigating the actual evidence and suggesting an alternative. The article sets forth the view that the royal hunt, as a form of dangerous leisure, served as an intentionally conspicuous, grandiose risk-taking, simultaneously used to build and cultivate an image of control and physically incorporating the surrounding wilderness, thus expanding the domain and the charge of the Shang king and his archaic state in a dynamic process of “domestication” that is central to state formation.

On this view, the royal Shang hunting expeditions embody the very process of organizing and shaping the fledgling Bronze Age monarchical state in relation to its surroundings. While this royal form of “consumption beyond utility” obviously also carried instant, concrete rewards (harvested game for the royal kitchen, the perfection of martial arts, and so on), the answer to why the kings of the late Shang dynasty should have been so obsessively and personally interested in risky hunting expeditions is to be sought in how these expeditions and the hunting of wild animals—and of wild people—helped establish the king as king. Put otherwise, the “utility” of the hunt, if we choose to stay with such terms, must be sought in the very process of cultivation of monarchical status and power.

The traditional explanation of the hunt as decadent sport is as unsatisfactory as are, ultimately, all of the other more recent explanations which typically seek to isolate some sort of plain utility or immediate practical reason behind it. Some indicate that the great expenditure of effort involved served as a form of military exercise which would have its practical utility by “paying off” in times of war; others have seized upon the possibility that this was a supplementary subsistence activity supplying meat to the royal kitchen; and so on. Neither altogether incorrect, nor mutually exclusive, these partial explanations in effect fail to address the central symbolic “utility” of the royal hunt in the dynamic context of its time. All of this begs the question anew.

The Shang royal hunt is no latter-day invention: it has been amply confirmed both in the historical and archaeological record of the late Shang kings (ca. 1200–1045 BCE), notably their oracle bones, an archive of sorts of the last of these kings, uncovered in the large-scale excavations under way since the early 20th century at the Shang ruins at Anyang, in what is now northern China. The Shang warrior-farmer dynasty, an emerging “Bronze Age theocracy,” drew sustenance for its immediate

---
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subsistence mainly from food produced in settled agriculture: millet grown in rain-irrigated fields, and also cattle, pigs, sheep, dogs, and other domestic animals, supplemented by fishing, and hunting.4 The kings, who must be imagined as constantly struggling with capricious natural forces and hostile enemies, persistently engaged ritual specialists, or "diviners," to carry out pyromantic oracle divinations. The immediate, overt intention was to probe the influence exerted by various gods, especially ancestor spirits,5 on the affairs of the living, and determine what course of royal action might be auspicious. The main media used came from domestic animals: bovine scapulae (i.e. cattle shoulder blades), or turtle shells. These were heated up to cause cracks to form and sound, which were then interpreted, and recorded, using inscriptions. Royal divination concerned sacrifices to ancestors and other deities, the weather or the harvest; hunting and warfare; combinations of the above, or other topics like the generalized recurring dangers hidden in every coming night or week; the king's illness; royal child-births; and so on. Divination was a very prominent and labor-intensive activity, a daily preoccupation which actively involved the king himself. It was not invented by the Shang kings, but instead built on long traditions predating the Shang and persistent not just with the king and his court, but beyond their sphere of influence, and also within other Shang social strata.6 The texts found on the stored "oracle bones" come, however, almost exclusively from royal divination at the court. Admittedly, they are not only severely constrained in both scope and outlook, but often obscure, or fragmented. By today, however, a full century of paleography scholarship has realized their potential as one of the major sources of knowledge about the Shang. Their discovery, some aspects of which I will mention later on, transformed the Shang from a diffuse presence in transmitted

texts to a new status as the earliest Chinese historical dynasty,7 and many scholars have worked on their decipherment, and dating.8 The existence of the Shang royal hunting expeditions and their great importance might well have remained unknown without the oracle bones.9 Royal hunting is revealed as a frequent topic—more than one-tenth of over known 100,000 known inscriptions.10 The kings and their associates probed the auspiciousness or suitability of choices of hunting destinations, the choice of companions, the timing, and so on. The inscriptions sometimes even included the results of the action taken, in "verifications"12 listing the various animals captured. This forms the crucial bridge to the physical remains recovered in archaeological excavations. While archaeological materials offer insights that could never have been obtained from the inscriptions alone, the remains of the hunted prey, as well as the other victims of hunting, sacrifice, and slaughter, both animal and human, can be systematically compared with the written record. 

Connecting the two most important intertwined sources with direct bearing on the Shang circumstances (the oracle bone inscriptions, and the archaeological discoveries at Anyang13), is a central aim here. Since Shang archaeology is a distinctly historical archaeology, our inquiry into the significance of the Shang royal hunt must obviously strive to make these two types of data inform each other. These sources should, moreover, always be placed in their proper context: not only should they be placed within the fragmented history of the recovery of remains in our times, and,  

---

1. Already Confucius had complained of the lack of sources on the Shang, which shows that already in his time, the oracle bone inscriptions had been forgotten. 

2. Dating depends on writing style, overlapping sequences of groups of diviners, the records of offerings to royal ancestors, etc., determining the succession of kings. The obtained sequence is used to date archaeological remains in turn (see above, 2.1). The most widely cited periodization has been Dong Zhuzhin's five-period system, which in turn is being revised and modified. For example, some Period IV inscriptions are now understood to belong to an even predates Period I. See, e.g., Alice K. A. J. van der Heijden, "Shang: China's First Historical Dynasty," 247-51. 

3. Indeed, it has always been known to the Chinese literary world that the Sovereigns of the Dynasties of the Shang line were devoted followers of the chase; but until the beginning of the present century, none knew or any reason to suspect that records of such hunting expeditions were still in existence. But they were... L. C. Hopkins, Records of David's Deer in Hunting by Shang-Yu soveriengs, Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland (1934), 424. 

4. Huang Feng, "Guizhi xue de shi ji qi tianzun," Zhongguo shi yu jie (1992), p. 40, citing an unpublished paper by Cen Weizhan. Also see the latter's recent book, Shang wai tianji jier (Shang's External Territorial Inscriptions; Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chubanshe, 1994). A figure of seventeenth or more of the total is suggested by Zhang Sijie, "Yin Shang shi tianzun bingfang de shi ji you zanxian," Lishi ya (April, 1990), 96. Keightley (Sources of Shang History, 165-70) notes the difficulties of assessing to what extent the recovered oracle bones actually represent a representative sample of the total number used in divinations. On such difficulties, see too below. 

5. For more on the structure of inscriptions, see below 3.1. 

6. Since the 1980s, Shang-period archaeology has expanded far beyond Anyang, locating regional interconnections and a whole series of contemporaneous Bronze Age polities across the East Asian mainland. On Shang archaeology beyond Anyang, see Robert Bradley, "Shang archaeology," in Lawrence and Shawbray, eds., The Cambridge History of Ancient China, 132 ff. While the Shang were clearly one of many polities within an interconnected dynamic web of early states, Shang Anyang is as the most important known center within the long-standing general trends towards centralization in south and east central China. The fact that most oracle bone inscriptions have been recovered from Anyang is but one aspect (news reports in April 2001 mention the discovery of late Shang inscribed oracle bones at Ouanchaung, Shandong Province).
obviously, within the contemporaneous Shang-era socio-historical context, but we should also "cast a wider net" not just around animals per se, but also (to anticipate, once again, the final discussion) try to capture the larger context of the uses of the wild, of the "domesticated" animals, and of people.

There are several other potential sources of information. These include visual renderings of animals and people in the shape of decoration on objects such as the bronze ritual and funerary vessels, to which I will also refer occasionally. The representations of various animals are often life-like and powerful. Examples from the Anyang center have been regarded as more stylized, and Southern examples more naturalistic. No Shang pictorial renderings of hunting itself have been preserved,15 so there are no immediate sources for iconographic studies of hunting as such in the Shang period (except as inferred from elements of the Shang writing system16).

The Classical texts, which postdate the Shang, are above all important not just sources but also the basis of the traditional Chinese condemnation of the Shang royal hunt as wasteful and degenerate. These texts may be useful as sources of comparative information on ritualized hunting in later times, including also in imperial (Han) China, but they must be treated with suspicion since they are twice removed from the Shang context. They are not only composed in a different cultural context but heavily colored by later views, including the Classical Chinese justification of the Zhou conquerors' destruction of their Shang predecessor, and particularly in this relation they have been constantly re-edited and embellished throughout subsequent history.17 While recognizing the comparative interest of these texts, as with materials on royal hunting orgies worldwide (on which more below, in the conclusions), we should refrain from using such texts as direct sources. I will refer to Classical texts occasionally and discuss certain continuities and discontinuities in the conclusions.

Insights can also be drawn from the uses of hunting elsewhere in the world (which I barely hint at in this article, only suggesting, in the conclusions, some useful directions for further inquiry), and in other times. Looking back into regional prehistory, there are a number of continuities and parallels. The main differences between the Shang and the preceding polities of the region lie in the increased scale of social organization and social complexity accompanied by the monopolization of violence, the enormous investments in bronze use, and writing. But pyromantic divination using turtle shell and bone was not new; it is known already from the preceding Neolithic, including Longshan (龍山) cultures. Other aspects of demonstrable continuity from prehistoric times include the keeping of domesticated animals, such as cattle, pig, dog, alongside the consumption of wild animals; agricultural tools and methods; ceramic styles; and mortuary rituals, even in the continuant construction of elite burials with wooden coffins in stepped pits. Very little is known, however, of the status-differentiated aspects of hunting in prehistoric societies,18 and I will

---

15. Bagley, "Shang archaeology," 210-11, etc. The representation of animals in artistic renderings on prestige goods has been correlated generally with the emergence of the early state, as in the Mesopotamian examples cited by, for example, Charles Melville, "The point of the animal," "Art and politics in the early Shang society," Journal of Anthropological Research 9,1 (1963), 1-30. This is an aspect of Shang royal significance that I have left out almost entirely here. For more discussion of animal life, royal signs and bronze imagery in the Shang period, see Hayashi Mineo, In Shu jukite okibiki imaya no komin (Tokyo: Yosukan, 1986), Vol. 1, p. 120-25, 157-58, Vol. 2, p. 102-103, etc.; and the further references cited by Keightley, The Advanced Bronze Age, esp. 109-111 and 110 n. 43, including 114., "Hunting records, funerary remains and decorative patterns from the archaeological site of Anyang, Guo Tai T'ung Yueh roi keng, ca. 1300 B.C.", J. of the American Oriental Society 85, 3 (1965), 327-31; and also see E. Childe Johnson, The metamorphic image: A predominant theme in the ritual art of Shang China," BMFAE 70 (1998), 5-17.

16. Pictorial depictions of hunting outside of the writing system are preserved only from periods after the end of the Shang era, as in the last part of the Zhou Shih dynasty (Eastern Zhou, c. 770-221 BCE); see for example: Xu Zhonghao, "Gouqian shi yu ti kou," in Qian zhe Qu bao hui: zhaohan 65 ai binghuang (Peking Academy Sinica, 1935, Vol. II, 569-671); Mary H. Feng, "The origin of Chinese pictorial representation of the human figure," Ars Antiqua 49 (1989), 10-12, and 14; Charles D. Weber, "Chinese pictorial bronzes of the Late Zhou and the Warring States," Ars Antiqua 29-30 (1967), 135-77; Michael Lewis, Man and Beast. The hybrid in early Chinese art and literature, Mushan Books (1972), 97-117, Song Zhong, "Zhou yun: Zhongguo meiyi congshu, Wuxia 1981.6, 75-77; etc. Such representations could of course have existed even in the Shang, perhaps on perishable material such as wood or cloth. But it seems unlikely that such a genre existed since no trace has been found, not even in the woodavings reconstructed from traces in the soil of Shang royal tombs (figs. 2.2.1, 2.2.2, on such traces; one example illustrating what might be a tiger is found in K.C. Chang, Shang Civilisation, 106, fig. 34, from Uchimura Sueji, Inoue hatogumi makke nioten, Kyoto: Benrishi, 1959).

17. The characters of the oracle bone inscriptions themselves often include suggestive pictorial representations, on which more below (3.2). They are mostly highly stylized and actually function as more or less arbitrary signs within a sophisticated writing system. Even when they "depict" something (such as when a "foot" is combined with a "pig" is meant for the meaning of "pursue") they are not always pictorial representations. On Shang writing as a system, see Keightley, "The origins of writing in China: Scripts and cultural context," in W.M. Strong, ed., The Origins of Writing (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989). The very notion of writing in its social context as an exclusive tool is, in itself, also highly significant, far beyond beyond its presence as mere sources of event chronology. As noted by Diane M. O'Dowd, if we were to define early writing "exclusively as that which records or fixes its system of representation within a singular place and therefore forecloses the possibility of examining what that signifying system may have motivated in local and regional contexts," a "Critical Distance: Practicing the Chinese art of history," Journal of the American Academy of Art 2,1-2 (2000), 333. On the place of writing in Shang society see also Redmill-Demjanjuk, "Ecriture et divination sous les Shang." In Karine Chéroux et al., eds., Démocratie et nationnalité en Chine ancienne. Extrême-Orient, Extrême-Occident 21 (1999), 13-35.

18. "ROYAL HUNTING AND STATE FORMATION IN SHANG CHINA"
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concentrate on the Shang, some of the discernible trends and developments that have a particular bearing on the interpretation of the Shang royal hunt will be also mentioned in the conclusions.

The immediate sources for this inquiry into the royal Shang hunt remain the archaeological remains and the Shang oracle bone inscriptions—and, not least, the work done on this and related topics by other scholars.18

Part 2, below, is a review of the "ground truth," the remains of animals and other related items used or consumed by the Shang: the remains of waste and refuse from the consumption of food items; grave offerings, as well as offerings of animals and people in sacrifice. While highlighting some of the limitations and problems that still afflict the archaeological record, I will also seize the opportunity to suggest renewed research agendas which could remedy some of these problems by elevating the study of Shang-era biological remains to the level of serving cultural analysis.

Part 3 is a review of information on the royal hunt found in the oracle bone inscriptions. I outline certain general features of the hunting inscriptions, examine several key aspects (again cataloguing the victim species, in section 3.2.3). Changes over time and other trends in the oracle bone record, like the crucial implications of renewed research agendas which could remedy some of these problems by elevating the study of Shang-era biological remains to the level of serving cultural analysis.

Part 4 presents and questions the various views on the nature and role of the Shang royal hunting expeditions that have been put forward so far, mainly by Chinese scholars.

Part 5 concludes with my own discussion of what the information we have gathered can tell us about the role of the hunting expeditions, including as a means for building up the Shang king's position of power.

2. The archaeological remains

2.1 Overview of Anyang archaeology

Because of the intense curiosity focused on the "Yin Ruins" (殷墟) near Anyang 安阳 on the part of Chinese historians, early Chinese archaeology came to focus on

ROYAL HUNTING AND STATE FORMATION IN SHANG CHINA

this area, riding high on a wave of nationalist interest in confirming the historical reality of the Shang dynasty and extending national history further back in time.20 Finding Shang dynasty oracle bones in situ was the top priority, but a long series of other, unexpected discoveries followed, above all the architectural remains of a Shang royal center.21 The thousands of oracle bone found have for the most part been unearthed in association with these building remains, often as caches placed in so-called "ash pits" constructed for storage, and also in some cases containing both animal and human skeletal remains. Burials have also been found in large numbers, either in cemeteries or in "sacrificial pits" containing humans, animals, or material artifacts: weapons, tools, ceramics, bronze, figurines, etc. Some items, like the horse-drawn chariot, indicated long-distance borrowing, ultimately from Western Asia. Last but not least, a series of now-famous large-scale tombs of the late Shang kings were also found. These Anyang remains were once a Shang dynastic capital, probably corresponding to the "Yin" of later (Zhou-inspired) literature.22 Proto-"capitals" such as this apparently only emerged towards the end of the Shang period. According to Sima Qian's Shiji (second century BCE)23 and other texts (see n. 15), the Shang previously had no "fixed" capital and moved the seat of their dynasty seven times before finally settling at Anyang.24 It is widely acknowledged that the Anyang palace remains and royal tombs of kings indeed represent such a more fixed-site capital site, as suggested by Sima Qian. Indeed, the 20th-century combined discoveries at the Anyang sites prove that this area constituted if not a grand capital.

18 Chinese field archaeology until this time had focused on prehistoric finds, which could not immediately be related to historical texts in the same manner. On the historical setting, see also K.C. Chang, The Archaeology of Ancient China (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980). On the historiographical orientation of Chinese archaeology, see Anthony 67 (1993): 393-95; and Robert Bagley, "Shang archaeology," in The Cambridge History of Ancient China, 124-231. Classical Chinese texts (notably the chapter on Shang history in Sima Qian's Shiji) stated the Shang kings starting with Ran Gong (聞公) had ruled from a new, fixed capital city at "Yin" widely regarded as an early direct ancestor to later-day "Chinese" politics.


21 "Yin" is used in Zhou texts when referring to the Shang and is therefore often still used by Chinese and Japanese scholars in lieu of the native "Shang." I generally use "Shang." "[Sima Qian] was the first archaeologist of China" (Chang Text-ken, Archaeology in China, Vol 2: Shang China [Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1960], xvi); apparently even visiting, the Shang ruins personally while researching his monumental Shiji — some inscriptions suggest that another "Great city of the Shang" (Da yi Shang) may have been located southwest of Anyang, at present day Shangqiu (Knychel, Sources of Shang History, xiv n. 6; "The late Shang state: When, where, and what," 532 ff.). The search continues, including under the leadership of the director of the Anyang work team, Tang Jigen, who is also redrafting Shang periodization. See Tang Jigen, "Zhang Shang wenchou yuandi," Kaogu 1994.3, 393-420; "New discoveries at Anyang, capital of Bronze Age China," presentation of April 7, 2003; Institute of Archaeology and the University of Minnesota Archaeology Laboratory, Anyang Huayue liuyu kaogu yuandi chubao kaoji, Kaogu 1998.10, 13-22; Tang Jigen et al. "The largest walled Shang City located in Anyang, China," Antiquity 74 (2000), 479-80; and the most recent version by the Anyang work team, "Shangzhi Shangzhe de gongzi yuandi zaxian," in Shangzhi shenhua huiyi, (Caidi shengkai xianshi zangzhu zongyi) (Shangzhi: 2003), 54-62.

The apparent inconstant nature of Shang kingship has been taken as an indication that the Shang originally relied more on herding and their economy became more permanently inclined towards settled agriculture only after settling at Anyang. This is possible; it has not yet been substantiated by nonarchaeological or other research.
tal" in the manner of later periods, then clearly an important center, actively used in the 1500 years or so immediately preceding the demise of the Shang dynasty, in about 1045 BCE. While relatively few dwelling structures have been found, extensive bronze and bone workshops have been located within and near the palace area. Simplistic labelling or divisions of the remains as "religious" vs. "economical" spheres are clearly unworkable, and facile sacred/secular dichotomy that may not fit Shang times should be avoided. Still, the late Shang center at Anyang had a heavy emphasis on ceremonial and mortuary aspects. The increasing concentration and monopolization of resources,\(^26\) not least the clear indications that the center embodied a trend toward more permanent royal establishments, are all highly significant for our topic.

At present, four different strata are generally discerned within Anyang cultural deposits: Prehistoric (mainly Neolithic Longshan pottery and associated remains); Pre-dynastic Shang; Dynastic Shang (i.e. from when Anyang became an important center and until the dynasty ended); and Post-Shang. Obviously, archaeologists active in Anyang field research will proceed with refining the dating of Shang remains, but this is still the general framework for the division of Shang dynasty deposits into four archaeological "Yinxu culture periods," derived primarily from the pottery sequence and correlated with other artifact sequences.\(^26\) Period I corresponds roughly to the reign of Wu Ding,\(^14\), a very active hunter-king. Much of our knowledge about his reign comes from an important corpus of oracle turtle deposits: \(^15\) It is therefore not yet possible to associate specific archaeological remains with subdivisions of the late Shang, constructing a picture of changes in animal use or relating material remains more closely with the changes in the institution of the royal hunt seen in the oracle inscriptions. We must accept the more general dates and further confirmation of the trends we seek to identify will depend on the refinement of various tools in response to a reinvigorated research agenda.

Animal and human skeletal remains at Anyang mainly come from excavations in the vicinity of Xiaotun village, in 1928-37, then interrupted by the Japanese war. The excavated objects were moved several times, and some were lost, including much of most of the skeletal remains. What remained was taken to Taiwan in 1949, where several senior investigators eventually published reports from the first 15 seasons.\(^29\) Excavations restarted in 1950, and continue to this day under the auspices of a permanent research station.

### 2.2 Animal and human remains in the context of Anyang archaeology

The main sources for information on Anyang remains are the following archaeological reports:

- **A** Four volumes of preliminary reports from 1929-33 (Li Ji, ed. Anyang fajue baogao, published in Peiping, or Peking, and Shanghai);
- **B** The large set of reports from the Xiaotun area (Shih Chang-ju et al., *Xiaotun yiichi de faxian yu fajue*, 1959—etc., published in Taiwan);
- **C** The large set of reports from the first series of excavations at the royal cemetery area at Xibeigang (Liang Siyong et al., *Houjiaxiang Yinmian* mudi, 1962—etc., published in Taiwan);
- **D** Postwar reports in mainland monographs and journals;
- **E** A number of specialized studies of Anyang animal remains and offerings.\(^30\)

Any animal and human skeletal remains have been found mainly in three kinds of circumstances, which form the framework for our review. They reflect not only the precise remains of hunting, but they do constitute recoverable traces of the prey's destiny within the Shang context. They are:


\(^26\) Some periodizations allowing for the initial use of the Anyang sites to have begun before Wu Ding. Period I sometimes includes the two kings who preceded Wu Ding (Pan Gong and Xiao Xin), or even the pre-dynastic Shang: Wu Ding's reign is sometimes seen as beginning with Pan Gong's death in 1045 BCE, through the early part of Wu Ding's reign, period 2 to late Wu Ding through Zu Gong and Zu Jia; period 3 to Ling Xin; cf. Xin Xin Pan Gong/Wu Ding and period 4 to Di Yi and Di Xian (i.e. Zhen, the last Shang king, overwhelmed by the Zhou). D. Zhang. *Zhangyi* (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 1995), 277-300; cf. Keightley, *The Shang*, 234-35.

\(^26\) It is not yet possible to associate specific archaeological remains with subdivisions of the late Shang, constructing a picture of changes in animal use or relating material remains more closely with the changes in the institutionalization of the royal hunt seen in the oracle inscriptions. We must accept the more general dates and further confirmation of the trends we seek to identify will depend on the refinement of various tools in response to a reinvigorated research agenda.
Storage or waste pits (in Chinese, "ash pits," or huukeng 灰坑, H number series): underground cellar-like structures associated with the remains of buildings and other architectural features (numbered in F series) at the late Shang center. These remains represent either refuse or waste; storage of grain or other foodstuff; or archives of oracle bones (2.2.1).

Human burials (mu 穴, M number series): here, animals (and sometimes additional human beings) serve as additional grave offerings, alongside objects such as ceramics, weapons or bronze items (2.2.2).

"Sacrificial pits" (jisiheng 祭壇坑, also numbered in the M series): these Shang people made ritualized disposals of goods, animals (or people), as sacrifice; thus they are neither graves, nor ash pits for storage or waste (but the functions may overlap), such as when humans are themselves buried as offerings in "sacrificial pits;" see below; 2.2.3).

Several general terms deployed here deserve more explanation:

- "Storage" pits and waste ("ash") pits. These have sometimes been re-assigned as "sacrificial pits" (e.g. MA, MB, MC and MD, in the area C building foundations; see below, 2.2.3), either because the remains were clearly articulated, or because the pits also contained burned bone, which depending on the circumstances may indicate sacrifice, rather than waste, or storage.31
- "Burials," or "graves" are forms of disposals of deceased members of society who have met with death from disease, old age, war, or other calamities. Burials in the Shang context also often include additional sacrificial offerings, including animals (almost exclusively a small range of domesticated animals), human beings, and material goods.
- "Sacrifice": the intentional disposal of animals, people or goods which are renounced and removed from immediate human use, either by being killed and willfully disposed of, or simply by being renounced in some other way (as with burial offerings).32 Thus the sacrifices in "sacrificial pits" (2.2.3) differ from the waste disposal of ash pits (2.2.1) in that the items found in them and the use value of those things have been intentionally and willfully "given up," rather than being discarded because their immediate use value already ended (when they are consumed, broken, etc.; such features and structures may also, of course, be pregnant with meanings). The sacrificed items (animals, material goods, human enemies, or low-status people) are possessions which are intentionally and ritually renounced by the living. Put otherwise, the renouncing, killing or outright murder of these sacrificial items (at times archaeologically visible in cutting wounds imprinted in skeletal remains, otherwise inferred from the circumstances) are the ways in which the living discontinue their possession of these living beings and material goods. The act of symbolic removal from present and future human use and ostensibly from society itself clearly takes place in, and derives its meaning (as communicative status display, and so on) from within the social context, which in the Shang case is obviously hierarchical, and dynamic.

- This relates to the issue of how to define "sacrificial pits" (2.2.3) and differentiate them from low-status burials (2.2.2). The "sacrificial" pits were called "small graves" in many pre-war reports. Later, they were redefined as sacrificial pits (believed to hold sacrificed "slaves"33), but they are nevertheless still numbered in the "M" (mu 穴) series for human graves, in archaeological reports. Low-status burials generally lack traces of mutilation in the main occupants, and the presence of limited numbers of intentional grave goods or offerings accompanying the buried person, who can then be assumed to have died naturally, buried in an "everyday" mortuary context. Human remains which show mutilation, and/or lack grave goods, are readily defined as "sacrificial pit" offerings. Non-mutilated, intact humans also are made to follow the deceased higher-status person in their death, i.e. as offerings, in all types of tombs (including in lower- and medium-status Shang tombs). Thus, human bodies with no trace of mutilation, and who have even been given some grave goods of their own, may still also qualify as sacrifice (in the sense given above, i.e. a removal from use by the living in the manner of, say, dogs or horses, equally intact, who are made to die in order to follow the dead as posthumously useful sacrificial offerings). Such graves, when there is a spatial or other association with a regular burial, could either be called sacrificial burials—as they sometimes are in Western scholarly writings—or labelled "sacrificial pits" (jisiheng). (Note that there are also a number of instances of individuals who appear to have been subjected to various forms corporeal punishment, reflected in oracle bone graphs. We may regard these as the remains of Shang subjects, who suffered punishment on account of crime, etc. and not as sacrificial offerings34).

The implications of these distinctions, and of the treatment of humans as animals, will be discussed further in the conclusions. The nature and quality of the information we have on these remains depends to a high degree on the circumstances of the archaeological research, and the presentation will therefore necessarily also trace parts of the course of their discovery.
2.2.1 Remains found in storage or waste pits ("ash pits")

All but three of the 15 pre-war pioneer seasons were spent at Xiaotun Locus North, the center of the "Yin ruins," and up to 90% of pre-war excavated animal remains came from ash pits there, and are continuously found there. Initially, excavators dug long trenches forming a large network and further expanded when specific features such as an ash pit was encountered. The early trenches yielded hundreds of inscribed and uninscribed oracle bones, pottery, etc., for which location, depth and soil color were recorded. Although animal skeletal remains were recorded to some extent in later seasons, during the earlier three seasons they apparently were not always recorded ("...there were very many more large animal bones, not included here, but stored at Anyang..."). As the excavations expanded, large excavation pits were opened and it was realized that what had at first been thought to represent hardened flood sediment deposits was a large complex of rammed-earth building foundations, some constructed within vast building "beds," some built directly on the ground, and some with foundation stones that probably supported wooden pilars. It became apparent that the technique of pounding layers of clay-rich soil into a hard surface had also been used in many storage and burial pits, which became easier to recognize. Starting with the fourth season, tracing these structures became an important goal, and as one result of this, records were further improved.

The building foundations at Xiaotun Locus North, over fifty in all, form the most important part of the Shang center apart from the royal tombs. The buildings formed three groups, A, B and C, as described in the first report volume.

One interpretation has been that the A group represented royal living quarters; B temples, and/or palaces; and C perhaps sacrificial altars; also, on the basis of the associated distribution of metallurgical remains, it has been suggested that area A structures had been built first, then B, and C last. This is not entirely convincing: Such a view of "practical" rise and "sacrificial" decline may be prejudiced by the Classical texts inspired by the Zhou enemy, which would predict "religious" decadence and decline going before the fall of the Shang dynasty to righteous Zhou attackers. The three distinct palatial building groups have since come to be seen as an integrated whole, where each have been constructed over considerable time. When viewed from the outside, such as from the north side of the river Huan, the site and the palace buildings must have appeared commanding and imposing. Although the surrounding landscape today is dominated by flat farmlands, any visitor will notice that these buildings were located in a strategic position in a corner bend of the river. West and south of the architectural remains, a moat has been found, indicating a defense perimeter inside the river bend that creates an enclosure of the center on all four sides. This probably reflected what has been called the "squariness of the Shang cosmos," an emerging penchant for cardinal directions, including in alignments and arrangements of human burials, and other aspects of increasing regularization (on which more below).

In the earliest reports, details on animal remains in the central Xiaotun Locus North area are included only occasionally, as "deer antlers," "horse hoof" etc., in the case of clearly defined features, the records are somewhat better: "Round pit at second northern extension of horizontal trench 13C [...] Large potsherds, animal bone, shell, deer teeth, a very large number of bovine horns; also some bone plates put in layers, bone projectile points, and fragmented jades..." Illustrations show the more prominent caches of deer antler, uninscribed bovine scapulae, and turtle plastrons. In some pits with uninscribed oracle bones, fragmented human bone was also found. Many more skeletal parts from wild and domestic animals continued to be found in the undeveloped trenches, and in ash pits: tiger and leopard, "rat type" bones, and so on, including cattle and buffalo (in great contrast to the specially built of..."

---

31. Shi Chengru, "Henas Anyang Xaotun can Yin mu zhong de dangyue guahai," 1953, 3 ff. Seasons 10-12 in 1934-35 were conducted at the royal cemetery area at Xitoungou.


33. These were discovered in undisturbed caches as isolated fragments, or in deposits disturbed by excavations or by post-depositional digging (farmers' farming wells, etc.).

34. Citated from Dong's note in his summary table for the first season. Dong Zuohui, "Zhonghua xiaotun 17 mian 10 yue xiaojie Anyang Xaotun baozou disu," 35.

35. Most descriptions and plans in the later reports are offered in terms of these 10 x 10 m pits. For example, burial pit M721 is in the SE part of C134 (located in area C, excavation pit 314).

36. A total of 25 separate units of pit building, B twenty-one, and C seventeen. Having already used Latin letters to designate the initial, large arbitrary excavation units at Xiaotun, the archaeologists here used the Chinese characters for, and anguishing Li (Anyang 151 ff.) thus renders these as "off", "beta" and "gamma," but Chang (Shang Civilization, 92 ff.) calls them Northern, Middle and Southern Groups, although in Shi Chengru's reports, these terms had been used in English for three subdivisions of burials associated with the important structure 87 (Anyang jing 7) (cf. Xuanmu xiaojie de fenxi yan jia, fangqian. Yinxu xiangmao zhongliang 1972, 1973). The "group" refers to the structures, but Northern etc. "section" refers to associated burials.

37. Shi Chengru, "Xiaotun xianxia de fajue yan jia", jiaokao yizhi (Nankang, Tiantan: Academia Sinica, 1959); see too Li JI, Anyang, 49-73, 95-104; K.C. Chang, Shang Civilization, 73 ff., Virginia C. Kao, "A re-examination of Anyang archaeology," Ars Orientalia 10 (1975), 93-110. The burials were described in more detail in later volumes of Shi's report (see 2.2.2).
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shops have been found, yielding large amounts of unfinished and worked bone as well as tool-making tools; the raw bone material was mainly from cattle and pigs, sometimes also horses, sheep, dogs, and deer antlers and bone. One separate pit excavated in 1987 contained a cache of interesting bird bones (see below: 2.3.2, Species identification). Post-war discoveries of ash pits also include the 120 pits found during the 1973 excavations at Xiaotun Locus South. Many stored oracle bones, published first and separately; others were refuse pits with discarded tools and animal remains such as deer antlers and other unspecified refuse, which apparently has yet to be identified, quantified, and analyzed.

The animal remains recorded from pre-war excavations of ash pits originally were published by Liang Siyong, who recognized their high importance. Due to the war, his tragic death, and his premature death, they have not been published. Re-analysis of original notes, along with new research on remains that have been retained for future study, might include attention to both the temporal and spatial distribution of different species within the sites, the distribution of specific animal parts—such as, answering the question of precisely where the tiger skulls were found (reportedly more than twenty tiger skulls, along with some limb bones!?)—as well as the study of cutmarks of refuse (to attempt to understand butchery patterns and comparing them with oracle-bone inscriptions regarding sacrifices, etc.).

A renewed research program taking these issues into account could help us arrive

"sacrificial pits", where, apparently, all bovines without exception were domestic cattle, not buffalo. One trench expansion yielded the remarkable, much-debated find, the inscribed skulls of three large mammals. One has been identified as a wild bovine, 2 were from deer. Yet another storage pit discovered in 1931 contained a scapula and several vertebrae of whale, along with one elephant mandible, of great interest, but poorly recorded. This exemplifies the incomplete nature of the published record for the ash pits. Shih Chang-yu noted more examples with large amounts of animal bones (H30, etc.), without further details. Other Xiaotun pits contained pottery, bronze weapons, or other artifacts; many others contained only uniform greenish soil (perhaps subterranean granaries).

In the post-war period, several more important excavations have been conducted in the area. More architectural remains have been found [see 2.2.3, below], but nothing that compares in scale to the building clusters at Xiaotun Locus North or to the royal tombs. Other important discoveries include bronze production areas and burials associated with the building foundations. Sheng period bone work-

50 Shih, "Hsien Anyang... dongguan gahua," 5 (for example, in the pit D111). It is not clear who made the identifications.

51 Dong Zhuzhi, "Yin hai bu lio jie," in Anyang jiaque banguo, ed. Li Ji, Vol. 2 (Peking: Academia Sinica, 1928), 106; cf. Li Ji, Anyang fenzi banguo (Peking, 1951), map 5, only the location, no other context information is provided. The identity of the animal is much debated, probably because of the mention of an animal in the inscription. The skull was from a buffalo. Buffaloes have been regular inhabitants of the other locations (cf. species identification, 2.3.2).

52 They are all held in the Museum of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica, Taipei. The inscriptions are not oracle divination texts but record inscriptions. See Dong Zhuzhi, "Yin hai bu lio jie," and inscriptions in Isin-Ho 3:393-394. The bone skull (Isin-Ho 3933) is HJ 37398, Period V (on citations of inscriptions, see 3.1). Other similar but less well-prepared finds of inscribed bones from hunted animals have been made, but they never seem to have been used for divination. Keightley, Sources of Shang History, 8 n. 22 refers to the "tiger bone in White, Bone Culture of Ancient China, plate 28, 39-67 (pl. 14), inscribed with the record of the capture of a large tiger. See Hsiu Hsin Chun-hsiung, Oracle Bones from the White and Other Collections (Toronto: Royal Ontario Museum, 1979). Four other large inscribed skeletons believed to have been discovered in Xiaotun (published in 1914 in Jihua (Yin-shu jihua), well before the excavations started, were lost thought to be from elephants, but they were later also shown to be bovine bones (Dong Zhuzhi, "Da jianjuan jiefu xiang Quote: zheng", Anyang wenwu 3 (1961), from what species is unknown). Another inscribed scapula is, however, likely to be from an elephant; it records a hunt (now) but no names of captured animal (= HJ 13758; see Li Ji, Anyang wenwu 8, 68-71, map 71. No detailed record is available. Whale bones were later also found in royal tombs (see below: 2.2.3).

53 For this and another similar pit (E10); Li Ji (Anyang, 1973) only refers to the chronological tables published by Shih Chang-yu in 1952. But the record here for this particular season only summarily mentions E10 (not E10); for E16; Shih (p. 12) mentions a whale scapula and tiger bone along with an inscribed deer skull, and 791 inscribed oracle bones. The bronze pottery and inscriptions suggest a date for E16 of Yin Period I or 2 (Hsiu Hsia). "Shen zu bu lio shu fen", in Xu Zhonghui, zhuangzhang shihui xiaoduo jianzhen suenti (Chengdu: Boluo shuop, 1990), 62, quoting Li Ji, "Xiaotun xian xia zhi tonghui", Zhongguo kungzang zhi cao 1948; 4, and Zhuo Huang, "Sudan Yin zhou wenwu fenq", Beijing dexiu renwen juhe 1964:5, 60-61, table 4. For a recent summary, see Chi Hung-fong, "Some thoughts on the dating of Late Shang bronze weapons".

54 Shih Chang-yu, Xianzou de shuizi guan yu yuanxiu, in Zhaokai 70:8, 43-65, 497-500, 514, which confirms that he is "no zoologist," and paleontologists ma may not be entirely reliable. (One question mark remains regarding his note that species such as elephant and whale were only found in burials at Xiheigang (Shih, "Hsien Anyang... dongguan gahua," 5). The early record clearly indicates such remains also came out of pits at Xiaotun, as mentioned above.


57 This exemplify the incomplete nature of the published record for the ash pits. Shih Chang-yu noted more examples with large amounts of animal bones (H30, etc.), without further details. Other Xiaotun pits contained pottery, bronze weapons, or other artifacts; many others contained only uniform greenish soil (perhaps subterranean granaries).

58 North of the village of Daokang, north of Beimeiaochang village, and in other locations (see Institute of Archaeology, Yin-shu jiaque banguo 1958-1961, 79-80).

59 Institute of Archaeology, Yin-shu jiaque banguo 1958-1961, 80; also, Institute of Archaeology, Yin-shu jiaque banguo 1984, 102.-The reports rarely offer detailed information on the raw material used in such bone workshops, and few studies attempt to relate the bone working industry to the faunal remains and to animal use in a wider sense, but see W.C. White, Bone Culture of Ancient China (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1947); also Wang Ying, Jiaque and Gender in Bone Art at the Late Shang Center at Anyang (University of Pittsburgh, 2000, which I have not seen). As for Shang sites outside Anyang, Xu Jianhui briefly discussed the raw material in the "palace area" bone workshops of the pre-Anyang Shang city at Zhengzhou, in "The Shang city at Chengzhou (Zhengzhou) and related problems," in K.C. Chang, ed. Studies of Shang Archaeology (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), 15-48, citing his report in Wenwu 1982:4, 1-14, which identifies cattle, pig, deer, and horse as used there. Zhengzhou datu workshop materials are also mentioned in a preliminary study of the ca. 100 human skull finds at Zhengzhou, believed to be "drinking vessels" manufactured and decorated in Shang times (Hao Hengxing, "Shiunan Zhengzhou chuang Shang di renwu gu jinyu," in Hsiung wenwu yamen, ed. Hsun Shan, Zhengzhou di shi Juanjg yu yu yu 1985-1982 (Zhengzhou: Zhengzhou gui, 1993).

60 Anyang work reports, "1973 nian Xiaotun xian jiaque banguo 1973," Kaoguxue ji she ji 1973: 52 ff. (see p. 5.9). Other works published by the Institute of Archaeology, Anyang, for example, are carefully described in their articles, as for example, "On the monumental remains found... Anyang," for more on the methodological problems involved, see section 2.3.1.


62 The study of butcher marks on skeletal remains has only recently been initiated in Chinese archaeology as part of a more sophisticated approach to the study of animal use.
at a more sophisticated and comprehensive understanding of patterns of animal use both inside and outside of burial contexts, and how they evolved. On the further implications of the available data, see the conclusions (Part 5).

