



SESSION III: TOMB NUMBER FIVE AT ANYANG AND FU ZI

(Ed. Note: Given the close relationship in subject matter among these papers, the discussions are grouped together by topic and follow the abstract section.)

8. VIRGINIA KANE (University of Michigan)
ART HISTORICAL ISSUES ARISING FROM THE M5 BURIAL AT ANYANG

ABSTRACT:

This paper takes the position that the "late Wu Ting" or "Period II" dating for M5, now accepted by many scholars, cannot be reconciled with the advanced typological and stylistic qualities exhibited by so many of its bronze vessels, and that therefore the reading of the M5 bronze inscriptions 帚好 as "Fu Hao" and the viewing of this as the name of a single individual woman, the consort of Wu Ting, constitute a methodology which must be rejected. Instead, the inscriptions could be read as "Fu Tzu," with Tzu (好) recognized as the feminization of the Shang surname Tzu (子). Since this name would have been inherited by all daughters of the Tzu clan, there would have been at any one time a sizable number of royal women of various ages appropriately titled "Fu Tzu" (婦好); and the necessity of identifying the Fu Tzu of the M5 inscriptions only with a woman named in the Wu Ting oracle bones can be eliminated. It is, moreover, likely that even in the Wu Ting oracle-bone inscriptions the references to "Fu Tzu" actually concerned several different ladies of the royal clan--daughters or aunts of the king, as well as consorts (the royal clan being endogamous).

In a section on "typological sequences," the ceramic and bronze formal sequences of the Anyang period are contrasted as manifestations of "slow happening" and "fast happening." An examination of the sequence of pottery chüeh, as shown in *Kaogu xuebao* 1979.1:110-111, takes note of the similarity between the chüeh of its Period III (group 3) and the chüeh from M5, and further observes the apparent chronological gap between the chüeh of group 3 and group 4 in Period III, which suggests that Period III ceramics are still too insufficiently known for the M5 chüeh to be consigned to Period II with any kind of final certainty.

The "fast happening" of Anyang bronze sequences is discussed in relation both to the possible pace of artistic creativity during the Wu Ting period and to the dramatic slowing of that pace during Period III and Period IV which could necessarily be the effect of a Period II dating for M5. In addition, the sequences of several M5 vessel-types--the tall chia, trumpet-mouth tsun, hu, p'ou, fang-lei, etc.--are examined in order to demonstrate that the systemic age of the M5 examples is invariably more advanced than the systemic age of counterparts from the other Period II burials considered to be contemporaneous with M5. This discrepancy in systemic ages strongly argues against the contemporaneity of M5 with M18, M17, M331, M238, etc.; and the advanced systemic age of the latest M5 vessel-types demands a dating for M5 at least two or three generations subsequent to Period II.

The third section of the paper considers the Ssu Mu Hsin (司母辛) and Ssu T'u Mu Kuei (司兔母癸) inscriptions from M5, concluding that no vessel carrying an ancestor dedication would have been interred in the tomb of the very person to whom it was dedicated, and therefore Fu Tzu cannot be the same woman as either Mu Hsin or T'u Mu Kuei. Both of these women would more logically be viewed as deceased female relatives of Fu Tzu to whom she performed sacrifices during her life and whom she likewise would have "entertained" in the spirit world after death. Since Mu Hsin may reasonably be identified as Pi Hsin (妣辛), the official consort of K'ang Ting and the mother of Wu I, the Fu Tzu of M5 could have been Wu I's sister, a daughter of Mu Hsin, or else she could have been a consort of Wu I, in which case Mu Hsin would have been her deceased "mother-in-law." Depending on one or the other of these alternatives, T'u Mu Kuei could have been the mother-in-law or the mother of Fu Tzu, with Tzu Shu Ch'üan (子束泉) either her husband or her brother. (Although these identifications are surely speculative, they seem at least as plausible as those speculations which would equate Fu Tzu with Mu Hsin and T'u Mu or would see T'u Mu Kuei as the second consort of Wu Ting.) If the M5 Fu Tzu was a consort of Wu I who predeceased that king, then she may have been the mother of Wen Wu Ting, who, when he succeeded his father on the throne, caused the Ssu Mu Wu (司母戊) fang-ting to be cast for her and installed in an offertory shrine erected over her grave.

Finally, the meaning of the character Ssu 司 in the Ssu Mu Hsin and Ssu T'u Mu/Kuei inscriptions is considered, with a consequent rejection of its interpretation either as Hou 后 or as Tz'u 祠. Instead, the evolution of Ssu 司 into Ssu 妣, traceable in Shang and Western Chou bronze inscriptions, is observed, and an attempt is made (admittedly conjectural) to suggest that Ssu 妣, the surname eventually attributed to the Hsia dynasty, may have originated in the

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