

Shang title Ssu 司 applied to "mothers of heirs," and that the original meaning of Ssu 司 was close in meaning to ssu 嗣, 似, "heir," "to inherit," and thus not very different in dynastic connotations from the Shang surname Tzu (子, 女).

Virginia Kane indicated in her verbal introduction that, since her art-historical reasons for dating M5 to Period IV were well-covered in her paper, she would mention again only her epigraphic arguments.

*9. CHANG PING-CH'ÜAN (Institute of History and Philology, Taipei)
ON THE FU HAO INSCRIPTIONS

ABSTRACT: Both the paper and the author's presentation.

The paper deals with the oracle-bone inscriptions referring to Fu Hao (or Zi), indirectly addressing the question whether this Fu Hao is the same person as the one mentioned in the bronze inscriptions from M5 at Anyang. The combined researches of Shima Kunio and Yen I-p'ing have already established that all but one of the 262 Fu Zi oracle inscriptions so far known are from Tung Tso-pin's Period I. The only doubtful instance remaining is Jiabian 668, dated by Shima to Tung's Period IV. The main reason for this dating was the shape of the graph used for the character wu 午. On Jiabian 668, this graph is rendered as 𠂇, whereas according to the received opinion it should, in Period I, have been 丨, or 𠂇. Chang Ping-ch'üan, however, had also observed the graph 𠂇 in Period I oracle bones. Therefore he agreed with Hu Houxuan's opinion that Jiabian 668 ought to date from Period I. Among Tung Tso-pin's criteria for dating oracle bones, calligraphic style was decidedly the weakest, and it should not be made the basis for far-reaching arguments.

There is a logical flaw in dating Jiabian 668 to Period IV and at the same time assuming that Fu Hao was Wu Ding's consort. Neither Wu Yi nor Wenwu Ding could have referred to her as fu 婦, but would have had to address her as mu 母, or bi 妣, or gaobi 高妣. Yen-I-p'ing's hypothesis that Jiabian 668 was inscribed when Fu Hao had already long been dead did not take this into account.

Furthermore, neither Wu Yi nor Wenwu Ding had a Xin 辛 consort; Kang Ding did, but this reign was very short, and the richness of grave goods in M5 seem to suggest a longer period of production and accumulation.

For these reasons: (1) if Jiabian 668 does date from Period IV, then its Fu Hao and the Period I Fu Hao must be two distinct persons. (2) More probably, however, all oracle-bone inscriptions mentioning Fu Hao should be dated to Period I, and only one Fu Hao ever appeared

in the divinatory record. (3) If there was only one Fu Hao it should be to this Period I person that the M5 bronzes were dedicated. (4) On the other hand, if M5 dates from later than Period I, the oracle-bone inscriptions about Fu Hao -- and especially Jiabian 668 -- cannot be used in cross-dating.

It did not matter to Chang whether one pronounced 婦好 as Fu Hao or as Fu Zi (Kane had vigorously pleaded for the latter alternative). However one reads it, 好 (zi or hao) was not a personal name, but a surname or a clan name. Its exact nature was as yet unclear to Chang, who thought it conceivable, however, that there might be a connection with a place name. Chang referred to an article by Zhang Zhenglang in Lishi jiaoxue, which he had only recently seen, where this matter had been touched upon; though on slightly different grounds of reasoning, Zhang's conclusions agreed with what Chang Ping-ch'üan had surmised in his 1967 article "Jiaguwen suo jian rendi tongmingkao."

*10. ZHENG ZHENXIANG (Institute of Archaeology, Peking)
THE SI-TU ("QIAO")-MU INSCRIPTIONS EXCAVATED FROM THE FU HAO TOMB

ABSTRACT:

(N.B. A version of this paper has now been published in Kaogu 1983.8:716-725.)

Of the bronze vessels discovered in 1976 when the Fu Hao tomb at Anyang was excavated, 190 were inscribed. The inscriptions were of 9 types. The most common, occurring on the most complete inventory of vessels, was the inscription Fu Hao (or Zi 字), found on 109 vessels. The next most common was the inscription Si Tu Mu 司土母, occurring on 26 ritual bronzes, including one pair each of the square hu-jars, round jia-tripods, and round zun-beakers, one set of 11 gu-goblets, and one set of 9 jue-beakers. There was also a pair of large square zun-beakers inscribed with 4 characters, one line containing the characters Si Tu Mu, all written backwards, the other containing the character gui 癸; including these there are 28 examples. The dating of these vessels is essentially the same as that of those vessels inscribed Fu Hao. It is very seldom that we find such a large number of vessels with the same inscription unearthed from the ritual bronze vessel horde of a single tomb. Bronzes with this inscription have been recorded since the Song dynasty and a bronze with this type of inscription was excavated from a Shang tomb at Xiaotun before liberation. There is also a bronze yue-axe with this inscription that currently exists. The study of this group of bronzes is very important.