2.2.2 Offerings found in human burials

Intentional offerings in human graves of animals, together with humans offered in ways similar to animals, constitute another important class of data. Such remains are a form of sacrifice, found in a large number of Shang human burials. Because burials persist as clearly defined structures and often contain artifacts deemed more valuable than animal bones, they have historically merited more description. As a consequence the quality of the data is higher. The late Shang burials can be divided into three relatively distinct types:

- **Low-status human burials (2.2.2.1)**
- **Middle-status human burials (2.2.2.2)**
- **High-status human burials, or royal tombs (2.2.2.3)**

All three types are found in spatially distinct planned cemeteries (rows or clusters of graves). The first two are found both north and south of the Huan river; the third category (royal tombs) is found almost exclusively in the Xibeigang area located across the river to the north (the tomb of Queen Pu Hao, an exception, is located near Xiaotun village just southwest of the main architectural remains, see 2.2.2.3).

2.2.2.1 Low-status burials

More than five thousand Shang-period lower-status burials have been identified in and near the late Shang center at Anyang. Despite some internal variation, all share a relatively simple basic structure: a simple rectangular grave cut, just about large enough for burying one or several human bodies; only rarely are there traces of any wooden coffin; grave goods are present but they are relatively modest (ceramics, and various kinds of tools). As might be expected, there are only very few additional offerings of animal, or humans. Occasional single dog offerings are the most common, sometimes using several dogs, typically buried directly under the body of the grave occupant in what is called a "waist pit" (yaokeng 隆坑). Only in rare cases are additional humans used. These are then buried with the main grave occupant, as offerings directly comparable to the use of dogs.

Many low-status burials are "suburban," located closer to low-status living quarters nearby (imperfectly known), just outside of the palace area, to the west, south and northeast. A number of low-status human burials have been found and excavated in the Xibeigang royal cemetery area, both before and after the war. Low-status graves are identified by the completeness of the skeletons, the layout, and the modest grave goods (i.e., the features which create the main contrast with the "sacrificial pits"). Sometimes information is provided on any additional animal or other remains included as offerings. Because these burials are associated with the Xibeigang royal cemetery area and are interspersed among the "sacrificial pits" found there, they will instead be reviewed in section 2.2.2.3.

In the Xiaotun palace area itself, lower-status burials are not common (which probably underlines the high-status character of this center within the center). Examples include a few single human burials with standard "waist pit" dog offerings.

Nearby, to the west and south of Xiaomintun village, extensive excavations of a large cemetery dominated by small low-status burials were carried out in 1969-1977. A report summarized 939 burials. There were only a few medium-status burials, and only 18 had additional humans as offerings. Most were simple low-status or commoner's burials. There were few animal offerings, but one-third of these were for dog offerings. 21

76 It is worth stressing that many issues remain in the exploration of social patterning in the mortuary program, which is only outlined here. On mortuary site analysis, esp. the distribution of grave goods, see the classic papers by C. Peelies et al., "Some archaeological correlates of ranked societies," _American Antiquity_ 42.3 (1977), 421-48; and J.A. Brown, "The search for rank in prehistoric burials" in R. Chapman et al., _Archaeology of Death_ (Cambridge: Cambridge University press, 1981), 25-37; also, B. Barlow, "A historical review of ethnological and archaeological analyses of mortuary practice." _Journal of Anthropolical Archaeology_ 1 (1982), 32-58, etc.

77 As mentioned, dates given in Chinese archaeological reports for burials and sacrificial pits are often limited to placing them in the Shang dynasty. This is based on Shang style grave goods such as bronze vessels and other artifacts (not makeup bones, which are only rarely found in burials or in sacrificial pits). C-14 dating has only been attempted for a limited number of the remains. In cases where there are few grave goods or none at all, as in many of the commoner's graves or in the sacrificial pits containing nothing but skeletal remains of animals or decapitated humans, etc., the spatial and stratigraphic context still implies an association with the royal tombs or with Xiaotun architectural remains.

78 This feature of the Shang mortuary program apparently became increasingly popular in Middle Shang times (Tang lige, "Zhong Shang wenchus yanjiu," 397).

79 For tabulations of Shang dog offerings as well as offerings of horses, cattle, sheep and pig, see Okamura Hiroshi, "In-Shi jida no dobuta no kogi" (also includes similar offerings from Neolithic through Zhou times) — Humans are not included in these tabular as a major category of offerings. As mentioned, our identification of "human offering" is based on varying degrees of pre-burial mutilation (the extreme example being the beheaded humans of the Xibeigang royal tombs), or a perceived "supplementary" relation to the main occupant who is invariably placed centrally and in an extended, supine position. When, in the Anyang context, such supplementary skeletons are mutilated in addition to having been placed in an inferior position, they are interpreted as remains of slaves or other inferiors that had been reduced to offerings, and they are believed to correspond to the offerings seen in medium-sized and royal tombs where they occur in much larger numbers (see below, 2.2.2.4; compare also Table 1, p. 108-109). (The latter "supplementary" type, not mutilated, might include forebears of the practice of burying wives with husbands seen in later Chinese mortuary practice. The data on gender, alas, do not permit the pursuit of this line of inquiry).


81 C.f. esp. Yang Xueliang and Yang Baochen's brief overview ("Cong Shangdai jishou zu Shangdai mei shehui de rensheng") also Okamura Hiroshi, "In-Shi jida no dobuta no kogi.

82 Kai Chi-i-shun, "The royal cemetery" appropriately discuss them along with the "sacrificial pits" there.

83 M31, described by Shih Ch'ang-yu ("Xiantun yishi de jishou zai yi jishou" 222-223). Yuyao musang, 1970.369-72, the "northern section" (of the Xiaotun area associated with building structure 37), M326 and M329, described by Shih ("Xiantun yishi de jishou zu yi jishou" 222-224). Yang Xueliang, 1981, 258-71, (on burials outside the building foundations of the C-cistern) 220-223: Anyang wo shu, 1959-1977 tiani Yinu xiqu musang, "Jinhe huaxia" _Kangru xuekan_ 1979.1, xun cang p. 29-30. Most burials in this cemetery were at a depth of about 1-1.5 m, not sealed by any cultural layers, but they included Shang pottery. As with many post-war reports, there are no stratigraphic section plans and only limited written exploration of the stratigraphy.
included dog offerings, most often a single dog, but sometimes two or more. The dogs were placed either in a "waist pit," in the grave fill, or both.75 The orientation of the dogs differed if there was more than one—giving an impression of an intention to obtain added posthumous "protection" from an increased number. Interestingly, many dogs had a bronze bell at the neck, not reported from any dog offering even in royal tombs. Perhaps these were hunting dogs, or guard dogs. Occasionally, sets of animal remains had been added: the formal combination of bovine/sheep/pig limb bones also seen in association with funerary vessels in some royal tombs (see below). One such grave contained three separate dog skeletons and burial pottery vessels associated with a sheep leg.76 This type of offering mainly occurred in addition to dog offerings, but occasionally also without the presence of dogs (as in M1024, where one articulated bovine limb was found in association with a single offering of a human being). Other than complete dog skeletons, there were occasional additional animal offerings in seven graves: heads or incomplete skeletons of dogs, sheep, pigs or bovines, limb bones of bovines, pigs, sheep, or chicken; and occasionally turtle or fish remains.77

The pattern or program evident in these data is valid for most low-status Shang burials. What is especially notable already, is that no wild animals at all, apart from occasional turtle or fish remains, are apparently included amongst the offerings included in these burials. This intriguing and highly significant pattern will be seen to repeat itself throughout most of the visible expressions of Shang mortuary programs.

2.2.2.2 Medium-status burials

These are believed to have been constructed for Shang aristocrats, courtiers or officials, the "managers" of the Shang state with relatively high status, in contrast to the rank-and-file Shang people seen in the low-status burials. They are much less common and are found either separately or in small groups (cemeteries), including in locations near the central palace remains. They are substantially larger than the low-status burials but generally lack the access ramps and the wealth of grave goods seen in the much larger high-status or royal tombs.

Middle-status burials typically also have dog offerings in waist pits and often additional dogs placed around the walls. There are also larger numbers of human offerings, suggesting whole groups of slaves or servants, in lieu of the singular or several humans that occasionally "follow the dead" in lower-status graves. Medium-status tombs often share some further elaborations of features in the Shang mortuary program with the still-larger royal tombs (2.2.2.3); thus, there may be a step platform halfway down the grave pit (an ereognai; i.e. marks); centrally placed wooden coffins (i.e. traces thereof); and more elaborate sets and quality of material grave goods, as well as of animal and human offerings.

- Two medium-sized tombs were excavated in 1976 in the Xiaotun cemetery area located near the high-status tomb of Queen Fu Hao, with whom they are believed to have been contemporaneous. The area is set apart from the main Xibeigang area of royal tombs. M17, with two apparently subadult humans used in addition to the main tomb occupant, also contained one articulated sheep leg; M18, with five such human sacrifices, again seemingly young or subadult males, and accompanied by weapons. There were two dog burials, one in a "waist pit," and one in the matrix of the north "second-level platform," on which one pig limb bone was placed. In the grave were also remains of an articulated bovine limb, and some important grave goods.78

- At Xiaotun itself burials in this category also include M232, an isolated burial located southwest of the main buildings.79 Other than the main occupant, interred in a central coffin, it contained 8 humans. Three dogs were buried around the top of the grave itself;80 another dog was placed in a waist pit.81 All were buried headed north, just as the majority of the human offerings. In addition, what may have been chicken bones were noted in the upper part of the grave: this was either refuse, or perhaps a form of sealing sacrifice for the grave.82

At the "C" building complex at Xiaotun (southwest of B, the largest complex), four medium-sized tombs were found, along with four separate animal pits and four lower-status single human burials.83

- M362 was equipped with a second-level platform; 12 of its total of 13 human bodies were sacrificial burials, arranged on the platform around the four walls of the main burial chamber.84 The grave had been robbed of most jade or metal objects, but still contained weapons, such as a bronze spearpoint, and fragments of inscribed bone and shell (otherwise very rare in mortuary contexts). In addition to the dog in the waist pit, there were two more dogs; one at the eastern wall, another in a separate pit on the southern second-level platform. On the
northern part of the platform, there was also a set of animal limb bones similar to that seen in both low-status and royal tombs. These were mostly complete, articulated mamal limbs: one sheep (?) limb with the scapula still attached (the last phalanx missing); one pig limb (?), scapula attached (identified by its last phalanx); and one bovine (?) limb. These bones are not definitely identified, nor is the side determined, but this is one of the more complete examples of this set "pig-sheep-cattle" sacrifice of specific animal limbs, along with complete traces of a woven mat discerned beneath all three components.

- M331, immediately east of M362, was slightly larger, but lacking a second-level platform. Apart from the main tomb occupant, there were five sacrificial human burials divided on the east and west sides; and only two dog burials: one in a waist pit, and southeast of it the trace of one more dog burial. M331, having escaped plundering, was very rich in grave goods, including four sea shells, other shells, bronze vessels, musical implements and some inscribed oracle bones. Significantly, this tomb showed that most grave goods had been smashed before burial, and in the case of both white pottery and oracle bones, only fragments were used. The wealth of various ornaments along with the relative lack of weapons caused excavators to believe the tomb's occupant was female (perhaps buried near her husband, in M362). Whatever the case, there was no offering of animal limbs, and fewer dogs, which may have been more closely associated with men, as guardians and huntsmen.

- M333, where the upper part of the tomb had been severely disturbed, revealed one dog in a waist pit beneath the center of the wooden tomb floor, and two more dogs immediately to the south of the central coffin, but above the floor. There were also two human offerings, one along each side of the coffin, which held but fragments of the occupant.

- M388 was similar to the above, poorly preserved but with a similar array of grave goods (bronze vessels, jades), and two dog burials: one in a waist pit, and one, very fragmented, to the north of the coffin.

- At Xibeigang, near the eastern cluster of royal tombs, tomb M259 is interpreted as the tomb of a royal family member, and as a warrior, because of the weapons included. Not much larger than a low-status grave, it did have a "second-level" platform, and grave goods indicating higher status. It included six dogs, one just

2.2.2.3 High-status burials, or royal tombs

These are twelve (or thirteen) substantially larger and richer tombs concentrated in two clusters in the Xibeigang area ("Northwestern heights") north of the Xiaotun palace area, on the other side of the river Huan—evoking the duality seen at Luxor, Egypt, with temples for the living mainly on the Eastern side and a sprawling necropolis on the Western side of the Nile.

One large tomb with four access ramps and Shang-like mortuary ritual (including the use of 48 human offerings), has been found in Shandong, at considerable distance from Anyang, but Xibeigang is the only place where a cluster of such tombs has been found—a further indication of Anyang's importance in its day.

The tombs are divided into a western and an eastern cluster, separated by about

...turbed soil of a small, unsuccessful looters' pit. These may have been parts of the animals buried in the grave, or perhaps deriving from the sacrificial "set" of limb bones mentioned above.

- Yet another example in the Xibeigang area is the isolated "59/Wuguan/M1" tomb of a lower-level aristocrat, located about 100 m south of the WKGM tomb at Xibeigang and excavated in 1959. It was particularly rich in grave goods, and contained six human offerings (four represented only by skulls), and one dog.

- Outside Xiaotun and Xibeigang, tomb M160 at Guozhizhuang village nearby may be the most important undisturbed burial discovered since Fu Hao's tomb. The grave goods here amounted to 349 objects (including 288 bronze; as well as bone and one ivory object). The offerings also included four humans and three dogs, plus limb bones and scapulae of bovines and sheep, and two horse offerings buried at a short distance from the tomb.}

---

80 Anyang work team, 'Yinxu 259, 260 hao mu de fujian baogao,' Kaogu zazhi 1987.1, 111.
82 Li 1985, two horse burials apparently related to the grave were found, only 30 m away. Anyang work team, 'Anyang Guozhizhuang 160 hao mu,' Kaogu 1991.5, 290-91, pl. 1; Liu Yizhu, 'Anyang Guozhizhuang 160 hao mu de fujian ji zhouyao shilun,' Kaogu 1998.9, 64-74.
83 One was empty and unfinished, and is widely thought to have been intended for the last, deposed ruler, Di Xin (Zhao).
84 Excavations began at Xibeigang under Liang Siyong during seasons 10-12 (1934-35). The reports were not published until 1962-1976 (listed under Liang, ed., Gao Quan). See also Kao Chi-hsien, 'The royal cemetery: Li Jr. Anyang, 74-94, K.C. Chang, Shang Civilization, 111-24; Bagley, 'Shang archaeology,' 184 ff.; On the dates of the tombs, see CH. Yu Fangwen, 'Some thoughts on the dating of Late Shang bronze workshops.'
85 The Sufutun tomb in Shandong (Shandong sheng wenwu guan chuishu, 'Shandong Yifu Sufutun di hao nuli xunzangmu,' Wenwu 1972.8, 17-30; Bagley, 'Shang archaeology,' 219-21.
86 Li Jr., underlined the continuity of the work of the three seasons towards the understanding of the Shang dynasty in terms of the organization of labor (as inferred from the labor needs for the construction of the large royal tombs), human sacrifice (both its presence, which had previously been doubted, and its unexpectedly large and pervasive scale), the nature of the material burial offerings, and the high level of technology of stone carving (jades) and bronze-making. See Li Jr.'s preface to Liang Siyong's HPKM 1001 (Taipei: Academia Sinica, 1962), also Li Jr., Anyang 82-84. The reports (Liang Siyong, ed., 1962-1976) explain the excavation procedures, with particular attention to the sequence of pits dug before and after the construction of the main tombs (such as pre-tomb features cut by the tomb, and the sequence of later looters' pits), and to the recovered artifacts (especially those of jade, bronze etc.).
100 m. They have long access ramps, leading down into a central burial chamber, and because of their dramatic shape, Chinese archaeologists have labelled them “inverted pyramids.”

Apart from large quantities of grave goods (which often, however, have been looted), they also frequently have elaborate offerings of both animals and humans, both within the tombs’ central chamber and arranged as offerings on the access ramps, and in the tomb fill, sometimes also placed in associated pits in the immediate vicinity (which then may be [mis-identified as separate “sacrificial pits”).

The royal tombs are oriented north-south, with the descending access ramps in most cases extending out from the center into all four cardinal directions, so that the tomb plan will appear as cross with a square center, always with longer north-south ramps (alternatively, the ramps exist only on the north and south sides). Some tombs (M1001, 1004, 1550) are located very close to each other, so that ramps cut into the ramp of an earlier tomb,29 providing one basis for relative dating.30 The ramps lead down to a central pit with a center wooden burial chamber, which in turn has a central wooden coffin. There is a second-level platform (ereng-tat).

Liang Siyong’s original plan was that the animal remains from these royal tombs should form a special chapter in the final reports. Because of Liang’s early illness and death, however, this part of the plan was never realized.31 The following is a summary of available information on the offerings of animals and humans, and their context:

• Tomb 1001: More than 30 looter’s pits, recent as well as ancient, had been dug into this tomb; 20 more much later burials cut into the upper fill of the tomb.32 The wooden burial chamber even featured some impressions of carvings left by the wooden chamber walls;33 plus nine human sacrificial burials beneath the wooden floor, each was accompanied by a dog.34 Liang Siyong compared the placement of “guardians” with dogs under the floor of the large tomb to a “waist pit” dogs of low- and medium status graves. Here, too, the dogs appear to have been put into their graves before the accompanying humans, and they were located as if “guarding against attack from the underworld.”35 The positioning of the nine man-with-dog burials around the corners of the floor was clearly intentional, and can be interpreted as posthumous guardians with dogs—possibly hunting dogs. There were also supplementary burials around the walls inside the tomb, also interpreted as sacrificial offerings, but these do not contain dog skeletons and may have held other types of servants.36 In addition, the access ramps yielded a total of 59 sacrificial human burials lacking their head, arranged in groups37 and also a total of 73 separate skulls,38 the highest numbers on the southern ramp. Both the headless bodies and the heads had been put down successively as the ramps were filled in with soil at the time of the construction of the tomb.

Among the animal figurines in jade found in the tomb were naturalistic renderings of tiger, buffalo, an owl-like bird, turtle, frog, fishes, and cicadas.39

There were also 31 more human burials immediately outside and to the east of the main pit, also interpreted as sacrificial offerings for the tomb’s occupant. They contained 68 mostly complete human skeletons, buried in numbers varying from one to five. A few had accompanying set animal limb offerings reminiscent of the program seen in lower-status burials.40 Seven of these 31 pits had no human remains, but horse offerings (either 2, 3, or 4 whole adult horses in each pit, or burial).

• Tomb 1002: Immediately southwest of M1001, had been disturbed even more thoroughly than M1001; impeding excavation and recording. At northern ramp entry point, there was a sacrificial offering of animal limbs similar to those already mentioned from lower-status tombs: three animal limb bones, possibly bovine, sheep, and pig, combined with three different pottery vessels.41

• Tomb 1003: another royal tomb heavily looted already in ancient times, held many different artifacts, but some of the records from the excavations were later lost. On the bottom of one of the early looter’s pits extending into the western ramp, excavators found unidentified scattered animal limb bones, one animal scapula and other bones (suggested the same set as that seen in M1001), plus some artifacts, including an ivory cup. At the southern ramp entry point, a large whale rib and a whale scapula were found (apparently in situ, at a distance of about 1.5 m from each other, and in immediate association with the remains of two chariot wheels). This second whale scapula—the other found previously in an ash pit—came from one and the same whale. The discovery in two different

---

29 See the plan in Liang Siyong, HPRM 1001, Part 2, p. 2.
30 The issue of how to correlate the tombs with individual late Shang kings has, of course, been much debated, in the absence of oracle bones which were not buried with the kings (or queens). See K.C. Chang, Shang civilization, 112 ff; Yang Xiliang, "Anyang Yinxu Xibeiqiao. Lu ma de fenpi ji yi yougan weici," Zhongguo wenwu 1001, 52; and Yang Xizhuang, et al., "Cong Shangdang jialing kan Shangdang nishi daxue de rendang," 14, quoting Zou Heng, "Shisan Yinxu xiuhe fenpi," Zhi zhi duiyu renwen zhong 1004.4-5.
31 Li H, Aspöck, 123-25.
32 The tomb itself cut into earlier, Neolithic (Longshan) pit. Liang Siyong, HPRM 1601, p. 3-4 (the later burials are illustrated with photos in Part 2). On M1001, also see Ruggles, "Shang archaeology," 185-92.
33 Impressions of wood-carvings included a large snake, and other monster-like beings. See Liang Siyong, HPRM 1001, p. 24 and pl. 12, 39, 61, etc.
34 Liang Siyong, HPRM 1001, 28-30, Li H, Aspöck, 91-92. No further information is provided on these remains, except their orientation and position. There is no estimate of the sex; the drawings and photos (Liang Siyong, ibid., 30, pl. 16-20) indicate that all the humans were adult.
35 Liang Siyong, HPRM 1001, 31.
36 Some were heavily disturbed, but others yielded small weapons such as bronze dagger-axes that could have been intended as guardian’s weapons. A few had small wooden coffins of their own, thus displaying some similarity to independent, lower-status burials outside Xibeiqiao.
37 They included both adults or adolescents (24 of the 59 are listed as “under 15”).
38 Some skulls were accompanied by a few of the cervical vertebrae, and others had cuts in their mandible, indicating some variation in the beheading of these offerings (Liang Siyong, HPRM 1001, 47).
39 Other artifacts included a wealth of bone implements (Liang Siyong, HPRM 1001, 205 ff).
40 These included human limb bones in M1510, and 2 dogs in 1006—which also contained a pile of six projectile points in bronze and two small dagger-axes. Other burials lacking animal offerings had even more of these projectile points (as many as 50 in burial M2077) (Liang Siyong, HPRM 1001, 48-56). They may have been tomb.eofid B. 1006 found at the beginning of the excavations in 1939, or low-status people unrelated to the tomb.
41 Liang Siyong, HPRM 1002 (Taipei Academia Sinica, 1985), 19 ff. Plate 35 shows the three limb bones together with the three vessels, neatly lined up in situ, but has no information on the identity of the bones. Liang speculated that the limb probably still had flesh on them when they were placed in the tomb, so originally there probably was no distance at all in between the three well-articulated animal limbs.)
places of associated whale remains was regarded one of the most exciting of all the early seasons. It clearly was an exotic item, which testifies to the ability of the Shang kings to attract and bring in objects from afar.108

- Tomb 1004: Heavily looted, and similar except in that it retained more burial goods overlooked by looters (a wealth of bronze spearpoints, dagger-axes, and spears, and also two now-famous large bronze vessels decorated with deer-head and a buffalo head, found at the point of entry into the burial chamber of the southern ramp).109 A number of disturbed remains of human sacrifices included skulls arranged similar to those in M1001. One such sacrificial burial (M1311), in the eastern part of the tomb fill, had a dog buried above the human skeleton and one more dog at the feet, oriented westward; beneath this yet another dog in a small pit dug immediately under the skeleton oriented eastward just like the human victim. The tomb yielded 239 animal bones (largely unidentified, sadly enough), which included two more whale bones.110

- Tomb 1217: Unlike the royal tombs described above no large looter's pit was disturbed but looters had dug mainly "accurate" pits directly down into the burial chamber to steal the main offerings, and barely disturbed the access ramps and the burial chamber corners. A total of 116 human sacrificial burials were discovered, 114 in the form of severed human heads, either portioned out in depth intervals as the tomb was filled in, strewn around the corners deep in the burial chamber, or placed around the northern access ramp's point of entry.112 Animal remains consisted in "two animal teeth, one dog skull, two bovine horns, 15 bone fragments, and 39 pieces of turtle shell."113 The bovine horns were identified as a new species of takin (an exotic goat-like animal).114 One interesting additional offering, placed in the southern access ramp area, was the three pairs of small animal figurines (dragons, buffalos, and tigers) arranged in pairs in two rows, probably also a form of tomb guardians.115

- Tomb 1550: The state of preservation of this tomb was the worst among all the large tombs, but four sacrificial burials with more or less complete human skeletons were found, as well as 243 severed human skulls, again concentrated in the northwestern access ramp point of entry into the central burial chamber and arranged in a way similar to M1500.116 At the same spot was another set of animal offerings (but no pottery vessels): One sheep forelimb, and one bovine, laid down on top of the sheep bones. The report also makes brief note of "12 deer antlers, one buffalo horn, one 'animal hoof', 727 shells, 2 magui turtles, 148 turtle plates, and 12 'large animal bones', i.e. whale vertebrae" all found within a looter's pit extending down into the central burial chamber.117

In the eastern part of the Xibeigang royal cemetery three more similarly shaped large tombs were excavated in 1935 in an area about 100 m east of the western cluster: M1400 (the largest of all tombs in the eastern part; the only one with four access ramps), M1443, and M1129 for which results have not been completely published.118 In addition to this cluster of three, two more have later been excavated here: the WKGM1 tomb (or "Wuguan da nu" 武官大墓, a major discovery), a further 50 m. east, excavated in 1950 and 1976, and M260, excavated in 1984.119

- The WKGM1 tomb, may be regarded as a part of the Xibeigang royal cemetery even though it is slightly smaller than most of the royal tombs. The main chamber had been looted, but a total of 79 additional human bodies were discovered. There were both intact and mutilated victims, the latter including 34 severed skulls.120 17 males were found on the west side of the tomb, and 24 females on the east—a dichotomy not recorded from any other tomb.121 Some of the intact individuals, possibly royal attendants with higher status, had their own coffins and were accompanied by their own human sacrifice, or by an animal.122 Pt E9 (E = east side of the main chamber) had a dog companion, and E10 immediately to the east of the main chamber was accompanied by a monkey skeleton, and some separate dog pits. The intact humans as well as the mutilated victims were all interpreted as stratigraphically contemporaneous with the tomb. Some other tombs, even though they were located at different depths, presumably they too were constructed in intervals, as the tomb was being filled in and finished off as a completed burial for the main occupant.

110 One viceversa, and one unidentified bone: Liang Siyong, HPKM 1004, 28-29, pl. 19; for whole remains, pl. 31; compare M1003, M1550.
112 Liang Siyong, HPKM 1500 (Taipei: Academia Sinica, 1974), 31 ff, successive plans on 33-38.
113 Liang Siyong, HPKM 1500, 49-50.
114 Yang Zhongqian, "Anyang Yinxu niujingju xiao fuxian ji qi yinli" (1948); also see 2.3.2.
115 Liang Siyong, HPKM 1500, 40, plan on p. 41, 42; pl. 14, etc.
116 235 skulls. The remaining 8 were found on the southern ramp. The skulls were put down onto the access ramp successively, in ordered rows perpendicular to the direction of the access ramp itself. For plans indicating successive depth of rows of skulls in the ramp, see Liang Siyong, HPKM 1550 (Taipei: Academia Sinica, 1976), 19-21; on the resting distance, 1-2.
117 The additional identification of Liang Siyong's original "large animal bones" as whale vertebrae was supplied by the editor, Gao Quxun (Liang Siyong, HPKM 1550, 26) (whale bones were also found in M1004 and M1003).
118 These eastern royal tombs are not described in Li Ji's Anyang or in K.C. Chang, Shang Chinsawan. Hu Houxuan, one of the Anyang archaeologists who stayed on the mainland after the war, published a summary on the Yinxu excavations up to the early 1950s which provided some information on these three tombs (size measurements, artifacts, etc.) but no information on animal remains. He briefly mentioned a sacrificial pit with burial under the floor of M1443 (Hu Houxuan, Yinxu faju (Shanghai: Shanghai xuehui shangwu jia, 1951) 87-89, ff).
119 They are believed to date to Yinxu period 2 (see the discussion in Yang Xichang et al., Cong Shangdai jishu ziran baogao, 14). The discovery of many sacrificial burial sites initiated a long-lasting debate on Shang human sacrifice.
120 Gao Bajian, "1950 nian chin Yinxu faju hangbang" (Zhuanggu baogao xuexi 1951, 5: 1-12; pl. 1-45, 14.
121 This kind of information is otherwise mostly lacking from reports. The description of skeletal remains in post-war mainlind reports is often as weak as the reports on pre-war excavations, but in some cases sex and tentative age estimates are provided.
122 Gao Bajian, "1950 nian chin Yinxu faju hangbang" 15 ff.
Separate animal offerings in WKGM1 amounted to 52, apparently all complete, articulated skeletons. In the eastern part of the tomb were 4 dogs, 1 monkey, 1 deer,123 and 9 other unidentified animals; in the western part, 2 dogs, 2 monkeys, and 6 other unidentified animals.124 In addition, a total of 16 horse skeletons were found distributed on three pits in the northern access ramp area, accompanied by further dog skeletons and by kneeling humans caretakers. In the southern access ramp were three more horse pits arranged in a formation, the one in the center slightly ahead of the others.125 The tomb was surrounded by a number of smaller pits, possibly additional sacrifices made over time, in commemoration of the buried person. No animal remains were mentioned from these pits in 1950 (but some from 1966).126

- M260 was a large, rectangular-shaped tomb with a single access ramp, and a main burial pit slightly smaller in size than the other royal tombs. The famous Si Mu Wu da ding (司母戊鼎) bronze vessel is thought to have been looted from this tomb in the 1940s.127 Although looted, the tomb yielded the remains of a total of 38 human sacrificial victims, including 22 skulls and 15 other animals, probably those of the people from which these skulls were severed. The tomb was looted, but the excavators found a wooden box with a jade dagger-axe—reminiscent of the dog guardians in M1001 and M1004. The flexed position differed from the extended "guardian" burials described from other royal tombs. While smaller, the location under the floor of the main tomb was similar. The flexed burial chamber and the access ramp of M260 is said to have contained bones from horses, bovines, sheep, pigs, dogs and other animals, but no count was done, reportedly because of the bad state of preservation.128

- The area excavated during the 1950s was the main tomb chamber, containing a flexed male human burial superimposed on a dog skeleton, and equipped with a jade dagger-axe—reminiscent of the dog guardians in M1001 and M1004. The flexed position differed from the extended "guardian" burials described from other royal tombs. While smaller, the location under the floor of the main tomb was similar. The flexed burial chamber and the access ramp of M260 is said to have contained bones from horses, bovines, sheep, pigs, dogs and other animals, but no count was done, reportedly because of the bad state of preservation.128

- M5, the famous Queen Fu Hao's (妇好) tomb, excavated in 1975–76, was located away from the other royal tombs at Xibeigang, immediately northwest of Xiaotun, in what may be an early cemetery area that preceded Xibeigang.129 It had never been looted, and contained a vast number (1600+) of grave goods, such as bronze items (more than 400 items, out of which 210 ritual vessels, more than all that had been discovered before the war), and other precious artifacts. For the first time, the tomb occupant could be identified with a high degree of certainty: because half of the inscribed bronzes bore the inscription "Fu Hao," the tomb is believed to be that of Fu ("Lady") Hao, a queen or consort of the late Shang dynasty king Wu Ding. An important historical figure in her own right, she is mentioned in a number of known oracle bone inscriptions.130 An elaborate house structure, with postholes and foundation stones, was found superimposed on the tomb, interpreted as a funerary structure constructed afterwards—this is not seen at any other tomb, but such structures may have been obliterated post-depositionally. The skeleton of Fu Hao herself had not survived (indicating post-depositional destructive forces), but the wooden coffin and outer chamber were better preserved than in any of the other large Shang tombs at Anyang. 16 human offerings were found, at least one whom had been decapitated. Apart from some unidentified animal bone fragments, there were 5 dog skeletons. These were not directly associated with humans and not located under the tomb floor, but in the fill around the walls of the main tomb pit at the level of the upper lid of the coffin.131 Associated artifacts included jade and ivory renderings of humans, tigers, elephants, buffaloes, horses, deer, hares, birds, fish, frogs, and other animals.

To summarize briefly, we note that the offerings made to accompany the deceased in all of the different types of Shang burials almost exclusively are domestic animals, as well as human beings (another "domesticate"). The mortuary program varies mainly in terms of the scale of sacrifices made, including of material goods, and the presence

---

123 Guo Baqiu, op. cit., pl. 6.
124 Guo Baqiu, op. cit., 22; Hu Houman, Yinxi fazhi, 130. Another report gives the number of animals found inside WKGM1 as 27 horses, 1 dog, 3 monkeys, 1 deer, and 15 other animals, in all 59 individuals. Anyang excavation team, "Anyang Yinxi nian jingkeng de fazhi," Kangu 1977:1, 30. The report does not describe the precise location of any of the remains. The implication is that the 15 unknown skeletons were probably also from wild or exotic, and thus unfamiliar, species.

125 Anyang excavation team, "Anyang Yinxi nian jingkeng de fazhi," 31–32. The southern ramp was not fully excavated in 1950, because it extended into a modern burial ground, but the presence of horse pits was established. The excavation of the horses in pits S1, S2, and S3, including some harnessing implements, was completed in 1976.

126 See below, 2.2.3; on the interpretation of WKGM1 see also the conclusions (section 5). The 1950 excavators described the animals as having been "buried above, beneath, to the left and to the right" of the humans. Guo Baqiu, "1950 nian xin Yinxi fazhi baogao," 22, simply refers the reader to the chapter on Shang history in the Shang Shi lu (Shang History, where the last, decadent king Zhou of the Shang dynasty is said to have been "collecting an exorbitant amount of dogs and horses as well as curiosities to fill his palace" and "expanding his Sand Dune Garden Pavilion and acquiring wild animals and flying birds to put into them" (cit. Shang Shi lu, 104), echoing the Classical description of the late Shang as decadent. But there is no indication that the burial was of Zhou, and the explanation is insufficient. The nature of the animal "curiosities" remains unclear (deer, horse, or monkeys, or perhaps more?). It cannot be determined if the high-status mortuary context included not only exotic curiosities but also wild or indigenous animals.

127 This may have been the tomb of Si Wu, a queen of Wu Ding (but see K.C. Chang, Shang Civilization, 113–15; Yang Xitong et al., "Cong Shaoguo jingkeng kan Shangde mali shihui de renshu," 14); also Anyang work team, "M26 lu zhuan Yinxi jingkeng jicheng fang", 115.

128 In M1790 and M1153, both to the east of the tomb; one that was noted but not excavated, M256 (Anyang work team, "Yinxi 259, 260 hao mu de fazhi baogao," plan 4, 8 and 15).

129 No identification was attempted, although the report suggests this was an in situ burial (Anyang work team, "Yinxi 259, 260 hao mu de fazhi baogao").

130 Zheng Zhenxiang, "Yinxu fazhi liusti nian gudin," 932. After the discovery, further excavations in the vicinity have revealed several structures and some sacrificial burial pits to the southwest, containing one or three decapitated humans. The large structure was believed to be a temple, since it lacked hearths or other features associated with inhabited structures. The area is believed to have held more large tombs, several of which have been located in modern times (Anyang work team, "Anyang Xiaotun cunshu de liang zuo Yinxi mu," Kaogu 1981:4, 401–403, and 509, describe medium-sized tombs—see these, above, 2.2.2.2). On Fu Hao's tomb see also Bagley, "Shang archaeology," 194–202.

131 The name Fu Hao occurred in earlier inscriptions dated to two different periods, reigns of kings believed to have been separated in time by at least four other reigns, and the identity of the crowned person is still discussed. However, because the very basic for the dating of the later inscriptions (Zong Zongji's period IV) has been doubted (they carry too few references to ancestor's names, an important guide to the date of inscriptions, and could be re-assigned to an earlier period on other grounds), the argument for the identity of Fu Hao as one of the queens or consorts of king Wu Ding (the fourth king of the late Shang Anyang period) is strong. See Zheng Zhenxiang et al., "Tian Fu Hao mu de Yinxi weishen he bui qianne de jiyi," 51 ff; see also Institute of Archaeology, Zhengduo huangxian zhuang jian-14 siwushui shuan buo 1965–1987 (Peking: Wenwu, 1988), 801–On Fu Hao, see also 3.2.4.


133 Institute of Archaeology, op. cit., 8–9; plan on p. 13.
of additional offerings of humans, too, correlates with increases in size and status. The offerings of living beings are of several distinct kinds, recurring in recognizable patterns within the mortuary program:

- Set offerings of domesticate animals’ limb bones (pig, cattle and sheep), probably a burial sacrifice for the deceased.\(^{134}\) Perhaps the rest of the killed animals was consumed by those attending funeral feasts. The set of limbs seems to have been offered to all main tomb occupants, including in the royal tombs, and appears to have been put down at the time of the burial (as exemplified in M1550, where it appears to have been put in place directly after the body was buried in the central chamber, clearly before the subsequent placement of human skulls in the ramp as the tomb was filled);
- Dogs, alone or alternatively included alongside human hound keepers, who themselves are treated as offerings in the program and whose presence become a further indicator of the status of the deceased;
- Offerings of human guardians, slaves or other followers, whose bodies are intact (thus presumably for a continued use in a function in the afterlife which was to be similar to their attachment or subordination to the higher-status tomb occupant during his or her life);
- Offerings of humans or parts of humans that have been mutilated through decapitation, and thus not intended for use in the afterlife; this is seen only in the highest-status or royal tombs;
- Additional offerings of animals, such as the scattered remains of animals in tomb fill, which can be hard to detect, identify, and interpret. Few are articular, and while some may have constituted additional sacrifices made during the actual completion of the tomb, some such remains may also have been much later refuse accidentally included through looter’s pits or other postdepositional forces, etc.

The last category is admittedly problematic, but together with the poor preservation of some human remains serves us well as a reminder that all of the Shang past may not become visible even in a well-established record of archaeologically recoverable features.

### 2.2.3 Offerings found in sacrificial pits

More than two thousand such pits have been discovered, about half at Xiaotun, and half at Xibeigang. As mentioned, “sacrificial pits” or jiiskeng are not primarily burials but separate pits containing sacrificial items, offerings, but no primary tomb occupant. They are not tombs in themselves, and are found in spatial association either with the architectural remains at Xiaotun (below, 2.2.3.1), where they are either expressions of rituals connected with the construction of the architectural structures (such as when a dog is buried under a building foundation corner stone, etc.); or, in a more general way, associated with mortuary sites such as the royal tombs at Xibeigang (below, 2.2.3.2) where the mortuary program obviously was more complex and wide-encompassing than for simpler burials. Especially in the case of the latter type of sacrificial pits, which includes the special case of the chariot pits, they too, like the tombs, may contain large numbers of animal or human offerings. Thus, and notably because of their general spatial association with the Shang center and the highest-status tombs there, the sacrificial pits reviewed here (even when they are not in immediate association with any burials) may also be regarded as an extension of the “additional offerings” described above.

#### 2.2.3.1 Sacrificial pits at Xiaotun

A large number of “sacrificial” pits containing human and animal remains, have been found inside or in the immediate vicinity of the architectural remains of the Xiaotun area, beginning during the pre-war excavations.\(^{135}\) As explained already, they are interpreted as “sacrificial pits” because of their location, and the large numbers of buried animals and humans which they contain, including the large numbers of whole animals, and decapitated humans. The presence of such pits has, in turn, reinforced the interpretation of these structures either as “temples” or royal palaces, or both. In area A and C at Xiaotun Locus North, a large number of these pits were found in the vicinity of, and clearly related to, the structures.\(^{136}\)

Among the sacrificial pits, the chariot pits, which often include both chariot remains, horses, and horse keepers, must be mentioned as a special, exotic category. Chariots are clearly used by the king, as attested in the oracle bone inscriptions, and should also be regarded as an element of social display which (like oracle bone divination itself) also may have been used by wealthy, medium-status figures subordinate to, but outside of, the royal court.\(^{137}\)

\(^{134}\) This set of offerings may correspond to the oracle-bone graph last, which on the basis of Zhou and Han texts traditionally has been held to be a sacrifice using cattle, sheep and pigs, often directed to the ancestors. But it has been unclear in what form, and some scholars appear to have taken the lack of any joint sacrificial pits for cattle, sheep and pigs (similar to those of dogs and sheep or sheep and cattle) to indicate that the traditional interpretation was mistaken. See Yen Xuanfa, “Zhu jian bu chieh,” Guozue yu jingdian 9 (1984), 25–36. On the range of Shang sacrifices see also Zhang Bingyan, “Zhang bing yang de zhongxian,” Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology (Academia Sinica, Taipei) 38 (1988), 181–232, the best overview of the variation and patterning in the offerings of domestic animals.

