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Abstract

This thesis first collects and presents all the basic, objective, and complete information currently available on bronze objects, site by site in northern China during the 4th and 3rd millennium B. P. with particular attention being paid to the catalogue, figures, and related cultural ascription of the bronze objects.

It surveys archaeological complexes located in the northeast, north-central, and northwest of China. Their distribution, chronology, periodization, cultural features, origins, and the bronze assemblages and metallurgical techniques unique to each culture are the main focus. The cultural development of each complex, and the cultural connections between various archaeological complexes during different periods are also discussed. Apart from the internal connections within the northern bronze cultures, their external relations, namely their relations with the Central Plain, Xinjiang region and the Eurasian Steppe are also analyzed. The cultural and chronological framework of bronzes in northern China during the 4th and 3rd millennium B. P. is thus provided.

Finally, this study offers an insight into the origins of early metallurgy in northern China, on the basis of an analysis on all of the earliest copper/bronze objects available in northern China, providing an opportunity for a fresh understanding on the origin of the earliest metallurgy in the world.
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Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 The background to the rise of the archaeological research in northern China

Western scholars became very interested in the onset of Chinese metallurgy at the beginning of the twentieth century, when a number of bronze artifacts characterized by animal or geometrical patterns were discovered or collected in northern China. These bronzes consisted of weapons, tools, horse and chariot fittings and various kinds of personal ornaments. The majority of them were personal ornaments, such as earrings, finger rings, necklaces, belt hooks, buckles, plates, plaques, beads and so on. The personal use and possession of bronzes in northern China displays a sharp contrast to those of the Central Plain, in which the most typical bronze objects such as bronze vessels were communal in the sense that they were used during various rituals attended by members of the ruling elites.

As more and more archaeological excavations and expeditions were conducted in northern China, more cultures during the 4th and 3rd millennia B. P. in this area were identified, which share common cultural characteristics and display distinctive traits to those of the Central Plain. Therefore, the statement that the exquisite and amazing bronze techniques shown in the Central Plain were developed independently and were much earlier than those in other areas of China is severely questioned. The interest in the origins of Chinese civilizations aroused a new argument amongst scholars around the world. Furthermore, Eurasia as a whole has been attracting considerable attention. It has been acknowledged, that northern China may have played a pivotal role in the early Eurasian cultural interaction.

In the following sections, I will first review the previous studies on the bronzes in northern China; finally, I will outline the methods, scope, and goals of this monograph.

1 Salmony 1933; Andersson 1932; Andersson1933; Egami Namio/Mizunari Seiichi 1935.
4 That the Chinese civilization developed through, and in large partly because of the influence from West Asia is generally assumed among western scholars represented by Keightley (1983, xix-xx) and so on. Several scholars notably Chang K. C. (1963), strongly argued for the indigenous origins of Chinese civilization on the basis of a large number of new archaeological finds in China. Especially after the 1980s, as more early finds were made in the region outside the Central Plain. The traditional assumption that the Central Plain is a nucleus origin has been severely questioned, consequently the ‘multi-centered origins’ and ‘Chinese interaction sphere’ was put forward (Chang 1986, 234-244; Lin Y. 1986, 268-271; Linduff 1998, 133-145). Considering that the regional cultures outside the Central Plain may have independent developments, which connect between the Central Plain and the cultures in the contiguous areas, or even areas as far away as southern Siberia and Central Asia.
1.2 Previous studies of the bronzes in northern China

The research on the bronzes in northern China has excited great interest amongst scholars since the 1920s, which can be roughly divided into three phases: from the 1920s to the 1950s, from the 1950s to the mid-1970s, and from the middle 1970s.

1.2.1 From the 1920s to the 1950s

Even before the early 1920s, many expeditions into Xinjiang, Gansu, Tibet and the neighboring regions were conducted. These earliest expeditions in northern China have been summed up by a Korean scholar Pak Y. J. (Table 1)\(^6\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Leader</th>
<th>Expedition area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1898-1899</td>
<td>D.A. Klementz</td>
<td>Turfan, Xinjiang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1899-1901</td>
<td>S. Hedin</td>
<td>Loulan, Lop Nor in Xinjiang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>1900-1901</td>
<td>A. Stein</td>
<td>Niya, Dandanwulike in Xinjiang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1902-1903</td>
<td>A. Grunwedel</td>
<td>Turfan, Kuche in Xinjiang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1902-1903</td>
<td>Otani Kozui</td>
<td>Kezi’er, Kumutula Grottos in Xinjiang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1904-1907</td>
<td>A. Grunwedel, A. von Le Coq</td>
<td>Turfan, Kuche, Hami, Yanqi, Bozikeliike Grotto in Xinjiang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1905, 1908</td>
<td>Torii Ryuzo</td>
<td>Inner Mongolia, Manchuria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>1906-1909</td>
<td>A. Stein</td>
<td>Niya, Dandanwulike, Loulan, Milan in Xinjiang, Tunhuang in Gansu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1906-1909</td>
<td>P. Pelliot</td>
<td>Bachu, Kuche; Kezi’er, Kumutula Grottos in Xinjiang; Tunhuang in Gansu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1906-1909</td>
<td>Otani Kozui</td>
<td>Turfan, Loulan in Xinjiang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1906-1909</td>
<td>P.K. Kozloff</td>
<td>Heicheng, Inner Mongolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1910-1912</td>
<td>K. Otani</td>
<td>Kuche in Xinjiang, Dunhuang in Gansu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>1913-1915</td>
<td>A. Stein</td>
<td>Xinjiang; Tunhuang in Gansu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1914-1915</td>
<td>S.F. Oldenburg</td>
<td>Xinjiang; Tunhuang in Gansu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>E. Lichten</td>
<td>Linxi, Chifeng in Inner Mongolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>E. Lichten</td>
<td>Qingyang, Gansu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1922-1923</td>
<td>E. Lichten, T. de Chardin</td>
<td>Salawusu, Inner Mongolia; Shuitonggou, Ningxia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1923-1924</td>
<td>J. G. Andersson</td>
<td>Gansu, Qinghai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>1923-1924</td>
<td>L. Warner, H. Jayne</td>
<td>Heicheng, Inner Mongolia; Dunhuang in Gansu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Foreign expeditions to northern China between 1898 and 1924 (after Pak Y. J. 1996, 8 Table 1.1).

Many of these explorers excavated prehistoric as well as historic sites. While the

\(^6\) Pak Y. J. 1996, 8.
expeditions to Xinjiang were more concerned with historical sites and transportable relics, those to Inner Mongolia and Gansu resulted in the discovery of Paleolithic, Neolithic and Bronze Age sites. However, this kind of foreign expedition was akin to pillaging the historical remains from China, which was interrupted after the outbreak of World War I. The results of these expeditions nevertheless laid the groundwork for later systematic studies of prehistoric archaeological cultures in northern China.

From the 1920s to the 1950s, archaeological expeditions to northern China were mainly undertaken by foreign archaeologists who began to cooperate with the Chinese authorities. Pak Y. J. has a review on most of the expeditions, surveys and excavations during this period in detail. In addition, a small quantity of research papers, monographs and books have been published, which mainly put an emphasis on describing the bronzes discovered or collected in northern China.

Furthermore, some researchers began to discuss the relationships of the Bronze Age cultures between the Central Plain, northern China, and outside of China. There were two different dominating views. One view was generally assumed among western scholars, that the bronzes discovered in northern China originated from the western cultures that influenced also the Central Plain. Nevertheless, the original area as previously suggested by western scholars differs as well. For example, M. Rostovtzeff believed that the earliest animal-shaped bronzes in northern China share the same root as those in Mesopotamia. However, A. Salmony suggested that some kind of bronze ornaments imitated the forms of the samples from the Minusinsk Plain. While Japanese researchers such as Egami Namio and Mizunari Seiichi put forward that northern bronzes could be traced back to 500 BCE or so and originated from the Scythian area around the Black Sea, then spread from west to east. The statement ‘the main complex of Suiyuan bronzes is contemporary with the late period of the Karasuk culture’ proposed by G. Ecke who also believed that the animal style of the Yin Dynasty in the Central Plain came from northern Eurasia, is in contrast with the opinion that Suiyuan bronzes originated from the Seima-Turbino culture, which is put forward by M. Loehr. In addition to this, M. Loehr pointed out that the bow-shaped wares could have possibly been influenced by the Karasuk culture, and even that the bronze metallurgical techniques were spread from the west through Siberia or

10 Andersson 1925; Andersson1933; Andersson1943; Salmony 1933; Bergman 1939; Egami Namio/Mizunari Seiichi 1935; Yawata Ichiro 1935: Yawata Ichiro1940; Liang S. Y. 1933, 1-44.
11 Rostovtzeff 1922; Rostovtzeff 1929.
12 Salmony 1934.
13 Egami Namio/Mizunari Seiichi 1935.
14 Ecke 1943.
15 Loehr 1949, 126-144.
Xinjiang. Finally, on the basis of the comparison of the Ordos short swords and knives, he emphasized that many elements shown in the bronze cultures of northern China and the Central Plain were exported from outside\(^\text{16}\). Borodino\(^\text{17}\) puts forward that images of elk and waterfowl were prevalent in the Seima-Turbin culture, but images of horse and buck were absent which existed in the Yin culture. Furthermore, he raised the point that both of the animal-headed bronze knives in Europe and China come from Siberia.

On the other hand, a few scholars\(^\text{18}\) are inclined to claim that the bronzes found in northern China originated from the Shang culture. For instance, B. Karlgren points out that animal-headed and loop-headed knives, animal-headed swords, hollow-handled axes and bow-shaped wares were all influenced by the Yinshang culture, which also influenced the Karasuk culture and spread through Ordos, Suiyuan, Mongolia and the Yenisei regions, even reaching as far as Scythia in the south of Russia. Li Ji states that the bronzes discovered at Yinxu resemble those found in Siberia, and it was only after the Yinshang Dynasty that such kind of animal-shaped bronzes at Yinxu were becoming popular in northern China.

Only a small number of scientific excavations were carried out in northern China during the 1920s to the 1950s. The majority of the bronzes that were mainly collected from the surface, therefore lack information of a cultural nature and associated correlation. Thus, most of the western scholars analyzed them based on the chronological system of western cultures; as a result, the research was more or less limited in depth. In any case, the designation of *Suiyuan bronzes*\(^\text{19}\) and *Ordos bronzes*\(^\text{20}\) indicate that the special individuality and traits of such bronzes were evidently recognized.

### 1.2.2 From the 1950s to the mid-1970s

Notably the establishment of the People’s Republic of China in 1949 made a great push towards archaeological work in northern China, which led not only to stricter fieldwork, but also to further research. A significant number of sites were discovered and investigated, such as Xituanshan\(^\text{21}\), Chifeng\(^\text{22}\), Shiertaiyingzi\(^\text{23}\), Zhizhushan\(^\text{24}\), Nanshan’gen\(^\text{25}\), Shuijiangoumen\(^\text{26}\), Sujigou\(^\text{27}\), Huangniangniangtai\(^\text{28}\), Dahezhuang\(^\text{29}\).

\(^{16}\) Loehr 1951, 77-162.
\(^{17}\) Borodino 1957.
\(^{18}\) Yetts 1925; Yetts 1939; Karlgren 1949; Li J. 1929; Li J. 1933; Li J. 1949; Gao Q. X. 1945.
\(^{19}\) Andersson 1929, 149; Egami Namio/Mizunari Seiichi 1935.
\(^{20}\) Andersson 1932, 224.
\(^{21}\) Tong Z. C. 1964, 29-49.
\(^{22}\) Lü Z. E 1958, 25-40.
\(^{24}\) ZSKKN 1979, 215-243.
\(^{26}\) Zheng L. 1965, 50-51.
and so on. A few important bronze cultures were also identified in northern China. Most of the important archaeological fieldwork and their related contribution have been well summarized and reviewed by Pak Y. J. region by region\textsuperscript{30}, so it will not be repeated here.

With growing information available on the bronzes in northern China based on archaeological fieldwork, previous viewpoints about the origin of the bronzes in northern China were questioned and changed. For example, K. Jettmar\textsuperscript{31} stated that the animal-shaped bronze artifacts could have been imported from the Baikon region, and then returned to the northern area with the advanced metallurgical techniques. Soviet scholar, C. В. Киселёв\textsuperscript{32} who once supported the opinion of a western origin for the northern bronzes turns to believe that some bronzes of the Karasuk culture originated from China. However, it was not the Yinshang people but the people living in northern China that transferred to the Minusinsk Plain, then integrated with the indigenous people, consequently created the Karasuk culture. This is reflected in the close similarity of the bronzes, potteries and the decoration style between the Karasuk culture and cultures distributed around north of the Chinese Great wall, especially in the Ordos, Suiyuan and Rehe regions\textsuperscript{33}. In addition to the issue on origin, the relative chronology between western and eastern cultures also attracted significant attention among scholars.

It is worth mentioning that Chinese scholars began to do some research work during this period as well. In this respect, a leading Chinese archaeologist at that time, Gao Quxun\textsuperscript{34} insisted that the animal-headed knives, bow-shaped artifacts, long hollow-handled axes and bronze daggers in the Karasuk culture were influenced by the Yinshang culture, and the bronze daggers were without doubt of Chinese style. Another scholar, Tang Lan\textsuperscript{35} explained the function of the bow-shaped artifacts.

Conclusively, on one hand, many important sites as well as some vital bronze cultures were found and confirmed\textsuperscript{36}. On the other hand, the discussion on the distribution, chronology, and periodization of these bronze cultures has not been furthered. By contrast, the research work was much more scientific when compared to the previous studies undertaken. In addition, western scholars, especially soviet scholars still

\textsuperscript{27} Gai, S. L. 1965, 44-46.
\textsuperscript{28} GSB 1960c, 53-71; GSB 1978, 421-448.
\textsuperscript{29} HHGS 1960, 9-12; ZKK 1974, 29-62.
\textsuperscript{30} Pak Y. J. 1996, 16-22.
\textsuperscript{31} Jettmar 1950, 22.
\textsuperscript{32} Киселёв 1951.
\textsuperscript{33} Киселёв 1959, 302-314.
\textsuperscript{34} Gao Q. X. 1958, 658-719.
\textsuperscript{35} Tang L. 1972, 178-184.
\textsuperscript{36} Including the Lower Xiajiadian, Xindian, Siwa, Shajing cultures and so on.
carried out the majority of the research work with the exception of one part being undertaken by Chinese scholars.

1.2.3 From the middle 1970s

Despite the fact that the archaeological fieldwork was broken off abruptly by the Cultural Revolution (1966-1976), the continuous accumulation of new archaeological data in northern China from the middle of the 1970s to this day is quite remarkable. The research entered a new flourishing phase accordingly, which can be reflected upon in the following aspects.

Firstly, during the 1960-1970s, with the birth and development of the New Archaeology, a contrasting tendency arose to stress the internal processes and independent origins of cultures rather than focusing on an outside influence. The shift in theoretical orientation was also seen in the studies of the bronzes in early China. The theories of multi-centered origins and indigenous origin came into being. The latter became characteristic of the mainstream thought amongst sinologists, represented by Wu En, Tian Guangjin, Lin Yun and so on.

Secondly, some scholars turned their interest to certain types of bronze artifacts, especially the animal-shaped plaques or animal motifs. In addition, almost every type of bronze artifact was researched thoroughly and systemically, such as bronze cooking ware-Fu, bronze swords, bronze mirrors, bronze knives, bronze axes, horse gag bits, bow-shaped artifacts, bronze plaques and so on. The

---

37 Pak Y. J. (1996, 19-23) summarized the important archaeological discoveries in northern China from the middle 1970s until the middle 1990s.
38 For a discussion on the development of the New Archaeology, see Tregger 1989, 289-328 and Binford 1968, 5-28.
41 Wu E. (1985, 135-155) put forward that the formation of the Karasuk culture is later than the Yinshan culture, so it is impossible that bronze cultures in northern China originated from the Karasuk culture.
42 Tian G. J. (1997b, 266-307) stated that the development of bronze cultures in northern China is in one continuous line. An abrupt change in the weather from warm and humid to dry and cold brought on the corresponding sharp economic shift from agriculture to pastoralism and nomadism. Hence, the steppe bronze cultures are characterized by the Ordos bronzes.
43 Lin Y. (1998a, 331-334) stated that the birth of the northern bronzes could be traced back to the Erlitou culture. Meanwhile, he seriously questioned the views either of a western origin or of a Central-Plains-centered origin.
44 For a review about the “multi-centered” origins and indigenous origins, see MJJ 2000, 1-2.
51 Zhai D. F. 1984, 296-316.
related research included not only characters, chronology and the distribution of the artifacts but also their origins and spreading process. Nevertheless, such research on a single bronze artifact makes it difficult for the readers to tell how this bronze artifact is related to the other bronze artifacts. The lack of an archaeological context and assemblage information also makes it hard to judge its importance and function within an area or a culture.

Thirdly, the study of various regional cultures was carried out in order to emphasize the archaeological heritage of each region. For instance, Zhong Kan and Han Kongle did a study on the classification and characteristics of the bronzes found in the Guyuan region, Ningxia during the Spring and Autumn and the Warring States period. They suggest that the bronze cultures in south Ningxia may be indigenous cultures, though influenced by the Zhou and Qin cultures, and similar to the neighboring Ordos cultures\textsuperscript{54}. Besides, another Chinese scholar Luo Feng\textsuperscript{55} furthered the above views that the Eastern Zhou period of bronzes found in the Guyuan region have not only the main characteristics of the northern bronzes but also strong local traits based on the number of bronzes found in this region. Some regions within northern China have been treated as different cultural units, including the Ordos region, Liaoxi region, south Shaanxi, west Shanxi, Dalinghe region, Gansu and Ningxia region, Chifeng region, north Hebei and so on\textsuperscript{56}. Such a study concentrates on the divisions between different stages within a whole period as well as on the relations, especially coexistence within the archaeological culture. While, rarely has any such study inspected the local culture from the point of view of either the entire northern China or the whole Eurasian Steppe, therefore it fails to see the cultures from a larger background\textsuperscript{57}.

Fourthly, the discussion about the relationship between northern bronze cultures, western cultures and the Central Plain cultures has been much more probed on the basis of the comparison of similar bronzes\textsuperscript{58}. This type of study combines the research about the Xiongnu people mentioned in written records with other forms of historic records, coaparing it with related foreign artifacts. Nevertheless, the research still needs to understand the make up of the Xiongnu tribes—the central authority of the Confederation established by Modu (冒顿) and the differences between all those groups, which were once separated before they amalgamated. To do this, we need more research on the correlations between different archaeological cultures during the

\textsuperscript{54} Zhong/Han 1985, 203-231.
\textsuperscript{55} Luo F. 1990, 743-750.
\textsuperscript{56} The review of the regional cultural research in northern China has been quite elaborated upon by Li Hairong (2003, 7-9).
\textsuperscript{57} YJH 2004, 204.
Spring and Autumn, and Warring States period in the northern cultural zone of China and in the Steppes cultures further north\(^6^9\).

Fifthly, the scientific examination of the metallurgical technique as well as the availability of a wide range of chronometric dating techniques, including radiocarbon dating provided an opportunity for scholars to distinguish earlier archaeological data from the Central Plains and western cultures. Scholars used both the optical microscope and scanning electron microscope or energy-dispersive X-ray fluorescence analyzer to determine the microstructure of the artifacts, which provided a direct insight into the techniques used in their manufacture. This data provided significant evidence that allowed the comparison between the metallurgical technologies of the different culture\(^6^0\). Most of these analyses focused on the chemical components and metallurgical structure.

Except for the aforementioned studies, much comprehensive and systematic research has also been carried out from archaeological findings since the early 1990s\(^6^1\). At the end of the 1990s, western scholars were starting an overall research of the entire cultural zone\(^6^2\). Chinese scholars started to look at the northern bronzes in China against the background of the entire Eurasian Steppe\(^6^3\). However, due to a lack of research on the division of different stages within the Spring-Autumn period and Warring States period, these types of studies look upon all the remains of the Eastern Zhou culture in the whole area as a unit, thus depriving us of the possibility to understand the dynamic development and different cultures in this region.

In addition, some topics need to be further researched, such as the subsistence of the bronze-using cultures in northern China, and the social organization of societies in different parts of northern China. Nevertheless, some scholars have dealt with such topics. For instance, Pak Y. J. did a case study on the Yuhuangmiao cemetery in order to reconstruct the social organization and discuss the social stratification and subsistence of the economy\(^6^4\).

It is worth mentioning here that the Chinese concept of archaeological culture is descriptive rather than explanatory. Any attempts to reconstruct human behavioral aspects of the past, to delineate the cultural process or to interpret the meaning of archaeological remains, are relatively rare. It seems that in addition to the conventional traditional ‘normative’ view, more diverse approaches to ‘archaeological culture’ are in great demand among archeologists in China, in order to broaden the

---

\(^{69}\) YJH 2004, 204.

\(^{60}\) For a review about the metallurgical research on the northern bronzes, see Li. H. R. 2003, 15-16.

\(^{61}\) Lin Y. 1998d, 368-387.

\(^{62}\) Miyake Toshihiko 1999.

\(^{63}\) Wu E. 2002, 437-470.

\(^{64}\) Pak Y. J. 1996, 415-466.
perspective on the prehistoric societies of China\textsuperscript{65}.

1.3 Scope of this study

1.3.1 The temporal scope

The time from the 4\textsuperscript{th} to the 3\textsuperscript{rd} millennia B. P. is approximately parallel to the period of the Xia\textsuperscript{66}, Shang and Zhou dynasties in the Central Plain. Whether the Xia Dynasty existed is not the issue here. However, most of the Chinese scholars are used to giving a relative dating, namely the corresponding period of the Xia, Shang and Zhou dynasties in central China to the cultures even though they are situated outside the Central Plain. Therefore, the term ‘Xia’ will still be used in this study, not only for the scholars who hold the traditional views on the earliest Dynasty in China but also for helping normal readers to better understand the northern bronze cultures within the resplendent background of the Central Plain. Therefore, it is necessary to make a brief introduction to the time range of the Xia, Shang, and Zhou Dynasties.

The relationship between the Xia Dynasty and the Erlitou culture has been long argued amongst scholars who believe that the Xia Dynasty existed. Whether the first stage of the Erlitou culture is parallel to the period of the earliest Xia Dynasty is still questioned\textsuperscript{67}, however, it is widely accepted that the Erlitou culture can be divided into four stages\textsuperscript{68}. Therefore, in this study, the radiocarbon dates of the beginning and end of the Erlitou culture\textsuperscript{69} will be quoted to compare with the period of the Xia Dynasty despite that the very beginning of the Xia Dynasty was dated to 2070 BCE by the expert team of the project on dating the Xia, Shang, and Zhou dynasties\textsuperscript{70}. Accordingly, the Xia period is parallel to 1900-1600 BCE in this study (Table 3).

The chronology of the Shang period from 1600 to 1046 BCE is in no doubt. However, on the periodization of the Shang Dynasty, there are many different views. Zou H.\textsuperscript{71} divides the Shang cultures into three stages: Pre-Shang, Early Shang and Late Shang. Later, Li Boqian\textsuperscript{72} ascribes the Xiaqiyuan culture to the Pre-Shang period, which was widely accepted. Some scholars put forward that the Shang cultures in the Shang Dynasty should be divided into three such phases: Early Shang, Middle Shang\textsuperscript{73} and

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{65} Pak Y. J. 1996, 24.
\item \textsuperscript{66} Whether the Xia Dynasty existed or not is a hot topic amongst scholars.
\item \textsuperscript{67} A: Zou H. (2001b, 89-170) stated that the Erlitou culture I stage represents the early Xia Dynasty or early Xia culture.
\item B: Li B. Q. (1986, 41-47; 2000, 11-14): the Erlitou culture I stage is not equal to the earliest Xia culture; the Erlitou culture I-IV stage represents the period from “Houyi (后羿)”to “Jie (桀)”.
\item C: ZSKK 2003.
\item \textsuperscript{68} Erlitou 99, 28-33.
\item \textsuperscript{69} Qiu S. H. et al. 1983, 923-928.
\item \textsuperscript{70} Duandai 2000, 86-88.
\item \textsuperscript{71} Zou H. 2001c, 29-86.
\item \textsuperscript{72} Li B. Q. 1998a, 78-90.
\item \textsuperscript{73} When “Middle Shang” ended is still in dispute.
\end{itemize}
Late Shang. However, the cultural content and chronological framework of the Middle Shang as stated by Tang Jigen is equal with the IV, V, VI stages of the Early Shang put forward by Wang Lixin. Therefore, the new concept of the “Middle Shang” made no essential differences in cultural content with the previous periodization of Early Shang and Late Shang. Besides, the sub-division of Early Shang and Late Shang is still controversial (Table 2). In short, this study prefers to use the two-phase chronology for the Shang period (Table 3).

Though Chinese scholars still argue for the periodization of some typical Western Zhou sites, dividing the Western Zhou Dynasty (1046-771 BCE) into early, middle and late three stages, has been largely accepted (Table 3). Besides, the Eastern Zhou period is marked as the Spring and Autumn period (770-475 BCE) and the Warring States (475-221 BCE).

As mentioned above, the period from the 4th to the 3rd millennia B. P. being regarded as the period of the Xia, Shang and Zhou dynasties in central China is in agreement. However, in terms of archaeology, whether northern China had entered the Iron Age after the fourth century BCE is still in dispute. Lin Yun suggests that northern China during the Warring States period (475-221 BCE) belonged to the Bronze Age because the bronze weapons which are regarded as the landmark of the Bronze Age were still utilized in great numbers at that time, though a considerable quantity of other iron objects were in use as well. According to his opinion, the Bronze Age lasted until the Qin period or even the Han period. While some scholars represented by Wu En state that the appearance of lots of iron tools and weapons should signify the rise of the Iron Age, though bronze tools and weapons were still in use at the same time. Hence, he puts forward that the cultures in northern China entered the early Iron Age instead of the Bronze Age after the late Spring and Autumn period. This study prefers to agree with the opinion of Lin Yun because the bronze tools and weapons had not disappeared when the iron objects, which are similar in form to the bronze objects came into being. Accordingly, this study will discuss the ‘bronze’ cultures in northern China.

76 Wang Lixin, Cong Songshan nanbei de wenhua zhenghe kan Xia wangchao de chuxian (Discussion on the birth of the Xia Dynasty from the cultural interaction in the south and north of Songshan). It is not yet published. Wang Lixin is a young scholar who works at Jilin University.
77 The doctoral dissertation: Taihangshan liangyi beifang qingtong wenhua yu Xia Shang Xizhou wenhua de hudong guanxi (The interactive relations between the Northern bronze cultures along the Taihang Mountain and Xia, Shang and Western Zhou cultures) by Jiang Gang (2006) who studied in Jilin University is not yet published. He sent me the electronic version of his doctoral dissertation via the Email shortly before he printed it. Therefore, the pages I mentioned in this study may be a little different with the printed version. He made a review on the views about the periodization of the Shang Dynasty.
78 Fengxi 62; Zhangjiapo 99; Liulilihe 95.
79 The Qin Dynasty is from 221 to 206 BCE.
80 The Han Dynasty followed the Qin Dynasty, from 206 BCE to AD 220.
Table 2. Different periodization of the Shang Dynasty (adapted from Jiang G. 2006, 3 Table 1.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zou H. 2001a; 2001b</th>
<th>Pre-Shang</th>
<th>Early Shang</th>
<th>Late Shang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I: Lower Erligang C1H9</td>
<td>2 stage</td>
<td>3 stage</td>
<td>4 stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II: Nanguan Erligang C1H17</td>
<td>5 stage</td>
<td>6 stage</td>
<td>7 stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III: Upper Erligang C1H2</td>
<td>VIII: Yinxi I</td>
<td>IX: Yinxi II</td>
<td>XI: Yinxi III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV: Upper Erligang C1H1</td>
<td>VII: Taixi</td>
<td>XII: Yinxi IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V: Upper Erligang C1H2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI: Upper Bajiazhang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZFFH 95.</th>
<th>Yinxi I</th>
<th>Yinxi II</th>
<th>Yinxi III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zheng /Chen 1985</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang L. X.</td>
<td>Early Shang I</td>
<td>Early Shang II</td>
<td>Early Shang III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZSKK 2003</td>
<td>Early Shang I</td>
<td>Early Shang II</td>
<td>Early Shang III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiang G. 2006</td>
<td>Late Xia</td>
<td>Early Shang I</td>
<td>Early Shang II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(from the cultural interaction in the south and north of Songshan) It is not yet published. Wang Lixin is a young scholar who works at Jilin University.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dynasty</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Early period</th>
<th>Late period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Xia Dynasty</strong></td>
<td>Ca.1900-1600 BCE</td>
<td>Erlitou I, II</td>
<td>Erlitou III, IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shang Dynasty</strong></td>
<td>Ca.1600–1046 BCE</td>
<td>Early Shang Ca.1600-1251 BCE</td>
<td>I: Ca. 1600-1500 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II: Ca. 1500-1400 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III: Ca. 1400-1251 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Late Shang Ca.1251-1046 BCE</td>
<td>Early stage: Wuding---Zujia(武丁-甲组)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Late stage: Bingxin---Dixin(癝辛-帝辛)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zhou Dynasty</strong></td>
<td>Ca.1046-221 BCE</td>
<td>Western Zhou Ca.1046-771 BCE</td>
<td>Early stage: Wuwang—Zhaowang(武王—昭王)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle stage: Muwang—Xiaowang(穆王—孝王)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Late period: Yiwang----Youwang（夷王—幽王）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastern Zhou Ca.770-221 BCE</td>
<td>The Spring and Autumn period Ca.770-475 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Warring States Ca.475-221 BCE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. The chronological framework of the Xia, Shang and Zhou dynasties.

1.3.2 The spatial scope

Northern China is strategically located at the crossroads between the east and the west. It lies in the south-easternmost part of the Eurasian Steppe, bordered by the heartlands of the Central Plain to the south (Map 1). This area is where ancient central Chinese people could meet, contact and communicate with the northern nomadic people, namely the agricultural and pasturage interactive belt. The crucial importance of this region for the prehistoric period, and specifically for the Bronze Age has now come to be recognized.

1.3.2.1 The geographical range of northern China

The term ‘northern China’ indicates neither the whole area outside the Central Plain, nor all the regions in the north and east of the Central Plain in the general sense, but specially denotes the frontier belt along the Great Wall of China built mainly during the Qin and Han Dynasties, approximately between N 32°- 43° and E 95°-125°.

---

83 The dates from the early Shang to the Western Zhou are all quoted from the expert team of the project on dating the Xia, Shang and Zhou Dynasties.
84 Many scholars prefer to use the term northern zone.
It is bounded on the east by the Xiliaohe and Xilamunhe\textsuperscript{85}, through the Yanshan, on the west by the Helanshan, on the north by the Yinshan, and on the south by the Weihe (Map 1). It is at present divided into several administrative units, including the southeast and middle-south of Inner Mongolia, north Hebei, north Shanxi, north Shaanxi, Ningxia, Gansu and northeast Qinghai and west Liaoning.

1.3.2.2 The geographical environment of northern China

Geomorphological features are quite complicated in northern China, including mountains, plateaus, rivers and deserts. The direction of the mountains and position of the high plateaus construct the important geographical barriers and distinctive features in this region (Map 1). The Yinshan in middle Inner Mongolia stretches from the west to east, forming a natural barrier between the southern Gobi desert and the north Yellow River. The Yanshan is a major mountain range lying north of the North China Plain in the northern Hebei Province, and it is an important traffic gateway between the north and the south. The Helanshan is a mountain range, forming the border of Inner Mongolia and Ningxia, stretching from the north to the south. The Taihangshan is a mountain range running from the Northeast down the eastern edge of the Loess Plateau in the Henan, Shanxi and Hebei provinces. The range extends over 400 km from north to south and has an average elevation of 1,500 to 2,000 meters. The Qilianshan is a northern outlier of the Kunlun Mountains, forming the border between the Qinghai and Gansu provinces of northern China. The range stretches from the south of the Dunhuang some 800 km to the southeast, forming the western border of the Gansu Corridor.

The Inner-Mongolia Plateau, the Ordos Plateau, and the Loess Plateau are all 1000-2000 meters above sea level. On the borders of these plateaus are mountains with elevations of more than 3000 meters, such as the Taihangshan on the eastern margin of the Loess Plateau. Between these Plateaus are a numerous series of hills and mountains, generally with elevations of 500-1000 meters. Forests, grasslands, and deserts are scattered between these mountain ranges, plateaus, and rivers of northern China.

Northeast China is relatively better watered by large and small rivers. In addition to the Liaohe, Dalinghe, Luanhe rivers, small rivers are located in the northeast and the middle reaches of the Yellow River and its tributaries lie in north-central and northwest China. A few perennial inland rivers are fed by snow and ice melting from the high mountains during the warm seasons. All inland rivers flow into saline inland

\textsuperscript{85} He as suffix means river; Shan as suffix means hill or mountain.
lakes or die away in Sandy deserts or salt marshes\textsuperscript{86}.

As for the climate concerned, northeast China is characterized by moderate and semiarid, the Inner Mongolian region by moderate and arid, and the northwest by arid and deserts. It is believed that the distinctive environmental conditions of northern China have played a vital role in setting apart this region culturally from its neighboring region to the south. It is highly probable that the climate which includes temperature, precipitation, latitude, topography, monsoon, wind, sand and geomorphological features affected human activities greatly. Pak Yangjin makes a comprehensive introduction to the climate in northern China (Map 3; Map 4; Map 5; Map 6)\textsuperscript{87}.

The unique physical and biological components of the environment in northern China may be conducive to the formation of the distinctive archaeological cultures in this region. However, the adaptation to its environment by each individual society in each ecological zone varies greatly from one to another\textsuperscript{88}.

1.3.3 Three Subregions and complexes

According to the differences of the geographical characteristics and cultural aspects, northern China is normally divided into different sub-regions. Of course, scholars have not agreed with each other about the spatial and cultural range of these sub-regions. Pak Yangjin divides northern China into three complexes: the Northwest Complex, North-central Complex and Northeast Complex. It is worth mentioning that the designation of ‘complex’ is heavily influenced by the culture-classificatory theory proposed by Su Bingqi, who is one of the leading figures in modern Chinese archaeology, and plays a significant role in the advancement of archaeological theories and methodologies regarding the typology and classification of archaeological cultures. It was in his article that he first put forward in written form the basic idea of the regional typology of archeological cultures. He writes: in order to conduct classification of the region (Qu 区), complex (Xi 系), and type (Leixing 类型) of archaeological cultures, colleagues in each area must rely on the local archaeological work, and make efforts to clarify cultural features and their relationship. By selecting a few representative sites and conducting a scientific excavation of them, one can acquire representative material remains for an analysis. Afterwards, on the basis of the classification of cultural types, and similarities and differences of cultural characteristics within a relatively large area, one can deduce systems of cultures. Here a region is a chunk, a complex is a stem, and a type is a branch. After certain amounts of effort, we will have important breakthroughs and

\textsuperscript{86} Pak Y. J. 1996, 31-32.
\textsuperscript{87} Pak Y. J. 1996, 35-47.
\textsuperscript{88} Pak Y. J. 1996, 40.
results on the issue of the region, complex, and type\textsuperscript{89}. This paper follows the usage of ‘complex’ in his opinion.

This study also divides northern China into three sub-regional and cultural complexes: the Northwest Complex, North-central Complex, and south of the Yanshan Complex, which differs with Pak Yangjin in some spatial range and cultural ascription.

The North-central Complex is almost equal to the definition by Pak Yangjin in spatial range, centered itself in the south and middle of Inner Mongolia, Ningxia, and the Qingyang region in Gansu. It is represented by the bronzes with animal patterns, namely so called ‘Ordos Bronzes’ or ‘Northern Bronzes’ (Map 2)\textsuperscript{90}.

In terms of the cultural classification by Pak, the bronze cultures identified from northern Hebei and Beijing in the south, to the Heilongjiang province in the north, are ascribed to the Northeast Complex; administratively, it includes the Heilongjiang, Jilin and Liaoning provinces\textsuperscript{91}. As we know, the Northeast Complex is famous for its widespread use of bronze daggers with curved blades that differ to the typical Ordos bronze daggers with straight blades. This type of bronze dagger has been discovered not only in the bronze cultures in northeast China\textsuperscript{92} but also in the Korean Peninsula and Japan\textsuperscript{93}. Therefore, this area characterized by bronze swords with curved blades is ruled out in this study.

South of the Yanshan Complex, centered in the south of the Yanshan region, includes the bronze-using cultures distributed mainly within the north Hebei region and the Beijing and Tianjin regions, almost corresponding to the south of the Northeast Complex which is defined by Pak. Its peculiarity has been long ignored in previous research and has attracted more interest amongst scholars in recent decades. Therefore, it will also be an emphasis in this paper.

Here the Northwest Complex is centered in the Hexi Corridor, administratively including the north and middle of Gansu, and the north of Qinghai, however, the Xinjiang region is excluded as it has its own special pottery assemblage, burial patterns, and bronze artifacts, which seem to have more connections with central Asia and south Siberia.

With increasing fieldwork, dozens of bronze cultures have been identified and

\textsuperscript{90} The definition of ‘Ordos Bronzes’ and ‘Northern Bronzes’ will be explained in the following sections.
\textsuperscript{91} Pak Y. J. 1996, 54.
\textsuperscript{92} Such as the Upper Xiajiadian culture, Xituanshan culture, Lower Xiajiadian culture and so on.
researched in these sub-regions of northern China. Of them, the bronze cultures characterized by the ‘northern bronzes’ will be the main emphasis\(^\text{94}\). The cultural aspects and bronze materials will also be an emphasis in this study.

### 1.3.4 ‘Ordos bronzes’ and ‘Northern bronzes’

The North-central Complex and south of the Yanshan Complex are characterized by the so-called ‘Ordos bronzes’. Originally, the term ‘Ordos’ was a geographical name given to the Steppe region, situated between the great loop of the Yellow River and the Great Wall in the Inner Mongolia-Shaanxi border. Bronze artifacts found from the Ordos Plateau drew much attention from Western, as well as Japanese and Chinese scholars. Here, it is necessary to have a brief introduction to the history surrounding, the so-called Ordos bronzes, which will help us to understand the following sections.

In the early 20\(^{th}\) centuries, some special bronzes adorned with animal and geometrical motifs were discovered in Suiyuan and its neighboring area of Inner Mongolia. J. G. Andersson named them ‘Animal Style’ or ‘Suiyuan bronzes’.\(^\text{95}\) In addition, Japanese scholars: Egami Namio and Mizunari Seiichi\(^\text{96}\) continued to use the title ‘Suiyuan bronzes’. Furthermore, they put forward that these ‘Suiyuan bronzes’ were mainly found around the Suiyuan region, and had even arrived in areas along China’s Great Wall. However, Andersson reassigned them a new name ‘Ordos bronzes’ in 1932\(^\text{97}\) because the majority of these bronzes were found in the Ordos region.

In fact, the greater amount of such bronze objects have been widely discovered not only in the Ordos or Suiyuan regions, but also in the broader area of northern China in recent decades. Consequently, Chinese archaeologist, Tian Guangjin named them ‘Ordos-style bronzes’\(^\text{98}\) which enlarged its meaning to cover all the bronzes characterized by animal and geometric patterns discovered in China and Mongolia, and even including the northern Ural river district\(^\text{99}\). His opinion is widely accepted, nevertheless, most scholars are accustomed to the old usage of ‘Ordos bronzes’, which in this case is equal to the ‘Ordos-style bronzes’.

Later, some archaeologists such as Wu En\(^\text{100}\) and Lin Yun\(^\text{101}\) raised the titles “Northern Bronzes”, “Northern-style bronzes” and ‘Northern Complex’ to represent all bronzes characterized by animal motifs, which were distributed extensively in China,

---

\(^{94}\) Some bronze cultures characterized by the Shang or Zhou style will be mentioned, but not as an emphasis.

\(^{95}\) Andersson 1929, 149.

\(^{96}\) Egami Namio/Mizunari Seiichi 1935.

\(^{97}\) Andersson 1932, 224.

\(^{98}\) Ordos 86.

\(^{99}\) The new title ‘Ordos style bronzes’ is based on the original title ‘Ordos bronzes’ and the meaning of the former is much more elaborated upon by Tian G. J., which is mostly accepted. In spite of this, most scholars prefer to use ‘Ordos bronzes’

\(^{100}\) Wu E. 1985, 135-155.

\(^{101}\) Lin Y. 1998c, 262-281.
Mongolia and the Ural region. These titles distinguish themselves from ‘the Central Plain style’ and ‘Northeast complex’ by literal meaning. On the other hand, it emphasizes its differences in classification, forms, decoration, and artistic style with those of the Central Plain, as well as implying its close connection to similar bronzes in the whole Eurasian Steppe.

Actually, the earliest usage of ‘Northern Bronzes’ was put forward by Japanese scholars: Umehara Sueji and Takashi Okazaki. It included the bronzes found not only in northern China but also in north Xinjiang, the Mongolia Plateau and Siberian region, which is approximately equal to the views stated by Lin Yun. However, if we consider the whole Eurasian Steppe as a unit, the title of ‘Northern bronzes’ does not seem to suit the larger background.

The term ‘Ordos culture’ or ‘Ordos bronzes’ used in this study is in accordance with the opinion by Pak, with a limited and narrow definition. ‘Ordos bronzes’ is applied to the late bronze age assemblages found in south central Inner Mongolia and its neighboring areas to the south. In contrast to the definition used by Tian Guangjin and other Chinese scholars, the ‘Ordos bronze cultures’ does not include the earlier ‘Northern-style bronzes’ during the late second millennia BCE. This is because the Northern-style bronzes have been found not only in south-central Inner Mongolia but also in northeastern and northwestern China during the late second millennia BCE, suggesting that the development of these bronzes was a pan-regional phenomenon and not limited to the Ordos Plateau.

The term ‘Northern bronzes’ or ‘Northern-style bronzes’ used in this study is equal to the definition by Lin Yun. In fact, the iron, gold, and silver objects characterized by this style are also included in this dissertation.

1.4. Aims of this study

The ultimate aim of this paper is to try and create a chronological and cultural framework of bronzes in northern China during the 4th and 3rd millennia B. P., so special attention is paid to the bronze information and cultural aspects in each complex.

Therefore, this study will first try to collect and present all the basic, objective, and complete information available on bronze objects site by site in northern China. The
catalogue, figures, and related cultural ascription of the bronze objects will be included. So far, no scholars have arranged these materials in this way, though they may have researched them. This is a basic work for a further study. In addition, all of the bronze information available on northern China will be mentioned in terms of the published archeological reports before 2008. Thus, the first aim of this study is to build a data bank for bronzes in northern China, which will help the scholars, especially western scholars who do not understand any Chinese, to better and more quickly grasp the relevant bronze information they need.

Secondly, most of the bronze cultures that have been identified and classified in northern China will be discussed; their distribution, chronology, periodization, cultural features, and origins, especially the bronze assemblage and metallurgical techniques of each culture will be analyzed. Normally the metallurgical analysis is taken little account of by Chinese scholars. Therefore, the second aim is to outline the overall situation of bronze cultures in northern China, thus providing a full-scale and comprehensive background for western scholars to research the bronze cultures in the Eurasian Steppe as an entire unit. In addition, it is visible that the cultural framework of bronzes in northern China is dynamic and continuous in view of aforementioned research.

Thirdly, this study will try to describe how the bronze cultures developed in each complex, and how cultural complexes influenced or connected with each other at the different stages. This work will be based on the research of the bronze and pottery assemblages, burial practices and so on. An abundance of archaeological discoveries achieved in the past decades provides us with clues and evidence to commence new research. Compared with similar research by Pak in 1996, some improvements will be presented in this study. Firstly, some new bronze cultures will be added. Secondly, the cultural ascription of some sites and the definition of some cultures by Pak will be questioned and improved. Thirdly, more evidence based on pottery and bronze assemblages for periodization and cultural aspects of each culture will be supported. Fourthly, except for the traditional typological research, the archaeological context of bronze artifacts and available bronze metallurgical information will be used to analyze the development of the bronze metallurgy. Local economy models and society context will be briefly discussed as well.

In short, the third aim is to clarify the internal connections within the northern bronze cultures, and then the fourth is to explore the external relations, namely how northern China in this study was related to the Central Plain, Xinjiang region, and the Eurasian Steppe. Therefore, what kind of role northern China played during the 4th and 3rd

---

107 Based on the articles available regarding the metallurgical analysis.
millennia B. P. in the progress of ancient cultural spreading and interaction will be revealed.

This monograph is also trying to outline the origins of the bronzes in northern China, which is quite a hot topic at present. Therefore, the earliest copper and bronze artifacts found in China, related metallurgical techniques, and cultural relations will be included.

Conclusively, this study intends to offer an insight into five specific problems based on the archaeological and archaeometallurgical materials available at present from northern China: 1) Where, when and what kind of bronzes began to be used in northern China? 2) What was the cultural context like for northern China during the 4th and 3rd millennia B. P.? 3) What kind of internal cultural connections existed in northern China? 4) What kind of external cultural connections and technological interactions existed between northern China and its neighboring regions during the 4th and 3rd millennia B. P.? 5) What is the origin of the bronzes in Northern China?

In order to answer these questions, a chronological and cultural framework of bronzes in northern China will be presented vividly. I hope it will not only enrich our knowledge of bronzes in northern China, but also contribute to a new perspective in understanding the early development of Chinese civilization within the whole Eurasian Steppe as a background.
Chapter 2 Discoveries of bronzes

In this chapter, I would like to present all of the information available on the bronzes site by site, on the basis of recent archaeological finds and research. Some ancient sites belonging to the Bronze Age however lack bronze artifacts, are temporarily not included.

2.1 Discoveries of bronzes in the Qinghai Province

Located at the northeastern edge of the Qinghai-Tibetan Plateau between ca 32° and 39° N and ca 90° and 103° E, the Qinghai Province is named after the biggest inland lake-Qinghai Lake. This is a region with a complex topography and hydrology. Mountain ridges and high plateaus elevating from about 2500 to 4500 meters above sea level dominate the region. The Kunlun and Bayanhar Mountains lie in the middle of the Qinghai Province; in the north lies the Altai and Qilian ranges; and in the south the Tanggula Mountain is situated. These mountains divide the whole region into three areas: the Qilian range, Qaidam Basin and the Qinghai-Nanshan (Qingnan) Plateau.

The Qilian range lies in the northeast of the Qinghai Province. The west Qilian, with an average altitude of 3500-meters is higher than the east. The Huangshui, Yellow River, and Datonghe rise in the east. The Qaidam Basin, lying to the northwest of the Qinghai Province, is the deepest part of the Qinghai-Tibetan Plateau with an average altitude of 2600-3100-meters. It was once an ideal place for expeditions because the ancient prosperous Silk Road stretched across it. Lying to the south of the Qinghai Province is the Qiangan Plateau, which is rich in glaciers and mountains. The Yangzi River and Yellow river rise in these mountains.

The present climate is transitional from sub-humid to semi-arid, with the mean annual precipitation fluctuating between 250 and 600mm per year, resulting in a large water deficit. The main part of precipitation comes during May-September and is associated with the Pacific Monsoon. Up to 40% of the annual precipitation has been known to fall in a single storm. This, together with a spread of loess sediment and intensive land use has led to strong erosive activity in the region\textsuperscript{108}.

Due to its strategic location in the northwest of China, the research on the Bronze Age cultures in the Qinghai Province plays an important role for understanding the connections and interactive influences between the northwest, the Central Plain and the Eurasian Steppe. In the following section, the archaeological information available on the copper and bronzes found will be provided site by site.

\textsuperscript{108} Xu X. G. et al. 2003, 85.
2.1.1 Hualong county

The Hualong county is located southeast of the Qinghai Province, 130 km north of Xining. Two important cemeteries belonging to the Kayue culture; Shangbanzhuwa and Xiabanzhuwa, have been excavated in the Hualong county.

2.1.1.1 Shangbanzhuwa cemetery

The Shangbanzhuwa cemetery, located in the north of the Xiongxian township, and west of Hualong county, was first excavated in 1988. Eighty-five graves of the Kayue culture, three bronze items, including one chisel and two knives as well as several hundred bronze bulbs were found together with 141 potteries and 98 stone wares\textsuperscript{109}.

One bronze knife and one bronze awl were found together in tomb M159 (Fig. 001, 1.9). Most of the bronze bulbs have a triangle section (Fig. 001, 2-7). The excavators thought the whole cemetery should be ascribed to the Kayue culture, which can be divided into two subtypes: Yellow River and the Huangshui Valley. In 1990, the second excavation of the Shangbanzhuwa cemetery was conducted. Sixty-two burials were found together with 98 complete copper and bronze artifacts out of 749 quite distinctive funerary goods\textsuperscript{110}, consisting of 3 bells, 79 bulbs, 1 awl, 12 joined beads, 1 knife, 2 battle axes (Fig. 001, 10-17) and small fragments of bronze tubes, strips and plaques.

