

City University of New York (CUNY)

CUNY Academic Works

Publications and Research

York College

2014

“Fu hao”, “fu hao”, “fuHao” or “fu Hao”? A cataloger’s navigation of an ancient Chinese woman’s name

Junli Diao
CUNY York College

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

More information about this work at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu/yc_pubs/228

Discover additional works at: <https://academicworks.cuny.edu>

This work is made publicly available by the City University of New York (CUNY).
Contact: AcademicWorks@cuny.edu

“Fu hao”, “fu hao”, “fuHao” or “fu Hao”? A cataloger’s navigation of an ancient Chinese woman’s name

Chinese language catalogers’ work is not only challenged by the revolution in cataloging standards and principles, but also by ancient Chinese names that emerged in archaeological discoveries and Chinese classic texts, which create a significant impact on records description and retrieval in terms of consistency and accuracy. This article takes an example of an ancient Chinese lady’s name that is inconsistently romanized and described in OCLC and attempts to explore the appropriate form in an authority record through the consulting both Western and Eastern scholarly practices. This article has a further investigation of the evolving history of pre-Qin Chinese names that are not addressed and exemplified in the Library of Congress Romanization Table. A revision of LC Chinese Romanization Table is suggested.

Keywords Chinese name, pre-Qin Chinese name, authority control, Chinese cataloger, romanization, romanization table, Fu Hao

INTRODUCTION

In 1991, Lau and Wang¹ concluded that the two fundamental difficulties in cataloging Chinese language materials came from the intricate nature of the Chinese characters and the variations of romanization standards. After Pinyin replaced Wade-Giles romanization scheme by the introduction of the Library of Congress Chinese Romanization Table in 1998, the lengthy and endless debate about the preference of romanization standards has been terminated, and, accordingly, variant romanization schemes are no longer a challenge for Chinese language catalogers. But the complex and evolving history of the Chinese language itself still adds to the problem of identification and romanization of Chinese personal names for the achievement of accurate and consistent bibliographic records in library systems. For instance, in OCLC, there are five different publications written in Chinese about a Chinese woman “婦好” (Traditional Chinese characters will be used below only until the appropriate romanization is justified) who lived during the Shang dynasty (1600-1046 B.C.). In the romanized title fields that are paired to the Chinese vernacular in bibliographic records, however, her name inconsistently appears in Pinyin as “fu hao” (#OCLC 70694259), “fuHao” (#OCLC 51791141), “Fuhao” (#OCLC 48819775), and “fu Hao” (#OCLC 17053253).

Given the fact that an increasing number of American libraries offer vernacular-based access to Chinese language resources, it may become less critical than it used to be to retrieve those

resources through the application of Pinyin romanization. For those library users who are not familiar with Chinese characters, however, romanization still serves as an alternative but important tool to retrieve the desired information and to read and understand bibliographic records. Name inconsistency appearing in titles not only causes users' confusion, but also creates a potential problem in library systems' indexes that may hinder users from finding, identifying and selecting the desired items. Therefore, from the point of view of quality in bibliographic control, to construct a clear, unambiguous and consistent romanization of “婦好” in the title field requires answers to these questions to be found:

1. Who was this woman?
2. How do both Western and Eastern scholars romanize this woman's name in their scholarly works?
3. Which one should be the correct romanization for this Chinese woman, “fu hao”, “fuHao”, “Fuhao”, or “fu Hao”? If none of them, what is the appropriate one and why?
4. If there is a necessity to establish a name heading for her in the Library of Congress Name Authority Files (LCNAF), what should be the preferred name as the authorized access point?
5. What are the possible reasons causing the varied romanization of this woman's name in bibliographic records?
6. Did Chinese people, like this woman, living in the Shang dynasty have the same naming convention as they do today? Is it reasonable for the library community to apply current Chinese naming conventions in bibliographic descriptions to those people who lived thousands of years ago?
7. Does the LC Chinese Romanization Table give any guidance and examples of those ancient Chinese names for catalogers to follow? If not, what improvement should be made?

In order to answer these questions, this paper will begin with revealing the myth of this Chinese woman “婦好”. Then the focus will be given to the exploration of contextual and historical information behind the name “婦好” through the consultation of scholarly works about her in both Western and Eastern academia to justify the appropriate romanized form of “婦好”. The discussion will be extended from this particular name to a group of ancient Chinese personal names—pre-Qin Chinese names—that are inconsistently romanized in OCLC bibliographic records. The causes of their varied romanization in OCLC bibliographic records will be discussed and tentative suggestions to improve the LC Chinese Romanization Table will be provided.

Looking at the complexity of ancient Chinese names, this paper tends not to provide definitive solutions, but to initiate an open platform for Chinese language catalogers to discuss and navigate the complicated relations between those ancient Chinese names and their background. It should help catalogers raise their awareness and sensitivity to those names while creating bibliographic or authority records.

WHO IS “婦好”?