\(^{135}\) An overview is found in Shih Chang-ju, Xiaotun yi shi de jiaxun yu jiaju: long shien. Yinxu mu:zhang zhi yi. Bei zu mu:zhang (Nanking: Taiwan: Academia Sinica, 1970), 5–6, general plan on p. 7. Note that Shih Chang-ju’s several reports (Shih Chang-ju, 1970, 1972, 1973) mention the “Northern,” “Middle,” and “Southern” sections (the latter with only a single pit); these labels refer only to portions of the important burial area associated with structure B7 within area B.

\(^{136}\) In area A, in contrast, only two such pits were found outside of the architectural foundations there and none in their immediate vicinity. The latter have not been fully described. Shih Chang-ju, Xiaotun yi shi de jiaxun yu jiaju: long shien. Yinxu mu:zhang zhi yi. Bei zu mu:zhang, 6–8. K.C. Chang, Shang Civilization, (92).

\(^{137}\) Chariots were unexpected, and the techniques of exposing them by the “shadow” traces of wooden parts was developed only in the course of the excavations. One may suspect that chariot remains, victims of postdepositional decay, had been present in at least some pits cited with 2 and 4 horses respectively (note corresponding to the numbers seen in chariot burials later on). On horses, chariotry and Anyang chariot remains, see also Shih Chang-ju, “Yin che fuyuan shuming,” Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology 58.2 (1987), 253–88; F. Shaugnessy, “Historical perspectives on the introduction of the chariot into China,” Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies 48.1 (1988): 189–237; Lu Lianchang, “Chariot and horse burials in ancient China,” Antiquity 57.225 (1983), 284–38; Institute of Archaeology, Yinxu de jiaxun he jiaju, 138 ff; and further examples cited by Okamura Hideki (“In-Shui jida no dōbutsu kō,” 47–51). Okamura argues that such offerings away from the center may also have been done in local noblemen’s sacrifices (as opposed to those performed for the royal court). See also Bagley, “Shang archaeology,” 202–208.
The most famous concentration of sacrificial pits is that found in area B, outside of building structure B7. Several aligned clusters of pits were found immediately south of B7, suggesting an intentionally designed whole. In the immediate vicinity, there was also a bone-working workshop where several hundred pieces of raw material and arrowheads were found. The pits have been divided by scholars into northern, middle, and southern sections. In the southern section there were only one burial, the medium-sized tomb M232 mentioned above. In the northern section, there were 49 sacrificial pits, centered on five chariot pits. Of these, only two were more or less undisturbed (M20, M40), yielding weapons and other artifacts (chariot fittings and decorations). In M20, the remains of four horses were buried at the deepest level, a chariot had been buried over them, and three humans (interpreted as the remains of charioteers, armed with arrows etc.) buried last. M40 held the remains of three humans with two horses (again, horses were buried first; the interment suggests the humans' functional attachment to the horses), together with cowrie shells, weapons, and other artifacts. East of these chariot pits were 27 more pits, holding a total of 125 decapitated humans, four to seven individuals in each, sometimes represented only by the skull. None of the human sacrificial pits contained animal or other burial offerings, except in one case (M86) where one of the five bodies apparently had not been decapitated and were remains of a shell head-band. The only other buried person here that had not been beheaded was a single, extended human burial of the low-status type. Just to the west, however, there were two child burials, two flexed adult human burials in an upright sitting position, one more extended (prone) adult human burial, two burials with human beings believed to have been companions or guardians of stored goods, and a sheep pit. A few of these human burials contained ceramic grave goods; none had animal remains. Another independent sheep pit (M182) was situated at the north-eastern edge of this area, as defined by the excavators. It held ten whole sheep oriented west (their legs pointing alternately north and south).

In front (south) of the above-mentioned chariot burials there were five heavily disturbed pits with five humans in each, and three other burials oriented east-west instead of north-south. Only the latter had any grave goods; none had any animal remains. Two of the humans seemed to have been found, one with the arms behind the body and the other in front. Shih Chang-ju noted the parallel with Shang ceramic figurines unearthed in pit H358 depicting slaves or prisoners-of-war, also known from the oracle bone inscriptions.

Two other pits in the B7 northern section (M209 and M210) were the only separate pits for a single pig and for birds, respectively, seen in all of the pre-war excavations. M209 was initially lumped together with a pit containing more pigs (all burried complete), but it was later recognized as a separate single-pig burial pit. M210, also a small burial pit, contained only bird bones. The B7 middle section pits were clearly part of a planned layout, centered on human sacrifice. They were laid out in twelve long north-south rows with a total number of 80 pits, most of which contained only human skeletons, numbering from 1 to 13 in each, most often 6-8, often red-colored, divided into groups facing opposite directions (east or west). Almost all had been beheaded before burial, sometimes with a cut through the mandibles, often with the skulls placed at the foot end of the bodies (as in M161, M180 etc.). There were no animal offerings and rarely any other grave goods. A separate animal pit (M152) contained 3 dogs, and 3 sheep superimposed on the dogs.


Inside 10 out of the twenty-one structures within the foundations labelled area B were Shang sacrificial pits that either predated, or postdated the buildings. In all, 62 such pits were discovered, with 60 humans, 96 dogs, 98 sheep and 41 bovines.\(^{152}\)

- **B7**: Inside this structure were several pits with human offerings,\(^{153}\) and several single-dog pits directly below its foundations.\(^{154}\) Immediately outside of the buildings, more animals were found buried in the same way (below the beginning of rammed earth layers, or within them). Shih Chang-ju believed these animals were sacrificed and buried at various stages of the construction of buildings supplementary to B7. They include M230, with five near-complete bovine skeletons (described as short-horned, small cattle) all oriented either east or west, and always reclining on their left side; M229, severely disturbed but containing 1 dog and 2 sheep, also oriented east-west; M96, with 3 bovine skeletons, all oriented east; and M106 with 1 dog and sheep;\(^{155}\) M141, with 2 dogs and 1 sheep; M94, again with 2 dogs and 1 sheep; M105, where remains were very badly preserved but 4 sheep and 3 dogs were identified; M140, with three bovine skeletons, oriented south (in this pit, there were traces of a mat on the floor of the pit); and finally M168, with a single flexed human burial, in an upright, kneeling position. There were no grave goods in this or any of the other burial pits (with the exception of the trace of wooden remains in M168, which had been cut into from above by a storage pit containing oracle bones, the inscriptions of which were tentatively dated to the time of the very last Shang kings.\(^{156}\) In all, 1 human, 11 dogs and 14 sheep were buried in sacrificial pits within the small area of structure B7.\(^{157}\)

- **B8**: several dog pits, apparently building foundation offerings.\(^{158}\)

- **B11**: several “upper” burial pits with single humans only, within the later parts of the structure.\(^{159}\) The only pit with animal remains was M280, which contained a single human with a dog.

- **B13**: In addition to one single human burial, this structure contained a series of 7 large animal burial pits with large numbers of dogs, bovines, and sheep arranged in rows, lacking in any other grave goods or offerings. The excavators suspected that two more pits may have existed in the central part of the structure but had been destroyed by recent well-digging. These pits were: M363, located under two foundation stones, with 17 sheep, all oriented to the north, and described as arranged in three rows.\(^{160}\) M390, alongside and under a row of five foundation stones, held the remains of 30 bovines and 3 sheep. The bovines were mostly oriented north, but were in considerable disorder. However, most had bent forelegs and stretched hind legs, indicating that they were buried post-mortem. The three sheep skeletons were located under the bovines farthest east.\(^{161}\) M368, an elongated rectangular pit similar in layout to M390 (but not located beneath any foundation stones), had 10 dogs in the western part, and 10 sheep in the eastern part, alternating in orientation north and south. According to the excavators, there was visible variation in the size of the buried animals within each species.\(^{162}\) M364 had at least 20 dogs and 10 sheep arranged in rows; again, dogs on the western side, and sheep on the eastern side of the pit. M401 had 10 dogs and 10 sheep in a northern and a southern row, with five of each in each row; all animals in the northern row oriented north, and all in the southern row oriented south.\(^{160}\) M380, on the northern border of B13, held 20 dogs and 31 sheep; the pit was partly destroyed (the original number was probably higher). In this pit, dogs and sheep were intentionally mixed, and not arranged separately as in the other pits. M356, at the western entrance of B13, contained only the skeleton of a human child, at a short distance the skeleton of one dog, both oriented north.\(^{164}\)

A few other smaller structures contained similar sacrificial pits, smaller in scale: M255 in B16 with one dog and three sheep, all oriented south.\(^{165}\) In B19, M348 with a single dog skeleton, oriented south. In B20, four more single-human pits.\(^{166}\) Similarly, in B21 (a small, square structure located within the much larger B20), there was only one dog burial.\(^{167}\)

\(^{152}\) Shih Chang-ju, *Xiaotun yizhi de fazhun yu fazhun* 52. *Yinxu muzang zhi si yi*. (Shih Chang-ju, *Xiaotun yizhi de fazhun yu fazhun* 52. *Yinxu muzang zhi si yi*).

\(^{153}\) Shih Chang-ju, *Xiaotun yizhi de fazhun yu fazhun* 52. *Yinxu muzang zhi si yi*. (Shih Chang-ju, *Xiaotun yizhi de fazhun yu fazhun* 52. *Yinxu muzang zhi si yi*).

\(^{154}\) These include M297, where the body had been buried vertically on its head in a pit constructed between two large postholes related to the structure. Two earlier burials (M245, M299) both were close to the gates of the structure, and each contained the remains of a human child (M245 also a few stone implements) (Shih Chang-ju, *Xiaotun yizhi de fazhun yu fazhun* 52. *Yinxu muzang zhi si yi*).

\(^{155}\) Shih Chang-ju, *Xiaotun yizhi de fazhun yu fazhun* 52. *Yinxu muzang zhi si yi*. (Shih Chang-ju, *Xiaotun yizhi de fazhun yu fazhun* 52. *Yinxu muzang zhi si yi*).

\(^{156}\) Shih Chang-ju, *Xiaotun yizhi de fazhun yu fazhun* 52. *Yinxu muzang zhi si yi*. (Shih Chang-ju, *Xiaotun yizhi de fazhun yu fazhun* 52. *Yinxu muzang zhi si yi*).

\(^{157}\) Shih Chang-ju, *Xiaotun yizhi de fazhun yu fazhun* 52. *Yinxu muzang zhi si yi*. (Shih Chang-ju, *Xiaotun yizhi de fazhun yu fazhun* 52. *Yinxu muzang zhi si yi*).

\(^{158}\) Shih Chang-ju, *Xiaotun yizhi de fazhun yu fazhun* 52. *Yinxu muzang zhi si yi*. (Shih Chang-ju, *Xiaotun yizhi de fazhun yu fazhun* 52. *Yinxu muzang zhi si yi*).

\(^{159}\) These include M297, where the body had been buried vertically on its head in a pit constructed between two large postholes related to the structure. Two earlier burials (M245, M299) both were close to the gates of the structure, and each contained the remains of a human child (M245 also a few stone implements) (Shih Chang-ju, *Xiaotun yizhi de fazhun yu fazhun* 52. *Yinxu muzang zhi si yi*).

\(^{160}\) Shih Chang-ju, *Xiaotun yizhi de fazhun yu fazhun* 52. *Yinxu muzang zhi si yi*. (Shih Chang-ju, *Xiaotun yizhi de fazhun yu fazhun* 52. *Yinxu muzang zhi si yi*).

\(^{161}\) Shih Chang-ju, *Xiaotun yizhi de fazhun yu fazhun* 52. *Yinxu muzang zhi si yi*. (Shih Chang-ju, *Xiaotun yizhi de fazhun yu fazhun* 52. *Yinxu muzang zhi si yi*).

\(^{162}\) Shih Chang-ju, *Xiaotun yizhi de fazhun yu fazhun* 52. *Yinxu muzang zhi si yi*. (Shih Chang-ju, *Xiaotun yizhi de fazhun yu fazhun* 52. *Yinxu muzang zhi si yi*).

\(^{163}\) Shih Chang-ju, *Xiaotun yizhi de fazhun yu fazhun* 52. *Yinxu muzang zhi si yi*. (Shih Chang-ju, *Xiaotun yizhi de fazhun yu fazhun* 52. *Yinxu muzang zhi si yi*).

\(^{164}\) Shih Chang-ju, *Xiaotun yizhi de fazhun yu fazhun* 52. *Yinxu muzang zhi si yi*. (Shih Chang-ju, *Xiaotun yizhi de fazhun yu fazhun* 52. *Yinxu muzang zhi si yi*).

\(^{165}\) Shih Chang-ju, *Xiaotun yizhi de fazhun yu fazhun* 52. *Yinxu muzang zhi si yi*. (Shih Chang-ju, *Xiaotun yizhi de fazhun yu fazhun* 52. *Yinxu muzang zhi si yi*).

\(^{166}\) Shih Chang-ju, *Xiaotun yizhi de fazhun yu fazhun* 52. *Yinxu muzang zhi si yi*. (Shih Chang-ju, *Xiaotun yizhi de fazhun yu fazhun* 52. *Yinxu muzang zhi si yi*).

\(^{167}\) Shih Chang-ju, *Xiaotun yizhi de fazhun yu fazhun* 52. *Yinxu muzang zhi si yi*. (Shih Chang-ju, *Xiaotun yizhi de fazhun yu fazhun* 52. *Yinxu muzang zhi si yi*).
The C area or building complex was a smaller cluster of structures located to the southwest of the largest complex, B. As in previous reports, the report on sacrificial pits describe those located outside (i.e. north of) the building foundations,\(^{116}\) and those within the confines of the foundations.\(^{117}\) Outside and north of these foundations, apart from the highly interesting medium-sized tombs described above (2.2.2.2), were four sacrificial pits with nothing but animal remains (the pits may have been related to the burials, but are described here).\(^{117}\) The shallow pit M357, just south of the tombs, contained the remains of 41 dogs and 42 sheep, in four rows, predominantly oriented south.\(^{117}\) Preservation was poor, and figures were probably higher, in both cases. In addition, the report mentions a total of 338 animal bones and fragments located in the adjoining pit H354, which should represent "at least five animal bodies"; in addition, there were 25 dog and sheep jaw bones, which "could represent five animals,"\(^{117}\) and 130 postcranial bones in M383 (situated below M357).\(^{117}\) Finally, there was M410, a small pit with just one sheep; M383, five sheep and one dog,\(^{117}\) and M382, 4 dogs and 4 sheep all oriented south, the dogs placed around them as if "protecting" the sheep.

* At the area C complex, a total of 17 units, ten contained sacrificial pits within the rammed-earth structure foundations themselves. The largest structure, C1, encompasses C2 and C3, and most of the pits found in area C were located within its borders\(^{118}\) (the review of pits within the structure in area C is limited to this unit). There was a series of pits containing human remains, none of which had any grave goods or animal offerings;\(^{119}\) and seven separate animal pits: M338, a two-layered pit which may represent two subsequent animal offerings: the lower layer (about 20 cm beneath the upper layer) contained five sheep and one dog; the upper layer held two sheep and three dogs, plus a number of further, unidentified fragments;\(^{119}\) M339, inside the rammed earth foundation of C1, with only three badly preserved sheep skulls, and limb bones; M377, a total of 20 dogs, divided on small and big specimens.\(^{118}\) The last four pits (MA, MB, MC and MD), previously described as ash pits, since they contained burned bone, have been redesignated. The content of each such feature is unclear, since only obviously articulated skeletal materials were recorded: in pit MA, a string of bovid vertebrae; MB: a bovine horn (core?); MC: disarticulated large limb bones (bovine?), believed to have been cut at the joints and burned (or cooked?) with the flesh still in place; finally, in MD, which was situated beneath M377 (above) there was a cluster of articulated bovine (?) limb bones; one was stuck inside a ceramic vessel.\(^{119}\)

* Within the same C complex, there were also several other pits with burned animal bone fragments, believed to have resulted from some ritual activity.\(^{119}\) For example, H314, associated with C3, contained unidentified animal limb bones.\(^{119}\) These remains may either have been food refuse, or indicate that area C was some form of "processing point" or temple for the preparation of sacrificial animals or the supply of raw material for divination, but at present neither possibility can be confirmed.

2.2.3.2 Sacrificial pits at Xibeigang

Apart from the large royal tombs, excavations at Xibeigang have also revealed a large number of sacrificial pits.

The total count of such Shang-era pits discovered during the pre-war work at Xibeigang was 1,221. Of these, 1,117 were in the eastern part, and only 104 in the western part;\(^{120}\) 439 were undisturbed, 419 partly disturbed or destroyed, 188 were suspected of having been looted already\(^{121}\). Kao Chi-hsin summarized data from 643 largely intact pits, mostly leaving out specific data on form, size, depth and orientation (some were apparently quite uniform: rectangular shape, and northward orientation).\(^{122}\) They fall into human, animal, and artifact pits. On the basis of the spatial arrangements in groups (nine such groups in the eastern part, one in the western part) and long rows, it was concluded that these pits must be intentionally related to the large royal tombs.

Sacrificial pits containing human remains were apparently mixed with both low-status burials, and multiple burials of people not mutilated as purposeful sacrifice, and thus not interpreted as "sacrificial" by Chinese archaeologists. This highlights the uncertainty involved in these distinctions, since, obviously, in the hierarchical Shang social context, such burials may also be people that were killed and buried to supplement, as offerings, the main deceased in larger, royal tombs nearby.
Among these burials/sacrificial pits, single-occupant human burial where the occupant lacked visible mutilation included grave goods in 85 out of a total of 131 documented cases, including pottery, bronze vessels, weapons, etc., and in some cases (number unspecified) animal offerings such as bovine limbs and complete dogs. Second, there were burials of multiple humans who had not been mutilated (57 in all, ranging from 2 to 11 skeletons), which also contained similar grave goods, but no animal offerings. Third, pits with mutilated humans: postcrania skeletons lacking skulls (192 in all, 1 to 10 skeletons in each pit; found exclusively in the eastern part of the Xibeigang cemetery area) and also skull burials without any postcranial remains (a total of 209, with 3 to 39 skulls in each pit). Here grave goods were rare, and no animal offerings were reported.

The animal remains seen in these different kinds of pits are subdivided into three categories:

* First, 20 horse pits (13 in the eastern, and 7 in the western part). The number of horses buried was identified in only 16 of these (ranging from 1 to 4 horses; one containing 37 horses).

* Second, 2 elephant pits in the western part of the cemetery area, both relatively deep. One contained a juvenile elephant, oriented west, and the other a large elephant oriented north, accompanied by one human, interpreted as an elephant tender, a mahout.

* Third, 12 unidentified "animal pits," all located in the eastern part of the cemetery. The only observations on this third group were made in the field: they included two monkey skeletons; eight of the twelve pits contained only mammal ("animal") bones; 3 held a mixture of mammal and bird bones; one contained nothing but bird bones. No grave goods were recorded from any category of these animal pits.

In 1976, further large-scale excavations were carried out in the eastern part of the Xibeigang cemetery. More than 250 sacrificial pits, mostly with multiple human offerings, were found southwest of WKGM 1 between M1400, WKGM 1 and M260; 191 were excavated. On the basis of pottery and other grave goods discovered in only a small number of the pits, an early Yin period date was ascertained. The number of humans was 1,178 (or higher), each pit mostly containing between 8 and 10 individuals. The report offers interesting information on the human skeletal materials, indicating that mainly young males were used. The excavators interpreted most pits as sacrificial, but in contrast with pre-war excavators they did not believe them to be directly related to any royal tombs, i.e. they were not thought to have been offerings made for the occupants of those tombs at the time of their burial, but were seen as sacrificial pits constructed according to cycles of ancestral sacrifices only indirectly related to the royal tombs. Thus, they were construed as material evidence for the existence of sacrificial offerings, and sacrifices described recurring human and animal sacrifices addressed to royal ancestors. However, it was still suggested that a few might be sacrificial burials directly related to the nearby tombs of WKGM 1, 1400, or the Simu Wu tomb.

Only five of the Shang pits excavated in 1976 yielded animal remains: M3, a single, complete pig; M98, 10 dogs and 3 humans (not decapitated, possibly dog keepers); M99, badly preserved dog remains; M110, two horses, their heads adorned with bridles; and M217, a burial pit with a single human accompanied by five birds, probably eagles, or falcons, with their falconer.

Also, horse pits (either with horses buried alone, or with their keepers), have been discovered outside of the immediate palace area.

A second major excavation of sacrificial pits was undertaken in 1978. 40 pits, out of the 120 that had been defined, were excavated. Unlike the above pits, they were located in between and slightly to the south of the two groupings of royal tombs. Yet another elephant pit was found, containing the remains of one elephant, and a pig. The elephant was juvenile, only 2 m long and 1.6 m high, and no tusks; a bronze bell was still attached, an indication that it most likely was tame, perhaps a pet, or even domesticated.

---

154. Kao Chi-chih, "The royal cemetery," p. 9. Only one chariot was located. It contained no horse remains. Bronze fittings from an estimated six chariots were found.

155. The depth was over four m. below the surface, as opposed to a maximum depth of three for any horse pit. There is no further stratigraphic information.

156. Kao Chi-chih, "The royal cemetery," p. 8. In his review of the pre-war work at Anyang, Hua Haozun only mentioned one of these two elephant pits (the one with the accompanying human elephant keeper, an "elephant slave" [Kao Chi-chih, Yinjuxiaoyan, p. 99]). This has misled many scholars interested in the role of the elephant in oracle bone inscriptions, such as Wang and Yang 1982, whose only source for pre-war remains was Hua, and who thus ignore the additional juvenile elephant found in 1935 and mentioned only our pre-war elephant pit, along with the one discovered in 1978 in the same area (the excavation reports see below and fig. i, p. 48).

157. Regrettably, the unidentified animal remains were later lost. They were first shipped to Nanking, but left behind in the face of the Japanese invasion.


160. All decapitated skeletons from the 1976 excavations appear to have been from young adult males, except a few juvenile-to-adult males. This seems to have been the case in pre-war human remains from the same area. The table summarizing the human skeletal evidence in Yang Xizheng et al., "Cong Shangdai jisheng kan Shangdai moli xueshu de zhengcheng," 33-36, is superseded by list. of Archaeology, "Anyang Yinxu jisheng yingwu de xingzhe yingwu de jianzhu," Kungtang 1977-3, 210-14; the latter presents further data on the sex and age of burials in the context of the remains. See, too, Huang Guoyong, "Zhongguo Shangdai de ranjing renwu," (Beijing: Wenwu, 1990), 41-78. Only among those not beheaded before their burial were there any female adults, or juveniles. In the young adult males, a high frequency of abnormal bone condition in vertebrae and other pathological changes (not described) were observed and taken as further proof of the exploitation of the slave class (Anyang work team, "Anyang Yinxu moli jisheng de jiaju," 1977, 29-30). This is a premature conclusion, given the lack of comparative materials from non-slave people.


162. Anyang work team, "Anyang Yinxu moli jisheng de jiaju," figs. 4, 3, 40, 41, pl. 2.

163. One example: pit 1123 with 1 horse, 3 adult humans (one accompanied by a pig head offering) and 2 children, is described from the 1972 excavations at Xiaoxian Longju South (Anyang work team, "1972 nian Xiaoxian nandu faguoyan" hz. 62-63). For more examples, see Anyang work team, "Anyang Guoguzhong xian de Yinxu de changning," Kungtang 1988-10, 862-93; Hesuan Anyang shi Meyezhandun dang'ang de Yinxu changning," Kungtang 1988-20, 46-65, etc.


165. Anyang work team, "Anyang Wuquancun bei Shangdai jisheng de jiaju," 1005-1006; Wyong, Yuuyan, and Yang Baosheng, "Yinxu xianxiong de 'Yin ren bo xiang' de zu taitou," in Wu Huxiu et al., eds., Xian zhanqi (Peking & Hongkong: Sinology, 1982), 467-471, S1. Olenski notes, in "The Aryan Elephant, Hellenistic Asia, and Chinese culture," The Explorer's Journal 72 (1) 1994, 34, that it is not clear whether the animal buried with this elephant was a pet or a dog, and all bones from this pit have now been lost. Some post-war juvenile elephant bones are still extant at Anyang (Yang Xizheng, personal communication, Anyang field station, September 1993).
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The additional building foundations recently excavated at Xiaotun, in 1989-91, seem to date to the early part of king Wu Ding’s reign. They also contain several human sacrificial pits, the most important of which are associated with a structure named F1, which is more than 60 m long, with gateways lined with pebbles, and ten human sacrificial pits (M2–3, M14 through 21) arranged in rows underneath with at least 29 decapitated victims. These offerings apparently included no animals, but in a number of pits smashed ceramics and bone arrowheads had been included as further offerings. These human offerings may have had higher status than many seen in earlier excavations.197 Moreover, as mentioned, recent years have seen yet further discoveries of architectural remains, including, since 1999, the newly discovered Middle Shang city wall remains and building foundations north of the Huang river. At these structures, which predate the previously known late Shang Anyang remains, the associated sacrificial pits seem similar to those seen at Xiaotun. Those described so far have been pits with whole dog skeletons and pig skulls, as well as dog-sheep pits, and pits containing mutilated human remains, placed in front of an early palace structure.198

This concludes the overview of relevant data culled from archaeological reports. I now turn to the reported results of the identification and analysis of the excavated Anyang faunal remains, summarizing what we know about which animals were present, as well as the problems inherent in the record as assembled and analyzed so far—before turning to the oracle bones, and their contents (Part 3).

2.3 Faunal analysis and the Anyang animal remains

2.3.1 The legacy of early research on Anyang faunal remains

The mammal remains excavated at Anyang during the “early period”199 were first examined in detail by the two paleontologists Pierre Teilhard de Chardin and C.C. Young (Yang Zhongjian), on behalf of the Academia Sinica.200 Despite serious flaws, their account has often been used as a standard reference on Anyang animals. It was compiled by scholars who did not take part in any excavations, and in the manner of early, unsophisticated research on animal remains, they obviously also had no influence on the research design of the excavations. Their conclusions and, more seriously, methodological assumptions have continued to influence post-war research. The re-evaluation of Teilhard and Young’s work is necessary to any attempt to reconstruct Anyang fauna—obviously not just for zooarchaeology, but for general Shang archaeology.

200 There is no discussion of what the qualitative and quantitative nature or distribution of such remains might tell us about the Shang—in contrast, we can assume that this would have been a prominent topic of Liang Siyong’s intended reports. Teilhard and Young will simply note that “there is no reason... to assume that our specimens belong to modern animals... accidentally buried in the deposits,”201 and so, part of the “Anyang fauna.”202 No analysis of the “dogs’ importance is offered, apart from that it belongs on the species list. When Teilhard and Young mentioned the need for more study of non-cultural faunal assemblages in contemporaneous deposits, they did so only to help resolve remaining taxonomic issues by means of controlled comparison between cultural and non-cultural faunas, not to promote cultural analysis.

The interpretive aims stated by Teilhard and Young did not extend far beyond their basic interest in taxonomy, but they did hope to make inferences from the faunal data about the general climate of the Anyang area in Shang times (by relating the various discovered animal species to their presumed climate preferences, and to their present-day geographical distribution); and, also, searching for evidence of long-distance trade contacts, whereby exotic species could have been introduced into their “Anyang fauna.” And yes, while much of the information potential of the data will

200 Teilhard and Young, “On the mammalian remains from...Anyang,” 201 Teilhard and Young, op cit., 58; H. Matsumoto, “On some fossil mammals from Honan, China,” Scientific Report of the Tihoku Imperial University 3 (1915), 1–28; Teilhard and Young rejected some of Matsumoto’s identifications (which were also not based on excavated materials).

201 Teilhard and Young, “On the mammalian remains from...Anyang,” 7.

202 Because of the morphological proximity of the specimens to modern Chinese domestic dogs and the reducing suspicion which might arise on the part of other paleontologists that “contamination” by even more recent or “modern” materials had occurred.
necessarily remain unexploited, these types of concerns indeed may still be considered on the basis of "species list" zooarchaeology: basic historical zoogeography and paleoenvironment, and the presence or absence of trade in exotic items.

To address even such issues in a more meaningful way, however, it is necessary to define some level of temporal and spatial resolution. The lack of such control is the cause of some of the most serious problems arising from later archaeologists making reference to Teilhard and Young's study (1936) or to the follow-up study by Yang Zhongqian (= C.C. Young) and Liu Dongsheng (1949). Neither provide adequate contextual information, and in fact, we cannot even be sure that the "Anyang fauna" always equals materials derived from Shang dynasty deposits. Shih Chang-ju, one of the excavators at the time, noted in his seminal 1953 article that animal bones during the pre-war seasons (that is, those submitted by the excavators for study), all had record numbers linked to spatial and stratigraphic coordinates, but Teilhard's and the other accounts failed to include this "level of detail" and so, they actually also include pre-Shang Neolithic materials. Shih, in a brief evaluation of the problem, said "animals like whale, tiger, leopard, elephant, deer, cattle, pig and dog were commonly found in Shang layers; black rat and bamboo rat were mostly found in Longshan layers; in Yangshao (i.e. pre-Longshan) layers there were also dog, sheep and cattle bones." The elementary failure to record the specific cultural context of the remains under study means that the arguments made regarding the "Anyang fauna" as described by Teilhard, Yang (Young) & Liu for our understanding of Shang culture have often been flawed. Not only does this imperil serious analysis of spatial, temporal or social variation, it also affects the study of climate and trade. An animal believed to indicate a warmer climate (or the existence of an exchange route for exotic objects) during the Shang period (like bamboo rat, or rhino) does not prove this if the remains actually date to a period long before the Shang! The implication is that the important pre-war Anyang animal remains need to be re-studied with attention to stratigraphy and spatial distribution. The various arguments previously made about climate and the role of different animals in Shang culture must be re-evaluated.

Shih's important article was a first step; re-analysis will depend on the availability of the excavated materials, and field-notes.

The continued lack of systematic use of the precious information hidden, as it were, in the animal remains is also related to the long-standing scarcity of archaeologists trained in the theory and methods of zooarchaeology, the study of human skeletal remains, or general osteology and paleopathology, during both pre- and post-war excavations at Anyang, a fact which may explain many of the shortcomings of the formal published archaeological reports as regards identification of excavated faunal remains. This is probably what could be expected in an era when the analysis of animal bones from archaeological sites worldwide often at best consisted of sending a sample of hopefully identifiable specimens to zoologists who did not visit the sites, or even have a chance to influence the research design or excavation methods.

Excavators were often unaware even of simple methodological issues and did not give priority to biological remains.

In the post-war period, excavation practices either did not change, or standards even deteriorated: animal bones are still often incompletely recorded, often not collected or stored, but instead reburied before study—retained only in a few exceptional cases when entire, articulated and well-preserved skeletons are encountered in contexts such as sacrificial pits. The same is true for human skeletal material: very little material has been retained, even from burials, except well-preserved crania used largely only for osteometric biodistance studies.Only recently has this situation begun to change.

The changes under way will also certainly affect future methodologies for quantification, a related issue of crucial importance. Teilhard and Young offered only the crudest estimates and did not even comment on the prevalence of certain body parts, etc. Neither Yang and Liu's 1949 addendum, nor the archaeological reports seriously consider just what it is that the samples represent. As a result, later estimates of abundance are just as subjective and basically unreliable as the pre-war notes of "more than one thousand," "one hundred to a thousand," etc., unrelated to spatio-temporal boundaries. This means we do not know what these figures represent, beyond a count of what was ended up on the paleontologist's table.

As Shih Chang-ju pointed out, Yang and Liu also didn't distinguish between storage or waste pits and burial offerings. The formal archaeological reports do not only mention the remains from storage pits, but also to burial context (for example, the uncertain identification of pig/sheep/horse/human bones in tomb M362, see above; 2.2.3, etc.).

Personal communication, Yang Zhitang, staff archaeologist, Xiaoyao, Sept. 1993.

For a long time, few staff members with a training in either human or animal osteology, zooarchaeology, human paleopathology, etc. were affiliated with the Anyang Work Team of the Institute of Archaeology. After the institute added a first specialist zooarchaeologist (Dr. Yuan Jiing) to its staff in the mid-1980s, biological remains now receive more attention; this will doubtlessly influence Chinese archaeology as a whole (cf. Yuan Jiing, "Shih Yangqiu tong heng shi de zhiwu yu yanjiu," Kouhsou kenp' 1985: 2, 84-88; and, on Anyang remains, Gao Ruji, "Yin de shi'lu bu shi'lu yu Yin wengzao de gaozao shi'an," Hekisou kenp' 1990: 3, 87-90).

Which is what his 1953 paper attempted to accomplish (without addressing the issue of quantification). Shih Chang-ju ("Henan Anyang... dongwu yanjiu"), 13-17. Anyang and other first-hand summaries of the excavations actually offer little more than personal impressions.
contain figures for the animals found in sacrificial pits and usually also for burials, but basic methodological problems are evident and the count is confounded by bad preservation. In the case of well-defined features this may seem to concern only details, like the difference between, say, 40 and 44 dogs in a pit. This kind of quantifications becomes an issue, however, when inquiring about patterns of symbolic meanings in the Shang sacrificial pits. The problem is even more readily apparent in the lack of any sound appreciation of the astonishing grand total of animal remains that came from "ash" or storage pits, an estimated 90% of the pre-war recovered materials.

The following review of identified species and rough estimates of quantification is based on published information. I add question-marks where appropriate, and seek to contribute suggestions towards the development of archaeological research for the future. The review is also the foundation for comparison with the information contained in the oracle bone inscriptions (3.2.3, below). An overview is listed in Table 1, p. 168–69 below. The general implications of the distribution and patterning in the "Anyang fauna" will be discussed in the conclusions.  

2.3.2 Identification and quantification

The species seen in the "Anyang fauna" were listed in three groups by Teilhard and Young (1936) and in the additional study by Yang and Liu (1949) on the same selection of materials.219 I continue using this tripartite division here, including the basis of the original identification of each represented animal, changes and additions from later reports (based on Shih Chang-ju220 and other authorities), and any recent scientific name changes.219

As for quantities, the two influential enumerations of the Anyang fauna used estimates in which each species was placed in one of four categories: under 10, 10–100, 100–1000, and over 1000. Only three species were listed as being represented by more than 1000 individuals in the collection: the long-standing domesticate short-snouted pig (zhongmian zhu, see below), the (semi-)domesticate elaphure, and the buffalo.220 The information provided in their tabulated data on represented skeletal parts sometimes suggest interesting trends (the ubiquitous buffalo was represented by jaw bones, not horns, which thus conceivably had been used somewhere else, etc.). But because of the paucity of contextual information, no in-depth analysis of the distribution of specific skeletal parts can be attempted. However, as mentioned, interesting patterns emerge in the general distribution of species.

The list includes a total of 29 animals including the 5 species added by Yang and Liu, plus fishes, birds, turtles, etc. They are as follows:

I. Wild indigenous animals

Tiger (Panthera [formerly Felis] tigris; hu lü): Represented in the first sample by one tiger skull, and some cranial fragments. Identical to modern Chinese tigers. More skulls and bones were reportedly excavated, but not described, in the second study (most regrettable).221 Shih Chang-ju mentioned in passing that unspecified tiger and leopard bones were found, for example, "in the pit Hill:"222

* Leopard, or panther (Panthera pardus; bao lü): Identified from a small number

219 Or by less-than-perfectly symmetrically organized offerings. In the case of the large animal pit M537, with over 40 individuals each of dogs and sheep, the numbers were approximated (i.e. by Shih) through dividing a number of unidentified bones (sic) by a more reliable estimate of the MNI (minimum number of individuals) that would require all fragments to be collected, identified and sided as far as possible, then deriving a count from selecting and counting only the identifiable parts (see R.G. Klein et al., The Analysis of Animal Bones from Archaeological Sites).

220 Shih Chang-ju, "Henan Anyang… dongwou gulya;", 3.

218 It had not been possible to all materials to Peking, since the remains were very many, especially limb bones. Even this time, there was not time to examine all" (Yang Zhongjian and Luo Dongchong, "Anyang Yinxu zhi furu dongwou qun buyi," 1949). Yang and Liu (himself a palaeontologist), still did not discuss such issues as the sample, provenience, etc.

221 Shih Chang-ju, "Henan Anyang… dongwou gulya;" For another brief summary of animal remains, see Institute of Archaeology, Yinxu de faxian he yansu (Peking: Renwu, 1994), 415–18.

222 S.J. Olson pointed out that "many of the taxonomic designations… assigned to the Anyang excavated mammals in the 1930s have been changed, due to more recent discoveries and comparisons. Many of the Anyang foods [sic] were described at a time when it was the common practice to erect a new taxon, based only on fragmentary materials, without having adequate and valid specimens for comparison" ("The Asian Elephant... and Chinese culture;", 23). Only occasionally has it been possible to add recent taxonomic re-designations. For these, I rely on zoological treatises on Asian fauna such as Roomag (1991); Liao and I.A. McNichol, Mammals of Thailand (Bangkok: Ithumathi Press, 1988); G.B. Corbet and J.E. Hill, The Mammals of the Indomalayan Region: A Systematic Review (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992); and Don E. Wilson and D.M. Reeder, Mammal Species of the World: A Taxonomic and Geographic Reference (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1993).
of cranial fragments. Shang remains may be exotic imports from the south, 223 in later history it is only known from southern China.

- River-deer (also called water-deer; *Hydropotes inermis*; e.g. *zhang* 青) identified from large amounts of cranial elements, including mandibles, crushed skulls, etc.; a small water-deer still living in the Yangtze river valley. Its present range extends south to Guangxi, north to Korea. 224

- Sika deer (*Pseudaxis hortulanum*, now *Cervus nippon*); 225 in Chinese it is called *machi* 茅家 or *meihua鹿* (梅花鹿). Particularly common, identified from antlers, cranial elements, limb bones, including a small number of metacarpals. Identical to the modern Sika deer. Antlers and bones were frequently sown, i.e. derived from bone tool workshops (as refuse, etc.). One sample skull with an inscription on the frontal part was likely the deer skull discovered together with the water buffalo skull, mentioned below (under Bovines). 226

- "Anyang Deer" (*Elaphurus; Elaphurus maerasianus*; Chinese mi or miu 蒽鹿; or *sibuxiang lu* 四不像鹿; now included in *E. davidianus*). Father David's or simply David's Deer; they were obviously very closely related, if not identical. 227 Probably the most common element in the Anyang fauna, identified from large amounts of antlers, which is frequently discovered in large piles of sawn pieces. 228 No skulls were used for identification, and very few mandibles or postcranial bones (apart from some metacarpals and metatarsals) were reportedly recovered. The antlers' peculiar form, different from the known David's deer (*E. davidianus*), and the separate "Anyang Deer" is the sole basis for the taxonomic identity. Teilhard and Young saw the characteristic antler form as the result of inbreeding in a closed, domesticated or semi-domesticated group. However, not a single antler came from animals where the antler base was preserved and the antler had been shed naturally— all of these animals must have been killed to obtain their antlers. Presumably, they were wild animals captured and killed for this purpose. The many instances of hunting of what are apparently elaphure deer in the oracle bone inscriptions also suggest this (see 3.2.3). 229

- *Buffalo: (genus Bubalus):* Listed as *Bubalus mephistostepheles* Hopwood, a new species, identified as over 1,000 individuals in the original sample, both from almost complete specimens and from large numbers of horn cores (characteristically "triangular" and pointing backwards in a parallel plane to the maxillary tooth row). Two of the described skulls had been worked, if only incompletely sown. The identification of a separate extinct species of Anyang buffalo is still recognized as taxonomically valid. 229 The buffalo's listing as a domesticate is tentative; most buffalo may still have been wild. There may also have been wild cattle, perhaps several species. 230

- *Badger (genus Meles, today with only one species, M. meles)*; Shih Chang-ju listed it in his 1953 review as *M. leucurus*; identified from a small number of mandibles only. Identical to modern Chinese badgers (*huo 獭*). It represents a Palaeartica fauna (i.e., not southern, Indo-Malayan). 231

- *Raccoon-dog* (or "raccoon*; Canis procyonides*; now *Nyctereutes*, 獭, or hao 獫*) identified from just 3 mandibles. This wild dog species is still common all over East Asia, but extends no further south than northern mainland SE Asia. (The domesticated dog was much more commonly represented; see below). 232

- *Fox* (*Vulpes vulgaris*, now *Vulpes vulpes*, hou 狼*); identified from several skulls only, and estimated as "not very common" at Anyang 233 (No wolves have been identified).