These 79 bronze bulbs, of different shapes and sizes, were laid diversely in the tombs, sometimes they were placed on the head of the skeleton, on the breast, between two legs, or near the feet. The two-shouldered battle-axe (Fig. 001, 17) seems to have been formed by cold forging because there are two mostly separated pages of bronze pieces. Another socketed battle-axe (Fig. 001, 16) was discovered with the remains of wood shaft in the socket.

The Yellow River type of the Kayue culture, represented by the Ahatela site, was traditionally considered to be characterized by an abundance of painted potteries dominated by two-eared pots with big mouths and ball-shaped pots. The two-eared pots with smaller mouths and abdomen-eared pots were used exclusively as funerary objects.\textsuperscript{111}

The Huangshui type of the Kayue culture, represented by the Shangsunjiazhai site, is characterized by pots without ear in the early period; the Tangwang-style-potteries\textsuperscript{112} and a small quantity of single-eared bowls in the late period; and coarse pots existed continuously from start to finish. In addition, the deceased was normally placed in a

\textsuperscript{109} QHY 1996, 27-44.
\textsuperscript{110} QHY 1998, 51-66.
\textsuperscript{111} Xu/Ge 1988, 35-44.
\textsuperscript{112} Tangwang-style-pottery represents one independent culture in the Hehuang valley, parallel to the Kayue culture, which was put forward by An Z. M. (1957, 23-51) according to one pottery group collected from the Chuanshanshen, Tangwang, and Dongxiang sites of the Gansu Province.
supine position, with a wood coffin in a one-sided shaft earth pit.

While the Shangbanzhuwa cemetery is characterized by single-eared bowls, and red coarse pots with raised strips or an incising decoration in the two ears, which are hardly seen in the Ahatela site. The deceased placed in a supine position were often buried in shaft-pit graves without a wood coffin, which is rarely seen in either the Shangbanzhuwa site or the Ahatela site. The pots without an ear in the Shangbanzhuwa cemetery appeared also in the early stage, while the red pots existed only in the beginning period, later replaced by a single-eared bowl. Besides, some potteries unearthed from the Shangsunjiazhai site show some similarities in how the ears were decorated, especially the raised strips and incising patterns.

By contrast, the Shangbanzhuwa cemetery shows not only similarities but also differences with the Yellow River type and the Huangshui type of the Kayue culture. It is hard to determine which subtype of the Kayue culture it should belong to.

### 2.1.1.2 Xiabanzhuwa cemetery

The Xiabanzhuwa cemetery lies south of the Xiongxian township. A total of 17 graves and about 300 funeral objects were found in two excavations during 1990 and 1994\(^{113}\), including over 10 bronze artifacts, consisting of 2 knives, 2 earrings, 11 bulbs, 2 joined beads, and one fragment (Fig. 002.). It is interesting to note that sixty bodies of the deceased were laid in the same direction, with all of the heads facing westwards. Accordingly, these graves may well be a cemetery of one group of people.

The excavators suggested that the cemetery should be assigned to the early Kayue culture in light of the funeral objects, which are inclined to show more similarities to the Ahatela type than the Shangsunjiazhai type.

Besides, in 1986, two bronze bulbs were found in the survey of the Suolatai cemetery in the Hualong county\(^{114}\). The pictures of them are not yet published.

### 2.1.2 Gangcha county

One cemetery located 10km north of the Qinghai Lake and west of the Gangcha county, was excavated in 1989 and 1990\(^{115}\). In light of the funeral objects and burial convention, the excavators ascribed all of the 42 graves to the Kayue culture. Over 10 bronze artifacts were found, including one knife, one awl that had a bone shaft tube with six bone needles inside (Fig. 003, 1-3), buttons, and joined beads and so on.

Not only the funeral objects, such as the two-eared potteries, bronze wares and bone needles, but also the mortuary practice, especially animal sacrifice and the secondary burials, show similarities with those in the Kayue culture. The excavators ascribed the
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bronze knife (Fig. 003, 1) to the Kayue culture, although to which period of the Kayue culture is still uncertain.

In 1971, one tomb near the Buhaha site was discovered together with one bronze tube (Fig. 003, 4). It is difficult to tell which culture it belongs to because too few accompanied potteries were found\textsuperscript{116}.

2.1.3 Ledu county
The Ledu county lies east of Xining and the north bank of Huangshui. It was surveyed in 1982 and 1986\textsuperscript{117}. About 29 ancient culture sites ascribed to the Majiayao, Qijia, Kayue and Xindian cultures were identified in the Hongshui village. In addition, one bronze arrowhead with a tubular handle was collected, and ascribed to the Xindian culture by the excavators (Fig. 004).

2.1.4 Ping’an county
The Ping’an county is situated northeast of Xining. Four tombs of the Bronze Age were excavated in 1998 at the Shaka village, the Gucheng township in the south bank of Huangshui, which is situated south of the Ping’an county\textsuperscript{118}. Based on the potteries and bronze artifacts, the two-eared and long-necked potteries, bronze bulb (Fig. 005, 3) and other bronze ornaments found, the excavators suggested that these graves belonged to the Kayue culture.

Except for one secondary burial, the other three graves were all buried with animal bones, so it is possible to infer that animal husbandry perhaps prevailed during that period. In addition, one bronze bulb was also collected from the Xinzhuang site\textsuperscript{119}.

2.1.5 Minhe county: Shanjiatou cemetery
The Minhe county is situated on the south bank of the Huangshui. The Shanjiatou\textsuperscript{120} cemetery, lying east of the Hetaozhuang village, is one important Bronze Age site in the Minhe county. A total of 33 shaft-pit graves were found together with 69 potteries, 1 bronze hook (Fig. 006.), a few bronze bulbs, and some stones and bone wares.

The excavation of the Shanjiatou cemetery made a breakthrough in the archaeology of northwestern China, filling in the missing gap between the ancient cultures in the Gansu and Qinghai regions and providing valuable information for researching the mutual relations between them.

As for the mortuary practice presented in the Shanjiatou cemetery, the deceased were normally buried singularly, in rectangular-shaft-pit graves, in an extended and supine

\textsuperscript{116} Gu W. H. 1978, 69-70.
\textsuperscript{117} Wu H. X. 1994, 7-10.
\textsuperscript{118} QHY 2002a, 29-37.
\textsuperscript{119} DTJQH 1996, 13.
\textsuperscript{120} Ge/Hong 1990, 10-15.
position as well as several secondary burials.

When comparing it to the other sites of the Xindian culture\textsuperscript{121}, such as the Lianhuatai site in the Yongjing, Gansu Province\textsuperscript{122}, the Liuwan site in the Yuedu county\textsuperscript{123} and the Boji site in the Minhe county of the Qinghai province\textsuperscript{124} and so on, the excavators viewed it as a special subtype of the Xindian culture.

### 2.1.6 Huzhu county

#### 2.1.6.1 Zongzhai

Zongzhai\textsuperscript{125} is the most important cemetery of the Bronze Age discovered in the Huzhu county, because 6 tombs of the Machang type, 10 of the Qijia culture and 1 of the Xindian culture were found, providing vital stratigraphical evidence. It is worthwhile mentioning that the Machang type tomb M38 was broken by the Qijia culture tomb M39, proving the supposition that the Qijia culture is later than the Machang type culture (Fig. 007b, 9). Furthermore, the difference resulted from gender or class in the Qijia culture has been reflected not only in the varieties of the funeral objects but also in the quantities. Besides, some forms and patterns of the potteries found at the Shangsunjiazhai cemetery and the Ahatela site of the Kayue culture are also seen in the Zongzhai site. Six bronze artifacts, identified as the Kayue culture, include two knives (Fig. 007a, 1.2) and four bronze wares compounded with a bone shaft (Fig. 007a, 3.4).

Conclusively, the tombs at the Zongzhai cemetery are vital for us to clarify the particular traits of the Qijia culture and the relations between the Qijia, Kayue, and Xindian cultures. In addition, some bronze bulbs were found at the Chengjiatai site in the Huzhu county\textsuperscript{126}, however the pictures are not yet available.

#### 2.1.6.2 Fengtai

The Bronze Age settlement near the Fengtai village, 45km north of the provincial capital, Xining, was discovered by members of the Archaeological Institute of the Qinghai Province, during the course of systematic archaeological surveys in the early 1980s. It was declared a cultural heritage zone in 1986. Based on red grit tempered potsherds collected from the surface, the site was attributed to the Kayue culture.\textsuperscript{127}

In July 2000, the Archaeological Institute of the Qinghai Province guided an archaeological field excursion, for colleagues from the Archaeological Institute of the Chinese Academy of Social Science, and the Department of Eurasian Archaeology of

\textsuperscript{121} Xindian culture, one bronze culture in the Qinghai region, will be discussed in the following sections.

\textsuperscript{122} GSG et al. 1988, 7-20.

\textsuperscript{123} Liuwan 84.

\textsuperscript{124} Gao/Wu 1984, 30-33.

\textsuperscript{125} QHWD 1986c, 309-317.

\textsuperscript{126} DTJQH 1996, 95.

\textsuperscript{127} Xu X. G. et al.2003, 87.
the German Archaeological Institute. The joint research team collected a large number of various artifacts attributed to the Kayue culture. The stratigraphical observations and richness of the stray finds led to the assumption that the Fengtai site is a well-preserved long-term dwelling place, providing sufficient archaeological substance to merit close examination.\textsuperscript{128}

Firstly, one important result from the excavation at Fengtai, suggests that the excavated part of the Bronze Age settlement existed for approximately 400 years, the last 200 years of the second millennia BCE and 200 years of the first millennia BCE (e.g. 1000±200 cal BCE). The radiocarbon dates obtained (Appendix) based on the East Profile (Fig. 020b) and West Profile (Fig. 020a) of Trench TG1, and the South Profile of Trench TG2 (Fig. 020c) helped to narrow down the time interval in which the Kayue culture is usually placed (Appendix). Both the sedimentary and chronology records correspond with each other, helping to divide the history of the opened settlement into two periods. The pottery complex supported this conclusion.

Secondly, three modes of house construction were found in Fengtai. The first mode is characterized by a steep slope with a large amount of ash, burned wood and pieces of mud-plaster as well as the absence of dwelling floors. This indicates a distinct mode of house constructed against the slope, which was laid out on two or more levels with timber being used as the main construction material (Fig. 020b). The second construction is quite different. The profiles show horizontal house floors with multi-layered mud and lime plastering (Fig. 020b, columns E.F; 020a, columns C-E about 2.7-2.9 meters in depth). No postholes or any other traces of wall construction materials were found. The third architectural feature of the settlement was found in the uppermost part of the ancient cultural layers at a depth of about one meter (Fig. 020b, columns A.B) with a collapsed mud brick wall. The excavators thought the wall was not a fortification enclosing the entire settlement, but more likely the wall of a single building or yard.\textsuperscript{129}

In addition, the excavators attributed the Early Period of wood house construction to the Kayue culture. The construction of mud floor houses and a mud brick wall are synchronous to the spread of the Xindian culture.

Besides, the excavation of Fengtai provides the assumption that the period between 1500 and 900 cal BCE experienced slightly wetter conditions than at present, which is in agreement with the archaeological results.

\textbf{2.1.7 Tongren county}

The Tongren county lies in the Longwuhe Valley. Many sites of the Qijia and Kayue

\textsuperscript{128} Xu X. G. et al. 2003, 88.
\textsuperscript{129} Xu X. G. et al. 2003, 106.
cultures were identified in the surveys conducted in 1983 and 1987\textsuperscript{130}. One dagger axe and two knives (Fig. 008) were collected from one grave of the Zong’an temple in the Tongren county\textsuperscript{131}. The excavators suggested that they were related to the Scythian bronzes. However, the two-eared potteries coexisting with these bronzes were very common in the Kayue culture.

2.1.8 Xunhua county: Suhusa cemetery
The Suhusa cemetery lies southeast of the Xunhua county and the south bank of the Yellow River. It was excavated twice, whereby 116 graves\textsuperscript{132} were discovered. Of them, 65 belonged to the Banshan culture, 1 to the Neolithic, 22 to the Kayue culture, and 28 are unclear.

The tombs of the Banshan culture are mainly distributed in the northern half part of the cemetery. Apart from an earth catacomb, others are built in earth shaft pits; 39 of them are furnished with wooden coffins. As for the burial manners, there were primary, secondary, and crematory burials; most of the dead were buried singularly and secondarily; by contrast, double-person or multi-person burials occurred rarely, only in three cases. Among the funeral objects, pottery vessels were the most commonly found.

The tombs of the Kayue culture lie principally in the southern half part of the cemetery. As for the type of tomb concerned, the earth shaft pit, mostly furnished with coffins of birch planks, is the dominating form. Three urn burials and one catacomb were found as well. The urn coffin was made of two jars, which were jointed mouth to mouth. Regarding the burial manners, the secondary burial with single disordered dead is the most popular. Among them, are two double-person burials; and a few single tombs, where the dead lie in an extended supine position. Besides, 16 bronze artifacts were found, including 15 bulbs, and one joined beads (Fig. 009).

The excavators temporarily assigned these 22 graves to the Kayue culture according to the pottery complex. The complicated elements shown in the Suhasa cemetery should be noted. Some bronze artifacts were also discovered at Ahatela\textsuperscript{133} and Duojiamaga\textsuperscript{134}, but unfortunately, the information is not yet published.

2.1.9 Guide and Jianzha county: Shanjiaping cemetery
Over 190 sites belonging to the Neolithic and the Bronze Ages were found in the surveys of the Guinan and Tongde counties conducted in 1980, 1983 and 1987\textsuperscript{135}. One bronze bulb and bell were collected from the Chengxi village (Fig.010, 1-2).

\textsuperscript{130} QHY 1990a, 36-47.
\textsuperscript{131} Gao D. L. 1985b, 48-49.
\textsuperscript{132} QHK 1994, 425-469.
\textsuperscript{133} Xu/Ge 1981, 24-29.
\textsuperscript{134} QHY 1991, 320.
\textsuperscript{135} QHY 1990c, 16-23.
The Shanpingtai cemetery\textsuperscript{136} lies west of the Guide county, which was excavated in 1981. A total of 90 burials were found, together with 629 funeral objects, including 2 bronze bells and 1 bronze knife (Fig. 011). According to the potteries and mortuary practice, the excavator assigned the Shanpingtai cemetery to the Kayue culture.

Thirteen sites of the Qijia culture, and 90 sites of the Kayue culture were identified in the survey of 1987 in the Jianzha county, and no remains of the Xindian culture were found\textsuperscript{137}. Some bronze artifacts ascribed to the Kayue culture were also found, including 1 ring, 1 arrowhead, some ornaments and tubes\textsuperscript{138}.

2.1.10 Datong county: Huangjiazhai cemetery

A total of six sites of the Majiayao type culture, six sites of the Qijia culture, and a few sites of the Kayue culture that resemble more with the Shangsunjiazhai type, and eight sites of the Han Dynasty were identified in the archaeological survey of 1986 in the Datong county\textsuperscript{139}.

In 1990, one dagger axe with a sheep on the guard and two axes (Fig. 012) were collected from the Liangjiao township in Datong county\textsuperscript{140}. The blades of all three bronze artifacts show evidence of being used. However, due to the lack of an archaeological context, it is difficult to tell whether they belonged to the Kayue culture.

Lying 27km north of Xining, the Huangjiazhai cemetery is an important Kayue culture site in the Datong county found together with 26 graves of the Bronze Age in 1985\textsuperscript{141}. A total of 16 bronze artifacts were found, including 1 bronze bird ornament with a long beak and convex abdomen, 5 bells, 6 tubes, 2 bulbs, 1 spear and 1 scraper (Fig. 013). The excavators put forward that gender and social class differences were reflected in the burial manners. Bronze spears, bone daggers and bone arrowheads were always found in the male burials, implying that men were mainly engaged in war and hunting; however knives, awls, chisels and spinning whorls accompanied the female burials, showing that perhaps women undertook the daily productive labour. A total of 8 seashells were found, and 7 of them were in tomb M5. The excavators proposed that the seashells should be regarded as primitive money, proving that a small number of people owed more wealth than the majority of people at that time. Furthermore, the potteries found at the Huangjiazhai cemetery show the characteristics of the Qijia and of Kayue cultures, which seems more like a transitional type between the Qijia and Kayue cultures.

\textsuperscript{136} QHWD et al. 1987, 255-273.
\textsuperscript{137} QHY 1990d, 47-56.
\textsuperscript{138} Figures are not yet published.
\textsuperscript{139} QHY 1994a, 320-329.
\textsuperscript{140} Liu/Chen 1990, 83.
\textsuperscript{141} QHY et al. 1994, 193-205.
2.1.11 Huangyuan county

The Huangyuan county, lying in the upper reaches of the Huangshui River, is one of the important Kayue culture counties.

2.1.11.1 Dahuazhongzhuang cemetery

The Dahuazhongzhuang cemetery was excavated in 1983, found together with 118 graves and over 1000 funeral objects, including about 425 bronze artifacts.\(^{142}\)

Without containers, these bronze artifacts consist of implements of production, daily wares, and ornaments, made by a mould pouring practice, including 6 spears, 1 arrowhead, 1 awl, 3 knives, 34 mirrors, 4 tubes, 2 sticks, 43 bells, 7 earrings, 5 rings, 204 bulbs (Fig. 014a), 65 plaques and 61 beads\(^{143}\) as well as 2 pole tops. It is worth mentioning that one pole-top was discovered from tomb M87 in the form of a dog lying on the end of the long beak, of a long-necked bird head, barking against a cow with erected shoulders and upwards tail, standing on the bead-circled round eyes of the bird. It is interesting that one calf stands under the cow drinking milk (Fig. 014, 5). Certainly true to life, this artifact was skillfully constructed. Another one was also discovered but broken and incomplete in tomb M87.

Both the burial manners and funeral objects of the Dahuazhongzhuang cemetery have their own attributes, providing important new materials for research on the Kayue culture and its development. Firstly, the oval and triangular shaped tombs were bigger than the rectangular shaped ones and normally had a racking platform. Secondly, most of the dead had been dug out and disturbed after being buried for some time, then reburied into the original tomb. Quite a few of these tombs were disturbed at the same time so that the mix up of the skeletons was unavoidable, causing some of the dead to have less bones and others to have more. The ash and gravel in front of the tombs implies that one sacrifice ceremony was probably held after the secondary burial (Fig. 014b; Fig. 014c). This phenomenon is perhaps owing to the religious tradition at that time. Thirdly, ornaments made by bronze, stone, jade, bone, shell and so on were the main funeral objects. This custom still prevails nowadays in Zang (藏) people. We can also infer the flourish of animal husbandry at that time in light of the abundant bones of horse, sheep and bull buried in the tombs. Fourthly, there are 6 groups of 14 tombs with superimposing relations: M98→M90; M97→M95; M94, M93→M96; M107→M101; M104→M105, M106→M105; M103→M102, these relations provide important proof to date the relative chronology of the potteries. The excavators considered that if the Shangsunjiazhai type belonged to the late Kayue culture, the Dahuazhongzhuang cemetery should be later than the Shangsunjiazhai type.

\(^{142}\) QHHYB et al. 1985, 11-34.

\(^{143}\) The figures are not yet published.
2.1.11.2 Mobula site

Although thousands of graves belonging to the Kayue culture have been found in the Qinghai Province, it was the first time in 1987 that 4 houses, together with 1 grave (M7) of the Kayue culture were discovered and formally excavated at Mobula\textsuperscript{144} in the Huangyuan county.

Houses F1 and F2 were supported by wood pillars and neither the walls or roof were discovered. So it is thought that they were used as a kitchen or corral (Fig.015a). This kind of house, still exists today. Neither wood pillars nor traces of walls or roofs were found in F3 and F4 (Fig. 015b). Furthermore, the floor was slanted so that it helped to drain water, which resembles that of the present tent. Besides, more ashes than objects were discovered inside the house. It was proposed that the feces of bulls and sheep found were used as fuel, implying that the people in Mobula probably made a living from animal husbandry during the time of the Kayue culture. On the basis of the potteries and other objects (Fig.015c; Fig. 015d) found, the excavators assigned the Mobula site to the late Kayue culture, thus these 4 houses provided important information about the economic situation of the late Kayue culture.

2.1.11.3 Huabiliang and Luanshan

In total, 13 graves of the Kayue culture were excavated at Huabiliang in the Tawan township, and 5 graves were found at Luanshan in the Shenzhong township in 1982\textsuperscript{145}. Most of them were secondary burials. Some of them were buried with animal bones, especially those of horses, cattle, dogs, and sheep. Several bronze artifacts were found, including 1 spear, 1 knife, a few bulbs, bells and plaques (Fig. 016a). 1 bronze bird and 1 human figure were also collected (Fig. 016b).

Some of the potteries found in the tombs show great similarities to the Tangwang style pottery. On the other hand, they differ with the typical Tangwang style pottery. On observing the manufacturing technique of the potteries, the excavators attributed them to the late Kayue culture.

2.1.12 Huangzhong county: Panjialiang cemetery

The Huangzhong county lies in the middle branches of the Huangshui and south end of the Qilian Mountains. The Panjialiang cemetery is one of the important Bronze Age sites\textsuperscript{146} in the Huangzhong county.

A total of 244 tombs of the Kayue culture (Fig 017a) were discovered at Panjialiang, together with over 7000 funeral objects in 1981 and 1982\textsuperscript{147}. Among them: 25 knives, 12 tubes, 2 arrowheads, 15 axes, 1 battle axe, and many ornaments including bells,

\textsuperscript{144} Gao/Xu 1990, 1012-1011.
\textsuperscript{145} QHWD 1986b, 882-886.
\textsuperscript{146} HHWWZ 1991.
\textsuperscript{147} QHY 1994b, 28-98.
bulbs, joined beads all of which were made by bronze (Fig.017b) were found. No
evidence has proven that the bronze axes were used; accordingly, these axes were
perhaps exclusively manufactured as funeral objects.

The mortuary practice of the Panjialiang cemetery is very characteristic. The deceased
were first placed in an extended and supine position. After a certain period of time,
most of tombs were consciously dug up and the bodies were dragged out of the tombs
and torn into pieces, normally the head was smashed and broken. Then they were
taken back to the tombs and buried again (Fig. 017f). The excavators considered that
all of the 84 potteries (most of them are complete) found in front of the tombs (Fig.
017g) were used as articles of tribute for the secondary burials, which did not belong
to certain tombs but the whole cemetery. These burial manners could be one of the
religious ceremonies.

The quantity and variety of the funeral objects differ in gender and status. In addition,
some of the dead were supposed to be buried alive as articles of tribute. They were
laid down against the walls (Fig. 017c) or corners (Fig. 017d; Fig. 017e) of the tombs
and seemed to be bound, and kneeling down towards the main dead, normally without
being disturbed after the second conscious disturbing of the main dead (Fig. 017g).
The excavators therefore concluded that they could have been the slaves of the main
dead. In total, 32 cases of the dead were found buried alive in 26 of the 244 tombs.

Besides, 14 groups, namely 25 tombs with the superimposing relations were found
(Fig. 017h; Fig.017i; Fig. 017j). Accordingly, the excavators divided most of the
tombs into three periods based on the pottery complex.148 In addition, the human
bones found from tomb M78 were dated to B. P. 2838±145.

Named after the Kayue village, the Kayue culture is one important bronze culture in
the Qinghai and Gansu regions. The Panjialiang cemetery is situated only 1.5km north
of the Kayue village. The potteries found in Panjialiang are almost the same as those
found in the Kayue culture, nearly without any trace of elements from other cultures,
as stated by the excavators.

Many other sites in the Huangzhong county, such as the Zhujiashai149, Nancun
cemetery, Zhaodongkou cemetery, Huanggaotai cemetery, Zhadongkou cemetery,
Huangjiatai, Dongjiawan, Xiatai, Baiya, and Kayue village150 were found with bronze
artifacts as well (Fig. 018, 1-3). However, most of the related figures have not been
published. One bronze axe and two mirrors were collected from the Qianyang village.

2.1.13 Other sites
The Guinan and Tongde counties are situated in the south bank of the upper Yellow

---

148 QHY 1994b, 63.
149 An Z. M. 1959a, 376.
150 DTJQH 96.
River. In total, 73 sites of the Bronze Age were identified in the survey of 1982 and 1987\textsuperscript{151}. A total of 49 pieces of bronze artifacts, including mirrors, hoops and bulbs (Fig. 019, 1-3) were found at Gamatai, Guinan county\textsuperscript{152}. Some bronze hoops (Fig. 019, 4-6) and dagger axes were unearthed from the Zongri and Tongde counties\textsuperscript{153}. In 1957 and 1959, Dulan county was surveyed and excavated\textsuperscript{154}, found together with 9 adobe walls, 11 houses, 9 adobe pits and 3 urn burials. Some slag and 14 bronzes were collected as well, including 3 axes, 7 bronzes, 1 Yue and 3 arrowheads (Fig. 101d, 1-18).

Some other copper and bronze artifacts were found at Dalitaliha\textsuperscript{155}, Tawentaliha and Baishuihe\textsuperscript{156} as well. It is worth mentioning that the big spear (Fig. 018, 4) found from Shenna\textsuperscript{157} aroused great interest and argument amongst archaeologists\textsuperscript{158}.

### 2.2 Discoveries of bronzes in Ningxia

The Ningxia Hui Autonomous Region, one of the five autonomous regions of minority ethnic groups in China, situated in the eastern part of northwestern China is between 104.17° E and 107.38° E, and 35.14° N and 39.23° N. The Shanxi Province lies to its east, the Gansu Province lies to its south, and Inner Mongolia adjoins it in the north. The region covers 800 square km. Its topography is mainly composed of mountains and highlands. The whole region is 2000 meters above sea level, although generally the southern part is higher than the northern part. Rivers that flow through Ningxia include the Yellow River.

Ningxia is a relatively dry and desert-like region. The region is 1,200km from the sea and has a continental climate with average summer temperatures rising to between 17 and 24°C in July, and average winter temperatures dropping to between -7 and -10°C in January. Seasonal extreme temperatures can reach 39°C in the summer and -30°C in the winter. The average temperature variation in summer is 17°C. Annual rainfall averages from 190 to 700 millimeters, with more rain falling in the south of the Ningxia region.

A number of Bronze Age sites were identified and excavated in Ningxia. The related copper and bronze information will be introduced as follows.

\textsuperscript{151} Wang G.S. 1990, 17-44.
\textsuperscript{152} Shinian 91.
\textsuperscript{153} QHW et al. 1998, 1-14. 35.
\textsuperscript{154} QHW et al. 1963, 17-43.
\textsuperscript{155} QHW et al. 1963, 17-43.
\textsuperscript{156} DTJQH 1996.
\textsuperscript{157} Nianjian 93.
\textsuperscript{158} It will be discussed later.
2.2.1 Zhongwei county: Langwozikeng

The Zhongwei county borders the Ordos Plateau along its northeast and the Hexi Corridor along its northwest. In 1987, a total of 11 burials were unearthed at Langwozikeng, Zhongwei county found together with about 400 bronzes, including short swords, daggers, knives, axes, awls plaques, figures and horse and chariot fittings (Fig. 021).

As stated by the excavators, the short swords (Fig 021, 11-14), crane hook (Fig. 021, 17), axes (Fig. 021, 22-25), chisel (Fig. 021, 26), and buckles (Fig. 021, 37-38) show great similarities to those found from the Taohongbala 160 and the Hulusitai cemeteries 161. While the turbine shaped plaque (Fig. 021, 36), the spade shaped plaque (Fig. 021, 39), horse figure (Fig. 021, 42) and bell resembled those found from Yushugou in the Yongdeng county 162.

In addition to the absence of iron knives and gold earrings, when compared to the Taohongbala Cemetery, the bronzes found at Langwozikeng are much simpler in form and manufacturing technique. The Taohongbala Cemetery was generally dated to the late Spring and Autumn period, so the iron sword with a bronze handle found in Langwozikeng (Fig. 021, 10) is dated to the early Spring and Autumn period. Furthermore, the bronze sword, crane hook, arrowhead, and dragon-patterned plaque possess the typical traits that dominated the Western Zhou period. Accordingly, the whole cemetery was later than the Spring and Autumn period.

2.2.2 Pengyang county

The Guyuan region lies in the south of Ningxia, bordered by the northern nomadic zone and the central agricultural region, synchronously impacted by the Ordos bronzes and the Central Plain. The Pengyang county is situated inside the Guyuan region. Quite a number of bronzes were found there.

Since 1974 a large quantity of bronzes have been discovered or collected from different sites in the Pengyang county, including the Zhangjie village in the Caomiao township (Fig. 022a; Fig. 022b), Baiyanglin village in the Xinji township 164 (Fig. 029, 4.19.22), Miyuan village in the Liuyuan township (Fig. 023; Fig. 029, 5), the Xianma village (Fig. 024) and Guantai village (Fig. 025) in the Jiaocha township, the Baicaowa village in the Goukou township (Fig. 026), the Baicha village in the Yaoxian township (Fig. 027), the Dianwa village in the Gucheng township (Fig. 028), and the Mengyuan village and so on (Fig. 029). 165

159 Zhou X. H. 1989, 971-980.
160 Tian G. J. 1976, 131-141.
161 Ta L. etc. 1988, 11-18.
162 GSBG 1981a, 34-36.
164 Luo/Yan 1993, 17-21
165 Luo/Han 1990, 403-418.
The Zhangjie Cemetery lies to the north of the Zhangjie village, Caomiao township, Pengyang county. It was officially excavated again in 1998.\textsuperscript{166} The work resulted in the revelation of 6 tombs and 1 burial pit, which yielded 72 animal victims and 84 pieces of grave goods, including 72 bronzes and pottery vessels, iron wares, bone and stone artifacts. The tombs were put into earth caves with shaft passages and earth shafts. Only tombs M2 and M3 were well preserved (Fig. 022b, A.20,B.18.). The bronzes largely consisted of swords, knives, chisels, tubular ornaments, plaques, buckles, and button-shaped ornaments (Fig. 022b). The cemetery was assigned by the excavators to a burial ground of the Western Rong (西戎) ethnic group, from the late Spring and Autumn period to the early Warring States period.

The other bronze sites found in the Pengyang county resemble them in not only burial manners but also grave goods. Most of the bronzes were unearthed from the graves. The earth pit graves were very common. Some of the graves included animal victims, such as cattle, sheep and horses. Normally the deceased were placed in an extended and supine position. The burial manners show typical traits of the northern people. Most of the bronzes can be dated between the late Spring and Autumn period and the late Warring States.

### 2.2.3 Xiji county

The Xijie county also lies inside the Guyuan region, south of Ningxia. During 1985-1991, a total 7 of burials were found together with bronzes at the Chenyangchuan village, Xining township\textsuperscript{167} (Fig. 030). Some bronzes were collected from the Baiya township and Xinglong township as well(Fig. 031).\textsuperscript{168} Unfortunately, only a few of the materials have been officially published. The excavation in 1988 conducted at the Chenyangchuan village yielded a total of 62 bronzes (Fig. 030, 1-16) and 15 sets of animal victims. It is worth mentioning that two iron swords (Fig. 030, 21) were found, thus the excavators ascribed it to the late Warring States period.

### 2.2.4 Longde county

The Longde county lies south of Ningxia. In the middle of the 1980s, some graves of the early and middle Warring States period were discovered in the Longde county\textsuperscript{169}. The tombs at the Wugou village in the Wenbao township, Jizhuanchan in the Shatang township, and in the Heshenlin township were partly or heavily disturbed and destroyed. The accompanying bronzes (Fig. 032) and animal victims show great characteristics of the Northern Bronzes, which were attributed to the Xiongnu people by the excavators.

---

\textsuperscript{166} NXY et al 2002, 14-24.  
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2.2.5 Zhongning county: Niding

The Zhongning county is bordered by the Tenggeli Desert. One group of bronzes were discovered from the Niding village\textsuperscript{170}. These bronzes contained a short sword, knife, arrowhead, mirror, awl, axe, buckle, and many horse and chariot fittings, such as horse bit, gag bit, Danglu, Dun and tubular ornaments (Fig. 033).

Though one grave was partly destroyed, the excavators attributed these two graves to the same culture based on the grave goods assemblage. The antenna-headed short sword was quite common in the Spring and Autumn period, however it was largely replaced by loop-headed short swords in the Warring States period. One bronze sword found at Niding has an antenna head and the other three have loop heads (Fig. 033, 1-4). Besides, the motifs on the mirror (Fig. 033, 20) show great differences to those from the Central Plain, not only in content, but also in their variating pattern. Consequently, the two graves were dated by the excavators to the early Warring States period.

Besides, most of the grave goods are constituted of horse fittings and weapons. With the exception of the geometrical designs, tigers and hawks were the favorite designs, implying the nomadic life of the deceased. Bronze short swords, crane hacks, socket axes and various kinds of ornaments are the main characteristics of the northern bronze cultures. The ethnic ascription of these two graves is still in argument.

2.2.6 Guyuan county

The Guyuan county lies south of Ningxia. Quite a lot of Bronze Age sites have been identified and found in the Guyuan county.

2.2.6.1 Mazhuang

From September to November in 1989, a total of 49 tombs of the Eastern Zhou period near the Mazhuang village in the Yanglang township were excavated with 891 various objects and 2011 beads\textsuperscript{171}.

Twenty tombs were heavily destroyed and the other 29 tombs displayed rather strong local and ethnic features. The catacomb was popular and the deceased was placed with the head lower than the feet (Fig. 041a). Normally the deceased were buried singularly in an extended and supine position. No joint burials as well as coffins have been found. Both the inside of the caves and passages were scattered with sacrificial animals, such as cattle, horses, and sheep.

The funeral inventory includes objects made of gold, silver, bronze, iron, bone, horn, stone, agate, turquoise and so on. Of them, the bronzes are the largest in quantity and bone wares and iron wares come next. Bronzes, chariot trappings and clothing

\textsuperscript{170} Zhong K. 1987a, 773-777.
\textsuperscript{171} NXY et al. 1993, 13-56.
ornaments with local features were the most common, though a few articles show similarities to their counterparts in the Central Plain. All objects were originally made for daily use (Fig. 041b).

According to the stratigraphical evidence and assemblage of funeral goods, the tombs can be divided into an earlier phase and a later phase: the former corresponds to the time from the end of the Spring and Autumn period to the early Warring States period; the latter, to the late Warring States period. All the graves were probably remains of the same ethnic group.

In light of written records and previous studies, it can be inferred that the Mazhuang cemetery belonged to the Rong tribes, as stated by the excavators. Its discovery provides new knowledge regarding the content of the Northern Bronzes cultural system and its creators. Zhong Kan and Han Kongle pointed out that the bronze cultures in south Ningxia were well developed in the middle Spring and Autumn period, forming special local traits, though influenced partly by the Qin culture from the east. The excavators ascribed these bronze cultures in south Ningxia to the Xiongnu People.

2.2.6.2 Others

In 1973, one group of bronzes were accidentally found at the Xijiao Commune, including pickaxes, adzes and ornaments, which were considered to have belonged to the Xiongnu People (Fig. 034), dated to the Warring States. In addition, 3 silver objects were also found.

More graves were found with a considerable number of bronzes, including Yangwa in the Hechuan township (Fig. 035), Dabeishan in the Yanglang commune (Fig. 036) Wangjiaping in the Touying commune (Fig. 037) and Lüjiaping village in the Hechuan township (Fig. 038). There are also some stray finds(Fig. 039). These graves are similar not only in mortuary practice but also in the bronze objects. Firstly, the animal victim was very common, as the 20 horse skulls found at Dabeishan and 14 at Yangwa demonstrate. Secondly, apart from a small quantity of spears and daggers, the bronzes consisted mainly of horse and chariot fittings and ornaments. Moreover, animal motifs, such as deer, tigers, donkeys, horses and the head of hawk dominate as well as some geometrical designs. All of them fully reflect the natural environment, animal husbandry, and hunting life at that time. Zhong Kan and Han Kongle date the Dabeishan cemetery in the Yanglang Commune and the Yangwa cemetery to the Late Spring and Autumn period and date the Wangjiaping village in the Touying Commune to the late Warring States on the basis of comparing
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the bronzes to those found at the Taohongbala Cemetery in Inner Mongolia. As for the collected bronzes concerned, they are also dated to between the Spring and Autumn and the Warring States period\textsuperscript{176}.

Besides, quite a considerable quantity of bronzes were found at the Samen village and Houmo village in the Pengbao township as well as in the Hechuan township and Nanjiao township and so on\textsuperscript{177} (Fig. 040). It is notable that the cowrie and cuniform gold found in the Houmo village, were probably used as a primitive kind of money at that time.

It was the first time in 1981 that one pit with horse and chariot fittings and one tomb ascribed to the Central Plain style were found in Sunjiazhuan\textsuperscript{178}. This pit lies 7.5km northeast of the Guyuan county and 2km south of the Qin Great Wall. There were two sets of horse skeletons. The typical Central Plain style bronze wares such as vessel-Gui and Ding were also found in this tomb (Fig. 042). In addition, the excavators dated them to the Western Zhou period. Whether this tomb belonged to the northern people or the Zhou people is still in dispute.

\section*{2.3 Discoveries of Bronzes in the Gansu Province}

The Gansu Province is situated at the geographical center of China, lying on the upper reaches of the Yellow River, and is a vast area. The Gansu Province is located between 32°11′ - 42°57′ N and 92°13′ - 108°46′ E. It meets Shanxi in the east, near Sichuan in the south, joins Qinghai and Xinjiang in the west, leans on Inner Mongolia and Ningxia, and borders Mongolia in the north. The total land area of the Gansu Province is 425,800 square km and ranks seventh place in China. The Gansu Province is a mountainous province and the major mountains are Qilianshan, Wushaoling, Liupanshan, A'erjinshan, Mazongshan, Helishan, Longshoushan, Xiqinshan and Ziwulin and so forth. Most of them orientate from northwest to southeast. The forest resources are centralized in these mountainous areas, and most rivers form their main streams from these mountains. The landforms are complicated, the mountainous regions, plateaus, plains, river valleys, deserts and the Gobi are in staggered distribution. The topography shapes long and narrow areas with a length of 1,655km from east to west and a width of 530km from north to south, which can be divided into 6 large regions with different features: the Longnan region, Longzhong loess plateau, Gannan plateau, Hexi corridor, Qilianshan area, and north area of the Hexi corridor.

At the intersection of the three plateaus: the Loess Plateau, Qinghai-Tibetan Plateau and Mongolian Plateau, the climate of the Gansu Province is dry, the daily difference
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in air temperature is large, the sunlight is sufficient, and sun radiation is strong. The annual average air temperature is between 0-14 °C and reduces from the southeast to the northwest; the annual average air temperature in the Hexi Corridor is 4-9°C and the annual average precipitation is about 300mm. The precipitation varies greatly from 42 to 760mm and reduces from the southeast to the northwest.179

Situated along the Silk Road, Gansu was an important province economically and a cultural transmission path as well. The related archaeological bronze information will be provided as follows.

2.3.1 Dongxiang county: Linjia

The Dongxiangzu Autonomous county lies in the middle of the Gansu Province and borders the Linxia county to the west. The Linjia site is situated on the east bank of the Daxiahe. It was excavated in 1977, found together with 27 houses, 3 kilns and 98 pits of the Majiayao period, as well as 3 houses and 1 burial of the Qijia culture. Over 3000 pieces of artifacts belonging to the Majiaoyao period were discovered, including stones, bones, potteries, and bronzes180.

It is worth noting that the earliest metal artifact—one bronze knife (Fig. 043b, 1) was found near the north wall of House F20 in Square T42 (Fig. 043a), which was attributed to the Majiayao period by the excavators. The Archaeometallurgy Laboratory of Beijing University of Iron and Steel Technology made an assay, showing that it consists of copper and tin. From the metallographic observation (Fig. 043b, 2), α solid solution dendritic crystals and a small amount of α+β eutectoid structure are visible on the blade and handle of the knife. The estimated tin content of the artifact is between 6% -10%. α dendrites are arranged along the blade, 1-2mm in width. We can also observe that this bronze knife was probably cast by two molds, one is a curved shape; the other is flat181.

Slag was discovered from H54 (trash pit), also dated to the Majiayao period. A petrology test indicated that the small slag pieces were constituted from malcachite, and the large pieces contained 30% malachite, 40% limonite, 10% quartz, 5% hematite, 5% copper and a bit of olivine. Metallic copper is distributed irregularly in the central part of the slag, malachite is found in the outer shell and between cracks; and the quartz looks like a globular pellet. All of these indicators suggest that the slag comes from the remains of incomplete smelting copper-iron ore. Two pieces of such slag were also discovered in the 4th stratum of Square T57.

Apart from the evidence of the slag, the Gansu Province is provided with abundant copper ore, including cassiterite and jewellers putty, implying from another viewpoint...

---

181 GSG et al. 1984, 116; Sun/Han 1997, 38.
that the bronze knife may have been accidentally made by the local people instead of being consciously produced, or introduced from the outside.

There are three radiocarbon dates. The two dates from H19 and F21 are much closer, nearly 4700 B.P.(ca.). The third one from F20 is dated to 5200 B.P. (ca), almost 300 years earlier than the other two. While houses F20 and F21 are both in the upper layer (the later period), therefore both of them should stay in the same period, namely the date from F20 is probably not advisable. Consequently, both F20 and H54 at Linjia belonged to the late Majiayao culture remains, which can be dated to 2740 BCE (after tree-ring correction), or equivalent to the late Yangshao culture in the Central Plain.

Unfortunately, the earlier dates of the Linjia site have not been appraised. In the excavators’ opinion, the earlier Linjia site is parallel to the Caojiazui site in Lanzhou and the Jiangjiaping site in the Yongdeng county. The knife (75.X.D.T473) found at Jiangjiaping was determined to be a tin-bronze product. A Machang copper block and awl were found at Gaomuxudi and Zhaotitan in Juquan county respectively. The former is a cast copper, and the latter was shaped by hot forging. The date of the Machang culture ranges from 2300 to 2000 BCE.

2.3.2 Minle county: Donghuishan

The Minle county lies at the foot of the Qilianshan and the middle of the Hexi Corridor. Situated northwest of the Minle county, the Donghuishan site was surveyed and excavated in 1987 and 1988. A total of 249 Siba culture tombs were discovered, found together with 15 bronzes and 1 gold earring (Fig. 044a). Among them, 15 pieces were appraised (Table 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lab No.</th>
<th>Original No.</th>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Situation of rust</th>
<th>Assay item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>T7(3):4</td>
<td>Earring</td>
<td>Surface is covered with green rust</td>
<td>1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>M21:1</td>
<td>Earring</td>
<td>Surface is covered with green rust</td>
<td>1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1652</td>
<td>M205:3</td>
<td>Knife</td>
<td>Surface and interior are entirely corroded</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>M127:12</td>
<td>Knife</td>
<td>Surface is covered with green rust</td>
<td>1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1654</td>
<td>M4:2</td>
<td>Knife</td>
<td>Surface and interior are entirely corroded</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

182 GSG et al 1984, 159.
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Table 4. Basic information on the 15 bronzes found at Donghuishan, Minle county, Gansu Province. Remark: ① Atomic absorption spectrometry by the center laboratory of the University of Science and Technology Beijing. ② Scanning electron microscope by the Material Department of the University of Science and Technology Beijing. ③ Metallographic structure analysis by the Archaeometallurgy Laboratory of the University of Science and Technology Beijing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>1655</th>
<th>0155</th>
<th>Knife</th>
<th>Surface and interior are entirely corroded</th>
<th>②</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1666</td>
<td>M218:2</td>
<td>Knifepoint</td>
<td>Surface is covered with green rust</td>
<td>①③</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1667</td>
<td>M78:3</td>
<td>Knife</td>
<td>Surface and interior are entirely corroded</td>
<td>②</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1668</td>
<td>M51:1</td>
<td>Earring</td>
<td>Surface is covered with green rust</td>
<td>①③</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1669</td>
<td>T12②:3</td>
<td>Earring</td>
<td>Surface is covered with green rust</td>
<td>①③</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1670</td>
<td>M79:1</td>
<td>Earring</td>
<td>Surface is covered with green rust</td>
<td>①③</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671</td>
<td>M26:10</td>
<td>Awl</td>
<td>Surface is covered with heavy green rust</td>
<td>③</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672</td>
<td>M23:6</td>
<td>Loop</td>
<td>Both surfaces are covered with green rust</td>
<td>②③</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1673</td>
<td>M36</td>
<td>Knifepoint</td>
<td>Heavy rust</td>
<td>③</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1674</td>
<td>M34</td>
<td>Earring</td>
<td>Surface is covered with green rust</td>
<td>①③</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Results of the Atomic Absorption spectrometry on the Bronzes of the Siba culture found at Donghuishan in Minle, Gansu (adapted from Donghuishan 98, 192 Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lab No.</th>
<th>Cu</th>
<th>Sn</th>
<th>Pb</th>
<th>Fe</th>
<th>As</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1650</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.005</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.005</td>
<td>&lt;0.005</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>&lt;0.005</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>96.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1666</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>97.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1668</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1669</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1670</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1674</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample 1672 and 4 knives (1652, 1654, 1655, and 1667) were observed by Energy Dispersive X-ray Analysis. A secondary electron image of 1672 shows that many white granules are distributed in solid solution grains that contains 95.5% copper, 2.1% arsenic, and 1.4% tin. The white granules are lead (Fig. 044b, 1). The four knives are heavily corroded. Their secondary electron image shows that there are laps between three layers of rust. Meanwhile the Energy Dispersive X-ray Analysis shows that the four knives are made of Cu-As alloy.

In addition, 11 pieces of samples have been appraised by metallographic structure identification. Many grey-blue copper and iron sulphide granules are distributed in the surface; all samples exhibit a forging structure, solid solution re-crystallized grains, and compound twins after etching. Some hot forged samples have signs of further cold working (Table 6; Fig. 044b, 3-5; Fig. 044c).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Metallographic structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1650 earring</td>
<td>The microstructure consists of solid solution re-crystallized grains and twinned structure with numerous black porosity and grey-blue sulphide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651 earring</td>
<td>Solid solution re-crystallized grains and twins are relatively bigger than the numerous black holes that are distributed along the grain boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653 knife</td>
<td>As the same as 1650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1666 knife</td>
<td>Solid solution re-crystallized grains extend along the processing direction as well as the grey-blue sulphide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1668 earring</td>
<td>Solid solution re-crystallized grains are a little deformed with slip lines, and deformed sulphide inclusions are distributed along the boundary of grains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1669 earring</td>
<td>Solid solution re-crystallized grains distort slightly with slip lines. It consists of numerous black porosity and grey-blue sulphide inclusions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1670 earring</td>
<td>The microstructure consists of solid solution re-crystallized grains, twinned structure, porosity, and grey-blue sulphide inclusions. Some parts of the borders distort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671 awl</td>
<td>The microstructure consists of solid solution re-crystallized grains and slip lines. In the boundaries are distributed black porosity and sulphide inclusions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672 loop</td>
<td>The microstructure consists of solid solution and twinned structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1673 knifepoint</td>
<td>The sample is corroded. Solid solution re-crystallized grains are elongated after etching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The microstructure consists of solid solution re-crystallized grains and twinned structure. In the boundaries, many sulphide inclusions and porosity are distributed.

Table 6. Metallographic structure of the bronzes from the Donghuishan, Minle county, Gansu Province (adapted from Donghuishan 98, 193 Table 3).

All of the results are concluded as follows:

1) The forms of the 15 artifacts are very simple. There are twelve arsenical coppers containing 2-6% arsenic. According to the results of the atomic absorption spectrometry, three artifacts are shaped by hot forging, containing 1.4%, 1.7% and 8% tin respectively.

2) 11 artifacts show a forged structure by metallographic identification. In the process of hot forging, the solid solution takes shape into the deformed re-crystallized grains and slippery. Six hot forged artifacts have signs of further cold working. Forging techniques and the content of arsenic are typical traits in the early period of the Siba culture alloys.

The slag found from the mining site of Dajing in Linxi county that was dated to the Spring and Autumn period\textsuperscript{186} contain 3.4-6.0% arsenic, with an average of 4.5%. It is remarkable that the average amount of arsenic contained in the bronzes from the Donghuishan site is 4.3%. In addition, the Qilianshan is provided with nonferrous metal ore. Therefore, it is possible that the ancient people used condurrites such as panabase and arsenopyrite at that time.