In 1976, a Shang dynasty tomb was excavated in Anyang City, Henan Province, which attracted international attention and was considered one of the greatest archaeological discoveries after the

People's Republic of China was established in 1949. The Shang dynasty was a formative period of Chinese civilization during which the early Chinese people had swept the dust off the Late Neolithic potteries and bathed in the dazzling light of the Bronze Age. The numbers, varieties, and sophistication of the unearthed bronze and jade objects astonished archaeologists and historians. Many objects in this tomb, especially a bronze axe weighing nine kilograms and engraved with mysterious and sophisticated decoration, demonstrate the unparalleled status and power of its owner. Based on the analysis of the tomb objects and the inscriptions in bronze vessels by archaeologists and historians, “婦好” (See Figure 1) was proved to be the owner, one of the consorts of the 23rd King 武丁 (Wu Ding) (1250-1192B.C.) in the late Shang dynasty.

The starting point of Chinese civilization is still controversial, however, both Western and Eastern archaeologists and historians agree that the Shang dynasty is the first one that has left behind the concrete written records—oracle bone inscriptions and other crucial and massive archaeological evidences that can prove its existence to the world.² Oracle bone inscriptions carved on turtle shells or ox and other animal bones are the earliest form of Chinese writing. They were done shortly after the moment of divination by the Shang kings and diviners to make predictions about the future through observing the shape and direction of the cracks. Questions raised by the kings included military activities, astronomical events, weather, medicine, birth, marriage, field hunting, ritual ceremony, and disasters. The name “婦好” also frequently appears in oracle bone inscriptions that show the King 武丁 (Wu Ding)'s concern for her well-being. According to oracle bone inscriptions, “婦好” took the lead in military operations and triumphed over small states to the north of the Shang; held ritual services to worship ancestors; and assisted royal affairs at the Shang court.³ After this elite woman died, the King 武丁 (Wu Ding) constructed this tomb near the palace compound at the capital settlement of the Shang dynasty.

“婦好” is known to both Western and Eastern scholars mainly through archaeological and inscriptional data. The tomb of “婦好” is one of the major sources used to study the social, political and ethnographic aspects of the Shang dynasty. Therefore, to comprehend the real meaning of “婦好” and to construct a clear romanized name in bibliographic records that make sense to library users in accordance with cataloging rules, scholarly practices regarding “婦好” in publications from both Western and Eastern historians, archaeologists and other experts in related field are the means to solve the problem of the name variations in OCLC bibliographic records. The reason is threefold. First, the rules of cataloging, such as choice of access points and authorship, grew out of and were intimately influenced by the tradition of Western scholarly practices. Second, LC has a tradition and preference that the name headings in authority files come from English reference resources and are commonly known to Westerners instead of Chinese, for instance, Confucius and Mencius, which have been firmly integrated into English vocabulary. Third, scholars have better knowledge of linguistic context and the historical background associated with this name.

“婦好” IN WESTERN AND EASTERN SCHOLAR PRACTICES

“婦好” romanized as “Fu Hao” by Western Scholars

In the research publications by early Chinese studies experts in Western academia, “婦好” is romanized as “Fu Hao”, neither “fu hao”, “fuHao”, “Fuhao”, nor “fu Hao”, as it appears in

OCLC records. David Keightley's works can be taken as a typical example. Major⁴, an independent scholar specializing in Chinese intellectual history, considered that "David Keightley has made a brilliant career of interpreting this evidence. It is hard to remember a time when he was not the West's foremost scholar of oracle bones, and its most persuasive interpreter of the era that produced them." In Keightley's book *Sources of Shang History: The Oracle-Bone Inscriptions of Bronze Age China* and other research articles, "婦好" is frequently and consistently romanized as "Fu Hao" when he is interpreting oracle bone inscriptions. For example, Keightley⁵ interpreted "貞：王夢婦好不其孽" as "Divined: 'That the king dreamed of Fu Hao does not mean that there will be harm'" (41). Keightley⁶ interpreted "乙酉卜殼貞：呼婦好先登人于龐" as "Crack-making on yiyou (day 22), Que divined: 'Call upon Fu Hao to first raise men at Pang'". Another well-known archaeologist and sinologist, Kwang-Chih Chang, in his book *Shang Civilization* used "Fu Hao", too.⁷ In research works by other prominent American scholars studying the origin of Chinese civilization, such as Campbell et al.,⁸ Chang,⁹ and Watson,¹⁰ the consistent romanization of "Fu Hao" can be found. Scholars focusing on East Asian studies in Europe, such as Li,¹¹ also used "Fu Hao" while describing the myth of the Shang dynasty.

"婦好" interpreted as "Lady Hao" by Western Scholars

Another interesting and significant expression of "婦好" in Keightley and other Western scholars' works is a combination of both the English translation of "婦" and Chinese Romanization of "好". "婦", itself, literarily means woman and is idiomatically translated into English counterpart "Lady" and "好" is romanized as "Hao". "婦好" becomes "Lady Hao". Keightley¹² interpreted "甲申卜殼貞：婦好媿不其嘉。三旬又一日甲寅媿允不嘉佳女" (See Figure 2) as "Crack-making on jiashen (day 21), Que divined: 'Lady Hao's childbearing might not be good.' (After) thirty-one days, on jiayin (day 51), she gave birth; it really was not good; it was a girl". Djamouri¹³ used "Dame Hao aura un fils" when he was interpreting oracle bone inscription "婦好有子".