---

223 Teilhard and Young, op.cit., 12; Leakey and McNeely, Mammals of Thailand, 628.

224 Teilhard and Young, op.cit., 25-26; Wilson and Reeder, op. cit., 388.

225 Teilhard and Young, op.cit., 27-30; Wilson and Reeder, op. cit., 385-386. Relatively few antlers and bones were adult, and the size "generally" small. Teilhard and Young made no attempt of determining the reason for this, only speculating that the specimen may be juvenile (miu), or that the size may be the result of changes due to domestication.

226 Shang-era deer may also have included red deer (*Cervus elaphus*), possibly also the small Muntjak deer (*Muntiacus f. elaphus*), but none of these have been confirmed archeologically.

227 Wilson and Reeder, Mammal Species of the World, 282-288; Teilhard and Young, op. cit., 30-38. Teilhard and Young didn't have access to dentition or other materials from David's Deer for comparative purposes. On David's Deer, which only recently became extinct in the wild but still exists in some zoos, see L.C. Hopkins, Records of David's Deer as hunted by Shang-Yin sovereigns, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (1939), 422-29; F.H. Schaffer, "Cultural history of the Elaphurs," *Sinologue* 4 (1958), 281-72; and Benjamin B. Beck and Christien Weems, eds. *The Biology and Management of an Exotic Species: Por David's Deer* (Park Ridge, N.J.: USA: Noyes Publications, 1983). In the latter work Weems (p. 15) says the classification of the David's deer is still unclear, decades after the British mammalogist Percival wrote that "there is no stag whose systematic position has troubled zoologists as much as *Elaphurus*." Weems does not refer to Teilhard and Young, nor to *E. maerasianus*. Like Wilson and Reeder in *Mammal Species of the World*, he supports an independent single-species *Elaphurus* genus. On this animal see too Sowerby, "Horns of a new deer..." (1933).

228 Teilhard and Young, op. cit., 30, quoting Dong Zoubin's observation.

---

229 Teilhard and Young, op.cit., 45-57, 56; Wilson and Reeder, Mammal Species of the World, 402; see too Keightley, Sources of Shang History, 7, 17, 18, 20; for a discussion of the difficulties in identification. Peter Cuthb (letter of Aug. 5, 1954) confirmed that buffalo taxonomy is problematic, but assuming that *B. mephistostepheles* was correctly identified (that is, based on fossil materials), and that it was a domesticate, the name is still valid. No comparison of the Anyang bones have been made with modern Southeast Asian species such as the gaur, whose range may have extended farther north in antiquity. For the natural and cultural history of the buffalo, a species of large wild cattle still present in the far Southwest of China and Southeast Asia hunted and also used for breeding purposes in many areas until very recently, see E. and E.S. Simons, *A Ceremonial Ox of India: The Mithun in Nature, Culture, and History—With Notes on the Domestication of Common Cattle* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1968). Other possibilities are kouprey and hanteng (see Lleonsong, *Mammals of Thailand*, 267-69). None of these wild species have been identified from China, as far as I know, but they have perhaps been overlooked. The kouprey was new to science as late as in the 1930s; as late as in the mid-1990s a new species of deer was discovered in Vietnam.

230 Teilhard and Young's account did not include the famous 1929 find of a large mammal skull with an inscription mentioning the capture of a horned animal, later confirmed as a bovine; a wild hunted buffalo. The skull is shown in Dong Zoubin, "Hue bai lin jie" (326, pl. 1, 2). The paleontologist Pu Wenzhong, in a rebuttal of Dong, wrote that "the Chinese paleontologist [Teilhard de Chardin] identified the teeth... as bovine... according to the paleontologist Yang Zhongjian, this... is really a bovine skull" (in The "Anyang Zuoji" Friedig. "1934, quoted by Lei Huizhong (A.A. Lefevre), "Wei Niu fang di", 1990, 6-7). Lefevre asked the paleontologist Sauvage d'Audignies to examine it at the Academia Sinica in Taipei; he concluded it was a buffalo, not a rhino. See also Jean A. Lefevre, "Some remarks on the graph X and the character "Early Chinese Spot", 1, 1986; and his exhaustive article, "Rhinos and wild buffaloes north of the Yellow River at the end of the Shang dynasty: some remarks on the graph and the character," *Monuments Sinica* 30 (1990-91), 131-57. J.C. Chang (The Archaeology of Ancient China, 270, et al.) suggests the buffalo was domesticated in late neolithic times. See 2.2.1, and 3.2.3 for the oracle bone evidence.

231 Teilhard and Young, op. cit., 30; Garbet and Hill, Mammals of the Indomalayan Region, 4. 232 Teilhard and Young, op. cit., 7.

II. Domesticated indigenous animals

- **Hare (Lepus sp.; 田鼠):** Represented in great numbers, by both cranial and post-cranial elements, most likely identical with the present common hare of the area.244

- **Bamboo rat (Rhizomyinae sp.; Shih Chang-ju listed it in his 2001 review as Rh. troglodyten, Chinese zhushu 竹鼠):** Identified from several mandibles, indicating a size smaller than the contemporary bamboo rats that Teillard and Young knew existed in southern China. The find was a surprise, seen as a strong indication that the Anyang area climate was much warmer during the Shang than now.235 However, the remains "mostly" came from Longshan strata, not Shang.238 The identification itself may also be problematic.237

- **Black rat (Eptesicus rattus, now Rattus rattus):** Identified from two skulls. Identical with the present species.236

- **Field rat (Spalax sp., now Myospalax spilurus; tianshu 田鼠):** Identified from just a few elements. Interestingly, it is not known from South China but extends north into Mongolia and Eastern Siberia.235 These animals could have been consumed as meat, just as rural people dig for, catch and eat field rats in Southeast Asia today as a poor man’s protein food (thus, as with other species, the internal distribution within the Anyang sites holds considerable interest).

- **Bear (Ursus sp., some Li japonicus; xiong 熊):** First described from only 1 maxilla and 2 left mandibles (species identification uncertain), plus 1 large mandible probably from yet another species. Listed as "less than 100 specimens" in Yang and Liu's report. The former bear may have been a small variety of indigenous Chinese black bear, perhaps a captive, imported southern form. And since morphological comparison were made with measurements from modern northern specimens, it would not be surprising if they were larger than Anyang-era native bears.230 Thus these bears were probably "wild, indigenous." The relatively limited record also may simply reflect that the investigated deposits didn't represent the locales where bears were deposited.236

- **Pig (Sus scrofa):** Represented in large numbers. Probably a domesticated pig, with the new name of Sus vittatus var frontalii given to it by Teillard and Young.235

---

235 The widespread use of dogs as burial offerings at Anyang is never mentioned (Teillard and Young, op. cit., 6–7).
237 Teillard and Young, op. cit., 44–45. It had earlier been described and named Rous exiguus, a new species from Anyang, by H. Matsumura, "On some fossil mammals from Honan, China.")
238 The taxonomic identification probably should be re-evaluated, as both the earlier new species and the identification were based on very few fragments. Wilson and Reeder, Mammal Species of the World (400–402) lists reference to B. exiguus. One co-author, Dr. Peter Grubb, told the present author (letter of Aug. 5, 1994) that "as a probable domesticate, according to taxonomic practice (with preference for an informal nomenclature for domesticated breeds or morphotypes) it may be subsumed under the senior synonym Bos taurus (i.e. the descendant of the West Asian and European aurochs, Bos primigenius, the ancestor of European and Indian common cattle. It may also be a descendant of local wild boar forms (see below).
239 On the fallacy of osteological identification of domesticates from small samples (which could be deceptive because of considerable variation within species), see J.S. Olsen, "Archaeologically, what constitutes a domesticated animal?" in Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory, ed. M.B. Schiffer, vol. 2 (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1979), 181–83. Teillard and Young do not spell out their criteria for a domesticated status.
240 Teillard and Young, op. cit., 38–42. Did the field excavators communicate such an impression to the authors, or was it based on their own observations? This remains a mystery—The species is apparently no longer recognized (Wilson and Reeder, Mammal Species of the World, 402–403, lacks any reference to Bos shangi).
Young on the basis of morphological traits and the relatively large number of juveniles in the collection. There is also a single specimen of a different species, either a different domesticated pig, or a wild boar. The skulls depicted are from long-nosed animals, which possibly could be wild, since these depend to a larger degree on their own foraging for food than domestic pigs, which have been demonstrated to develop shorter snouts and canines. In that case the majority of the pigs may have belonged to a wild form, and a smaller amount to the domesticated form (both named Sus scrofa). Depending on the length of the domestication process and the amount of breeding with wild animals, the morphology could have varied substantially.

- Horse (Equus caballus; ma 马). Identified from four teeth only. The Shang-era Anyang horse probably is a small, domesticated form, possibly derived from the Central Asian Przewalski horse. (Again, as with the dog, the authors did not mention horse offerings in sacrificial chariot pits, etc.).

- Monkey (Macaca; hou 猴): Identified only from maxillary and mandibular fragments corresponding to the Macacus tibials, still present in north China. Later, monkey remains were again found both in independent sacrificial pits at Xibeiang, including in the tomb WKGMI, but no precise identifications have been made.

III. Imported exotic species

- Elephant (Asian elephant, Elephas indicus, now E. maximus; xiang 象): "Not uncommon" (sic!) at Anyang, wrote Teilhard and Young who only described one incomplete lower molar (1), but also mentioned "fragmentary young skulls and limb-bones," and regarded the elephant (as well as the tapir, below) as "a southern type brought in as a tribute" which must have been brought in alive, the authors argued, because not only the ivory but "perfectly useless bones" were present. Teilhard and Young overlooked the discovery of two complete elephant skeletons in 1935, and another in 1978, in sacrificial pits at Xibeiang (above, 2.2.3). A long-standing debate has followed on the identity of the Shang elephants and if they were native to the area. 252

---

251 Teilhard and Young, op. cit., 19-20; the context is now replaced by S. scrofa (Wilson and Reeder Mammal Species of the World, 729).

252 No wild boar is otherwise noted. Yang Zhongjian et al. (p. 147) give an estimated abundance at "1000". For a long-nosed pig (1938), a "swollen-face pig," and "101-" for "pig." K.C. Chang (Shang civilization, 120) translates these as Sus entericus and Sus scrofa respectively, which is incorrect.


254 Thus called longiusculus by Teilhard and Young, op. cit., 19. Yang Zhongjian et al. later also examined skulls and other bones (Anyang yinixi jin furu dousou qun buyi, 147).

255 Teilhard and Young, op. cit., 53-54.


256 Three different rhinoceros species live or have recently lived in Asia and may all be possible candidates:

1) Sumatran (or asiatic two-horned, or hairy rhinoceros) (Dicerorhinus sumatrensis); in Chinese, "Somos xiucai.

2) Indian rhinoceros (Rhinoceros unicornis, "Yinxiu xiucai"), historically existed in much of SE Asia (and probably) in South China (Wilson and Reeder, Mammal Species of the World, 372).

3) Great Indian rhinoceros (Rhinoceros unicornis, "Yinxiu xiucai"), which may have occurred in SE Asia until the medieval period; and

4) Iriomotan or four-horned rhinoceros (Rhinoceros sumatrensis, "Zhouxiu xiucai"), found in most of SW China and SE Asia before the middle of the 19th century (see Burton and Pearson, Collage’s Guide to Rare Mammals of the World, 164-65, Boa norom Lewgol and McNelley, Mammals of Thailand, 653-50, Wilson and Reeder, Mammal Species of the World, 371-72, G.B. Corbet et al., The Mammals of the Indian Subcontinent, 241-45).

Carlyle, only in this single case do the authors Yang and Liu underline that the original context was recorded (Anyang yinixi jin furu dousou qun buyi, 149-50). Again, this agrees with Shih Changch’i’s account of T’Han Anyang... douguo gubu, 1953, reiterated in a June 15, 2002 conversation) that all the bones’ context originally was recorded (but never published). The conspicuous absence of rhinoceros remains is also a powerful case against the flawed argument that the oracle bone graph interpreted as Yi (9) might mean rhinoceros.

257 Teilhard and Young, op. cit., 16-18; 53, 58.

258 Teilhard and Young, op. cit., 12. On the whale remains, see too above, 2.2.
taint ranges of Shaanxi, and possibly Shanxi.257 The subspecies, now extinct, was represented by one pair of horns excavated from the royal tomb M1500, stained green from the association with bronze grave goods.258 It is possible that it was not local but imported as exotic goods (like the whale bones and other animal remains introduced as offerings in the royal tombs).259

As for animals other than mammals, and other animals not reported above, we know less. Many smaller fish, birds, reptiles and other animals have escaped detection due to sample bias, or because they have been less obvious and not a focus of interest. As for humans, left off the paleontologists' and archaeologists' lists, they are set aside for the moment, but the following must be mentioned:

* Birds, unidentified bird bones have been mentioned in several circumstances, and both domestic chicken and wild birds have been confirmed. In the pre-war excavations, one small pit with only bird bones was found (M210, see 2.2.3); also, Shih Chang-ju said eggshell and bones believed to be from domestic chicken were common in Shaan pits at Xiaotun; as for burials, he quoted observations made by local grave-robbbers, that there was a pattern of "dogs underneath, chicken on top" in Shaan graves, but this was formally recorded only once.260 In post-war excavations chicken bones have often been found inside ceramic vessels.261 Li Ji had some Anyang bird specimens identified in 1960 (presumably all from Shang strata): a vulture, and also a peacock and a pheasant which now inhabits southern regions only.262 In 1987, a concentration of bird remains was found in the northeastern part of the Xiaotun area.263 It included at least 4 individuals from 3 different raptors (Aquila, or Buteo sp., represented by 4 crania and 20 or more talons, but no tarsals or metatarsals), plus single or very few bones from other birds (common house hen, pheasant, and owl; 2 lower beaks from kingfishers; a single radius from a red-crowned crane) The exact provenience was not recorded, from this particular pit. The exotic content indicates that this was no ordinary trash pit—perhaps an exotic pet cemetery.

* Fishes: Five species of fishes still native to the area and one coastal species not found inland were recovered from the pre-war excavations.264 Also, a sturgeon bone, possibly a long-distance import from the Yangtze river (over 600 km to the south), is reported from a recent excavation at Xiaotun.265

3. Oracle bone inscriptions

3.1 Introduction: The structure of oracle bone inscriptions

The enormous importance of the oracle bones and the history of their discovery has already been mentioned in the general introduction. This section will examine the evidence for hunting in the inscriptions.

The general structure of the hunting inscriptions, like most Shang hunting inscriptions, is as follows.266

First, there is a prefix listing the date of the divination, with the day designation in the 60-day Shang cycle of ten-day weeks; the diviner's name (a Shang court divination specialist267); and sometimes the place where the divination was undertaken (often outside the Anyang center).

Second, the charge, which is the central part of the divination, a record of the matter being put forward for consultation,270 such as stated plans on hunting or for making war at a certain place or time, etc.

Third, the prognosis, or "reading" of the result of the charge, usually

259 Young, "Jiezou...", 162 rejects this as too "hard to believe" and described it as an exact, local form. Climate change may be one explanatory factor. More comparative materials is required to address this issue.
260 In M232, a middle-status grave. See 2.2.2 above, and Shih Chang-ju, "Hunan Anyang Xiancong Yin mu zhong de douguo gudou," 12.
261 Institute of Archaeology, Yinxu de jie zhi xiexi ji, 417.
262 K.K. Chung, Shang Civilization, 140.
263 Hou Lianghai, "Li Anyang Yin xu zaoqi de miandai," Kaogu 1989, 10, 942 ff.
264 They are listed in Wu Xuanwen, "Ji Yinxu jie zhi xiexi ji qi yi," Zhongguo kaogu 1949, 4, 139-43; see also R.C. Chang, Shang Civilization, 140.
265 I.e. 87AXTIH. Hou Lianghai, "Li Anyang Yin xu zaoqi de miandai," Kaogu 1989, 10, 947.
made by the diviner-king, who determined if the crack could be “used” and whether the obtained result consisted in approval, or not.

Fourth, the verification, i.e. a note on what actually happened after the action was carried out (for example, the actual capture of animals); this is often, but not always, signalled by the word yun 元 ("indeed" captured...).

Fifth, there may be a postface stating the month of the year, the place of divination, and (during the last period, V) the sequential number of the divining king’s sacrificial cycle.

In addition, there may also be short crack notations (which say “auspicious”), and crack enumerations, carved alongside the cracks.

3.2 Hunting expeditions in the oracle bone inscriptions

The various aspects of content related to hunting in the inscriptions can be divided up as follows: The terms central to hunting, including those reflecting major hunting methods; the terms used for various hunted prey; the actors involved; the timing and location. These aspects are reviewed in the following, citing a number of examples. 271

3.2.1 Examples of typical hunting inscriptions

The general features of Shang oracle bone inscriptions described above can easily be recognized in the following translated examples of divination inscriptions on hunting, from various periods:

Crack on yiwu [day 22]. [No diviner's name included]. “Today, if the king hunts [show] at Guang, we will capture.” [The king] really caught 2 female tigers, 1 wild buffalo/cattle [xi], 21 deer, 2 hours, 127 antelope deer, 2 tigers, 2 hares, 27 pheasants. Eleventh month. (Heji 10197, from Dong Zuobin's Period I, approximating the reign of Wu Ding).

Crack on wusu [day 55]. Que divining: “We will hunt [show] at Gal.” The following day [we] hunted, [and] indeed captured ... one tiger, 40 deer, 164

271 When citing oracle bone inscriptions I follow current practice among oracle-bone scholars, as far as possible citing the reference number in the recent comprehensive collection Jiaogan Jiāo 玉版 (= Heji). Only the charge itself is enclosed by quotation marks. Within cited inscriptions, dots enclosed in brackets [“...”] indicate a passage omitted by me, while dots without brackets (“...”) indicate a missing passage [the recovered bone or shell was damaged either post or post-depositionally]. Words added within brackets ["the king"] are my own additions. A Roman numeral after a citation indicates the periodization given to the inscription made by the Heji editors (thus "Heji 1000", III is an inscription assigned to Dong Zuobin's Period III—as mentioned above, those assigned to Period IV must probably be transferred to the earliest period). A further note on transcription: Shang graphs are often transcribed into modern Chinese characters. Often there is indeed a clear relation (generally speaking, Shang writing and grammar have a directly ancestral relation to later Chinese), but many Shang graphs have either not survived into the written language of later times, and thus cannot be transcribed, or they are duped by scholars. The Latin script transliterations here are only indicative, based on conventions in modern studies, and they are not to be understood as necessarily corresponding to how these words were pronounced in Shang times.

We note that the basic topic of divination in these hunting inscriptions was whether or not the hunt would be auspicious and successful; either simply with regard to the king’s hunting, or more in detail, regarding the proposed time, place, companions, or the appropriateness of the choice of hunters when the king opted for delegating the hunt to others and was not himself (explicitly or implicitly), the chief hunter; all this is included in the stated charge or charges. A “typical” divination made in anticipation of a hunt may also express a concern for the weather (rain, wind etc.), or for the choice of hunting method.

3.2.2 How? Hunting methods, and implements

The methods used in the royal hunt included driving game, either using only people (perhaps foot soldiers, and other officers aiding the king), fire, or war chariots. Sometimes the driving was specified as a means of forcing the wild game into pitfalls or traps. The latter are sometimes also mentioned separately, as are various forms of nets. The only identifiable method where the hunters actually struck the animals was with arrows (no other such method is specifically mentioned). Although it is also possible that the people used for driving also used spears or pikes (to defend themselves in case of danger or for actually killing the prey), this does not seem to be mentioned. Other specific tools or weapons used for catching and killing animals...
in the hunt will be mentioned below, in connection with each different method of hunting.

The original terminology of the hunt can be divided into three groups, representing different semantic levels. These three levels are not always represented, not even in completely preserved inscriptions, but this is the general pattern. They are used in this sequence:

Hunt [general] → specific method → catch [identity and/or amount]

The first is a general word for hunting (tian [H], shou [W], etc.), used to indicate the general context of the action or where it will take place (occasionally, two such words are used in combination, and the full meaning is not always completely clear). Next, one of a series of different verbs connoting specific methods for capturing the prey is used; the meaning is again not always clear but the grammar and function is generally unambiguous. Finally, one of three terms for “capture” is used, announcing the enumeration of the captured prey, most often (but not always) at the very end of each inscription. Thus the pattern is: “Hunting [at such and such a place, together with such and such a companion, etc.] ... by means of ... , we got ...”

The presence of terms from the second and third groups are what proves conclusively that it is really hunting that is taking place, as when the prey is named and the general context of the action or where it will take place (occasionally, two such words are used in combination, and the full meaning is not always completely clear).

Next, one of a series of different verbs connoting methods for capturing the prey is used; the meaning is again not always clear but the grammar and function is generally unambiguous. Finally, one of three terms for “capture” is used, announcing the enumeration of the captured prey, most often (but not always) at the very end of each inscription. Thus the pattern is: “Hunting [at such and such a place, together with such and such a companion, etc.] ... by means of ... , we got ...”

The presence of terms from the second and third groups are what proves conclusively that it is really hunting that is taking place, as when the prey is named and the general context of the action or where it will take place (occasionally, two such words are used in combination, and the full meaning is not always completely clear).

Among the general terms, the two most prominent are tian and shou. The word tian was not used commonly in Dong Zuobin’s Period I, but increasingly in II-V, the other prominent word, shou, shows the opposite development, and was occasionally used conjointly with tian. The two words may thus at least during one period of time have had different connotations. It is suggested that a shift of connotations may have taken place, with the briefly used tian-shou perhaps to be read as “to take to the field and hunt,” with the meaning “to hunt” later completely transferred to the word tian. Such shifts in meaning are, of course, clearly possible over a time span of several centuries.

Inscriptions in which the “general” words are used alone, without enumeration


277 My division into three semantically distinct categories differs from those scholars who collapse the various terms into “hunting methods” (for example, Huang Renwei, “Yin wang tian de kaoji”), for further examples and discussion of certain rarely mentioned hunting methods, see also Hui Fuxuan, “Bazi zhong gao jian shi Yin dai tongqi,” 44–47, Wang Yuan et al., Jiaotun yishi wai, 559 ff.

278 That is, in Period III. Yao Xianlin et al., Yinxu jinglu leixue, 1174, lists 8 such examples from Period III (except 2, which are from Period IV).

279 Keightley, Sources of Shang History, 180–81, 181 n. 24.
In the following, the five general verbs deployed in the accounts of the Shang royal hunt are discussed, with examples. They are included here because they frequently occur in association with prey enumeration, but the last three, as in the case of tian, may have involved a broader semantic field than hunting.

3.2.2.1 Five general hunting terms: tian, shou, bu, she, and ge (A-E)

A. tian [天, modern 天], meaning "to [take to the] field," "to hunt": the graph is similar to the modern Chinese character for the noun "field," a picture of a square divided by internal strokes into four units (sometimes more). The division of land for agricultural activities may be one of its original meanings,240 and the use of tian as a noun for "fields" constituting part of Shang-controlled territory is attested in some inscriptions.241 There are examples suggesting tian may mean actual "farming" (tiling of the land)242 but there are only very few cases that indicate this clearly:

Crack on yimao [day 52]... diving: "[If we] call [on X] to tian at Y, [then we] will receive a harvest."

It has also been suggested that tian [i.e. "field"] is used for, and should be taken to mean, "hunting" because of what it does for the fields: clearing them from harmful wild animals (wei tian chu hai as 后除害). Hunting is indeed frequently linked with clearing of fields in later historical periods, historically and ethnographically, not least in swidden farming where the deployment of fire to clear forest creates the opportunity for hunting.243 By extension, the usage of tian for royal hunting could be explained by what the king does to the wild in the hunt, "turning the wild into fields."244 The name of the place for the hunt is not always provided, but certain place-names did serve both as the location for hunts and for farming—indicating that hunting with fire and opening new fields may indeed have been if not synonymously, then at least increasingly related, especially in the late period.245 The fact that tian increasingly becomes the general word for hunting in the later periods (i.e. coupled with animal victims of the hunt) may also reflect the acceleration of such a process of expansion.

The word tian was also used for an office ("Keeper of the Land.") not to be confused with the verbal use of tian 禄 (modern transcription, 天)246. Similar titles include "Hound-Keepers" (guan 犬, and 'Herdsman' (nu 畜))247. Such armed officials, stationed in outlying areas by the king, sometimes also are mentioned as capturing enemy prisoners (most often termed qiang 羯, "barbarians") and presenting them to the king;248 these various officers also hunt and catch animals (see below, 3.2.4). The king himself, and his act of putting himself at risk in the hunt, is the main topic of interest in the inscriptions, however. There are numerous examples:

"Crack on renchen [day 29]. He [a personal name] diving. If the king hunts, [there will be] no misfortune." (Heji 28440, III.)

The divinations may be made well in advance:

"Crack on jingyi [day 51]. The king said: Divine. On the next yimao [day 52], [If we] hunt, [there will be] no misfortune. At Cai."

The word tian is, as mentioned, sometimes used in combinations with other words. In one rare case, tian is used in a hunting inscription along with what is apparently a specification of the weapon used (Tiansan 4556). Another, more common combination is with xing [cing, modern 萍], the meaning of which is believed to approximate "inspection," thus "field/hunting-inspections" carried out by the king himself or by others assigned by him.

There is often concern for the weather (especially wind and rain, as might be expected when hunting). For example:

240 Qiu Xigu, "Jiaguwen sui juan de Shangdai mengying," 218-20, 225. Qiu cites a Zhongguo minguo shi, chengguo 中國歷史(周代)-隋唐 (Draft History of Chinese Agriculture) part 1, p. 43, which also discusses the coinage of tian 'farming' and tian 'hunting,' using the same graph. The fact that this must have been because killing wild animals helped expand agriculture. Qiu cites Zhang Zhongyao's (1973) mention of a "Tang dynasty poem on burning the forest, killing animals and opening fields for farming in one stroke," and suggested that this could have been the same during the Shang period, e.g., more than 17 centuries earlier. For more examples, see Wang Nengsheng, "Shi tianli; Yin Shuang, Pu jing and forests; C. Keightley, The ancestral landings; 111 etc. Qiu Xigu, "Jiagu bu ci zhong yangjuan de tian 'lu' mei dong zhiulun de yanjiu," Wenwu 19 (1958), 1-4, quotes numerous examples to refute the view that tian was a Shang rendering of the later, and different, office of hou. The tian office survived, at least in name, in the Shang [i.e. early Zhou and later times] (Qiu Xigu, op. cit., 1, quoting the "Ju guo shi"; Shou gao [15]).

241 See the comparative ethnographic data discussed by Wang Nengsheng, "Shi tianli," in Wang Zhiyu zixuan zhushi qiankou jiaotian (Tianjin: Nankai daxue, 1994). 152-62, and Yin Shuang, People and forests: A human-ecological History of South China Agriculture in Yunnan (Kunming: Yunnan Education, 2001), and Yang Shengnan, "Yun jia tian ju shou, 61. Zhang Jingquan's suggestion (cf. Yue Xiuxi, "Jiagu kou jiaotiao kou," 41) that hunting was called tian simply because the agricultural fields would be trampled during the hunts is less productive.

242 If so, no tian (cf. Heji 6057A, B, etc.) may mean "our fields" in the sense that the king's action makes them fields of the Shang. We note that many such places were frequented by non-Shang people prior to the king's "taking to the field" there. This could also supports such an explanation.

243 See the comparative ethnographic data discussed by Wang Nengsheng, "Shi tianli," in Wang Zhiyu zixuan zhushi qiankou jiaotian (Tianjin: Nankai daxue, 1994). 152-62, and Yin Shuang, People and forests: A human-ecological History of South China Agriculture in Yunnan (Kunming: Yunnan Education, 2001), and Yang Shengnan, "Yun jia tian ju shou, 61. Zhang Jingquan's suggestion (cf. Yue Xiuxi, "Jiagu kou jiaotiao kou," 41) that hunting was called tian simply because the agricultural fields would be trampled during the hunts is less productive.

244 If so, no tian (cf. Heji 6057A, B, etc.) may mean "our fields" in the sense that the king's action makes them fields of the Shang. We note that many such places were frequented by non-Shang people prior to the king's "taking to the field" there. This could also supports such an explanation.

245 The king himself, and his act of putting himself at risk in the hunt, is the main topic of interest in the inscriptions, however. There are numerous examples:

"Crack on renchen [day 29]. He [a personal name] diving. If the king hunts, [there will be] no misfortune." (Heji 28440, III.)

The divinations may be made well in advance:

"Crack on jingyi [day 51]. The king said: Divine. On the next yimao [day 52], [If we] hunt, [there will be] no misfortune. At Cai."

The word tian is, as mentioned, sometimes used in combinations with other words. In one rare case, tian is used in a hunting inscription along with what is apparently a specification of the weapon used (Tiansan 4556). Another, more common combination is with xing [cing, modern 萍], the meaning of which is believed to approximate "inspection," thus "field/hunting-inspections" carried out by the king himself or by others assigned by him.

There is often concern for the weather (especially wind and rain, as might be expected when hunting). For example:
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including the delegation or invitation to others to hunt; the names or titles of such persons may or may not be specified.

In summary, there may have been several meanings to tian and capturing wild animals clearly was an important aspect. We do not know exactly why this graph was used in the sense "hunting," but its graphical characteristics and its usage history does imply a close connection with agriculture related to the symbolic clearing or preparing of fields, either indirectly, or directly by killing off the wild in order to transform and incorporate land into domestic agriculture. In many cases, given the right context, it can properly be translated as "hunting."

B. shou (modern 夏, or III), "to hunt": the graph for this verb is composed of an implement thought to be hunting equipment and a dog. This has led to generalization about the use of dogs in hunting which is highly probable, but for which there is actually no firm evidence, only indications of this suggested connection (and the office of the Dog-Keeper mentioned above). As mentioned, dogs were frequently used as individual grave offerings at almost all levels of society; there are also many oracle bone inscriptions that indicate the sacrifice of dogs (i.e. separately, in sacrificial pits). One example of such a non-hunting inscription:

Crack on shou (day 30); "you [sacrifice to Father Ding: dogs, one hundred; sheep, one hundred; split [animal offerings, nuo], 10 cattle; 10 dogs, 5 more dogs; split cattle; one."

The translation of shou as a general term for "hunting" is supported by the wide range of animals that figure as the prey of (shou) hunting. They can even include fish (if only very rarely), as in Heji 10918, I:

"[... If] the king [will] hunt the fish of Hao [he will] capture."

This underlines that shou refers to hunting more generally, and not just hunting-with-dogs (to cover even fishing, where dogs are not usually involved). This is confirmed by examples where the king will shou ("hunt") but specifically avoid a certain specific method, as evidenced by this pair:

Crack on zhi (day 6). [We will] hunt shou [by] [shou =] driving.

Crack on zhi (day 6). [We will] hunt, but not [shou =] drive."

As mentioned, shou is sometimes used with other words, such as in wang shou (往, "to go [out] and hunt," in Period I:

[... if] the king [will] hunt the fish of Hao [he will] capture."

This underlines that shou refers to hunting more generally, and not just hunting-with-dogs (to cover even fishing, where dogs are not usually involved). This is confirmed by examples where the king will shou ("hunt") but specifically avoid a certain specific method, as evidenced by this pair:

Crack on zhi (day 6). [We will] hunt shou [by] [shou =] driving.

Crack on zhi (day 6). [We will] hunt, but not [shou =] drive."

As mentioned, shou is sometimes used with other words, such as in wang shou (往, "to go [out] and hunt," in Period I:

[... if] the king [will] hunt the fish of Hao [he will] capture."

This underlines that shou refers to hunting more generally, and not just hunting-with-dogs (to cover even fishing, where dogs are not usually involved). This is confirmed by examples where the king will shou ("hunt") but specifically avoid a certain specific method, as evidenced by this pair:

Crack on zhi (day 6). [We will] hunt shou [by] [shou =] driving.

Crack on zhi (day 6). [We will] hunt, but not [shou =] drive."

As mentioned, shou is sometimes used with other words, such as in wang shou (往, "to go [out] and hunt," in Period I:
Another combination encountered in Period V is *she shou* (see below under *she*). As mentioned, it is also used with *tian* (perhaps in a transitional period before *tian* became the most commonly used word for *hunting*):

> Crack on *xinchou* [day 38]. “On a following ren-[day], The king will *tian shou* [to take to the field hunting] ...” “Greatly auspicious.” (Heji 28775, III)

> In short, *shou* is a prominent general term for hunting. Also, it is probably the most common term in the early part of the late Shang period.

*C. bu* ( Resolve, corresponds to modern *bù* ), “[to hunt while] marching”

The graph simply consists of two “foot” components. The basic meaning may have been “to go on foot.” There are nearly 400 known inscriptions using the word *bu*, again corresponding to the general structure. Some scholars believe the term was specifically used for hunts in conjunction with the military campaigns of King Di Xin during the last part of the Shang dynasty. In much later times, in the Western Zhou, it was used to mean “travel.”

> Chen Weizhan believed *bu* meant traveling not by foot, but by chariot, and listed four points supporting its close relation to the royal hunts. First, it is found juxtaposed with *zhu* (drive, pursue), such as in one paired inscription:

> Crack on *bingshen* [day 33]. Zheng divining: “If the king pursues [zhu] elaphure deer [me], he will meet [a] catch up with [them]."

> Crack on *bingshen* [day 33]. Zhong divining: “The king *bu*.” (Bingbian 88, Heji 10345, I)

> Furthermore, in a number of cases *bu* is used together with *tian* and *shou* where these terms clearly indicate hunting. The king will, for example, divine about hunting at a place and then go on to *bu* at that same place. Chen Weizhan justifiably disagreed with those scholars who have taken these first two facts as proof that *bu* can be translated as “to hunt”—in fact they only indicate that *bu* is related to it in some way. Third, inscriptions divining about *bu* often note the capture of animals in the verification; fourth, locations chosen for *bu* often coincide with hunting grounds. Notes on capture are actually, however, rare. One of the inscriptions quoted by Chen is damaged, and ambiguous. It may originally have used a different word for “hunting”:

> *See Yao Xiaozuo et al.,* *Yinou jingju kezhi biaozun,* 283–88. The majority is from Period I; a small number derives from all other periods.

> Huang Qingxin, *Yinou tandou yanjiu,* 14 (citing Dong Zhaohui’s *Yin & pu*).


> Chen Weizhan, *Yungnan jiaogong tandou bian de wenzi,* 52: the examples are few, and include those that are not in the same inscription but occur together on the same bone.

> Present in only ca. 1% of 400 bu inscriptions listed in Yao Xiaozuo’s *Yinou jingju kezhi biaozun*.

> Yet another damaged inscription suggests that the activity *bu* was supplemented by hunting on an opportunistic basis if game was encountered:

> Crack on *xinchou* [day 38]. Divining: “[If] the king went to *bu*, [and] [we] came forward [he] will not ...” (Heji 13568, I).

> Other examples are: *Heji* 24346 ("the king will capture when returning from *bu-ing*"); *Heji* 27998 (limited to saying *bu*, and “capture”); also 37475 (V):

> The king’s crack, on *gongzi* [day 37]. At *Mai-zi* [?]. Divining: “Today [we] *bu* at *Zeng* [?], [and] there will be no misfortune.” It was in the first month. Capture of foxes, eleven.

> The relationship between *bu* and hunting is clearly present, but may actually be indirect. This is further supported by the manner of the occasional mention in *bu* inscriptions of one of the more specific hunting methods:

> Crack on *gongzi* [day 47]. X = Diviner’s name) (divining): “Let it be the next day [that] *bu* is done.” Shot [with arrows] one *si* [wild cattle] at X (Heji 20731, I)

> In *bu* inscriptions, concern about the weather, is mentioned more often than with *ge* (Heji 12043 etc. mention rain, and 11274 etc. clear weather in the verification). Also, in a way similar to the *ge*-inscriptions, there are occasional examples of the word *bu* used alongside *shou*:

> Crack on *zus* [day 24]. Zheng divining: “The king should not *bu* and [shou = hunt]. Ninth month. At X.” (Heji 10993, I).

> Crack on *gongzi* [day 37]. [If] the hunt (shou) [is carried out, and on] *xinchou* [day 38] [we] *bu*, then she [will] not rain.” It really did not rain. Ninth month? (Heji 20780, I)

> Another example indicates a close association of *bu* and military operations: “Let it be in the [Shang] [jung =] ‘land of the Shang’ [that] we *bu* [and] [we] march [poss. carry out a sacrificial rite] to [our ancestor king] Tai Yi, [and then] attack the land of the *jiaqi* [= barbarians].” (Heji 27982, III)

> There is also a *bu* inscription that identifies the *geren* (“dagger-axe men”[?]), a kind of soldier often engaged in warfare, as participants in a *bu* operation:

> "Translation adapted from Kegley, *Sources of Shang History,* suggesting (29, 29 n. 9) that on the basis of standard eating practices during this period, the words “it was” should be inserted. The record of captured animals may also have served as a record of the time of the event (that is, the Shang were using the capture of a certain number of animals as a mnemonic device so as to remember the date by referring to that particular capture).

> Incidentally, this example reflects Chen Weizhan’s assertion (Yungnan jiaogong tandou bian de wenzi, 52) that all animals mentioned as capture in *bu* inscriptions are foxes.

> Heji 39868, no capture. On *geren* see note below, 3.2.4.
Considering the tiny number of captures resulting from \textit{bu} activity and the use of this term alongside \textit{shou}, we can conclude that \textit{bu} probably also did not primarily mean “to hunt,” but may have been a word for aggressive military maneuvers also suitable for hunting. The term was mainly used in the early part of the late Shang dynasty, and the activity seems to have been conducted on foot (or where, the king, specifically, moved on foot). It can be translated as “to march,” or as “[to hunt while] marching.”