As we know, in the fourth millennia BCE, arsenic-copper artifacts were very common in West Asia, south Europe, and North Africa, so the evidence of arsenic-copper in Donghuishan provides some more evidence in understanding the connections between the east and the west.

The Huoshaogou cemetery in Yumen was excavated in the middle of the 1970s, found together with over 300 tombs and 200 bronzes\textsuperscript{187}. There are four radiocarbon dates from the Huoshaogou Cemetery: 3250±100 B. P., 3300±85 B. P., 3490±100 B. P., 3350±100 B. P. (see Appendix). So far, only two radiocarbon dates of the Donghuishan site\textsuperscript{188} are available: 3490±100 B. P. and 4230±250 B. P. (Appendix) The former is very close to the radiocarbon dates from the Huoshaogou Cemetery.

2.3.3 Wuwei county: Huangniangniangtai

The Wuwei county is situated in the central part of the Gansu province, on the east end of the Hexi Corridor. The Huangniangniangtai site has been excavated three times

\textsuperscript{186} Li/Han 1990, 151-160.
\textsuperscript{187} GSB 1979, 139-151.
\textsuperscript{188} One charcoal sample is collected from Square TG; another sample is carbonized wheat.
from August 1957 to 1959\textsuperscript{189}, which opened up a total area of 750 square meters, including 5 dwellings in the form of a square with a plastered floor, 42 ash pits and 24 tombs, found together with 23 pieces of copper and bronzes (Fig. 045a, 1-11).

The deposits of the site were relatively well preserved. The discovery of copper implements and oracle bones in the remains of the Qijia culture is a matter of great interest. Most of the oracle bones uncovered come from pig and cattle. Moreover, their preparation is also of a rather primitive nature in comparison to that of the Yin oracle bones unearthed at Anyang\textsuperscript{190}. The copper implements found at this site consisted only of a few small items such as the knives and awls, showing that the use of metal was still in its infancy. The excavators are, therefore, of the opinion that the Qijia culture or at least its later stage already belonged to the Chalcolithic period. The finds also indicate that there already existed well-established burial customs at that time. For instance, flexed burials appear to have been very common in the early stage of the Qijia culture, while on the other hand, extended burials are usually found in tombs with a neatly shaped rectangular pit. Sometimes the latter may also be found in the deposits of the later stage or else superimposed on the flexed burials. The absence of any tomb furniture in the early stage as well as its increasing presence in the latter tombs is testament to the increased productivity towards the end of the Qijia culture.

The fourth excavation at the Huangniangniangtai site in 1975\textsuperscript{191} yielded a total of 62 graves, 4 house remains and 23 pits of the Qijia culture (Fig. 045b), found together with stone implements, bone objects, copper tools, ornaments and oracle bones. The bulk of the implements are made of stone. It is worth noting that the hoes, adzes, and chisels are in fact made of jade or some jade-like stones, which are largely hand-made and decorated with either a basket or cord design.

Seven pieces of copper artifacts were discovered in tombs, including 2 knives, 3 awls and 2 drills (Fig. 045a, 12-15). In addition, the painted pottery was rather small and their decorations were dominated by rhomboid zigzags. The large number of animal remains consisted of pigs, goats, cattle, horses, chickens, and deer.

The tombs contain either one single burial, a joint burial or a triple burial. There were 12 joint burials. Except for one tomb with an adult and a child, the others consisted of one man and one woman. The man is buried in an extended position at the middle of the tomb facing upwards, while the woman lies in a flexed position on her side, mainly facing towards the man (Fig. 045c). It could be inferred that the men might have had a higher social status than the women at that time.

Out of the total number of single tombs, 52 were found to contain tomb furniture, which ranges in number from an average of about ten pieces to as many as well over

\textsuperscript{189} GSB 1960c, 57-71.
\textsuperscript{190} GSB 1960c, 71.
\textsuperscript{191} GSB 1978, 421-447.
ninety pieces. Besides, the dead were sometimes interred in a very haphazard manner. One house remain was also found, it was probably used by a single family because not only were many kinds of potteries found in the house but also a number of stone and bone implements (Fig. 045d). As suggested by the excavators, the Huangniangniangtai site is a pure and classical Qijia culture site. In addition, one part of the bronzes found from the Huangniangniangtai site has been examined\textsuperscript{192} (Table 7). Most of them are identified as copper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample No.</th>
<th>Material and identification method</th>
<th>Manufacturing technique and identification method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H9 (3)</td>
<td>Copper (A)</td>
<td>Mold (observation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T13:1</td>
<td>Copper (C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT5:249</td>
<td>Copper (C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T18(2) collected</td>
<td>Coined copper (observation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Hardcover</td>
<td>Hammer (observation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6:3</td>
<td>Hammer (observation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T10:3</td>
<td>Hammer (observation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT2(2)</td>
<td>Hammer (observation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9(3)</td>
<td>Hammer (observation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T19(2)</td>
<td>Hammer (observation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19948</td>
<td>Copper (D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2281</td>
<td>Copper (D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>Copper (A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19946</td>
<td>Copper (A. B)</td>
<td>Forge (metallographic examination)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.W.X. T17</td>
<td>Copper (A. B)</td>
<td>Forge (metallographic examination)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19947</td>
<td>Copper (A. B)</td>
<td>Forge (metallographic examination)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.W.X.T18/3</td>
<td>Copper (D)</td>
<td>Forge (metallographic examination)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19968(long)</td>
<td>Copper (D)</td>
<td>Forge (metallographic examination)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.W.X. T5</td>
<td>Copper (D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19968(short)</td>
<td>Copper (D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.W.X. T5</td>
<td>Copper (A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.W.X.T17/2</td>
<td>Copper (B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19951</td>
<td>Copper (B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.W.X.T14/3</td>
<td>Copper (A. B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Results on the identification of the bronzes from Huangniangniangtai. (A) isotope portable X-ray fluorescence analysis; (B) quantitative atomic emission spectrometry analysis; (C) semi-quantitative spectrometric analysis by the Geology

\textsuperscript{192} Sun/Han 1997, 79.
Bureau of Gansu; (D) Atomic Absorption Spectrometry. Sample 19948 is now identified as copper instead of bronze (adapted from Sun/Han 1997, 79 Table 1).

2.3.4 Yongchang county

The Yongchang county lies in the middle of the Gansu Province, to the east of the Hexi Corridor and at the foot of the north Qilianshan.

2.3.4.1 Sanjiaocheng and Hamadun

In the survey of 1979 at Yongchang county\textsuperscript{193}, one city wall and four houses were found at Sanjiaocheng. Twenty-two tombs were found at Hamadun, which lies west of Sanjiaocheng (Fig. 046c) as well as a few bronze artifacts (Fig. 046a; Fig. 047b). The excavators attributed both sites to the Shajing culture\textsuperscript{194} in light of one accompanying cylindrical pottery cups which show typical characteristics of the Shajing culture although the bronze artifacts exhibit the northern style.

The dwelling remains found from Sanjiaocheng may well have been a settlement for the nomadic people at that time because only an oven was found, no pillar hole was discovered and the boundaries of the house are unclear, implying that it may have been used as a tent. In total, 12 tombs were in the form of a one sided shaft pit. Most of the deceased were laid in an extended and supine position, and animal victims were very common (Fig. 046d). Till now, seven radiocarbon dates: 2530±90 B. P., 2650±95 B. P., 2600±125 B. P., 2500±90 B. P., 2870±160 B. P., 2770±90 B. P., and 2600±100 B. P., resulted from the charcoal samples taken from Sanjiaocheng (Appendix). All of them are in the time span of the early Spring and Autumn period\textsuperscript{195}.

2.3.4.2 Xigang and Chaiwangang

Xigang lies 310 meters east of Sanjiaocheng, and Chaiwangang is situated about 800 meters east of Sanjiaocheng. After the excavation at Sanjiaocheng and Hamadun during 1976 and 1979, Xigang and Chaiwangang were excavated from 1979 to 1981\textsuperscript{196}.

A total of 452 tombs at Xigang and 113 tombs at Chaiwangang were excavated, found together with about 2000 items of funeral goods, including potteries, bronze objects, iron and gold objects, stone wares, bone wares, leather, and textiles. In addition, the bronze objects were the most common funeral goods found (Fig. 065f; Fig. 065g; Fig. 065h; Fig. 098d; Fig. 098e; Fig. 098f), including swords, knives, beads, loops, plaques, buckles, bulbs, bells, tubes, mirrors and other ornaments. As stated by the excavators, all of the bronze objects show great similarity to the Ordos bronzes, however they differ in types and quantity. Among them, small personal ornaments

\textsuperscript{193} GSBG et al. 1984, 598-601; GSY 1990, 205-236.
\textsuperscript{194} In 1924, some bronzes were found from Shajing in Minqin county, Gansu Province. Therefore, Andersson put forward the title of Shajiang culture.
\textsuperscript{195} ZSKKY 1981, 366.
\textsuperscript{196} Xigangchaiwangang 2001.
were larger in quantity than weapons and implements. For example, personal ornaments such as various plaques, buckles, and beads were the chief components. While the Ordos bronzes (Fig. 098a, A 1; 2) were only unearthed in two cases from 565 tombs.

All of the tombs at Xigang and Chaiwangang were built in earth pit, which consisted of three forms: lateral-shaft pit (Fig. 065a; Fig. 065b; Fig. 065c; Fig. 098a; Fig 098b), vertical shaft pit (Fig. 065d; Fig. 098c, A.B.C), and double-shaft pit (Fig. 065e; Fig. 098c, D). The lateral-shaft pit is the dominating form among them, with 281 tombs at Xigang and 45 tombs at Chaiwangang in quantity. Normally some logs, which were covered by mats or dry grasses, leaned against the lateral pit, where the deceased were buried (Fig. 065a, A.B.C). In addition, most of the vertical shaft pits were one meter in depth, with subsoil platforms on both sides, on which was sometimes blocked with some logs similar to a coffin cover (Fig. 065b, A). Dozens of tombs were built in double-shaft pits. Normally the deeper pit had a subsoil platform (Fig. 065e, A; B).

The mortuary practice of the Xigang and Chaiwangang cemeteries are quite coincidental. The body of the deceased, sometimes wrapped up in grass mats, textile or leather, was usually laid in an extended supine position on the grass mats; some were laid in a flexed side position. Besides, animal sacrifices of sheep, horses, and cattle and even human beings were also found in some tombs, indicating that polarization of the rich and poor may have existed at that time. The excavators ascribe these two cemeteries to the Shajing culture.

2.3.2 Linxia Hui Autonomous Prefecture and Yongjing county

The Linxia Hui Autonomous Prefecture and Yongjing county lie in the west of the Gansu Province. Some Bronze Age sites were once administratively attributed to the Yongjing county, and later to the Linxia Hui Autonomous Prefecture. All of the sites found from both counties will be discussed together.

2.3.2.1 Lianhuatai

The Lianhuatai village\(^{197}\) lies in the north of Linxia county, which is separated by the Daxiahe into two parts: Wazhazui and Heitouzui. A total area of 889.5 square meters was unearthed in 1959\(^{198}\). The excavators thought that the characteristics of Wazhazui resembled the Zhajiazui type of the Xindian culture\(^{199}\), however the characteristics of Heitouzui is similar to the Jijiachuan type of the Xindian culture, according to the differences shown in the potteries. Altogether 9 pieces of bronze artifacts were found

---

\(^{197}\) Lianhuatai once belonged to the Yongjing county, now it belongs to the Linxia county.

\(^{198}\) Xie R. J. 1980a, 296-310.

\(^{199}\) Xindian culture is one Bronze Age culture in the Gansu and Qinghai regions. Zhangjiazui and Jijiachuang represent two subtypes of the Xindian culture, which will be discussed later.
from both sites in the Lianhuatai village, including 3 knives, 2 awls, 3 buckles and 1 dagger (Fig. 047, 1-6). Among them, the dagger and one awl were identified as bronze, containing 81.2% and 81.7% copper (Table 8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Cu</th>
<th>Sn</th>
<th>Pb</th>
<th>Zn</th>
<th>Fe</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KGI H119:1 awl</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KGI H193:2 dagger</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Compositional analysis on the samples from Wajiazhu and Heitouzui (adapted from Xie R. J. 1980a, 304; 308).

The Lianhuatai site was excavated again in 1984200, found together with 18 burials as well as 16 bronze artifacts including 2 buckles, and 14 tubes (Fig. 047, 7-11). The excavators divided the 18 tombs into three periods, according to the potteries from tomb M10 and M11, the former overlying the latter (Fig. 047b). The Lianhuatai site provides critical information on the Xindian culture.

### 2.3.2.2 Zhangjiazui and Jijiachuan

The Zhangjiazui and Jijiachuan sites201, located in the southern part of the Yongjing county and excavated in 1959202 and 1960203, contain both remains from the Qijia and Xindian cultures, providing stratigraphical evidence that the Xindian culture is later than the Qijia culture. The cultural relics of the Xindian type found at Zhangjiazui constitute a new type of culture that embraces both the pottery of Tangwang-style pottery204 and the remains of group B of the Xindian culture. In order to differentiate this one site from the other, the excavators designated one site to the Zhangjiazui type and the other to the Jijiachuan type.

A total area of 995 square meters was excavated at Zhangjiazui, bringing to light 13 storage-pits from the Qijia culture, 165 storage-pits from the Xindian culture as well as artifacts of stone, bone, pottery, and bronze. Among the pottery objects from the Xindian culture, flat-bottomed vessels were the most common, next came tripods and vessels with ring-foot, while very few were round-bottomed vessels. Many of them are of unique shapes, such as the angular-contoured basins with their handles taller than their mouth, single-handled cups with a bulging body, painted Dou-vessels with a pedestal, painted Li-tripods, and double-handled jars with three short feet. The patterns of painted decorations on the pottery vessels differ from those of other cultures. Fragments of bronze vessels, spearheads, and slag were also discovered. The presence of the bronze slag here indicates that these bronze objects were made locally rather than exchanged from other places.

200 GSG et al. 1988, 7-19.
201 The Jijiachuan site once belonged to the Yongjing county, so it was attributed to the Yongjing county in some previous reports.
204 The Tangwang-style pottery is mainly considered to be one Bronze Age culture in the Gansu and Qinghai region.
The Jijiachuan site yielded one house and one storage-pit of the Qijia culture, another house, forty-one storage-pits, and one tomb of the Xindian culture, and plenty of stone, bone and pottery objects. The houses were of a semi-subterranean oblong structure and had a hole in the roof over a cauldron-shaped cooking stove. This kind of building has never been found in the Xindian culture before.

The potteries of the Jijiachuan type have their own style. Among them, concave bottomed vessels are the most common. Tripods occupy second place. Flat-bottomed vessels were few and those with ring-foot were not found. Very typical are single-handled cups, double-handled long-necked jars and double-handled Li-tripods. The painted designs on pottery objects included bands, zigzag patterns, rectangular spirals, linked-lozenge patterns and vertical line designs.

It should be pointed out that the double-handled Li-tripods found at Jijiachuan were extremely similar to those unearthed from the Western Zhou sites in the Central Plains. The patterns of rectangular spirals on the Li-tripods also resemble that on the bronze vessels of the Western Zhou Dynasty, indicating close relations between the Xindian and Western Zhou culture, and the fact that the ancient cultures in northwest China cannot be separated from the splendid culture in the Central Plain.

A few slag and bronze fragments were found at the Zhangjiazui site (Fig. 048). One piece of slag and spear were examined by spectrum qualitative general analysis (Table 9) and metallographic analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Cu</th>
<th>Sn</th>
<th>Pb</th>
<th>As</th>
<th>Sb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KG5T65:2</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√ (trace)</td>
<td>√ (trace)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bronze fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG5T56:9</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bronze spear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Compositional analysis on the samples from Zhangjiazui (adapted from Xie R. J. 1980b, 204 Table1).

The microstructure of sample KG5Y65:2 shows signs of cast and consists of solid solution dendrite-like grains and a minimum of grey particles. At the edge of the dendrite-like grains is distributed lead and a small quantity of $\alpha + \beta$ eutectoid structure. The microstructure of sample KG5Y56:9 shows signs of cast as well, consisting of $\alpha$ solid solution dendrite-like grains and a minimum of grey particles, and a small quantity of penniform $\alpha + \beta$ eutectoid structure.

### 2.3.2.3 Dahezhuang

The Dahezhuang site lies on the first terrace of the south bank of the Yellow River and about 2km to the southwest of Lianhuachun in Yongjing county. In 1959 and 1960 two excavations were conducted within an area of 1589 square meters\textsuperscript{205}, bringing to

\textsuperscript{205} HHGS 1960, 9-12; ZKKG 1974, 29-61.
light the remains of 7 dwellings (1 house and 6 dwelling floors), 15 storage pits, 5 stone circles (cromlechs), and 82 tombs. Numerous stones, bones, pottery tools and articles of daily use in the Qijia culture, including one bronze knife (Fig. 049a, 1) and one bronze fragment were found. This knife is 12 cm long and is attached by some scorched millet when it was excavated inside House F7206.

House F7 is a square subterranean structure with an area of 36 square meters and a door opening to the southwest. At the centre of the house lies a 30cm-deep depression, in which the floor and the walls were both coated with whitewash. A circular hearth is located close to the door with pottery vessels that were still filled up to one third of their capacity with scorched millet (Fig. 049b, 1-2). The remains of the dwelling floors are all square in shape and hardened on the surface, with an average area of about 4 by 2 meters, which is surrounded by postholes. On one side of the floor is a circular hearth. The excavators believe that they probably represent the remains of small huts. The storage pits were usually circular in shape except for a few square ones (Fig. 049b, 4). Some of the pits were rather peculiar in structure, indicating that they might have served a particular purpose.

The cemetery yielding 82 tombs is adjacent to the dwelling area, indicating that they may belong to the same clan. They tombs were arranged in a very orderly manner and normally built with rectangular shaft pit. None of them yielded any trace of a coffin and the dead usually faced towards northwest. About 60% tombs belonged to children. Of particular interest is the presence of some pig mandibles in these tombs, implying that the distinction between the poor and the rich perhaps already existed. In a few cases, traces of textile impressions have been found on either the skeleton or the funerary pottery. The presence of ochre on some of the skeletons might be related to religious beliefs.

Near the cemetery, stone circles were usually found, built by flat natural gravels that were arranged in a very neat order (Fig. 049b, 3). In this area, oracle bones and the carcasses of cattle and sheep were found, highlighting the fact that they might have been connected with some primitive religious beliefs.

Among the objects unearthed are all kinds of vessels of fine red wares and sandy reddish-brown wares. The amphora and double-looped vases with a flaring mouth, high neck and deep belly are both very characteristic of the Qijia culture. There were also many vases with a contracting mouth. The fact that their belly often has traces of smoke suggests that apart from serving as containers, they were probably used as cooking utensils. On the other hand, there are very few Zeng-steamers, Li-tripods and Ding-tripods. Among the numerous stone implements found, the most common are the knives, axes and shouldered spades. In addition, there were many bone spades

206 This knife (TF:7) is made of 96.96% copper, 0.02% of tin and trace other elements.
made of animal mandible or scapula. Other finds include the bone spoon, ornaments, and toys. Radiocarbon dates\textsuperscript{207} resulting from two charcoal remains unearthed from F7 are 3690±95 B. P. (1725±95 BCE) and 3660 ±95 B. P. (1695±95 BCE), close to the Early Shang period.

\textbf{2.3.2.4 Qinweijia}

The Qinweijia and Dahezhuang sites were separated by one small river, Kushuigou. Several copper and bronze objects were found (Fig. 049a, 2-7) at the Qinweijia site, which was excavated in 1959 and 1960\textsuperscript{208}. One sample (M99:6) consists of 95\% copper and 5\% lead, identified with an electron probe analysis\textsuperscript{209}. Furthermore, the bronze axe (Fig. 049a, 3) and awl (Fig. 049a, 2) were identified as Cu-Pb-Sn alloy, made by casting and forging respectively.\textsuperscript{210} The metallurgical technique seems to have been improved when compared to copper techniques.

The whole cemetery with 138 tombs is divided into two groups, one in the north (Fig. 050b) and the other in the south (Fig. 050a). The tombs of the southern group, which occupy a much larger area than those of the northern group, are distributed in two layers. The upper layer contains 99 tombs arranged in 6 rows, in which the heads of the deceased all point towards the northwest. The 8 tombs found in the lower layer are dispersed in a rather haphazard manner with the heads of the deceased all pointing to the west. Judging from the stratigraphical evidence, the tombs of the northern group were contemporaneous with those of the upper layer in the southern group while those in the lower layer of the southern group were slightly earlier in date. Of the 138 tombs, 114 dead were placed singularly, in an extended position. The other 24 were joint burials containing either two adults or one adult and one child. In the most common joint burials, the man lay in an extended position while the woman was interred in a flexed position to his left, indicating that they probably represent man and wife. The joint burials with an adult and child could very possibly be that of a parent and their child.

The appearance of the joint burials with a man and a woman suggests that the marriage system had developed from pairing to monogamy. At the same time, it implies that the man held the dominating position while the woman was subjected to a life of slavery. Archaeological evidence shows that the man and the woman were often interred at the same time, indicating that the woman was probably immolated at her husband’s burial.

Most of the dead were found with tomb furniture that usually consisted of 4 or 5

\textsuperscript{207} ZK 1972, 55.
\textsuperscript{208} HHGS 1960, 9-12; Xie R. J. 1975, 57-96.
\textsuperscript{209} Xie R. J. 1976, 353.
\textsuperscript{210} Appraised by the Spectrum Laboratory of Beijing University of Iron and Steel Technology.
potteries (bowl, stemmed Dou-cup, double-looped vase, vase with flaring mouth, and high necked vase with two loops) and some bone implements. About one third of the tombs have further yielded the pig’s mandible, which ranges in number from a single piece in one case to as many as 68 in another. The number of pig mandibles present is a good indication of the tomb owner’s wealth; therefore, this evidence suggests that the distinction between the poor and the rich had already appeared.

In addition, 73 storage pits were found, which contained potteries, stones, bones and even coppers. Among the copper objects found, awls, axes, finger rings and perforated ornaments were very common, attesting to the outstanding technological breakthrough achieved by the Qijia people.

2.3.2.5 Xinzhuangping
The Xinzhuangping site lies in the Yinchuang township, Jishishan county, Linxia Hui Autonomous Prefecture and borders the Yellow River to the north. It is about 10km from the Dahezhuang and Qinweijia sites. It was surveyed in 1989211 and one large area area and a cemetery were identified as belonging to the Qijia culture. A number of stone wares, potteries and a total of 12 bronze artifacts including 5 bracelets, 6 bulbs and 1 knife were collected (Fig. 068, 1-3). The stonewares found in the Xinzhuangping site are more advanced than those found from the Dahezhuang site, however similar to those from the Qinweijia site. The excavators attributed the potteries found in the Xinzhuangping site to the Qijia culture.

2.3.6 Xihe county: Lanqiao
The Xihe county lies in the south of the Gansu Province and on the east bank of the Xihanshui. The Lanqiao site was excavated in 1982, found together with 9 graves. Over 200 potteries and a few bronzes were discovered212. Dou-cups and pots with a double-saddle shaped ring were very common, showing typical characteristics of the Siwa culture.213 It is noticeable that some parts of the dead were broken up before they were buried in the shaft earth pit without coffins, namely they are partially broken burials (Fig. 051a). Only 3 bronzes were found, including 1 dagger and 2 bulbs (Fig. 051b).

As stated by the excavators, the 9 graves should belong to one group because the funeral object assemblage is very similar. In addition, two bone samples from Tomb M4 were dated to 3010±120 (Appendix), close to the middle and late Shang period. The excavators speculated that the Lanqiao site lasted from the late Shang period to the early Western Zhou period.

212 GSG et al. 1987, 678-691.
213 The Siwa culture is one of the Bronze Age cultures in the Gansu and Qinghai regions, characterized by pots with double saddle shaped ring, which will be discussed later.
2.3.7 Lintao county: Siwashan

The Lintao county lies in the south of the Gansu Province. Siwashan is located in the south of the Lintao county and west bank of the Taohe. In 1924, it was first excavated by J. D. Andersson\textsuperscript{214}. In the excavation of 1933, Anderson discovered 8 burials as well as 1 bronze bracelet (Fig. 052). The Siwa culture was named after the Siwashan site. The potteries found at the Siwashan site were attributed to the Siwa culture while the attribution of this bronze bracelet is still in argument.

In 1945, Siwashan was surveyed and excavated again by Xia Nai.\textsuperscript{215} Six tombs were excavated, and no bronzes were found. Regarding the absolute date of the Siwa culture, Liang Siyong put forward that the Siwa culture existed during 1400-1100 BCE and developed from the Shajing culture\textsuperscript{216}. However, Xia Nai stated that the Siwa culture is parallel to the Shajing culture\textsuperscript{217}.

2.3.8 Zhuanglang county

The Zhuanglang county lies on the east bank of the Huluhe, found together with a few Bronze Age sites.

2.3.8.1 Shaoping village

One earth pit grave was discovered at the Shaoping village in 2000\textsuperscript{218}. A total of 86 funeral objects were found, including 85 bronze artifacts (Fig. 053) and 1 turquoise artifact. One bronze dagger and Dun (镦)-vessel were distributed respectively near the head and the feet. On both sides of the waist lie short swords. A horse skeleton lies under the feet as well as many bronze ornaments and chariot and horse fittings.

Not only the burial manners but also the bronze artifacts show the typical style of the Northern Bronzes. In light of the bronze dagger and short swords, the excavators dated the grave from the Spring and Autumn period to the Warring States period.

2.3.8.2 Xujianian village

A total of 104 graves were excavated at Xujianian in 1980\textsuperscript{219}. It is worth mentioning that few graves were buried with bronze objects (Fig. 054), the number ranges from one to five or six pieces, implying that bronze was quite precious at that time.

As we know, the Siwa culture has close relations with the Zhou culture. The Xujianian site provides such related evidence. Most of the graves were built in a rectangular earth pit. There were 7 cases of human sacrifices that lie in the niche of the tomb. Horse and chariot victims, and human being sacrifices were very common in the

\textsuperscript{214} J. D. Andersson 1943, 179-185.
\textsuperscript{215} Xia N. 2000, 269-310.
\textsuperscript{216} Liang S. Y. 1935, 546.
\textsuperscript{217} Xia N. 2000, 305.
\textsuperscript{218} ZLB 2005, 43-46.65.
\textsuperscript{219} ZSKKJ 1982, 584-590.
burials of the Yin and Western Zhou cultures.

2.3.9 Qingyang region

The Qingyang region lies in the most eastern part of the Gansu Province. It is in the lower middle part of the Yellow River on the Loess Plateau. Elevation ranges from 885 to 2082 meters above sea level. There are five major rivers in the Qingyang region including the Malianhe, Puhe, Honghe, Xilang, and Huluhe. Their combined annual flow is more than 800 million cubic meters. This region administratively includes the Xifeng urban district, Qingcheng county, Zhenyuan county, Heshui county, Huachi county, Ning county and Zhengning county.

2.3.9.1 Heshui county: Jiuzhan

Jiuzhan was officially excavated in 1984, found together with 75 square meters of dwelling remains, 80 burials and over 900 objects\(^{220}\). A total of 52 bronze artifacts were discovered in burials, including 1 dagger, 1 short sword, 1 knife, 5 armlets, 1 bell and 43 bulbs (Fig. 055a)

As stated by the excavators, the whole cemetery can be divided into two groups (Fig. 055b; Fig. 055c; Fig. 055d): one group is represented by M26 and M48, including 5 tombs in an east-west direction; the other group is represented by M1 and M17, including 72 tombs, which are all facing in a north-south direction. Furthermore, 4 tombs in an east-west direction overlie or destroy the tombs in a south-north direction, implying that the former are later than the latter.

The excavators speculated that the Jiuzhan cemetery started from the Spring and Autumn period to the end of the Warring States, or even until the Han Period based on the potteries and iron hooks found in the burials. The excavators attributed the Jiuzhan cemetery to the Siwa culture.

Both the burial manners and tomb forms discovered in the Jiuzhan cemetery have their own characteristics. A shaft pit grave with a niche was the main burial form, which is different to the shaft pit that dominated the Zhou culture. In addition, the haphazard burial is striking in the Jiuzhan cemetery while it is absent in the Zhou or Pre-Zhou culture. Therefore, the Jiuzhan cemetery provides evidence that the Siwa culture had its own characteristics though related to the Zhou culture as well.

2.3.9.2 Ning county, Zhengning county, Zhenyuan county

Since 1984, many archaeological surveys have been carried out in the Qingyang region\(^{221}\). A considerable number of bronzes were discovered at Yuanjia village in Ning county (Fig. 057), Houzhuang village in Zhengning county (Fig. 058), Miaoqu village (Fig. 059), Hongyan village (Fig. 060), and Wujiagou village (Fig 061) in

\(^{220}\) Wang/Shui 1997, 300-460.

\(^{221}\) Liu/De 1988, 413-424.
Zhengyuan county. Comparing the bronzes to those found in the neighboring regions, some bronzes which were collected in the Qingyang region (Fig. 062), were dated from the Spring and Autumn period to the middle Warring States. These bronzes reflect nomadic life in the steppes and were possibly related to the Xiongnu people.

2.3.10 Gangu county: Maojiaping

The Gangu county lies on the south bank of the Weihe. The Maojiaping site, situated 25km west of the Gansu county, was firstly surveyed by Pei Wenzhong in 1947. A few potsherds were collected from the surface in 1956. In 1982 and 1983, it was officially excavated, found together with 45 graves, 29 pits and 4 houses.

The excavators divided the remains found at the Maojiaping site into three types: 1) Shilingxia type, which is characterized by painted pottery (Fig. 063a, 5A.5B); 2) Group A; (Fig. 063a, 3.4A.4B); 3) Group B; (Fig. 063a, 3.2). The earlier period of Group A had some features of the Western Zhou culture as well as some features of the Qin culture in the Eastern Zhou period. From beginning to end, Group A (Fig. 063b, A) seems to be related and continuous, therefore providing vital clues on the formation of the Qin culture. Some remains of Group A coexisted with Group B (Fig. 063b, B) in the third layer (Fig. 063a). However, the special potteries found in Group B are absent in Group A (in Layer 4A and 4B). Meanwhile, the potteries of Group B are hardly seen in the Qin culture sites, and some similar potteries were found at Wanggong and Hezigou in the Zhuanglang county. Therefore, Group B potteries in the Maojiaping site probably represent one new culture, namely, the Siwa culture.

2.3.11 Qingshui county: Liuping

The Qingshui county lies on the south bank of the Weihe. The Liuping village lies 25km northwest of the Qingshui county. A number of bronze daggers, knives, dagger axes, Jue-drinking wares, and cups were discovered by local peasants during 1960-1975. One big earth shaft grave and a few heavily disturbed small graves were unearthed when it was excavated in 2000. All of the bronzes found in the graves including the stray finds, have come to a total of over 600 pieces (Fig. 064a). In addition, a considerable number of bronze horse and chariot fittings as well as a few gold wares (Fig. 064b) were found in the big graves.

The bronzes found at the Liuping site resemble those found in the Guyuan region, in Ningxia. However, gold ornaments were rarely seen in the Guyuan region and the Central Plain. The bronzes decorated with animal motifs and patterns are closely

---
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related to the northern people.

2.3.12 Yumen: Huoshaogou

312 tombs were excavated at Huoshaogou in Qingquan, Yumen county, Gansu in 1976, and 106 tombs were found together with copper and bronze objects. The second excavation in 1990 revealed 17 tombs, and 4 of them yielded copper and bronze metal objects. They included implements, weapons, and ornaments, such as axes, knives, spears, awls, needles, chisels, tubes, plaques, earrings and so on. The majority was small artifacts, and big-scale vessels are scary. In the end of the 1970s, a qualitative study was carried out on 65 samples. In recent decades, 37 of the 65 samples have been re-examined by metallographic determination and quantitative component analysis of Energy Dispersive X-ray analysis.

The results of the first metallurgical analysis are as follows. Half are copper artifacts, while the other half are bronzes (Table 10). Most of the bronzes are tin-bronzes; lead-bronzes come next. Only six lead-tin-bronze artifacts have been found. 60% ornaments and 40% implements are made of bronze. Of the 29 samples tested for arsenic content, only 5 were determined to contain arsenic in a small amount. Among the cast artifacts, there is a so called ‘staff of authority’ (mace head or pole top) with four goat heads decorating it (Fig. 104b, 34). Parts protrude from a hollow, suggesting that the goat heads and the base were cast separately. If so, this would be the earliest composite cast bronze product ever found in China. In addition, a stone mold for casting two arrowheads was found at Huoshaogou. The mold was made from sandstone of a moderate hardness and possessed good fire resistant properties. The surface of sandstone is easy to carve and can be used repeatedly. All data indicates that the arrowheads were probably local products.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type/Name</th>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Material and methods of testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ornament</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pao (dome-shaped object)</td>
<td>76.Y.H.M83; 3</td>
<td>L N N - S T</td>
<td>Copper (note 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M11:19</td>
<td>Y N Y - - -</td>
<td>Lead-bronze (note1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M88:10</td>
<td>Y N Y - - -</td>
<td>Lead-bronze (note1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M215</td>
<td>Y N Y - - -</td>
<td>Lead-bronze (note1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M48:8</td>
<td>L Y Y N - -</td>
<td>Lead-tin-bronze (note 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M254:10</td>
<td>L N N N - -</td>
<td>Copper (note 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nose ring</strong></td>
<td>M206:8</td>
<td>L S N N - -</td>
<td>Copper (note 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M84</td>
<td>L M S - S T</td>
<td>Tin-bronze (note 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M47:26</td>
<td>L Y S N - -</td>
<td>Tin-bronze (note 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earring</strong></td>
<td>M47:13</td>
<td>L Y S N - -</td>
<td>Tin-bronze (note 2), forged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M266:1</td>
<td>L Y N N - -</td>
<td>Tin-bronze (note 2), forged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M127:26</td>
<td>L Y S N - -</td>
<td>Tin-bronze (note 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool &amp; Utensil</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrowhead</td>
<td>Lead-bronze (note 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knife</td>
<td>Lead-bronze (note 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spear</td>
<td>Copper (note 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Results from the analysis of copper and bronze objects found in Huoshaoqou, Qingquan, Yumen county, Gansu Province. Method of testing: note 1, portable radioisotope X-ray fluorescence instrument qualitative analysis; note 2,
Most results of the second metallurgical analysis are in accordance with the first metallurgical analysis. However, the second one shows that there is also Cu-As-Sn, and Cu-As-Pb alloys in addition to Cu-Sn-Pb alloys. For example, only 5 of the 29 samples contained a small quantity of arsenic in the first analysis. In contrast, the second analysis shows that there are not only a few Cu-As alloys but also a number of Cu-Pb alloys (Table 11).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lab. No.</th>
<th>Original No.</th>
<th>Average Composition (%)</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cu</td>
<td>Sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>883</td>
<td>76YHM6:6</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>887</td>
<td>76YHM18:1</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@888</td>
<td>76YHM20:2</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>886</td>
<td>76YHM28:6</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>907</td>
<td>76YHM47:28</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>76YHM50:2</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>894</td>
<td>76YHM56:8</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>898</td>
<td>76YHM64:9</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>911</td>
<td>76YHM90:6</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>909</td>
<td>76YHM120:4</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>884</td>
<td>76YHM128:8</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>903</td>
<td>76YHM136:10</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

232 Sun/Han 1997, 80 Table 2; translated in Linduff et al. 2000, 182-183.
Table 11. Results from the quantitative composition analysis of copper and bronze objects found at Huoshaogou, Qingquan, Yumen, Gansu Province (adapted from BJGY 2003, 89 Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>@916</th>
<th>76YHM170:12</th>
<th>93.1</th>
<th>1.2</th>
<th>4.2</th>
<th>Ag:1.4</th>
<th>CuSb(Ag, As)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>@916</td>
<td>76YHM170:12</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Ag:2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>889</td>
<td>76YHM176:9</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Cu (Pb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>905</td>
<td>76YHM185:4</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Cu-As</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906</td>
<td>76YHM185:12</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cu-As</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>890</td>
<td>76YHM196:11</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fe:1.3</td>
<td>Cu (Fe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>896</td>
<td>76YHM201:4</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>Cu-As (Fe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>904</td>
<td>76YHM215:4</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Fe</td>
<td>Cu (As)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@892</td>
<td>76YHM252:11</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cu-Sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>913</td>
<td>76YHM255:9</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>Cu-As</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901</td>
<td>76YHM276:11</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sn, Pb</td>
<td>Cu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@910</td>
<td>76YHM299:21</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cu-Sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@882</td>
<td>76YHM304:5</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Cu-Sn-As (Sb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>891</td>
<td>76YHM304:15</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cu-Sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@899</td>
<td>A045stray find</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cu-Sn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.13 Others

A number of Bronze Age sites have been identified in the Gansu Province, found together with metal objects. In 1980, one grave was excavated at Yushugou, Yongdeng county\(^{233}\). A total of 146 bronze artifacts (Fig. 066), including a few iron objects and potsherd were found. The excavators ascribed this tomb to the Shajing culture\(^{234}\). However, the bronze deer figures show strong northern style. Therefore, it is debatable whether or not the grave belonged to the Shajing culture.

The Yinwoshu site, which is ascribed to the Siba culture, produced seven metal objects, including one awl, knife, arrowhead, and some bulbs\(^{235}\). All of them are bronzes and four of them have been analyzed metallographically. Two indicate a cast

---

\(^{233}\) GSBG 1981, 34-36.
\(^{234}\) One Bronze Age culture in the Gansu and Qinghai regions, is named after Shajing, the first representative site. It will be discussed later.
\(^{235}\) Sun/Han 1997, 79.
structure, another two show a hot forged structure. This site is dated slightly later than the Donghuishan and Ganguya sites.

The Ganguya in Fenglexiang, Jiuquan is a Siba culture site, dated between 1900-1600 BCE. A total of 105 tombs have been excavated at the site yielding 48 copper and bronze artifacts. Forty-six of them have been tested by method of scanning electron microscope. They are identified as copper, arsenic, tin-bronze, tin-arsenic-bronze, tin-lead-bronze and tin-arsenic-lead-bronze. The content of arsenic is less than 6%; the content of tin is around 2%-10%; and only three samples contain over 10% tin. Three tin-bronzes contain 2% iron. The metallographic tests carried out on 30 artifacts indicate that most samples were hot forged or cast. Two tools and an arrowhead had been cold worked after casting. The types, compositions, and the technology used in the manufacturing of the artifacts found at the Ganguya site are listed in Table 12-Table 14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material/artifact</th>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Weapon</th>
<th>Ornament/other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awl</td>
<td>Knife</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu-Sn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu-As</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu-Sn-As</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu-Sn-Fe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu-Sn-Pb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu-Sn-As-Pb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. Materials and artifacts of the Siba culture found at Ganguya in Fengle, Gansu (adapted from Sun/Han 1997, 8 Table 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material/artifact</th>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Weapon</th>
<th>Ornament/other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awl</td>
<td>Knife</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forging</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casting then cold working</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13. Manufacturing techniques and types of Siba artifacts found at Ganguya in Fengle, Gansu (adapted from Sun/Han 1997, 81 Table 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material/artifact</th>
<th>Casting</th>
<th>Forging</th>
<th>Casting then cold working</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

236 Sun/Han 1997, 75-84.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu-Sn</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu-As</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu-Sn-As</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu-Sn-Fe</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu-Sn-Pb</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu-Sn-As-Pb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14. Manufacturing techniques and types of Siba artifacts found at Ganguya in Fengle, Gansu (adapted from Sun/Han 1997, 81 Table 6).

The bronzes discovered from the Qin’an county before 1986 were mostly stored in the House of Culture in Qin’an county\(^{237}\), including swords, knives, crane hacks, ornaments, and Fu-cooking wares (Fig. 067). The antenna pommel swords, crane hacks, images of sheep, and Fu-cooking wares are all typical northern bronzes, dating from the Spring-Autumn period to the Warring States period.

Xinglin, lying 1km east of Taohe in the Min county, was surveyed in 1982\(^{238}\) and a few potsherds, bone wares, stone objects and two copper objects (Fig. 068, 4.5) were collected from the survey. According to the pots with double-loop ears, the Xinglin site is ascribed to the Qijia culture. In 1983 and 1984, four sites: Hongya, Baitashan, Wangtiezui and Yaozhuang in Min county\(^{239}\) were surveyed. Many pots with double-saddle shaped rings were found, suggesting that they belonged to the Siwa culture.

### 2.3.14 The Central Plain bronzes found in the Gansu Province

In addition to the above-mentioned bronzes, a small quantity of bronzes are attributed to the typical Central Plain style as well.

In 1983, one Western Zhou culture grave was discovered at Yu village in Ning county\(^{240}\), where 22 bronzes were found (Fig. 056, A). Another one was discovered at Jiao village\(^{241}\), found together with some bronzes (Fig. 056, B).

A total of 16 burials and 3 horse and chariot pits were excavated at Yujiawan in Chongxin county\(^{242}\), found together with a few bronzes, which show great similarity to those found from the Central Plain, including Ding-cooking wares, Gui-cooking wares, daggers and bulbs (Fig. 069, 1-3). The excavators assigned them to the Western Zhou period. Only a part of the bronzes have been published. One Western Zhou

---

\(^{237}\) Xu/Quo 1986, 40-42.  
\(^{238}\) Yang Y. M. 1985, 977-979.  
\(^{239}\) Yang Y. M. 1991, 80-81.  
\(^{240}\) Xu/Liu 1985, 349-352.  
\(^{241}\) QYB 1989, 24-27.  
\(^{242}\) GSG 1986, 1-7.
culture grave was discovered respectively at Tianshui county in 1993\textsuperscript{243} (Fig. 069, 4) and at Miaozui and Hanjiatan of Qingyang county\textsuperscript{244} (Fig. 069, 5-9).

It is worth mentioning that quite a number of the Central Plain bronzes were found in the Lingtai county, which lies between Jinhe and Weihe and borders Longyuan to the north, Qifeng to the south and Guanzhong to the east. It is a region impacted by both the northern nomadic people and the Zhou culture. In 1972-1973, some Zhou culture tombs were discovered in Yaojiahe, Dongxishan, and Xiling\textsuperscript{245}. Over one hundred bronzes were found, including Ding-tripods, Gui-round baskets, daggers, spears, bells, bulbs and even some horse and chariot fittings (Fig. 070). In addition, one Zhou culture tomb was discovered in Dongzhuang, Yawadadui, and Xinji Commune in 1983\textsuperscript{246}, found together with a few of the classic Central Plain bronzes.

The Baicaopo cemetery, located 15km to the northwest of the seat of the Lingtai county, was excavated in 1967 and 1972\textsuperscript{247}, yielding a total of nine Western Zhou tombs and a chariot pit. Apart from Tombs M2 and M9 that were rather well preserved, the rest had either been looted or destroyed. However, a considerable amount of tomb furniture was retained.

Tombs were mostly in the form of an oblong earth shaft. Seven tombs were medium-sized, while Tombs M6 and M9 are both small. The former were provided with a waste pit at the bottom, which sometimes contained dog skeletons. Though the wood structures have been poorly preserved, their vestiges indicate that some of the tombs were provided with outer and inner coffins, while others only had a single coffin. The tombs were all single burials. The chariot pit (Fig. 071b, C), situated between Tomb M1 (Fig. 071a) and M2 (Fig. 071b, C), consisted of a single chariot with four houses. Judging by the fact of its orientation towards Tomb M2, and the similarity between the decoration of its chariot fittings and those unearthed from Tomb M2, the chariot pit may have belonged to Tomb M2. The bulk of the tomb furniture was found in Tomb M1 and M2. The furniture consisted mostly of bronzes, including ritual vessels such as the Ding, Gui, Zeng, Zun, Yu etc., and weapons like Ge-halberds, swords, arrowheads and helmets, and tools such as axes, chisels and knives. In addition, there were all sorts of jade ornaments as well as cowries. Among the bronzes unearthed from Tomb M1 and M2, twenty-four articles were inscribed.

### 2.4 Discoveries of bronzes in Inner Mongolia

The Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region extends across the northern frontier of China, covering 1.183 million square km, adjoining the Heilongjiang, Jilin, and
Liaoning provinces in the east, and the Hebei, Shanxi and Shaanxi provinces in the south, Ningxia and Gansu to its west and bordering the Republic of Mongolia and the Federation of Russia to the north.

The bordering line extends 4221km in length. The topography of Inner Mongolia is mainly composed of plateaus, extending 3000km from the northeast to the southwest, and most of them are more than 1000meters above sea level. In this region, the area of grassland is 880,000 square km, accounting for 21.7 percent of the nation’s total, the largest of China’s five grasslands. From east to west, are scattered grassy marshland, typical grassland, wilderness grassland, grassy wilderness, and desert as well as hilly grassy marshlands, low wet and grassy marshland, and marshy grassland, distributed randomly anywhere.

In the east, there are many primitive forests in the Greater Xinggan Mountain Range, and in the west, there is a large area of desert centering on the Ordos Plateau. The extended areas from the plateaus are plains mainly formed by the reaches of the Yellow River and the Liaohe, known as the Hetao area and Liao-Nen area. Inner Mongolia is the distribution center of the so-called ‘Ordos Bronzes’ and ‘Northern Bronzes’.

2.4.1 Keshentengqi: Longtoushan

Keshentengqi lies northwest of Chifeng City. In the excavation of 1986 and 1977 at the Longtoushan site in Keshentengtqi, a total of 300 square meters were uncovered, revealing some houses, pits, ditch and one grave. About 200 funeral goods were found in the graves, including bronzes, bone wares and so on. These bronzes included swords, axes, knives, chisels, awls, bulbs, etc. As stated by the excavators, the swords with a tubular handle and straight blade found at the Longtoushan site are perhaps the original form of the swords with a tubular handle. In addition, these swords with a tubular handle and straight blade are the local traits of the Upper Xiajiadian culture, and it developed into the curve bladed sword with tubular handle. The square bronze axes with a fan blade and inverse-triangle designs on the ring are similar to the typical axes from the Shang culture. This grave is therefore dated from the late Shang to the Early Zhou period.

In light of the other objects found in the houses and pits, and especially the potteries, the whole site is attributed to the Upper Xiajiadia culture, namely ranging from before the Western Zhou to the Spring and Autumn period.

---

249 The Upper Xiajiadian culture (about 1000-600 BCE) is a Bronze Age culture in Northeast China, roughly contemporaneous to the Western Zhou period. The culture was found mainly in southeastern Inner Mongolia, northern Hebei and western Liaoning. It will be discussed in Chapter 3.
2.4.2 Chifeng region

The Chifeng City lies southeast of Inner Mongolia. Quite a lot of archaeological expeditions were conducted in this area.

2.4.2.1 Yaowangmiao and Xiajiadian

The Yaowangmiao and Xiajiadian sites are located in the outskirts of Chifeng City. In 1960, both sites were excavated; some house remains and pits, as well as some tombs were uncovered.

At Yaowangmiao, 70 square meters were excavated. The cultural remains have a striking resemblance to the Shang culture of the Yellow River Valley. At Xiajiadian, 250 square meters were excavated. The cultural remains of the Xiajiadian site can be divided into two types. The remains from the lower layer are similar to those uncovered at Yaowangmiao, while the remains and tombs found in the upper layer belong to a different culture, as stated by the excavators. Apart from the shape of the potteries and stone implements, the manufacturing process and the decorations on the pottery also show that the two layers represent two distinctive cultural remains. In the report on the excavations conducted in 1935, some Japanese scholars lump these two types together and refer to them as ‘Chifeng II culture’. Such a view is clearly contradicted by the stratigraphical evidence and other cultural remains found from the excavations in 1960. Furthermore, the excavators believe that the lower layer of the Lower Chifeng culture predated the Western Zhou Period (about 1100-1000 BCE) while the upper layer of the Upper Chifeng culture was not later than the Spring and Autumn period (800-700 BCE). In addition, the lower layer of the Upper Chifeng culture should not be later than the Warring States period when the cultural influence of the Yan and Qin States reached this region (400-300 BCE).

It is worth mentioning that some slag was discovered in the lower layer of the Xiajiadian site, found together with a few of the bronzes (Fig. 073).

2.4.2.2 Zhizhushan

Located near the northern fringe of the modern city of Chifeng, the Zhizhushan site is covered by layers of cultural deposits that range from 2-6.5meters in thickness. Their stratigraphical sequence from the bottom to up is as follows: Hongshan culture, Lower Xiajiadian culture, Upper Xiajiadian culture, and the Warring States-early Han culture.

The earliest layer is the Hongshan culture, very characteristic of the Neolithic cultures in the region. The pottery differs greatly from that of the other cultures in shape.