It has been accepted by archaeologists, historians, and experts in the related field that "婦" in the Shang dynasty is the appellation owned by a group/class of royal ladies who were enfeoffed with lands and had considerable power in the Shang court and significant status in the ritual system.¹⁴ The characters after "婦" represent the name of the clan from which those women originally came. Chen¹⁵ calculated that 94 ladies were graced with the title "婦" in oracle bone inscriptions, such as "婦媿" (Fu Nuan), "婦喜" (Fu Xi), "婦姘" (Fu Jing), and "婦鼠" (Fu Shu). As it is well-known in Western culture, "Lady" with capitalized letter "L" is a courtesy title for women to indicate their social class or status. "Our Lady" or "Notre Dame" is for "Virgin Mary" and "First Lady" is for the wife of the elected president. That "婦" is interpreted as "Lady" clearly addresses the special social status of this group of royal women in the Shang dynasty. This is a very simple, accurate and objective expression that carries the meaning and the tone of the original text in oracle bone inscriptions. Meanwhile, it still conveys contextual, cultural and historical sensitivity and appropriateness to both Western and Eastern audiences.

"婦好" romanized as "Fu Hao" and interpreted as "Lady Hao" in publications in mainland China

A few books and a significant number of research articles by scholars in Mainland China are written and published in Chinese with the attempt to uncover the mystery and legend of this royal lady, but only a few in English. The archaeological report “殷墟婦好墓” (*Yinxu Fu Hao Mu*) has an English abstract, in which “婦好”, however, is inconsistently romanized as “fu hao” and “Fu Hao”.¹⁶ It also has an English title which says *Tomb of Lady Hao at Yinxu in Anyang*¹⁷. Some articles published in China, mostly about her tomb or mural objects in the exhibitions, are written in English. These articles are considered having less academic and research value, but it is interesting to note that, “婦好” is romanized as “Fu Hao”, for instance in Feng,¹⁸ Huo,¹⁹ and Qian.²⁰

“婦好” romanized as “Fu-hao” by scholars from Taiwan

Very few research articles can be found, in which “婦好” is romanized as “Fu-hao”. Chou²¹ used “Fu-hao”, which indicates that this romanization practice is done in accordance with Wade-Giles scheme. Coincidentally, in both Pinyin and Wade-Gile scheme, “婦” is romanized as “Fu” and “好” as “Hao”. The difference is that the hyphen in Wade-Giles is used to separate syllables within a word, especially within one person’s given name, or to create grammatical linkage within a phrase.

The romanization of “婦好” in both Western and Eastern scholarly works should be the result of a careful attention to contextual and historical background of this ancient Chinese woman. It seems that both Western and Eastern scholars give their preference to “Fu Hao” as the romanized name and “Lady Hao” as the interpreted name of “婦好”. “婦” (Fu) is not a surname understood in a contemporary sense, but a title which indicated the position that this group of aristocratic women held in the Shang court. The characters following after “婦” (Fu), such as “好” (Hao), “姁” (Nuan), “喜” (Xi), and “姘” (Jing), are not given names but the clan names which relates to the names of the states that they came from or the signs of matriarchal lineage they bore before marriage. There is debate among some scholars, such as Chang,²² Childs-Johnson,²³ and Keightley,²⁴ that “好” might be pronounced as “Zi” in Pinyin or “Tzu” in Wade-Giles, not “Hao”. This is beyond the scope of this article but still is an arguable topic for scholars specializing in Chinese paleography.

If “Fu Hao” is the proper romanization of “婦好”, how should the name heading be entered in LCNAF, “Fu Hao” or “Hao, Fu” by following Western naming convention after modern Chinese names are romanized? The modern Chinese naming convention came into being during the Qin dynasty (221B.C.-206A.D.) and reached its maturity during the Han dynasty (221B.C. – 220A.D.).²⁵ When establishing the name heading in LCNAF, is it appropriate for Chinese catalogers to apply modern Chinese naming convention, as guided by LC Chinese Romanization Table, to those names, for instance, “婦好” (Fu Hao), existing before the Qin dynasty? What do research articles by archaeologists, historians or experts specializing in early Chinese history and civilization say about the pre-Qin Chinese names?

AUTHORITY RECORD FOR “婦好”

In OCLC, each of the five different titles written about “婦好” (Fu Hao) or the tomb of “婦好” (Fu Hao) has a significant number of holdings from global libraries attached. It is unfortunate

that none of these publications has been assigned with a specific name heading for this royal woman, through which they can be grouped together and retrieved by users with one single name search. For example, the archaeological report titled “殷墟婦好墓” (*Yinxu Fu Hao Mu*) published in 1980 has three duplicated records with a total of 49 libraries’ holdings attached, but none of them bears a name heading for “婦好” (Fu Hao). Therefore, the absence of a specific name heading for “婦好” (Fu Hao) in bibliographic records generates a strong need for the establishment of a name authority record in the LCNAF.