\textbf{D. she} [scribe]: suggested modern equivalent graph: 肩, “to hunt(?)”, “to march(?)”: this word is not usually listed as related to hunting in the oracle bone scholarship, but I introduce it here since, like \textit{bu}, it does appear to have a similarly close association with hunting, and also with warfare. The graph is composed of one “foot” on each side of a flowing river. It may have had the meaning of “crossing” or “wading over streams or rivers, not only on foot but presumably also by boat or raft. It is often used with a named river as the direct object of the action,\footnote{For examples, see Yao Xiaoxi \textit{et al.}, \textit{Yinshang jiaguwen}, 289-90.} and is also often combined with both \textit{shou} and \textit{tian} (thus “hunting while crossing over wetlands”). The divinations \textit{Heji} 28338-40 and 28889 (III) concern the king’s crossing a river and hunting (= \textit{tian}); \textit{Heji} 10602 uses a combination with \textit{shou}: \textit{Crack on dingyi [day 24]. Bin divining: “The king will go and \textit{shou} will hunt in the marshes.”}

The combination \textit{she shou} 肩狩 may literally mean “wade across and hunt,”\footnote{Or “foot across,” according to Chen Weizhan, “Yinshang jiaguwen tianshu bei de wenshu.”} and the word \textit{she} possibly also have had slightly broader connotations, such as perhaps “going into the marsh.”

E. \textit{ge} [\textit{ge}: “modern” \textit{ge}]: “exercise,” “maneuver” [?], “hunting while war-gaming”: the term \textit{ge} has been transcribed as \textit{guo} (ㄍㄛ), or \textit{wu} (ㄨ), and is most often translated as “hunting.”\footnote{For example, by Matsuoka Michio, “Yinshang bokukushi no yoroi ni tattor.”} The graph is composed of two parts, indicating “foot”/“locomotion,” and a weapon (\textit{ge} 步, dagger-axe), respectively. It is sometimes conflated with the similar \textit{tun} ( tieten), but there, another component replaces the dagger-axe.\footnote{Yao Xiaoxi lists nearly 400 inscriptions, almost exclusively from Period III and V.\footnote{Following the \textit{Heji} editors, who list the two graphs together, Yao collapses \textit{tun} and \textit{ge} into one. Actually, all Period III inscriptions apparently were written with \textit{tun}, and all Period V inscriptions as \textit{ge} (which shows more variation than does \textit{tun}). Chen Weizhan believes \textit{tun} means to temporarily occupy or defend a place, \textit{ge} on the other hand involves movement (of troops)—but at least one example quoted in support of this for \textit{tun} also involves movement.\footnote{It is possible that \textit{ge} replaced \textit{tun} over time.}}\footnote{Yao Xiaoxi \textit{et al.}, \textit{Yinshang jiaguwen}, 366-72.} Chen Weizhan, “Yinshang jiaguwen tianshu bei de wenshu,” 47-48.\footnote{Chen Weizhan, “Yinshang jiaguwen tianshu bei de wenshu,” 47, cf. “…the king expects to \textit{tian} from (e.g. rug, see below under 2.3.2) the east,” in \textit{Heji} 28768, quoted by Chen as Y198 (from \textit{Yinhu yiyao}).} The view that it primarily means \textit{tian} is supported by what appears to be a gathering of the army (\textit{tun} or perhaps \textit{he}); literally, “men under the flag,” who will proceed to \textit{ge} at a specific place. On this graph, see Liu Zhao, “Bukucu xian shi de foushu baozong,” \textit{Gaminli yuwen} 16 (1989), 73-83.} But this Chou-hunting observed that while the locations mentioned for \textit{tian}-expeditions in Period III and V largely coincided, those for \textit{ge} constitute a new, different set of locations (arguing against Matsuoka, “Yinshang bokukushi no yoroi ni tattor.” 147). This could be taken to imply that military exercises were concentrated in a new area, in response to geopolitical changes. I believe that this is also supported by the lack of concern for the weather in divinations using \textit{ge} (Heji Chin-hsiung, \textit{The Mentzer Collection}, sec. 102). However, there is actually a number of \textit{ge} inscriptions indicating weather concerns. \textit{Heji} 2973: 2973: 3129, 36729, and 38177, etc.).\footnote{Chen Weizhan, “Yinshang jiaguwen tianshu bei de wenshu,” 48] says \textit{ge} is more often used together with \textit{tian} than \textit{tun}. In fact there seem to be no cases of \textit{tun} and \textit{ge} used together at all (however, this could of course reflect the increasing predominance of \textit{tun} over \textit{ge}). Also, \textit{tun} is (only possibly) used alongside \textit{ge} only once, in one damaged inscription: \textit{Heji} 2973: 31.}$\footnote{In only 5 cases, with only single deer mentioned (Yao Xiaoxi \textit{et al.}, \textit{Yinshang jiaguwen}, 871).}$\footnote{It is supported also by \textit{Heji} 3642-65, where the word \textit{ge} is preceded by what appears to be a gathering of the army (\textit{tun} or perhaps \textit{he}); literally, “under the flag,” who will proceed to \textit{ge} at a specific place. On this graph, see Liu Zhao, “Bukucu xian shi de foushu baozong,” \textit{Gaminli yuwen} 16 (1989), 73-83.$\footnote{See also Wang Xinru, “Yinhu yiyao nian,” 559, counting and presenting different hunting terms, some of which are rare or obscure.}$

Additional specifications of methods of capture are never mentioned together with \textit{ge}. This may be a further indication that this word did not actually directly mean “hunting,” but at the same time was indirectly related to it. The view that it primarily refers to some form of military exercise, show of force, or maneuver is probably correct.\footnote{The lack of explicit references to hunting methods in inscriptions using \textit{ge} may be explained by that the king or his army simply used their regular weaponry to kill occasional game. The same general meaning of military exercise may also apply to the related word \textit{tun} (even if there is little indication that \textit{tun} also was related to hunting).}$\footnote{To summarize the five general terms, A-E: \textit{tian} is a general verb which often, if not always, refers to hunting (still, further research is needed to investigate its broader implications). The word \textit{shou} is also a general verb for hunting, perhaps the only one which is unambiguously translatable as “hunting.” The other general verbs discussed above (\textit{bu}, \textit{she}, and \textit{ge}) refer to activities that were indirectly related to hunting (\textit{bu} more closely related, \textit{she} and \textit{ge} more indirectly), but which allowed it and were eminently suited for it.}$

### 3.2.2.2 Specific hunting methods

In the following, a number of the specific methods used while performing “hunting” are briefly presented, in the approximate order of frequency.\footnote{But Hou Chih-hsiung observed that while the locations mentioned for \textit{tian}-expeditions in Period III and V are often closely related, those for \textit{ge} constitute a new, different set of locations (arguing against Matsuoka, “Yinshang bokukushi no yoroi ni tattor.” 147). This could be taken to imply that military exercises were concentrated in a new area, in response to geopolitical changes. I believe that this is also supported by the lack of concern for the weather in divinations using \textit{ge} (Heji Chin-hsiung, \textit{The Mentzer Collection}, sec. 102). However, there is actually a number of \textit{ge} inscriptions indicating weather concerns. \textit{Heji} 2973: 3129, 36729, and 38177, etc.).}$\footnote{Chen Weizhan, “Yinshang jiaguwen tianshu bei de wenshu,” 48] says \textit{ge} is more often used together with \textit{tian} than \textit{tun}. In fact there seem to be no cases of \textit{tun} and \textit{ge} used together at all (however, this could of course reflect the increasing predominance of \textit{tun} over \textit{ge}). Also, \textit{tun} is (only possibly) used alongside \textit{ge} only once, in one damaged inscription: \textit{Heji} 2973: 31.}$
 groceries and were probably imported from afar, which were probably used for hunting while clearing fields for agriculture (as discussed above, under tian). When the method zhu was used, large numbers of people may have been employed to drive the prey animals within the shooting range of the king. And indeed, divination is often concerned with the direction of the approach to the prey:

"... if we pursue elaphre deer at Xing, [approaching] from the east, west, and north, [then there will be] no calamity." (He 28789, III)

Here the prey is probably entire herds of deer, which may have lent themselves particularly well to this type of hunt. In one example, 30 deer are pursued:

Crack on dinghai [day 24]. The king [divining]. [We will] let it be 30 deer [that we] drive [zhu]. [We] really did drive, [and] caught 16 [deer]. First month. 211

On such occasions, the king and accompanying hunters may have been riding in chariots. These were high-status objects, together with the horses they depended on and which were probably imported from afar, 212 and as such were important elements of the Shang royal hunt. 213 There are a number of inscriptions that record the use of horses and chariots in hunting. 214 Chariot inscriptions with zhu, as one of the specific hunting terms included in the famous example with an accident where the king and which were probably imported from afar, 212 and as such were important elements of the Shang royal hunt. 213 There are a number of inscriptions that record the use of horses and chariots in hunting. 214 Chariot inscriptions with zhu, as one of the specific hunting terms included in the famous example with an accident where the king and a companion, Ziyang (a noble frequently asked to join the king's hunts 215), were riding in chariots:

Crack on guizi [day 30]. Que divining. "There will be no misfortune this [ten­day] week." The king prophesied and said: "This, too? [has =] is dangerous"

There is a closely related word, zhu 216-17; "elaphre," used in ways similar to zhu, but never for animals, only for human enemies, such as those of fang (enemy) politics. 217

The objects of zhu driving are deer (including elaphre deer, common deer, and antelers, deer), pigs (boars), a form of bird, 218 and zhi (wild cattle). These are all animals that lend themselves to hunting by "driving.

she 219-20; modern 4; "shooting (with bow and arrow);" the gun is an obvious rendering of a bow and an arrow (different from the she 211; ["to wade or boat across") mentioned above). The bow and arrow clearly was an important part of Shang weaponry. In his reconstruction of the Shang arsenal, Shih Chang-ju suggested that the bow was made of buffalo or cattle (niu 4) horns and sinew, and that arrows were wooden with arrowheads made from bone, antler, shell, or bronze.

The objects of she appear to be limited to elaphre and other deer, wild cattle (niu 4), as in Tutuan 222, and (only rarely) boars, or foxes; some may have been shot in the field, and some killed back at the temples. 223 The word she can also be the name of an official, or Archer. 224

526. *Kung Fu* 1, *Hei* 10405; translation Adapted from E. Shaughnessy, "Historical perspectives on the introduction of the chariots to China," 214.

527. In one exceptional case, it appears that the word is used for the pursuit of quan humans (Binglun 441). See Yao Xianxiu et al., *Yuezhu jikesi leishen*; 1164-1165; Ltu Zhao, "Buci suojian Yindai de jianshi huoding," 121, quoting Yang Shun, *Shuishen juanwen* (Peking, Chinese Academy of Science, 1965), 15; Yao Xianxiu (*Juzhe leishen* 4) 42; this suggests that zhu 4 can be used for people and zhi 4 for animals, but the cited examples are from the much later Eastern Zhou period—in one inscription, zhi is preceded by "marching." (Bu *Hei* 204633).

528. Perhaps a phrasal: Four examples are cited in Yao Xianxiu et al., *Yuezhu jikesi leishen*, 329.

529. Yao Xianxiu et al., *Juzhe jikesi leishen*, 101-1013. Huang Ranwu (*Yin wang tian li kao") cites one example of a niu 4 (the graph for domestic cattle, only otherwise seen in sacrifice) is she 9 (*Kung Fu* 300). For wild animals, it possibly reflects a tradition seen the later Zhou, in which (according to later literary sources such as the "Chu yan 4") 24 chapter of the Guozi 4, cited in Chen Pan, "Gao shuhua shiyun yu jie zhuyi gaozi," 9, the Zhou conuny of Son of the king must constantly move from the sacred animal (long) to the sacred ritual for which he is responsible, and a feudal lord "must personally shoot an arrow into his niu 4 when rituals are performed in his ancestral temple, personally assuming the role of sacrifice on behalf of his community which becomes eat as the sacrificial ("sacrifice" referring to the role of sponsor or beneficiary of sacrifice, as distinct from the "sacrifices," the actual performers; this follows Hubert and Blaus, *Sacrifice: Its Nature and Function* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), cf. Valerio Valeri, *Knigebuch and Sacrifice: Ritual and Society in Ancient Hanziu* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 37. On this ritual, see too Cai Zhenrao (Yui Cici-hsee), *Shao­sheng zhi", s. *Yinli xueyu* (M.A. thesis, National Taiwan University, 1978, 39-70); as mentioned in it, Child­ dulson, *"The metempsychic image": 37 -98.

530. There is no record of a "zhi 4 (the graph for domestic cattle, only otherwise seen in sacrifice) is she 9 (*Kung Fu* 300). For wild animals, it possibly reflects a tradition seen the later Zhou, in which (according to later literary sources such as the "Chu yan 4") 24 chapter of the Guozi 4, cited in Chen Pan, "Gao shuhua shiyun yu jie zhui gaozi," 9, the Zhou conuny of Son of the king must constantly move from the sacred animal (long) to the sacred ritual for which he is responsible, and a feudal lord "must personally shoot an arrow into his niu 4 when rituals are performed in his ancestral temple, personally assuming the role of sacrifice on behalf of his community which becomes eat as the sacrificial ("sacrifice" referring to the role of sponsor or beneficiary of sacrifice, as distinct from the "sacrifices," the actual performers; this follows Hubert and Blaus, *Sacrifice: Its Nature and Function* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), cf. Valerio Valeri, *Knigebuch and Sacrifice: Ritual and Society in Ancient Hanziu* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 37. On this ritual, see too Cai Zhenrao (Yui Cici-hsee), *Shao­sheng zhi", s. *Yinli xueyu* (M.A. thesis, National Taiwan University, 1978, 39-70); as mentioned in it, Child­ dulson, *"The metempsychic image": 37 -98.

531. i. e. as either zhi 4, dou she, dou she, dou shi she, or dou hai she (Liu Zhao, "Buci suojian Yindai de jianshi huoding," 87-90; Chen Mengjia, *Yuezhu congshu*; Wang Xianxi, *Juzhe yu she nian*, 455). This may be related to the archery rituals known from later times, as in the Western Zhou period, when the she 4 (this seems to involve capturing prey; the Zhou king, who is always present (according to the literary inscriptions which mention him), enveaths to come and shoot, and to receive arrows, quivers, etc. as "royal gifts."

But in one Western Zhou inscription inscription, the Mai jun, the king shoots birds from a boat together with a writing li 4 lord who is then "armed" (heavily) with a sword as his weapon (niwu). See Shihua, *Shuishen juanwen* (Peking, Huxianshu, 1978, 35); 60-62; see esp. 63-72. This Zhou ritual has been interpreted as a means of testing (and controlling) the loyalty of vassals (cf. Liu Yu, *Xi jian jianwen zhong de shei", *Kongfu* 11862.12, 1116). On the archery rituals of the later Zhou, see also Yang Kuang, "She li xun tan," in Gu shi xun tan (Peking, Zhejiang, 1903), 316-37; to Senju, "On the shooting ritual of ancient China," *Kongfu* 23 (1995), 108-202.
xian [X, modern X], "trapping": there are several different graphs used for "trapping," simply displaying different entrapped prey in a pit or trap. The prey are mostly various forms of deer, occasionally wild cattle (Yanmu 2589). The graphs also vary in utilizing either a "pit" (L) or a "well" (H) as the component for what the animal falls into, presumably there was a difference in scale. As always, the phonetic reading given here is based on the modern character for trapping, which is often used to transcribe all the various oracle bone "trapping" graphs. Typically, the king first "traps" and then again "catches" a number of deer, revealing that "trapping" is a specific method. When two small upward-pointing lines are added emerging from the bottom of the pit in the character, we may suspect that these represent upward-pointing spears on the bottom of the pit (such as those often used by hunting peoples in modern times). A graph appearing immediately before the word for "trapping-of-mi-deer" has been interpreted as "whip," an implement used to drive the deer towards the traps, or pitfalls.321 by Yu Xinwu, who also discussed "trapping" graphs that depict dogs, sheep or niu, placed in a pit in a similar way. Dogs and niu bovines were not hunted, but they were, as we have seen, common in sacrificial pits at Anyang (see 2.2.3). Thus those graphs should be read "ritual burial of dogs, etc." There is indeed at least one example of a "burial" pit with deer (at the royal tomb WKG1; 2.2.3), but reading the hunting inscriptions with "trap/burial" graphs containing deer as "burials" would force a difficult reinterpretation of the crucial word "obtain," seen in so many hunting expeditions where the animals are pursued or shot, including in inscriptions recording the trapping of deer. Although the structure of the depicted pit may appear similar, the sacrificial pits for bovines, sheep and dogs are often written with four dots (two below, two above), perhaps representing the burial pit fill.332 Such dots are rarely seen in the hunting inscriptions that mention trap-pits.333

The king apparently did not take part directly in trapping, but if it involved driving game into pitfalls, either using people or with fire (see below), the hunt would still include a dramatic aspect more like the other forms of royal hunting.341 One inscription suggests precisely this scenario:

Crack on bingwu [day 43]. X divining: "When the king goes to trap, he will drive."338

321 Yu Xinwu, Jiaoge semzi shihua (Peking: Zhongguo, 1979), 273, example 4 (cited as Yi 7080).
322 Yu Xinwu, op cit., 270-272, plus 5 more examples on p. 224-75.
323 In fact, I have not been able to find any examples of this. An alternative would be to read the dots as blood, but this would leave the problem of the two types of animals treated differently unexplained. Yao Xiaoou et al. (Xiaowu word jiaguo baoliu, 153) suggested that several graphs where a human body is seen in a pit surrounded by dots are depictions of human enemies being "trapped" in the same way as animals, but this is unlikely. The graphs probably also depict the burial of such people: sacrificial pits. One of the quoted inscriptions (Heji 19800, I) says that the person is being hunted/trapped "at the gate," whereas "gate" (men PL) may be a place-name ('Men'). But even so the main verb used in the example, again, appears exclusively used with other domesticated animals (see Yao Xiaoou et al. Yinxia jiaguo boliun, 217-19).
324 In more recent times, trapping generally has been used by lone hunters. See Carleton S. Coon, The Hunting Peoples (London: Jonathan Cape, 1972), 104-108. But driving large prey into pitfalls required more people. This form of hunting has become rare in modern times, due to the sharp decline in wildfowl worldwide. It is not inconceivable that the king did visit traps and moors in the fashion of the lone hunter known from various ethnographic records, but that seems less likely.
325 Hunt 931, quoted in Yao Xiaoou et al., Yinxia jiaguo boliun, 221, from the catalogue Huaite (White) along shi zuo cong jiaowen si, not included in the Heji.
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feb [X, modern X], "[driving with] fire": this method is less common, which would not be surprising (it probably was seasonal, dangerous, and very demanding). It is described using a graph that has two forms: one shows fire under trees (sometimes one tree, but mostly two), and the other with an added hand component (i.e. setting fire to the woods). The graph can also be used more generally, to refer to other fires (such as with the burning of (enemy?) granaries in Heji 583B, 584A.338). When used in hunting, it is closely related to zhuc i.e. driving game animals using fire, instead of (just) with people. The only animal recorded as caught using the variant with a hand holding the fire is the tiger (and this in just two inscriptions). It is possible that fen did involve carrying torches.347

"The king will [set, or hunt, with] fire at Dou [?], and it will be at the foot of the mountains at Dou." The king stood in the east. [A tiger emerged, and was] captured.348

The numbers of animals killed at one event using this method can be staggering, and the species are often mixed up, as seen in Heji 10198 (one tiger and 159 deer, etc.).349 Almost all of the 20 or so examples given in Yao's concordance come from period I.350 Examples:

"On the following guimu [day 40], [we] will [hunt with] fire, ... [and] capture. On guimu, [we] really did [hunt with] fire, captured ... si [wild cattle], 11; pigs, 15; tigers, ...; and hares [7]?" (Heji 10408A, I).

"... [hunt with] fire and drive [zhua]; ... the troops [?] at X." month. (Heji 10891, I).

In the second (badly damaged) inscription, it seems possible that foot soldiers were involved in setting fires to "drive" animals. The only other examples of fen divinations where capture of animals is recorded, are from period III:

"... on [a] 10-day; ... [hunt with] fire at Hui [?]." The capture [had =] included si [wild cattle] (Heji 28790, III).

When hunts using fire were planned, the concern about wind and rain was obviously likely to be greater than otherwise, as is indicated some divinations.341 In summary, fen refers to hunting where the prey is flushed out and driven out with fire,342 and the amount of captured prey can be very large.

327 Yao Xiaoou, "Jiaoge keji shouyi kan," 43.
328 As suggested by Yao Xiaoou ("Jiaoge keji shouiei kan," 43), this may be the method referred to in the Shijing poem no. 78, 'Shu ya tian [I] ?""
329 Heji 28790 III. The "feb" graph here is not the most common variant and has also been interpreted as standing for other animals (Yao Xiaoou, "Jiaoge keji shouiei kan," 44).
331 Yao Xiaoou et al., Yinxia jiaguo boliun, 473-74.
332 In the 'Tanum groups of hunting inscriptions discovered by Yao Xiaoou and Xiao Ding (Xiaowu word jiaguo baoliu, 126-27). They suggest "rain" is by ji 17 ("transcendent") and "no rain" suggestion which makes sense for when one wants to set a fire (but actually the expression by ji 17 doesn't appear to all in the inscriptions cf. Keightley, Sources of Shang History, 401).
333 It does, not primarily, as some have suggested, refer to slash-and-burn agriculture. Qiu Xijie pointed out that the two were not mutually exclusive (Qiu Xijie, "Jiangouhou jian de Shangdai nongye," 218). For a further discussion see Wang Qingdong, 'Shi tianhe.'
“netting”: there are a variety of graphs that include a net, ranging from just the “net” (网); via graphs where the net is hand-held, but no prey is shown; to graphs where the net is accompanied by one of several “netted” animals. Ding Su counted ten different forms of animals depicted under a net in such graphs. An example:

‘If we use nets [we will capture] deer. On the next morning [we] really captured.” (Heji 28322, III).

In “netting,” there is also concern for the wind, suggesting perhaps that animals were probably driven into nets, and it was important that they did not catch the scent of the hunters (including that of the king!) much too early, if at all:

Crack on jiyou [day 51]. “If we call on Ming [Bird’s Call] to net birds [he will capture]. On binghun [day 53] there was wind. Captured 5.” (Heji 10514, I).

The animals caught by various forms of “netting” are mostly deer. In one case, a tiger (?) was caught (Heji 10307A, I), in still others, birds.

zheng, or wei (?) (畏, modern 恐, or 憾), “to attack,” “to encircle, surround” (?): the graph consists of a pair of feet, and a “mouth” component. It has been interpreted by some as an equivalent of the modern graph “to encircle” (围). Most scholars read it as zheng 恐 (to attack or to “launch a punitive expedition against”), as in the numerous inscriptions with divinations about Shang warfare against various enemy countries (fang Ji), or about performing zheng at some location; an identical graph is used in a number of inscriptions that also use a word for “capture,” and where qiang enemies are the object. One inscription once cited to suggest that zheng is a hunting method is damaged, but the main verb is shou, followed by a zheng (with only one “foot”):

[Crack on dingmao [day 4]. “If we ... hunt [and] zheng ... [we shall!] net [animals].”] (We really?) captured 162 deer, 114 ... 10 pigs, one X.146

There is one inscription, however, which seems to be an exception to the rule that zheng does not take wild animals as objects:

Crack on jiyou [day 64]. Divining: “If Que goes to zheng pigs, [he] will not capture.” (At) X. Tenth month (Heji 6979, 1).147

But even so, there is little basis for regarding zheng exclusively as a hunting method. It may be a military term that is also related to hunting.

144 The phonetic reading as tu 附 is based on the use of a “hand” component. Ding Su, “Qiwon should ji jie shizhu,” 33B: 498-50A; also Yao Xinou et al., Yinxu jiyu bei kesi, 225. With deer, only the heads are shown under the net (apparently elaphur and antlerless deer, only used in Periods I and III).

145 Huang Qingyin, Yixuan yiyou yiyou, 13.

146 Yao Xinou et al., Yinxu jiyu bei kesi, 308-311.

147 Heji 10307, 1, cited by Huang Qingyin, Yingzi tiandu yiyun, 13.

148 Yao Xinou et al., Yinxu jiyu bei kesi, 323 renders the object of the verb zheng in this inscription as “dog” (or Dog), but it seems it could equally well be “pig” (as in Yao 1965: 123A).

As for further specific hunting methods, there are an additional few which are used only very rarely, and precisely what is involved is therefore less well understood. One example is the rare word used in Heji 5739, 5740 where the Duoshu ("Many Archers") are called on to "捕" and capture.246 The word bi (?), otherwise used in the name of several royal consorts, also appears as an attribute of animals indicating female sex,249 and as hunting method, perhaps using some special weapon:250

“If the king hunts at ... [and] let the ‘Tiger-troops’ bi, [he]they will capture, [and] no misfortune.” This was used. (Heji 27915, III).

The word li (?) is used as a word that may stand for hunting, in just a few cases, where the object is wild cattle (if). An example:

Crack on dingmao [day 4]. Divining at Run: “Chu [having] reported [and] said [as] wild cattle have appeared at Yang [Xiu’], the king lets it be today that the shall” li. “There will be no misfortune” Capture. (Heji 57392, V).

Another example of rare methods is the graph with a hand holding a net over a boar (附):

[Crack on ... yin. The king should not call on Ge ["Dagger-axe," a type of soldier, or a personal name] to X.151

The graph looks as a variation on the third word for “capture” listed below; the only difference is that a boar has replaced the bird. But it is here used in the function of hunting method. But the only example of an explicit capture is one where the particular type of activity denoted by this verb follows a campaign against an enemy where “five people” are “captured” (Heji 1021). It is perhaps not a hunting method, though the graph composition is suggestive (“capturing people as if they were bears”).

There are additional rarely used words, not discussed in detail here.252 However, fishing (yu) should also be mentioned. Fishing is uncommon in the record, and actual fishing methods do not seem to have been recorded. I have mentioned that it is once used as a specification of the general hunting term shou. The lack of interest in divini-

246 It is transcribed differently by Liu Zhao, “Buci xiaohou Yindai de jingji huodong,” 89, and by Yao Xinou et al., Yinxu jiyu bei kesi, 166.

247 See Jin Xiangdong, in Zhangzhou weishu 9 (1983); for further examples see Yao Xinou et al., Yinxu jiyu bei kesi, 10; Zhang Bingquan, “Ji’ bi ci zhong de xiaohou,” Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology 38 (1988), 186, etc.

248 Yao Xinou, “Ji’ bi ci zhong de xiaohou,” 46.

249 Heji 10713; most examples at Yao Xinou et al., Yinxu jiyu bei kesi, 378.

250 One graph transcribed by Huang Hanwei (Yin wuqiang li xun) 19B–20A also does not seem to be a hunting method, but rather a word meaning “to catch up wild” or “get [a shot at?]” such as is implied in Heji 190, I where the divination charge was about wild cattle, but the verification says that wild cattle could not be had, but "two bears were captured."—Liu Hanzhou [Shi shi shi] lists three additional, little-known hunting methods, Quan Xiqu ("Ji’ bi cuci xiaohou de you yun" "wee") 224–26 identifies a word (wu) which appears to mean “deer for fencing” and is often involved catching wild animals (Heji 28320, 28345 etc.). See also Wang Yuxin et al., Jingfeng jikeshu, 559 ff.
ing about fishing could be an indication that the greater prestige value in the display of game hunting was of more interest to the kings.333

Falconry is yet another hunting method that was possibly also used, but it is apparently not mentioned in the oracle bone inscriptions. It would be expected to leave few traces in the archaeological record—although some seem to have been found.334 Like fishing, it might be used together with the use of poison on arrows, or other weapons.

We should also note the glaring absence from the inscriptions of the dog, in its probable role as hunting assistant (in driving and cornering game, etc.). As mentioned, it is frequently encountered both in sacrifices seen in the inscriptions, and as burial offerings in the archaeological remains (often together with armed human “guardians”). The absence of hunting dogs in the inscriptions might simply be due to the fact that it seemed obvious or self-evident to the Shang diviners that dogs would join in the hunt. Note, however, that it is also curiously, and almost “completely neglected” in artistic representations.335 Representations of dogs and certain other animals may, of course have been restrained by Shang beliefs or prohibitions such as taboos. On the other hand, an official with the title quan or “Dog [keeper]” does have a role as a royal assistant (see 3.2.4), and it is still likely that dogs were involved in hunting in the field.

3.2.2.3 Enumerations of captured prey, “to get,” or “capture”

$qin$ ((entities), modern 單), “capture” (alternatively, “bag,” or “net”): this graph, for which the pronunciation is uncertain (it has also been transcribed as bi), is the simplest version of a series. Here it is composed of a “hand” and a “net” (?). understood as the combination of those two.336 Even if the upper part of the word indeed should can be interpreted as a net, the word is clearly used in a more general sense than “netting,” as indicated by the many examples of inscriptions stating that the king hunts ($shou$, or 田) and then the capture is enumerated using this word. Many inscriptions specify one of the different specific hunting methods prior to using this term, to express “capture.” Examples include Heji 33371, and Tianshao 26262, where the king hunts with pit-falls and then captures ($qin$ 單), in the latter case, “700 elaphure deer;” and Heji 27902, where the king first uses bow and arrow, and then captures ($qin$ 單). Alternatively, to express what may have been an original sense of “netting,” but still retaining a distinction from the following word, this graph could tentatively be rendered as “to bag,” or “to net” in a general sense.

The word is sometimes used conjointly with $huo$, the next word discussed here, but only for capture of animals and not human enemies, as with $huo$.337
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$huo$ (?)-A (entities), modern 射), “get, capture”: the graph is composed of a hand and a bird component, i.e. “grabbing a bird.” It may have had such a meaning earlier, but in the oracle bone inscriptions it clearly is a word which already had acquired a more abstract, general meaning. It is used for the capture of both animals and human enemies.338

$huo$ (?)-B (entities), modern 射), “get, capture”: the graph resembles both of the above, but includes a “net” in addition to the hand and bird components, i.e. “the grabbing/netting of a bird.” It may or may not include an additional “hand” (as if reaching for the bird on top). As the one above, it has a more abstract and general meaning, and it is also used for the capture of both animals and of human enemies.339

There are at least four more verbs expressing “capture”: two different graphs using the components $shi$ (in later texts = “scribe”) and $pig$, as well as $fu$ (entities): is “to take captive”;340 and $zhi$ (entities): “to take captive” or “to shackle.” The latter words refer specifically to the capture of human enemies, mostly if not always in a situation of war, and apparently never to the “capture” animals.341

3.2.3 What? Identification and quantification of the prey

Elaphure and other deer were the most common prey, but captured animals also included wild cattle and buffalo, foxes, boars, tigers, hares, pheasants or other birds, and, rarely, some other animals (such as fish, and elephants). Identifying the various prey is complicated, since many graphs used for captured animals are obscure, or variable. While it is most often perfectly clear that they depict animals, or at the very least have once been intended to depict animals (they often are obvious depictions of four-legged animals), an exact identification to living animal species is not always possible. Moreover, scholars have identified the graphs with different animals and there is considerable confusion. Moreover, Shang classification of animals as expressed in the written form of their language might have changed over time, and it may also have differed significantly from our present zoological systematic classification (itself an evolving system). If we could travel back to the Shang period and investigate Shang animal nomenclature, we might find that Shang categories don’t correspond to the 20th century taxonomy applied to the recovered skeletal remains from Anyang (outlined above, 2.3.2).

Against this background, how should we, for example, explain the fact that while a number of skeletal remains were identified, no bear has so far been identified in the oracle bone inscriptions? Perhaps the bear remains recovered were really pre-Shang, and thus irrelevant for our discussion; alternatively, the bear is represented in writing by some unidentified graph (of which there are many); or some graph may

333 Authors 1991.18, 1: Tianshao 673, III, mentioned above; further examples of $yu$ are given in Yan Xiang et al., Yiyao jiegu keli lunwen, 673–74, perhaps precedents for the much later Western Zhou royal fishing ritual (Jing deng, in Chen Mengjia, 'Xi Zhou tongji dianji,' Part 3, 120).

334 The bird of prey found in Xiaotan pits (such as M217; see above, 2.2.1 and 2.3.2) may have been used in such hunting (but the identifications remain unclear).

335 14 Ji, "hunting records," 15.

336 CSB, 407.

337 See, for example, Liu Zhao, 'Yiyao xiaoyuan Yunzhi de jiegu huadong,' 123–24.

338 Liu Zhao op. cit., 123–24.

339 Ibid.

340 On the taking of prisoners in war, and the word $fu$, see Yan Xiaosui, 'Shangdai de fufu,' Gunenzi yuanji 1 (1979), 337–60.

341 Liu Zhao op. cit., 124. There is a small number of examples in which antlerless deer, or wild cattle, are "taken," using this word (Yan Xiaosui, "Jugua kezi shenqi kai" 40).
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have been misinterpreted—or the bear may have been subsumed under some other "native" category.362

In our search for order we may begin by noting that the number of graphs for hunted wild animals (with the exception of deer) is much smaller than in those used for domestic animals, where there is a great proliferation of forms, including in the divinations specifying what animals should be used in sacrifices to different ancestors.363 Because the domestic animals were closer to home, detailed differentiation of color patterns, etc., could be made at leisure; wild animals, however, were probably seized upon for their identity as species, to which attributes are attached, and not because of individual shades of difference (as with the domestic victims of sacrifice, readily available for the leisurely choice of victims of a certain color, with certain stripes, etc.). This may be part of the explanation why, furthermore, many wild animal names are also used as a person's name.364

Still, there are certain observations, and even identifications, that can be made of animals mentioned in the inscriptions. Below, the most commonly hunted animals seen in the inscriptions are listed, again roughly in the order of frequency, with brief notes on the identification as well as on the methods used to capture them.365

- *mi* [Elaphurus davidianus]: Elaphere (or David's deer)

As with all the "deer" graphs, this is a rendering of an animal with an exaggerated head (the outgrowths depicted on top are generally understood as indicating the marked elaphere "eyebrows," not its curious and seemingly more obvious horns366). As mentioned, this animal is sometimes captured in large numbers (the highest number of elaphere deer caught in one single hunt in any inscription is 209, caught by trapping (Heji 10349.1). This is not counting the inscriptions that are not fully recognizable hunting inscriptions, but only use the graph for "trapping" or "pitfall," with an elaphere depicted inside: In one of these, as many as 700 trapped elaphere deer are mentioned (Yuman 2626.4V).—Other methods used for catching *mi* deer are shooting with arrows, and driving (zhu).367

362 Written, for example, how common bears in modern Chinese are called *gongshou feng*, "i.e. "dog-bear," in the "popular" classification system used today. This is not to say that the Shang did not distinguish bears from other animals. Similarly the fact that the Shang written language does not seem to have a category "animal" doesn't mean that the Shang did not conceptualize this distinction; or, for that matter, the distinction between animals and humans or a category including "human" enemies (i.e. qing), even when captured in ways similar to hunted animals. Such distinctions were evidently made, either linguistically or by other means (differential mortuary treatment, etc.).

363 Ding Su, "Qwen shoubi ji shouxing zhih," Zhongguo xue 21–22 (1986). 1A-II; also Zhang Bingsong, "Zhan hui zhang, de zhiheng." See too Yao Xiaosui et al., Yingx jiez kei xinjian, 579–605. On the oracle bones from the Hezuoanyun discovery at Anyang in 1991, which further confirm a wild/domestic divide where the qing animals have been placed on the "wild" side, see Liu Yuanan and Cao Bangyu, "Yuyan Huayuanzhong dougou busi xuanzhi yu. chubu yanjiu," Kang 1993.3, 208; and the discussion in the conclusions.

364 Such as when prefixed by "yi" ‘hit”. These names could probably be translated literally (for example, Zhi "hit" ‘hit’ as "Zhi-the-Deer-Trapper"); the connection to deer-trapping need not he immediately descriptive, but referring to some incident in the past, perhaps not even in the same generation. I have not been able to locate any examples of such a person actually mentioned together with a hunting operation.


366 Such as when prefixed by "yi" —hit”. These names could probably be translated literally (for example, Zhi "hit" ‘hit’ as "Zhi-the-Deer-Trapper"); the connection to deer-trapping need not be immediately descriptive, but referring to some incident in the past, perhaps not even in the same generation. I have not been able to locate any examples of such a person actually mentioned together with a hunting operation.

367 Depending on the species of deer, it could also refer to "deer." But this is less likely, since there is another pair of graph forms are used to indicate the sexes of various animals (occasionally for tigers, and often for cattle; see below, pp. 98 and 28) —using the very component which here stands as a single graph. The graph indicating "female deer" is still in use today (yin, deer). It is not unlikely that Shang people would associate antlerless females of a species with the males having antlers with that same species, and use the same graph for females when a herd was captured. Also there are antlerless deer species which may fit the sl graph could have been used for (such as muntjac deer, Muntiacus albinoni). Thus it seems prudent to translate the graph as "antlerless deer." For other views on deer identification, see too B. Childs-Johnson, "The metamorphic image," 26–28.

368 For more examples of the use of *mi* see Li Xiaoming, *Jiajuzi jie*, jilu, Vol. 10, 3063.
zhu (ㄓ; modern zhū): pig, or wild boar. The graph is in most cases identical to that used for domestic pigs. The distinction between the two is then made solely on that (judging from skeletal remains) there were domesticated pigs at Anyang, but also remains of wild boar, and the domesticated pigs could not have been driven and captured. The graph is also similar to that for dogs (ㄗ; t'ai), and the identification as pig or boar is made on the basis of the larger belly, sometimes absent in the dogs.  

In a number of cases, an "arrow" is added to the graph (through or alongside the pig body), it is then transcribed as zhi ㄓ boar, by most scholars. But the two graphs are used interchangeably in the context of hunting and sacrifice inscriptions (pigs with no arrow are given in verifications with hunting prey; pigs pierced by arrows are used in ancestral sacrifice, etc.)  

There seems to be no clear distinction between the two (the same goes for the graphs that instead add a "mouth," or a "meat" component). It should be noted that the graph with an arrow is used almost exclusively in Period I, and is only rarely seen after that (not at all in Period V). There may thus have existed some distinction that disappeared later.

hu (ㄏ; suggested modern equivalent hù): fox. This is a tentative definition. Some scholars have rendered it as "wolf." The graph describes a dog-like animal with an added phonetic component. Many Chinese scholars, especially in the past, have transcribed this graph as weng (ㄏ, retaining the Shang graph's phonetic component, presumably because of a reluctance to equate it with the fox). The equation is made on the basis of the perceived ancestral relation of the phonetic component of the Shang graph to that of the modern character for "fox." These "foxes" are sometimes caught in large numbers: the record quantity is 164 (in Heji 10198, 1).

si (ㄝi; suggested modern equivalent shi): wild buffalo. The graph emphasizes huge horns (or a horn) on the animal's head. It is captured through zhu ㄓ, pursuit, occasionally with fire (in Heji 10408, 1), and/or si ㄝ, shooting with arrows. The graph is believed to correspond to ㄝ, a character used in later Chinese texts, the meaning of which has long been unclear. In my view, the root cause of the problem is probably the (proto-historic/Shang) extinction of wild

bovines and lack of attention to the zooarchaeological data. This has given rise to a long-standing controversy over whether the oracle bone graph referred to wild buffalo or cattle, or to rhinoceros/unicorn, and over the issue of whether the animal it referred to persisted in the area later in historic times. Even after the identification as bovine of the famous 1292 skull, inscribed with the oracle bone graph in question (2.2.1),  

there has been some discussion about the meaning of the character, and of the fate of the rhinoceros in China. The issue, including the use of the character in the oracle bone inscriptions and in Shang and Zhou bronze inscriptions, has been reviewed by Lefevre, who argued convincingly that it cannot mean rhinoceros because a) the oracle bone character appears on what is definitely a bovine skull; and b) the scarcity of rhinoceros remains and large number of bovines in the Anyang faunal remains (2.3.2) speak against it. The so-called "si" is frequent in the inscriptions, and sometimes hunted in large numbers. This supports a bovine identity (most likely a buffalo). Not one of the possible rhinoceros species congregate in big herds in the wild, while most bovine species do.