---

250 The Chifeng city once belonged to the Liaoning Province, now to the Inner Mongolia.
251 ZKKN 1961, 77-81; ZKKN 1974, 111-144.
252 Hongshanhou 1938, 8-24.
decoration, and techniques of manufacture. For instance, a sandy brown pottery vase with a large mouth is decorated near the mouth and on the belly with either an impressed zigzag design or incised lines, while the bottom has an impressed mat design. There are also some fine red potteries, Bo-vases (the so-called red-topped bowl) of the Hongshan culture and their painted decorations resemble the painted Bo-vases found in the Hougang type of the Yangshao culture. Moreover, the two are also roughly contemporaneous in date.

The Lower Xiajiadian culture is later than the Hongshan culture, and dates from the Bronze Age. It is intimately connected with the Bronze Age cultures of the Yellow River and corresponds in date to the Xia and Shang cultures. Radiocarbon tests conducted on some specimens of charcoal unearthed from ash pit H42 gives a date of 3965±90 B. P. (Appendix). A study on the development of pottery shapes in light of the stratigraphical evidence has provided some clues regarding the periodization of the Xiajiadian culture (Fig. 074b). The discovery of a unique type of painted pottery is something new and rather unexpected.

The Upper Xiajiadian culture represents a much later Bronze Age culture in the region. Stratigraphical evidence shows that its lower layer is later than the Warring States-early Han remains found at the site. Judging by the date and geographical location, this culture might have something to do with the Shanrong and Donghu tribes of ancient China.\textsuperscript{254}

The last and latest cultural remains found at the Zhizhushan site are dated from the Warring States and early Han period. The artifacts unearthed from this layer are practically identical to those of the same period found in the Central Plain, indicating that the power of the State of Yan (燕) had reached this region during the Warring States period. A few bronzes (Fig. 074a) and iron objects were found, dated to the Warring States and Han period. In addition, the discovery of a Qin Dynasty pottery measure is proof that the region subsequently came under the control of the succeeding Qin Dynasty.

2.4.3 Linxi county

The Linxi county lies in the north of Chifeng City and borders Keshenketengqi to the west.

2.4.3.1 Susitai

One tomb buried with bronze and gold objects (Fig. 075, 1-3), potteries, and turquoise was uncovered at Susitai village, Shiertu township, Linxi county in 1981\textsuperscript{255}. The excavators attributed the tomb to the Xianbei people and dated it to the end of the

\textsuperscript{254} ZSKKN 1979, 242.

\textsuperscript{255} Wang G 1997, 461-462.
Eastern Han dynasty. The bronze Fu-cooking ware, comprised of two straight ears and a round base collected from the Dayingzi township (Fig. 075, 4) and another one from Susitai (Fig. 075, 1) are typical cooking wares used by the ancient northern people.

### 2.4.3.2 Jinggouzi

The Jinggouzi village lies 40km northwest of the Linxi county. One tomb with a stone structure was unearthed in 1996, found together with a few potteries, bronzes, and stonewares (Fig. 076a). The excavators first ascribed this tomb to the Upper Xiajiadian culture.

31 tombs were found at the excavation in the west district of the Jinggouzi village in 2002. Apart from the case that tomb M21 destroys pit H2 of the Upper Xiajiadian culture, that one tomb overlies or destroys the other has not been found. Furthermore, the structure, burial manners, and funeral objects of these tombs are quite similar so they may well have existed at the same time. The charcoal sample from tomb M17 is dated to 2115±65 B. P., thus it is inferred by the excavators that these tombs were later than the Upper Xiajiadian culture.

As we know, the Upper Xiajiadian culture is characterized by the tombs with stone structure and the dead were normally buried in an extended position lying on their stomach. However, the Jinggouzi cemetery is remarked by joint burials, animal victims and potteries that were absent in the Upper Xiajiadian culture. No stone structured tombs were found at the Jinggouzi cemetery. Besides, the Li-tripods of the Upper Xiajiadian culture and the Jinggouzi cemetery are quite different. Despite some similarities in the potteries, such as the straight high neck and layered ring-Li with handle on the abdomen as well as some bronze wares, the characteristics of the Jinggouzi cemetery display a different style. The majority of the bronzes found in the Jinggouzi cemetery consist mainly of small ornaments as well as a few weapons and implements (Fig. 076b).

Wang Lixin etc. put forward that the Jinggouzi cemetery may represent one new culture. Among 28 tombs, 25 tombs were buried with animal victims, including horses, oxen, sheep, donkeys, mules and so on. Dog is only in one case. Neither pig bones nor any agricultural implements were found. It implies that animal husbandry played a big role at that time. Some other animals were also identified, including deer, foxes, roes, whorls and mussels as well as a great quantity of bone arrowheads, which implies that fishing, might have been very significant at that time.

---

256 Wang G. 1994, 133.
Wang Lixin suggests that the Jinggouzi cemetery had quite a close connection with the Donghu (东胡) people in view of its location, time and industry.

Apart from three tombs being heavily destroyed and only one being well preserved, the other 27 tombs were very or partially disturbed. They seem to have been disturbed at the same time, which was very common in the Kayue culture. The second disturbance should be looked upon as some kind of special burial custom.

It is worth noting that the heavily destroyed tomb built with stone walls and a stone cover and unearthed in 1996 at the middle of the Jinggouzi village was attributed to the Upper Xiajiadian culture by Wang Gang. The sand-inclusioned pots with a wide flared mouth and ball-shaped abdomen (Fig. 076a, 2-4) are quite different to those found in the west region of the Jinggouzi cemetery. Furthermore, some scholars questioned whether the tomb found in 1996 belongs to the Upper Xiajiadian culture.

2.4.4 Ningcheng county

The Ningcheng county lies east of Inner Mongolia and south of Chifeng City. It is situated near the Kundu River, which is the upper section of the Laohahe.

2.4.4.1 Nanshan’gen

Nanshan’gen is located on the south bank of the Kundu River. In the survey of 1958 at Nanshan’gen, a total of 71 bronzes were found, including 1 helmet, 3 daggers, 1 spear, 2 Zun (鍾), 1 scabbard, 2 swords, 4 knives, 4 axes, 3 arrowheads, 1 nail, 28 plaques bulbs and so on (Fig. 077a). The excavators ascribed them to one grave and dated them to the Eastern Zhou period.

In 1961, Nanshan’gen was surveyed and excavated again, yielding a total of 236 square meters, including 14 pits and 9 tombs. The excavators believed that this site contains two different cultural remains, similar to those found at Xiajiadian in Chifeng city. Many potteries and bronzes (Fig. 077b) found from the Upper Xiajiadian layer were marked by distinctive local characteristics. In the case of some large tombs, these potteries and bronzes were found side by side with typical bronze ritual vessels of the Spring and Autumn period (Ding-tripods, Fu-vessels, and Gui-vessels) often encountered in the Central Plain. This fact suggests that the tombs probably date from the Spring and Autumn period.

In 1963, stone structured Tomb M101 was uncovered, found together with over 500 pieces of bronzes and a few gold, bone and stone wares (Fig. 077c). The bronzes

---

263 Li Y. Y. 1959, 276-277.
264 ZKKN 1975, 117-140.
265 ZKKN 1974, 111-114.
included vessels, weapons, implements, and chariot and horse fittings. The cultural elements of the funeral objects are quite complicated. The bronze vessels, such as Ding, Li and Bu (Fig. 077c, 7.8.11) are considerably similar to the pottery-Ding, pottery-Li and two-eared pots that were found at Hongshan, in Chifeng city. These potteries carried local traits in addition to some kinds of knives (Fig. 077c, 77-79; 81-85), swords (Fig. 077c, 56-69), axes (Fig. 077c, 16-22), scabbards (Fig. 077c, 73-76), plaques and horse and chariot fittings. Furthermore, some objects are similar to those found in the neighboring region, such as the curve bladed swords with a curved ridge (Fig. 077c, 56), knives with protruding teeth on the handle (Fig. 077c, 80), axes (Fig. 077c, 23) and arrowheads with three ridges (Fig. 077c, 67). In addition, some typical Central Plain bronzes also occupied a small quantity, including Ding-tripods (Fig. 077c, 5.6), Fu–cooking wares (Fig. 075c, 3), Gui-vessels (Fig.077c, 2), daggers (Fig. 077c, 70-72), and spears (Fig. 077c, 68.69), which existed from the end of the Western Zhou period to the early Eastern Zhou period. The excavators attributed Tomb M101 to the Upper Xiajiadian culture because it displays not only the sharp local traits but also connections with the Central Plain. Compared to the other tombs of the Upper Xiajiadian culture, Tomb M101 is bigger in size and more in quantity of funeral furniture in addition to some gold wares. Therefore, Tomb M101 probably belonged to a rich person with a higher social status at that time.

About 120 meters west of Tomb M101 (Fig. 077e), another stone-chambered Tomb M102 was uncovered, found together with a few bronzes and bone wares (Fig. 077d). Around the skull, 25 pieces of bronze cluster ornaments are distributed; bronze knives and a mirror lie near the waist; one bone board incised with patterns is situated under the right arm; horse and chariot fittings lie to the upper right of the body; and dozens of bronze bulbs are scattered around the upper part of the body. It is worth noting that the incised bone board (Fig. 077d, 22) which describes a hunting scene and horse and chariot in vivid detail, is quite precious as it provides evidence about how the ancient life was and how the chariot functioned. The excavators also ascribed this smaller Tomb M102 the Upper Xiajiadian culture.

2.4.4.2 Xiaoheishigou

The tomb located at Xiaoheishigou, Dianzi township, Ningcheng county was found in 1985, which was heavily destroyed and built with stones. It has a rectangular plan and measures 3.1x2.3x2.1m, yielding over 400 pieces or sets of funeral objects, including 21 ritual bronzes, 46 tools, over 70 chariot and horse fittings, 28 weapons, nearly 200 ornaments, over 20 gold articles and 34 utensils (Fig. 078). Among the bronze vessels, a Gui (簋) inscribed “许季姜簋” shows a quite Central Plain style,

267 Hongshanhou 1938.
269 Xiang/Li 1995, 4-22.
while the round-bottomed vessels and quaternary jars present a northern frontier style. The excavator ascribed this tomb to the Upper Xiajiadian culture and dated it between the mid-late Zhou Dynasty and the Spring and Autumn period.

2.4.4.3 Other sites

Since 1958, a small quantity of burials with bronzes were found or collected successively in Ningcheng city, including Beishanzui, Wafangzhong, Xiaoleheishigou, Tianjuquan, Liangjiayingzi, and Sunjiagou\(^{270}\) (Map 2.03). They were attributed to the Upper Xiajiadian culture, mostly dating from the late Western Zhou period to the early Spring and Autumn period. It is worth noting that the short swords with curved blades (Fig. 079A, 4; B,1; F, 9-12) were very common. Some swords characterized by a handle with naked figure (Fig. 079F, 12) are very interesting, providing the evidence about the ancient people and their religions.

The tentative digging in 1960 at Xiaoyushulinzi which lies on the south bank of the Laoha River in Ningcheng City, revealed the remains of two houses and two pits\(^{271}\), found together with a few potteries, stone and bone wares, and one bronze knife (Fig. 079F, 13). The excavators attributed this site to the Lower Xiajiadian culture, parallel from the Yinshang to the Western Zhou period.

2.4.5 Wengniuteqi

2.4.5.1 Dapaozi

Wengniuteqi lies on the south bank of the Xilamulunhe. One tomb was excavated at Dapaozi village, Wulanaodu Commune, in Wengniuteqi in 1981\(^{272}\), found together with bronze swords and potteries (Fig. 080). The potteries, such as red sand-inclusioned Dou (Fig. 080, 10), Li-cooking tripods (Fig. 080, 12) and curve-bladed knives (Fig. 080, 3-4, 8-19) were very common in the Upper-Xiajiadian culture, mostly parallel to the Middle Western Zhou period. However, the curve-bladed swords with a tubular handle (Fig. 080, 1-2) are simple and primitive.

2.4.5.2 Toupaizi

Three big bronze cooking wares were found in 1981 at Toupaizi village, Jiefangyingzi Commune\(^{273}\), including one Yan-tripod, one Li-tripod with a raised line, and another Li with a glutton motif (Fig. 081). According to the metallographic structure, these three bronzes are made of tin-lead-copper alloy. Most scholars ascribe them to the Middle Shang culture while Su He\(^{274}\) put forward that they may well have belonged to the Lower Xiajiadian culture, because the carapace-bone-script on the bronze Yan-

---

\(^{271}\) NMGG 1965a, 619-621.
\(^{272}\) Jia H. E. 1984, 50-54.
\(^{274}\) Su H. 1982, 4.
tripods may represent the title of one ancient clan, which existed during the Shang period and had a close relationship with the Shang culture.

2.4.6 Aohanqi

2.4.6.1 Tiejianggou cemetery

Aohanqi is situated east of Inner Mongolia. Tiejianggou village is located 6km southwest of the Xinhui township. In the excavation of 1991, a few tombs belonging to the Warring States were found. Three tombs were heavily destroyed with many funeral objects (Fig. 082). Another two tombs were excavated without funeral objects. These objects provide new clues about the cultural visage in the west Inner Mongolia region during the Spring-Autumn period and the Warring States period.

The bronze bird-like figures and loop-headed knives are very common in the Tiejianggou cemetery. Wild pig motifs are frequently used to decorate on the bronze. Not any tri-feet pottery vessel is found. All these characteristics differ to those of the Upper Xiajiadian culture. Nevertheless, both of them have some similarities, such as the spring-shaped earrings, ball-shaped ornaments, and the hand-made techniques used in the pottery.

2.4.6.2 Zhoujiadi cemetery

The Zhoujiadi cemetery lies 800 meters west of the Gulubanha Commune, in Aohan Banner. A total of 54 tombs were excavated in 1981, which were situated under the second layer—Upper Xiajiadian culture, or under the surface and even part exposed themselves to the surface. All of the tombs were built in earth shaft pits in the direction of north-west to southeast. Most of the dead lie in an extended position facing upwards; a few of the dead lie in an extended position on their sides; a small quantity consist of secondary burials and joint burials (Fig. 083a, A).

Tomb M45 was well preserved with a considerable number of funeral objects (Fig. 083b), providing evidence on what the ancient people looked like, which tribe they belonged to and how the leather belt worked and so on. For example, the discovery of the braid is in accordance with the description in ancient documents or wall paintings about the Donghu people, thus it is the first time we can prove that the creators of the Upper Xiajiadian culture, namely the Donghu people had braid. The well-preserved leather belt with scabbards, which was also seen at Nanshan’gen, is the earliest complete set that has been found, showing how they functioned together.

---
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278 LNY et al. 1973, 27-38; ZKKN 1975, 117-140.
is worth mentioning that it differs from those found at the Maoqinggou site.\textsuperscript{279} The excavators inferred that the different ways in how the bronze belt buckles and buttons work shown in the Zhoujiadi and Maoqinggou sites may represent two different people in northern China.

As stated by the excavators, the Zhoujiadi cemetery belonged to the Upper Xiajiadian culture, parallel to the Spring and Autumn period on the basis that the object assemblage (Fig. 083b, 1-14) resembled those from the other typical Upper Xiajiadian culture sites, such as Nanshan’gen in Ningcheng city\textsuperscript{280}, Zhizhushan in Chifeng city\textsuperscript{281} and so on.

\textbf{2.4.7 Liangcheng county}

The Liangcheng county lies in central Inner Mongolia.

\textbf{2.4.7.1 Yinniugou cemetery}

The Yinniugou cemetery lies 2km northeast of Maoqinggou, and 70km northeast of Huhehaote city. In the excavation of 1982\textsuperscript{282} and 1997\textsuperscript{283}, 15 and 23 burials were found respectively (Fig. 084e). All of the 15 tombs excavated in 1982 were a rectangular shaft earth pit; 9 tombs were in the direction of west and east; 6 in the direction of north and south. The former were normally buried with animal victims and iron objects without a coffin and outer coffin, and the dead lay in an extended position facing upwards; however, animal bones were absent in the latter and only 8 funeral objects were found together from the 6 tombs, although 2 of them had no funeral objects. It was therefore inferred that the tombs facing in a north-south direction belonged to the Han people, while the tombs facing in an east-west direction belonged to the Xiongnu people. This cemetery provides good evidence regarding the integration of the ancient northern people and Central Plain people.

The 23 tombs discovered in 1997 can also be divided into two groups: 16 tombs in a north-south direction and 7 tombs in an east-west direction. Four of the tombs facing in an east-west direction had wood coffins and some animal bones (Fig. 084a-c). The excavators suggested, that the differences between the north-south and east-west direction tombs are less than when compared to the tombs excavated in 1982, and that the cemetery was parallel to the late Warring States period in light of the comparison of the belt hooks (Fig 084d), which were partly influenced by the Central Plain. Furthermore, the Yinniugou cemetery and the neighboring cemetery of Maoqinggou\textsuperscript{284} were probably continuously built by the same people.

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{279} Tian G. J. 1983, 7-24.
\textsuperscript{280} ZKKN 1975, 117-140.
\textsuperscript{281} ZSKKN 1979, 215-243.
\textsuperscript{282} NMGG 1984, 26-32.
\textsuperscript{283} NMGY el al. 2001, 278-327.
\textsuperscript{284} It will be discussed in the next section.
\end{footnotes}
2.4.7.2 Maoqinggou cemetery

The Maoqinggou cemetery lies southwest of the Liangcheng county (Fig. 085d). A total of 79 Bronze Age and early Iron Age tombs were found together with weapons, tools, ornaments and implements for daily use and animal bones (Fig. 085a-c) in the excavation of 1979\textsuperscript{285}.

All of the tombs were distributed densely with rectangular earth shaft pits. A few of them had coffins or outer coffins. Most of them were built in an east-west direction and a small quantity lying the south of the cemetery were built in the north-south direction (Fig. 085e). A set of assemblages were characterized by different kinds of bead necklaces, northern bronzes, and potteries. The bronze objects included belt buckles, bird shaped plaques with double birds, belt ornaments, swords, daggers, spears, three-ridged arrowheads with wings and three-winged arrowheads with a tubular handle, crane hacks and horse fittings. The potteries included round abdomen shaped pots with small mouth and brown pots with ears (Fig. 085a-c). Some objects, like swords, and plaques with double birds, or rectangular tiger-shaped plaques were made of iron instead of bronze.

As stated by the excavators, the Maoqinggou cemetery is one typical cemetery, which belonged to the ancient northern nomadic people during the late Spring and Autumn period to the late Warring States period, similar to the Gongsuhao, Taohongbala, Hulusitai, Yulongtai and Xigoupan cemeteries\textsuperscript{286}. The quantity of animal victims is quite less in comparison to the number of the Gongsuhao and Taohongbala cemeteries.

It is worth mentioning that a special kiln was discovered near the cemetery though only a small number of coarse and simple potteries were found. In addition, the excavators pointed out that the tombs facing in a south-north and east-west direction may have belonged to two different ethnic groups. The burial manners and funeral objects of the tombs facing in a south-north direction show great similarities to those from the Central Plain, indicating that the people in the Maoqinggou region were probably engaged in agriculture.

2.4.7.3 Guoxianyaozi

The Guoxianyaozi cemetery is located 1km northeast of the Guoxianyaozi township, about 400km northwest of the Liangcheng county and in the Manhanshan region. The Maoqinggou cemetery lies 40 km southeast of Manhanshan. A total of 19 undisturbed graves and 6 damaged graves were excavated, and 6 grave funeral objects were collected in 1983\textsuperscript{287} (Fig. 086c).

All of the graves were narrow rectangular earth shaft pits, which is sometimes

\textsuperscript{285} NMGG 1986, 227-315.

\textsuperscript{286} These five cemeteries will be discussed later.

\textsuperscript{287} NMGY 1989, 57-81.
furnished with a niche and a subsoil platform. Normally, the dead were buried singularly in an extended supine position, with the head pointing to the east. Not any kind of coffin is discovered. Animal sacrifices were very common in burials, including horned cattle, pigs, dogs, and red deer. Funeral objects consisted mainly of bronzes such as plaques, buttons, rings and tubular ornaments, along with various stone beads and a small number of bone ornaments (Fig. 086a-b). Each grave generally had one pottery. As for weapons and tools, there were only bronze knives, bone arrowheads and bone bow-ends found.

In terms of the distribution and forms of these graves and the evolitional relations of their funeral objects, the excavators divided the Guoxianyaozi cemetery into two phases. The first phase is roughly parallel to the late stage of the Spring and Autumn period; the second phase is approximately equal to the late Spring and Autumn period to the early Warring States period.

Many of the bronze ornaments were typical Ordos objects. In contrast, neither the bronze weapons and harness which were very common in the Taohongbala cemetery nor the large belt ornaments which are often seen in the Maoqinggou cemetery were found in the Guoxianyaozi cemetery. On the other hand, the Guoxianyaozi and Maoqinggou cemeteries yielded more potteries than the other graves in the Ordos region.

2.4.8 Hangjinqi

2.4.8.1 Taohongbala cemetery

Hangjinqi lies in the northwest of the Ordos Plateau. Taohongbala village lies 45km southeast of Hangjinqi. A total of 7 graves were unearthed in 1973. All of the tombs were built in a rectangular shaft pit. Both the burial manners and funeral objects are quite similar, so they may well have existed at the same time. Only grave TaoM1 and TaoM2 were in a good state of preservation. Animal victims, bronze weapons, implements, ornaments, and horse fittings were very common (Fig. 087). According to the antenna-pommel bronze short swords (Fig. 087, 41), the excavators dated them to the late Spring and Autumn period, which corresponds to the radiocarbon date cal. 848-400 BCE (Appendix) from the wood of grave TaoM1.

2.4.8.2 Aluchaideng

Aluchaideng is situated in the Ordos Plateau, 40km southeast of Hangjinqi and 4km northeast of the Taohongbala village. One group of gold and silver objects were accidentally found in the winter of 1972. According to the remaining human bones and animal victims, they may have belonged to two barely destroyed tombs. This

group included 282 pieces of gold objects with over 4kg of weight, 5 pieces of silver objects and a few stone beads (Fig. 088).

It is possible that the people of a high status rather than the common people in the Xiongnu society would have owned these delicate gold objects\textsuperscript{290}. The model of the gold crown (Fig. 088, 1-3) is quite lifelike: an eagle with spreading wings and stretching claws stands on the motif of a wolf biting a sheep; and a crown band with animal designs lies underneath the crown. This is the unique Hu-crown (胡冠).\textsuperscript{291} All of these gold and silver objects were largely decorated with animal motifs, showing strong Ordos’s characteristics. In addition, the gold necklace found in Aluchaideng was also discovered in Xigoupan\textsuperscript{292}; a similar silver necklace was unearthed at Yulongtai\textsuperscript{293} and Waertugou\textsuperscript{294} (Fig. 133). Furthermore, in light of the incised Chinese characters on the gold plaque, this group of objects were dated to the late Warring States period.

2.4.9 Zhungerqi

2.4.9.1 Xigoupan

Zhungerqi lies in the west of Inner Mongolia and most eastern part of the Ordos plateau. Xigoupan lies in the north of Zhungerqi. Three tombs were unearthed in 1979\textsuperscript{295} and only tomb M2 was well preserved, found together with animal victims and a number of gold, silver, and bronze objects (Fig.089). Several iron objects were found from tomb M1, however the funeral objects of tomb M3 largely consisted of bronzes. The excavators regarded the antenna pommel sword (Fig. 089, 14) as the transitional type between the antenna-headed and ring-headed sword. Accordingly, they dated M2 to the early Warring States period. Furthermore, in light of the incised Chinese character\textsuperscript{296} on the silver Jieyue-horse masks (see Fig. 089, 35), Tomb M2 is probably related to the Zhao (趙) State (ca. 300-200 BCE).

2.4.9.2 Baohaishe

A total of 22 bronzes were collected from Baohaishe in 1984\textsuperscript{297}, including Dou-vessels, covers, buckles, axes, chisels, knives, loops, bulbs, beads, tubes, plaques and so on (Fig. 090). It is more than likely that they belonged to one grave. The shape and design of the two Dou-vessels shows a typical Central Plain style. By contrast, most

\textsuperscript{290} Tian/ Guo 1986, 348, 349.
\textsuperscript{291} See <后汉书, 舆服志>: 武冠，一曰武?大冠，诸武官冠之。侍中，中常侍加黄金珰，附蝉为文，貂尾为饰，谓之赵惠文冠。This gold crown was probably used by the military attaché of the Xiongnu people in light of the ancient document.
\textsuperscript{292} YKW et al. 1980, 1-11.
\textsuperscript{293} NMGB et al. 1977, 111-114
\textsuperscript{294} NMGXJ 63, Plate 80-93.
\textsuperscript{295} YKW et al. 1986, 351-365; YKW 1980, 1-10.
\textsuperscript{296} 雨.
\textsuperscript{297} YKW 1987, 81-83.
of the other bronzes display the typical style of northern bronzes, dating to the Spring and Autumn periods, as suggested by the excavators.

2.4.9.3 Yulongtai

The Yulongtai village lies north of Zhungeerqi. In 1974, a group of bronzes were collected from the Yulongtai village and one grave was excavated in 1975\(^{298}\), found together with animal victims, bronzes, iron and bone objects and so on (Fig. 091). The shape of the bronze buckles, buttons and knives as well as iron crane hacks, and gag bits are similar to those found at the Taohongbala and Xigoupan sites. They are accordingly dated back to the late Warring States period.

2.4.9.4 Sujigou

A group of bronzes in typical Ordos style were collected from the Sujigou village in Zhungerqi in 1962\(^{299}\), including figures of deer, horses, beaks of bird, animal heads and so on (Fig. 092). They may have come from the same storage pit.

2.4.10 Yijinhuoluoqi: Ming’anmudu and Shihuigou

Yijinhuoluoqi lies south of the Ordos Plateau. The Ming’anmudu village is located 5km southeast of the Buertaige township, Yijinhuoluoqi. One tomb was found from the Ming’anmudu village in 1988\(^{300}\), found together with disturbed horse bones, 80 pieces of bronzes, and 2 potteries (Fig. 093, 1-19). Since the bronzes are similar to those from the neighboring areas, this tomb was dated from the end of the Spring and Autumn period to the early Warring States period.

A total of 16 silver objects and 15 bronzes were collected from one grave at Shihuigou in 1984\(^{301}\). It was the first time that such silver objects with a tiger biting a deer were found in the Ordos region (Fig. 093, 20-25). Similar bronze objects were found at Fanjiayaozi \(^{302}\) (Fig. 093, 32-34) and Guoxianyaozi in Inner Mongolia and the Chenyangchuan village in Xijie, Guyuan County, Ningxia. Similar gold objects were also stored in Inner Mongolia and discovered in Nianfangu qu\(^{303}\). Furthermore, the motif characterized by two tigers biting each other is seen on a silver plaque, which is very similar to the gold plaque found at the Aluchaideng site.

The silver hedgehogs, goat shaped buttons, insoles and tortoise-shaped ornament present a highly developed metallurgical technique. Comparing the silver and bronze objects to those found from the neighboring regions, this grave is dated back to the late Warring States period.

\(^{299}\) Gai S. L. 1965, 44-46.
\(^{300}\) YKW et al. 1992, 79-81.
\(^{301}\) YKW 1992, 91-96.
\(^{302}\) Li Y. Y. 1959b, cover 3.
\(^{303}\) YKW 1991, 405-408.
2.4.11 Dongsheng city: Nianfangqu

The Dongsheng city lies south of the Ordos Plateau and borders Yijinhuoluqiqi to the north. In 1988, a group of gold and silver objects as well as many agate and turquoise beads were found from the Nianfangqu hoard at the Tala township, which lies 15km northeast of the Dongsheng city. The gold plaques decorated with a tiger and wolf biting and fighting each other (Fig. 094, 1) and gold ornaments with two dragons (Fig. 094, 4) are very similar to those found from the Aluchaideng (Fig. 088) and Xigoupan (Fig. 089) sites. It is worthwhile mentioning that the form of the tiger closely resembles the bronze ones, which were found at Guoxianyaozi (Fig. 086).

All of the objects found from the hoard consisted mainly of belts and necklace ornaments. They may have belonged to one noble person instead of one normal civilian. According to the ancient documented record on the objects, this gold and silver hoard found in Nianfangqu was dated to the late Warring States period.

2.4.12 Baotou: Xiyuan

The Xiyuan cemetery lies 20km east of Baotou city. A total of 7 tombs and 2 altar pits of the Spring and Autumn period were excavated, found together with over 160 bronzes, 42 bone objects and quite a lot of stone ornaments (Fig. 095). It is worth mentioning that no pottery was unearthed at the Xiyuan cemetery and no dwelling remains were found in the neighborhood.

These seven tombs were all earth shaft pits with a side pit and a subsoil platform, without coffins. Animal victims were very common. For example, 11 sets of animal victims were found from altar pit J1 and one round pit of pebbles on the right subsoil platform (Fig. 095, 10). In addition, the dead were placed in a supine and extended position. The funeral objects were composed mainly of small belts and necklace ornaments. However, horse and chariot fittings, weapons, and implements were very rarely seen in the Xiyuan cemetery.

The Xiyuan cemetery differs to the Taohongbala and Xigoupan sites in both burial patterns and the type of bronze objects. It resembles the Guoxianyaozi cemetery in bronze assemblages but differs in tomb forms. Therefore, it is difficult to tell the cultural ascription of the Xiyuan cemetery. Based on the comparison of the bronzes, the excavators dated the cemetery from the late Spring and Autumn period to the early Warring States period.

2.4.13 Other sites

Apart from the above-mentioned sites, quite a number of bronzes were also collected.

———
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or excavated from other places in Inner Mongolia.

Three graves were unearthed at the Hulusitai village, in Wulatezhonghoulianheqi\textsuperscript{307}, found together with a group of bronzes (Fig. 096). The excavators dated them to the early Warring States period by comparing the burial manners and funeral objects to those found from the Taolongbala, Yulongtai, Maoqin, Sujigou, Xigoupan sites and so on. One bronze knife (Fig. 097, 1) collected from the northwest of the Salaqi Town\textsuperscript{308} resembles one found from a grave at Shuijiangoumen in Tuyouteqi\textsuperscript{309} (Fig. 097, 3), dated back to the Warring States period.

In the survey of 1988 at the Nanpaoziya village of Kulunqi, a number of potteries and stone implements were collected from the surface\textsuperscript{310}. One broken bronze knife was also found (Fig. 097, 13). The excavators ascribed them to the Lower Xiajiadian culture. An animal headed sword, some belt hooks and buckles were found in one tomb at Goulitou, Xinghe county in 1988\textsuperscript{311} (Fig. 097, 9-12); some horse and sheep bones were also buried in the tomb; the sword (Fig. 097, 12) is similar to the one found at the Xigoupan site. Some ancient bronze or iron objects were also found in the tombs at Chenbaerqi\textsuperscript{312}, Hulunbei, northeast of Inner Mongolia (Fig. 097, 14-34); tomb M1B was buried with 25 sets of skeletons and animal bones; the cultural elements of this tomb is complicated.

2.4.14 Summary

As mentioned in Chapter 1, the Northeast Complex as defined by Pak\textsuperscript{313} will not be an emphasis in this study because this complex is characterized by the bronze swords with curved blades which highlights a different system compared to the typical northern bronze system. However, many remains in the South of the Yanshan Complex were traditionally attributed to the Upper Xiajiadian culture, which was one typical bronze-using culture in the Northeast Complex, distributed mainly to the north of the Yanshan region.

In order to clarify the differences between the Upper Xiajiadian culture and the cultures in the South of the Yanshan complex, the copper and bronze artifacts of the Upper Xiajiadian culture distributed in Inner Mongolia have been also provided, including Longtoushan, Yaowangdian, Xiajiadian, Zhizhushan, Jinggouzi, Nanshan’gen, Xiaoheshigou, Beishanzui, Wafangzhong, Tianjuquan, Liangjiayingzi, Xiaoyushulinzi, Dapaozi, Tiejianggou, Zhoujiadi sites. It is hoped that this will not only help the readers to distinguish the south of the Yanshan Complex from the Upper...

\textsuperscript{307} Ta/Liang, 1986, 223-226; 1980, 11-18.
\textsuperscript{308} Shi Y. T. et al. 1997, 18.
\textsuperscript{309} Zheng L. 1965, 51.
\textsuperscript{310} Hao W. B. 1996, 11-14.
\textsuperscript{311} Cui L. M. 1994, 473.
\textsuperscript{312} NMGG 1986b, 273-283.
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Xiajiadian culture but also to have a comprehensive grasp on the metallurgical and cultural development in different parts of the long and narrow Inner Mongolia region.
Chapter 3 The Northwest Complex

It is well known that the northwest of China was the most significant passageway for cultural interaction and exchange, between China and Central Asia during the prehistoric and early historic periods. The Gansu and Qinghai provinces are administratively the main components of this region.

The Gansu and Qinghai provinces are located along the upper reaches of the Yellow River, which passes through the southern part of this region. Arable land is located in the river valleys of many tributaries of the Yellow River, including the Taohe, Weihe, Daxiahe, Jinghe, Zulihe, Huluhe, Bailongjiang, Shiyanghe, Shulehe, Danghe and so on (Map 7). The landscape of the Gansu Province is very mountainous in the south and flat in the north. The mountains in the south are part of the Qilianshan range where many archaeological sites have been discovered in a belt that changes from a sub humid to a semiarid climate. The Qinghai Province is located on the northeastern part of the Tibetan Plateau. The Yellow River originates in the middle of the province, while the Yangzi and Mekong rivers have their sources in the southwestern part. The average elevation of the Qinghai Province is over 3000 meters above sea level. Mountain ranges include the Tanggula and Kunlun Mountains.

Archaeological sites are located in the river valleys and the Hexi Corridor. In general, the Corridor plain has abundant arable land resources, but the climate is dry with only scanty and sporadic rainfall that decreases from the southeast to the northwest. Hence, the distribution of any oasis farming is largely determined by the availability of irrigation water, which is generally most plentiful in the middle reaches of the inland rivers. 314

With the steadily gained discoveries and research conducted in the last half of the century, many bronze cultures have been confirmed in this area, dating from the 4th to 3rd millennia B. P. In addition to the Qijia culture, Xindian culture, Kayue culture, Siba culture, Siwa culture, and Shajing culture that have been mentioned by Pak Y. J. 315, the Nuomuhong culture and Tangwang-style pottery will be discussed in particular. The relations between these cultures are intricate and complicated.

3.1 Qijia culture

3.1.1 Distribution

The Qijia culture is widely distributed in the Qinghai and Gansu Provinces. It reached the upper section of the Jinghe in the east, the Bailongjiang valley in the south, Alashanzuoqi in Inner Mongolia in the north, the Huangshui valley in the northeast of Qinghai and the Shulehe valley in the Gansu Corridor (Hexi Corridor) in the west. About 430 sites of the Qijia culture were confirmed, located mainly in the west of the Hehuang valley and its tributaries (Map 7). Among them, Huangniangniangtaï, Dahezhuang, Qinwenjia, Zhangjiazu, Jijiachuan, Qijiaping in Guanghe, Xiping, Xinglin, Qiao and Fujiamen in the Gansu Province, Liuwan, Gamatai, Zongzhai, Huangjiazhai, Shenna and Zongri in the Qinghai Province, and Xinglong town at Xijie, and the Haijiawan town at Guyuan in Ningxia were officially excavated.

3.1.2 Chronology and periodization

The Qijia culture is characterized by pots with flat bottom, constricted neck, flared mouth, and two large vertical loop handles running from the rim to the shoulder. Similar pots with single or double small handles were also found in large numbers. Basket motifs, cord marks, and incised designs were very common. In contrast, the painted potteries were seen occasionally. According to the research on the archaeological remains, especially the potteries, scholars have different opinions about the classification and periodization of the Qijia culture. Xie Ruiju puts forward that the eastern Qijia culture is earlier than the western Qijia culture. In addition, he
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divides the Qijia culture into four stages. However, Hu Qianying holds the view that the Qijia culture should be divided into two types: the first type is represented by the Qinweijia and Dahezhuang sites; the second is represented by the Huangniangniangtai and Liuwan sites; the former is earlier than the latter. Other scholars such as Zhang Zhongpei propose a detailed chronology with three periods and eight stages for the Qijia culture, based on his study of stratigraphical data and typological analysis of pottery vessels from the Huangniangniangtai, Qinwenjia and Dahezhuang sites. Shui Tao establishes an internal periodization of the various Qijia sites in light of the research on the typology of the potteries and stratigraphical evidence and divides the Qijia culture into four periods and six stages. This opinion has been largely accepted so far. Another young scholar, Zhang Wenli divided the Qijia culture into three stages and considered that a Post-Qijia culture also existed, accordingly the Qijia culture should end much later than previously expected.

It is worth mentioning that one French scholar, Debaine-Francfort has undertaken a systematic research on the Qijia culture. She collected most of the available radiocarbon dates of the Qijia culture (Appendix). The majority of the radiocarbon dates fall into the late third and the first half of the second millennia BCE. Furthermore, it is largely agreed that the relative placement of the Qijia culture is later than the Majiayao culture and earlier than the Xindian, Kayue and Siwa cultures. Both of the chronologies are reconcilable. Accordingly, the Qijia culture falls approximately between 2300-1800 BCE (Appendix).

3.1.3 Copper and bronze

The emergence of copper and bronze objects marks a significant cultural achievement for the Qijia culture. So far, over 130 metal items have been identified. In this respect, previous research has mainly focused on the constituents and metallurgical technology used, in order to find out the metallurgical stage of the Qijia culture against the background of the whole Chinese Bronze Age. Few scholars noted the bronze assemblages, archaeological contexts, manufacturing techniques, and distribution of the Qijia culture.

The Qijia culture is famous for its copper objects, not only pieces (forged), but also large implements (cast). Only a few of them are determined as Cu-Sn alloys. For example, all thirteen artifacts from Huangniangniangtai in Wuwei county were made.
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of copper. The bronzes found from Qinweijia in Yongjing county and Qijiaping in Guanghe county were made of alloys including lead-bronze, lead-tin-bronze, and tin-bronze. Both casting and forging methods were used in the Qijia culture. Knives and awls were usually made by forging (Table 15. Test results from copper and bronze artifacts found in the Qijia culture of Gansu,)\textsuperscript{346}. These features indicate that copper metallurgy was mature during the Qijia period though the Qijia people had a limited knowledge of alloying.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site/number of artifacts</th>
<th>Tested artifacts and number</th>
<th>Material and means of testing</th>
<th>Method of manufacture and means of test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Huangniangniangtai Site, 30 artifacts</td>
<td>Bar, H9 (3)</td>
<td>Copper (note 4)</td>
<td>Mold (archaeological observation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awl, style II T13:1</td>
<td>Copper (note 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 artifacts and slag unearthed from the first three excavations</td>
<td>Knife, style I AT5:249</td>
<td>Copper (note 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ring T18 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Piece rolled up (archaeological observation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 artifacts found in the fourth excavation</td>
<td>Knife, style I (collected)</td>
<td>Singe mold cast (archeological observation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knife, style II F3</td>
<td>Hammered (archaeological observation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awl, style I T6:3</td>
<td>Hammered (archaeological observation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awl, style I T10:3</td>
<td>Hammered (archaeological observation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awl, style I BT2(2)</td>
<td>Hammered (archaeological observation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awl, style II H9 (3)</td>
<td>Hammered (archaeological observation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chisel T19 (2)</td>
<td>Hammered (archaeological observation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awl 19948</td>
<td>Copper* (note 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awl 2281</td>
<td>Copper (note 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awl, Gan267</td>
<td>Copper (note 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knife, 19946 75.W.X.T.17</td>
<td>Copper (note 1, 2)</td>
<td>Cast (metallographic examination)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knife, 19947 75.W.X.T18(3)</td>
<td>Copper (note 1, 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awl, (long) 19668</td>
<td>Copper (note 4)</td>
<td>Forged</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{346} Sun/Han 1977, 75-84.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site and Description</th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
<th>Material and Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75.W.X.T5</td>
<td>Awl, (short) 19668</td>
<td>Copper (note 4) (metallographic examination)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.W.X. collected</td>
<td>Awl, 75.W.X.T17 (2)</td>
<td>Copper (note 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.W.X.T14(3)</td>
<td>Awl, 19951 75.W.X.T14(3)</td>
<td>Copper (note 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.W.X. collected</td>
<td>Awl, 19950 75.W.X. collected</td>
<td>Copper (note 1, 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qinweijia site, Yongjing County</td>
<td>Awl, T6:2</td>
<td>Lead-tin-bronze (note 2) Forged (metallographic examination)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 artifacts</td>
<td>Ax, T72:1</td>
<td>Copper (note 2) Cast (metallographic examination)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ring M99:6</td>
<td>Lead-bronze Hammered (archaeological observation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ring, M70:2</td>
<td>Hammered (archaeological observation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ornament H4:1</td>
<td>Copper (archaeological observation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ornament H19:6</td>
<td>Copper (archaeological observation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bone handle bronze knife, Linxiazhoubo 187</td>
<td>Tin-bronze (note 1, 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Point, KG3 732 (2):27</td>
<td>Copper* (note 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahezhuang site, 2 artifacts, Dagger (TF:7) did not test</td>
<td>Copper piece T30:27</td>
<td>Copper (chemical quantitative analysis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qijiaping site, Guanghe county, 2 artifacts</td>
<td>Mirror 75.GT1 (g.g.p.) M91</td>
<td>Tin-bronze (note 1, 4) Curvature radius 214±7mm., convex mirror</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AX 75.GT1.AF1:1</td>
<td>Copper (note 1, 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiping site, Guanghe County, 2 artifacts</td>
<td>Sickle, Linxiazhoubo 137</td>
<td>Copper (note 1, 2, 4) Cast (metallographic examination)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xinxin site, Minxian County, 2 artifacts</td>
<td>knife</td>
<td>Copper (archaeological report) Cast (archaeological report)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ax</td>
<td>Copper (archaeological report)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15. Test results from copper and bronze artifacts found in the Qijia culture of Gansu, Method of testing: note 1, portable radioisotope X-ray fluorescence instrument qualitative analysis; note 2, atomic emission spectrometry qualitative analysis; note 3, spectral semi-quantitative analysis by the Gansu Geology Bureau; note 4, Atomic Absorption Spectrometry; note 5, electron probe micro analysis; *based on the results of the atomic spectrum qualitative analysis and metallographic analysis, the major elements in large or medium amounts in the qualitative analysis were found to be artificially added elements, so the awl (19948) and point (KG3732(2):27) are copper products, not bronze, as indicated in our earlier tests
The majority of copper and bronze objects from the Qijia culture were obtained by excavation, and a small amount were collected. Some of the objects have been published in detail; others were only mentioned briefly in related reports (Table 1). In total, these bronzes consist of small implements and ornaments (Fig. 099b). So far, no bronze containers have been found.

### 3.1.3.2 Assemblage, context, metallurgical technique, and social function

In light of Table 17, the Qijia culture bronzes differ in archaeological contexts, types, composition, and metallurgical techniques owing to regional differences (Table 16; Map 8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Context (amount)</th>
<th>Implements</th>
<th>Ornaments</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Huangniangntai (30)</td>
<td>S (18)</td>
<td>6 4 1 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zongzhai</td>
<td>T (6)</td>
<td>4 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahezhuang</td>
<td>S (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qinweijia</td>
<td>S (3)</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenna</td>
<td>U (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zongri</td>
<td>T (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamatai</td>
<td>T (49)</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xinzhuangping</td>
<td>C (12)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weijiataizi</td>
<td>C (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qijiaping</td>
<td>T (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiping</td>
<td>C (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xinglin</td>
<td>C (2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shangguandi</td>
<td>C (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16. Types, amount, archaeological contexts of the copper and bronze objects of the Qijia culture, S-settlement; T- tombs; C-collected; U-unknown; a-knife; b-awl; c-chisel; d-drill; e-axe; f-dagger; g- dagger head; h-loop; i-bracelet; j-bulb; l-ornament; m-stripped shaped object; n-dagger-shaped object; * means that the amount of this type is unclear.

(adapted from Linduff et al. 2000, 179-181 Table 1)\(^{347}\).

\(^{347}\) Sun/Han 1997, 79 Table 1; translated in Linduff et al. 2000, 170-181.

\(^{348}\) Wang Z. 2006, 9-16.
Table 17. Comparison of three groups of copper and bronze objects from the Qijia culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Implements</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Dwelling place</td>
<td>Implements</td>
<td>Knives, awls, chisels, drills</td>
<td>Cu</td>
<td>Forging, crudely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Tomb</td>
<td>Ornaments</td>
<td>Rings, bulbs, mirrors</td>
<td>Cu-Sn, Cu-Pb</td>
<td>Casting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Collected</td>
<td>Implements</td>
<td>Knives, axes, sickles, aggers</td>
<td>Cu; Cu-Sn</td>
<td>Casting, advanced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group A is mainly distributed in the Wuwei region, upper reaches of the Huangshui, and upper reaches of the Taohe, including the Huangniangniangtai, Zongzhai, and Dahezhuang sites. It is worth mentioning that most of the copper and bronze objects were found from dwelling places, including small implements such as knives, awls, drills, and axes as well as a small quantity of ornaments. In contrast, of the 88 tombs in Huangniangniangtai, 82 tombs in Dahezhuang and 10 tombs in Zongzhai, only a total of 4 tombs were found together with copper and bronze objects, which consisted mainly of small implements such as awls and knives. In addition, the tombs buried with copper and bronze objects were almost the same as the other tombs without metal objects in burial furniture and manners. This phenomenon implies that copper and bronze objects were probably buried as daily implements in the same way as the potteries and stone wares, namely, the appearance of metal objects in burials didn’t indicate the more personal wealth or higher social status of the owners. Seventeen samples of Group A have been metallurgically examined for their chemical composition. Sixteen are determined as copper, and one is determined as copper-tin-lead alloy. Most of them were very simple and crudely forged. A few of them were cast by using joint molds.

Group B was mainly discovered in the upper reaches of the Yellow River and eastern plateaus of the Qinghai Province, including the Gamatai, Zongri, Shenna, and Qinweijia cemeteries. In contrast to Group A, most of the copper and bronze objects of Group B were found in the burials. They consisted mainly of ornaments such as rings and bulbs as well as a few mirrors and daggers. Nevertheless, the Gamatai cemetery yielded 46 metal objects in 43 tombs. In addition, only 7 tombs in the Qinweijia and Zongri cemeteries were found together with bronzes. It is worth noting that these tombs neither seem to be richer in funeral objects nor higher in rank than the other tombs without metal objects, implying that copper and bronze ornaments were not treated as the symbol of wealth and status. So far, four samples have been metallurgically examined, showing that three artifacts were made of alloy and one was made of copper. The bronze mirror with delicate decorations, found at the
Gamatai site shows cast techniques.

Group C is mainly collected from Daxiahe, in the middle and lower reaches of the Taohe region. Most of these bronzes are small implements, which are more complicated in forms and manufacturing techniques than those in Group A. Some kind of loop-handled knives, socket axes, and mirrors were very common in the Huoshaogou cemetery. According to the periodization of the Qijia culture sites and the corresponding coexisting relations between the potteries and bronzes, Group B and Group C bronzes should have emerged later than Group A (Table 18).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2300</th>
<th>2100</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>1800 B.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18. Chronology of the bronzes of the Qijia culture.

3.1.4 Origin

There are many diverse opinions regarding the origin of the Qijia culture. Some scholars seek the origin of the Qijia culture in the remains distributed in the eastern region during the Longshan period such as the Lower Changshan culture, Caiyuan culture or Keshengzhuang II culture (Fig. 099c)\(^{349}\). Zhang Zhongpei states that the Qijia culture may have developed from the Xinglongzhen-Xiaqijia complex in the Xiji county of Ningxia\(^{350}\). Other scholars tend to emphasize the indigenous development and highlight the strong cultural continuity in pottery from earlier Neolithic cultures in the same region, especially the Majiayao culture (including the Majiayao, Banshan, and Machang types)\(^{351}\). In addition, Zhang Xuezheng suggests that the Machang type lasted much longer than previously thought and was contemporaneous for quite some time with the Qijia culture.\(^{352}\) On the basis of the previously held views, Shui Tao concluded that the main body of the Qijia culture had possibly developed from the Majiayao culture; however, the early Qijia culture absorbed many elements from the Lower Changshan culture and Keshengzhuang culture in the east (Fig. 099c). Most of the hypotheses regarding the origin of the Qijia culture are largely based on the pottery traditions and complexes. Therefore, this study will explore its origin from the copper and bronze artifacts, which will be mentioned in Chapter 6 and Chapter 7.