Based on the investigation of contextual and historical background of “婦好” (Fu Hao), “Fu Hao” should be used as the authorized heading that enters in the 100 field in the authority record. Usually romanized Chinese names in authority records adopt the Western practice in which a surname goes before a given name and is followed by a comma. In this case, however, there should be no comma “,” used in between them since 婦 (Fu) is neither the surname, nor 好 (Hao) the given name. Both the archaeological report “殷墟婦好墓” (*Yinxu Fu Hao Mu*) and Keightley’s research articles should be considered and included as the sources in 670 fields to justify the statement where the right name information comes from. This archaeological report also says that “婦好” (Fu Hao) died during the ruling time of the 23rd King 武丁 (Wu Ding) (1250-1192 B.C.).²⁶ Based on the above information, the 100 field should include the subfield “|d before 1192 B.C.”, which will also indicate the time she lived and help differentiate her from other Chinese names which have the same pronunciation, for example record nr 96032386 in LCNAF. “Lady Hao” should be considered a helpful cross reference since it appears in the English title page of “殷墟婦好墓” (*Yinxu Fu Hao Mu*), its abstract in English, and Keightley and other scholar’s articles, too. Plus Wade-Giles romanization, names in both simplified and traditional Chinese characters, the authority record for “婦好” should be roughly like:

100 0 Fu Hao, |d before 1192 B.C.

400 0 Lady Hao, |d before 1192 B.C.

400 0 Fu-hao, |d before 1192 B.C.

400 0 婦好, |d before 1192 B.C.

400 0 妇好, |d before 1192 B.C.

OTHER PRE-QIN CHINESE NAMES

The pre-Qin Chinese names in Chinese classic texts or oracle bone inscriptions and bronze vessels inscriptions have their own peculiarities in terms of practice, meaning, and structure. These peculiarities require catalogers’ acknowledgement and comprehension of the contextual and historical background in which these names are used. Here, a few pre-Qin Chinese names, which frequently appear in titles but are inconsistently romanized in OCLC, are chosen as examples.

1. “孟姜女” should be romanized as “Meng Jiang nü”, not as “meng jiang nu” (#OCLC 861918222), Meng Jiangnu (#OCLC 298418108), nor “Mengjiangnu” (#OCLC 848307696). “孟姜女” (Meng Jiang nü) does not exist in Chinese history as a real person, but is a legendary character in the Qin dynasty. It was said that her husband was drafted to build the Great Wall by the emperor, but died of the unbearable labor and was buried with others in the wall. She heard nothing from her husband since he left home, so she came to the Great Wall and looked for him. At this bad news, she burst into howling,

which made a section of the Great Wall collapse. It can be easily misunderstood that “孟” (Meng) is her surname and “姜女” (Jiangnü) is her given name, since “孟” (Meng) is a very commonly used Chinese surname nowadays. Bao²⁷ corrected this misunderstanding by noting that during pre-Qin period, “姜” (Jiang) is considered as a clan name and “孟” (Meng) is a special term used to describe the age sequence of siblings, meaning “the first” or “the oldest”. “孟姜女” (Meng Jiang nü) literally means “The first daughter of Jiang”.

2. “曾侯乙” should be romanized as “Zeng hou Yi” (#OCLC 55656810), not as “zeng hou yi” (#OCLC 865748133), “Zeng Houyi” (#OCLC 84318102), nor “Zenghouyi” (#OCLC 730060513). “曾侯乙” (Zeng hou Yi) was a ruler of the state “曾” (Zeng) in the Warring State Period (476-221B.C.). He was a real person but left no trace in Chinese historical records, such as “史记” (*Shi Ji*) which is also known as “The Records of the Grand Historian” in English, or other Chinese classics until his tomb was excavated in 1978. “曾侯乙” is repeated 208 times among the inscriptions engraved on ritual and musical objects and weapons.²⁸ Archaeologists concluded in the report “曾侯乙墓” (*Zeng Hou Yi Mu*) that “曾” (Zeng) is the name of a small state which is subordinate to the Kingdom of “楚” (Chu) (1042-223B.C.). “侯” (Hou) is the name of aristocratic rank which is equivalent to “Marquis” in English, and “乙” (Yi) is his real name. This has also been suggested in the title of English abstract “Tomb of Marquis of State Zeng”.²⁹ An authority record has been created in LCNAF (n 81023725) as “Zeng, Yi, |c Hou, |d -433 B.C.” The comma used between “Zeng” and “Yi” is unnecessary, which may lead to the belief that “Zeng” is the surname.
3. “柳下惠” should be romanized as “Liuxia hui”, not as “Liu xia hui” (#OCLC 421441116), nor “Liu Xiahui” (#OCLC 854000881). He was an official who lived between 720B.C. and 621 B.C. and his life is briefly documented in Chinese classics. The famous Chinese idiom “坐怀不乱” (Zuo huai bu luan) describing the noble virtue of a male comes from his anecdote recorded in “毛诗·小雅·巷伯” (Mao shi·Xiao ya·Xiang bo).³⁰ He saved the life of a lady who was on the verge of dying by holding her in his arms without initiating any indecent physical moves that might jeopardize his own moral character. He was appointed as the governor of the “Liuxia region”³¹, which is located in Henan Province. After his death, he was given a posthumous title “惠” (Hui) in honor of his noble values. His real name is “展获” (Zhan Huo). “展” (Zhan) is the clan name; “获” (Huo) is his given name. The story makes him commonly known as “柳下惠” (Liuxia hui) rather than by his real name. With the passing of time, “柳下” (Liuxia) was abbreviated as “柳” (Liu), which eventually became a very popular Chinese surname.³² This might be the reason why catalogers take “柳” (Liu) as the surname and “下惠” (Xiahui) as the given name in title fields in OCLC bibliographic records. Thus “柳下惠” is inappropriately romanized as “Liu Xiahui”.
4. “商纣王” should be romanized as “Shang zhou wang”, not as “Shang Zhouwang” (#OCLC 42255476), “Shangzhou wang” (#OCLC 36806481), nor “shang zhou wang” (#OCLC 298514072). He was the last king of the Shang dynasty and his real name is “帝辛” (Di Xin) as it appears in oracle bone inscriptions, which is a method of