In association with this larger skull, a deer skull with an inscription mentioning a royal hunting expedition was also found. Although it had been damaged precisely where it would mention the captured species, Dong ventured it would say "deer," suggested a correspondence between the animal mentioned in the inscription, and the bone; and also pointed out that at and deer are sometimes recorded as captured during the same hunt (Dong Zuohin, "Huo hai lin ji," 327). There are other examples recording just such an identity between the subject matter of the inscription and the bone on which it was written, on bones not used in pyromancy (for example, human and deer skull bones inscribed with non-divination inscriptions, as well as the tiger bone mentioned above). Keightley (Sources of Shang History, 7-4) says that most such inscriptions are from period V, and are records of either hunts or sacrifices; the vast majority of oracle inscriptions used in pyromancy are, of course, made on turtle shell burials. The proportions of cattle or buffalo has not been conclusively resolved. On the raw material of Shang oracle divination, see Keightley, Sources of Shang History, 6-12; Chen Mengxia, Yin zao zang gui, 4-9; and especially, Okamura Hideki, "Indai shi kai shi no henka," 25-28; Table 4.

Yao Xiuqu et al., Yanzu jing ke bi kuican, 628-31 (a total of ca. 140 inscriptions); the maximum seems to have been 40 animals killed during one hunt (Heji 3735), cited by Wang Yuxin et al., Jiaxiu yu hai nian, 503-04. On this issue, see Jean A. Lefevre (Lei Huanzhang), "Blinoceros and wild buffaloes north of the Yellow River at the end of the Shang dynasty," Monumenta Serica 39 (1990-91), 131-57; Dong Zuohin, "Huo hai lin ji," "Tang Lin; "Huo hai bu kan," Shi le melou 14 (1932), 119-121; Stone Jiry, "The Chinese rhinoceros and Chinese carvings in rhinoceros horn," Transactions of the Oriental Ceramic Society 1954/55, 31-62, pl. 5-26 (on the previous Lizhe/Luader debate); Carl Whiting Bishop, "Rhinoceros and wild ox in ancient China," China Journal 18 (1953): 322-30. Some scholars still argue that the character means rhinoceros (see for example, Yao Xiuqu et al., Xian nian mi niang kuican, 151; Wang Yuxin et al., Jiaxiu yu hai nian, 503-04). Probably because they have not considered the archaeological record and remain too much influenced by later texts. In addition, the rhinoceros holds a powerful fascination for the human psyche which goes beyond the attraction of the buffalo (a formidable illustration of this is the grand finale of Federico Fellini's masterpiece, Rifai solare).

Yao Xiuqu, "Jiaxiu he shibei lin ji," 50. Some scholars now believe that the script was used solely as a temporal progression. The choice to stylize or not may also have had religious or symbolic meaning (Keightley, Sources of Shang History, 119, 119 n. 75). As Keightley points out, Dong Si's suggestion ("Jiang shou jie jiu xiong zhao") that animal graphs were simplified as they became more familiar is too simplistic.  
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remain in the stylized forms, the translation "tiger" should probably not be taken as a secure reference to the species we know but rather be understood as meaning "large cat": either leopard or tiger (the remains of both species were present in Shang storage pits, according to Shi Shang-chji [see 2.2.1, and 2.3.2]).

- *zi* [⿰]; modern 猴: pheasant (?). This graph depicts a bird, most often with an added "arrow" component, which corresponds to a modern character for "pheasant." The catch varies from a few up to 27 (Heji 10197, I, cited above). Interestingly, they are almost always recorded last in the verifications, as if less important; and specific methods are seldom mentioned (Heji 10514, I, says pheasants are "netted").

- There is also another, unidentified bird (⿰) which is "driven" (鰜) in several cases and which may therefore also be some form of large ground-living bird. In addition, there are a few cases (Heji 4725, I) where birds represented by a simpler graph usually transcribed as *tsao* (⿰); without the elaborations of the pheasants(?), above) are hunted. Similar "birds" that are shackled (chicken?) are also used as sacrifices along with sheep, pigs, and dogs.

- *xiang* [⿰]; modern 象: elephant. The graph is recognized on the basis of its depiction of a long trunk. Again, some bronze forms are very obvious depictions, but the oracle bone forms are much more stylized and the identification of those graphs is perhaps not as straightforward as many scholars seem to have believed. The southern tapir, while not indigenous to the Shang area, but the oracle bone forms are much more stylized and the identification of those graphs is perhaps not as straightforward as many scholars seem to have believed. The southern tapir, while not indigenous to the Shang area, is also the only people among the various categories of prey should be added here, along with other prey. Foxes and wild cattle are also sometimes mentioned.

Finally, there is the important issue of the listed order of the captured prey in verifications, and other patterns there. A preliminary investigation indicates that even if there are exceptions, the elaphure, the tiger and other deer (in this order) are privileged on the verification "lists" of prey. Foxes and wild cattle (st) sometimes upset this order.

Deer with antlers are invariably listed before antlerless deer. The phrase for the prevalence of the deer and the tiger could simply be that deer (unlike foxes, etc.) were numerous and are also easily spotted, and their position at the top of the list might well reflect a status as a paradigmatic wild animal and object of hunting.

Another later graph, *wu* (⿰), glossed as "large elephant" in the Han dynasty dictionary Shuowen jizi, also is used today as a shortened name for Henan province. Xu Zhenghui ("Yin ren fu xiang jiang zhi ren quan qian," 63 ff) read the composite character as a merger of *wu*, with the original meaning 'Elephant dwelling (or city)' hence the name for the Henan province—ancient home of the Shang. This may be plausible, in the light of Mencius' description of the Zhou chasing the elephants away from the former Shang territory; but it remains impossible to substantiate.

The "qiang" inscriptions are listed in Yao Xianxian et al., Yinxu jiang kei leluan, 41 ff. For discussion of their use in sacrifice see for example: Keightley, The Ancestral Landscape, 106-107, also 68, 74 n. 51: on the ritual procedure in which they are brought into the center (for the sacrifice), see p. 77. Fu Houxuan has calculated that 7,426 such qiang victims were mentioned in divinatory inscriptions (that is, in the inscriptions available up until the mid-7th c.), cited in Keightley, The Shang China's first historical dynasty, 267. Most frequently, they are mentioned as ancestor-offerings where ten at a time are used, the highest number mentioned is 600. They correspond to the lowest-status, mass-mutilated victims seen in the excavations (2.2.3).

One striking but hard-to-explain feature of the verifications is that the attribute "white" is given, i.e. a small number of cases, to a range of prey animals: including boars, foxes (?), deer, and the famous "white si" of Heji 37398, V); to horses delivered in tribute, and in two cases to "white people" offered in sacrifice. Other colors are also sometimes mentioned.

There are several more obscure graphs and variations of graphs that clearly indicate animals captured in hunting, but which have not yet been deciphered (that is, correlated with later characters for animals, or their presence in the archaeological record).

One striking but hard-to-explain feature of the verifications is that the attribute "white" is given, in a small number of cases, to a range of prey animals: including boars, foxes (?), deer, and the famous "white si" of Heji 37398, V); to horses delivered in tribute, and in two cases to "white people" offered in sacrifice. Other colors are also sometimes mentioned.

Finally, there is the important issue of the listed order of the captured prey in verifications, and other patterns there. A preliminary investigation indicates that even if there are exceptions, the elaphure, the tiger and other deer (in this order) are privileged on the verification "lists" of prey. Foxes and wild cattle (st) sometimes upset this order.

Deer with antlers are invariably listed before antlerless deer. The phrase for the prevalence of the deer and the tiger could simply be that deer (unlike foxes, etc.) were numerous and are also easily spotted, and their position at the top of the list might well reflect a status as a paradigmatic wild animal and object of hunting.
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The tiger's position might reflect both its obvious high symbolic value (compare emperor Hadrian, cited at the outset!), and by its comparative rarity (just as the tiger, located at the top of the food chain, is relatively rare even where it maintains a strong natural presence). This is on the assumption that these tigers were indeed encountered in the wild and not kept or bred for the purpose of royal killings, as in the later empires (see below, Part 4).

3.2.4 Who hunted? The king and other participants and helpers.

As has been mentioned above, the king himself is the hunter par excellence in the inscriptions. Of course, the oracle bone inscriptions are essentially a royal record, so whatever other hunting that may have taken place simultaneously by the common people or by others unrelated to the king's affairs, is not reflected in this record. And as noted above, several hunting methods certainly imply that the king enlisted the aid of many people in the hunt (an observation which is also important for the interpretation of the importance of the hunt). Such helpers may have had different status, ranging from commoners, or common foot soldiers driving animals in the wild, to officials, and "guests."

The human chains formed when animals were driven or encircled may have consisted of the ci(?) ren men ("spear men") and the geren (dagger-axe men), probably foot soldiers armed with spears and dagger-axes, respectively. The dagger-axe is the most common bronze weapon in the archaeological record—in fact, in the late Shang period weaponry, it becomes the most prominent category of bronze artifact (along with ritual vessels), as part of a long-standing trend. But there seem to be no explicit record of these or other soldiers taking part in any activity that leads to the capture of animals. They are, on the other hand, explicitly mentioned as participating in she (she) (Heji 33230) and bu (bu) (Heji 8399, 39868), other activities sometimes related to hunting; and occasionally the "dagger-axe-men" are called on to she (ij), using bow and arrow (but there is no mention of any captured animals, except in a few possible cases where ge appears as used for the name of a person, not as the term geren (Heji 10713, 33378).

The "foot soldiers" of the hunt are only occasionally referred to in the divinations, and then as ren men, or men people, who are led by others:

"Let it be Bing who takes ren = people to hunt." (Heji 32270, IV).

On yichun (day 2), divining: "Let it be Ya who captures [li?], taking [ren =] people to hunt." (Yuanji 96, I, IV)396

396 For more examples of geren and ciwen and a discussion of their identity, see Liu Zhao, "Buc i suqian Yindai de lihui huabing," pp. 34-91.

399 Liu Zhao, "Buc i suqian Yindai de lihui huabing," pp. 34-91; see also Chen Fangmei, "Some thoughts on the dating of Late Shang bronze weaponry." 398 Yao Xiaoxi, "Jiagu keci shudie kou," 50; Chen Mengjia, Yixuan buci zongshu, 510-11.

On yichun (day 2), divining: "Let it be Ya who captures [li?], taking [ren =] people to hunt." (Yuanji 96, I, IV)396

Crack on wachen (day 5): "Dog-Keeper Zhang of Qin [Jin?] reports elephant. If the king shoots [them with his arrows], [there will be] no misfortune." "There was capture"399.

In two instances from Period I, the Duowan (The keepers of] Many Dogs?)}

---
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The king is not mentioned in these cases, but in using what probably were other types of soldiers, such as the "Tiger-troops" (in Heji 27915, III; see above, 3.2.2) and the "Guardians" (xu, or shu [x]), he was directly involved:

"If the king lets it be the Guardians [that he] takes to net [deer?], [he] will capture." (Heji 27968, III).

Crack on gongwu (day 7): Divining: "[The next six days = Tomorrow] the king will hunt and Mu [Home, the Cavalry-Officer] takes the lead, there will be capture, and [no rain]." (Heji 27948, III).

The king's enlisting or utilization of military officials or soldiers (so identified because they are also recorded as participating actors in war divinations) indeed does suggest a link between hunting and warfare, but not a very conscious one. The "military personnel" was put to use in the king's hunt, but there really is no direct evidence in the inscriptions that the hunt was carried out exclusively by them or as a form of military exercise (see 4.4).398

Officials such as the "Dog-Keeper," the Quan, may have been named after the duty of looking after hunting dogs, and seem to have been charged with organizing the practical matters of the royal hunts.399 They are sometimes mentioned as "reporting" (geoy; to the king) the presence of animals at a locality,400 as well as in several examples,401 such as:

Crack on zouchen (day 5): "Dog-Keeper Zhong of Qin [Jin?] reports elaphus. If the king shoots [them with his arrows], [there will be] no misfortune." "There was capture"400.

---

396 Chao Lin, The Socio-Political System of the Shang Dynasty (Taipei: Academia Sinica, 1982), 60 regards it as a proven fact that the Shang, just as later Chinese dynasties, hunted to train their soldiers, but he does not show much evidence. Referring to a few inscriptions indicating the use of military personnel, he has written (in a way similar to that which occurs in Western Zhou bronze inscriptions, notably the Xiao Yu ding, Feskjø, "Celebrations of military victories in the Western Zhou Period," Ms., 1992). There are also "reports" to the Ho, or River, perhaps a form of sacrificial ritual, etc. [examples as Yao Xiaoxi et al., Yixuan jiagu keci lian, 247 ff; Keightley, The Ancestral Landscape. Also, it is used in the same manner, i.e., sometimes follow after the inscriptions: "two reports," etc. There may be related to how the divinations were addressed to the ancestors. Here, the word appears to have the more directly practical meaning of reporting the existence of game so that it may be hunted by the king or that he could issue orders for it to be hunted, similar to the examples of "eaves" on "our fields," "reported" in Heji 6057A and B (already cited above). 399 Yao Xiaoxi, Yixuan jiagu keci lian, 247 ff.

398 Heji 27915, III (quoted in Qin Xin, "Jiagu buci zhouqian de "xiang" iu "wei...", 3, as Cihuang 935). In Heji 27948, III, Ioues are reported from the same place.
themselves actively hunt, using nets or traps. This suggests that while the hunting dogs may have given them their name, they may not always have used dogs.\(^{390}\)


The nature of the several ‘offices’ engaged in similar duties remains rather unclear. Apart from the Quan and Duoquan, they include the “Duozì,” the “Ya” (mentioned above), and “Duoya.” There are only a few other examples of anyone other than the Quan ‘reporting’ game to the king. These appear not to be Shang-office-holders but people of a landed aristocrat type, za, \(^\text{3}8\); probably blood relations of the king residing in places other than the royal center. Such examples include *Heji* 37592, V, and 37439, V.

“Crack on *auxu* (day 35). Divining at X. If Y reports Z an unknown graph composed from a deer and a component that could mean ‘seeing’ or ‘spotting’] deer, the king will accompany [i.e. join Y] in shooting. Going and coming [there will be] no misfortune. The king .... Yong [?] .... ” (*Heji* 37439, V; Yao Xiaosai et al., *Yinxu jiaji keci liaojuan*, 254).

This category of higher-status people is sometimes called upon by the king (sometimes this is only assumed, since he is not mentioned—the subject of an action is often left out in the oracle bone inscriptions, as in both Classical and modern Chinese) to go out and hunt. The king had such people accompany him as guests, or hunting companions, more than as practical assistants. When such people are mentioned in the oracle bone inscriptions, their names are the same as the name of their residence. An example of this is the representative of the clan Qu (Sparrow). In the reign of Wu Ding, the king frequently divined about the king’s well-being, and he was also asked to go out hunting.\(^{392}\)

Because the names of diviners and of Shang allies (who sometimes provided turtle shells in tribute) in some cases coincide, it has been suggested that the diviners also acted as hunters or warriors, but there is no secure evidence that not just

---

\(^{390}\) I take these *quanzuo* to be people, not dogs. Some scholars have found evidence for hunting dogs in the oracle bone inscriptions, but none of the quoted inscriptions seem to confirm it. Chao Lin (*The Social-Political System of the Shang Dynasty, 85*) quoted several inscriptions as if they referred to hunting dogs, but these are ‘Dogkeepers.’ In one inscription (*Yinxu* 53298), Chao’s interpretation rests on the character  on only, interpreted as ‘to bring [dogs];’ the character has been much debated and may here refer to the Dog-keeper, not dog. It also seems to be used as a personal name (cf. Yao Xiaosai et al., *Yinxu jiaji keci liaojuan*, 233, quoting *Heji* 57560-57590, etc.). In our present case, it may have been such a name. Similarly, I disagree with Yao Xiaosai’s view (*Yinxu jiaji shoujia, 55*) that captured *giao* prisoners were employed as hunters (based on examples where *dingji* and the ‘Many giao’ are ordered to go out and hunt). Yao does not explain why it could not be that this official simply carried this name, *Duoquan* (perhaps this meant on the basis of having killed many of the *giao*), just as it cannot be said that someone called *Xiang* must himself have been an elephant (*xiongr*).


---

**ROYAL HUNTING AND STATE FORMATION IN SHANG CHINA**

The terms *bi* and *cong* seem more closely related to the king’s high-status hunting companions, but they are also not restricted to it, indicating that the king may have sought the prerogative to select companions at will. Examples of *bi* include mention of the king himself “joining” others in the hunt, even (his own?)*’Dog-keeper’ (guan) of a certain locality when the latter has ‘reported’ available game and the king *bi* by hunting, i.e. “goes with” the Dog-keeper.\(^{393}\)

The term *cong*, on the other hand, is used both in its later sense of “coming” from\(^{394}\) and in a sense of “accompanying” akin to *bi* (it is also graphically very close):

“If [we] accompany the Dog-keeper of Kou, [we] will have capture of foxes.”

Indeed, [we] captured. ‘This was used.’\(^{395}\)

The Shang king’s allying himself with various temporary companions in hunting alongside him (or, inviting them to share the hunting with him, from his point of view) is a highly interesting topic. Chao Lin provides a useful tabulation of such companions, but it only includes what are most likely either nobles or officials. Local lords are not included.\(^{396}\) In the great majority of the hunting inscriptions, however, the king alone is the main actor, and it does not seem that there are any drastic changes over time in the frequency of the king’s asking someone else to accompany him, or assist him, in the hunt.

---

\(^{392}\) A few such inscriptions, all from Period I, concern mon: 9 examples at Yao Xiaosai, *Yinxu jiaji keci liaojuan*, 802, also, see *Thanum* 641, III (where the king apparently asks Xi, an ally, to help him “send forward” or “make appear” [bring the elephant] which are then “captured”).

\(^{393}\) See, for example: *Heji* 1772, 1 (where it is proposed that haze be ‘driven’ or pursued); and several of the *lin* inscriptions quoted above (Yao Xiaosai et al., *Yinxu jiaji keci liaojuan*, 802). There are only several examples of where someone is *bi* (“commanded”) to hunt (i.e., hunt). For example: *Heji* 33208, V, 23520, IV, and there is no report included on captured animals.

\(^{394}\) For example: *Heji* 28309, III, where the king approaches the game “from the east”; *Thanum* 1094, III-IV; and few other *Thanum* inscriptions see Yao Xiaosai et al., *Yinxu jiaji keci liaojuan*, 50.

\(^{395}\) *Heji* 28310, III; several more examples of *cong* in this sense can be found at Yao Xiaosai et al., *Yinxu jiaji keci liaojuan*, 60.

\(^{396}\) Chao Lin, *The Socio-Political System of the Shang Dynasty, 7-8*. The identity of companions and the places where such joint hunts were carried out would certainly merit more systematic research.
An additional, very interesting question is if women like the high-status Fu (royal ladies, consorts or queens) also participated in hunting. Divinations concerning their affairs, or in which they are mentioned, can concern sacrifices they make, their childbirth, personal health, etc. Queen Fu Hao, whose tomb has been identified (2.2.2.3), is mentioned as involved in warfare at various levels: In Heji 2631, I, this lady is the one who calls on another person to launch a war; in Heji 176, I, she is directly involved:

"Divining: ‘Call on Fu Hao to shakele [war prisoners] . . . ’"

In Heji 6480, I, the king orders Fu Hao to accompany a lord [raw] [in] "reporting" the attack on an enemy. Fu Jing, another royal consort, is explicitly asked (fu 乎) to make war [on the Longfang 龍方, or land of the Dragons [Heji 6585A]), and is also divined for in hunting terms:

"[If] Fu Jing hunts [tian], [she will] capture."

This is but one single example, but it does indicate that while the king was the hunter-in-chief, even his queens might be included among the various subjects and relatives that took part in hunting expeditions, or were called on to help.

3.2.5 Where and when? Timing and location of the hunt

Several scholars have taken an interest in hunting inscriptions mainly out of consideration for their potential usefulness in the study of the geography or sphere of influence of the Shang state (that is, largely divorced from the issue of the nature of the royal hunts as "hunting per se.") The many place-names* contained in the inscriptions on royal journeys made to hunt, to make war or for other purposes have been used to reconstruct the geography of the Shang state with the help of additional information (such as on the dates of divination, seen as indications of "departures" and "arrivals"). Briefly, the discussions have produced two widely divergent views: one sees the Shang king covering very long distances over much of north China and thus with far-reaching and direct influence; another sees the covered area as more restricted. The discussion then concerns where it was located. The arguments are complicated, and will not be discussed in detail here.

There are disagreements over the methodology utilized to address these issues: Hsi Chih-hsiung indicates the weak points in the general assumptions made by, for example, Matsumaru on the utility of the inscriptions for such purposes. Hsi convincingly argued that the mention of a number of hunting locations in a series of inscriptions cannot automatically be taken as an itinerary implying definite distances between "stops" on a journey, but probably only represents proposed possible destinations for the hunting expeditions (launched from some place to which the king might have returned in between the divinations, and expeditions), and they thus cannot be used with confidence for the construction of itineraries.

Still, an argument for a loosely defined, permeable sphere of action, and limited direct influence, would seem well founded. Of course, the ability to import whale bones and other exotic items to Anyang already indicates that the issue of "influence" cannot be disentangled from that of long-distance exchange. But apart from those complications, it should be noted that even if the Shang king indeed only covered a relatively limited area in his journeys (campaigns of war, or hunts), the Shang king as seen in the inscriptions is a very frequent traveler. David Keightley has written on the king's incessant mobility, and the apparent lack of a need (or inability, I would suggest) for him to remain at an administrative center. The center had a very important role, including for rituals addressed to the ancestors, but this role was combined with a pressing itinerary casting the king as a "traveling hunter" (or warrior). Indeed, there is an etymological relation between the word wang for "king" and wang for "travel, to go"; in Keightley's terms, the king was "the one who goes" in the sense that

---

* On these fu, see Wang Yuxin et al., *Yin-yang yi-bian nian*, 447 E.; incl. three examples of a fu making war (Heji 6412, 6480, and 6584).

* In most known hunter-gatherer societies and indeed among most hunters, women either do not take part or are restricted by factors that often separate the blood shed in war or hunting from that of menstruation or child-bearing. When women do hunt, they may be prohibited from using certain techniques, such as spears or arrows. See, for example, C. Levi-Strauss, *The Savage Mind* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969), 51-53; Valerio Valenti, *The Forest of Tabus: Morality, Hunting, and Identity Among the Huohe of the Mississippi* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1999), and "Wild victims: hunting as sacrifice and sacrifice as hunting in *The猎*, in *Fragments from Forests and Libraries: A Collection of Essays* (Durham: Carolina Academic Press, 2001), 249-88; and in women and hunting in general also A. Testart, "Essai sur les fondements de la division sexuelle du travail chez les Chasseurs-Cueilleurs", *Gebur der Homme* 25 (1980); R.L. Kelly, "Hunting and mensural taboo", *Human Evolution* 1.5 (1986), 475-70; Agnes Estéquio-Griffith et al., "The Woman the Hunter: The Agta", in F. Dahlberg, ed. *Women the Gatherers* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), 121-51.

* The number of place-names identified in the inscriptions was listed as over one hundred and fifty, by Chen Mengjia (Yin-yang yi-bian tongzhi, 249-312), 239 by Zheng Bohong ("Baczi zong xian jian Yang Wang tianyou dian kou", the latter dates heavily on Shima Kuniu, *Yin-yi boqi you*), 50 by Huang Hanwei (*Yin-wang tian luo kao*, the latter dates heavily on Shima Kuniu, *Yin-Shang nian*).

---
he was continually traveling to various areas of his domain,\textsuperscript{422} and the question why the king's frequent "travels," i.e., warfare, inspections, and hunting expeditions were required really becomes one aspect of asking why the hunts were conducted. There are examples of a specification of the direction of the hunt by the directions "east" and "west," offered as complementary alternatives in Heji 22043, I:

\[ \text{Crack on dingguo [day 44].} \] "We will hunt in the west;" and [Crack] on [ding] not [day 44]. \"[We] will hunt in the east."\textsuperscript{425}

This "cosmological" choice seems quite different from the more technically oriented directives in the inscription calling for "driving" from the "east, west, and north ... " used with zhu, to pursue, in Heji 28789, III (above, 3.2.2).

The characteristics of the natural environment in which the hunts took place is actually seldom mentioned. Many place-names do have a "water" component, and it can be assumed that they were either names of bodies of water, or of places located by marshes, lakes or streams. "Forests" don't seem to be explicitly mentioned as a location of hunts, perhaps because there was forest almost everywhere. In some cases, the specification lian is given, meaning "on the slopes of" (some mountain).

In contrast to the spatial specifications on the location of the hunt, the temporal preference does not seem to have been divined for. Again, this may be because the seasonality was obvious for the actors involved. The main evidence for temporal distribution is the month notation, which is not always given. But the distribution of these notations ranges over all the twelve months of the Shang year.\textsuperscript{424} It remains to be investigated whether any such seasonal preference (either for hunting in general or for specific methods) perhaps existed in (or declined, was altered, etc.) in specific periods of time.

The choice of date for the hunt within the Shang sixty-day cycle of six ten-day weeks, on the other hand, was much more important (just as it was for other activities, like ancestral sacrifices). Matsumaru Michio counted the frequencies of divinations for hunts carried out under the general headings of tian and ge, and concluded that dates for tian were not regulated in the first period, but became limited to the second, fifth, and eighth day (yi, xu, and xin) of the Shang ten-day week in Period II. In Period III, the ninth day (ren) was added. Period IV saw no change, but in period V the fourth day (ding) was added\textsuperscript{425}.

\textsuperscript{422} Knightley, "The Late Shang state: When, where, and what?" 553.

\textsuperscript{423} Based on a translation made by David N. Keightley. Huang Ranwei ("Yin yang tian he kan", 66A-B) lists a series of similar examples.

\textsuperscript{424} Meng Shikai, "Yin-shang shi<.bi tianslwu huodong," 100; Fù (The Memorie Collection, xxxiv) says this is curious—presumably because some later (Chou or Han period) texts such as the Liji 66A, include prescriptions designed to avoid the spring and summer breeding season ("Zhoulu 66A; Wen chuan 288", sect. 6; the Xantil 66A, "Wang zhi shi EB", "Royal regulations" chapter; and the "Wang zhi EB" chapter [identical name] in the Liji I 1885; trans. sect. II, 428]). But other texts indicate that hunting took place in all seasons during the Zhou (Zhouhuo, Duke Yin year 5; mentioning the different words used in that period's language, for hunting during each of the four seasons; also, the Liji ["Xia guan 471" section, ch. "Da san xia 471"] which mentions hunting (tian EB) all year round) [quoted in Meng Shikai, op. cit., 102].

\textsuperscript{425} Matsumara Michio, "Yin-kyo bokujia chi no enryuu ni tsuite," 43, 70; Fù Chen-huang, The Memorie Collection of Shang Oracle Bones, xxxiv—The third month may have been the most common in Period V, followed by autumn and winter (Keightley, personal communication; the sample in this case included only inscriptions formulated as "wang zhi EB" ("the king hunts...").

Hunts were sometimes conducted in connection with military battles, as can be seen both from how they were carried out at the very places that had been mentioned as battlefields,\textsuperscript{426} and from the way in which they took place in immediate temporal connection with the hunts. One such example is found on one already mentioned inscribed deer skull from Xiaotun, where, it seems, the hunt took place immediately after the war:

\[ \text{On xinyu [day 35] the king hunted [tian] at X. [It was at the time of the] sheng [sacrificial ritual?] for Wenwu ding, Xic. ... [It was when] the king came from making war on [shen], [the Renfang].} \textsuperscript{427}

This is a non-divinatory inscription recording a hunt, presumably commemorating it, by using the trophy obtained in that hunt as its medium.\textsuperscript{428} This trophy-recording and gift-giving immediately after a successful hunt or war is reminiscent of real and imagined Western Zhou events (such as the massive "hunting" expedition conducted by King Wu after the conquest of the Shang).\textsuperscript{429} One recently discovered divination concerned precisely what would be the appropriate order, or timing:

\[ \text{[A]. Crack on xinyu [day 58]. "Ding will first hunt [zhou], then [have W] carry out an attack on [the enemy]." [Crack notation:] One. [B]. Crack on xinyu [day 58]. "Ding will first attack [the enemy], then hunt." [Crack notation:] One.} \textsuperscript{430}

However, there are few actually few inscriptions that describe direct relationship or temporal relationship between hunting and war in this manner, and the sequence of having the hunt follow a (successful) war is not consistently present. On the connection between war and hunting during the Shang period, see further below (4.4).

\textsuperscript{426} Matsumara, in his study of the place-names connected with the hunt, also points to the coincidence of certain place-names as locations of both hunting and military endeavors suggested by the one of the word shi li (troops, encampment of troops) (Matsumara, "Yin-kyo bokujia chi no enryuu ni tsuite," 147-49).

\textsuperscript{427} Jiafan 3940, illustrated in Cheng. Archaeology in China, Vol. 2, plate 24: transcribed in Zhang Hongguan, Jiugong yi jingmu (Taipei: Ch'ah-hai hsiangchun, 1988), 476; and at Heji 36534, V—In the Heji, the word tian has been omitted by mistake from the inscription 36534, where it is clearly present. Another such hunt: trophy not listed in the Heji, is on a mammal long horn with ornaments and a commemoration of a royal gift-giving after a hunting expedition. It is illustrated in Henderson G. Cred, The Birth of China (New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1937), pl. 8—perhaps the editor overlook it or rejected it as a fake, which it probably is not.

\textsuperscript{428} The other animal skins' inscriptions (Jiafan 3941) [another deer skull], and 3939 at Heji 37258, V [wolf cruelly also have a similar structure, but appear to refer to a different occasion. The date notation is different and do not mention the king returning from that war episode.

\textsuperscript{429} Thus for example, Zhong Bosheng (in his "Bosi zhong xiujuan Yandai jishu chu—Yinshi de zhongxiang" I, 139-40 on "Post-battle hunts") does not quote: examples of post-battle hunts from oracle bone inscriptions, said to have been carried out by King Wu Wang after the demise of the Shang and described in different versions in the Mumong and in the Zhou shu. In the latter, the victor first destroys human enemies and then hunts (zhou EB) and captures (jia EB) large numbers of different wild animals, including tigers, deer, and wild boars (Yi Zhou shu, "Shi ch un", 6; Gu Jieqiu, "Yi Zhou Shen shi chu jin 'chun' xiao zhao", 14, 23, 29; Shanghao of the "Evidence of the Zhou Conquest", 50). In Mumong, cited-down, version, no rivers of blood flowed from the battle, and the "Zhou and hunt", but instead merely "chased away" the wild animal (Mumong 60, 155). On these types of hunts see too M. Faureq, "Celebrations of military victories in the Western Zhou period" (ms.); and Yong Kun, "Gu shi xin zhi, "Anyang work team," 1991 "xin Huangzhuang denglu, nandu fazai zhuanhang," Kaogu 1993, 496; inscriptions HJ 404-A-III.

422
The implications of these developments and of all the data so far will be discussed in the conclusions (Part 5). But firstly, Part 4 introduces some important elements in the interpretations of the Shang royal hunt that have been proposed.

4. Some important earlier interpretations of the Shang royal hunt

4.1 The hunt as a luxury sport or leisure activity

The view that the hunting expedition of the Shang kings mainly was a luxury sport has been very persistent. First, as the traditional, even Classical, Chinese interpretation inherited from Zhou times, assigning decadence to the late Shang kings in order to justify the Zhou conquest. Second, it reappears in many modern studies, ultimately because they build on the incorrect assumption that the hunting was done as the king's leisure or pastime. Many, perhaps most, influential Chinese and Japanese scholars in the past have opted for this type of explanation.149 K.C. Chang's 1980 synthesis of Shang archaeology refers to the royal hunt as "more of a sport than a subsistence activity"44 as if these were mutually exclusive, or even the only choices. This economical mode of thinking is evident in the works of many scholars. Similarly, Li Ji for his part, held that the comparatively larger size of Shang pottery indicated how Shang agriculture had become more "advanced," and therefore, (sic) "the game hunting mentioned in the ancient inscriptions were evidently pursued for pleasure and excitement rather than for economic necessities as occurred in the late Paleolithic period... these pleasure-seeking activities were evidently confined to the royalities and the aristocratic class..."45 On one level, this explanation can be understood as an attempt to reconcile Western evolutionary theories with the traditional Confucian explanation of the hunt. In the same vein, mainland scholars writing under the influence of Chinese Marxism also often start from the assumption that since the Shang was "advanced" in terms of social and technological evolution—i.e., agriculture was well developed—hunting and gathering, by definition, ought to have been left behind since it represents an early stage (this is the case both with Classical Chinese "evolutionism" and modern-day evolutionism inspired by 19th-century European theories).

Actually, at present we cannot assert for sure that it was only the king and the aristocracy members of who spent time hunting, or that it was exclusively a royal or aristocratic activity. Commoners may also have hunted, only they were not recorded in inscriptions. The only way of addressing this problem would be to study status differentiation in animal remains from different habitation areas identified with different social strata, which has not been attempted in the Shang context.46

In the end this still begs the question why the king and others did engage in hunting to the extent that they evidently did. The influential idea that the hunt should be thought of as "sport," that is, luxurious, decadent leisure enjoyed by the kings (i.e., as a benefit of their position but unrelated to their proper role as kings; rather a neglect, on the part of decadent kings, of their proper business), as mentioned, has deep roots in traditional Chinese historiography and the traditional "Confucian" interpretation of the victory by the Zhou over the late Shang king known as Zhou Ji. Since early Zhou times, the kings of the last part of the Shang invariably have been condemned for being overly "at ease." According to this traditional view, the early leaders of the Zhou dynasty stressed that for their part "dared not rest assured" about being able to keep "Heaven's mandate," and they repeatedly tried to justify the conquest of the Shang in terms of the decadence and evil on the part of the last Shang king.47 The locus classicus of this line of argument is found in the early chapters of the Shangshu 山書 (the Book of Documents).48 These traditions were created as orthodoxy by later Confucians (the creation involved extracting the original description of the bloody conquest itself from these early Zhou accounts; as mentioned in note 17, and 429x), and especially since the Han dynasty onwards, they have had a long-lasting influence. This even explains why many modern Chinese scholars have taken for granted that the last Shang king as indulged in decadent leisure and luxury and neglected the affairs of government, and then extend this to serve as an explanation for the hunting expeditions. Guo Moruo, for example, at one point believed hunting was concentrated in the times of the next to last Shang king Di Yi 周乙, during whose reign the Shang flourished, and where there would have been plenty of time for leisure activities, such as hunting.49

---

149 Li Ji's view may have something to do with the frequent use of dogs (perhaps hunting companions?) as offerings in Shang burials [as indicated above; dog offerings were more frequent in higher than in lower status burials but also occur in lower status burials, or with the large difference in the amount of grave goods, Li concludes that the life of the Shang rulers was very different from that of the farming masses—Dogs were evidently prized possessions even in later times [see no. 100, in the Shijing the praise of hunting in hunting (and modern-day evolutionism inspired by 19th-century European theories).

44 Matsuzawa Michio, "Yinyo hokujichi no denryokki ni tsuite," 141-42 (citing Guo Moruo 1945,p.217-23); Huang Qingsong, Yinidai tandai yinyo, 83-84 citing Guo Moruo 1933, p.163 as well as Chen Mengting (Yinidai hui zangdi, 552); Fu Huaqin ("Baozhi zaoxiang zhi Yinidai nongye" 2), and the Japanese scholar Katsuko Shigeki and Shirakawa Shizuka. But Shirakawa came to suspect that there was more to the hunt (both cited in Matsuzawa Michio, "Yinyo hokujichi no denryokki ni tsuite," 142, 143-44; see too Huang Qingsong, Yinidai tandai yinyo, 85.)

45 K.C. Chang, Shang Civilization, 142—at the same time, he noted that the royal hunt is a frequent topic of divination and criticized Li Ji for "underestimating the economic and symbolic importance of these hunts" (p. 214), but did not elaborate See below for further discussion.

46 Li Ji, "Hunting records," 12.
But Guo Moruo is putting the chariot before the horse. He is right about the link between the hunting activity of kings and the fortunes of the state—however, hunting does not necessarily imply lazy leisure: the royal hunt itself was instrumental in bringing about prosperity and the flourishing of the state. Indeed, the many hunting inscriptions from the time of Wu Ding Č‘ J, 438 another busy earlier king under whom the Shang kingdom is also believed to have prospered—because of, not “despite,” his preference for hunting. The suggestion that there was decadence and decline on the part of the late Shang kings in their indulging in the pleasures of hunting does not hold and should be exploded, just as the Zhou version of the conquest of the Shang dynasty has been exploded, already.439

At the same time, it is necessary to take seriously the view of the royal hunt as a form of “luxury” or “sport.” The royal hunt could indeed be understood as a “sport,”440 that is one not irrelevant to Shang kingship. In the introduction, I mentioned Bataille’s point of view regarding the uses of the useless, and on “consumption beyond utility.” One aspect of this is that luxury, something perceived as extravagance, unnecessary or even as waste by members of a society but is nevertheless “consumed” as a privilege by those that have the means, can serve as an item of conspicuous consumption, intended to impress. The people who were supposed to be impressed may have been precisely those who were not allowed to hunt (or who did not have the means to do so in the exuberant fashion of the king). In his famous Meditations on Hunting, Ortega y Gasset speaks of the resentment among the common people with respect to the aristocratic hunting privileges of Europe.441 Such resentment, envy, and awe may have existed in Shang China too.442 Not least in this sense, the “luxurious waste” of hunting may have served as one way to both establish and reaffirm the privileged position of the king. But the privilege of conspicuous wastefulness is not the only one that can be considered in this context and does not fully express the use of “luxury” and “waste” that Bataille suggested. While there is no space to even begin to exhaust the relevance of Bataille’s version of the conquest of Anyang as an example of incipient Chinese urban centers. He refers to a related, Weberian interpretation of hunting in feudal society to explain “the aristocratic pastime of the [Shang dynasty] conventionalized hunt, which figured prominently in the oracle inscriptions.” This type of pastime hunt or “game,” distinguished in Wheatley’s account from subsistence hunting, “served the several purposes of simulating military training, inculcating qualities of character, and providing an outlet of physical energy for the elite.”443 But this “pastime” was quite different from the traditional Chinese understanding mentioned earlier (i.e., in essence, a perceived neglect of the imperial duties within the state and in relation to the cosmos). Max Weber saw this type of hunt as a peculiar form of “training” related to the development personal military skills in the course of hunting as part of an “artistic” life-style of independent feudal lords—which really was “just as little a general ‘pastime’ as in organic life.”444 Feudal lords (such as, for example, in Europe and Japan) emphasized personal honor (and thus personal effort in war, as opposed to the industrial drill developed to discipline mass armies), and consequently latter also found themselves incompatible with the forces of “commercial rationality.” Their hunting, closely related to the one cherished by Ortega y Gasset, did not primarily have direct-utilitarian functions, but formed part of a purposeful, aristocratic negation of such functions. It constituted the pursuit of a “luxury” which “in the sense of rejecting purposive-rational control of consumption is for the dominant feudal strata nothing superfluous: it is a means of social self-assertion.”445

The “social self-assertion” is a conspicuous “privilege.” But Max Weber also suggests another interesting aspect which is relevant in the Shang case: the pursuit of hunting as an expression of autonomy (as opposed to dependency, or heteronomy), engaged in by the aristocrat as aristocrat (non-commoner) rather than simply as a privileged individual. The aspect is inherent in the hunt in several ways, including in the element of personal risk-taking and killing other living beings, and also in the very mobility of the hunter. The element of risk-taking also is very important to this peculiar pursuit of “autonomy,” so easily confused with “leisure.”