\(^{352}\) Zhang X. Z. 1993, 143.
3.2 Siba culture

3.2.1 Distribution

The Siba culture was first recognized at Sibantan, Shandan in 1953 when it was called ‘Siba-style pottery’. It was once regarded as a new late Neolithic culture, contemporary with the Qijia culture. After a number of archaeological excavations and surveys were conducted in the western Gansu region, it was finally reconsidered to be one of the early Bronze Age cultures in northwest China.

The Siba culture was mainly distributed in the middle of the Hexi Corridor, extending to the Wuwei county in the east, touching the lower reaches of the Heihe Valley in the north, the middle and upper reaches of the Shulehe Valley in the south, and the Hami basin in the west. Important sites of the Siba culture include: Huoshaogou and Shaguoliang in Yumen town, Ganguya in Jiuquan county, Donghuishan in Minle county, Xihuishan and Sibatan in Shandan, Yingwoshu in Anxi county, and so on (Map 12).

3.2.2 Chronology, periodization and origins

As for the periodization of the Siba culture, Li Shuicheng divides it into five stages based mainly on the typological analysis of the Ganguya and Huoshaogou potteries, suggesting that the Huoshaogou cemetery in the western region of the Hexi Corridor is, as a whole, earlier than the Ganguya cemetery in the middle region of the Hexi Corridor. Furthermore, the first Stage is represented by the Sibatan site; the fourth stage is marked by the Shaguoliang site; the fifth stage is represented by the Yingwoshu site.

In terms of the reanalysis of the potteries from Huoshaogou, Ganguya, Sibashan, Donghuishan, and Yingwoshu (Fig. 104a), Shui Tao proposes another relative chronology with 3 periods and 7 stages for the major sites of the Siba culture. He suggests that Donghuishan should represent the first period of the Siba culture; Huoshaolao lasts from the first to fifth stage of the Siba culture, earlier than Ganguya; Sibatan and Shaguoliang fall in the middle period; and Yingguoshu was in the late

---

355 As stated by Shui Tao (2001a, 321), some potteries found at Huangniangniangtai in Wuwei county belonged to the Siba culture.
356 Some painted potteries of the Siba culture were collected from the Heihe valley.
357 A number of sites were recognized as the Siba culture at Yumen town in the Shulehe valley.
358 Some typical elements of the Siba culture have been confirmed at the Hami basin.
359 The materials are yet to be published. Some of them have been mentioned in GSB 1979, 139-153.
360 The materials are yet to be published.
361 The materials are yet to be published.
362 Donghuishan 98.
Regarding the origin of the Siba culture, both Li Shuicheng and Shui Tao recognize the similarity and continuity in pottery styles from the Machang type, and the Qijia culture to the Siba culture. According to the stratigraphical evidence and pottery comparison, it is acceptable that the Siba culture is relatively later than the early Qijia culture. In addition, Li Shuicheng suggests that the middle and late period of the Siba culture was approximately parallel to the early Kayue culture in view of several potteries found in the Kayue style at Huoshaogou.

So far, only a few radiocarbon dates of the Siba culture are available (Appendix). The four radiocarbon dates from the Huoshaogou site and another four from the Ganguya site are approximately within the same time range, which supports the opinion, held by most Chinese archaeologists that the Siba culture may be dated to 1900-1500 BCE, parallel to the Xia period and early Shang period in the Central Plain.365

### 3.2.3 Metal objects

As with many other Bronze Age cultures in northern China, most of the information available on the Siba culture is from burials, and metal objects are no exception (Table 3.13). About 300 metal objects have been found, including tools, weapons, and personal ornaments, which are made of copper, bronze, gold, and silver. They include several small copper/bronze knives and earrings unearthed from Sibatan, over 200 pieces of metal objects discovered from Huoshaogou, over 10 metal objects found from Yingshuwo, 2 bronze fragments found from Xihuishan, 16 pieces found from Donghuishan and 48 pieces found from Ganguya. In total, over 270 pieces of metal objects were recognized as belonging to the Siba culture (Table 19).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Archaeological context</th>
<th>Copper, bronze, gold and silver objects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sibatan</td>
<td>Burial, settlement</td>
<td>Bronze/copper knives; gold earring³⁶⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huoshaogou</td>
<td>Burials (200 pieces)³⁶⁸</td>
<td>Bronze/copper, gold and silver objects³⁶⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yingguoshu</td>
<td>Burials³⁷⁰</td>
<td>Bronze/copper and gold earring, pea-shaped ornaments³⁷¹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³⁶⁴ Shui T. 2001a, 243-250.
³⁶⁵ Li S. C. 1993, 80-101; Shui T. 2001a, 250.
³⁶⁶ Li/Shui 2000, 36.
³⁶⁷ An Z. M. 1959b, 7-16.
³⁶⁸ A total of 312 tombs were excavated at Huoshaogou. Among them 106 tombs were buried with over 200 pieces of copper and bronze objects.
³⁶⁹ GSB 1979, 139-153.
³⁷⁰ A total of 3 tombs of the Siba culture were excavated, found together with 7 pieces of copper and bronze objects. Furthermore, several bronze objects were collected from the surface.
³⁷¹ Not yet published. According to the research by Li Shuicheng and Shui Tao (2000, 36-44).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Xihuishan</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Bronze/copper knife, scraper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donghuishan</td>
<td>Burials, settlement</td>
<td>Bronze/copper knife, awl, earring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganguya</td>
<td>Burials</td>
<td>Bronze/copper objects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19. Metal objects of the Siba culture.

### 3.2.3.1 Types

The metal objects of the Siba culture can be divided into three types: tools, weapons and personal ornaments (Fig. 104b), showing close relations with other cultures. Such a straight-handled knife (Fig. 104b, 13.14) is also seen in the Machang type and Qijia culture (Fig. 099b, 2.23). Compared to the metal objects found in the earlier Qijia culture, more compound tools appeared in the Siba culture, such as axes and awls (Fig. 104b, 9-12).

It should be noted that the metal ornaments were not only made of copper and bronze but also of gold and silver, especially earrings and rings. It has been mentioned earlier that one copper pole-top (or mace head) with four projecting ram-heads (Fig. 104b, 34) is very striking in the Siba culture. It is 8cm in height and the ring-base is 2.8cm in diameter. There are four string patterns at the end and four goat heads with coiled horns. This object implies highly developed metallurgical techniques at that time.

Overall, the metal objects display a nomadic style. So far, no bronze vessel have been found in the Siba culture, it is probably because they were not used as funeral goods.

### 3.2.3.2 Metallurgical technique

Sixty-six out of over two hundred items found at the Huoshaogou site have been analyzed, showing that 30 are made of copper and the others are made of tin-copper or tin-lead bronze. Except for four samples made by forging, the others are made by casting. The pole-top with four-goat heads displays a complicated metallurgical technique, including the method of using composite molds and a separate mold. In the second metallurgical analysis, a few Cu-As alloys were also identified (Table 10; Table 11).

---

372 Only two pieces of bronze fragments were found.
373 Li/Shui 2000, 36-44.
374 A total of 249 tombs were excavated at Donghuishan, found together with 16 pieces of copper and bronze objects.
375 Donghuishan 98.
376 A total of 105 tombs of the Siba culture were discovered at Ganguya, found together with 48 pieces of copper and bronze objects.
377 Li/Shui 1988, 271.
378 Li/Shui 2000, 38.
Sixty-eight items of the bronze objects found at the Donghuishan\textsuperscript{379} (Table 4; Table 5; Table 6) and Ganguya sites (Table 12; Table 13; Table 14) have been examined by atomic absorption spectrum analysis, scanning electron microscope, and metallurgical structure analysis. The metallurgical analysis of the bronzes found at the Donghuishan site has been discussed in Chapter 2.3.2, so it will not be repeated. As we know, 13 artifacts from the Donghuishan site contain 2%-6% arsenic. Among them, 3 artifacts contain respectively 1.4%, 1.7%, and 8% of tin as well. From Table 12, Table 13 and Table 14, we can see that the arsenic-copper alloys as well as the tin-copper alloys are very popular. In addition, the bronzes at the Yingguoshu site are mostly determined as Cu-Sn alloys\textsuperscript{380}.

Not all of the related bronze information about the Siba culture has been published. Based on the aforementioned research on the periodization of the major sites, the metallurgical development in the Siba culture can be roughly divided into two periods. During the early period of the Siba culture, copper was dominant, especially in the Huoshaogou site where copper occupies 50% of the analyzed samples. It is quite interesting that tools and weapons were made of copper more than of bronze, while ornaments were normally made of bronze. This is hard to explain. Arsenic copper alloy is popular at another early Siba culture site Donghuishan, however, tin copper alloy increases over time at Ganguya. During the late period, tin copper alloy takes the lead at Yingwoshu. The metallurgy of the Siba culture seems to have started from copper, then to arsenic copper alloy, and finally to tin copper alloy, in accordance with that in the Eurasian Steppe. This process differs greatly with the Central Plain, which is characterized by copper-zinc alloy in the early period and copper-tin alloy in the late period. In addition, an anthropology study has suggested that the Gansu-Hexi Corridor area was full of East Asian Mongoloids. No typical Caucasians have been identified in the region at that time\textsuperscript{381}.

The Gansu Province was and is one of the major sources of nonferrous deposits in China. The minerals are always distributed around archaeological sites, and ores of copper, tin, lead, and arsenic have been identified. All of the essential materials necessary for the emergence of metallurgy can be found in this region\textsuperscript{382}.

### 3.3 Xindian culture

#### 3.3.1 Distribution

The Xindian culture, one of the bronze-using cultures in the Qinghai and Gansu

\textsuperscript{379} The metallurgical technique of the bronzes found from the Donghuishan site has been discussed in Chapter 2.3.2 in detail.
\textsuperscript{380} Sun/Han 1997, 75-84.
\textsuperscript{381} Han/Pan, 1984, 243-263.
\textsuperscript{382} Sun/Han 1997, 84.
regions, is distributed mainly along the banks of the Yellow River and its tributaries in middle Gansu, and the Huangshui region in Qinghai (Map 9) and includes nearly a hundred sites. It has reached Gangu and Zhuanglang in the upper reaches of the Weihe in the east, Datong and Huzhu in the west, Kangle in the middle reaches of the Taohe in the south, and Yongdeng and Yuzhong in the north.

So far, Shanjiatou, Xiaohandi, Liuwan, Jijiachuan and Zhangjiazui, and Lianhuatai have been formally excavated and published. Sporadic finds have been discovered at Bojizhang, Bianqiang, Dongdapo, Shanghantai, Erfang, Zhonghuanshiguala, Zhuandao, Zongzhai, Hetaozhang, Xindian, Sishiding, Huizu, Heitouzu, Yanchang, Yatou in Qinhai and Gansu provinces in the survey.

3.3.2 Classification, chronology, periodization, origins and trace

The classification, chronology, periodization, and origin of the Xindian culture are still in dispute. Before the 1980s, the research mostly focused on the classification and the chronological relations between them. There are two main opinions. One opinion divides the Xindian culture into two types: A and B or Jijiachuan and Zhangjiatui though the chronology of the two types is still in argument. Another opinion, divides

---

383 DTJQH 1996.
384 Shui T. (2001a, 205) put forward that the remains of TM7 from Gansu should be ascribed to the Shanjiatou type of the Xindian culture.
385 Three potteries found from the Zhuanglang county were ascribed to the Jijiachuan type of the Xindian culture; see Nan. Y. Q. 1989, 73-109.
386 As noted by Shui T. (2001a, 319), some potteries of the Zhangjiazui type of the Xindian culture were confirmed in the survey at the lower Datonghe region.
387 Zhao/Xie 85.
388 According to the survey report.
389 In the survey at Yongdeng, some potteries of the Zhangjiazui type of the Xindian culture were discovered, however, are not yet published (Shui T. 2001a, 319).
389 Some potteries of the Shanjiatou type of the Xindian culture were identified in Yuzhong, however the related materials is not yet published (Shui T. 2001a, 319).
393 Liuwan.
396 Gao/Wu 1984, 30-33.
397 Hong/Ge 1990, 25-34.
398 QHY 1993, 193-211.
400 He/Gao 1982.
401 QHWD 1986b, 882-886.
402 Over 360 tombs were excavated in Hetaozhuang which is the biggest Xindian culture cemetery so far, while most of the materials have not been published. Chen H. H. (1990) mentioned that the Hetaozhuang cemetery includes the potteries of the second, third and fourth stages of the Lianhuatai cemetery and the first, second and third stages of the Zhangjiazui site.
403 Andersson 1925.
404 HHGS 1959, 181-184.
408 HHGS 1959, 181-184.
the Xindian culture into four successive groups; Tangwang, Zhangjiazu, Sishiding and Xindian.\(^{409}\)

With more excavation of the Xindian culture sites, scholars tend to emphasize the developing process and origins of the Xindian culture. There are three main ideas. Nan Yuquan divides the Xindian culture into 7 periods and 10 stages according to the materials of the Hetaozhuang and Lianhuatai sites. Furthermore, he insists that the Xindian culture should have originated from the Shanjiatou type of the Qijia culture, as the decoration on earlier potteries resembles those of the Machang type. It was also suggested that the Xindian culture lasted between 1500-600 BCE, approximately, from the Middle Shang to the Early Spring and Autumn Period\(^{410}\). Zhang Xuezheng states that the Xindian culture which was heavily influenced by the Qijia culture, was developed mainly from the late-Qijia culture, with elements of the Machang type which is especially reflected in painted potteries. In addition, it experienced three stages: Shanjiatou, Jijiachuan, and Zhangjiazu. Furthermore, the Xindian culture was dated from the late Xia period to the late Western Zhou period. The two-eared pots and bowls, ring-based pots and ring-based pots with a single ear can also be seen in the late Qijia culture. Based upon the research on the Shanjiatou cemetery and Xiaohandi cemeteries\(^{411}\), Xu Yongjie divides the Xindian culture of the Qinghai Province into 6 stages and puts forward that the monochromic and polychromic potteries with round base may have respective origins though they coexisted from the beginning to the end of the Xindian culture.\(^{412}\)

It is worth mentioning that Shui Tao\(^{413}\) divides the Xindian culture into 3 periods and 7 stages in light of the analysis of the potteries from different sites and related stratigraphical evidence (Fig. 100a; Fig. 100b). The first stage of Shanjiatou is parallel to the late Qijia culture; accordingly, the second and third stage of Shanjiatou cannot be earlier than the Qijia culture. The Tangwang-style potteries, parallel to the seventh stage of the third period of the Xindian culture, is speculated to have coexisted with the Zhangjiazu type potteries that are ascribed to the fifth and sixth stages of the third period of the Xindian culture. It implies that the former is not so close to the first and second stages of the Shanjiatou type, and the third and fourth stages of the Jijiachuan type. Some Tangwang-style potteries coexisted with the late Kayue culture remains in the Shangsunjiazhai site, Qinghai province, suggesting that the Tangwang-style potteries were relatively later than the other Xindian culture types. Therefore, as far as the relative chronology of the Xindian culture is concerned, it is later than the late

\(^{409}\) Yan W. M. 1978, 62-76. 
\(^{411}\) Zhang X. Z. 1993, 122-152. 
\(^{412}\) Xu Y. J. 1993, 166-203. 
\(^{413}\) Shui T. 2001a, 207-220.
Qijia culture, earlier than the Eastern Zhou culture in the middle Gansu region, and contemporaneous to the late Kayue culture in the east of the Qinghai region\(^{414}\).

Zhang Wenli divides the Xindian culture in the Qinghai Province into three periods and eight stages\(^{415}\). His opinion improves Shui Tao’s periodization and adds the materials of the Xiaoandhi cemetery, Bojizhang, and Shiguala sites (Fig. 100c; Fig. 100d). In light of the potteries, he put the Bojizhang, Bianqiang, and Shiguala into the second period of the Xindian culture, and the first to the fourth stages of the Xiaoandhi cemetery into the third period. His periodization will be used in this study.

In addition to the relative chronology of the Xindian culture sites, several radiocarbon dates provide us with a basis for absolute dating (Appendix). Shui Tao ascribes the Maluyuan site to the third stage of the second period of the Xindian culture\(^{416}\). Considering that the Tangwang-style pottery coexisted with the Kayue culture for a long time, the radiocarbon dates from some Tangwang-style potteries can also be used as a cross reference for the date of the Xindian culture\(^{417}\). Conclusively, the Xindian culture falls roughly between 1600-600 BCE, parallel from the early Shang to the Spring and Autumn period.

As for the origin of the Xindian culture, the relations between the late or Post-Qijia culture and the early Xindian culture is an unavoidable issue. It has been largely accepted amongst scholars that the Xindian culture probably originated from the Qijia culture, also adopting some elements of the Machang type\(^{418}\).

As far as the offspring of the Xindian culture is concerned, Yu Weichao\(^{419}\) and Nan Yuquan\(^{420}\) observe some similarities between the late Xindian culture and the early Shajing culture. While Zhang Xuezhen points out that the decline of the Xindian culture is probably related to the rise of the Kayue culture\(^{421}\).

### 3.3.3 Comparing the Xindian culture between the Qinghai and Gansu regions

In light of Yu Weichao’s opinion, the Xindian culture can be divided into Taohe and Huangshui types\(^{422}\). There are no big differences between the pottery assemblage of the Xindian culture in the Qinghai and Gansu Provinces, but minor differences in the quantity of different kinds of potteries. For example, the painted bowls with a handle,

---

\(^{414}\) Shui T. 2001a, 219-220.
\(^{415}\) ZW L. 2003, 17-23.
\(^{416}\) Shui T. 2001a, 220.
\(^{417}\) It will be discussed later.
\(^{421}\) Zhang X. Z. 1993, 122-152.
painted pots with two ears and tripods-Li are rarely seen in the Qinghai Province but are commonly found in the Gansu Province.

However, greater differences can be observed in the burial manners between the two provinces. In the Qinghai Province, the deceased were mostly laid out in an extended position in a coffin, or a coffin with an outer coffin; a few of them were buried in an earth pit as well as in a one-sided shaft pit and sarcophagus. The secondary burial was also particularly popular and may have been passed over from the previous ancient cultures in the Qinghai Province. By contrast, the burial manners of the Xindian culture in the Gansu Province were much simpler. The deceased were normally placed in an extended position in an earth pit without a coffin. Nevertheless, in contrast to the differences between the Qinghai and Gansu Provinces, the differences in the Xindian culture are less.

### 3.3.4 Bronze

Only a small quantity of bronze objects from the Xindian culture were discovered, including awls, axes, arrowheads, bulbs, tubes, buttons and so on (Fig. 100e). One bronze Guan-vessel discovered at Lianhuatai, was quite similar to the most common pottery of the Xindian culture. Few of the bronze objects of the Xindian culture have been metallurgically analyzed, so it is hard to tell how the metallurgical techniques developed in the Xindian culture. However, based on the available analysis and archaeological observation, all of them have been determined as bronze with varying degrees of tin and other metallic components. The bronze objects found at the settlement consisted mainly of weapons and implements. In contrast, the bronzes found in the burials are mainly personal ornaments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Bronze items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zhangjiazui</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>1 spear head, 1 fragment, 2 pieces of slag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lianhuatai</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>1 knife, 2 awls, 3 buttons, 1 spatula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lianhuatai</td>
<td>Burials</td>
<td>1 Guan pot, 2 buttons, 14 tubes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yatou</td>
<td>Burials</td>
<td>Rust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanjiatou</td>
<td>Burials</td>
<td>1 belt hook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuyangtou</td>
<td>Collected</td>
<td>1 axe; 1 awl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuangerdongping</td>
<td>Collected</td>
<td>1 arrowhead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20. Bronze objects of the Xindian culture.

423 Secondary burials were very common in the Shangsunjiazhai cemetery.
3.4 Kayue culture

3.4.1 Distribution

The Kayue culture\(^{424}\) is one significant Bronze Age culture in northwest China, mainly distributed in the Qinghai Province\(^{425}\). It reached the borders of the Gansu and Qinghai provinces in the east, the Xinhai and Tongde counties in the west, the Datonghe valley in the north, and Zeku in the Huangnanzhou county in the south. The regions along the Yellow River and the Huangshui valley are the central areas of the Kayue culture (Map 10).

So far, over 1700 sites have been identified as belonging to the Kayue culture\(^{426}\). Of them, the Shangsunjiazhai cemetery\(^{427}\) and Huangjiazhai cemetery\(^{428}\) in Datong county, Panjialiang cemetery in Huangzhong county\(^{429}\), Dahuazhonghuang cemetery\(^{430}\), Luanshan and Huabiliang villages\(^{431}\), Gangcha cemetery\(^{432}\), Momula cemetery\(^{433}\), Ahatela cemetery\(^{434}\), Suhusa cemetery\(^{435}\), Shangbanzhuwa cemetery\(^{436}\), Xiabanzhuwa cemetery\(^{437}\) and Shanpingtai cemetery\(^{438}\) have been formally excavated.

J. G. Andersson first identified its unique pottery assemblage at the Kayue site in Huangyuan county, Qinghai Province in 1923-1924\(^{439}\). It was until the 1950s that the Kayue culture was finally distinguished from the Siwa culture. After the 1970s, more research on the Kayue culture was carried out.

3.4.2 Chronology, periodization and origin

There are different opinions on the chronology, periodization, and origin of the Kayue culture since the designation was put forward in the 1950s.

Yu Weichao states that the Kayue culture originated from the Qijia culture, and then developed into two subtypes: Ahatela and Shangsunjiazhai. Furthermore, he divides
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\(^{424}\)It was once translated as Kayao where the remains of this culture were firstly discovered.

\(^{425}\)An Zhmin states that some sites along the Yellow River in Yongjing county, Gansu Province have been confirmed as the Kayue culture (An Z. M. 1956, 9-19). Shui Tao once pointed out that some typical Kayue culture potteries-long necked pots with ears in their abdomen were found in the Huoshaogou site, Yumen county, Gansu Province, however, the related pictures have not been published.
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the Kayue culture into four periods, roughly parallel from the late Xia period to the end of Shang period and the beginning of the Zhou period⁴⁴⁰.

Zhang Xuezheng holds the opinion that the Kayue culture experienced two successive stages: the Kayue stage and Shangsunjiazhai stage (including Tangwang-style potteries). In addition, the Kayue culture and the Siba culture belonged to the same cultural system, dating roughly to the Shang and Zhou period⁴⁴¹.

Xu Yongjie divides the Kayue culture into 3 periods and 6 stages. Meanwhile he puts forward that Shangsunjiazhai and Suhasa, two sub-types of the Kayue culture, have their own origins. The former perhaps originated from the Machang type and absorbed certain elements from the Huangshui type of the Qijia culture as well; the latter was considerably related to the Huangshui type of the Qijia culture and absorbed certain elements from the Machang type and the Xindian culture⁴⁴².

This study believes that the Kayue culture originated from the late Qijia culture because most of the earliest potteries of the Kayue culture can be traced to the potteries of the late Qijia culture (Fig. 101c). Besides, it absorbed elements of the Machang type and had a close relationship with the Tangwang-style potteries as well as the Siba culture.

On the basis of the typological research on potteries found at Ahatela⁴⁴³, Kayue, Xiaxihe, Panjialiang, Shangbanzhuwa, Xibanzhuwa, Shanpingtai, Dahuazhongzhuang, Huangjiazhai, Shui Tao divides the Kayue culture into two regions, namely the Huangshui valley and the Yellow River region, as well as 3 periods and 6 stages (Fig. 101a; Fig. 101b). In contrast, the painted potteries found in the Yellow River region are more advanced than those found in the Huangshui Valley. However, the type in the Huangshui valley developed parallel to that of the Yellow River region. Finally, both of them converged gradually. Fewer Li-tripods were found in the burials, in contrast more were found in settlements of the Kayue culture. Furthermore, the rise, development, and decline of the Tangwang-style potteries seem to be connected to the late stage of the Kayue culture.

Some stratigraphical evidence provides crucial clues for the relative chronology of the Kayue culture. The remains of the Kayue culture often overlies on those of the Majiayao type or the Qijia culture, indicating their relative dates. At Shangsunjiazhai,⁴⁴⁰ Yu W. C. 1985a, 166-203.
⁴⁴² Xu Y. J. 1993, 166-203.
⁴⁴³ The materials of the Alatela cemetery have not been published though a total of 217 Kayue culture tombs were found. The information is only mentioned in some research articles.
tombs of the Kayue culture were overlain with Tangwang-style potteries. Therefore, the Kayue culture is later than the Qiija culture and slightly earlier than the Tangwang-style potteries. Combined with the available radiocarbon dates (Appendix), the Kayue culture falls mainly between 1600-600 BCE, parallel from the early Shang period to the Eastern Zhou period.

3.4.3 Bronzes

Since most of the Kayue culture sites were found together with bronzes, the Kayue culture has the most bronze artifacts of any bronze culture in the Qinghai Province, in both quantity and variety. Including as-of-yet unpublished material, Liu Baoshan speculates that over 1000 bronzes are identified as belonging to the Kayue culture.\(^{444}\)

In addition to the unpublished copper and bronze objects, a part of them were stray finds and another part of them were published but without the information of coexisting contexts.

It is worth mentioning that a Japanese scholar, Miyake Toshihiko, made a primary research on the bronzes from the Kayue culture. He mentioned that the bronze-making technology in the Huangshui region was more advanced than that in the Yellow River valley by comparison, and that the sexual differences of the tomb-owners are reflected in the distinction of the funeral objects.\(^{445}\)

On the basis of the research by Miyake and Zhang Wenli\(^{446}\) and the relative chronology gained by the potteries, this study will try to make a tentative periodization and systematic analysis on all of the published bronzes in light of the typological research (Fig. 101d).

Taking into consideration the fact that there are too many bronze objects, the discussion about how to date them will not be described one by one in detail. The bronze objects whose ascription is still controversial will be the emphasis.

3.4.3.1 Classification and periodization

The bronzes of the Kayue culture consist of containers, weapons, tools, daily wares, ornaments and so on including cooking ware-Li, battle axe-Yue, axes, spears, swords, dagger axes-Ge, arrowheads, knives, helmets, chisels, awls, mirrors, bells, hairpins, bracelets, earrings, bulbs, joined beads, pole tops and so on. The distribution of each kind of bronze differs in the amount and period between the Huangshui and Yellow River valley (Table 21; Table 22).

\(^{444}\) Liu B. S. 1996b, 75-77.
\(^{446}\) ZWL 2003, 52-76.
### Table 21. Periodization of the bronzes of the Kayue culture in the Huangshui valley (adapted from Miyake Toshihiko 2005, 73 Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Huanghai valley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yue, spear, axe, chisel, knife, tube, bulb, bell, Joined bead, Pole-top, mirror</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yue, spear, axe, chisel, knife, tube, bulb, bell, Joined bead, Pole-top, mirror</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yue, spear, axe, chisel, knife, tube, bulb, bell, Joined bead, Pole-top, mirror</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yue, spear, axe, chisel, knife, tube, bulb, bell, Joined bead, Pole-top, mirror</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yue, spear, axe, chisel, knife, tube, bulb, bell, Joined bead, Pole-top, mirror</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yue, spear, axe, chisel, knife, tube, bulb, bell, Joined bead, Pole-top, mirror</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 22. Periodization of the bronzes of the Kayue culture in the Yellow River valley (adapted from Miyake Toshihiko 2005, 74 Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Yellow River valley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yue, spear, axe, chisel, knife, tube, bulb, bell, Joined bead, Pole-top, mirror</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yue, spear, axe, chisel, knife, tube, bulb, bell, Joined bead, Pole-top, mirror</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yue, spear, axe, chisel, knife, tube, bulb, bell, Joined bead, Pole-top, mirror</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yue, spear, axe, chisel, knife, tube, bulb, bell, Joined bead, Pole-top, mirror</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yue, spear, axe, chisel, knife, tube, bulb, bell, Joined bead, Pole-top, mirror</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yue, spear, axe, chisel, knife, tube, bulb, bell, Joined bead, Pole-top, mirror</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.4.3.1.1 Container

So far, several bronze containers were ascribed to the Kayue culture. One bronze cooking ware—Li discovered at the Baojiazhai site, near Xining (Fig. 101d, 1)⁴⁴⁷ is worth noting. Li Xueqin considered that it resembled the Li found from the Erligang site⁴⁴⁸ which is a typical early Shang site in the Central Plain. Another bronze Gui-vessel (Fig. 101d, 2), collected from the Dahuazhongzhuang site⁴⁴⁹ with the Chinese characters '史?乍朕皇考商中王女季?宝??其万年子孙永保用' on the base⁴⁵⁰, is dated from the late Western Zhou period to the early Spring-Autumn Period. Both of them were very common in the Central Plain. Liu Baoshan⁴⁵¹ ascribes some bronze
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⁴⁴⁷ According to the coexisting objects, it was ascribed to the Kayue culture. See Zhao S. C. 1995, 635 Fig. 1.
⁴⁴⁹ ZWL 2003, 55.
⁴⁵⁰ Some scholars considered it as an imitation.
⁴⁵¹ Liu B. S. 1996a, 115-118.
jars, boxes, and bowls to the Kayue culture\textsuperscript{452}.

### 3.4.3.1.2 Weapon

Quite a large quantity of weapons were found in the Kayue culture, including a socket battle axe, battle axe-Yue, dagger axe-Ge, spears words, arrowheads and so on (Fig. 101d, 3-40).

According to Fig. 101d, axes and Yue were more common than the other weapons during the Shang and Western Zhou period (Fig. 101d, 3-19). However, after the Spring-Autumn period, bronze spears were becoming more prevalent (Fig. 101d, 24-30). So far, only two short swords (Fig. 101d, 31.32) have been identified in the Kayue culture, which are suitable for fighting at a short distance. In contrast, bronze axes, battle axes-Yue, battle daggers-Ge, and spears applied to longer-distance fighting.

It is worth mentioning that the cultural ascription of the bronze spear with a barb between the body and the hilt (Fig. 101d, 24), which was found at the Shenna site, near Xining\textsuperscript{453} should be questioned. In previous research, most of the Chinese and foreign scholars ascribed it to the Qijia culture\textsuperscript{454} as well as comparing it to similar spears found from outside China, especially in the south of Siberia\textsuperscript{455} (Fig. 102). The original report regarding this spear says ‘the Qijia culture is the major cultural element of this site as well as a few of the Han remains…. There are 13 groups of superimposing relations. In light of the stratigraphical evidence, this site can be divided into two periods. This spear is discovered from one trash pit of the late period’\textsuperscript{456}. However, detailed information is not provided. Li Shuicheng noticed that this spear was marked as ‘the Qijia and Kayue culture’ in one exhibition several years ago\textsuperscript{457}. Are there any Kayue culture remains at Shenna? If there are, why are they not mentioned in the earliest report by the excavators? What does ‘one trash pit of the late period’ mean? How late is ‘the late period’? – Li Shuicheng questioned the traditional opinions of this special spear\textsuperscript{458}.

If we review the metal assemblage of the Qijia culture (Fig. 099b), most of the copper and bronze objects are very simple in form. In addition, there are not any objects with a tubular handle. The alloying knowledge of the Qijia people was still limited. By comparison, there are a considerable number of bronze objects with a tubular handle

\textsuperscript{452} See Liu B. S. 1996a, 115-118. However, the author has not provided the pictures of these bronze vessels
\textsuperscript{455} MJJ 2001, 17 Fig. 3.
\textsuperscript{457} Li S. C. 2005, 239-277.
\textsuperscript{458} Li S. C. 2005, 239-277.
in the Kayue culture, such as axes (Fig. 101d, 3-10), daggers (Fig. 101d, 22-23), and so on. Therefore, it seems more logical if we ascribe this bronze spear to the Kayue culture instead of the Qijia culture. In addition, it is 61.5 centimeters long and 10 centimeters wide (Fig. 101d, 24). No trace of any usage has been observed. It may have been produced as a special burial good rather than a weapon.

3.3.4.1.3 Tools, ornaments and others

The bronze tools of the Kayue culture include axes, knives, scrapers, chisels, awls, tubes and so on (Fig. 101d, 43-76). Regarding the function of some tubes (Fig. 101d, 64-76), this study prefers to believe that they were used as ornaments.

Ornaments constituted most of the artifacts in terms of quantity and variety, including bells, plaques, bulbs, joined beads, bracelets, armlets, hairpins, rings, earrings, animal and human figures and so on (Fig. 101d, 77-164), that were probably attached to clothing. In addition, more bronzes belonging to the Kayue culture were found in burials, which differ to the Qijia and Xindian cultures.

3.4.3.2 Cultural elements

Based on Table 21, Table 22 and Fig. 101d which has collected as many bronzes as possible belonging to the Kayue culture, it can be inferred that axes, Yue and daggers were much more popular in the earlier period. However, axes, pole-tops, and ornaments were in a growing tendency in the later period.

As for the cultural elements shown in the bronzes of the Kayue culture, Yu Weichao holds the view that the dagger axe-Yue (Fig. 101d, 11) of the Kayue culture was obviously influenced by the Central Plain; some kinds of the bronze knives were similar to those found from the center north.  

Lin Yun states that the bronzes found in the west of the Great Wall regions were influenced by both the Central Plain and North-central Complex, from the Shang period to the Spring and Autumn period. Furthermore, he believes that the west region might have had its own metallurgical foundry industry. While Mei Jianjun puts forward that the interactive connections between the cultures of the Ganqing and Xinjiang regions started from the end of the second millennia BCE and the beginning of the first millennia BCE, which is especially reflected in the Nianbulake and the Kayue cultures. Meanwhile, the origin of the Kayue culture can be traced back to the eastern Xinjiang region as well as the Mongolia region.

---

459 Yu W. C. 1985a, 222.
460 Lin Y. 2003, 95-145.
461 Some knives, tubes, beads, bells and ornaments.
462 MJJ 2000.
Scholars represented by Miyake Toshihiko\textsuperscript{463} and Zhang Wenli\textsuperscript{464} suggest that the bronzes of the Kayue culture possess at least three cultural elements: the native element, the element from the Central Plain and the element from the North-central Complex. The native element is manifested not only in forms such as axes (Fig. 101d, 8-10.13), spears (Fig. 101d, 26), chisels (Fig. 101d, 59-61), bells (Fig. 101d, 29-86), plaques (Fig. 101d, 103.104), pole-tops (Fig. 101d, 157.160.161), earrings (Fig. 101d, 155.156), and figures (Fig. 101d, 159), but also in decoration, that are mostly plain. A few of them are decorated with simple patterns, such as decorations on the rim or a pattern with `\[\]`. In addition, hollowed-out technology was highly developed and was frequently used in bells. Though no chariots or harness have been identified so far, some scholars suggested that these bells probably belonged to chariot fittings. Since the bells were mostly discovered at the waist or joint position of the deceased, they were more like personal ornaments.

Some bronze tripod cooking wares-Li and Gui (Fig. 101d, 1.2), axes (Fig. 101d, 17.19), dagger axes (Fig. 101d, 20), knives (Fig. 101d, 53), arrowheads (Fig. 101d, 36), mirrors (Fig. 101d, 41.42) and bells (Fig. 101d, 77, 78, 97, 99) show great similarities to those from the Central Plain. It is hard to tell whether they were imported from the Central Plain or imitated by the local people.

Other bronze axes (Fig. 101d, 5-7.15.16.18), spears (Fig. 101d, 21.22.24), knives (Fig. 101d, 46.50.51.52.58), arrowheads (Fig. 101d, 32.38.39), bells (Fig. 101d, 95.96.98.100-102), bulbs (Fig. 101d, 141.142), beads (Fig. 101d, 143-150), armlets (Fig. 101d, 112.113), hairpins (Fig. 101d, 111.117.118) and pole-tops (Fig. 101d, 163) resemble typical Northern bronzes. Besides, some bronze axes (Fig. 101d, 11.12), spears\textsuperscript{465} (Fig. 101d, 24) and bulbs (Fig. 101d, 138) show a certain similarity to those from northern Eurasia.

In light of bronze information, the Kayue culture seems to have had more contact with the Central Plain than with northern China in the earlier period; and it had closer contact with northern China than with the Central Plain in the later period.

\textbf{3.4.3.3 Metallurgical technique}

So far, neither smelting and casting sites nor molds have been found in the Kayue culture. Based on archeological observation of these bronzes, it is possible that the local people manufactured some of the bronzes by themselves, despite the fact that most of them may have been imported from the Central Plain and the neighboring regions.

\textsuperscript{463} Miyake Toshihiko 2005, 73-88.
\textsuperscript{464} ZWL 2003, 52-76.
\textsuperscript{465} It has been discussed in the preceding paragraph.
So far, few of these bronzes have been scientifically examined. For this reason, this study cannot provide the precise information on the metallurgical techniques used in the Kayue culture. However, according to the observation on some samples, we can see that most of them were made of Cu-As alloys except for some axes unearthed from the Shangsunjiazhai cemetery (Fig. 101d, 17.19) which were probably made of copper. Two kinds of bronze-making techniques may have been used: cold forging and mold casting. The former was usually used for the battle-axe (Fig. 101d, 4); the later can be observed from the axes found in the Panjialiang cemetery (Fig. 101d, 44,45,48,49).

Compared to the earlier bronze cultures in northwest China, such as the Qijia and Siba cultures, the bronze artifacts of the Kayue culture increased not only in amount but also in types and forms. When compared to the contemporaneous Xindian and Siwa cultures distributed in the east, the Kayue culture had more developed metallurgy as well.

3.5 Siwa culture

3.5.1 Distribution

The Siwa culture, named after the Siwashan cemetery in the Lintao county, excavated by J. D. Andersson, is another Bronze Age culture in northwest China. It was distributed mainly in the middle and southeast of the Gansu province. It extends to the middle and upper reaches of the Taohe in the west (Lanzhou, Huining county, and Qingyang county in the north, the Bailongjiang valley in the south, and the east foot of the Ziwulin in the east (Map 11).

The sites of the Siwa culture are represented by Siwashan in Lintao county, An’guo town in Pingliang county, Liuqia village in Zhuanglang; Xujianian, Lanqiao in Xihe county, and Jiuzhan in Heshui county. In general, the sites of the Xindian
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466 Andersson 1925, 18; 1943, 178-185.
467 Some remains of the Siwa culture have been identified at Zhuomi county and Linyuan county, which are the farthest sites so far. (Shui T. 2001a, 220.320).
468 Some remains of the Siwa culture have been discovered at Yuzhong in the survey of the Huining. They are absent in the north of the Yellow River (Shui T. 2001a, 220.320).
469 Some remains of the Siwa culture have been identified at Jingning county. However, they are absent in the region between the Huining county and Xijie county (Shui T. 2001a, 200.320).
470 The remains of the Siwa culture were mainly found at the south of the Xifeng town in Qingzang county.
471 Zhao/Si 1993, 8-16.
472 The Heshui site and Shiqiao site are located in the western foot of the Ziwulin site.
475 GSB 1963, 48.
476 ZSKKJ 1982, 584-590.
477 GSG et al. 1987, 678-691.
culture are located across an area bordering the Xindian culture to the west and north (Map 9; Map 11) and the pre-Zhou and Western Zhou culture to the east.

3.5.2 Chronology, periodization and origin

Based on the stratigraphical evidence and comparison of the potteries, especially those found from the 13 tombs at Siwashan, 104 graves at Xujianian\(^{479}\), 9 tombs at Lanqiao, and over 80 tombs at Jiuzhan, Shui Tao points out that differences shown between these sites are due to the stage difference rather than the regional difference. Furthermore, he divides the Siwa culture into 3 periods and 6 stages \(^{480}\)(Fig. 103a). Besides, some potteries in the first stage of the Jiuzhan site, namely the fourth stage of the Siwa culture (Fig. 103a) coexisted with some typical Pre-Zhou potteries. In addition, some potteries with the Eastern Zhou style were found in the third stage of the Jiuzhan site, which is the sixth stage of the Siwa culture. Therefore, the late period of the Siwa culture was approximately parallel from the late Pre-Zhou or early Western Zhou period to the early Spring and Autumn period.

It is worth mentioning that the Siwa culture maintained a close relationship with the Xindian culture. In the middle and lower reaches of the Taohe, remains of the early Xindian culture and the Siwa culture were found. As stated by Shui Tao, the two cultures may have shared many common features in their early periods, and probably had the same origin \(^{481}\). In the middle phase of the Siwa culture, the Xindian culture existed to its west. At the same time, the close connections with the Pre-Zhou and Zhou cultures to the east can be observed in the potteries. The eastern expansion of the Siwa culture may have coincided with the western expansion of the Xindian culture \(^{482}\).

As for the absolute date of the Siwa culture, only a number of radiocarbon dates are available (Appendix). Considering the relative chronology mentioned above, the Siwa culture falls mainly between 1400-600 BCE, approximately from the late Shang period to the late Spring and Autumn period.

3.5.3 Bronzes

The bronze metallurgy of the Siwa culture is not well known. Most of the bronze objects have been unearthed from burials (Table 23). When comparing the quantities of bronzes found in the burials, they did not seem to be generally and widely used as funeral goods. They were mostly weapons, tools and personal ornaments, including dagger axes, spears, arrowheads, knives, bells, disks, bracelets, buttons, and so on.

\(^{479}\) Most information on the 104 tombs is not yet published. Some were mentioned in ZSKKJ 1982, 584-590.
\(^{480}\) Shui T. 2001a, 220-229.
\(^{481}\) Shui T. 2001b, 110-114.
\(^{482}\) Shui T. 2001b, 110-114.
Evidence of local bronze production is yet to be discovered. In addition, it is suggested that some of the Siwa culture bronzes are similar to those of the Western Zhou culture. So far, no bronze vessels have been found.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Archaeological context (amount)</th>
<th>Bronze items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Siwashan Burials</td>
<td>13 tombs</td>
<td>1 bracelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xujianian Burials</td>
<td>104 tombs</td>
<td>Dagger axe, spears, daggers, arrowhead, knives, bells, buttons, bracelets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanqiao Burials</td>
<td>9 tombs</td>
<td>2 buttons, 1 dagger axe,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiuzhan Burials</td>
<td>&gt;80 tombs</td>
<td>52 pieces, including daggers, sword, knives, buttons, tubes, bracelets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23. Copper and bronze objects of the Siwa culture.

### 3.6 Shajing culture

#### 3.6.1 Distribution

From 1923-1924, the Shajing culture was first identified by J. G. Andersson at Shajing, in Minqin county, Gansu Province. Its related research was not continued until the 1970s because the archaeological field work was quite difficult to carry out in the desert. So far, the Shajing culture have been identified at Shajing in Minqin county, Sanjiaocheng, Hamadun, Xigang and Chaiwangang in Yongchang county, and Yushugou in Yongdeng county. Its distribution extends roughly to Lanzhou and Jingtai in the east, the center of the desert in the north, the Qilianshan in the south and the Zhangye county in the west (Map 13).

#### 3.6.2 Chronology and periodization

The report on the excavation at Xigang and Chaiwangang is newly published, providing elaborate information on the mortuary practices and funeral objects of the Shajing culture, thus filling in a gap on the research of the Shajing culture. The excavators divide the Xigang and Chaiwangang cemeteries into two periods and five stages based on the pottery complex and stratigraphical evidence. Meanwhile, a periodization research of the Shajing, Sanjiaocheng and Hamadun sites has been made by Shui Tao (Fig. 105b). The ascription of the Chaiwangang site to the second period of the Shajing culture proposed by Shui Tao, is not in conflict with
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483 Andersson 1925, 18-19; 1943, 197-215.  
485 GSY 1990, 205-236; GSBG et al. 1984, 598-601.  
489 Shui T. 2001a, 250-256.
the periodization of the Chaiwangang and Xigang sites as suggested by the excavators (Fig. 105a; Fig. 105b).

As far as the relative chronology of each period of the Shajing culture is concerned, some stratigraphical evidence combined with the pottery complex proves that the first phase of Sanjiaocheng is roughly parallel to the Spring and Autumn period. Moreover, the first and second phase of Shajing is mostly equal to the Western Zhou period because some grey pottery shard with parallel and crisscross cord impressions, and water wave patterns found in the second layer of Saojiaocheng, are regarded as typical traits of the potteries in the Central Plain during the Spring and Autumn period. In addition, some pocket-footed tripods-Li with double handles found at the Maojiaping, and Gangu sites in the Gansu Province, coexisted with some typical remains of the Spring and Autumn period.

Remains of the Shajing culture overlie on those of the Machang type, indicating their relative dates. So far, 9 radiocarbon dates from Saojiaocheng, Hamdun, Xigang and Chaiwangang are available (Appendix). Most of them fall between 900-400 BCE, roughly equal from the late Western Zhou period to the end of the Spring and Autumn period, which is in accordance with the deduction made by the archaeological evidence.

### 3.6.3 Metal objects

The Shajing culture was abundant with metal objects, especially bronze artifacts. In addition to a few copper and bronze objects found in Sanjiaocheng, Hamadun and Yushugou (Fig. 105c), the majority of metal objects were found at Xigang (Fig. 105d) and Chaiwangang (Fig. 105e). Apart from a small quantity of weapons and tools such as axes, knives and arrowheads, most of the metal objects of the Shajing culture consist of personal ornaments, including various tubes, buckles, bulbs, beads, bells, earrings, mirrors, animal figures and so on. Most of them were found in burials, and a number of them were discovered from the settlements at Saojiaocheng, implying that metal objects may have been regarded as a critical part of personal wealth. Generally, the metal complex is characterized by a strong smack of nomadic life, showing great similarities to the typical Northern bronzes, which is reflected not only in the shape and form, but also in the pattern and decoration. Some scholars speculated that the Shajing culture may have been created by the people who originated from the Ordos Plateau, and migrated westwards to the Hexi Corridor. Therefore, they had still kept their original traditions though they left the northern steppes. They influenced the local people as time went on. Thus, an advanced bronze culture took shape in
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490 The excavators dated such potteries to the Warring States, while Shui Tao suggested that they belonged to the Spring and Autumn period.
northwest China.491

The metal technology of the Shajing culture was well developed. Some iron and gold objects were also unearthed in graves together with bronze ones, suggesting a chronological difference. Of the hundreds of metal objects that have been identified as belonging to the Shajing culture, only some samples have been metallurgically examined. The Spectrographic Laboratory of the General Research Institute of Nonferrous Metals has examined some of the bronzes found at Xigang, Saojiaocheng and Shangtugougang with qualitative analysis and electric spark spectrum analysis. The results are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Bronze items/sample</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Cu</th>
<th>Sn</th>
<th>Pb</th>
<th>As</th>
<th>Alloy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Xigang</td>
<td>Knife 80YSXM429:1</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cu-Sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knife 80YSXM421:6</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cu-Pb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knife 80YSXM140:3</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>trace</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cu-Pb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanjiaocheng</td>
<td>Arrowhead (big)</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cu-Pb-Sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrowhead (middle)</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cu-Pb-Sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrowhead (small)</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cu-Pb-Sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrowhead (big)</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cu-Pb-Sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shangtugougang</td>
<td>Ornament</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cu-Pb-Sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shangtugougang</td>
<td>Bulb</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>trace</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24. Composition analysis of some bronzes in the Shajing culture.492

From Table 24, we can see that the Cu-Pb-Sn alloy is relatively popular. By contrast, the Cu-As alloy is rarely seen. The bronze objects found at Xigang and Chaiwangang exceeded not only in quantity, but also in types and forms, than the other contemporary bronze cultures in northwest China, suggesting a more advanced metallurgical industry in the Shajing culture. More metallurgical analysis needs to be carried out.

3.7 Nuomuhong culture

3.7.1 Distribution, periodization, chronology, and origin

The designation of the Nuomuhong culture was first put forward in 1959 because of the excavation at Dalitaliha and Nuomuhong. It is mainly distributed around the Tsaidam Basin, especially in the Dulan and Wulan regions. Until now, over 40 sites have been identified as belonging to the Nuomuhong culture, such as the Germutown, Delingha town, and Tianjun site. It is a pity that only the Dalitaliha site was officially excavated, yielding the remains of adobe walls, abode pits, houses, enclosures, and urn burials together with lots of potteries, stone and bone wares, and bronzes. Regarding the periodization of the Dalitaliha site, the description is inconsistent with the excavation report. The excavators firstly state that the remains from the fifth to the seventh layer are quite different to those found from the second to the fourth layer, and afterwards ascribe the remains from the seventh and sixth layer to the early stage, and the remains from the fifth to the second layer into the late stage. Therefore, the report on the Dalitaliha site aroused debate, especially on whether the Nuomuhong culture is an independent culture.

By re-comparing the related remains and layers at Dalitaliha, Shui Tao suggests that the Nuomuhong culture represents an independent culture. Meanwhile, he divides the Dalitaliha site into two periods: the first stage is from the seventh to the sixth stage; the late stage is from the fifth to the second stage (Fig. 106a).

Another opinion is inclined to believe that the remains of the Dalitaliha site probably originated or varied from the Kayue culture, or both the remains of the Dalitaliha site and the Kayue culture represent two subtypes of a big culture.