recording the royal lineage and genealogy by using ten sequential celestial stems. “纣王” (Zhou wang) is a derogatory term given to him by his rival “周文王” (Zhou wen wang) (1152-1056B.C.), who lived to the west but overthrew the Shang dynasty and built the West Zhou dynasty (1046-771B.C.). Therefore, rather than as “帝辛” (Di Xin), the last king of the Shang dynasty is better known to Chinese people as “商纣王” (Shang zhou wang) or “纣王” (Zhou wang) for short, which evolved into a common term to describe the cruelty, savagery and corruption of rulers. There has been a name heading established for him in LCNAF (nr 98032000) and the 100 field is entered under “Shang Zhouwang, |c Emperor of China, |d 1079 B.C.-1027 B.C.” According to the LC Chinese Romanization Table, titles or titles for royalty should be written in lower case and syllables should be separated. Therefore, “Shang zhou wang” should be the proper heading for “商纣王” in LCNAF. By the same token, “Zhou wen wang” should be the proper romanization for “周文王”, not as it appears in LCNAF (n 2006014490) “Zhou Wen wang |c Emperor of China” (n 2006014490) and “齐桓公” should be “Qi huan gong” not as “Qi Huan’gong, |d -643 B.C.” (n 99004209).

The analysis of the examples above suggests a few things that merit catalogers’ attention while constructing authority files for pre-Qin Chinese personal names:

1. Punctuation. Be cautious with the Western pattern of surnames first and given names last separated with a comma in name headings. After being romanized, Chinese personal names in authority files usually follow Western pattern by putting surnames before given names. Pre-Qin Chinese personal names have structures which are very different from modern Chinese names, especially names coming from archaeological discoveries of the Shang or the Zhou dynasty, or names appearing in pre-Qin Chinese classic texts.
2. Capitalization. Li³³ pointed out that pre-Qin Chinese personal names are intertwined with characters that indicates the sequence of siblings “伯” (Bo) or “孟” (Meng), “仲” (Zhong), “叔” (Shu), and “季” (Ji) and titles of royalty, nobility, and ranks of officials “候” (Hou), “公” (Gong), “王” (Wang), “士” (Shi), “卿” (Qing), “大夫” (Dai fu), “君” (Jun), “父” (Fu), “子” (Zi), “郎” (Lang) and “尹” (Yin). What distracts catalogers’ attention is that some of those characters are also used as very popular modern Chinese surnames which require capitalizations.

CAUSES FOR THE VARIATIONS OF PRE-QIN CHINESE NAMES IN BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORDS

The causes for the variations of the pre-Qin Chinese personal names in bibliographic records are complicated. They are largely due to the fact that those names originate from new archaeological discoveries in China or appear in Chinese classic texts. Names coming from the Shang dynasty, like “婦好” (Fu Hao), are often recent discoveries or little known to archaeologists and historians. Comprehending their real meaning requires certain knowledge of oracle bone inscriptions or bronze vessels inscriptions, which can be a challenge for scholars and experts in the related fields, let alone Chinese language catalogers.

Pre-Qin Chinese personal names, in most cases, appear only in the titles of publications and they do not have any association with authorship or editorship. In other words, those names are

not authors and they do not undertake any responsibility for the creation of the intellectual content of those publications. Therefore, it is possible that consistency was not at the forefront of catalogers' thinking and presumably it is neither a critical issue nor does it affect records retrieval in library databases. For catalogers, however, the supreme importance of consistency should be significantly related to all aspects of bibliographic description and control, so that cataloging records can be clearly understood by the library users. A further investigation of the contextual and historical information behind those names and a willingness to consult with experts or their scholarly practices should lead to appropriate romanization of those names in bibliographic records, which either shows great respect to historical facts or keeps in accordance with cataloging ethic codes. Hu³⁴ articulated that "a perfect solution to the many problems in entering Chinese names in American libraries will require the combined efforts of many experts ... [such problems] also exist in the entry of names in other languages, such as Japanese and Korean, which do not use a Latin alphabet."