However, as for Wheatley’s use of Weber’s model in the Shang case, it must be cautioned that Weber was characterizing independent feudal lords of medieval Europe and Japan as opposed to the “patrimonial patrimonialism” of a state centered on a “good king” ruling dependent subjects, a “Landeswirt.” He did not discuss the hunting activities of universalistic kings.446 Because the Shang state as it appears to us in the inscriptions was a state heavily centered on the king,447 it would perhaps have been more appropriate to apply such interpretations to the latter part of the

438 Such as most of the oracle bones from VH1127, see above (2.2.1); also Bixiang, and Takaduma Kenichi. A Concordance to Facsimile Three of inscriptions from the Yen Treats (Tiapres: Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica, 1985).

439 On this issue, see too the Introduction.

440 It is worth considering that even when the players are not kings and the game does not consist of hunting in the wild, “sport” is still a complex phenomenon in itself—not the least in modern Western society, where as an “upshot of the people” it obviously plays a role going far beyond the games themselves (witness the manifold social aspects of televised sporting events). The hunting “sport” of the contemporary West, is similarly invested with a host of meanings far beyond simple utilitarian aspects of recreation of body or mind, or of the procurement of food. Far more central to the discussion of the role of “play” are the imaginative discussions by Ichos Hauing, Homo Ludens: A Study of the Play Element in Culture (Boston: Beacon press, 1950); and for in-depth studies of ritualized games in other ancient societies, are Scarborough and Wilcox, eds. The Mesoamerican Ballgame (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1991), on the famous Mesoamerican ballgame; and W.J. Rockclie, ed. The Archaeology of the Olympics: The Olympics and Other Festivals in Antiquity (Madiso University of Wisconsin Press, 1987). But here we are concerned with the discussions of a “sport” where a king is not in the audience but an active participant at the center of the “game” (see further 4.1.1).


442 An example can be found in the Museum [2.2; Hartung/Wohlgang index 112]: the philosopher complains about the restricted access to a contemporary (3rd c. BCE) ruler’s hunting park, comparing it to the early Zhou king Wen’s X’s park which he described as modest, and open to the common people, including woodcutters (this, of course, is probably Mentzor’s own invention). On such parks, see too below [5.6].

443 Wheatley, The Pattern of the Four Quarters, 68, 102 n. 220.


446 As Bendix notes (op. cit., 201), although his two categories often are blurred in practice, Weber himself insisted on the analytic differences.

447 Wheatley labels the Shang a “patrimonial” state in a Weberian sense (The Pattern of the Four Quarters, 52).—On the nature of the Shang state, and Shang kingship, see too Reighley, The Ancestral Landscape; or the fluctuating sphere of influence of the Shang see also Xia (Shangzhou) 1087.
4.2 The hunt as a supplementary subsistence activity or “economic” factor

Chinese and other scholars in modern times who have wanted to improve on the Classical condemnation of Shang wastefulness as an explanation have also searched for direct-utilitarian or practical explanations of the hunt. These are ultimately inspired by Western industrialism’s ideals of effectiveness and economy, used to justify its own departure from aristocratic tyranny. These “new” explanations, often presented in calculated terms, include economic reasoning based in industrialism’s conceptions of supply and demand, such as the need to supply food for the Shang court, raw material for the workshops, or practical training for warfare. It is suggested, for example, that the Shang kings hunted to supplement their kitchen with the meat of wild game. This is, of course, entirely possible, but few if any scholars have contended that this could have been the sole motivation behind the organization of hunting expeditions and divination about their success. The evidently important role of agriculture and large-scale husbandry in Shang society, along with the simultaneous general acceptance of deterministic schemes of social evolution by both Marxists and non-Marxists, has precluded the adoption of such a simplistic conclusion.

The noted oracle-bone scholar Chen Mengjia rightly pointed out, against this “economistic” trend, that because of an abundant supply from agriculture and husbandry there would not actually have existed a real need for the Shang to supplement it with wild game: “...of course, the meat, fur, bones and horns of the prey animals were put to use in the royal house,... this was [also] one motivation behind the hunts” (his conclusion, however, tended to join with the one just rejected above: that the hunt must have been done purely for the sake of wasteful pleasure).445 Chen and others were heavily influenced by later accounts, where practical use of hunted animals is made explicit. Indeed there are references in the literature of later periods (the Zhou, etc.) which suggest game meat may have been consumed by the elite and other animal parts used in various ways.446

But the Shang oracle bone inscriptions do not, as far as I understand, contain any information about the eating or other use of wild game (other than in sacrifice, and then only rarely and problematically so—see below, 4.1.3), whether it is meat, fur, bone or antlers of the prey animals that was consumed or otherwise used. (We should also allow for the possibility that the ideology governing what could and what could not be eaten did not promote the consumption of all available resources, however obvious to us451). In any case, surely domesticated animals must have dominated as a source of food, given their dominating presence in the archaeological remains. K.C. Chang stressed that wild animals could not compare with domesticated animals as a Shang food source (that is in terms of subsistence, not as symbolic supplement, a role which we can readily imagine that wild animals may have had at the Shang court).452

There is not much evidence to go on in the archaeological record for answers regarding these various aspects. We do not, for example, know where the royal kitchen was or where the refuse went. Of course, hunting and fishing at least must have originated to provide food453 and the Xiaotun Locus North animal remains to some extent must be considered a royal kjøpekommudding. But on the basis of the existing record, as discussed earlier (section 2.3), it is difficult if not impossible to adequately assess the dietary role of animals caught in the hunting expeditions conducted by members of the highest strata of Shang society, or the extent to which they were put to other “practical” uses in the royal household or other social strata.

We do know, on the other hand, that the king cared deeply about the harvest that fed the majority (and thus also indirectly himself). The harvest is, along with the hunt, a very prominent concern in Shang divination;454 the intense interest that the king showed for the hunting expeditions also applied to agriculture. Data from other comparable early agricultural societies indicate that elites often have enjoyed a more varied diet than low-status people, but also consumed the products of agriculture. We know that one very famous series of oracle consultations concerned the “sick teeth” of King Wu Ding455—if we had been able to find Wu Ding’s remains and examine his teeth, we would probably see that they too were affected by the dental caries that afflict all agriculturalists dependent on a diet rich in soft carbohydrates (including, then, Shang commoners and royals alike). One conclusion is that the future archaeology of Shang biological materials will tell us more. It should study the distribution of faunal remains within the parameters of the Xiaotun sites, evidence of butchery on skeletal remains, etc.,456 and more human remains, which could

---

445 On this period, see also Lewis 1980—but note that in the single reference to the Shang, on page 21, it is concluded that hunting in the Shang period was a means to obtain meat for sacrifice and for ceremonial banquets.

446 Chen Mengjia, Yinshu bing zonghe, 552; see also Huang Qingxin, Yinzi tianqi yuanji, 84.

447 Such as, for example, the description of Zhou hunts in the Shijing (vol. 154; “...we go for badgers, we catch these foes and wild-cat; we make feasts for the young wild-men...”), p. 170 (“...if the footmen and charioteers are not attentive, the great kitchen will not be filled.”) and 180 (“We drew out our bows, we grasped our arrows, we shot at that small bear, we killed this big wild cattle, in order to serve up to our visitors and guests...”) (trans. based on B. Karlson, The Book of Odes: Stockholm Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities, 1974). In the latter poem, there are also records of pre-hunt selection of auspicious days and sacrifices. The Zhuozi mentions how the Shang (Lu—i.e., the official “hunt-men” of the lord of Yin has failed to “deliver fresh [meat]” because of the disruptions of an oncoming war (Lord Xuan, year 12.2; cf. Yang Bongun et al., Chouqiu Zazhiqiu chinan [Viking: Zhenghong, 1985], 235–36). The Zhushu (or, Rites of Zhou) specified that the Shang should present the king with woods in winter, elk-shares [not in 51] in summer, and other prey as the spring and the autumn, the meat delivered to the royal court (This is not certain—the Zhongxian commentary says he means sacrifices made to the ancestors of animals caught in the hunt); and send for, authors, etc. to the royal workshops (“Tianguan X/5 “section, “Shenmu” X/4 chapter, Jiuzi’s ed. 1885: 5/246; quoted by Ming Shihai, “Shangzhi tianzhu shengshi qihan,” in Hu Houxuan, ed., Kangqi zhi yu Yin Shang zhi, vol. 1 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 1983), 205.

450 In this regard, too, the eating habits of the masses of Shang commoners could have differed dramatically from that of the elite. On this topic, see Sahure 1976: 168 f. (“La Penne Bourgeoise: Western Society as Culture”).


452 As duly noted by Huang Qingxin (Yinzi tianqi yuanji), 5.

453 See note 253, above.

454 Koichi, Sources of Shang History, 85 n. 112; see Heji 13646, etc.

455 On the methodology, see above (2.3).
yield valuable information on the diet of Shang people of different status.\footnote{As mentioned, few high-status remains have; regrettably, been recovered so far, and very few excavated low-status skeletal remains have been preserved for re-study. There are clearly opportunities for the future. The archaeology of status-specific variation in diet and health is a rapidly expanding field of inquiry, largely unexplored in China. Chinese scholarship on human skeletal remains has often been limited to craniosomatic studies of genetic differences (Zhengqin geshi houkansou, Anyang Xiaozhou yangzi yanjus [Peking: Wenwu, 1985] and limited studies of dental pathologies [e.g., ibid., 119–31]). For recent scholarship on health and status in archaeology, see for example Colbert and Muckle, eds., The Analysis of Prehistoric Diets (Orlando: Academic Press, 1985). H. Rush et al., Health in Earliest Societies: Biocultural Interpretations of Human Skeletal Remains in Archaeological Context (Oxford: Tempus Reparatum, 1991). This research has an ancestor in the classic paper on health and social difference by J.S. Angell, ‘Health as a crucial factor in the changes from hunting to developing farming in the Eastern Mediterranean,’ in M.N. Cohen et al., Paleopathology at the Origin of Agriculture (Orlando: Academic Press, 1984, 51–73. See also Lori Ellen Wright, The Sacrifice of the Earth: Diet, Health, and Inequality in the Formation of Societies (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1984, incl. ch. 4: “Social Status and Heterogeneity in Diet and Health,” citing dietary status-differences in diet from pre-colonial Pacific islands and the Americas where mining lumps were provided with wild game by agricultural subjects. On dental pathology in the archaeology of early agriculturalists, see, for example M.L. Powell, “The analysis of dental wear and caries for dietary reconstruction,” in Gilbert and Milner, eds., The Analysis of Prehistoric Diets, 307–33.\footnote{See note 59, above. \footnote{For example: Meng Shukai, “Shandai toujie xiaobi chu: ‘Yin-Shang shidai taishou luolong.”}}\footnote{For example: Meng Shukai, “Shandai toujie xiaobi chu: ‘Yin-Shang shidai taishou luolong.”}}

As for animal bone and antlers as raw materials for tool-making and decorative carving, there is of course a certain amount of information to be gleaned from the archaeological record, including information on the rich bone- and antler-working sites—that have been found both at Anyang and at the earlier Zhengzhou Shang sites, but seldom detailed information on what animals were used.\footnote{See note 59, above. \footnote{For example: Meng Shukai, “Shandai toujie xiaobi chu: ‘Yin-Shang shidai taishou luolong.”}} Detailed studies of the skeletal material and tools from such sites, including the identity of the deer and other animals that provided raw materials, and the bone tools or ornaments themselves (so richly represented in the sumptuous large tombs and other Shang archaeological contexts), would be helpful. Clearly, much of the antlers used to supply the workshops with raw materials came from captured deer. But much of it may have been harvested by commoner hunters, or from semi-domesticate deer (or antlers delivered as gifts or in exchange from the outside). Whatever the case, the mere fact that the deer served as a direct-economic source of raw materials still cannot explain why it should be the king that goes out to shoot them. Even if there was a monopoly on hunted meat, and the Shang kings at least generally had easier access to meat than most low-status Shang people, this motive alone also cannot be regarded as a credible explanation of the obsession with hunting expeditions.

There is at least one other way of understanding the royal hunting expeditions as more directly “economically” useful: as a way of chasing off wild animals from agricultural fields, the wei tian chu hai (clearing fields of pests) sometimes referred to by modern scholars.\footnote{See note 59, above. \footnote{For example: Meng Shukai, “Shandai toujie xiaobi chu: ‘Yin-Shang shidai taishou luolong.”}} In concrete terms, wild buffalo, cattle, deer and even elephants can quite conceivably have intruded on farmed land, destroying the crops (as they do in our contemporary world when they come into conflict with encroachment on their territory). Tigers and other potentially dangerous animals could have been seen as “pests,” to be eradicated. This is both possible and probable, but there is little evidence to go on except the presence of these various animals in the faunal record, passages in much later textual evidence quoted by Chinese scholars, and the intriguing connections between “fields” (tián), “burning” (fén) and hunting discussed above (3.2.2). Still, it is a viable complementary explanation that may actually hold deep interest.

4.3 The hunt as a means of providing sacrificial victims

In an imaginative article published in 1949, Chen Pan argued that the royal hunt was primarily conducted to provide sacrificial victims. This view, of great interest, is sometimes reiterated by other scholars as well, but the cited sources are mostly later than the Shang (usually from the late Zhou and Han periods). Chen Pan cited the way in which how the Zhou king would celebrate successful hunts with feasts preceded by a sacrifice [to the ancestors], and held that Shang kings, too, always conducted a hunt prior to sacrifices to the ancestors, and in effect hunted for sacrifice.\footnote{Chen Pan, “Go shehui shouli yi jia zhi guanxu,” Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology 21:1 (1949), 4–5, 7–8.\footnote{Chang Bingguan, “Bai hui zhong de xishu,” see also Li Ji, Anyang 100 fl.\footnote{On the various kinds of sacrifices using domestic animals, apart from Zhang Bingguan’s study, see two Yio Xiaoxi, “Lao yang kaohuan,” Guomei jiyao ji 9 (1984), 25–36; and, on recent discoveries, Liu Yizun et al., Yin and Zhou Dynasty (Beijing: Commercial Press, 1990), 247–50; for a recent overview, Wang Yuan et al., Augurary Analysis, Ch. 13, 592 ff. etc.}}

But there is no conclusive evidence for this in the Shang data, either in the archaeological record, or in the oracle inscriptions. As already mentioned, and as will be discussed further in the conclusions, both of these sources suggest an overwhelming, almost exclusive preponderance towards making domesticated animals only—all the dogs, cattle, and sheep—are the sacrificial victims.

In the archaeological remains, this is true at least as far as offerings in “sacri­ficial pits” are concerned, and at all levels in the mortuary ritual, where domesticated animals are used exclusively, and with very few exceptions (as mentioned above, 2.2.3). Hunted humans constitute an exception, since they (unlike hunted animals) do appear as offerings in burials and sacrificial pits—and as mentioned in oracle inscriptions. The overwhelming majority of offerings to ancestors mentioned in the inscriptions that involve animals are from the same limited range of domesticates, and similarly also include humans (i.e. the qiang). As related in the special study by Zhang Bingguan,\footnote{As mentioned, there are examples of human skull bone fragments with inscriptions they record what may be the names of high-status enemy people. Chen Mengjia (Yinhu hui tanying, plate 13) cites a human cranial fragment with the inscription lu Chung yi ji (‘enemy country lord [named] Jia sacrificed’ [to?] which also may record historical events, and is not divination; see also Wang Geiming, Shang Zhou hula benlev, 255–56; and Wenwu kanzhan 1964:4, 1–3 (quoting by Tsou 1962, 37). These inscriptions are akin to the trophy inscriptions on deer and wild cattle skull described above, and suggest that humans may have been used in a way similar to those wild animals. Michael Loewe (“China,” in M. Loewe et al., Oracle and Divina­tion, Boulder, Colorado: Shambhala, 1981), 43 mentions one example of human skull bone used for divination, but also does not provide a source.} offerings most often consist of cattle (niu), sheep, pigs, dogs, or humans (among these, the pigs are comparatively scarce, but all the others are abundant in the mortuary and other offerings). Some of these animals may have been raised specifically for the purpose of sacrifice: in contexts where the inscriptions clearly indicate sacrifices to ancestors, these animals [cattle, sheep, etc.] are often referred to by graphs that picture them in an enclosure. Thus, they are often rendered as “penned cattle,” etc., in translation. Other types of sacrifices involve splitting the animals, drowning them, etc., but once again almost exclusively using domesticated animals.\footnote{The almost-identical inscriptions Heji 32555 and Tunnan 3786, from a divination on the topic of “the king shou [hunting] [for?] Zu Yi [an ancestor]” which are \footnote{Chen Pan, “Go shehui shouli yi jia zhi guanxu,” Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology 21:1 (1949), 4–5, 7–8.\footnote{Chang Bingguan, “Bai hui zhong de xishu,” see also Li Ji, Anyang 100 fl.\footnote{On the various kinds of sacrifices using domestic animals, apart from Zhang Bingguan’s study, see two Yio Xiaoxi, “Lao yang kaohuan,” Guomei jiyao ji 9 (1984), 25–36; and, on recent discoveries, Liu Yizun et al., Yin and Zhou Dynasty (Beijing: Commercial Press, 1990), 247–50; for a recent overview, Wang Yuan et al., Augurary Analysis, Ch. 13, 592 ff. etc.}}
more difficult to explain. Other scholars have pointed to a small number of similar inscriptions which suggest that wild animals were actually also offered in sacrifice, but this occurs on a much smaller scale. Zhang Bingquan listed cases where st wild cattle (6 cases), elephant (2), tortoise (2), and elaphure (1) are referred to in a way that suggests they may have been used in specific sacrifices, but the interpretation of the words used may be questionable.86 Wang Guimin also cites several inscriptions that apparently include post-hunt offerings of game animals, and suggests that such offerings were made in the field at the location of the hunt in the Shang period and that the corresponding Zhou ritual was moved inside the ancestor temple. In a single Shang inscription, a tiger seems to be sacrificed (Heji 27339, III); in three others, deer (Heji 10316, 30765; Ts’ anan 1998); two others apparently include the wild buffalo or cattle st (Heji 27146, III and 32631, IV). Nevertheless, these are limited numbers of divinations which demand further scrutiny, but they still would not challenge the huge preponderance of domestic animals. Furthermore, when considering these inscriptions, a distinction must be made between using wild game as sacrifice or rituals related to the hunt (either preceding or coming after the hunt, perhaps to please or appease the supernatural powers in the manner of fruit sacrifices, by giving up the prime catch), and on the other hand the actual offering of captured animals in such sacrifices, or in ancestral sacrifices. Moreover, the ancestral sacrifices carried out in connection with (i.e. as a preparation for?) the hunt, too, seem to deploy mainly domestic animals, rather than game animals (in Heji 33526, one bovine = niyu), probably domestic cattle, is used when "reporting" a hunt to the royal ancestor Fu Ding86. In the rare cases where it does seem that hunted animals are offered as sacrifices, such as most of the few examples cited by Zhang Bingquan or Wang Guimin (see above), the nature of the rituals involved is often not clearly understood. Thus, even if a number of such inscriptions can be found, they are but weak support for the idea that the hunt was intended for this purpose. The number is very small, and apart from failing to substantiate the hunting-for-victims-theory also cannot really clarify the issue of just what was done with the great majority of hunted animals after they were captured.

In the absence of wild animals confirmed in the archaeological record as mortuary or as other offerings, and in the light of the fact that hunted animals (again, apart from hunted human enemies) almost never even possibly occur as sacrificial victims in the oracle bone inscriptions, it surely is not possible to claim that the royal hunt was undertaken mainly to supply victims for sacrificial rituals. The main flaw with this argument is that it is out of sync with the proportions of victims of the hunt and in sacrifice that are manifest in the evidence, taken as a whole. It also obviously runs the risk of reducing aspects of Shang circumstances to fixed, unchanging attributes akin to the imaginary, essentialized cultural "traits" of an outdated anthropology. Still, the relationship between hunting and sacrifice does deserve further discussion and systematic exploration—but "systematic" is the key element.

4.4 The hunt as a form of military training

A number of Chinese scholars, including especially those who have searched for aspects of some more immediate practical utility behind the hunting expeditions, have suggested that the hunting expeditions primarily or at least in part should be understood as a form of military exercise, or drill. There are many references to the link between hunting and war exercises in the Classical literature, and these are often quoted to prove the point.86 Some doubts have been expressed about the practical utility of the hunting expeditions as an exercise for war as waged during the Shang. Still, at least in the case of encircling or driving animals, the coordination of many participants clearly on some level might have benefited from the practice.86 The link between warfare and hunting in the Shang oracle inscriptions has been reviewed in some detail by Zhong Bosheng in a recent study.86 Apart from a few "hunting" terms that probably have more to do with military exercises or maneuvers but which occasionally included hunting (bu, shu, ge; see above under 3.2.2), the link as discovered consists in a number of inscriptions that suggest the two activities were carried out in close sequence (either before, during, or after military campaigns), and at the same places. As already mentioned, these instances are not many. It is probable that such hunts were at times indeed related to warfare, but it is also clear that this cannot be the sole and only explanation for the Shang royal hunt. This is because it again fails to address the basic question of why the hunt should be such an important topic of divination of concern for the king, and why the king himself so often should act as the hunter.

We might, of course, speculate that the hunt is useful for the ruler himself insofar as it can provide for physical training of his own body (in a more military sense than the aristocratic "training" discussed by Max Weber), and also preparing him for waging war himself in the regions where the hunts are carried out. In that case, hunting would perhaps be done where it is anticipated that fighting might possibly occur in the future. This is what is suggested by one Chinese scholar, who quotes Machiavelli's observations on 16th century Italy in support of this interpretation, including especially Machiavelli's advice on the usefulness of hunting.86 While this may

86 Zhang Bingquan, "Hui buji zhong de xiezheng," 224-25: The word si possibly also refers to a deity, and is not always used for the animal as victim of the hunt, or as sacrifice [compare Heji 34185, discussed in Wang Xizheng et al., Jiguang yishu biaozhi, 599, citing new research by Qi Wenxin].
868 [But are the preceding notes]. Compare Wang Guimin, Shang Zhan zhi hua xuan, 250-52.
86 Wang Guimin, Shang Zhan zhi hua xuan, 250. This is but one example.
be true, such a Machiavellian hunting lord really would have no need to find any real animals or participate in killing them, as the Shang king evidently did. He also, strictly speaking, would not need to divine whether the hunting expedition would be an auspicious or a successful undertaking, nor would he need to make a specified record of the catch after its completion.

While the Shang royal hunts probably often could and did serve as a form of practical military training, such a function is not explicit in the oracle bone inscriptions, and in any case would still be insufficient to explain the phenomenon. However, the link between hunting and warfare should be explored further, especially in the oracle inscriptions (the archaeological data cannot provide much help, except perhaps through data on Shang weapons). There was obviously a connection between hunting and warfare, but it probably went far beyond mere practical rehearsal.

5. Discussion and conclusions:

The Shang royal hunt as a lever of state formation

Much of this article have been devoted to the critical review of existing sources, as well as earlier studies. The review of existing information has been necessary in order to establish what we really know as well as also the limits of what we can know, about the Shang royal hunt. Some of the problems with the existing archaeological record can be remedied only by improving the research design of future excavations and analysis, and by setting aside the hitherto rather too uncritical acceptance of the previously gathered biological data and their interpretation. The oracle bone inscriptions are still available for further study and also are augmented by new finds. Enormous advances have been made and continue to be made with regard to their interpretation. In the following, based on these reviewed data, I present a series of preliminary conclusions regarding the Shang royal hunt, as well as some major issues that remain to be explored from the new perspectives developed here.

5.1 The wild and the domesticated

The most striking pattern discerned in our empirical data is the stark dichotomy revealed in Shang use of wild and domesticated animals. The Shang kings' play on the dynamic potential inherent in this dichotomy fuels the dynamic growth of the state in which it is as a lever, a key tool, used by the kings not just for legitimation in the present, but seized upon to build up their position.470

The record suggests that wild animals (deer, tigers, etc.) are almost never given up in sacrifice. Domesticated animals, on the other hand—cattle, sheep, dogs, pigs, and the prestigious horses (and as humans, on which more below)—are all used as offerings, in large numbers, both inside and outside of mortuary contexts. The domesticated animals dominate in the recovered animal remains not only in mortuary contexts but also in the "sacrificial pits," as well as in the "ash pits." The animals used as offerings inside human burials are mainly dogs, cattle, and sheep (but not pigs); the use of limb bones from cattle, sheep and pigs471 in a special set of offerings is also widespread, again found more often in high-status than in low-status burials. The only exceptions are the wild or exotic animals found in several royal tombs and in sacrificial pits in the same royal cemetery area, which is the only mortuary context where animal offerings outside of the limited range of domesticated animals are present: wild or "semi-domesticated" species such as deer, "pets" such as the monkey, or exotic species such as the whale bones of several royal tomb or the horses with chariots, high-prestige items related to warfare and intimately associated with higher-status burials.472 Animal offerings are dominated by domesticated animals there, too, and there seem to be no cases where any animals outside of the above-mentioned range or set of domesticated animals are used in human burials other than the royal tombs. The emphasis on the same range of domesticated animals is equally strong in the "sacrificial pits" whether these are situated immediately outside human graves in the Xibeigang royal cemetery area (probably closely related to, or even part of, the mortuary ritual) or occur—most likely as building consecrations—at Xiaotun. Animals in these pits were used in patterned ways with set numbers of individuals, including single-species pits for sheep, dogs, or cattle and the combination of cattle and sheep, or of dogs and sheep (such as in the pits related to B7, B11, and B16 within the major building complex). Again, it is only in the Xibeigang royal cemetery area that there are any exceptions to the overwhelming dominance of this small range of domesticated animals.473

Wild animals, as captured prey, were of course brought back to Anyang, and their meat was consumed there. Their remains found in ash pits must have been discarded as refuse from such meals, as parts of animals not used for other purposes, etc. All these vast numbers of animals were brought into the commanding royal center, frequented by such famous royal hunters as king Wu Ding. They were brought there to be killed, sacrificed, eaten, or used in other ways, their horns, antlers, shoulder blades and other body parts processed to serve further purposes. They were brought in dead or alive, bound or caged. In the case of the tigers discovered in the palace perhaps their very arrival was one of the main points, and certainly was persuaded to be an auspicious and a successful undertaking, nor would he need to make a specified record of the catch after its completion.

470 For an overview of the archaeological data and the use and distribution of offerings and other remains, see table 1, pp. 108–60.

471 The pigs are actually problematic; they only occur in this form as a grave offering, and are only seen in the context of a "sacrificial pit" in one exceptional case (M209, 2.2.3); special taboos may have governed the use of pigs. It is also not clear what species the disarticulated, broken pig bones in waste pits belonged to (see Shih, "Hunan Anyang Xiaotun yan Yin yin zhi chang de duan guan qian."

472 For several interesting examples of burials of "pet" animals (such as favorite dogs or horses) by kings and scholars in the Eastern Zhou period, including the debate over the burial of the king of Chu's favorite horse 'where the king in the end was persuaded to cook the horse as food instead of "wastefully" burying it' and the burial of Confucius' dog, see Danielle Eribon, "Pratiques funéraires animales en Chine ancienne et médiévale," Journal Asiatique 280 (1992), 119–24. Eribsen mistakenly says (p. 123) there are no examples of animal burials from more ancient periods. At least some of the examples of dogs and other animals that I have cited from the burials of "pets" by Shang kings qualify as such burials.

473 Such as the monkey and elephant pits (and the twelve animal pits from which the remains have now been lost).
any concrete use (this is suggested by the many oracle divinations about the auspiciousness of tributes presented from abroad of various animals, such as horses, turtles, etc.). Given the many unanswered questions on such issues, every scrap of information on the splinters of smashed-up bone in "ash pits" would have been valuable—which is why it is so regrettable that the early reports often note only unspecified "animal bones" and provide very few details; that many of the early remains themselves, if collected at all, have been lost; and, especially, that most post-war research unfortunately also has been conducted with insufficient attention to these issues.

Which note that the very same pattern seen in the archaeological record is repeated with a vengeance in the corresponding oracle bone inscriptions. We cannot fail to mention both the hunting of wild animals and a host of sacrifices made to Shang ancestor-spirits and other deities, almost exclusively performed with victims from the same range. In the large corpus of oracle bone inscriptions that describe the several types of sacrifices where animals are "used," the offerings are made up almost entirely of bovines, sheep, pigs, dogs, and of qiang enemy people; but almost never any of the wild animals, not even deer, the number one prey animal.44 The distribution of sacrificial offerings and other uses of animals is listed in Table 1 (p. 168–69).

On one basic level this makes much sense: one cannot give up what does not already belong to oneself. The massive Shang use of precisely their own domesticated animals as victims (that is, giving them up and destroying them in sacrifice), is testimony to this basic truth—something which also corresponds to the pattern seen in many early agricultural societies. But this is complicated by another, equally basic fact which also is evident in the royal hunt; people also do partake of wild natural resources that they have not raised or cultivated by themselves, and which they therefore will tend to construe and treat as something that they do not own. This can apply both to animals caught in hunting, and to those wild species incorporated into human society in a process of domestication. As Valerio Valeri has conclusively shown (arguing against those who would recognize sacrifice solely within the exclusive purview of agricultural or pastoral societies), the sacrifice of wild victims is conceptually possible in both agricultural and completely non-agricultural societies. It can even be construed as integral to the cultural phenomenon of hunting itself, as witnessed in first-fruits sacrifice.45 In such cases sacrifice still belongs within the basic parameters of symbolic renunciation from practical use and ownership, but it can assume a variety of other forms, some of which may not leave traces in the Shang archaeological record, or, alas, in the inscriptions. In other words, wild animals may have been sacrificed (perhaps dedicated to forest spirits, or the like), but they are not represented in the oracle bone record. The analysis of long-lost Shang society, which cannot be studied in vivo, is greatly impeded by these problems the full spectrum of sacrificial practice and the entire range of its victims that is the only "fully appropriate unit of analysis." Nevertheless, the empirical data does hold the key elements of the answer to our question about the Shang royal hunt, especially the strong dichotomy confirmed in the two major sources available to us. While it is not possible to exhaust the analytic potential of the full spectrum of Shang "bio-politics," the dynamic socio-political play on the symbolism of all of the living beings that are exploited, I propose that the distribution of different victims in the royal hunt is the most important key. What we are witnessing is the fledgling king's dynamic mediation between the wild and the domestic, using the manipulation of the wild in its contrast to the domesticated as a lever for the development of his state. There are several interconnected aspects to this, sketched in the following.

5.2 The usefulness of the wild people, or barbarians (qiang)

The treatment of enemy people, positioned by the Shang themselves (as evident in the archaeological record) as an in-between category on the wild/domestic scale of the spectrum of sacrifice, must be regarded as a crucial key element. As mentioned, the oracle bone inscriptions tell us that these enemy human beings were captured much in the same way as various wild animals were captured during hunting expeditions they frequently fall under the heading of qiang 畛, the special term for the only outsiders used in this way. The terminology which applies to them in the inscriptions is strikingly similar to that used for the hunted wild animals, notably in the terms for the "catch." As far as we can see in the inscriptions, the use of these people in sacrifices to the Shang ancestors is also very similar. At the same time, while the hunted wild animals are glaringly absent from the various sacrifices that we are able to witness in the archaeological record, the remains of human sacrifice, as well as all the sacrificial pits constructed for enemy humans very closely resemble those of cattle, horses, dogs or sheep, i.e. domesticated animals, with which the hunted wild people are included.46 All this suggests that these non-Shang human beings were actively drawn into the Shang social dynamics as a species of conquered "wild" people transformed from the king's paradigmatic Other into a domesticated, dehumanized victim. In this process of demonstrative royal incorporation, the qiang were manifestly and evidently reduced to the level of "owned" or domesticated property judged appropriate for ritual renunciation within the Shang sacrificial program. In a sense, as the archaic kings' sacrifiable Other, conceptually and historically distinct from such enemy polities and neighbors that on account of their strength could not

44 Valeri noted the main aspects of this spectrum: "from the wild to the domesticated, from the unprocessed to the processed, from the natural to the artificial, and, of course, from the non-humans to the human" ("Wild Victim," 2003).
45 There is the possibility that some of them represent burials of people belonging to the same kin groups, but the uniform age and sex (predominantly young males) as well as the pre-burial desecration which is evident in many cases suggest that they were enemy captives used as sacrificial victims for one example of a precedent of collective reburial of human skeletons at the Wangjiatem Neolithic cemetery, see Knightley, "The quest for eternity in ancient China: The dead, their gifts, their names," in Ancestor Mortuary Traditions of China (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), 12-24.
possibly be reduced to this status, these qiang can be said to constitute China's first "barbarians."\(^{476}\)

The large numbers of beheaded humans in the archaeological record directly exemplify this intermediate category of wild people, or barbarians—human Others that are both hunted and sacrificed as animals. As victims they share the fate of decapitation with only a few of the animals harnessed as domesticates (some of the Shang-owned dogs, horses, etc., which most often are whole and remain articulated, as in the massive sacrificial pits where rows upon rows of these animals are lined up to serve their purpose). Why should so many of the human offerings have to be beheaded, in contrast both to those animal offerings (hounds, etc.) and to the human offerings (most likely Shang servants or other subordinates)\(^ {477}\) seen in royal tombs? The answer to this question, I believe, is to be found in the manifest cleverness of these people to the Shang self (they walk on two legs, their physical constitution is visibly similar to that of the Shang people, etc.). Decapitation was less urgently necessary for most animals, already radically sub-human and not in need of such reduction. Note, too, that most of the severed heads have been confirmed as male: these were potential [male] warrior representatives of their kind, all the more necessary to rob them of their will to fight, in symbolic decapitation.\(^ {478}\) By the comparison of the commonplace arguments "ethnifying" the "Qiang" (in this case, as in Jaures xxvii, 115 "Shang is a black fellig of the Hsia", 1898–1998 (Taipei: Taiwan shihai dace & Academia Sinica, Institute of History and Philology, 1998), 165–72; and many other handbooks of oracle bone studies, and debates over whether or not these "Qiang" were slave, herd-herders. See also, for a review of the data, I. Qin, "Yin-Shang shi ni de Qiang yu Qiangfang," in Wang Yumin ed., Jiaozuo yu Yan Shang shi (Wuhan: Shanghai guji, 1991), Vol. 3, 405–26; also Kehlighy, The Ancestral Landscape, 106–107, also 68, 74 n. 51, 77, etc.; and for another rebuttal of the view of Qiang herders, Guohe Shalch, "Qiang and the question of human sacrifice in the late Shang period," Asian Perspectives 35.1 (1996), 1–26; on this as an intermediary, see again, Liu Yimin et al., "Yin-Yu Huaxiazhun sengong bai waishi yi chu zuo yanji," 225. On "qiang/Qiang" as simultaneously a tool of signification and a potential ethnic label in the Shang period, and in Chinese history, see Wang Mingshe, The Chao of Ancient China Through the Han Dynasty: Ecological Frontiers and Ethnical Boundaries (Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1993), and Hong Xuehuan: Lishi ji yu zazhi renying (Taipei: Yuwen wenhu, 1997). Wang Ming-khe shows brilliantly that the term did not represent a single stable ethnic group but rather a generic term for borderland barbarians with whom Shang people came into contact, and which was then reused in later periods. It is not necessarily ethnocentrically related to the Qiang "minority nationality" officially recognized in China today. As for the general development of the Chinese conceptions of the barbarians, including my suggestion that the ancient Chinese took the barbarians as the first Chinese barbarian group, see my article "On the 'Raw' and the 'Cooked' barbarians of imperial China," 101 n. 64, etc., on headhunting warfare as sacrifice, see also Ph.D. dissertation, The Role of Sacrifice and the Making of Wu History (University of Chicago, 2000), Vol. II, Ch. 3, 287–354. On theoretical aspects also Valeri, op. cit. (esp. "Wild victims").

What, in contrast, are left with their bodies intact (while the heads of those decapitated were cut most violently, sometimes through the jaw). As discussed earlier, I suggest that this is because the intact bodies (whether they are the remains of elephant walrus, lacers, tigers, perhaps the signals, or the like, all interpreted as "subordinate Shang subjects") are interred whole because they are to continue to serve the deity, and thus cannot be mutilated by decapitation, which would render them useless for such tasks—of course, such a "giving up" of the highest purpose of sacrifice in the first place. In this sense, as fellow human beings put to intentional waste, the qiang barbarian represent a primordial foundation.
suggest, assigned essentially the same sort of conquered significance. There is a simi-
lar tendency to "dismantle" them, evident in the lack of complete, articulate intentional
burial. Instead they are found as disarticulated or fragmented remains. The tiger skulls found (but not described in detail) suggest that the tiger came close to approximating the stature of human enemies worthy of decapitation.464 We must, however, imagine that the symbolic yield even of the fierce tiger was lower, because of the limited capacity of animals for independent development compared to that of humans. The difference (again, as empirically manifest in the Shang archaeological and inscriptional record), is that the wild animals ultimately lack the socio-cultural capabilities and strategic cunning of ordinary humans, on the one hand, and on the other hand, unlike such animals that lend themselves to domestication, wild beasts cannot even be incorporated as domesticates to form a subservient, controllable part of Shang society. This is, I would suggest, why the beasts, unlike the intermediary qiang barbarians, are not allowed or deployed within the main range of the sacrificial victims propelling Shang social dynamics.

I'll have more to say below about the importance of hunting to the growth and
consolidation of Shang royal power, as well as about the larger trends involved in
early Chinese state formation. But first, several other aspects of the royal mediation,
through divination and other means, of this social landscape and the wild/domestic
dichotomy must also be discussed.

5.3 Animals as the king's medium of divination

The exclusive use of domestic animals not just as the main victims of sacrifice, but of
their scavenged bones as the primary medium of divination, could be understood (in
a similarly unabashed structuralist fashion) as yet another reflection of their interme-
tiary position between the wild animals and the Shang people.465 Controlled by
people, yet non-human, the domestic animals offered an almost self-evidently
suitable link to the unpredictable wild (including its animals), and equally well to
the similarly unpredictable non-Shang enemy peoples, both the more resilient fang
powers, and the pitiful qiang "captured" in war/hunting expeditions similar to wild
animals I should like to go further, and suggest that their use as medium is conceptu-
ally related to unpredictability in a general sense. It may be objected that none of
the many cattle, sheep and dogs that served as sacrificial offerings had any of their
twin scapulae removed. While the source was the common cattle, and the turtle, the
actual divination media did not immediately coincide with the very animals that
served in sacrifice — only on the species level, and only in the case of cattle.466 Still, it

is likely that the scapula bones indeed came from domesticated bovines. As for the
special role of turtles, I have already noted that the shells of the turtle, famous for
its unique longevity, was used for divination long before the Shang and continued
well after.467 The symbolic use of the turtle supplements that of domesticated cattle—and they, too, may well have been "domesticated:" it is quite likely that the
turtles were actually bred by the Shang for the purpose of divination.468 Both cattle
scapula and turtle shells were doubtless also valued for their flat, smooth surface,
ready for inscription. However, my interpretation is strongly supported by the fact
that while deer were captured in large numbers and their scapulae easily could have
been used, they never were. Note, too, the fact that deer almost never appear as
mortuary offerings, and are almost never mentioned together with domestic animals
in any of the contexts where these occur in the oracle inscriptions: not as ancestral
offerings, not as "penned" animals, and not as tribute (living beings as tributary offer-
ings included human captives, horses, dogs, bovines, and turtles).469 Thus, only ani-
malsthat were domesticated or controlled by the Shang were used as divination media.

