

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 簋 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 𠄎; 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.

In analyzing the inscription Si (Hou 后) Tu Mu Gui, one possible interpretation is that Tu Mu was the cognomen (Zi 字) of Fu Hao; another, is that it referred to a person close to Fu Hao in position. The inscription can be explained as Tu Mu, whose day name was Gui, or Mu Gui, whose name was Tu. She may have been another queen of Wu Ding, perhaps the Mu Gui sacrificed to in the Zu Geng and Zu Jia inscriptions, i.e., the Bi Gui who was the legitimate consort of Wu Ding in the Di Yi and Di Xin cyclical sacrifice records. Assuming this hypothesis is correct, then objects belonging to consorts Bi Xin and Bi Gui of Wu Ding have already been discovered. Since the discovery of the Fu Hao tomb, some scholars have put forth the theory that Mu Wu 毋戊 mentioned on the large inscribed Si Mu Wu ding-tripod may be Wu Ding's consort, Bi Wu. If the conclusions reached above can be established, then ritual bronze vessels belonging to all three of Wu Ding's consorts have been discovered. This fact is significant both for the study of the Shang ritual system and of the ritual bronzes.

Zheng Zhenxiang in introducing her paper used some slides showing the inscriptions from M5. Some of the bronzes had only recently been repaired and had not been included in the official report. It is worth noting that Zheng pronounced the character 𠄎 as qiao, not tu as did the majority of the participants.

*11. ZHANG ZHENGLANG (Institute of History, Peking)
A BRIEF DISCUSSION ON FU HAO

ABSTRACT:

(N.B. A version of this paper has now been published in Kaogu 1983.6:537-41.)

Fu Hao 婦好 (or Fu Zi 婦字) appears in the oracle-bone inscriptions from Anyang. The name is often seen in Period I inscriptions (from the time of Wu Ding) and occasionally in Period IV inscriptions (from the time of Wu Yi and Wen Ding). The two are separated by four kings (Zu Geng, Zu Jia, Lin Xin, and Kang Ding), perhaps by as much as one hundred years. Does the Fu Hao in both periods refer to the same person? How can we explain this phenomenon?

In the oracle-bone records of people and their activities there are cases where one figure is active in different periods. These names are often also place names, and these figures possess a populace and products. These names are probably what is termed "Clan-Territory titles" 國氏土地之号 (a term found in the Gu shi kao, as quoted in the "Zheng yi" 正義 commentary to the Zuo zhuan