A good knowledge of the evolving history of Chinese personal names prior to the Qin dynasty will help catalogers do a better job in bibliographic descriptions. Zhang³⁵ summarized three evolving stages of Chinese personal names during the pre-Qin period. Stage one is from a matriarchal society to the Five Legendary Emperors period, which ends in 2070B.C. This is the embryonic period of Chinese civilization. In this mythical rather than historical period, Chinese personal names, especially surnames, were conceived in the matriarchal clan signs or totems of ancient tribes for the achievement of group identity. Stage two is from the Xia dynasty (2070-1600B.C.) to the middle of the West Zhou dynasty (956-858B.C.), equal to from the Neolithic period to the Bronze Age from archaeologists' point of view. It is also a formative period of Chinese civilization. During this shift period, the Chinese writing system was developed and evolved in the forms of characters in oracle bones and inscriptions on bronze vessels.³⁶ Generally speaking, during this period, Chinese females primarily adopted "姓" (Xing), which is considered as a "clan name" or "matrilineal surname"³⁷ to indicate matrilineage or marital status; and Chinese males adopted "氏" (Shi), a "patrilineal surname"³⁸ designating their polity or enfeoffment granted by the kings or emperors. Both "姓" (Xing) and "氏" (Shi) were only held by the upper ruling classes or the privileged groups. Males had their matrilineal surname "姓" (Xing), too, but they preferred their "氏" (Shi) to be known by the public. For example, "曾侯乙" (Zeng hou Yi) has the clan name "姬" (Ji), which does not frequently appear in the bronze inscriptions. It is very appropriate to include his other lesser known name "姬乙" (Ji Yi) as a cross reference in the authority file. However, it is inappropriate to establish the little-known clan name as a heading but the better-known name in history as a cross reference. For instance, in authority record (n 81089523), the heading of a Chinese military strategist who lived in the transitional period from the Shang dynasty to the Zhou dynasty is established under his rarely-known patrilineal name "吕尚" (Lü Shang) rather than the name "姜子牙" (Jiang Ziya) which is better known to every Chinese household.

Stage three is from the middle of the West Zhou dynasty (956-858B.C.) to the Qin dynasty (221-206B.C.). During this period, matrilineage started to lose its popularity in the social structure and gradually gave way to patrilineage. This period was a turbulent and chaotic era in Chinese history, when old social systems and conventions collapsed or were tossed away. The power of the Zhou King was weakened by the increasing number of enfeoffments and its authority was threatened and fragmented by the growing satellite states. Technology was

innovated and productivity was increased. The heavy and dignified bronze axes exited the stage of history and the light and sharp iron swords came to the fore. Numerous wars made ruling classes lose their royalties and privileges, as well as their glorious “姓” (Xing) or “氏” (Shi). Grassroots leaders grabbed the opportunity to become new rulers and nobles and began to obtain “姓” (Xing) or “氏” (Shi) through their efforts, military merits and intelligence. Both “姓” (Xing) and “氏” (Shi) began to be used by common civilians and gradually lost its original function of indicating social status. When “姓” (Xing) and “氏” (Shi) were used interchangeably for family identity and the distinction between them had gradually diminished in the Han dynasty (206B.C.-220A.D.). That “姓” (Xing), with the composition of two radicles: “女” (Nü) on the left means women and “生” (Sheng) on the right means birth, naturally became the chosen Chinese character that indicates the meaning of surname is rooted in the fact that this character not only suggests a sense of aesthetical value, but also a touch of cultural complex for identity and origin of a family. Thus the pattern of surnames “姓” (Xing) first followed by given names “名” (Ming) became Chinese people’s naming convention since the Han dynasty, which has been adopted for thousands of years.

Romanization of Chinese personal names in general has been extensively researched in North American libraries for decades. A series of topics have been explored by librarians and linguistic experts, such as the debates on the preference of romanization schemes and related issues by Lu,³⁹ Studwell, Wang and Wu,⁴⁰ and Young,⁴¹; inclusion of vernacular scripts by Agenbroad;⁴² word segmentation by Arsenault,⁴³ and Nie and Ren;⁴⁴ difficulties in determining Chinese personal names by Hu,⁴⁵ Lau and Wang,⁴⁶ and Wang;⁴⁷ the challenges of Chinese names in English by Harrison;⁴⁸ and the Chinese names with a non-Chinese given name by Lin.⁴⁹ All these topics reflect the complexity and vitality of the Chinese language on the one hand and have enriched library literature through the discussion of its linguistic, cultural, and technical effects on library practice on the other. It is notable that the pre-Qin Chinese personal names were rarely mentioned and used as examples in those literatures and studies. Scarcity of library literature on the discussion of the pre-Qin Chinese personal names and the increasing availability of pre-Qin Chinese language materials in library systems present great complications and difficulties in cataloging.