This should also suggest that the domestication of deer, if attempted, was a fail-
ure (as it most often has been, throughout history, where it has always remained
just beyond this possibility). Not all animals are suited for either subjugation or dog-
like cohabitation with our species—or, indeed, suited for the Shang symbolic play
on domesticated animals as media for the divining and subjugation of their breth-
ren in the wild. A simple opposition between wild and domestic is always overly
simplistic: the term "cultural control" could be used to cover intermediary stages,
where animal populations are subjected to some degree of control but not total
dependency—467—where the cultural play on symbols will always thrive.

The confusing variety of bovines, the source of cattle scapulae which constitute
a major divinatory medium, are also, of course, of special interest precisely in how
they constitute a grey-zone similar to that of the deer. The Anyang remains might

463 Divination with turtle shells continued into the Han imperial era (probably because of the symbolic importance
attached to the turtle’s long life, which perhaps answered the myth of longevity of the divine, etc.); see Michael
Lowe, “Man and Beast: The Hybrid in Early Chinese Art and Literature,” Names 25.2 (1978), 97-117, and “Divi-
nation by shells, bone and sticks during the Han period,” T‘ung-Pao 74 (1988), 81-118.

464 Turtle brooding for divinatory purposes is noted in Sima Qian’s Shih Chi (ch. 126, “Cun de li fuchun 8li9/19/9” p. 3225; recorded in the Hsu dynasty, i.e. long after the demise of the Shang); see too Keoghley, Sources of Shang History, 12, 15-17 (turtle brooding). On turtle species, see 2.3.2.


466 Nomads follow herds in seasonal movements and partly control their breeding. For example, the Sarsi rein-
deer of northernmost Europe, and so on; hunter-gatherer people often capture and keep animals as pets, or
keep free game animals in captivity as a form of "five store." See Howard M. Hecker, “Domestication revisited: its implications for faunal analysis,” Journal of Field Archaeology 9 (1982), 217-36. The conflicting evidence on Anyang elaphine deer (local inbreeding, vs evidence for hunting in the oracle bone inscriptions) may indicate a combination of approaches to the deer, perhaps not only the elaphine, on the part of the Shang people. This invites research on the relative representation of young animals, the male/female ratio, etc. The elaphine (Anyang deer) was described as a domesticate by Fréind and Chardin on grounds of its smaller stature, perhaps the result of breeding.
include both the Anyang buffalo and varieties of domestic and wild cattle, and there is still considerable confusion regarding the status of the buffalo and of the hunted wild cattle (including the famous 92% of the oracle bone inscriptions, mentioned in both section 2.3.2 and 3.2.3). I believe future research, and debate, must attend to the type of cultural aspects I have indicated here. Teilhard and Young for their part believed that the cattle were securely domesticated animals, and the buffalo a possible domesticate with an additional wild presence. It is uncertain if wild cattle bones have been included among the bovine remains in storage or waste pits (perhaps included under the heading of larger buffalo), and we do not have any means to know, in order to explore what further differences there might have been in the uses of wild and domesticated bovines. Shih Chang-ju suggested that all bovine remains found in sacrificial pits without exception were from domesticated cattle, huangniu 黃牛, identified by their smaller size. Only in waste pits did both this type of cattle and buffalo remains occur together. Both the buffalo (listed as numerous, "over 1000" in the several reports that are available) and the smaller cattle may thus have been deposited after sacrifices or consumption as food (or both, in ritual feastings). The smaller cattle (the diminished stature of which probably indeed is a result of domestication) may have been the only one accepted for use in sacrifices, in addition to serving as a medium of divination, while other bovines were hunted, eaten as food, and used in other distinctive ways.498 Clarification of these fascinating issues would certainly require new research on skeletal remains.

5.4 Incorporation of the wild as a form of risk management

At the heart of Shang divination, as with all forms of divination, is the wish to be able to know and then to influence or control the future. The Shang diviner-king the socially significant position of mastering, influencing and manipulating the results of divination and by extension the future, by means of his privileged access both to the oracle voices and to the means of interpreting and recording them.

Shang divination was often carried out at different places, and on different consecutive days. The same bones were used again and again over a period of several weeks, if not months.499 in series of divinations which were then brought home to Anyang. Hunting divinations, too, were often made in the field in this manner, and then brought back to the royal center.499 Hunting divinations, like other topics, was often based on a consecutive series of cracks in the bone, or plastron, and there may be several accompanying inscriptions concerning the same topic, placed on the same bone or shell—series of attempts to consult of the oracle-powers, undertaken when the results were unsatisfactory or, put otherwise, when the king or the diviners believed that the divination failed for some reason. For the same reason, divination often were done with pairs of inscriptions divided on positive/negative charges (or, strong/weak), also indicating that the effort was not simply to acquire hidden knowledge about future events but to be able to seem to be influencing them.499 I believe that this propensity is also evident in the intentional deployment of the expression rui 瑞, "approval," which is meant to indicate that if a certain course of action is taken, it will be approved by the powers-that-be. Few hunting inscriptions explicitly invoke the powers of spirits in this way,499 but the same basic assumption also governed them, and the general trend towards increased control and regularization of the inscriptions is also present, indeed pronounced. This trend is increasingly evident in the last Shang inscriptions (Period V), where the prayer-like injunction "if we X [at Y, with Z, etc.] there will be no misfortune" is increasingly used, an expression of an intensified quest for certainty in an uncertain world (see too below, 5.5).

In the Shang context, the outlook for future harvests and the uncertainties of war, as well as pests and disease among humans or domestic animals, are likely to have counted as the most important risk factors. In many early agricultural societies where increasing populations relied heavily on grain (corn, etc.) for food, the risk of crop failures was a real and dangerous threat. With settled agriculture, there is a lot of labor investment and potentially also high yields (at least as compared to mobile hunting and gathering of wild or semi-domesticated resources499), but the main drawback is the much higher risk, in case of crop failure, of catastrophic disease and famine. Population increase makes the risk of famines even more pronounced, and so the requirement to find more fields and organize production and granaries becomes a pressing issue in a vicious circle wherein epidemics can strike much more violently and effectively than in less concentrated and less sedentary societies. This may be especially true of early agricultural societies where there was little variation in the diet, and the majority of people often suffered from nutritional deficiencies and related diseases. People who are mainly hunter-gatherers invest less in their food

498 But not for plowing: there is little or no evidence for plowing with any animal in China until long after the Shang dynasty. It did not become widespread until perhaps in the Eastern Zhou. The history of plowing in the Shang is much debated Ch'en Wen-hua, 'Shih-i wang gan mii shi shang de yi ge wen yi,' Kongtu xuehuan 1984, 4, 407-25), and Xu Xuanjiang, 'Juguang wu biwai ci de xiangzi,' Zhongguo cishu 1981, 4, 91-113. Xu agrees with the interpretation that plowing existed based on the oracle bone graph believed to have persisted into modern times (85); but also refers to a passage in the late text Zhou li 上古之禮 which lamented that cattle, properly sacrificed in the ancestral temples, increasingly are used for work in the fields (Xu, op. cit. 95). Plowing may have been started in the Shang, but was never widespread, and the main use of domesticated cattle was as a sacrificial animal (as attested in the inscriptions, and in the archaeological record), and possibly for transportation. Anyang bovine skeletal materials could be studied for more answers. Compare C. Higham et al., 'The David-philanthropist and prehistoric ploughing,' Journal of Archaeological Science 8 (1981), 453-65.


499 On these "traveling divinations" away from the ancestral temples but with records carefully kept and brought home, see Knightley, op. cit., 45-47. As mentioned earlier, they have been recovered either as scattered, discarded fragments in late Shang 9th pit, or in buried storage, sometimes in large circles. The latter constitute post "archives" assembled in Shang times (they may not have been meant to be accessed again, and incidentally, in themselves may constitute a sacrifice in our definition). The hoards of the famous VH127, possibly the former archives of king Wu Ding, discovered after his death; F. Shaugnessy, personal communication, July 1994, may have been unearthed before they were buried.

499 On the metaphorical implications of complementary changes in relation to hunting and other expeditions, see also Knightley, The Ancestral Landscape, 115-16, 116 n. 59.

499 See: Knightley, The Ancestral Landscape, Ch. 7, esp. 111 ff. There is one divination where a "prayer" (rui) is addressed to an ancestor for success in the hunt ("...so Father Fa, we pray for [great] hunting," Fei 26275, lines 3-4) The inscription does not spell out the result of the hunt activity, so it is not clear that this fact here actually stands for the act of hunting.

499Hunting clearly also belongs in such an in-between category. On the development of hunting, see Oomura Hikichi, "Indai ni okoru shibun no hen'naku," Tohoku gijutsu 27 (2003), 1-49.
getting, which may yield less, but they also are at a lower risk level in terms of famine and epidemic diseases because they are less numerous and can move away more easily if game or plant resources should become scarce. Of course, even in their world there are numerous unpredictable factors which may form topics for divination (the availability of game, or the success of a hunt), but the dangers of failure would seem to be much smaller than in an agricultural society like the Shang.

The growth and the institutionalization of divination seen in the Shang period was intimately linked to the growing importance and expansion of agriculture. The intriguing use of the word tian [天] (an obvious picture of a humanly organized—agricultural?—field, split into four subareas) for "hunting" certainly points to a significant relation between agriculture and royal hunts, which may involve the forced conversion of the wild into farmland. The increased use of this word in the sense of hunting towards the end of the late Shang is probably, as I suggested above (3.2.2), a reflection of a successive increase in the conversion of the "wild" plains into farmed land (regrettably, the nature of and importance of agriculture both in the pre-Shang Neolithic cultures and in the Shang is imperfectly known).

Assuming that this general picture is valid, it is conceivable that the attractiveness of the hunting expeditions as a royal topic of divination in contrast with the agricultural issues of threatened harvests increased steadily. The hunt surely was risky and unpredictable—but while a hunting expedition may fail, it is difficult to imagine that a failed hunt on a certain day could amount to a royal disaster comparable to the perilous consequences of failed harvests or serious outbreaks of pest among the domestic cattle or sheep herds. Also, while hunting wild animals must have been risky at times, and unpredictable in many ways, it was probably not nearly as dangerous and uncertain as confronting the concerted efforts of human enemies in war.

This is why I suggest that in addition to the tremendous symbolic value inherent in the king's sustained conquest of wild animals, wild people, and of wild space in the king's sovereign position (in the "Weberian" terms cited above), but also a willingness to take on risks on behalf of his community—without risking too high costs for himself. The king facing symbolic dangers, tigers and other dangerous wild animals that would have been frightening to the general populace, is a potentially useful image which the kings seized upon. The risk-taking was not "purely" symbolic: The kings did put themselves at risk by personally conducting the hunt (confronting and subduing the wild, although with easily herded animals such as deer this aspect would have been more symbolic than actual, as opposed to the case of dangerous wild cattle, or tigers). As these hunter-kings ruled over an agricultural society where harvest failure and enemy attack were among the most important uncertainties, the confronting and capture of wild animals in the hunting expeditions helped create an arena for a dangerous but symbolically extremely valuable risk-taking, on which the kings might build and reaffirm their prestige before their own subjects as well as before their enemies—and just as emperor Hadrian, before themselves as well—thus their status as arbiters of Shang society's internal and external power relations was, achieved by way of setting themselves up as both attentive arbiters and violent conquerors of the dangerous wilderness surrounding their society.

5.5 The regularization of state divination

The role of the hunt as a valuable risk-taking exercise, and the changes in that role, can explain not only the tremendous general interest in the hunt shown by the kings but also the highly interesting trends towards regularization of the oracle bone divinations during the relatively short time-span of 150 years from which they derive, as previously demonstrated by David Keightley and other scholars.

As is evident from the many hunting inscriptions divined in the field and returned to the cult center of Anyang for storage, the topic of hunting remained one of the most important divination topics throughout the Late Shang, but it gained increasing relative importance and became even more conspicuous in the last phase, Period V. One major reason was the disappearance of many other ad hoc-topics divined in the earliest inscriptions. In the early phase of the oracle bone "window" on Shang history, king Wu Ding divined on a very wide range of different topics, from war, sacrifices and hunting to his own toothaches and the child deliveries of his...
consorts. Now the divination inscriptions themselves became much more standardized and, in effect, more like prayers for safety than divinations where even negative or auspicious answers from the oracles were expected. Also, as mentioned above (3.2.5), the range of days for which hunting expeditions were divined became much more limited. The kings also became more directly involved with maintaining the divination process related to hunting. While the king earlier had sometimes carried out prognostications, and thus perhaps supervised the divination process indirectly, the prognostications were now more often explicitly listed as being made by the king himself. Perhaps as a consequence, auspicious readings also became very rare, and the king increasingly took over the divination itself, to the point of almost becoming the exclusive divisor (so that we only rarely find the names of diviners listed in the preface, but the king, wang 王子 in their place). Divinations also came to be carried out more immediately in advance of events, no longer long in advance, as happened occasionally during earlier periods. Also, there seems to have been a successive reduction and elimination of conditional elements. Whereas before, the inscriptions were often made in pairs containing strong and weak charges, in the last period they were often prayer-like or "declarative," and very rarely made in complementary pairs. The recurring standardized phrase "going and coming, there will be no calamities" was increasingly seen in many hunting inscriptions, especially towards the end of the late Shang (Period V).

Regularization may also be detected in another important aspect of the hunting expeditions, also related to their role as a state-building device. While the investment in risk-taking and conquest of the wild brought prestige in the eyes of the common people, casting the king as their master hunter, the king also used the hunt (as he did with warfare) to build relations and alliances with prominent allies and neighbors in such a way so as to promote his position as a primus inter pares. Casting himself as a superior, offering protection and also making a gift out of his own companionship, the aggrandizing king let the light shine on his invitees beyond the awe instilled in his own populace. The prestigious ambiance and character of royal hunting, in which such allies would be able to share, is indicated in the many inscriptions concerned with the king's companions (local lords, etc.), and also by the use of prestige items such as horses and chariots. These are devices that the archaeological record clearly indicate were items controlled by the highest strata of society and which would reflect a high prestige value placed on the king's personal presence, and his capacity to mobilize a grand setting. To have others join such hunting expeditions was likely a favor given with political purposes in mind, perhaps as a symbolic gift of an alliance that could become useful in times of conflict with fellow enemies, and perhaps as a reaffirmation of their alliance against both wild animals and human enemies. This was another, highly important symbolic function in confirming and expanding the territory or sphere of influence of the Shang king.

ROYAL HUNTING AND STATE FORMATION IN SHANG CHINA

But the daring hunting expeditions into the wild later appear to have lost this prestige value. If the fleeting character of the galaxy of polities of the North China region gave way to a central state supremacy, formalizing a monopoly on violence and, notably, settling more permanently in one place (as seem to have occurred at Anyang), this aspect of the king's personal presence and itinerant alliance-making would be surpassed by the king's increasing isolation in his palace, elevated above his regularized armies and officials in what became more and more a bureaucratic state. Matsumaru Michio suggests that the range of the king's expeditions narrowed accordingly—this really, I suggest, indicates the narrowing road which ultimately led to the sterilized, fixed hunting parks of the later bureaucratic emperors (on which see below).

The demise of primus inter pares Bronze Age kingship halfway through the Zhou dynasty is linked to the decreasing relevance of, and the disuse of, the Shang-style royal prerogative for the conduct of prestige-building hunting jointly with allies. Accordingly, this prerogative, as an attribute of traditional kingship, was later adopted by usurpers. Both the etymology and the later usage transformation of one of the most important terms for hunting, shou, also supports this scenario. As has been described above (3.2.2), the word was used for royal hunting in the Shang and early Zhou, but from the Spring and Autumn period (770-476 BCE) of the later Zhou onwards it came to be used (minus the animal component, originally a dog) for how the local lords "occupied and defended" their respective area in lieu of and on behalf of the Zhou "Son of Heaven," who no longer made hunting expeditions like those once organized by Western Zhou sovereigns in the manner of the Shang-era kings.

There are further aspects of the transformation of the hunt that suggest the regularization and bureaucratization of the state and its divinatory practices. In Period

---

Footnotes:
608) Keightley, Sources of Shang History, 35-36, 122; also "The late Shang state: When, where, and what?" 550, 555-56.
609) Keightley, The Ancestral Landscape. Certain exceptions indicate that the desire to influence the future by making desirable forecasts in the older form of complementary charges did persist to some extent.
611) Matsumaru, "Yin-bokujich ni demyoshibi ni tuite," 127 ff, see the discussion by Keightley, "The Shang: China's first historical dynasty," 289, including on the drastic reduction of the number of inscriptions concerned with the choice of allies (who may no longer have been needed).
612) This long-term trend is reflected in the passage of the Zhouhuang 作狩 for 632 BCE (four hundred years after the demise of the Shang) where the Zhou king Xiang 項 is invited by an increasingly powerful local lord to hunt in the land of that lord, which amends to usurping the prerogative of invitation, asking the king instead of the king inviting that lord to hunt with or for him. See Han Peng, "Gyudai yamashou zoku," 42 ff (I am grateful to David Keightley for this reference). Han quotes a small number of Western Zhou bronzes inscriptions (five) that more or less expressly cite the king as hunting at some place, as in the oracle bone inscriptions. None of them list captured animals, except the last inscription quoted by Han (Hantaip yu), which is not quoted in full. The last part says that "three deer" are awarded; Shirakawa Shizuka believes these deer were eaten in an enclosure, not hunted. See his Juunou de shijou: Yua-Zhou Shihui di (Taipei: Lianjione, 1980), 77. The fishing ritual of the Jing ding (Chen Mengzi, Xi Zhou tongqi duan dai, Part 3, 120), is once reminiscent of the Shang hunt. Some of the early Zhou inscriptions (hunting and coming, there will be no calamities) were often paired with "pursuits wild animals," at a plan explained on page 132, 127 (where the king "goes and zhou [fishing]" i.e. "sees our herdsman to hunt wild cattle" [primitive translation]; and plates 33, 74-75, abu 111; 86, on p. 81, is very similar to the Shang oracle bone graph for "capable" [animals]). For a discussion of these oracle bones as historical sources, see E. Shengbehrens, "Zhuyuan yaohe-shou inscriptions: entering the research stage?" Early China 11-12 (1985-87), 146-84, on Zhou/Shang oracle bones and their Zhou origin, see Song Xiu-wei, Wu-Shang wendu yuanshuo (Xian: Xian shang (ren), 1993), 257-88, and others.
as the range of captured animals largely stayed the same, the variation in the note on captured animals in verifications became almost the only part of divination inscriptions where unpredictability still lingered. As I have suggested, the archaic king had made use of the hunt as a relatively secure and easily manipulated mode of risk-taking. But now it was re-conceptualized as the one remaining arena where the capricious forces of nature and its deities were still recognized. The royal hunting expeditions had previously always been organized on an ad hoc basis, as when receiving “reports” about available prey somewhere. The very agility of the king, his itinerant character, had been linked with the need to be able to respond personally to immediate threats. But the regularization of divination meant the elimination of these surprise elements. Only the wild victims themselves still provided a symbolically valuable element of unpredictability and uncertainty—precisely the core element in the conception of the “wild” and of “barbarians,” which are both superficially dangerous, and were only painted as such because of the vagaries of royal appearances and the demands of the project of state formation.

The notion of controlling the unpredictable, of course, is at the core of the work of divination. The lingering, increasingly regularized pretense of unpredictability quite conceivably helped justify the continuation of the divination process itself, while it declined in all other respects, as the state administrative system solidified. This overall trend was, I would like to suggest, a reflection of that the process of incorporation outlined above was increasingly successful and the Sung state thus successively became more solidly entrenched—all the while the wilderness and its wild denizens were already in sharp decline on the North China Plains.

5.6 The domestication of the wild and the birth of empire

Relating to the issue of environmental and climate change, Teilhard and Young made the pertinent suggestion that “the destructive action of Man” consisting in hunting and environmental destruction, may be the reason why animals like the tiger, raccoon dog, and Sika deer became locally extinct. The basis for this view on climate change, pronounced with some certainty at the time, now seem much less well-founded, but
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whether or not the climate has indeed become cooler (as it seems), over-zealous hunting, agricultural exploitation denuding the forests, and the related environmental degradation may all also be responsible for the decline or disappearance of many species (like water-deer, the Anyang buffalo, and others). As it is, the lack of contextual information means that the various possible contributing variables can hardly be disentangled from each other and independently controlled, which is why some of Teilhard de Chardin’s and Young’s conclusions now appear contradictory and easily challenged. Clearly, the related fields of both climate history and, even more, socio-environmental history merit more research.

These developments are related to how royal divination and royal hunting—certainly royal hunting as practiced by the Shang (and early Zhou kings, too)—form parts of an integrated whole and find their historical end together. Shang-style divination, as a means of dealing with the threats to the very survival of the state as an apparatus, is subsumed in the sea of empire. The first, vast empires appearing several centuries after the demise of the Shang hunter-kings were already equipped with vast administrative apparatuses laying claim to the total rule of much larger populations and much larger areas than the Shang. The process of constructing these bureaucratic empires (to use another of Weber’s terms) may have begun already in the Shang dynasty, but was accelerated in the Zhou period when local lords increasingly gained the ability to challenge the power of the diviner-king, perhaps through the proliferation of metal and weapons technology further accelerating the extermination of wild animals (and barbarians) in the region of the so-called Central Kingdoms. Increasingly, the old forms of legitimation of rule would no longer be workable, for the very foundation of their existence, the wilderness, had been tamed. In the process, the hunt of wild animals by and large lost its meaning as an effective demonstration of the royal powers to overcome the unpredictability of nature.

510 Several scholars have attempted to investigate Shang climate in the oracle bone inscriptions, for example through studying the distribution over the year of mention of rain, and have concluded that the period was probably slightly warmer and wetter than it is now (see K.C. Chang, Shang Civilization, 141). My point here is that the Anyang archeological data, as published thus far, hardly can confirm or deny these indications.

512 For example, the identification of the poorly preserved Anyang elephant and as “southern” tribute animals ignores the fact that if other “southern” species could live at Anyang, these presumably equally well had lived nearby. Some animals, such as the tiger, the bear, and the elephant, may have belonged to several different categories: rare but still indigenous species could have been accepted in tribute from far; elephants are mentioned in oracle bone inscriptions both as a beast of prey and as tribute (3.2.3); perhaps they were also pets or household animals (the several elephants at Xibeigang found with bronze bells and human attendants are similar to many of the dogs, as are the monkeys; 2.2.3). Elephants may have been captured, tamed, and kept, instead of being killed—also, the oracle bone inscriptions generally do not explicitly state that the animals captured were “killed,” only that they were captured (see Part II). In the case of the various “tributary” ceremonies or other ceremonies, closer analysis may have yielded further information. Again, the context is not sufficiently known to accomplish this—definitely not for the tigers or the rhinoceros, which were never recorded properly, and thus may have come from any period, see Shih Chang-p’o, “Hsuan Anyang Xionglin cuin Yin ruo zhong de chungwu gun,” 5. Of course, whales and marine shellfish could not have lived at Anyang, and are indeed evident for Late Shang long-distance trade. These animal “curiosities” in high-status graves (such as the whole, and perhaps also the技术和 others) also suggest a long-distance trade in exotic items captured and controlled by the highest level of society.

513 The first empires were the Qin (221-206 BCE), and the Han (206 BCE—220 AD), built out of centuries of intensive warfare between those local kings that usurped the powers of the ancient Shang and early Zhou hunter-kings.
True, later lords and even the emperors also hunted, and to some extent they could, of course, also utilize such hunts to show their power by overcoming wild beasts in a way similar to what I have suggested for the Shang. They also conducted inspection tours of their respective realms, and often hunted along the way. But their hunting park rituals are profoundly different. I believe the difference must be understood in relation to the combined factors of the exponential growth of state power, the disappearance of the wildlife, and the accompanying decline of Shang-style royal divination. Hunting “parks” are known from later periods but probably did not exist during the times of Shang kings, who hunted in the actual, still-existing wilderness. The various discussions of the hunting parks of ancient China published so far all seem to stop short of attempting to account for just why these pitiful parks were brought into being. I see their role as symbolic remnants of the wilderness, providing for a sterilized ritual hunt carried out in a microcosm after the macrocosm was already conquered. The archaic kings’ launching themselves far into forests and outlying areas in incessant hunting expeditions was part of an itinerant kingship-in-motion very different from the universal rule of the vast empires. The Shang king’s risk-taking was replaced, in the Qin and Han empires, by hunting within a confined, tightly controlled and entirely predictable “wilderness” that carried nothing of the potency of the real forest. These parks are imperfectly known, but existing descriptions generally describe them as recreated microcosms of the entire universe under imperial rule (they thus contain miniature versions and vistas illustrating not only wild animals, but every conceivable thing). If, as seems to have been the case, this kind of microcosm was intended as a representation of absolute universal rule, the intention was well expressed in the manner in which animals captured and enclosed beforehand were killed in the park: The latter-day emperor “hunters” were served predictable, pre-arranged catches of prey. At the same time, the symbolic potential of the “hunt” itself was much reduced—retained only as a token of its martial, symbolic, and nostalgic value. The incessant expeditions launched by the Shang kings would have seemed highly inappropriate for the imperial Son of Heaven. The emphasis on the cyclical observances of hunting rituals in such parks is indicative of an imperial ideology where the Son of Heaven was conceived as the mandated manager of the entire world, ruling it in all aspects, in accordance with the cycles of nature. In my view, the evidence from the Shang displays an entirely different situation and worldview. In the imperial situation, the question is who should be emperor. In Shang times, because of the much more precarious existence of the royal polity itself, the question might be whether there would still be kings.

The enormous state structures of the empires, ruling tens of millions of people where the Shang had ruled (at most) a few hundred thousand, seem hydra-like and once created, indestructible, in comparison with the fledgling, vulnerable Shang kingdom and his incessant divinations on the topic of success or failure. Although universal imperial rule was never truly absolute, but also necessarily consisted in constant alliance-making and negotiation of unfolding events, the empires clearly differed greatly from the Shang. In the Shang world, the conquest of or victory over the wild animals (and the land they inhabited) was not a “fixed” game (definitely not so in the early part of the late Shang period), and most certainly did not take place in a hunting park. No wonder that the disintegration of “itinerant” Shang-style kingship was accompanied by both a decline in the relative importance of divination to rulers, in the use of animal bones as a medium, and by important changes of the place of animals in artistic representation, as well as by the emergence of minimalistic hunting confines.

The decline of divination using bone and shell did not mean that divination disappeared altogether, or became unimportant. But the role of divination changed dramatically. Whereas it had been a royal prerogative in the Shang and the early Zhou dynasty, it seems to have been taken up in all social strata during the later Zhou period. First, it became accepted (as related, for example in the Zuo zhuan, for local lords to divine, and the appearance of written divination manuals such as the various versions of the Yi jing). In this period suggests that it then also had become desirable and acceptable for everyone to divine. By that time, the Shang-style diviner-king using cattle shoulder blades and turtle shells inscribed with charges and records was no more, and the change is thus related to both the decline and

514 This is the reason why Zhang Boheong ("Bu Shang zongxian Yiandai jukui zhi ci—Yiandai de zhongguo", 120) also cannot find any evidence for hunting parks in the oracle bone inscriptions (even so, however, Zhang still holds that they ought to have existed, on the basis of their occurrence in much later periods). This can be described as a case of reading later history back into time, too hastily (on this point, see also Haggis, Shang archaeology, 220—31). Edward H. Schafer, “Hunting parks and animal enclosures in ancient China,” Journal of Economic and Social History of the Orient 11 (1968), 318—43, discusses the history of hunting parks and enclosures, and notes that there is no evidence for the existence of hunting parks earlier than from the Eastern Zhou dynasty (King Hui of Zhou apparently established one in 675 BCE, according to a brief statement in the Zuozhuan, Zheng b. 31 (6. Yang, ed., in 2121). The First Emperor of Qin had a large enclosure, the Sheng Lu, described in Ban Gu in Jio. Xingfu fa. @R6O (Illustrated on the Western Capital); see Schafer, “Hunting parks and animal enclosures in ancient China,” 326 ff. M. E. Lewis, Slaughtered Victim in Early China (New York: State University of New York Press, 1990), 150—54, also discusses the hunting parks, Ban Gu’s description of the First Emperor’s park as a microcosm of the world, and various accounts of the Shang imperial hunting parks see his book Writing and Authority in Early China (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993). For Ban Gu’s version and other poems on imperial hunting, see Xiao Long’s Wei Yuan, juan 7, 8, and 9. On imperial hunting parks and post-Shang hunting park lore, see also Roel Sterckx, The animal and the divine in Early China (Albany: Shang, Han, and the Dynastic Succession in China (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), 165—83.
515 See the references in the preceding note.

516 It is sometimes suggested (on the basis of oracle bone inscriptions describing the driving of animals from three directions, such as Hiji 20979, 111, cited under zhao above [3.2.2]) that the Shang shared the “sacrificial” ideology expressed in the ji (“wang zhao”), i.e., large (1085, trans.: ll.25), prohibiting hunting in the breeding season. The evidence in the ji is very vague and in any case, there is little evidence that the Shang shared the personification of wild animals (see also note 290). But as noted above [3.2.5], there is little evidence that the Shang treated any such restrictions. The ideology of observing nature’s cycles seen in the ji represents an imperial approach to the management of the wild world after it has been conquered. Such a goal was not conceivable in the world inhabited by the Shang hunter-kings.
517 See Knechtel, The Ancestral Landscape, 107 n. 33, citing estimates made by Song Zhenhao.
518 Manumay have been produced and spread precisely since it was no longer only ritual specialists such as those kept by the Shang king, who made the divinations (E. Shaughnessy, personal communication).
519 As several scholars have noted, later texts (late Zhou, Han or later) do not unquestionably associate the oracle bone inscriptions of the Shang. This ignorance in itself suggests a gap in the record, as well as of how Shang divination must have been a very restricted activity, confined to the court (the Shang court, as well as other courts, such as the earlier Zhou, from which there also are divination records). The decline may also have involved a decline in the use of plants, such as millet).
finally (with the end of the Western Zhou) the disintegration of centralized kingship as known during the Shang and the Zhou. With the disease of animals as media for divination, incipient kingship based in mediation of the "wild" also disappeared. In this regard there is, curiously, evidence that such natural media was once believed to have the power of fending off dangerous wild animals and poisonous plants: the chapter on the history of divination in the Han dynasty Shiji 史记 says that in Jiangnan 江南 area south of the Yangtze River, where tortoises serve as oracles and divinatory milfoil grows, "among the animals there are no tigers or wolves, and among the grasses, there are no poisonous weeds."(20) Another powerful indication of the nature of the divinatory media, i.e. as intermediary between the domesticated and the wild, in itself helped master the threatening wildlife.

The disappearance of this intense relationship to the wild relates to the changes that occurred as the whole East Asian world was engulfed by imperial rule. Arbitration through divination and Shang-style itinerant challenge to the wild was no longer needed. The formation of large armies and improvements in weapons technology may have further accelerated the extermination of wild animals on the northern Chinese plains—to the point that in time, the imperial hunting parks probably very early on turned into refuges for the threatened fauna. The landscape evidently still teemed with wildlife in Shang times but successively became inhabited by not much more than the emperor and his subjects (plus the barbarians characteristically located beyond the pale of the realm): no wild life, only tame animals.

5.7 The Chinese archaic state and the hunting-king in comparative perspective

The tremendous potential for further investigation of the Shang royal hunt, using the perspective developed here on the emerging king as an arbiter-conqueror in motion, will help reveal more clearly a state-building device characteristic, if not crucial, to a family of social formations gathered under the name of "the archaic state." Proponents of various general theories of state formation have suggested different factors such as agrarianization through trade, warfare, control over irrigation systems, etc. as the most important motivating factors behind the development of state polities, but there will always be many interacting factors, entering into play in a dynamic process. (21) The search for isolated "prime movers" in the complex processes of state formation has thus been largely abandoned, as a futile project. Nevertheless, the phenomenon of the royal hunt should be regarded as one highly important aspect. It is perhaps as a valuable window on the changes in the relationship between human society and the larger natural world within the larger processes of state formation that the study of the Shang royal hunt has its strongest appeal, and this is where the present study of incipient or archaic states in ancient East Asia connects with the larger, modern project of attempting to understand the emergence of the state as such—that is, violence monopolies emerging where there were none before.

East Asia is conspicuously absent from much of the international scholarly discussion of state formation, (22) so is the royal hunt. Whenever the archaic Shang state is brought into comparative discussions, the concern often remains focused on the search for grounds for classification and definition (city state or territorial state, etc.), which risks underpinning essentialist assumptions that Shang "civilization" in its basic essential characteristics was static and unchanging—rather than seizing upon the transformational dynamics revealed in the royal hunt, and similar processes, and inserting the investigations of the Shang state into the study of state formation as socio-political transformation. (23)

There are actually a number of intriguing parallels worldwide to the royal hunt of the Shang, and to the sanitized imperial hunting of later periods in China. Comparative data abound on "hunting" as a close, nearly inseparable kin of "war," and in this capacity as a prominent tool of early state-building. Examples of agrarianizing kings seizing upon the hunt and using it for their own "higher" purposes can be found in ancient India, in the ancient Near East and the Mediterranean world, as well as in the Americas, including in the pre-Inca Moche culture of northern Peru. (24)

520 Simu Qian, 史记, chapter 128 ("Guizhe ce bie zhan"), 3252 (note that this is recorded in the Han dynasty, i.e. long after the demise of the Shang).


522 See, as one example, Feinman and Marcus, eds., Archaic states.

523 See, for one recent, admirable effort to link the description of the Shang state with general research in this field, which suffers from some of these problems, see Bruce C. Trigger, "Shang political organization: A comparative approach," Journal of East Asian Archaeology 1.1-4 (1999), 43-62.

These significant parallels can help us relate the Shang phenomenon to the general problems of the emergence of kingship and archaic states as such. These emerging states, too, were largely dependent on agriculture, “already” in the midst of a process of devouring and annihilating the surrounding wilderness, leaving hunting behind as a source of everyday subsistence but often continuing and ritualizing it in ways not unlike the Shang royal obsession with hunting. The hunting of wild animals—and of those people that the archaic kings chose to designate as “wild” people, or barbarians—served as the means of incorporation and domestication of the entire range of living things, using the wild as a lever of state formation. Obviously, it was not just in East Asia that the state first rose from blood-stained fields.
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Table 1: General overview of the distribution and use of the remains of wild and domestic animals and people in Shang archaeological contexts at Anyang.

"Not found" indicates absence (baring new discoveries). Frequency is indicated roughly, as Not found. Rare/Exotic. Present (but frequency unknown). Occasional, or Frequent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species or type / Archaeological context</th>
<th>&quot;Ash&quot; pits (waste or storage pits)</th>
<th>Low-status burials (Shang commoners)</th>
<th>Medium-status burials (Shang managers, aristocrats, etc.)</th>
<th>High-status burials (Shang kings &amp; family)</th>
<th>Sacrificial pits (non-burial, or as accompaniment of human offerings)</th>
<th>Chariot burials (a special form of sacrificial pit)</th>
<th>Bone &amp; antler workshop sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wild animals</td>
<td>Frequently, gen. fragmented, mix.</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found, apart from exotic finds</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Only deer (along w. cattle, a major material source)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer (possibly semi-domesticated)</td>
<td>Frequently, fragmented &amp; occasional</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Occasionally in tomb fill (?), in rare cases as offering</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Frequent (antlers and bone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo/wild cattle (possibly in process of domestication)</td>
<td>Frequently, fragments &amp; occasional</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Occasionally in tomb fill (?), in rare cases as offering</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiger &amp; leopard</td>
<td>Yes, fragments, occasional</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turtle</td>
<td>Frequently, as fragments or caches</td>
<td>Occasional fragments</td>
<td>Occasional, also (rarely) in situ, carapaces</td>
<td>Occasional, in tomb fill, etc.</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monkey</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodents</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild birds</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Rare*, including falconers/garbage hunters' tools</td>
<td>Not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mollusc shells</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>Occasional, also (rarely)</td>
<td>Exotic</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whale</td>
<td>Exotic (once)</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Exotic</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tain</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant</td>
<td>Exotic</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Exotic, once w. human caretaker</td>
<td>Not found, but not found (ivory carving practice)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type or species / Archaeological context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Ash&quot; pits (waste or storage pits)</th>
<th>Low-status burials (Shang commoners)</th>
<th>Medium-status burials (Shang managers, aristocrats, etc.)</th>
<th>High-status burials (Shang kings &amp; family)</th>
<th>Sacrificial pits (non-burial, or as accompaniment of high-status burials)</th>
<th>Chariot burials (a special form of sacrificial pit)</th>
<th>Bone &amp; antler workshop sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humans</td>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>Occasional, also (rarely)</td>
<td>Large numbers, either intact or mutilated (i.e., enslaved 'Qiang' captives/slaves)</td>
<td>Large numbers, often mutilated (enrolled 'Qiang' captives/slaves)</td>
<td>Charioteers, buried with their horses and chariots</td>
<td>(Reported from beyond Anyang, at Zhengzhou, incl. human skulls)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic animals</td>
<td>Frequent, often fragmented, mixed (never with wild animals, apart from turtle and fish remains)</td>
<td>Frequent, and exclusive (nevers with wild animals), plus humans</td>
<td>Frequent; exclusive (never with wild animals), plus humans</td>
<td>Frequent; exclusive (never with wild animals), plus humans</td>
<td>Frequent; exclusive (never with wild animals, often along with humans)</td>
<td>Frequent; exclusive (never with wild animals, often along with humans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog</td>
<td>Frequent, as fragments</td>
<td>Frequent (one or several whole animals)</td>
<td>Frequent (one or several whole animals)</td>
<td>Frequent (one or several whole animals)</td>
<td>Frequent (one or several whole animals)</td>
<td>Frequent (one or several whole animals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig (mixed with wild boar?)</td>
<td>Frequent, as fragments (incl. as limb offerings)</td>
<td>Frequent (one or several whole animals)</td>
<td>Frequent (one or several whole animals)</td>
<td>Frequent (one or several whole animals)</td>
<td>Frequent (one or several whole animals)</td>
<td>Frequent (one or several whole animals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>Frequent, as fragments (incl. as limb offerings)</td>
<td>Frequent (one or several whole animals)</td>
<td>Frequent (one or several whole animals)</td>
<td>Frequent (one or several whole animals)</td>
<td>Frequent (one or several whole animals)</td>
<td>Frequent (one or several whole animals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep (or goat, generally not distinguished)</td>
<td>Frequent, as fragments (incl. as limb offerings)</td>
<td>Frequent (one or several whole animals)</td>
<td>Frequent (one or several whole animals)</td>
<td>Frequent (one or several whole animals)</td>
<td>Frequent (one or several whole animals)</td>
<td>Frequent (one or several whole animals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicken</td>
<td>Occasional, as fragments (incl. as limb offerings)</td>
<td>Frequent (one or several whole animals)</td>
<td>Frequent (one or several whole animals)</td>
<td>Frequent (one or several whole animals)</td>
<td>Frequent (one or several whole animals)</td>
<td>Frequent (one or several whole animals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td>Not found</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. One exception is the collections of exotic animals discovered at Xibeogang, perhaps royal "pet cemeteries," or a unique form of sacrificial pits.
2. Several different whale bones may have come from one single animal, thus the whale was a highly exotic import.
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