Based on the pottery complex and remains of the settlement, Zhang Wenli holds the view that the Nuomuhong culture contains not only elements of the Qijia culture but also elements of the late Kayue culture (Fig. 106b). In addition, he supports the fact that the Nuomuhong culture is an independent culture because the pots with straight walls, basins with four buttons, stone axes, felt and the special adobe technique used in the architecture are unique at the Dalitaliha site.

As for the absolute date of the Nuomuhong culture concerned, so far two radiocarbon
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dates from the Dalitaliha site are accessible (Appendix). The date from the third layer seems too early. Considering the elements of the Qi jia culture and late Kayue culture contained in the Nuomuhong culture, we may infer that it falls in the first half of the millennia BCE, from the middle Western Zhou period to the Warring States period. More archaeological discoveries and research on this culture are hoped.

### 3.7.2 Bronzes

The bronzes of the Nuomohong culture are relatively less in quantity and variety, and were mainly found at the Dalitaliha site, the Baishui River, and the Buha River (Table 25), including axe, Yue (battle axe), knife, awl, tube, arrowhead and nail (Fig. 106c). It is considerably difficult to tell the chronology of these bronzes because most of them were collected from the surface. When comparing the counterpart bronzes from the other cultures such as axes, Yue, knives, and tubes, we can infer that these bronzes of the Nuomuhong culture may be parallel to the Western Zhou period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Amount and items of the bronzes</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dalitaliha</td>
<td>Yue 1; axe 3; awl 1; arrowhead 1; nail 1;</td>
<td>QHW et al. 1963, 17-43.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalitaliha</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>DitujiQH 1996, 185.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Awl 1</td>
<td>Xu/Ge 1988, 35-44.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baishui</td>
<td>Knife 1</td>
<td>DitujiQH 1996, 193.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25. Copper and bronze objects of the Nuomuhong culture.

No metallurgical analysis has been carried out on the copper and bronze objects of the Nuomuhong culture. From archaeological observation, the open and composite molds may have been used for some bronzes. Meanwhile, some bronze slag and fragments were found at the Dalitaliha site, implying the possibility of a local metallurgical industry. More fieldwork and scientific metallurgical analysis leave much to be desired.

### 3.8 Tangwang-style-pottery and others

The address of the ‘Tangwang-style-pottery’ was first put forward by An Zhimin in the 1950s in light of the pottery complex collected from the Tangwangchuan site. It designates the assemblage of pots with black-painted spire patterns on a violet slip, pots with two big ears in the neck or belly, and vessel-Dou with handle (Fig. 107a). Such assemblages were mainly discovered in the Gansu and Qinghai regions. Its
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distribution has reached the Yongjing county in Gansu in the east, the Gangcha county in the northwest, and Guinan in the southwest. According to the recent surveys, the Tangwang-style-pottery was centered in the Qinghai region. The major sites of the Tangwang-style-pottery have not been scientifically excavated.

In fact, the arguments over the designation, characteristics, and ascription of the Tangwang-style-pottery have never been solved. There are two main opinions. One is presented by Xu Yongjie, that Tangwang-style-pottery represents one independent Bronze Age culture, parallel to the Kayue culture and the Xindian culture. Furthermore, the typical Tangwang-style-pottery includes pots with two angulated ears, painted pots with big double ears, pots with round belly, Dou with handle, tripod-Li with handle and so on. Another opinion is inclined to believe that Tangwang-style-pottery cannot be classified as an independent culture; however, it belongs to either the Kayue culture or the Xindian culture.

Nevertheless, the individuality of the Tangwang-style-pottery is convincing. On the other hand, stratigraphical evidence at the Ahatela, Suhusa, Shangsunjiazhai, and Xiaohandi sites proves that this so-called Tangwang-style-pottery coexisted with the Kayue culture and the Xindian culture, so their close connections cannot be neglected. Zhang Wenli has completed a comprehensive research on the periodization and comparison of the Tangwang-style-pottery (Fig. 107a; Fig. 107b) on the basis of coexisting relations and comparing this kind of assemblage to different sites and cultures.

The origin and offspring of the Tangwang-style-pottery have aroused discussions and disputes amongst scholars for a long time. Some scholars suggest that it should have developed from the Kayue or Xindian culture. Whereas Zhao Jianlong holds the view that, it should have come from the Siba culture. Xu Yongjie puts forward that the main body of the Tangwang-style-pottery originated from the Qijia culture as well as being influenced by other cultures. In general, the origin of the Tangwang-style-pottery is much related to the Qijia and Siba cultures.

The offspring of the Tangwang-style-pottery is not clear at present. Some pots with two ears in the belly and Dou with single handle found at Subashen, and painted Dou
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with a high ring base and bridge-shaped ears found at Nianbulake\textsuperscript{513} are quite similar to the Tangwang-style-pottery. However, it is hard to tell whether or not they had direct connections.

In light of the coexisting relationship of the potteries, Zhang Wenli states that some radiocarbon from the Shangsunjiazhai and Ahatela sites (see Appendix) can be regarded as evidence of the absolute dates for the Tangwang-style-pottery as well\textsuperscript{514}. The radiocarbon dates are approximately from the end of the Western Zhou to the middle of the Spring and Autumn period. Zhang Wenli proposes that the Tangwang-style-pottery started from the end of the Shang period, and ended in the late Spring and Autumn period.

In general, due to a lack of sufficient discoveries and excavations, it is hard to regard the Tangwang-style-pottery as an independent culture in northwest China. However, the classification and identification of the Tangwang-style-pottery is quite valuable in understanding the relations between the Kayue, Xindian, Siba, Qijia, and Machang cultures. Besides, metal objects of the Tangwang-style-pottery are not well known.

### 3.9 Summary

#### 3.9.1 Origin and development of the bronze cultures

In light of the distribution, chronology, and periodization of the potteries and bronze assemblages of each culture that have been discussed above, this study believes that they are continuous both in cultural aspects and chronological sequence (Fig. 136), implying from another viewpoint that an indigenous bronze metallurgy was possible at that time in northwest China.

The Qijia culture, the earliest bronze culture in northwest China, is speculated to have originated either from the Neolithic culture Majiaoyao, which is distributed in the middle and west of the Gansu region, or from the remains of the Longshan period located in east of the Gansu region. According to the materials found from the Liuwan and Huangniangniangtai cemeteries, there was a transitional type\textsuperscript{515} with close relations to the Siba culture, which originated from the Machang type and was parallel to the Qijia culture for a long time.

Scholars pay much attention to the origin of the Siba culture. Some hold the view that the Majiayao culture polarized into two regions during the Machang period: the east

\textsuperscript{513} Subashen and Nianbulake are situated in the Xinjiang Province.

\textsuperscript{514} C14 91.

\textsuperscript{515} Scholars represented by Shui Tao and Li Shuicheng, believe that there is a transitional type between the Qijia culture and Siba culture.
region developed into the Qijia culture; however, the Siba culture came into being in the west (Map 1; Map 12). In recent research, the so-called ‘transitional type’ was regarded as the origin of the Siba culture. It is characterized by black and black-brown painted jars with double ears, a round belly and flat base. Similar kinds of remains have been identified in the Huoshaogou cemetery, Liuwan cemetery and Yuanyangchi cemetery in Yongchang county. Some potteries in the early Siba culture are quite similar to those in the late Qijia culture. Accordingly, some scholars represented by Shui Tao and Li Shuicheng, believe that the Siba culture may have originated from the ‘transitional type’. Some excavation of the Siba culture is not yet published, therefore this view needs to be proven.

Recent research has thrown great light on the origin of the Kayue culture too. Though there is a gap of 200 years between the late Qijia culture and the early Kayue culture, forms and patterns of some painted potteries of the early Kayue culture, especially found in the Ahatela site (Fig. 101b) show distinct similarities to those of the late Qijia culture (Fig. 099a) and the Machang type.

The Xindian and Kayue cultures are not only roughly parallel in chronology but also share a cross-area in border between the middle-west Gansu and north Qinghai (Map 9, Map 10). Many characteristics of the early Xindian culture can be also seen in the late Qijia culture, such as the cord patterns, jars with a round belly and round base, ears on the same level with a ring and so on (Fig. 099a,c; Fig. 100a-d). Furthermore, the painted potteries of the Xindian culture are close to those of the late Qijia culture which were supposed to have originated from the Machang culture. Furthermore, Shui Tao puts forward that the early Xindian culture in east Gansu shows connections with the pre-Zhou culture.

The Siwa culture, a little bit later than the Xindian culture, coexisted with the Xindian and Kayue cultures for a long time. It was distributed southeast of the Xindian culture in south Gansu. A lack of sufficient discoveries from the early Siwa culture makes it harder to explore its origin. Some scholars suggest that the Qijia culture developed into the Siwa culture in the east, and into the Kayue culture in the west. However, we cannot explain the large time gap between the Siwa and Qijia culture (Fig. 136). Nevertheless, as discussed in the above sections, the close ties between the Xindian culture and the Siwa culture are noticeable.

A lack of sufficient evidence also makes it hard to discuss the origin of the Tangwang-style pottery, which was parallel to the Kayue and Xindian cultures for a while.

Whether the Tangwang-style pottery can represent an independent culture is still in argument, however its individuality helps us to understand the complicated relations between the Kayue, Xindian and Qijia cultures.

As for the Nuomuhong culture, more archaeological discoveries need to be supplemented. Wherever it came from, the influence from the late Kayue culture is reflected in some potteries and bronzes. Moreover, the adobe techniques, wooly goods, and some painted potteries show similarities to those found in the east Xinjiang region.

When compared to the other bronze cultures mentioned above, the Shajing culture, which appeared roughly in the Middle Western Zhou period or even earlier, may have a totally different origin. Double-eared jars, pots with ears at their belly and single-eared jars were very popular; a drum-shaped belly, round base, and painting patterns with triangles and diamonds were very common. Such features can be traced to the middle Western Zhou cultures. The report on the excavation at Xigang and Chiwangang in 2007 provides us with new information on the Shajing culture, especially the bronze assemblages. Personal ornaments constitute the main body of them, as well as some weapons and tools, showing a great similarity to the northern bronzes. We still cannot judge where the Shajing culture came from, but it seems impossible for it to have derived directly from an earlier bronze culture.

### 3.9.2 Spatial distribution and interactions

These bronze cultures distributed in different areas and different periods, consist of the main body of the Northwest Complex. Their cross correlations are quite complicated, reflected in three aspects.

Firstly, there is not any so-called leading or dominating culture. All the cultures are scattered on a small scale throughout northwest China. However, they have their own individuality though they communicated with each other frequently. Secondly, some cultures coexisted for a long time side by side in different areas, such as the Kayue, Xindian, and Siwa cultures; thirdly, the origins of these cultures are not singular. Normally a later culture originated from an earlier culture, meanwhile absorbed foreign elements from the neighboring cultures.

As for the research on the metal objects in these cultures, it has been largely restricted to the traditional typology analysis. Nevertheless, there is a growing tendency for the metallurgical analysis of the bronzes found from the Gansu region. By contrast, very little metallurgical work has been undertaken on the bronzes found in the Qinghai region; accordingly, it is difficult to reconstruct the ancient metallurgical industry in this area. Despite this, some scholars speculate some manufacturing technique by
archaeological observation. It would be great if Chinese scholars pay more attention to metallurgical analysis in the future, which will definitely provide us with new clues towards a better understanding of the earliest metallurgy in northwest China. Besides, only a small quantity of radiocarbon dates are available so far. Therefore, it would be contentious to date a culture mainly based on the pottery complex, bronze assemblage and so on.
Chapter 4 The North-central Complex

The definition of the North-central Complex is almost in accordance with Pak’s\(^\text{518}\). It designates the bronze-using cultures in south central Inner Mongolia and adjacent areas, including northern Shaanxi, northwestern Shanxi, the Qingyang region in Gansu, and Ningxia. However, apart from the Zhukaigou culture, Maoqinggou culture, and Yanglang culture mentioned by Pak, some new cultures have been recently identified and recognized with the increasing archaeological discoveries. They include the Lijiaya culture, Xicha culture, and Taohongbala culture.

4.1 Zhukaigou culture

4.1.1 Definition and distribution

The Zhukaigou culture was first put forward in 1988, named after the Zhukaigou site, which is located in Yijinhuoluoqi, Yikezhaomeng, Inner Mongolia\(^\text{519}\). Four field seasons at the Zhukaigou site yielded a total of 83 houses, 207 ash pits, 329 burials, and 19 urn burials. The archaeological remains discovered from this site include over 510 potteries, 270 stone wares, 420 bone wares, and 50 bronze objects. The excavators represented by Tian Guangjin, divided the Zhukaigou site into five stages. The first stage is parallel to the late Longshan period. The second stage is close to the end of the Longshan period and the beginning of the Xia period. The third stage is contemporary with the early Xia period; the fourth stage is equal to the late Xia period; and the fifth stage is close to the period of the Upper Erligang culture in the Shang Dynasty. This opinion has commenced a heated controversy.

Except for some different opinions on the periodization of the Zhukaigou site\(^\text{520}\), the scholars doubt whether the entire remains of the five stages of the Zhukaigou site belong to the Zhukaigou culture. Li Boqian points out that the typical Li-tripods with serpent motif are absent in the first stage of the Zhukaigou site\(^\text{521}\). Afterwards, Cui Xuan puts forward that it is not appropriate to ascribe all the remains of the Zhukaigou site into the Zhukaigou culture, because the remains during the first to fourth stage, found in the burials are absent in the settlements. Furthermore, he classifies the remains of the Zhukaigou site into four groups, and only the third group

\(^{519}\) NMGY 1988, 301-331.
\(^{520}\) Zhang Zhongpei suggests that it should be divided into three periods: the first period is represented by the tripods-Li with a handle; the second period is marked by the tripods-Li with a high neck; the third is characterized by the coil ringed tripods-Li with sack-shaped feet (Zhang Z. P. 1990d, 209-213).
\(^{521}\) Li B. Q. 1991.
represents the Zhukaigou culture. As stated by Wei Jian, it is from the third stage, the Zhukaigou site belonged to the Zhukaigou culture. This study prefers to exclude the first stage of the Zhukaigou site from the Zhukaigou culture, because not only was this stage parallel to the late Longshan period but also it was after the second stage that the tripods-Li with serpent patterns appeared.

Despite this, the ascription of the Zhukaigou site and the Zhukaigou culture are still in dispute, as the bronze objects and Li-tripods with serpent motif are regarded as the main characteristics of the Zhukaigou culture. Therefore, in addition to the Zhukaigou site, Erliban, Nan Hao, Gaojiaping, Baiabao, Bainiyaozi, Zhaizita, Yangchanggou, Zhuangwoping, Guandi, and Haishengbulang were also confirmed as belonging to the Zhukaigou culture. Very few bronze objects have been unearthed in these sites. According to present day fieldwork, the Zhukaigou culture is mainly distributed to the south and middle of the Inner Mongolia region, centering on the Ordos Plateau and the area near the Liangcheng county (Map 15).

4.1.2 Periodization and chronology

As an early Bronze Age culture in northern China, the opinions on the periodization and chronology of the Zhukaigou culture still differ greatly to this day. One is represented by Tian Guangjin, who first divides the Zhukaigou culture into five stages in light of the remains from the Zhukaigou site as mentioned above. Furthermore, he believes there is a strong cultural continuity from the first stage to the fourth stage of the Zhukaigou site, though a possible short lapse exists between the fourth and fifth stage. In his subsequent articles, he ascribes the Zhukaigou culture into three periods and five stages, and suggests a chronology from the late Longshan period to the early Shang period.

Another statement is put forward by Wei Jian and Cui Xuan, that the Zhukaigou culture flourished during the Xia and early Shang period, and declined during the late Shang period until the Western Zhou period. Besides, it is from the third stage of the Zhukaigou site that it belonged to the Zhukaigou culture.
Lü Zhirong suggests that the Zhukaigou culture started from the end of the fourth stage of the Erligang culture, and terminated in the second period of the Yinshang culture. Moreover, the tomb M2007 at Zhukaigou, the remains of the early period of the Gaojiaping site, and the remains of the Nanqiao site represent the first stage of the Zhukaigou culture. The second stage is represented by tomb M2004, tomb M1052, and house H5030 of the Zhukaigou site, the remains of the Zhaizita site, and the first group remains of the Guandi site. QH78, QH79, H4006, M1040, M1046 of the Zhukaigou site, the second group remains of the Zhaizita site, and the D point of the Bainiyaozi site represent the third stage. The fourth stage is represented by the fourth group remains of the Zhaizita site, the remains of the Yangchanggou and Wozhuangping site, and the remains of the late Gaojiaping site.

Based on the above-mentioned opinions, Wu En divides the Zhukaigou culture into three periods. The early period is represented by the remains of the second and third stage of the Zhukaigou site\textsuperscript{536}, the Zhukaigou culture remains at Erliban, the early remains of the Gaojiaping site, the Zhukaigou culture remains at Nanqiao, remains of the fourth stage of the Zhuangwoping site, and remains of phase I in the fourth stage of the Zhaizita site. It is parallel to the first and second stage of the Erlitou culture (1900-1600 BCE). The early period is characterized by Li-tripods with a serpent motif, pots with buttons (Fig. 108a, 1.2; 9.12), and patterns of basket and cord. Some small bronze objects, such as chisels, awls, rings, needles and loops were found at Wozhuangping and Zhukaigou. The middle period includes: the remains from the fourth stage of the Zhukaigou site, the late Gaojiaping site, the fifth stage of the Guandi site, phase II within the fourth stage of the Zhaizita site, the Yangchanggou site, the fifth group of the Bainiyaozi site, and the Haishengbulang site. It is close to the period of the third and fourth stage of the Erlitou culture, dating to 1600-1500 BCE. Moreover, the middle period is recognised by the assemblage of the serpent motif Li-tripods, pots with buttons and Urns with three feet (Fig. 108a, 3.10.13.7). By contrast, the basket motif decreased and the serpent motif increased during this period, and some bronze objects also appeared. The late period is represented by the remains from the fifth stage of the Zhukaigou site, the phase III of the fourth stage of the Zhaizita site, and the D point of the Bainiyaozi site, which is roughly close to 1500-1200 BCE. Li-tripods with serpent motifs and gritty pots with buttons dominated this period (Fig. 108a, 4.5.11.14). Many potteries with elements of the Erligang culture appeared, such as Li, Gui (Fig. 108b, 10) and Dou (Fig. 108b, 9). In addition, more big bronze objects were found, including Jue-vessels, Ding-cooking tripods, swords, battle daggers, knives, guards and so on.

\textsuperscript{536} According to the periodization supposed by Tian G J.
As for the absolute dates of the Zhukaigou culture, so far six radiocarbon dates are available. Four of them also positively support their relative chronology as proposed by archaeologists (Appendix). Conclusively, the Zhukaigou culture falls roughly between 1900-1200 BCE, parallel from the Xia period to the late Shang period.

4.1.3 Cultural elements

The cultural elements contained in the Zhukaigou culture are quite complicated. In addition to the serpent-motif Li-tripods (Fig. 108a, 1-5), which appeared in the third stage of the Zhukaigou site and are considered to be one of the most important representative pottery vessels of the Zhukaigou culture, the assemblage of the so-called Northern-style bronzes (Fig. 108c, 1-15) and objects with a strong Central Plain style (Fig. 108b, 9.10; Fig. 108c, 16-19) are quite distinctive.

The bronze tripod-Ding and daggers (Fig. 108c, 16-19), pottery Dou and Gui (Fig. 108b, 9.10) reflect close relations to the Central Plain. In addition, bronze knives, arrowheads, and earrings of the Zhukaigou culture show similarities to those of the Qijia and Siba cultures that appeared earlier in northwest China. Accordingly, the bronze metallurgy in the Zhukaigou culture may well have originated from the northwest, meanwhile absorbed elements from the Central Plain.

In addition to the Qingyang region, the serpent-motif potteries have been found as far away as eastern and northern Mongolia, and in the Trans-Baikal area of Siberia (Fig. 108i). Though the chronology and ascription of such potteries are still in dispute, Russian archaeologists are almost in agreement with the suggestion that they may have originated from the Yellow River region. A Chinese scholar, Wu En, supports this opinion and remarks that the serpent-motif pottery may have originated from the Zhukaigou culture or the Zhukaigou culture disseminated towards the north at that time.

The Zhukaigou culture is regarded as one of the earliest bronze-using cultures in the west of north-central China. The advent of bronze metallurgy falls roughly into the early second millennia BCE. Following this culture, a more advanced bronze-using culture appeared, characterized by distinctive traits of the so-called ‘Ordos bronzes’.

4.1.4 Metal objects

4.1.4.1 Types

After the third stage of the Zhukaigou site, small quantities of bronze artifacts were discovered at Zhukaigou (Table 26) and Wozhuangping, which are so far the earliest

537 Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 85.86.
538 According to the periodization by the excavator, Tian G. J.
bronze objects discovered from the middle section of North-central China.

As shown in Table 26, bronze objects found from the third and fourth stage occurred only in limited numbers. It was during the fifth stage, close to the early Shang or the Upper Erligang period that many different kinds of bronze objects began to be buried in tombs. These bronze artifacts consisted of not only small ornaments, such as earrings, rings, bracelets, awls and needles, but also weapons and tools, including swords, knives, arrowheads, Mou-helmets and guards (Fig. 108c, 1-19). It should be noted that Lin Yun regards one bronze loop with a mushroom end and point end (Fig. 108c, 13) as a kind of headdress for one’s temple in light of two similar gold loops (Fig. 108c, 20), which was discovered from one tomb at Tebuxiwula, Inner Mongolia, dating to the last half of the second millennia BCE.

As stated by the excavators, the local metallurgical industry may have existed in the Zhukaigou culture because one broken stone mold for an axe was unearthed from square T102②. However, some bronze Ding-cooking wares for rites (Fig. 108c, 16), Jue-vessels and battle daggers (Fig. 108c, 17-19) were discovered as well, and they were probably imported from the Central Plain.

4.1.4.2 Metallurgical analysis

Metallographic and scanning electron microscope analysis, have been used to determine the compositions and microstructure of these samples, and to research their manufacturing techniques. Most of the samples were selected from broken parts of the artifacts. The metallurgist used a 0.1mm Mo-wire cutter machine to cut a small piece from complete samples, and fixed the cut pieces back into the original artifacts after the analysis. The samples were mounted and polished, then etched in a FeCl₃ + HCL + alcohol solution. An optical microscope and SEM were used to observe the microstructure. Analysis of the compositions were conducted using an SEM-Cambridge S-250 MK3 with a link AN10000 energy spectrum (or EDS). The acceleration voltage was 20kv. The working distance was fixed. Considering the possible compositional segregation in the cast structure, the electron beam was selected and maximized. The surface scanning method was adopted in order to determine the composition of each object.

Thirty-three of the forty-three metal artifacts of the Zhukaigou site, discovered without being disturbed, have been analyzed by the University of Science and Technology Beijing (Table 26; Table 27).

540 Linduff et al. 2000, 256-257.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stage III (1900-1700 BCE)</th>
<th>Stage IV (1700-1600 BCE)</th>
<th>Stage IV (1500-1300 BCE)</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weapon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arrowhead (M4040:1)</td>
<td>4 battle daggers (M1040:1, M1052, M1083, M2012); 1 broken dagger (H5028:3); sword (M1040:2); Mou (M1083), 4 arrowheads (F5001:1-3, H5003:7), 2 broken arrowheads (H5003:11, H5028)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool</td>
<td>Chisel (T230 ③:1); Awl (H1044:1); Needle (T238 ③:1)</td>
<td>Knife (M1040:3), 3 broken knives (H5028:1, H5028:2, H5028)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily ware</td>
<td>Broken Ding (H5028:4); foot of Jue (H5028:5); Jue (H5028:5)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ornament</td>
<td>2 Bracelets (M4007:2; M4035:1); Earring; ring</td>
<td>3 rings (M4003:1, M4060:6, M6011:4); 5 collected earrings</td>
<td>4 plaques (M1040); loop (M1070); 2 earrings (M2012:2, T124②:1)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26. Bronzes of the Zhukaigou site\textsuperscript{541}.

\textsuperscript{541} Zhukaigou 2000.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sam. No.</th>
<th>Original No.</th>
<th>Artifact</th>
<th>Position of sampling</th>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cu</td>
<td>Sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2692</td>
<td>T238③:1</td>
<td>needle</td>
<td>broken part</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2696</td>
<td>T230③:1</td>
<td>chisel</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2673</td>
<td>H1044:1</td>
<td>awl</td>
<td>end of handle</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2697</td>
<td>M4007:2</td>
<td>armlet</td>
<td>broken part</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2698</td>
<td>M4035:1</td>
<td>armlet</td>
<td>Not yet sampled</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2693</td>
<td>M4040:1</td>
<td>arrow</td>
<td>end of shaft</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2694</td>
<td>M4060:6</td>
<td>ring</td>
<td>end of point</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2695</td>
<td>M6011:4</td>
<td>ring</td>
<td>Not yet sampled</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2699 -1</td>
<td>collected earring</td>
<td>broken part</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2699 -2</td>
<td>collected earring</td>
<td>broken part</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2699 -3</td>
<td>collected earring</td>
<td>broken part</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2700</td>
<td>collected earring</td>
<td>broken part</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2701</td>
<td>collected earring</td>
<td>broken part</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28. Composition of the bronze artifacts from the third and fourth stage of the Zhukaigou site. √ means that it contains this element; - means this element hasn’t been identified (adapted from Li/Han 2002, 243 Table 3).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sam. No.</th>
<th>Excavated Object No.</th>
<th>Artifact</th>
<th>Position of sampling</th>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2647</td>
<td>M1040:2</td>
<td>sword</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>Cu-Sn-Pb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2646</td>
<td>M1040:3</td>
<td>knife</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>Cu-Sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2645</td>
<td>M1040:1</td>
<td>dagger</td>
<td>edge</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>Cu-Sn-Pb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2691</td>
<td>M1040:4</td>
<td>plaque</td>
<td>whole body</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>Cu-Sn-Pb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2655</td>
<td>M1070</td>
<td>ring</td>
<td>incompletely</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>Cu-Sn-Pb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2689</td>
<td>M2012:2</td>
<td>earring</td>
<td>broken part</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>Cu-Sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2687</td>
<td>H5003:7</td>
<td>arrow</td>
<td>End part of shaft</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>Cu-Sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2684</td>
<td>H5003:1</td>
<td>Tang of arrow</td>
<td>broken part</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>Mg 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2670</td>
<td>H5028:1</td>
<td>handle of knife</td>
<td>broken part</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>Mg 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2669</td>
<td>H5028:2</td>
<td>point of knife</td>
<td>broken part</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>As 6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2663</td>
<td>H5028</td>
<td>fragment of knife</td>
<td>broken part</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>As 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2686</td>
<td>H5028:3</td>
<td>fragment of dagger</td>
<td>broken part</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>As 6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2671</td>
<td>H5028:4</td>
<td>fragment of Ding</td>
<td>broken part</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>Cu-Sn-Pb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2672</td>
<td>H5028:5</td>
<td>foot of Jue</td>
<td>broken part</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>Cu-Sn-Pb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2690</td>
<td>H5028:5</td>
<td>fragment of Jue</td>
<td>broken part</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>Cu-Sn-Pb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2674</td>
<td>H5028</td>
<td>arrow</td>
<td>broken part</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>Cu-Sn-Pb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2685-1</td>
<td>F5001:1</td>
<td>arrow</td>
<td>end part of shaft</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>Cu-Sn-Pb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2685-2</td>
<td>F5001:2</td>
<td>arrow</td>
<td>end part of shaft</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>Cu-Sn-Pb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2685-3</td>
<td>F5001:3</td>
<td>arrow</td>
<td>end part of shaft</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>Cu-Sn-Pb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2688</td>
<td>T124(①):1</td>
<td>earring</td>
<td>broken part</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>Cu-Sn-Pb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29. Composition of the bronzes from the fifth stage of the Zhukaigou site
The results show: during the third and fourth stage of the Zhukaigou site, 39% of the metal objects are copper; 54% are forged and 70% of them are small ornaments (Table 28). By contrast, during the fifth stage, no copper is identified; all of them are arsenical copper; five of them are Cu-Sn alloy; fourteen of them are Cu-Sn-Pb alloy (Table 29). This evidence indicates the matured metallurgical techniques used in the fifth stage at Zhukaigou. In addition, five Cu-Sn alloys contain less than 2% Pb. These objects has about 6-17% Sn. The decoration of these objects was very simple. Among the 13 sampled Cu-Sn-Pb alloys, five contained less than 5% Pb, and five contained more than 30% Pb. The size, shape, and distribution of Pb depends on the content and manufacturing technology used.

As for the metallurgical structure, 31 of the 33 samples have been examined. As we can see in Table 32, four bronze artifacts were cast; three were hot worked, another three were cold worked; and one cast artifact was slightly cold worked. According to Table 33, of the 20 bronzes found from the fifth stage of the Zhukaigou site, three were formed by cast; three were hot worked; five cast objects were slightly cold and hot worked; another six cast objects were hot worked. Special attention should be paid to object H5028:3 Ge (2686), since it is a Cu-Sn-As alloy containing 6.8% As. The object found in H5028, was artificially broken, and reheated on the surface. Metallurgical observation clearly shows dendritic segregation, but the structure is different from a Cu-Sn-Pb alloy. Further analysis indicated that the bright zone of As and Zn content is higher than the matrix by about 2.5 times. Not many early Shang period bronze objects contain As—other than this sample found at Zhukaigou, we also have two others and they contain 0.3-1.4% As. In addition, the mechanical properties of some bronzes have also been analyzed, including the hardness, intensity of tension, and elongations (Table 31). This provides us with clues to understand the different manufacturing techniques used in copper and distinct alloys. Additional lead enhances the fluidity of the alloy and wearability of metal products. In general, the metallurgical results indicate that the copper and bronze objects found at the Zhukaigou site were provided with a local character.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Copper</th>
<th>Manufacturing technique</th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
<th>Tiny composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III, IV</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>54% forged</td>
<td>Small ornaments (70%); no containers</td>
<td>Second-phase with Sn, Pb, Bi, As, Sb and Bi, Te, Sb, Ag or Bi, Su, Pb, Te</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Linduff et al. 2000, 262.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage V</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Mostly cast; 3 by heat work</th>
<th>More weapons; some Ding, Jue appeared</th>
<th>Ag, Fe, As</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 30. Comparing the bronze objects between the third and fourth stage and the fifth stage of the Zhukaigou site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lab. No.</th>
<th>Original no.</th>
<th>Artifact</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Mechanical property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sn (%)</td>
<td>Pb (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2693</td>
<td>M4040:1</td>
<td>Arrow</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2684</td>
<td>H5003:11</td>
<td>Tang of arrow</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2685-1</td>
<td>F5001:1</td>
<td>Arrow</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2685-2</td>
<td>F5001:2</td>
<td>Arrow</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2685-3</td>
<td>F5001:3</td>
<td>Arrow</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2674</td>
<td>H5028</td>
<td>Arrow</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2692</td>
<td>T238③:1</td>
<td>Needle</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2645</td>
<td>M1040:1</td>
<td>Dagger</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2647</td>
<td>M1040:2</td>
<td>Sword</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2646</td>
<td>M1040:3</td>
<td>Knife</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31. Mechanical properties of the bronzes discovered from the Zhukaigou site (adapted from Li/Han 2002, 252 Table 10; Table 11).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lab. No.</th>
<th>Sample No.</th>
<th>Artifact</th>
<th>Metallurgical structure and observation</th>
<th>Manufacturing technique</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2692</td>
<td>T238③:1</td>
<td>Needle</td>
<td>There are obvious slip lines in the matrix, containing some Pb grains mixed with Cu₂S grains.</td>
<td>cold and hot worked</td>
<td>Fig. 108e, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2696</td>
<td>T230③:1</td>
<td>Chisel</td>
<td>There is obvious solid solution of dendritic segregation and tiny (α+δ) solid solution.</td>
<td>cast</td>
<td>Fig. 108e, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2673</td>
<td>H1044:1</td>
<td>Awl</td>
<td>α solid solution in matrix has an obvious segregation which is composed of Ab and Sn; there are also some Pb grains and a tiny second image composed of Pb, Sn, Sb, As and Bi.</td>
<td>cast</td>
<td>Fig. 108e, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2697</td>
<td>M4007:2</td>
<td>Armlet</td>
<td>There is obvious α solid solution segregation which is caused by uneven distribution of Zn element; some (Cu+Cu₂O) eutectic crystals are distributed in the boundary of the crystals; there are some second-image particles containing Bi, Te, Sb, Ag, and As.</td>
<td>cast</td>
<td>Fig. 108e, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2693</td>
<td>M4040:1</td>
<td>Arrow</td>
<td>α solid solution segregation is obvious; edge of the sample is rusty; there are some Pb particles.</td>
<td>cast</td>
<td>Fig. 108e, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2694</td>
<td>M4040:6</td>
<td>Ring</td>
<td>There is obvious α solid solution segregation, some slip lines, Pb particles, Cu₂S particles, and the second-image particles composed of Cu and Pb.</td>
<td>Cast then slightly cold worked</td>
<td>Fig. 108e, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2699-1</td>
<td>collected</td>
<td>Earring</td>
<td>α solid solution isometric crystals and twin crystals, and petty Pb particles are dispersedly distributed with tiny blue inclusions. Part of the edge is corroded.</td>
<td>hot worked</td>
<td>Fig. 109f, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2699-2</td>
<td>collected</td>
<td>Earring</td>
<td>It is heavily corroded so the edge of the inner crystals have been joined</td>
<td>hot worked</td>
<td>Fig. 109f, 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
together like a net; there are $\alpha$ solid solution isometric crystals and twin crystals, which are mean in size; the corrosion produces CuC$_2$; there are also some tiny Cu$_2$O, Pb and Cu$_2$S particles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lab. No.</th>
<th>Sample No.</th>
<th>Artifact</th>
<th>Metallurgical structure and observation</th>
<th>Manufacturing technique</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2699-3</td>
<td>collected</td>
<td>Earring</td>
<td>Some slip lines are distributed in the $\alpha$ solid solution isometric crystals and twin crystals; some inclusions with Cu$_2$S containing Sn or Fe; more slip lines are distributed along the edge; crystals are a little distorted.</td>
<td>hot and cold worked</td>
<td>Fig. 109f, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2700</td>
<td>collected</td>
<td>Earring</td>
<td>$\alpha$ solid solution isometric crystals and twin crystals are not even in size; some crystals have slip lines; some Cu$_2$S inclusions and second-image of Te and Bi are distributed around the boundaries of the crystals.</td>
<td>hot and cold worked</td>
<td>Fig. 109f, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2701</td>
<td>collected</td>
<td>Earring</td>
<td>It is heavily corroded. Some Pb particles and second-image particles composed of Pb, Cu and Sn are distributed along the boundaries in the solid solution isometric crystals and twin crystals.</td>
<td>hot worked</td>
<td>Fig. 109f, 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32. Results for the metallurgical structure of the bronzes from the third and fourth stage of the Zhukaigou site (adapted from Li/Han 2002, 247 Table 7).
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>there is a δ structure too.</td>
<td>forged and cold worked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2691</td>
<td>M1040: 4</td>
<td>Plaque</td>
<td>It is heavily corroded. Distribution of Pb particles is obscure; there is a distinct cast structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2655</td>
<td>M1070</td>
<td>Fragment of loop</td>
<td>It has a thick corroded layer. α isometric crystals and twin crystals with straight twin grains were distributed in boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2689</td>
<td>M2012: 2</td>
<td>Earring</td>
<td>There are α solid solution isometric crystals and twin crystals with straight boundaries, tiny inclusions composed of Fe, Cu, and S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2687</td>
<td>H5003:7</td>
<td>Arrow</td>
<td>α solid solution dendrite segregation is obvious. There are some gray-blue inclusions. No δ structure is found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2684</td>
<td>H5003:1 1</td>
<td>Tang of arrow</td>
<td>There is an obvious α solid solution dendrite segregation, some (α+ δ) structure, shrinkage cavity, and trace Pb particles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2670</td>
<td>H5028:1 handle of knife</td>
<td>There are α solid solutions; boundary of the (α+ δ) crystals is rusty.</td>
<td>cast and hot-worked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2669</td>
<td>H5028:2 point of knife</td>
<td>There are α solid solution and ramified distributed (α+ δ) crystals in boundary; it is very corrosive.</td>
<td>cast and hot-worked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2683</td>
<td>H5028 Fragment of knife</td>
<td>α solid solution and ramified distributed (α+ δ) crystals; it is high rusty.</td>
<td>cast and hot-worked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2686</td>
<td>H5028:3 fragment of dagger</td>
<td>There is obvious segregation; it is very corrosive.</td>
<td>cast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2671 | H5028:4 fragment of Ding | Segregation of α solid solution dendrite-like grains is not distinctive; a little bit of δ structure; Pb particles are dendrite-like distributed; there are some isometric crystals and twin crystals in the edge. | Cast, item shattered to pieces | hot-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Object Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Processing Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2672</td>
<td>H5028:5</td>
<td>foot of Jue</td>
<td>There is obvious segregation of $\alpha$ solid solution dendrite-like grains, some $\delta$ structure, a few slip lines; Pb particles are distributed like dentrite or crumb, together with gray-blue inclusions.</td>
<td>Cast by crushing and heat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2690</td>
<td>H5028:5</td>
<td>Fragment of Jue</td>
<td>Segregation of $\alpha$ solid solution dendrite-like grains is not distinct; some ($\alpha+\delta$) structures are located in the boundaries; Pb particles are unevenly distributed, together with some gray-blue inclusions; it is very corrosive.</td>
<td>Cast by heat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2674</td>
<td>H5028</td>
<td>Arrow</td>
<td>Cast segregation is obvious; there are some gray-blue inclusions with Pb particles, and some slip lines.</td>
<td>Cast by crushing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2685-1</td>
<td>F5001:1</td>
<td>Arrow</td>
<td>There are distinctive segregation of $\alpha$ solid solution dendrite-like grains and a little bit of ($\alpha+\delta$) structures; some gray-blue inclusions and crumby-like Pb particles; some tiny isometric crystals and twin crystals are distributed along the boundary.</td>
<td>Slightly hot work after casting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2685-2</td>
<td>F5001:2</td>
<td>Arrow</td>
<td>There are distinctive segregation of $\alpha$ solid solution dendrite-like grains and no ($\alpha+\delta$) structures; some gray-blue inclusions and some Pb particles</td>
<td>cast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2685-3</td>
<td>F5001:3</td>
<td>Arrow</td>
<td>There are distinctive segregation of $\alpha$ solid solution dendrite-like grains and a little bit of $\delta$ structures; Pb particle is dendrite-like distributed.</td>
<td>cast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2688</td>
<td>T124 ②:1</td>
<td>Earring</td>
<td>There are some fine $\alpha$ solid solution dendrite-like isometric crystals and twin crystals; Pb particles distributed along the processing direction and cast segregations. No $\delta$ structures are found.</td>
<td>hot worked</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33. Results for the metallurgical structure of the bronzes from the fifth stage of the Zhukaigou site (adapted from Li/Han 2002, 248 Table 8).
4.2 Lijiaya culture

4.2.1 Definition and distribution

The Lijiaya culture is named after the Lijiaya site at Qingjian county, Shaanxi Province. This site has been excavated four times during 1983-1984, yielding over 3000-square meters of the remains of city walls, settlements, hoard pits, and burials. A number of bronze battle-axes, axes with tubular socket, and axe-Qi were discovered from the 40 tombs. Above all, the assemblage of the potteries and bronze artifacts at the Lijiaya site is characterized by the mixture of the bronzes used with strong Shang style and local style.

In fact, a dozen sites, located in northwestern Shaanxi and northern Shaanxi concentrated in the Shilou area (Map 16), have yielded such similar assemblages characterized by the rich Northern-style bronzes, together with or without the late Shang bronze ritual vessels before the excavation of the Lijiaya site (Table 34). However, most of these sites were discovered by local villagers. Therefore, the controlled excavations at the Lijiaya and Xuejiaqu sites provide us with a criterion for the Lijiaya culture. The sites mentioned in Table 34 are also ascribed to the Lijiaya culture by Wu E.

The recognition of the Lijiaya culture is a cumulative and controversial process. The earliest research had noted the differences between the bronzes found from the northern Shaanxi and northwest Shanxi and the Shang Dynasty in the Central Plain. In recent research, the scholars divide the bronze objects from north Shaanxi to northwest Shanxi into three groups: the Shang bronzes, local bronzes, and the mixture of the Shang and local bronzes. Some researchers have not only discussed the chronology and periodization of these bronzes, but have also penetrated into the economic, social structure, and even the ancient tribes and connections with the neighboring bronze cultures. It is worth mentioning that some scholars, represented by Zou Hen and Liu Jundu, ascribed these bronzes to the Guangshe culture instead of the Lijiaya culture. The research of the Lijiaya culture is still more or less at the beginning, more materials, and evidence of the settlements and burials need to be supplemented.

---

545 Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 142-144.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Northern style bronzes</th>
<th>Shang style bronzes</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erlangpo, Shilou, Shanxi</td>
<td>Collected from surface</td>
<td>Loop-headed knife; axe</td>
<td>Ritual vessels; Ge-dagger</td>
<td>SXW 1958, 36-37.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hejiaping, Shilou, Shanxi</td>
<td>Collected from surface</td>
<td>Animal-headed dagger</td>
<td>Ritual vessels; Ge; arrowheads; jades</td>
<td>Yang S. S. 1959, 71-72.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houlanjiagou, Shilou, Shanxi</td>
<td>Collected from surface</td>
<td>Bow-shaped objects; adzes; spatulas; axes, awls; 3 gold earrings.</td>
<td>Ritual vessels; Ge; arrowheads; (2 jades).</td>
<td>Guo Y. 1962, 33-34.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taohuazhuang, Shilou, Shanxi</td>
<td>1 tomb</td>
<td>Tiger-shaped spade; bow-shaped object; bulbs; 13 gold ornaments;</td>
<td>Ritual vessels; Ge, arrowheads; (20 jades).</td>
<td>Xie/Yang 1960, 50-52.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At Zhujiayu, 1 tomb, in 1975</td>
<td>Snake-headed dagger; loop-headed knife; Ge; bow-shaped object; ornament.</td>
<td>Ritual vessels; Ge; arrowheads.</td>
<td>Yang S. S. 1981a, 49-53.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shangdong, Ji county, Shanxi</td>
<td>1 tomb</td>
<td>Bell-headed sword; axe with tubular</td>
<td>Ritual vessels.</td>
<td>JW 1985, 848-849.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaohong, Liulin, Shanxi</td>
<td>1 tomb</td>
<td>Bell-headed sword; helmet; spears; axes; knives; bells.</td>
<td>Yang S. S. 1981b, 211-212.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhanglangou, Yanchang, Shaanxi</td>
<td>Collected from surface</td>
<td>Knives; arrowheads.</td>
<td>Ge; Yue; adze; chisel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lijiata, Zichang, Shaanxi</td>
<td>Hoard</td>
<td>Ritual vessels.</td>
<td>Qi T. G. 1989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yantou, Suide, Shaanxi</td>
<td>Hoard</td>
<td>Deer-headed knife; snake-headed dagger; adze; chisel.</td>
<td>Ritual vessels; Ge; Yue; arrowheads; bulbs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourenjiagou, Suide, Shaanxi</td>
<td>1 tomb</td>
<td>Sword; knife; three-ribbed object.</td>
<td>Ritual vessels; Ge; arrowheads.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiejiagou, Qingjian, Shaanxi</td>
<td>1 tomb</td>
<td>Snake-headed spoon; daggers.</td>
<td>Ritual vessels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhuangjiagua, Qingjian, Shaanxi</td>
<td>Collected from surface</td>
<td>Ritual vessels.</td>
<td>SXSZQTQ 1979, 65-70 Plate 61-66.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yangquanpo, Xin, Shanxi</td>
<td>Collected from surface</td>
<td>Ritual vessles.</td>
<td>SXSZQTQ 1979, 71-82 Plate 67-78.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siyan, Qingjian, Shaanxi</td>
<td>1 tomb</td>
<td>Snake-headed spoon; arrowheads;</td>
<td>Ritual vessels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidouzui, Chunhua, Shaanxi</td>
<td>4 tombs</td>
<td>Knives; bulbs; bow-shaped object; axes; gold ornaments.</td>
<td>Ritual vessels; arrowheads; bulbs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34. Discoveries of the bronzes of the Lijiaya culture.
It is noticeable that the potteries of the Lijiaya culture have their own features, showing its uniqueness in contrast to the classical Shang and Zhou potteries (Fig. 109a), especially the flaring-mouth cooking ware-Li with short legs (Fig. 109a, 5) and oblong-body cooking ware-Yan with a flaring mouth, girdle and pouched legs (Fig. 109a, 6).

4.2.2 Periodization and chronology

As far as the relative chronology of the Lijaya culture is concerned, the scholars are unanimous in their opinions because the bronze ritual vessels of the late Shang period have been well studied and appropriately dated in most cases. It is worth noting that some of the Shang-style vessels identified in the Lijaya culture are the same as those found at the Yinxu site, dating from the first to the third period of Yinxu, thus providing vital evidence for the relative chronology and periodization of the Lijaya culture. Accordingly, the Lijaya culture started roughly from the late Shang period and ended in the early Western Zhou period (about 1300-1000 BCE).

Besides, there is little disagreement amongst scholars on the periodization of the Lijaya culture (Table 35; Table 36) owing to different opinions on the periodization of the Yinxu, which has been discussed in Chapter 1 (see Table 2). Nevertheless, Liu Jundu differs with many scholars on this issue because he regards some tombs of the Zhukaigou site as belonging to the first of the four stages in the Lijaya culture. This study agrees with the designation of the Lijaya culture rather than the Guangshe culture as well as the chronology and periodization proposed by Zou Heng and Zhang Changshou. In addition, this study prefers to exclude some late remains of the Zhuakaigou site from the Lijaya culture. A lack of sufficient stratigraphical evidence and comparison of the potteries are still the greatest drawbacks in the chronology of the Lijaya culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lijaya culture</th>
<th>Relative date</th>
<th>Representative sites or groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage I</td>
<td>Yinxu II (Wuding-Zujia [武丁-祖甲])</td>
<td>Hejiaping; Houlanjiagou; Niuziping; Yangquanpo; Taohuazhuang A; Xiaxinjiao.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 35. Periodization of the Lijiaya culture proposed by Zou Hen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Yinxu I (Hejiaping; Hualanjiagou; Niuziping; Yangquanpo)</th>
<th>Stage II Yinxu II (Erlangpo; Taohuazhuang; Zhujiayu; Xiaxinjiao; Zhangjiagua; Xiejiagou (Hualanjiagou))</th>
<th>Stage III Yinxu III (Linzheyu; Yanlou; Hourenjiagou)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage I</td>
<td>Yinxu I</td>
<td>Relative date</td>
<td>Representative sites or groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hejiaping; Hualanjiagou; Niuziping; Yangquanpo;</td>
<td>Zhang C. S.</td>
<td>Zheng/Chen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage II</td>
<td>Yinxu II</td>
<td>Erlangpo; Taohuazhuang; Zhujiayu; Xiaxinjiao; Zhangjiagua; Xiejiagou (Hualanjiagou)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage III</td>
<td>Yinxu III</td>
<td>Linzheyu; Yanlou; Hounrenjiagou</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 36. Periodization of the Lijiaya culture proposed by Zhang Changshou, Zheng Zhenxiang, and Chen Zhida

#### 4.2.3 Metal objects

The Lijiaya culture is also a bronze-using culture, which provides valuable evidence on the early bronze metallurgy in north-central China. The bronzes of the Lijiaya culture can be divided into three types: Shang-style, Northern-style, and mixed style.