PRE-QIN NAMES AND LC CHINESE ROMANIZATION TABLE

LC’s Chinese Romanization Table, based on standard national Chinese pronunciation principle “汉语拼音方案” (Han yu pin yin fang an),⁵⁰ serves as the guideline for Chinese language catalogers to construct romanized fields parallel to vernacular fields in bibliographic records or to establish name headings in authority files. However, there are no pre-Qin Chinese names included in this table and denoted as examples to demonstrate how they should be romanized properly.

This table is composed of Romanization, Separation of syllables, Connection of syllables, Capitalization, Punctuation, Dates and Correspondence of Wade-Giles to Pinyin. The major part of it, frequently consulted by catalogers, focuses on the discussion of syllable aggregation practice in personal, corporate, and geographic names, terms of address and titles of royalty. Plenty of examples supplied under each category to justify syllables aggregation and capitalization come from modern Chinese or contemporary context. Absence of the discussion and exclusion of examples of pre-Qin Chinese names in this table leaves a significant vacuum

area, the consequence of which is that there are no principles for catalogers to follow. This is the primary reason why inconsistent romanization of the pre-Qin Chinese names has been introduced into bibliographic records or authority files. Few revisions have been made to the LC Chinese Romanization Table since its adoption in 1998. A complete and comprehensive table which will integrate the pre-Qin Chinese names and provide special guidance for Chinese language catalogers to follow is needed. Failure to include the pre-Qin Chinese personal names in the LC Chinese Romanization Table makes the construction of access points for those names in authority files remain a complicated process.

CONCLUSION

It is no surprise, given the peculiar contextual and historic characteristics conveyed in the pre-Qin Chinese personal names, especially those ones emerging from modern archaeological excavations of the Shang or the Zhou dynasty, that it is not an easy job for Chinese language catalogers to distinguish and romanize those names in bibliographic description and authority control. Unfortunately, the current LC Chinese Romanization Table provides neither a clear guidance nor concrete examples for catalogers to follow. To identify the right form of those names requires catalogers' endeavor through interdisciplinary research or consultation with archaeologists, historians, and experts in related fields or by seeking information in their scholarly works. Without carefully analyzing the contextual and historical background of the pre-Qin Chinese personal names, catalogers may run the risk of inputting inaccurate or inconsistent romanization into bibliographic descriptions and authority files. To eliminate the anomalies from records, catalogers need the courage and caution to navigate those names in the contextual and historical minefield. This is just the beginning!

Notes:

-
- ¹ Shuk-fong Lau and Vicky Wang, “Chinese Personal Names and Titles: Problems in Cataloging and Retrieval,” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 13, no. 2 (1991): 45-65.
- ² David Keightley. *Sources of Shang History: the Oracle-Bone Inscriptions of Bronze Age China* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985)
- ³ Hung-hsiang Chou, “Fu-X Ladies of the Shang Dynasty,” *Monumenta Serica* 29, (1970-1971): 346-390.
- ⁴ John S. Major, “The Ancestral Landscape: Time, Space and Community in Late Shang China (ca. 1200-1045) (review),” *China Review International* 9, no. 2: 461.
- ⁵ David Keightley, “At the Binning: The Status of Women in Neolithic and Shang China,” *Nan Nü: Men, Women and Gender in Early and Imperial China 1*, no. 1 (1999): 41.
- ⁶ *Ibid.*, 32.
- ⁷ Kwang-Chih Chang . *Shang Civilization* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980), 87
- ⁸ Roderick B. Campbell, Zhipeng Li, Yuling He, and Yuan Jing, “Consumption, Exchange and Production at the Great Settlement Shang: Bone-Working at Tiesanlu, Anyang,” *Antiquity*, 85 (2011), 1279-1297.
- ⁹ Ping-ch’üan Chang, “A Brief Description of the Fu Hao Oracle Bone Inscriptions,” in *Studies of Shang Archaeology: Selected Papers from the International Conference on Shang Civilization*, edited by Chang Kwang-Chih (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), 121-140.
- ¹⁰ William Watson, *The Arts of China to A.D. 900*,” (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995)
- ¹¹ Jun Li. *Chinese Civilization in the Making, 1766-221BC* (New York: MacMillan Press, 1996)
- ¹² David Keightley, “The Diviners’ Notebooks: Shang Oracle-Bone Inscriptions as Secondary Sources,” in *Actes du Colloque International Commemorant le Centenaire de la Decouverte des Inscriptions sur os et Carapaces (Proceedings of the International Symposium in Commemoration of the Oracle-Bone Inscriptions Discovery)*, edited by Yau Shun-chiu and Chrystelle Marechal (Paris: Editions Langues Croises, 2001), 21.
- ¹³ Redouane Djamouri, “Etudes Grammaticales des Inscriptions Shang: Résultats Acquis,” in *Actes du Colloque International Commemorant le Centenaire de la Decouverte des Inscriptions sur os et Carapaces (Proceedings of the International Symposium in Commemoration of the Oracle-Bone Inscriptions Discovery)*, edited by Yau Shun-chiu and Chrystelle Marechal (Paris: Editions Langues Croises, 2001), 127.
- ¹⁴ Xie Chen. *Shang Zhou xing shi zhi du yan jiu* (Beijing: Shang wu yin shu guan chu ban, 2007)
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁶ Zhongguo she hui ke xue yuan yan jiu suo. *Yinxu Fu Hao mu* (Beijing: Wen wu chu ban she, 1980), 242.
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁸ Qu Feng, “Funeral with Jade Articles,” *Jin ri Liaoning*, 3 (2009): 59.
- ¹⁹ Jianying Huo, “Pieces of the Past: Tales from the Yin Ruins,” *China Today*, November (2006), 65.
- ²⁰ Wei Qian, “The Formative Period of Chinese Civilization (I): Chinese Cultural Property Exhibition Held in Italy,” *Chine & the World Culture Exchange* 1(2002): 25.
- ²¹ See 3 above.
- ²² Cheng-lang Chang , “A Brief Discussion of the Fu Tzu,” in *Studies of Shang Archaeology: Selected Papers from the International Conference on Shang Civilization*, edited by Chang Kwang-Chih (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), 103-119
- ²³ Elizabeth Childs-Johnson, “Fu Zi (Hao): Shang nu wu shi = Fu Zi: the Shang Woman Warrior,” in *The Fourth International Conference on Chinese Paleography [ICCP]*, the Chinese University of Hong Kong, October 15-17, 2003, <http://echildsjohnson.files.wordpress.com/2012/02/fu-zi-e5a9a6e5ad90efbc88e5a5bdfbc89.pdf>. (accessed on January 5, 2014).
- ²⁴ David Keightley, email message to author, October 25, 2013.
- ²⁵ Shenghui Wu. *Zhong hua sing shi da dian*. (Shijiazhuang: Hebei ren min chu ban she, 2011)
- ²⁶ See 16 above, 228.
- ²⁷ Ximing Bao, “Gu jin xing shi qian tan,” *Yin du xue kan* 2, 1996: 52-54.
- ²⁸ Hubei Sheng bow u guan, *Zeng Hou Yi mu* (Beijing: Wen wu chu ban she, 1989).
- ²⁹ *Ibid.*, 684.
- ³⁰ Shaohou Zhu, “Liu xing shi zu Liu xia hui,” *Xun gen = Root Exploration*, 2 (2013): 120-126.
- ³¹ *Ibid.*, 122.
- ³² *Ibid.*, 122
- ³³ Xueqin Li, “Xian Qin ren ming de ji ge wen ti,” *Li Shi Yan Jiu* 5 (1995): 106-111.

-
- ³⁴ Jiajian Hu, "Transactional Analysis: Problems in Cataloging Chinese Names," *Illinois Libraries* 82, no.4 (2000): 258.
- ³⁵ Fuxiang Zhang, "Zhongguo shang gu xing zu zhi du yan jiu," *Journal of Nanjing University (Philosophy, Humanities and Social Sciences)*, no. 1 (2013): 75-92.
- ³⁶ David Keightley, "Art, Ancestors, and the Origins of Writing in China," *Representations* 56, fall (1996): 68-95.
- ³⁷ See 14 above, 25.
- ³⁸ Ibid.
- ³⁹ Suping Lu, S. (1996). "A Study on the Chinese Romanization Standard in Libraries," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 21, no. 1 (1996): 81-96.
- ⁴⁰ William E. Studwell, Rui Wang, and Hong Wu, "A tale of Two Decades: the Controversy over the Choice of a Chinese Language Romanization System in American Cataloging Practice," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 18, no. 1 (1993): 117-125.
- ⁴¹ Joann S. Young, "Chinese Romanization Change," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 15, no. 2 (1992): 15-35.
- ⁴² James E. Agenbroad, "Romanization is not Enough," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 42, no. 2 (2006): 21-34.
- ⁴³ Clément Arsenault, "Word Division in the Transcription of Chinese Script in the Title Fields of Bibliographic Records," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 32, no. 3(2001): 109-137.
- ⁴⁴ Jian-yun Nie and Fuji Ren, "Chinese Information Retrieval: Using Characters or Words?" *Information Processing and Management* 35, no. 4 (1999): 443-462.
- ⁴⁵ Qianli Hu, "How to Distinguish and Catalog Chinese Personal Names," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 19, no. 1 (1994): 29-60.
- ⁴⁶ See 1 above.
- ⁴⁷ Yewang Wang, "A Look into Chinese Persons' Names in Bibliography Practice," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 31, no. 1 (2000): 51-81.
- ⁴⁸ Scott Edward Harrison, "Chinese Names in English," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 15, no. 2 (1992): 3-14.
- ⁴⁹ Joseph C. Lin, "Chinese Names Containing a Non-Chinese Given Names," *Classification & Classification Quarterly* 9, no. 1 (1988): 69-81.
- ⁵⁰ Han yu pin yin fang an (Beijing: Wen zi gai ge wei yuan hui, 1962)