The bronze ritual vessels identified as belonging to the Lijiaya culture (Fig. 109b, 27-32) aroused many conjectures amongst scholars. Some scholars take it for granted that the Lijiaya culture was certainly influenced by the Shang culture in the Central Plain. While some speculate that, the owners of the Lijiaya culture were the enemies of the Shang culture according to the ancient oracle inscriptions on tortoiseshells. Therefore, the powerful local leaders who were proposed as Guifang or Gufang were probably able to plunder these ritual vessels from Shang during the war. Other scholars point out that not only oracle inscriptions, but also ancient Chinese documents recorded that the Shang once attacked Guifang. However, no ancient records imply that the Guifang once

---

Zou H. 2001d, 233-270.
Guifang and Gongfang, ancient tribes recorded in Chinese documents, lived in the north of Central China.
<周易·即济>: 高宗伐鬼方，三年克之。《Zhouyi·jiji>says: it took the King of Gaozong three years to overcome the Guifang. There was a period that was called Fangguo (方国), implying that there were many other tribes in north of the Central Plains. However, the other ancient tribes were rarely recorded in ancient documents; therefore, this study does not agree that the owner of the Lijiaya culture must be related to the Guifang. There are more possibilities.
invaded the Shang. The evidence surrounding the suggestion that the local people robbed ritual vessels from the Shang is therefore not adequate. Wu E. Suggests there was probably a relatively peaceful period when the Shang and so-called Guifang people communicated with each other frequently by trading.\(^{556}\)

As for the Northern-style bronzes of the Lijiaya culture, some of them were very common around the Great Wall region and its northern areas. They consist of swords with curved handles (Fig. 109b, 1-3), helmets (Fig. 109b, 4)\(^{557}\), socket-handled axes (Fig. 109b, 10.13), dagger axe-Ge, weapon-Yue and Qi, snake-headed daggers\(^{558}\) (Fig. 109b, 4-6), sheep-headed knives (Fig. 109b, 8), loop-headed knives (Fig. 109b, 7.9), knives with a socket on the back which are regarded as weapons by Wu E. (Fig. 108b, 14.15)\(^{559}\), snake-headed spoons or spoons with animal figures (Fig. 109b, 25.26), bow-shaped objects (Fig. 109b, 21-23), arrowheads, horse and chariot fittings, combs, and hair clasps, and so on. As we know, animal style, socketed daggers or axes, and objects with bells are typical northern bronzes. It is worth noting that the animal style presented in the bronzes of the Lijiaya culture are mostly of full relief, which are so far the earliest works discovered in northern China. Furthermore, the motif of a snake was quite popular in the Lijiaya culture, and some scholars proposed its prototype to be a crocodile or it may have been related to some ancient religious beliefs. The chronology and styles of the Lijiaya culture as described above are also a great help in seeking the origin of the northern bronzes, which has been a topical issue since the early half of the nineteenth century.

The bronzes characterized by a mixed style from the Central Plain and Northern China are quite remarkable, including cup-Gu, cup-Dou with bell (Fig. 109b, 19), vessel-Gui adorned with straight-lines, socketed dagger axe-Ge, double-eared pots with slim collar, cup-Gong (觥) with dragon motif, vessel-Ding with ‘S’ shaped cloudy patterns, and cup-You (卣) with bale handle and so on\(^{560}\). These kind of bronzes have not been seen at the Yinsu site and other Shang sites.

Another remarkable characteristic of the Lijiajia culture is gold objects. Earrings (Fig. 109b, 17.18.20) were the most common of the 30 gold objects found. Gold bow-shaped objects comes next (Fig. 109b, 21), which are identical to the bronze bow-shaped objects in form. The tombs buried with or without gold objects and the amount of gold wares may well be related to the social status or wealth of their owners.

\(^{556}\) Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 158.
\(^{557}\) This kind of helmet is regarded as the earliest one found in northern China.
\(^{558}\) This is one of the representative Lijiaya culture bronzes.
\(^{559}\) Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 153.
\(^{560}\) Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 151.
In contrast to the Zhukaigou culture which is regarded as the possible precursor of the Lijiaya culture, the metallurgical technique of the Lijiaya culture seems much more prosperous, which is reflected in both quantity and quality. Despite the fact that the related metallurgical analysis is so far not available, this study is inclined to believe that the metallurgical industry of the Lijiaya culture was more developed than that of the Zhukaigou culture. Firstly, the bronzes characterized by mixed style haven’t been found in the Central Plain, so they may well have been manufactured by local people. Secondly, some slag, fragments of earth mold were found at the Lijiaya site, and pottery molds were discovered near the Shilou county. All data indicates the matured and developed metallurgical techniques at that time.

4.3 Xicha culture

4.3.1 Definition and relations between the Zhukaigou culture, Lijiaya culture and Xicha culture

The excavation of the Xicha site, which lies in the Dantaizi township, Qingshuihe county, was a crucial archaeological discovery in south-central Inner Mongolia. The excavators divide the Xicha site into three periods. One tomb buried with potteries from the second period was ascribed to the Zhukaigou culture. The remains of the third period yielded 19 settlements, 132 pits, and 18 tombs together with lots of potteries, jades, stone objects, and some bronzes. Accordingly, the excavators proposed the designation of ‘the Xicha culture’ to the remains from the Xicha site, which is dated to the Yin and Zhou period\(^{561}\). A few of the bronzes collected from within the Qingshuihe county, including socketed axes, daggers, and buttons (Fig. 110, 2.4.7), were ascribed to the Xicha culture as well\(^{562}\). In comparison to the similar remains found at the Zhukaigou site and Yinsu site, these collected bronzes are dated to the end of the Shang period and the beginning of the Western Zhou period, roughly between 1400-1000 BCE. Thus, the so-called Xicha culture is approximately parallel to the Lijiaya culture.

As mentioned in chapter 4.2, the Zhukaigou culture is regarded as the possible precursor of the Lijiaya culture, though there is still a tiny discontinuity between them. The newly discovered Xicha culture, dated to the late Shang period, is also distributed within the range of the Zhukaigou culture. Furthermore, elements of the Zhukaigou culture identified in the second period of the Xicha site, make some scholars believe that the Xicha culture was much closer to the Zhukaigou culture rather than the Lijiaya culture.

\(^{561}\) NMGY/QSHW 2001, 60-80.
\(^{562}\) Cao J. E. 2001.
On discussing the relations between the bronze cultures in south central Inner Mongolia, two opinions need to be improved. Firstly, in previous research, the scholars are inclined to believe that the bronze ritual vessels should have appeared in northern China more or less later than that in the Central Plain. However, the communication and mutual dissemination between the Central Plain and northern China at that time was much more frequent and faster than we expected. Secondly, the traditional Chinese scholars preferred to link the owners/origins of one archaeological culture to the ancient tribes mentioned in oracle inscriptions or documents. Considering the complicated relations between the Zhukaigou, Lijiaya, and Xicha cultures, it is quite hard to distinguish their related owners based on the present evidence available.

### 4.3.2 Metal objects

Some bronze objects have been identified as belonging to the Xicha culture, however only briefly mentioned in the archaeological report lack corresponding graphs. They are mainly unearthed from burials, including axes, earrings, daggers, buttons, and so on (Fig. 110). In addition, the objects with socket or tubular handle are the most common form. Besides, one pottery mold was discovered at the Xicha site, providing vital evidence for the possibility of a local metallurgical industry in the Xicha culture. So far, no metallurgical analysis has been attempted. The acquaintances of the Xicha culture need further archaeological fieldwork.

### 4.4 Maoqinggou culture

#### 4.4.1 Definition and distribution

In 1986, ‘the Maoqinggou type’ was first put forward by the excavators of the Maoqinggou cemetery who pointed out that the Maoqinggou cemetery had distinctive local characteristics, and the burial objects have sequential relationships on the basis of an in-depth research on the date, periodization, characteristics, ethnic groups and its relations with the neighboring cultures.\(^{563}\)

In fact, scholars hold different opinions of the cultural ascription of the Maoqinggou cemetery. By comparing the tomb forms, mortuary practices, burial goods, animal-style patterns on bronzes, and metallurgical techniques, Wu En divided the areas from the east of the Hexi Corridor to the Yanshan region, during the Eastern Zhou period into five districts in 1992. The five districts are: 1) East of the Hexi Corridor; 2) the Qingyang and Guyuan regions; 3) the Ordos region; 4) the south of the Yinshan; 5) the Yanshan region. He stated that the five districts might have

\(^{563}\) NMGG 1986, 227-315.
belonged to different ancient tribes. Besides, the Maoqinggou, Guoxianyaozi, Fanjiayaozi, Yinniugou, Shuijiangoumen, and Hulusitai sites that are located in the south of the Yanshan region belong to the same cultural system\textsuperscript{564}.

In 1993, Tian Guangjin divided the culture distributed around the Great Wall in Inner Mongolia into three types. They are: 1) the Taohongbala type, which belonged to the steppes culture; 2) the Xiyuan type, located in the front of the Baotou site, characterized by shaft graves with a side pit and related to the south of Ningxia; 3) the Maoqinggou type lying in the Daihai region, which is characterized by a mixture of pastoral, nomadic and agriculture subsistence\textsuperscript{565}. Meanwhile, Lin Yun divides the northern steppe cultures in China during the Eastern Zhou period into six areas: A, northern Hebei; B, east of Yinshan; C, northeast of the Hetao region inside Inner Mongolia; D, south of Ningxia; E, the Qingyang region in Gansu; F, west of Yinshan in Inner Mongolia. Furthermore, he points out that the six areas belonged to different cultures\textsuperscript{566}. However, Yang Jianhua divides the Inner Mongolia region during the Eastern Zhou period into west and east areas. In addition, she proposes a five-phase chronology for the east area that is represented by the Maoqinggou, Yinniugou, and Guoxianyaozi cemeteries\textsuperscript{567}.

In 2002, Wu En not only formally put forward the designation of ‘the Maoqinggou culture’ but also made a study on its date, periodization, and connections with its neighboring cultures. This study prefers to use ‘the Maoqinggou culture’ to designate cultural remains that are similar to the Maoqinggou cemetery, because it will help us to distinguish the other cultural remains, which are also characterized by animal-style.

Situated in Liangcheng county, Inner Mongolia, the Maoqinggou cemetery yielded a larger number of burials belonging to different periods, and a dwelling area\textsuperscript{568} dated to the early Iron Age by the excavators\textsuperscript{569}. In addition to the Maoqinggou cemetery, the Fanjiayaozi, Shuijiangoumen, Qiandesheng, Yinniugou, Guoxianyaozi, and Goulitou sites are also ascribed to the Maoqinggou culture by Wu En (Table 37, Map 17). Conclusively, the Maoqinggou culture is mainly located in south-central Inner Mongolia and its adjacent areas.

\textsuperscript{564} Wu E. 1992, 149-161.
\textsuperscript{565} Tian G. J. 1993, 16-22.
\textsuperscript{566} Lin Y. 1998d, 368-396.
\textsuperscript{567} Yang J. H. 2002, 157-175.
\textsuperscript{568} It has been discussed in previous chapter.
\textsuperscript{569} NMGG 1986, 227-315.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Bronze items</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fanjiayaozi(^{770}), Helingeer county, NMG</td>
<td>Burials</td>
<td>Swords, daggers, knives, awls, plaques</td>
<td>Fig. 093, 32-34.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuijiangoumen(^{771}), Tumoteqi, NMG</td>
<td>1 tomb</td>
<td>Ge, knife, button, tube, plaque, gag bit</td>
<td>Fig. 097, 2-8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qiandeskeng(^{772}), Liangcheng county, NMG</td>
<td>Burials</td>
<td>Hu-vessel, chariot fitting, belt ornaments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yinniugou(^{773}), Liangcheng county, NMG</td>
<td>Burials in an east-west direction</td>
<td>Arrowheads, knives, buttons, hooks; iron swords, crane hacks, axes; jade</td>
<td>Fig. 084d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guoxianyaozi(^{774}), Liangcheng county, NMG</td>
<td>Burials</td>
<td>Knives, axes, plaques, tubes, buttons, earrings; jade</td>
<td>Fig. 086a-b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maoqinggou, Liangcheng, NMG</td>
<td>Burials</td>
<td>Weapons, tools, ornaments, horses, and chariot fittings</td>
<td>Fig. 085a-c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulitou(^{775}), Xinghe county, NMG</td>
<td>Burial</td>
<td>Sword, arrowhead, button, belt hook</td>
<td>Fig. 097, 9-12.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 37. Discoveries of the bronze objects of the Maoqinggou culture.

4.4.2 Chronology, periodization, and characteristics

In addition to the burials, other archaeological remains from settlements, ash pits, and kilns in the Maoqinggou cemetery suggest that the site was occupied for a long time. The excavators proposed a four-phase chronology for the Maoqinggou cemetery from the late Spring and Autumn period to the late Warring States period. However, according to the five-phase chronology of the east area of Inner Mongolia during the Eastern Zhou period proposed by Yang Jianhua, the cultural remains in this area represented by the Maoqinggou cemetery ended around the middle Warring States because this area was ruled by the Zhao State after the late Warring States.

Based on previous research and the comparison of the bronze objects, Wu En puts forward a three-phase chronology for the Maoqinggou culture from the middle Spring and Autumn period to the late Warring States period. The first phase is

\(^{770}\) Li Y. Y. 1986, 222.  
\(^{772}\) Gai S. L. 1986, 185-197.  
\(^{774}\) NMGY 1989, 57-81.  
\(^{775}\) Cui L. M. 1994, 473.
represented by the burials in the first phase of the Maoqinggou cemetery and Guoxianyaozi cemetery. It is characterized by pots with a round belly, pots with double ears, antenna-pommel swords, loop-shaped buttons, and belt ornaments with designs of double birds. It is roughly equal to the middle and late Spring and Autumn period (700-400 BCE). The second phase is represented by the burials in the second phase of the Maoqinggou cemetery and the second and third phase of the Guoxianyaozi cemetery. During this period, the pottery differs slightly in form. Meanwhile, the bronze objects, such as swords, belt buttons, and plaques with double birds are almost the same as those in the first phase. Besides, some iron swords with a deformed antenna pommel, iron swords with a loop head and iron belt hooks also appeared in this period. The Fanjiayaozi and Goulitou sites belonged to this period as well. It is approximately parallel to the early and middle Warring States period (400-300 BCE). The third phase includes the burials of the third and fourth period of the Maoqinggou cemetery and the Yinniugou cemetery. Iron objects, noticeably increased in amount, including swords, crane hooks, knives, belt hooks, and plaques decorated with tiger or double birds. However, small bronze personal ornaments, such as bird-shaped objects, animal-head-shaped objects, and tubes were scarce in this period. It is probably parallel to the late Warring States period (300-200 BCE). There are three radiocarbon dates gained from the Maoqinggou cemetery (Appendix). Although there does not seem to be a pattern or cluster, nevertheless they provide support for the proposed chronology summarized by scholars.

An inhabitation area of about 200X100m has been investigated, and burials consisted of the main remains of the Maoqinggou culture. By comparision, burial customs of the Maoqinggou culture were consistent throughout the period. Most burials were in rectangular earthen pit graves (Fig. 085a-c). Some burials of the Maoqinggou and Guoxianyaozi cemeteries have additional structures: a niche and a second-level ledge or second level platform. Wooden coffins or chambers were rarely used. Animal sacrifice was common.

Compared to the characteristics of the Taohongbala culture and the Yanglang culture in the neigbouring area, the assemblage characterized by potteries and bronze objects in the Maoqinggou culture is in particular. For example, 42 potteries from the Maoqinggou cemetery, 28 from the Guoxianyaozi cemetery, and 7 from the Yinniugou cemetery were unearthed as well as numerous pottery shards. Except

---

576 The periodization of the Maoqinggou and Guoxianyaozi cemeteries is in accordance with the excavators’ suggestion.
578 The Maoqinggou, Taohongbala, and Yanglang cultures were distributed side by side in north-central China for a long time. The other two will be discussed in the following sections.
for a few sand-inclusion potteries, most of them were made of clay. Pots were the most common form found, including round-belly pots and double-eared pots (Fig. 131a). The discoveries of dwelling remains and iron objects are also the distinctive characteristics of the Maoqinggou culture.

### 4.4.3 Metal objects

The metal objects of the Maoqinggou culture differ over time in quantity and variety. According to the periodization proposed by Wu En, bronze objects comprised the main body of the burial goods during the first and second phase; after the third phase, iron objects increased in quantity, implying advanced metallurgical techniques. Besides, small ornaments constituted the majority of the burial goods; weapons and tools were small in quantity; and only a few horse fittings with simple forms were found, which are not seen in the Guoxianyaozi and Yinniugou burials (Fig. 131b-c).

As mentioned above, antenna pommel swords and a number of small ornaments with patterns of birds and deer were the most prominent features of the metal objects in the Maoqinggou culture. The antenna pommels constructed with patterns of two vivid birds are regarded as the typical forms in the earlier period (Fig. 131b, 1-4). However, the deformed antenna pommels formed by two loops or animal heads, was probably originated from the bird patterns (Fig. 131b, 6-9; Fig. 131c, 1).

Moreover, weapons and tools such as crane hooks, adzes, axes, and chisels that were very common in the neighboring Taohongbala and Yanglang cultures were however absent in the Maoqinggou culture. Taking into consideration the fact that there were a few discoveries of horse fittings, it is reasonable to believe that the economy of the Maoqinggou culture was probably not based on a pastoral nomadic subsistence, though a number of small ornaments show a full-bodied steppes style.

### 4.5 Taohongbala culture

#### 4.5.1 Definition and distribution

‘The Taohongbala culture’ was first formally put forward by Wu En in 2002,\(^{579}\) named after the Tonghongbala cemetery, which was scientifically excavated and yielded lots of bronze objects, including swords, crane hacks, arrowheads, awls, chisels, needles, belt buttons, loops, animal style figures, beads, plaques, and horse fittings as well as a few iron objects and gold earrings\(^{580}\) (Fig. 087).

As we know, the scholars were in the habit of using the designation of ‘Ordos

\(^{579}\) Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 323-356.
\(^{580}\) Tian G. J. 1976, 131-143.
bronzes’ to indicate all the bronze objects that were found in the Ordos region and its adjacent areas. In fact, an abundance of gold, silver and iron artifacts with the so-called Ordos style were also discovered. Meanwhile, with increasing archaeological discoveries, the traditional designation has been challenged and synthetic research has been carried out. In 1983, Tian Guangjin divided the cultures located in south-central Inner Mongolia from the Shang period to the Qin and Han period into three periods: 1) from the Shang period to the Spring and Autumn period; 2) early Iron Age, namely the Warring States period; 3) the Iron Age, namely the Han Period\textsuperscript{581}. In 1986, the book ‘鄂尔多斯式青铜器 (Ordos-style Bronzes)’ touched upon the classification, periodization, cultural characteristics, origin and related ethnic tribes of such bronzes. This was the first time that Chinese scholars made a comprehensive study on the Ordos bronzes\textsuperscript{582}. In 1997, Tian Guangjin suggested to divide the northern steppes during the late Spring and Autumn period into three archaeological cultures. They are: 1) the Shanrong culture, which is centered in Beijing and northern Hebei; 2) the Ordos bronze culture, which is located mainly in the Ordos region, south-central Inner Mongolia; 3) the Xirong culture, which is distributed in the Gansu and Ningxia regions around the Longshan. The Ordos bronze culture includes the Xiyuan type, Maoqinggou type and the Taohongbala type\textsuperscript{583}. In 2001, Yang Jianhua pointed out that the east and west sides of the south-central Inner Mongolia region during the Eastern Zhou period differ in cultural aspects. They show great differences in burial practice and potteries though they resemble each other in metal weapons and tools\textsuperscript{584}.

Considering previous research, this study will use ‘the Taohongbala culture’ to designate one late bronze culture\textsuperscript{585} distributed in the Ordos Plateau within the Hetao region (Map 18). In addition to the Taohongbala cemetery, many other sites were also confirmed as belonging to the Taohongbala culture by Wu En\textsuperscript{586} (Table 38). As we can see, all the remains were burials. So far, no settlements have been found.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Metal objects</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nalingaotu\textsuperscript{587}</td>
<td>Burials</td>
<td>Gold: skull cup with animal</td>
<td>Fig. 132, 1-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{581} Tian G. J. 1983, 7-24.  
\textsuperscript{582} Ordos 86.  
\textsuperscript{583} Tian G. J. 1997b, 266-307.  
\textsuperscript{584} Yang J. H. 2001, 83-98.  
\textsuperscript{585} Some scholars represented by Wu En hold the view that northern China had entered the Iron Age after the middle Spring and Autumn period because iron objects became popular step by step. While Lin Yun put forward that bronze was no longer used as the major material for weapons and tools marks the end of the Bronze Age. In his opinion, the Bronze Age existed until after the Qin period though many iron objects have appeared at that time. Consequently, Wu En ascribed the Taohongbala culture to an early Iron Age culture. This study will attribute it to the late Bronze Age culture in terms of Lin Yun’s opinion.  
\textsuperscript{586} Beifangcaooyuan 2007, 322-324.  
\textsuperscript{587} Dai/Sun 1983, 23-30.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site Location</th>
<th>Artifacts</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shenmu, Shaanxi</td>
<td>patterns, tiger figure; silver: tigers, loops, swords, pole tops; bronze: buttons.</td>
<td>Lijiapan, Burials: Bronze: buttons, tubes, axes, loops, beads, and plaques.</td>
<td>Fig. 132, 16-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waertugou, Zhungeerqi, Inner Mogolia</td>
<td>Bronze: figures of sheep and deer.</td>
<td>Se</td>
<td>Fig. 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sujigou, Zhungeerqi, Inner Mongolia</td>
<td>Bronze: figures of animals and animal heads, bells, pole tops; silver necklace.</td>
<td>Se</td>
<td>Fig. 092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluchaideng, Hangjinqi, Inner Mongolia</td>
<td>Gold: belt ornaments, buttons, tubes, necklaces, earrings, skull top, ornaments, figures of tiger heads.</td>
<td>Se</td>
<td>Fig. 088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yulongtai, Zhungeerqi, Inner Mongolia</td>
<td>Bronze: arrowheads, knives, adzes, animal figures, ornaments, horse fittings; iron: crane hacks, horse fittings; silver: necklaces.</td>
<td>Se</td>
<td>Fig. 091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hulusitai, Wulatezhongho ulianheqi, Inner Mongolia</td>
<td>Bronze: swords, crane hacks, arrowheads, axes, adzes, buttons, tubes, plaques, horse fittings.</td>
<td>Se</td>
<td>Fig. 096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xigoupan, Zhungeerqi, Inner Mongolia</td>
<td>Gold: belt ornaments with animal patterns; silver: swords, arrowheads, belt ornaments; bronze: animal head, ornaments with animal patterns; iron: swords, horse fittings.</td>
<td>Se</td>
<td>Fig. 089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baohaishen, Zhungeerqi, Inner Mongolia</td>
<td>Bronze: Dou, knives, axes, chisels, awls, bute, buttons, loops, beads, plaques.</td>
<td>Se</td>
<td>Fig. 090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shihuigou</td>
<td>Silver: plaques, buttons,</td>
<td>Se</td>
<td>Fig. 093, 20-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

References:

589 NMGXJ 63, plate 80-83.
590 Gai S. L. 1965, 44-46.
592 NMGB et al. 1977, 111-114.
593 Ta/Liang 1980, 11-18.
595 YKW 1987, 81-83.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Objects Found</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yijinhuoluoqi, Inner Mongolia</td>
<td>Burials</td>
<td>Ornaments; bronze: crane heads, sheep heads, deer, and horse fittings.</td>
<td>31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nianfangqu, Dongsheng, Inner Mongolia</td>
<td>Burials</td>
<td>Gold: belt ornaments, earrings, tubes, beads, loops; silver loops</td>
<td>Fig. 094.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ming’anmudu, Yijinhuoluoqi, Inner Mongolia</td>
<td>Burials</td>
<td>Bronze: axes, knives, buttons, tube, bell, loop, gag bit.</td>
<td>Fig. 093, 1-19.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 38. Discoveries of the metal objects from the Taohongbala culture.

4.5.2 Chronology and periodization

Scholars still have disputes over the chronology and periodization of the Taohongbala culture. As proposed by Tian Guangjin, it should fall between the late Spring and Autumn period and the Warring States period. However, Yang Jianhua suggests that it should fall from the early or middle of the Spring and Autumn period to the Qin period on the basis of the object assemblages and radiocarbon dates available (Appendix). While some scholars question not only the radiocarbon dates but also the iron objects found.

This study agrees with Wu En’s suggestion, that the Taohongbala culture started from the middle Spring and Autumn period and ended at the end of the Warring States period (700-200 BCE). Firstly, the radiocarbon date obtained from tomb M1 of the Taohongbala cemetery is cal. 848-400 BCE (Appendix), indicating that this tomb would not be earlier than the middle Spring and Autumn period. Secondly, the Ming’anmudu tombs are probably earlier than the Taohongbala cemetery because the socketed axe found at Ming’anmudu (Fig. 093, 1) was also seen in one tomb at Shanbio town, Hui county, Henan Province which was dated between 300-240 BCE. Thirdly, the gold and silver objects found at Shihuigou (Fig. 093, 20-31) and Nianfangqu (Fig. 094) show strong features of the Warring States period, especially the animal patterns. As stated by Wu En, the appearance of the gold, silver, and iron objects cannot be regarded as enough evidence for dating them into the Qin or Han period, because the iron objects appeared quite early in the adjacent Maoqinggou culture and Yanglang culture. Furthermore, some typical metal objects found at Nianfangqu and Shihuigou are absent in the Qin and Han period.

596 YKW 1992, 91-96.
597 YKW 1991, 405-408.
598 YKW et al. 1992, 79-81.
599 GBJ 59, Plate 26.5.
600 The Yanglang culture will be discussed in the next section.
which is regarded as the golden age of the Xiongnu people.

Due to a lack of sufficient stratigraphical evidence and standard objects, it is hard to make a detailed periodization for the Taohongbala culture. However, on the basis of the assemblages of burial goods and in contrast to the Maoqinggou culture, it can be still roughly divided into two periods. Ming’anmudu, Baohaishie, Shuijiangoumen, Taohongbala, Hulusitai, and Tomb M3 of Xigoupan are probably a little bit earlier because the bronze swords, crane hacks, belt buttons, animal shaped figures, tubes and so on are similar to those of the first phase of the Maoqinggou culture, roughly parallel from the middle Spring and Autumn period to the early Warring States period. The other cemeteries, such as tomb M2 of Xigoupan, Aluchaideng, Yulongtai, and Nalin’gaotu may be a little bit later because iron objects as well as gold and silver objects increased remarkably.

In contrast to the Maoqinggou culture, the Taohongbala culture has its own peculiar traits: 1) less pottery was found; 2) so far, no remains of a settlement have been discovered; 3) gold and silver objects were much advanced; 4) horse and chariot fittings were more prosperous than those in the Maoqinggou culture.

4.5.3 Metal objects

4.5.3.1 Types

The metal objects of the Taohongbala culture are bounteous and varied. In light of the raw material, they can be classified as bronze, gold, silver, and iron. Bronze objects present a strong nomadic style, including weapons, tools, horse and chariot fittings, and ornaments. Of them, the antenna pommel swords that were very typical in the Maoqinggou culture (Fig. 131b, 1-6) are relatively few in the Taohongbala culture (Fig. 134a, 1-3; Fig. 132, 23). However, the knives are much richer in quantity and forms (Fig. 134a, 6-8) than in the Maoqinggou culture (Fig. 131b, 39). The tubes are similar in patterns and shapes to those in the Maoqinggou culture (Fig. 134a, 14-16; Fig. 131b, 32-36). One bronze axe with a brush on the handle is attractive though its function is not clear (Fig. 134a, 9). Compared to the Maoqinggou culture, more horse masks (Fig. 134a, 54.55.57) and pole tops (Fig. 134a, 40, 42-45.48.49) were found in the Taohongbala culture. In addition, the ornaments were splendid and rich in patterns and forms (Fig. 134a, 21-39).

The Taohongbala culture is famous for the great number of splendid gold and silver objects (Fig. 134b-e). The Aluchaideng, Xigoupan, Nianfangqu, Shihuigou, and Nalingaotu cemeteries produced many gold and silver artifacts, a testimony to the exquisite metallurgical techniques used at that time. For example, the delicate gold crown with a headband (Fig. 134d) is striking and amazing, showing high skill.

141
Gold and silver belt ornaments, ornament sheets, necklaces, earrings, and eardrops were quite common in the burials (Fig. 134c).

As we know, iron objects are hard to preserve because of corrosion. Nevertheless, a considerable quantity of iron objects were also found in the Taohongbala culture, including swords, crane hacks, knives, awls and so on. The iron sheath found at the Xigoupan cemetery is coated with gold sheets and animal designs (Fig. 134a, 19). One sword handle found at Nalingaotu (Fig. 132, 1) is very characteristic, with a silver coat inlaid with gold decorations, implying highly skilled metalwork at that time.

The so-called Ordos bronzes are well known for their splendid animal patterns and designs, which are fully manifested in the metal objects of the Taohongbala culture. The designs and patterns include prey attacking herbivorous animals (Fig. 134b, 2; Fig. 134c, 18; Fig. 134d, 1-3), animals in combat (Fig. 134b, 1;), animals in a standing or crouching position (Fig. 134d, 4; Fig. 134c, 2.5.8.17; Fig. 134a, 21.25), full-relieved animals (Fig. 134a, 40-49), and fictional animals (Fig. 134c, 19.20; Fig. 134d, 5). Many images of animals were included such as tigers, leopards, wolves, deer, antelopes, hedgehogs, eagles, cranes, birds, horses, oxen, sheep, dogs and so on, indicating a vivid nomadic lifestyle.

The influence from the Central Plain is reflected in metal objects as well. For example, bronze and iron horse masks were found at the Taohongbala cemetery and Dou-vessels (Fig. 134a, 50, 51) were discovered at the Baohaishe site. Besides, the Chinese characters were engraved on gold and silver objects which were unearthed from the Xigoupan cemetery (Fig. 089, 35). All data indicate close relations between northern and central China.

4.5.3.2 Metallurgical analysis

In previous research, all of the animal style bronzes found in the Ordos region and its adjacent areas are called ‘Ordos bronzes’. The earliest composition analysis of the Ordos bronzes was undertaken by Japanese scholars in 1932. A total of 11 objects including mirror, sword, axe, knife, Fu-cooking ware, belt buckles and so on were examined\(^\text{601}\). In 1965, sponsored by the Sackler Fund, W. Samolin Isabella and M. Drew made a study on 91 bronze objects from the Sackler collections. It was devoted solely to the composition of the alloys and trace element patterns. The results showed that: 1) 50 plaques of a wide geographic base dating stylistically from the Spring and Autumn period to Han (403 BCE-AD 220) were tabulated; 2) Pb, Ag, Sn, Zn and Cu were determined calorimetrically or complexometrically; 3)

\(^{601}\) Egami Namio/Mizunari Seiichi 1935.
trace elements, such as Al, As, Au, Bi, Ca, Co, Cr, Fe, Mg, Mn, Ni, Sb, Si, Ti were observed\textsuperscript{602}. At that time they stated: ‘Although we believe the greater part of the material to be authentic, the aforementioned bronze objects that have been analyzed do not, to our knowledge, contain any pieces obtained by a controlled archaeological excavation’. 

In 1996, Chinese scholars made a metallurgical research on the so-called Ordos bronzes that were found from Inner Mongolia. This involves composition analysis, metallographic structure, and manufacturing techniques\textsuperscript{603}. A total of 15 bronze objects from the Zhukaigou site which was excavated with clear stratigraphical evidence and chronological information, and 20 objects collected from the Yikezhaomeng region were determined. The information obtained is as follows:\textsuperscript{604} (Table 39; Table 40; Table 41):

1. The chemical composition of these bronzes. 6 of the 35 artifacts are brass. Of the other 29 bronzes, 1 is determined to be copper, 28 objects to be tin copper alloys and tin lead copper alloys (Table 39).

2. Metallurgical structure. 8 of the 35 objects contain less than 2% Pb. 7 objects contain 3-19% Sn, and most of their metallurgical structure shows a pure and tight texture with tiny impurity. In addition, 17 objects contain over 20% Sn and show a cast structure. 18 objects, mainly ornaments and vessels, have obvious alloy segregation of dendrite-like grains. Besides, a section distributed with slip lines, $\alpha$ equiaxed crystals, and twin crystals indicate that it may have been partially cold and hot worked after cast. Such items are in 8 cases. Most of them are weapons and tools.

3. Of the 6 brasses, 4 are Cu-Pb-Zn alloys and 2 are Cu-Sn-Pb-Zn alloys. Their metallurgical structure is $\alpha$ or $\alpha+\beta$ casting structure, containing 0.5-1.6% Fe. It is worth mentioning that sample E.1601, a bronze figure of a human riding a horse, contains even 1% Ni.

4. About half of these bronze objects contain over 1% Mg-compound or 1% chloride. It may have been caused by corrosion from being buried in alkaline soil.

As we can see in Table 40 and Table 41, 4 of the 6 brasses contained over 30% Zn, indicating that they were not accidentally produced from paragentic mineral or

\textsuperscript{602} Salmolin/Drew 1965, 170-183.
\textsuperscript{603} Han/Li 1996, 104-114.
\textsuperscript{604} Information on the bronze objects of the Zhukaigou site has been discussed in the preceding section on the Zhukaigou culture.
mixed ore. As for the trace elements, over 0.1% Si, Al, Mg, Cl, As, Fe, Sn, Ni, Pb, Ag have been identified. Of them, Si, Al and Mg may be interfused from the changing material. While As, Sn, Ni, Ag with a content of over 1%, may provide vital clues for finding out the raw materials used for the alloy bronzes. In addition, a high content of Ag in some objects from the Zhukaigou site implies distinct local characteristics.

Table 39. Chemical component of the Ordos bronzes, 刀-knife; 剑-sword; 戈-Ge; 鏖-arrowhead; 斧-axe; 锥-awl; 容器-vessel; 镜-mirror; 垂饰品-pendant ornament (after Han/Li 1996, 105).

---

Han/Li 1996, 111.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lab. No.</th>
<th>Sam. No.</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Chemical composition (%)</th>
<th>Scanning method</th>
<th>Metallographic structure</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2652</td>
<td>E.1639</td>
<td>mirror</td>
<td>Cu 89.3 Sn 6.9 Pb 3.2 Fe 0.4 Cl</td>
<td>FF SF</td>
<td>There are distinctive dendrite-like segregation of ( \alpha ) solid solution; A spot is ( \alpha ) structure containing Pb, Sn and Cl; B spot is ( \alpha ) structure with trace Sn and Pb</td>
<td>Cu-Sn-Pb, cast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2658</td>
<td>E.1658</td>
<td>Jieyue</td>
<td>Cu 60.9 Sn 2.8 Pb 0.5 Zn 35.5</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>There are ( \alpha ) solid solution and dendrite-like distributed ( \delta ) structure.</td>
<td>Cu-Zn-Pb, cast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2659</td>
<td>E.1659</td>
<td>Jieyue</td>
<td>Cu 60.7 Sn 0.7 Pb 5.8 Zn 0.9 Ni 31.4</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>There are ( \alpha ) solid solution and some ( \delta ) structures; Pb particles are scattered.</td>
<td>Cu-Zn-Pb, cast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2660</td>
<td>E.1501</td>
<td>tiger figure</td>
<td>Cu 67.5 Sn 15.8 Pb 16.6</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>There are distinctive dendrite-like segregation of ( \alpha ) solid solution, many ((\alpha+\delta)) eutectoids, uneven Pb particles, inclusions composed of Cu and S.</td>
<td>Cu-Sn-Pb, cast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2661</td>
<td>E.1502</td>
<td>elephant figure</td>
<td>Cu 66.7 Sn 5.9 Pb 25.6 Ni 1.7Cl</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>There are distinctive dendrite-like segregation of ( \alpha ) solid solution, a few of ((\alpha+\delta)) eutectoids, many Pb particles which are strip-like, lump-like or dendrite-like distributed, many sulphide inclusions containing Cu.</td>
<td>Cu-Sn-Pb, cast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2662</td>
<td>E.1503</td>
<td>elephant figure</td>
<td>Cu 72.1 Sn 14.1 Pb 13.5 Ni 0.2Cl</td>
<td>FF</td>
<td>dendrite-like segregation of ( \alpha ) solid solution is obscure; there are a few of ((\alpha+\delta)) eutectoids, Pb particles and sulphide</td>
<td>Cu-Sn-Pb, cast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab. No.</td>
<td>Sam. No.</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Chemical composition (%)</td>
<td>Metallographic structure</td>
<td>Remark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2653</td>
<td>E.1601</td>
<td>riding human</td>
<td>Cu: 71.5, Sn: 3.2, Pb: 17.0, Fe: 0.9, Mg: FF</td>
<td>There are distinctive dentrite-like segregation of α solid solution and a few of (α+ δ) eutectoids; A spot is α brass containing Pb, Fe, Ni, Sn; B spot is α brass containing much Sn and few Fe; C spot is the second image.</td>
<td>Cu-Sn-Pb-Zn, cast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>figure</td>
<td>Cu: 72.7, Sn: 3.8, Pb: 16.4, Fe: 0.8, Mg: SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cu: 72.9, Sn: 2.3, Pb: 4.1, Fe: 0.1, Mg: A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cu: 37.4, Sn: 35.9, Pb: 1.0, Fe: 1.0, Mg: B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2656</td>
<td>E.1602</td>
<td>riding human</td>
<td>Cu: 58.4, Sn: 0.3, Pb: 6.3, Fe: 1.5, Mg: 35.5, FF</td>
<td>There is distinctive casting dendrite-like segregation; it is (α+ δ) brass together with a few Pb particles.</td>
<td>Cu-Zn-Pb, cast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>figure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2654</td>
<td>E.1612</td>
<td>human figure</td>
<td>Cu: 56.3, Sn: 6.2, Pb: 1.5, Mg: 35.5, FF</td>
<td>(α+ δ) brass contains few Fe; there are distinctive casting dendrite-like crystals, which are even.</td>
<td>Cu-Zn-Pb, cast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2657</td>
<td>E.1585</td>
<td>human figure</td>
<td>Cu: 67.4, Sn: 6.0, Pb: 10.8, Mg: 14.7, FF</td>
<td>There is distinctive dendrite-like α solid solution which is (α+ δ) brass containing much Sn.</td>
<td>Cu-Sn-Pb-Zn, cast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 40. Results of the metallurgical analysis of the Ordos bronzes, FS: flat plane scanning method; SS: spot scanning method (adapted from Han/Li 1996, 108 Table 2).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lab. No.</th>
<th>Sam. No.</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Chemical composition (%)</th>
<th>Metallographic structure</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2648</td>
<td>E.10</td>
<td>knife</td>
<td>Cu: 77.8, Sn: 11.2, Pb: 9.3, Fe: —, Mg: —</td>
<td>There are distinctive segregation of α solid solution, a few (α+ δ) eutectoids, dendrite-like Pb particles, and partially distributed α isometric crystals and twin.</td>
<td>Cu-Sn-Pb, cast, partial hot working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Sample Code</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Cu</td>
<td>Sn</td>
<td>Pb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2649</td>
<td>E.13</td>
<td>knife</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2650</td>
<td>E.14</td>
<td>handle of knife</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2680</td>
<td>E.27</td>
<td>knife</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2677</td>
<td>E.53</td>
<td>knife</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2649</td>
<td>E.111</td>
<td>knife</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2651</td>
<td>E.113</td>
<td>knife</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2678</td>
<td>E.116</td>
<td>knife</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
solution, many (α+ δ) eutectoids; edge of the sample is rusty, located some sulphide containing Pb, Cu, Fe; the point of the knife is distorted because of cold working.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2675</td>
<td>E.117</td>
<td>handle of knife</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2676</td>
<td>E.137</td>
<td>knife</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2681</td>
<td>E.194</td>
<td>knife</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2682</td>
<td>E.1</td>
<td>sword</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2663</td>
<td>E.228</td>
<td>axe</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 41. Results of the metallurgical analysis of the Ordos bronzes (adapted from Han/Li 1996, 106-107 Table 1).
4.6 Yanglang culture

4.6.1 Definition and distribution

Increasing archaeological discoveries centered roughly around the Longshan in the Gansu and Ningxia regions, have aroused great interest amongst scholars for a long time. However, the designation of the remains characterized by metal horse fittings and weapons with animal styles, which are similar to the so-called Ordos bronzes in this region, have long been disputed.

In 1985, Zhong Kan first questioned the traditional address of ‘the Xiongnu culture’ regarding the archaeological remains found in the south of Ningxia on the basis of a comprehensive study on the classification, characteristics, chronology, and ethnic attribution of the bronze objects. In 1993, Xu Cheng and Li Jinzeng titled the cultural remains distributed from the Yinshan and Ordos regions to the south of the Ningxia and Qingyang regions of Gansu as ‘Rongdi (戎狄) bronze culture’. In addition, the former centered in the Yinshan and Ordos region, is classified as ‘the Maoqinggou type’, belonging to the Di (狄) people; the latter centered on the south of Ningxia and the Qingyang region of Gansu is classified as ‘the Yanglang type’, owned by the Rong (戎) people. After the excavations at Mazhuang and Yujiayu in the Guyuan county, some scholars put forward the designation of ‘the Xirong culture’, ‘the Yanglang bronze culture’ and ‘the Loss Plateau bronze culture’.

Considering the dispute on the ethnic attribution, and on the difference of the remains distributed in the Ordos and Yinshan regions, this study will use the ‘Yanglang culture’ which was put forward by Wu En to designate the remains characterized by Ordos-style metal objects, distributed mainly in south central of Ningxia and the eastern part of Gansu (Map 19).

In addition to the Mazhuang cemetery in the Yanglang township, some other sites were confirmed as belonging to the Yanglang culture as well (Table 42), mainly in the south of the Ningxia and Qingyang regions in Gansu.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site/location</th>
<th>Contexts</th>
<th>Metal objects (most of them are made of bronze)</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Zhong/Han 1985, 203-231, Xu/Li 1993, 1-11, NXY 1995, 105, NXY et al. 1993, 13-56, Xu/Li 1993, 1-11, Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 357-360.* The metal objects of these sites have been discussed in chapter 2.2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Burials</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Langwozikeng, Zhongwei county, Ningxia</td>
<td>11 burials</td>
<td>Over 400 pieces of bronzes: weapons, tools, ornaments, horse fittings; some iron swords</td>
<td>Fig. 021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhangjie village, Pengyang county, Ningxia</td>
<td>Over 10 burials</td>
<td>Bronzes: weapons, horse fittings, tools, ornaments; and some iron swords, loops.</td>
<td>Fig. 022a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miyuan village, Pengyang county, Ningxia</td>
<td>1 tomb</td>
<td>Bronzes: swords, spears, arrowheads, axes, knives, adzes, horse fittings, small ornaments.</td>
<td>Fig. 023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xianma village, Pengyang county, Ningxia</td>
<td>1 tomb</td>
<td>72 pieces of bronzes: swords, spears, axes, adzes, awls, crane hacks, horse fittings.</td>
<td>Fig. 024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guantai village, Pengyang county, Ningxia</td>
<td>Collected from 1 tomb</td>
<td>Over 30 pieces of bronzes: Ge, spears, knives, arrowheads, pole tops, bells, plaques, horse fittings; some iron swords.</td>
<td>Fig. 025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baicaowa villag3, Pengyang county, Ningxia</td>
<td>Collected from burials</td>
<td>17 pieces of bronze: spear, Dun, crane hacks, bulbs, pole tops.</td>
<td>Fig. 026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baicha village, Pengyang county, Ningxia</td>
<td>Collected from burials</td>
<td>14 pieces of bronzes: Ge, Dun, shaft of cart, bells, plaques.</td>
<td>Fig. 027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianwa village, Pengyang county, Ningxia</td>
<td>Collected from burials</td>
<td>25 pieces of bronzes: Dun, shaft of cart, gag bits, bulbs, pole tops, figures of deer.</td>
<td>Fig. 028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chenyangchuan village, Xijie county, Ningxia</td>
<td>2 tombs</td>
<td>Bronze ornaments and horse fittings; iron swords; silver Jieyue and plaques.</td>
<td>Fig. 030; Fig. 031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wugou, Longde county, Ningxia</td>
<td>burials</td>
<td>Bronze arrowheads, plaques, figures.</td>
<td>Fig. 032, 1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niding village, Zhongning county, Ningxia</td>
<td>2 tombs</td>
<td>Bronze: swords, socket axes, axes, arrowheads, knives, horse fittings; gold plaques.</td>
<td>Fig. 033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xijiao, Guyuan</td>
<td>Collected</td>
<td>Bronze: horse fittings, plaques, bulbs, crane</td>
<td>Fig. 034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

620 Yan/Li 1992, 573-575.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>From Tombs</th>
<th>Hacks</th>
<th>Figures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yangwa, Ningxia</td>
<td>1 tomb</td>
<td>Bronze: swords, Ge, knives, axes, chisels, belt buckles, plaques, horse fittings.</td>
<td>035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dabeishang, Yanglang, Ningxia</td>
<td>1 tomb</td>
<td>Bronze: spears, knives, horse fittings, pole tops, plaques</td>
<td>036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangjiaping, Guyuan county, Ningxia</td>
<td>1 tomb</td>
<td>69 pieces: bronze spears, bells, tubes, plaques, figures of falcon; iron tools.</td>
<td>037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leping, Guzuan county, Ningxia</td>
<td>1 tomb</td>
<td>75 pieces of bronzes: spears, Ge, bells, horse masks, plaques, buckles, figures of relief deer.</td>
<td>038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samen, Nianjiao, Siyangshiku, Sanying, Mengyuan, Shangtai</td>
<td>Burials and collected</td>
<td>Bronze: weapons, tools, horse fittings, ornaments.</td>
<td>040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazhuang, Guyuan county, Ningxia</td>
<td>49 tombs</td>
<td>743 metal objects, bronze: weapons, tools, ornaments, horse fitting; iron: swords, knives, gag bits, chisels, loops, plaques; gold earrings; silver earrings</td>
<td>041b-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yujiazhuan, Guyuang, Ningxia</td>
<td>28 tombs</td>
<td>Bronze: weapons, tools, ornaments, horse fittings; iron: swords, plaques, ornaments; gold plaques.</td>
<td>057-061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wujiagouquan, Yuanjia, Houzhuang, Miaoqu, Hongyan, Wulipo, Qingyang, Gansu</td>
<td>Burials</td>
<td>Bronze: weapons, tools, horse fittings, ornaments; iron swords with bronze handle; silver earrings</td>
<td>062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazhai, Ligou, Tatou, Fengbao, Qingyang, Gansu</td>
<td>Burials</td>
<td>Bronze: swords, spears, knives, belt ornaments, deer figures, tubes, joint beads.</td>
<td>067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wangjia, Qin’an county, Gansu</td>
<td>Burials</td>
<td>Bronze: swords, knives, tubes, joint beads.</td>
<td>067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 42. Discoveries of the metal objects from the Yanglang culture.**
4.6.2 Chronology, periodization, and relations with the neighboring cultures and others

Based on the three-phase periodization from the middle Spring and Autumn period to the middle Warring States put forward by Luo Feng, Wu En suggests one more detailed three-phase periodization from the early and middle Spring and Autumn period to the middle and late Warring States period for the Yanglang culture as well. The early phase is represented by the Langwozikeng cemetery which is dated to the early and middle Spring and Autumn period (800-500 BCE) because the socket daggers (Fig. 021, 17-20) are regarded as the prototype of the crane hacks, which became popular in the later period. Furthermore, loop-headed swords and gag bits show features in their earlier development. In addition, the Niding village is also attributed to the early phase. The middle phase is recognized by the earlier tombs of the Yujiiazhuang and Majiazhuang cemeteries (A group), and the accompanying metal objects display great similarities to those found at the Taohongbala, Maoqinggou and Guoxianyaozi cemeteries. The antenna swords, belt buckles, tubes, and figures of birds were dated from the late Spring and Autumn period to the early Warring States period (ca. 500-400 BCE). The late tombs of the Mazhuang cemetery (B group) fall into the late phase of the Yanglang culture because horse and chariot fittings and iron objects increased in number when compared with A group. Furthermore, the Baiyanglin village, and Chenyangchuan village are also attributed to this period as the animal-style patterns, such as tigers biting sheep, duck heads and so on imply a style of the later period. The late period is roughly parallel to the middle and late Warring States period (ca. 400-200 BCE).

So far, no settlement sites which are contemporary with the burials of the Yanglang culture have been reported. As for the burials, in addition to the usual earthen pit graves, the vertical rectangular pit graves with a side pit at the base into which the body of the deceased was placed were quite popular (Fig. 041a). This burial structure was also very common in northwestern China during the Neolithic and Bronze Age, especially in the Shajing culture. A few of them are even seen in the Zhangjiapo, Liujiacun and Nianzipo cemeteries, implying that the owners may have entered the Central Plain.

Pottery was very scarce in the Yanglang culture. For instance, only 4 pieces of pottery were found from the 49 tombs at Mazhuang, and only 7 were discovered from the 29 tombs at Yujiiazhuang. Most of the potteries were plain pots with single or double ears.

---

635 The remains of the Mazhuang cemetery is divided into A and B two groups: A is ascribed to the earlier stage of the Mazhuang cemetery, B is attributed to the later stage.
as well as a few spoons and cups (Fig. 135a).

The Yanglang culture was located west of the Ordos region where the Taohongbala culture disseminated (Map 17). They resembled themselves not only in animal sacrifices such as horses, cattle, and sheep, but also in animal-style patterns and objects, including antenna-pommel swords, crane hacks, belt buckles, tubes, figures of birds, joint beads, and plaques with varied animal patterns. Meanwhile, they differed themselves in the form of the tomb structure used: the Yanglang culture is recognized by vertical earthen pit graves with a side pit; while the Taohongbala culture is characterized by earthen shaft graves. Not only some burial goods including iron swords with a bronze handle and some kinds of bronze spears and pole tops, but also some animal patterns such as a tiger biting a sheep and deer motifs were also not seen or were scarce in the Taohongbala culture. It is also hard to judge which culture was in a much stronger situation at that time. The cultural characteristics that the Yanglang culture shares with the Taohongbala culture are so prominent that they led Tian Guangjin to conclude that the Yanglang culture were remains of the so-called ‘Xiongnu culture’ centered in south-central Inner Mongolia. However, other scholars attribute the Yanglang culture to the Yiqu (义渠) or the Yuezhi (月氏). Until now, no opinion on the ethnic attribution of the Yanglang culture has been largely accepted amongst scholars. No matter which historic group produced these remains, the Yanglang culture seems to have emerged at the same time as the Taohongbala culture. There was probably a sudden increase in pastoral nomadic activity in southern Ningxia and south-central Inner Mongolia.

As mentioned in pervious chapters, the vertical earthen pit graves with a side pit were very common in the Shajing culture (Fig. 098a-098f; Fig. 065a-065h) which is an earlier bronze culture distributed in middle-eastern Gansu, and produced lots of bronze horse fittings and ornaments. It may be the possible origin of the Yanglang culture.

**4.6.3 Metal objects**

Compared to the other contemporary bronze cultures distributed central and east of the Northern Zone, the metal objects of the Yanglang culture lack the bronze ritual vessels of the Central Plain style.

As for the bronze objects, they consist of weapons, tools, horse fittings, and personal ornaments, characterized by local features. The loop-headed swords and antenna

---

638 Zhong/Han 1985, 203-231.
639 Luo F. 1990, 743-750.
pommel swords which were also seen in the Taohongbala culture and the Maoqinggou culture were very common (Fig. 135b, 1-8) in the Yanglang culture. The socketed end of the bronze spears seems to be connected to the wood handle (Fig. 135b, 10.11). Only a small quantity of axes were found. It is worth mentioning that the crane hacks with a round or oval socket and two-axe-shaped ends (Fig. 135b, 18.25.28) were regarded as the prototype of the crane hacks with one-crane-shaped end. In addition, over one hundred pieces of tubes in length from one to twelve centimeters were unearthed, decorated with patterns of dog’s legs, spirals, raised lines, triangles, semicircles, ears, diamonds, and so on (Fig. 135b, 19-24). These tubes were probably used as boxes for needles or chisels. In addition, chariot and horse fittings were quite advanced in quantity and quality, especially gag bits, darts, Danglu, shafts of dart, pole tops, and bells (Fig. 135c, 1-14). Finally, the Yanglang culture was exceedingly rich in the personal ornaments. Over 400 belt ornaments were discovered (Fig. 135c, 15-23; Fig. 135d, 11-16.20-22.28.29), characterized by patterns of a single bird, two birds, four birds, deformed birds and animals in combat. The plaques decorated with animals in combat may have been used to decorate the belt (Fig. 135c, 15-23). The decoration on the belt buckles is also quite complicated and varied (Fig. 135d, 1-3.6-8.19), including nipple patterns, trellis designs, raised lines, curved lines, ear patterns, and so on. So far, the spade-shaped plaques of the Yanglang culture (Fig. 135d, 17) have not been found in other regions.

There were also a great number of iron objects found in the Yanglang culture, including swords, spears, gag bits, darts, belt ornaments, loops, awls, plaques, and armlets (Fig. 135d, 48-54). In the earlier phase of the Yanglang culture, only some iron swords with a bronze handle occurred. After the middle phase, iron objects increased gradually both in number and forms. Iron swords with a bronze handle are one of the most remarkable characteristics of the Yanglang culture. Such a bronze handle is a mushroom-shaped pommel, decorated with cord patterns or nipple patterns in the body of the handle (Fig. 135b, 9). According to the opinion of Wu En, such iron swords may have originated from the west of the Eurasian Steppe.641

The decorative art of the Yanglang culture is quite splendid, reflected richly in the openwork carving and relief techniques used on the bronze objects. The decorative images include tigers, deer, horses, camels, sheep, falcons, birds and dogs. The forms include animal heads or bird heads decorated on swords or ornaments, plaques in the shape of standing animals, animals in combat, prey attacking herbivorous animals, relief deer, dogs, and humans riding on horses or camels (Fig. 135d, 38-47), implying a strong pastoral nomadic life at that time.

641 Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 375.
A small number of gold and silver objects were also found in the Yanglang culture. Information on metallurgical analysis is not available. However, judging from the abundant glorious metal objects found so far, we can infer that the metallurgical techniques used in the Yanglang culture were considerably well developed.

4.7 Summary

It is worth mentioning that there are two discontinuities in the cultural development of the North-central Complex (Fig. 136), though the earlier and later bronze cultures show certain relations and succession.

The first small discontinuity appears between the Zhukaigou culture, the Lijiaya culture, and the Xicha culture, roughly during the transitional time between the early and late Shang period (about 1300-1200 BCE). Some scholars suggest that the formation of the Lijiaya culture was caused by the southwards spreading of the Zhukaigou culture, in light of some similarities in the pottery assemblage and style of the dwelling place. As mentioned in chapter 4.3, the Xicha culture was much closer to the Zhukaigou culture than the Lijiaya culture was. In fact, both the Lijiaya and Xicha cultures were newly identified in recent decades, so the recognition of some cultural aspects needs to be improved. Until now, the archaeological materials were not sufficient to prove that these three cultures were well joined. It is also hard to speculate the cause of this discontinuity. It was probably caused by some disastrous events or simply due to the sporadic archaeological excavations carried out.

The second big discontinuity (Fig. 136) emerges during the middle Western Zhou period to the early Spring and Autumn period (about 900-700 BCE). It may be a result of the haphazard excavation undertaken. Moreover, the scarcity of cultural remains may be due to infrequent human activities at that time.

Immediately after, the so-called Ordos bronze cultures came on stage in north-central China. The flourishing Yanglang, Taohongbala, and Maoqinggou cultures were distributed side by side from the early Spring and Autumn period to the late Warring States period. On one hand, they show some common characteristics, such as animal sacrifices, splendid metal objects in a strong pastoral style, and so on. On the other hand, they distinguish themselves by their burial patterns, bronze assemblages, and subsistence. Besides, the cultural ascription of some sites found with northern-style bronzes in

---

643 The slight difference in subsistence will be discussed in the following Chapter 6.2.3.
north-central China is still controversial. For example, the Xiyuan cemetery is characterized by earthen shaft pits with a side pit and a second platform, animal victims, and small bronze ornaments (Fig. 095). Therefore, it is hard to ascribe it to any so-called Ordos bronze culture.

\textsuperscript{644} See Chapter 2.4.12.
Chapter 5 The South of the Yanshan Complex

The South of the Yanshan Complex designates the bronze-using cultures distributed within the northern Hebei region and the Beijing and Tianjin regions, as almost corresponding to the south of the Northeast Complex which is defined by Pak. Its individuality has been recognized gradually by scholars. On the cultural ascription of some sites, scholars have not agreed. Despite all of this, the cultural aspects of the Datuotou culture, Weifang III culture, Upper Zhangjiayuan culture, and Yuhuangmiao culture become more and more clear.

5.1 Datuotou culture

5.1.1 Definition and distribution

The Datuotou culture is named after the Datuotou site in Chang county, Hebei Province, yielding 2 houses together with some potteries, stone wares, animal bones, and bronze arrowheads\(^\text{645}\). It took a long time for the recognition of the Datuotou culture to be accepted by archaeologists. Previous research generally attributes such remains that are similar to those found from the Datuotou site to the Lower Xiajiadian culture, ‘the Yannan type of the Lower Xiajiadian culture’\(^\text{646}\), ‘the Yanshan type of the Lower Xiajiadian culture’\(^\text{647}\), or the ‘North-Haihe complex of the Lower Xiajiadian culture’\(^\text{648}\). Some scholars divide such remains found from the south of the Yanshan into ‘the Datuotou type’ and ‘the Huliuhe type’. With increasing archaeological fieldwork and related materials, some scholars put forward that the cultural remains distributed in the south of the Yanshan during the Xia and Shang period should be excluded from the Lower Xiajiadian culture, implying an early independent bronze culture in terms of the potteries, burials, and settlements\(^\text{649}\). So far, many sites found together with bronze objects have been identified as the Datuotou culture (Table 43), as well as some sites without bronze objects, including Pangjiahe\(^\text{650}\), Jiancun I, II\(^\text{651}\), Banjiegou\(^\text{652}\), Qianbao, Zhuangke, Sishilipo\(^\text{653}\) and Jiaozhuang\(^\text{654}\) in Hebei Province, Liujiahe\(^\text{655}\) and Fenghuangshan\(^\text{656}\) in Beijing, Niudaokou II\(^\text{657}\) and Qingchi\(^\text{658}\) in

\(^{645}\) Han J.G. 1966, 8-13.
\(^{646}\) Li J. H. 1980, 163-170.
\(^{647}\) Zou H. 2001d, 233-270.
\(^{649}\) Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 40.
\(^{650}\) JMHK 1988, 421-453.
\(^{651}\) HBW 1992.
\(^{652}\) Liu/Li 2002.
\(^{653}\) ZJKK 1984.
\(^{654}\) ZJKK 1984.
\(^{655}\) BJWG 1992, 51-64.
\(^{656}\) BJKG40.
Tianjin (Map 20).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Contexts</th>
<th>Bronze objects</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Xiaoguanzhuang, Tangshan, Hebei</td>
<td>6 cist graves</td>
<td>Earrings</td>
<td>An Z. M. 1954, 81-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dachengshan, Tangshan, Hebei</td>
<td>Pits; burials</td>
<td></td>
<td>HBWG 1959, 17-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guye, Tangshan, Hebei</td>
<td>2 pits</td>
<td>Needle; knife; loop</td>
<td>HBW 1984, 769-778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dongzhuangdian, Luannan, Hebei</td>
<td>1 pit</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>HBW 1983, 775-778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanguan, Yu, Hebei</td>
<td>Settlement; burials</td>
<td>Earring</td>
<td>ZJKK 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lidarenzhuang, Zhangjiakou, Hebei</td>
<td>6 pits; 9 burials</td>
<td>Loop</td>
<td>ZJKW et al. 1990, 398-402.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiayuegezhuang I, Yi, Hebei</td>
<td>15 pits</td>
<td>Arrowhead; earring;</td>
<td>JMHK 1988, 421-453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hair clasp;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qinggongtai, Langfang, Hebei</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gold armlet</td>
<td>LFW et al. 1999, 26-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xueshan III, Beijing</td>
<td>Pits; burials</td>
<td>Arrowheads; earrings;</td>
<td>Lu/Ge 1978, 23-34;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>knives</td>
<td>Zou H. 2001d, 242-244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liuulidian, Beijing</td>
<td>2 graves</td>
<td>Earrings; rings</td>
<td>TJW 1979, 163-171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tazhao, Beijing</td>
<td>Pits, burials</td>
<td>Earring</td>
<td>BJWY 1989, 205-218;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BJWY 1999, 1-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhangjiayuan, Ji county, Tianjin</td>
<td>Pits; settlements</td>
<td>Arrowheads; knives,</td>
<td>TJW 1979, 163-171;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>earrings</td>
<td>TJLBW 1984, 698-705;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1993, 311-323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weifang II, Tianjin</td>
<td>1 house; 3 pits</td>
<td>Knives; earring</td>
<td>TJWK 1983, 877-893</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 43. Bronzes of the Datuotou culture.

Conclusively, the Datuotou culture is roughly distributed in the south of the Yanshan, reaching the Zhangjiakou region and Huliuhe Valley to the west, the Yanshan to the north, Bohai to the east, and the Laishui and Jumahe in the south (Map 20). Of course, some scholars have arguments over its range because some remains of the Datuotou culture were even found north of the Yanshan\(^\text{659}\) and south of the Jumahe valley\(^\text{660}\).

The differences between the Datuotou culture and the Lower Xiajiadian culture are

---

\(^{657}\) TJLBK et al. 1991, 577-586.
\(^{658}\) TJLBK 2001, 96-97.
\(^{659}\) Tian S. H. 1995, 48-52.
\(^{660}\) HBW et al. 1992.
reflected in many aspects. Firstly, the representative potteries of the Lower Xiajiadian culture such as cylinder-shaped cooking ware-Li and Yan were rarely seen in the Datuotou culture. By contrast, the round-belly Li which was very common in the Datuotou culture was however scarce in the Xiajiadian culture. Secondly, remains of stone city and altar pits found in the Lower Xiajiadian culture have not been discovered in the Datuotou culture. Furthermore, neither the adobe technique used in architecture nor the niche used in the burials are seen in the Datuotou culture. In addition, the quantity of bronze objects from the Datuotou culture exceeds those of the Lower Xiajiadian culture.

5.1.2 Chronology, periodization, and origin

The Weifang, Guye, and Niudaokou sites provide stratigraphical evidence (Table 44), showing that the Datuotou culture should be later than the Longshan culture, and earlier than the Weifang III culture. Since the Weifang III culture is contemporary with the end of the Shang period and the beginning of the Zhou period, the Datuotou culture should not be later than the first phase of the Yin Xu. Besides, several radiocarbon dates from the Sanguan and Qianbao sites (Appendix) fall mainly between 1900-1300 BCE, corresponding to the relative chronology based on the stratigraphical evidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weifang (T8)</th>
<th>Niudaokou</th>
<th>Guye</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Layer</td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Weifang III</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Datuotou</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV, V</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 44. Stratigraphical evidence of the Datuotou culture.

Scholars differ slightly in their opinions on the periodization of the Datuotou culture in view of the stratigraphical evidence and pottery assemblages. As suggested by Wu En, who divides the Datuotou culture into two types; Datuotou and Huliuhe. Both types are synchronous in development though the former is bordered on the north by the Lower Xiajiadian culture, while the latter is bordered on the east by the bronze cultures, west of the Taihang Mountain. Therefore, Wu En proposes a three-phase periodization of the Datuotou culture. The early phase is characterized by the earth pit graves that were sometimes built with a second platform, and tripod cooking wares, such as a cylinder-shaped Li, and oblique-belly Li without feet, and so on. The middle phase is represented by the cylinder-shaped Li with shorter feet and crotch, and round-belly Li in the typical Shang style. During the late phase, some cist graves emerged north of the Datuotou type, meanwhile, some urn burials appeared in the

---

661 The Weifang III culture will be discussed in the next section.
Huliuhe. The cylindrical-shaped Li with shorter feet and body, and a round-belly and oblique belly in a strong Shang-style, as well as the angular-shouldered Li came into vogue (Table 45; Fig. 111a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Representative remains</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Date (BCE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>Weifang III, Zhangjiayuan 9T1③; Sanguan 82m2008, 82M2010</td>
<td>Earth pit graves; the dead lying in an extended supine position; cylinder-shaped Li, oblique-belly Li without feet, round belly Li.</td>
<td>1900-1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Zhangjiayuan 79T②, 65F4; Sanguan 82M2047, 82H2022, Qianbao 82F1</td>
<td>Earth pit graves; cylinder-shaped Li with shorter feet; round-belly Li in the Shang style appeared.</td>
<td>1700-1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>Zhangjiayuan 65T1④; Lijiadian M1; cist graves of Xiaoguanzhuang; Qianbao 82 TB1②; Sishilipo 81H28</td>
<td>Some cist graves and urn burials; cylinder-shaped with shorter feet and body; more Shang-style Li; angular-shouldered Li appeared.</td>
<td>1500-1400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 45. Periodization of the Datuotou culture.

As we know, the cylinder-shaped Li (Fig. 111a, 1-6) reflects the close relations between the Lower Xiajiadian culture and the Datuotou culture, implying that the former may have spread southwards. However, the typical tripod cooking wares such as the round-belly Li and Yan of the Datuotou culture are seen neither in the Lower Xiajiadian culture nor in its precursor. Thus, the traditional opinion, which regards the Lower Xiajiadian culture as the origin of the Datuotou culture is heavily questioned, though their close relations cannot be neglected.

Wu En proposes that the Datuotou culture originated from the Longshan culture in Hebei, that is represented by Xueshan II. However, Xueshan III is attributed to the Datuotou culture. The Xueshan site provides stratigraphical evidence, showing that Xueshan I, II, and III were continuous in their cultural development; for example, tripod-cooking wares-Yan and round-belly-Li were very common in Xueshan II (Fig. 111b). Accordingly, this study prefers to believe that the Datuotou culture originated from Xueshan II. As for the offspring of the Datuotou culture, it is accepted by some scholars that the Weifang III culture originated from the Datuotou culture, which will

---

662 Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 46-47.
be elaborated upon in the next section.

5.2.3 Metal objects

Dozens of metal objects have been found in the Datuotou culture, including 5 knives, 4 arrowheads, 8 earrings, 3 rings, 2 plaques, some needles, and 1 gold armlet⁶⁶³ (Fig. 111c). Most of them are small ornaments in simple forms. In addition, the bronze earrings with one pointed end and another flaring end are quite remarkable. The armlet found from the tomb at the Qinggongtai site was made from gold.

If we look back on the copper and bronze objects found from the Qijia culture (Fig. 099b) and the Siba culture (Fig. 104b), undoubtedly, the bronze objects of the Datuotou culture (Fig. 111c) show great similarities to them. In view of the amount, types, and date of the bronze objects in northwest China, we can infer that the bronze metallurgy of the Datuotou culture may have been heavily influenced or even imported from northwest China. Afterwards, the metal technique was probably introduced from the Datuotou culture into the Lower Xiajiadian culture via the Yanshan since less bronze earrings were unearthed from the Lower Xiajiadian culture until now⁶⁶⁴.

The use of bronze objects was a great leap in the Datuotou culture. It is worth mentioning that one stone mold for an axe with copper ashes was collected from the Guye site. Slag was discovered in some of the sites, indicating that the local people had grasped some technological skills though only small-scale bronze objects have been found so far. No further information on a metallurgical analysis is accessible.

5.2 Weifang III culture

5.2.1 Definition and distribution

The Weifang III culture is named after the third phase of the Weifang site which yielded remains of one stove and two bodies together with potteries, stonewares, animal bones, bronze chisels and so on⁶⁶⁵. It is distributed mainly in the south of the Yanshan, bordered by the Taihang Mountain on the west, the Luanhe Valley on the east, and the Jumahe region on the south (Map 21). Many sites have been identified as the Weifang III culture, including Dongmenggezhuang⁶⁶⁶, Xiematai⁶⁶⁷, Beifudi⁶⁶⁸, Tazhao II⁶⁶⁹ and Zhenjiangying⁶⁷⁰. Of them, some sites have been found together with

---

⁶⁶⁴ Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 55.
⁶⁶⁶ Ma H. L. 1983, 478.
⁶⁶⁷ TJLK 1996, 14.
bronze objects (Table 42).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Contexts</th>
<th>Bronze objects</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangjun, Ji, Tianjin</td>
<td>6 tombs</td>
<td>Ritual objects</td>
<td>TJLBK et al. 1988, 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mashao, Qian’an, Hebei</td>
<td>collected</td>
<td>Ritual objects</td>
<td>Li/Yin 88-89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donghangezhuang, Lulong, Hebei</td>
<td>1 tomb</td>
<td>Ding; Gui; bow-shaped object; gold armlets</td>
<td>Tang Y. M. 1982, 44-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chenshantou, Luan, Hebei</td>
<td>1 tomb</td>
<td>Ding; Gui; axes; bow-shaped objects</td>
<td>Meng/Zhao 1994, 376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiaoshandongzhuang, Qian’an, Hebei</td>
<td>tombs</td>
<td>Ritual objects; gold armlets, earrings</td>
<td>Li/Yin 1995, 58-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liujiache, Beijing</td>
<td>Tomb M1</td>
<td>Ritual objects; horse and chariot fittings; gold armlet, earring, hair clasp</td>
<td>BJWG 1977, 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhangjiayuan, Ji, Tianjin</td>
<td>4 tombs</td>
<td>7 ritual objects; 4 gold earrings</td>
<td>TJLBK 1993, 311-323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaodaogou, Qinglong, Hebei</td>
<td>hoard</td>
<td>Sword; socket axe, Ge; deer-pommel, loop headed and bell-headed knife</td>
<td>HBWW 1962, 644-645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guye III, Tangshan, Hebei</td>
<td>8 pits</td>
<td>Knives</td>
<td>HBW 1984, 769-778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiancun III, Laishui, Hebei</td>
<td>38 pits</td>
<td>Earrings; knives</td>
<td>HBW 1992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 46. Bronze objects from the Weifang III culture.

Since the designation of the Weifang III culture was put forward in the 1980s, the research work has much improved with the increase of archaeological fieldwork (Table 47). However, some scholars still insist that the remains of the Weifang III site cannot represent an independent culture (Table 48). From Table 47 and Table 48, we can see that there is still great disagreement amongst scholars on this issue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, reference</th>
<th>Opinions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Han J. G.</td>
<td>1984, 220-229. There were two cultural systems in the Tianjin and Beijing regions during the Shang and Zhou period: local cultures and the Shangzhou culture. The former includes the Datuotou culture, Upper Weifang culture, and Upper Zhangjiayuan culture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summarizes three excavations of the Zhangjiayuan si te and corrects some mistakes in previous archaeological reports. He emphasizes that the Weifang III culture is a transitional culture between the Datuotou culture and the Upper Zhangjiayuan culture, dating to between the Upper Erligang culture period and the end of the Shang period.

He divides the Weifang III culture into four phases: phase I is parallel to the Yinxu II period; phase IV is parallel to the early Western Zhou period.

The cultures in the south of the Yanshan can be divided into two continuous types: Datuotou and Weifang III. The latter was distributed wider than the former.

She classified the bronzes found from south and north of the Yanshan into several groups: A group, represented by bronzes from the Liujiahe burials implies the Shang nobility moved northwards and influenced the local people; C group, including the bronzes found from Zhangjiayuan, Chenshantou, Donghangezhuang, Xiaoshandongzhuang, Mashao, and Bangjun, should be ascribed to the Weifang III culture.

Remains of the Zhangjiayuan site belonged to the Yan culture; however remains of the Weifang III and the Weiyingzì site, which lies north of the Yanshan should be regarded together as the Weifang III culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, reference</th>
<th>Opinions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Li B. Q. 1994, 131-143</td>
<td>He attributes the so-called Weifang III culture and remains of the Upper Zhangjiayuan site to one and the same culture. In addition, he divides them into 3 periods and 5 phases from the Yinxu II period to the early Western Zhou period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liang/Yu 2001, 17-23</td>
<td>Remains of the Weifang III site and the Zhangjiayuan site represent two parallel types of one and the same culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ji L. M. 2002.</td>
<td>The cultures distributed in the south of the Yanshan can be divided into Datuotou, Lower Xiajiadian, Upper Zhangjiayuan, Jiyan, Upper Xiajiadian, Jundushan, and curved-bladed bronze sword cultures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In short, the subject of this argument is whether or not the local cultural remains distributed in south of the Yanshan during the late Shang period to the early Western Zhou period can represent one independent culture, namely the Upper Zhangjiayuan culture, or should it be classified as two continuous cultures: the Weifang III culture and the Upper Zhangjiayuan culture. The stratigraphical evidence from the Weifang and Xiematai sites provides the chronological sequence. The typical Upper
Zhangjiayuan potteries, such as the high-necked tripods-Li with overtopped lips, joint-crotched tripods-Li in the Zhou style, socket-leg tripod-Li in the Shang style and thick-lipped vessels-Gui are scarce in the Weifang III site. Accordingly, this study prefers to believe that the Weifang III culture and the Upper Zhangjiayuan culture represent two continuous cultures in the south of the Yanshan Complex.

5.2.2 Chronology, cultural elements, and origin

The chronology of the Weifang III culture suggested by the excavators, from the Shang and Zhou period to the beginning of the Eastern Zhou period has been seriously questioned. Until now, the opinions on the chronology and periodization of the Weifang III culture still differ. With respect to the periodization, Yang Jianhua and Wu En propose a two-phase chronology (Table 49), which fall in the three radiocarbon dates resulted from the Liujiafen site: 2770±75 B. P., 2980±75 B. P., 2920±80 B. P. (Appendix).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Characters</th>
<th>Date (BCE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early</strong></td>
<td>The second layer of the Weifang site; Fuwei III; Zunhua; Lidarenzhuang H2; Donghangezhuang; Shangheyingzi;</td>
<td>Vertical slim cord mark decorated on pottery; tripod cooking wares such as Yan and lace-ringed Lì</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Late</strong></td>
<td>The first layer of the Weifang site; Zhangjiayua; Bangjun; Jiancun H7</td>
<td>Crossed thick cord mark decorated on pottery; potteries with more Central Plain style</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 49. Periodization of the Weifang III culture proposed by Wu En and Yang Jianhua.

The cultural elements contained in the Weifang III culture are quite complicated. The hoard and burials found together with bronze objects can be divided into three groups: A, ritual bronzes in the Shang style; B, Northern-style bronzes; C, mixture of ritual bronzes and Northern-style bronzes. The Lijiaya culture, distributed in the north of Shaanxi and northwest of Shanxi (see Chapter 4.2) has also such three kinds of bronzes. Regarding the ritual bronzes, they may have been owned by the central China people who moved into the northern region or the local people who gained them by trade or other ways. Moreover, the gold earrings with one flaring end and armlets with fan-shaped ends, which were buried in the Liujiahe site do not seem to belong to the Shang people though some bronze ritual objects were discovered as well. As proposed

---

671 It will be discussed in the next section.
by Wu En, the Weifang III culture, centered itself on Tianjin, Beijing and Tangshan, represents a local bronze culture, though it was influenced strongly by the Shang culture. The ritual objects probably implied the social status and richness of the local people who liked to imitate the funeral practices from the Shang people⁶⁷³.

As mentioned in chapter 4.4.2, it is mostly accepted by scholars that the Weifang III culture originated from the Datuotou culture, which can be proven from two aspects. On one hand, the Weifang, Xiematai, Jiancun sites show that the remains of the Weifang III culture overlie on remains of the Datuotou culture, implying their continuous relations. On the other hand, many features of the Datuotou culture can also be seen in the Weifang III culture, such as round-belly Li, angular-shouldered pots, gold earrings with one flaring end, bronze knives, arrowheads and so on (Fig. 111a; Fig. 112a; Fig. 111c; Fig. 112b).

5.2.3 Metal objects

As mentioned above, the metal objects of the Weifang III culture consist of three styles: Northern-style, Shang style, and mixture of two styles. Of the bronze ritual objects, tripods Ding and Gui (Fig. 112b, 17.-19.22) are the most common. Besides, some inscriptions on the bronzes are still identifiable, such as ‘戈父丁’, ‘天’, ‘口乍？鼎’ and so on.

In brief, the main characteristic of the Weifang III culture is the northern-style bronzes (Fig. 112b, 1-16). It is worth mentioning that the pick-dagger (Fig. 112b, 6) may well be the precursor of the crane hacks, which were very popular in northern China in the later period. Furthermore, the loop-headed knives (Fig. 111b, 3) and gold earrings with a round and pointed end are also seen in the Siba culture which was distributed in the northwest of China. The deer-headed swords and knives, bell-headed knives, socketed axes and bow-shaped objects⁶⁷⁴ were very common in northern China. Apart from the bronze objects, gold earrings and armlets also have a sharp local style, indicating the developed metallurgical techniques used at that time. The metallurgical analysis has not been carried out.

5.3 Upper Zhangjiayuan culture

5.3.1 Definition and distribution

The Upper Zhangjiayuan culture was named after the fourth type of remains from the Zhangjiayuan site that was discovered in the third season of an excavation in 1987. Remains revealed in the second season of 1979 are regarded as the Weifang III culture.

⁶⁷³ Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 121-122.
⁶⁷⁴ The function of the bow-shaped objects aroused arguments amongst scholars. It will be discussed in the following sections.
Except for the Zhangjiayuan site, the third layer of Niudaokou\textsuperscript{675}, later remains of Guye\textsuperscript{676}, Tanshan\textsuperscript{677}, Xiematai\textsuperscript{678} are identified as the Upper Zhangjiayuan culture as well. Besides, some sites were found together with bronze objects, including Baoshenmiao, Dongnangou, Liushugou, Xiaohenan, Niuquanziliang, Donggoudaoxia, Baifu, Xibozi, Zhengjiangying and Bangjun (Table 50; Map 22). Of them, the cultural ascription of some sites aroused great arguments. Compared to the Weifang III culture, the Zhangjiayuan culture was distributed in a smaller region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Contexts</th>
<th>Bronze objects</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baoshenmiao, Tangshan, Hebei</td>
<td>collected</td>
<td>5 stone molds for spear, axe and knife</td>
<td>An Z. M. 1954, 81-82.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donggoudaoxia, Tucheng, Hebei</td>
<td>1 cist grave</td>
<td>knife; awl; chisel; mirror; bulb and stone mold</td>
<td>Bai G. 1999, 23-27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhengjiangying, Beijing</td>
<td>Shangzhou III layer</td>
<td>Earring</td>
<td>ZT 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangjun, Ji, Tianjin</td>
<td>Settlements</td>
<td>Arrowhead</td>
<td>TJLBK et al. 1988, 98.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dongnangou, Pingquan, Hebei</td>
<td>26 tombs (16 cist graves)</td>
<td>sword; dagger; knife; plaque; bulb; earring</td>
<td>Zheng S. Z. 1977, 51-55, Fig. 116.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baifu, Changping, Beijing</td>
<td>3 tombs</td>
<td>over 100 bronze objects; some jades</td>
<td>BJWG 1976, 246-258; Fig. 113a-113c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xibozi, Yanqing, Beijing</td>
<td>hoard</td>
<td>Fu-cooking ware; Ding; spoon; dagger; knife; awl; axe; adze; bulb</td>
<td>BJWG 1979, 227-230; Fig. 115.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiaohenan, Xinglong, Hebei</td>
<td>hoard</td>
<td>10 bronzes: sword, dagger, spear, axe, knife, cover</td>
<td>Wang F. 1990, 57-58; Fig. 114.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 50. Bronzes from the Upper Zhangjiayuan culture.\textsuperscript{679}

\textsuperscript{675} TJLBK et al. 1991, 577-586.
\textsuperscript{676} HBW 1984, 769-778.
\textsuperscript{677} JMHK 1988, 421-453.
\textsuperscript{678} TJLBK 1991, 14-24.
\textsuperscript{679} The cultural attribution of the Baifu, Xibozi, Xiaohenan and Dongnangou sites are still under dispute. See chapter 5.3.2.
As mentioned before, it is still a matter of dispute whether the Upper Zhangjiayuan represents an independent culture. Han Jiagu holds the view that the Datuotou culture, the Weifang III culture and the Upper Zhangjiayuan culture are the continuous bronze cultures in the south of the Yanshan Complex. Some other scholars believe that the Datuotou culture (or the so-called Lower Xiajiadian culture) was succeeded by the Zhangjiayuan culture or Upper Zhangjiayuan culture, including both remains from the upper Weifang site and upper Zhangjiayuan site. In fact, these two arguments differ only on whether the Weifang III culture or the Upper Zhangjiayuan culture represents one independent culture respectively.

This study prefers to regard them as two separate cultures. Firstly, some typical potteries of the Zhangjiayuan culture are absent in the Weifang III culture. Secondly, some sites, such as Beifeng, Duntai and Tanshan were discovered with little remains similar to the Weifang III culture. Thirdly, the Xiematai site provides stratigraphical evidence for the relative date of the high-necked tripod-Li with a layered lip and the straight-necked tripod-Li with raised patterns. Finally, the Yan State, which was subinfeuded by the Zhou Dynasty around the Tianjin and Beijing regions, may have caused the cultural changes.

5.3.2 Chronology, origin, and cultural attribution of some sites

As far as the cultural attribution of the Baifu cemetery, Dongnangou cemetery, Xibozi hoard, and Xiaohenan hoard (Table 50) is concerned, the scholars have different opinions. Some scholars propose that the Baifu cemetery (Fig. 113a-c) and Xiaohenan hoards (Fig. 114) as well as the Liulihe cemetery were owned by the Shang people of the Yan State who were influenced by the northern people. In addition, the Xibozi hoard (Fig. 115) and Dongnangou cemetery (Fig. 116) reflect the impact of the Upper Xiajiadian culture, which was distributed in the north of the Yanshan. While Wu En ascribes all of them to the Upper Zhangjiayuan culture on the assumption that the local nobility imitated the funeral practices from the Central Plain or north of the Yanshan.

As we know, the Baifu and Xiaohenan cemeteries are characterized by the tombs built with a coffin and outer-coffin, buried together with some bronze ritual vessels, horse fittings, and some northern-style weapons and tools (Fig. 113a-111c; Fig. 114). The Xibozi hoard yielded many typical northern-style bronzes (Fig. 115), such as tripod-Li and cooking-ware Fu with double ears (Fig. 115, 22-23) which are very distinctive. The Dongnangou cemetery is recognized by cist graves and northern-style bronzes

---

682 It means 姬姓燕国（Ji xing Yan guo—the Yan State with the last name of Ji）.
The cist grave was also very common in the Upper Xiajiadian culture. However, the assemblage of bronzes differs between the Dongnangou cemetery and the Upper Xiajiadian culture.

In the process of dissemination, cultures affect and communicate with each other, which probably resulted in the similarities of pottery or bronze objects between cultures. However, the burial pattern of each culture is hard to change even with frequent connections or impacts from the outside. Accordingly, this study agrees to propose that the Baifu and Xiaohenan sites reflect the Shang people of the Yan State were influenced by the northern people and northern cultures, and the Dongnangou cemetery and the Xibozi hoard provide evidence that the Upper Xiajiadian culture may have gone over to the south of the Yanshan. That is, these four sites were unfit for any culture in the south of the Yanshan Complex.

These four sites are dated from the middle Western Zhou period to the early Spring and Autumn period. Therefore, Wu En proposes that the Upper Zhangjiayuan culture should end by the late Western Zhou period and the beginning of the Spring and Autumn period. As mentioned above, this study excludes these sites from the Upper Zhangjiayuan culture. Accordingly, the chronology of the Upper Zhangjiayuan culture is limited to the early and middle Western Zhou period, roughly between 1100-900 BCE.

Conclusively, the characteristics of the Upper Zhangjiayuan culture are not very distinctive until now. It is hoped that future archaeological fieldwork will provide fresh materials for the Upper Zhangjiayuan culture and new clues for the cultural ascription of the Baifu, Dongnangou, Xibozi, and Xiaohenan sites.

### 5.3.3 Metal Objects

Some stone molds for adz, socket spear, and knife were found in the Upper Zhangjiayuan culture (Fig. 117b, 7-12), including single mold and joint molds. So far, only a small quantity of the bronze objects have been identified as belonging to the Upper Zhangjiayuan culture, consisting of adzes, knives, bulbs, mirrors, awls and chisels (Fig. 117b, 1-6). The mirror-shaped objects with a bridge button on the back (Fig. 117b, 4) may have been used to decorate the clothes, which was very common in the Eurasian Steppe. The knives with nipple protrusions are quite remarkable (Fig. 117b, 5,10). According to the stone molds shown in Fig. 117b, 11 and Fig. 117b, 12, we can infer that the socket spear is about 13-15cm in length with protrusions and hooks on the handle. This kind of spear was also seen in the Kayue culture (Fig. 101d, 24), which is 61.5cm long.

---

685 The cultural relations will be discussed more in chapter 6.
With the expansion of the Yan State in the Western Zhou, it is understandable that the Upper Zhangjiayuan culture was distributed in a smaller region in contrast to the Weifang III culture. In addition, the south of the Yanshan region became a cultural melting pot, so it is quite common that one site is unearthed with mixed cultural remains. Therefore, it is hard to identify sites with only the remains of the Upper Zhangjiayuan culture. Compared to the earlier bronze cultures in the south of the Yanshan Complex, the smaller quantity of bronze objects from the Upper Zhangjiayuan culture does not imply that the metallurgical technique went backward. The metal objects found at the Baifu, Xibozi, Dongnangou and Xiaohegou sites prove the complicated cultural interactions in the Yanshan region during the Shang and Zhou period.

5.4 Yuhuangmiao culture

5.4.1 Definition and distribution

The Yuhuangmiao culture was formally put forward by Jin Fengyi, on the basis of the research of the bronze dagger-shaped swords with straight blade found in the northern Hebei region\textsuperscript{686}. In previous research, the excavators of the Yuhuangmiao cemetery address it as the Shanrong\textsuperscript{687} culture because they believe that the owners of the cemetery were the ancient Shanrong people\textsuperscript{688}. Later, some scholars questioned its ethnic ascription and put forward the ‘Beixinbao culture’ after the excavation at the Beixinbao site\textsuperscript{689}. Immediately after, Yang Jianhua divided the cultural remains of the northern Hebei region during the Zhou period into five groups: 1) the Baifu cemetery in Changping; 2) the Xibozi hoard in Yanqing; 3) the Dongnangou cemetery in Pingquan; 4) the Eastern Zhou cemeteries in Jundunshan; 5) the fourth and fifth remains of the Baimiao site in Zhangjiakou\textsuperscript{690}. Of them, the fourth group is quite complicated, and is roughly identical to the so-called ‘Yuhuangmiao culture’.

The Beijing Institute of Cultural Relics excavated the Yuhuangmiao, Hulugou, and Xilianguang cemeteries in the Yanqing county between 1985 and 1990. Altogether, about 570 burials were excavated at the three cemeteries, along with different kinds of grave goods, numbering about 20,000 items in all. The Yuhuangmiao cemetery is the largest of the three, with 400 excavated graves and lots of information\textsuperscript{691}. It is worth mentioning that some scholars have made an in-depth study on the Yuhuangmiao cemetery, with particular attention being paid to explain the social division and

\textsuperscript{687} One ancient tribe described in Chinese document.
\textsuperscript{688} BWSR 1989, 17-35.
\textsuperscript{689} Lin Y. 1999b, 174-183.
\textsuperscript{690} Yang J. H. 2000, 22-30.
\textsuperscript{691} BWSR 1989, 17-35.
differentiation, subsistence economies, ethnic ascription, and cultural relations with one another, in view of the environment and layout of the cemetery, mortuary practice, burial goods, and object assemblages. In addition, the mortuary practice such as face-masking, earrings, necklaces, and animal-style plaques are the most remarkable characteristics of the Yuhuangmiao cemetery. The individuality of the Yuhuangmiao cemetery is distinctive, so this study prefers to use the designation of the ‘Yuhuangmiao culture’ for the remains found, which are similar to the Yuhuangmiao cemetery.

With increasing archaeological fieldwork being carried out since the 1980s, the research of the Yuhuangmiao culture has been much improved, though some scholars still hold different opinions on some points. On the distribution of the Yuhuangmiao culture, the scholars are in agreement with the opinion that it reached Zhangjiakou in the west, and Luanping and Longhua in the east. The center of the Yuhuangmiao culture is in the northern hilly areas of Hebei that is located north of the Taihang Mountain, including the Jundushan and Yanshan mountains. Except for the Beixinbao, Qingzigou, Luotuoliang, Paotaishan, Baimiao, Ganzibao, Nihezi, Xiaobaiyang, Yuhuangmiao, Hulugou, Xiliangguang, Lishugoumen, Longqingxia, and Daolazui sites (Table 51; Map 23), Wu En confirms the Hanjiafen and Huagtupo sites as belonging to the Yuhuangmiao culture too.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Contexts</th>
<th>Bronze objects</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beixinbao, Huailai, Hebei</td>
<td>2 tombs with animal victims</td>
<td>Ritual objects; weapons, horse and chariot fittings, ornaments; gold earrings and buttons</td>
<td>Fig. 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qingzigou, Luanping, Hebei</td>
<td>2 tombs</td>
<td>Swords, arrowheads, knives, axes, bulbs, plaques etc.</td>
<td>Fig. 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luotuoliang, Longhua, Hebei</td>
<td>1 tomb</td>
<td>Sword, knife, bead, arrowhead, bulbs</td>
<td>Fig. 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paotaishan, Heshenha</td>
<td>4 tombs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fig. 121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

693 Arne 1933, Tarif I-VIII; XIV, 2. This site produced over 100 bronze objects and some gold objects, including swords, axes, knives, arrowheads, belt hooks, awls, chisels, animal-style plaques, buttons, and ornaments.
694 Arne 1933, Tarif IX-XIII; XIV, 1.3.4. This site yielded about 90 bronze objects, including swords, knives, axes, arrowheads, loops, animal-style plaques, and ornaments.
Table 51. Discoveries of bronze objects from the Yuhuangmiao culture suggested by Wu En.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ganzibao, Huailai, Hebei⁶⁹⁹</td>
<td>21 tombs, Over 1100 bronze objects, including ritual objects, weapons, horse and chariot fittings, ornaments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baimiao, Pangjiabao, Zhangjiakou, Hebei⁷⁰⁰</td>
<td>1 pit and 4 tombs, Sword (collected)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nihezi, Zhangjiakou, Hebei⁷⁰¹</td>
<td>collected, Sword, axe, horse bit, plaque.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiaobaiyang, Zhangjiakou, Hebei⁷⁰²</td>
<td>48 tombs, Swords, axes, knives, awls, arrowheads, chisels, ornaments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liushugoumen, Luanping, Hebei⁷⁰³</td>
<td>tombs, Weapons, ornaments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daolazui, Zhulu, Hebei⁷⁰⁴</td>
<td>1 tomb, vessels; figures; Ge; knife; gold necklace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longqingxia, Beijing⁷⁰⁵</td>
<td>12 tombs, Ritual objects, horse fittings, ornaments, dagger, arrowheads, daggers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuhuangmiao, Yanqing, Beijing⁷⁰⁶</td>
<td>Over 400 tombs, Ritual objects, weapons, ornaments, gold objects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scholars hold different opinions regarding the cultural ascription of some sites such as Baifu (Fig. 113a-c), Xibozi (Fig. 115), Dongnangou (Fig. 116), and Baimiao (Fig. 123). As discussed in Chapter 4.6, Wu En ascribes the Baifu, Xibozi, and Dongnangou sites to the Upper Zhangjiayuan culture, and the Baimiao site to the

⁶⁹⁹ He/Liu 1993, 23-75; HBWX 1980, 30.
⁷⁰¹ Zhang/Tao 1983, 94.
⁷⁰² Tao Z. Y. 1987, 41-49.
⁷⁰⁵ BJWY 1994, 32-45.
⁷⁰⁶ BWSR 1989, 17-35.
Yuhuangmiao culture. While Jin Fengyi attributes the Xibozi and Dongnangou sites to the Yuhuangmiao culture. On this issue, this study agrees with Yang Jinhua and would not ascribe these sites to any other culture for the time being, but regards them as separate groups found in the northern Hebei region during the Zhou period.

5.4.2 Chronology and some problems

As we can see in Table 51, burials are the representative remains of the Yuhuangmiao culture. The burial goods, especially the bronze ritual objects similar to those found from the Yan State and Central Plain provide vital information for the relative chronology. Wu En proposes a two-phase periodization for the Yuhuangmiao culture. The early phase is marked by the Yuhuangmiao, Xiliangguang, Hulugou, Xiaobaiyang and Ganzibao sites; the late phase is represented by the Beixinbao, Lishugou, Nihezi, and Paotaishan sites. In addition, the sand-inclusioned potteries with a reddish-brown slip and mud grey potteries were very common, including the high-necked potteries, Ding, high Dou and so on (Fig. 130a).

The Yuhuangmiao cemetery was dated to the Spring and Autumn period (770-448 BCE) by the principle investigator, Jin Fengyi who proposes the Shanrong tribe as its owner, living in the north of the Yan State during that time according to the Chinese annals. Due to the different cultural ascriptions of the Xibozi and Dongnangou sites, opinions on the date of the Yuhuangmiao culture differ accordingly. Without regard to the Xibozi and Dongnangou sites, the Yuhuangmiao culture falls approximately between the early Spring and Autumn period and the early Warring States period, roughly equal to 800-400 BCE. So far, only one radiocarbon dates (cal. 790-401 BCE, see Appendix) from the Yuhuangmiao culture is in accordance with the chronology that archaeologists proposed. The other three radiocarbon dates (cal. 1088-769 BCE, 2202-1766 BCE, 1219-796 BCE, see Appendix) are out of this range.

In addition, the ethnic attribution, economic subsistence (semi sedentary or pastoral nomadism), origin, and offspring of the Yuhuangmiao culture are still in dispute.

5.4.3 Metal objects

5.4.3.1 Types

The Yuhuangmiao culture was a late bronze culture with an advanced metallurgical industry, distributed north of the Yan State during the Zhou period. The bronze objects of the Yuhuangmiao culture can be divided into two styles: Central Plain-style and local northern style. The former includes ritual vessels such as Ding, Li, Lei, Ye, Dun, and Dou as well as daggers, some horse fittings (Fig. 130b), and some typical patterns of the Central Plain style, such as the Kui-dragon design on the handle of the sword, indicating the influence from the Yan State. The latter is plentiful in types, including
vessels, tools, weapons, personal ornaments and horse fittings (Fig. 130c, A, B, C, D). As we know, the bronze cooking ware-Fu with deep round belly, ring base and double looped ears (Fig. 130c, A1) was one special vessel used by the nomadic person. Such Fu is not only found at the Yuhuangmiao cemetery but also at the Ganzibao and Beixinbao sites. Bronze knives were the most common in quantity in the Yuhuangmiao culture. Among them, the big loop-headed knives with a circular ridge (Fig. 130c, A10) were seen in most cemeteries. Some knives decorated with saw-teeth patterns or triangular patterns on the handle or with antenna head are regarded as the typical Northern-style bronzes (Fig. 130c, A3, 8, 9, 18). Another kind of knife with projections on the handle (Fig. 130c, A19) was also very popular in the Upper Xiajiadian culture and Shiertaiyingzi culture which were distributed mainly in the north of the Yanshan region. It is interesting to note that the bronze awl (Fig. 130c, A7) was normally combined with bone or wood handles and placed in bronze tubes which are decorated with animal patterns, teeth patterns, check designs, and vein patterns (Fig. 130c, A2, 4, 13, 14, 20). Furthermore, the bronze axes, socketed axes, adzes (Fig. 130c, 5, 6, 15-17) were also very popular in northern China. It is worth mentioning that the angular-ridged swords with complicated decorations on the handle and antenna heads (Fig. 130c, B 1-11) were quite prevalent in burials. Some curve bladed swords were found as well (Fig. 130c, B12-14). A large number of personal ornaments made of bronze, gold, agate, turquoise were discovered in burials as well as some stone wares and bone wares. They include belt hooks, buttons, bulbs, earrings, necklaces, beads, and animal-style plaques (Fig. 130c, C). In particular, about two-thirds of the Yuhuangmiao burials have yielded bronze earrings. Many of these personal ornaments are decorated with a variety of animal designs, including the motifs of horses, tigers, deer, fantasy animals and other wild and domestic animals. Furthermore, the well-preserved tombs in the Yuhuangmiao cemetery provide evidence for the function of some ornaments as well.

5.4.3.2 Metallurgical analysis

As mentioned above, we can see that the big bronze vessels were scarce in the Yuhuangmiao culture; knives, swords, and axes were very common; and personal ornaments comprised the majority of the burial goods. A total of twenty-three samples found from Jundushan in Yanqing county (Table 52) were examined with the energy spectrum analysis of scanning electron microscope707. From Table 52, the bronze alloying techniques used in these bronze objects were quite advanced. Firstly, the tri-element alloy with tin as the leading element was popular. In weapons and tools particularly, the average tin content exceeds that of lead, and the tin content is not low, which is in accordance with modern technological principles.

For example, the swords contain 12.66% tin and 5.09% lead on average; the knives contain 10.85% tin and 2.48% lead on average; the adzes and axes contain 7.82% tin and 2.52% lead on average. It is worth mentioning that the body of the buckles contain 11-14% tin and 3-6% lead, however the pin-stick of the buckles contain 22% tin and 5-6% lead. All data indicates that advanced metallurgical techniques have been used in such small ornaments. By contrast, the alloy with lead as the leading element was only found in two cases (sample B51 and B52, see Table 52) out of 23 samples. In addition, neither copper nor arsenic and zinc alloy were determined.

So far, 64 samples of the Upper Xiajiadian culture have been examined. Of them, 24 artifacts are Cu-Sn-Pb alloys, and 38 artifacts are Cu-Pb-Sn alloys that contain more lead than tin. Besides, a total of 11 out of 39 swords were Cu-Sn-Pb alloys, 25 are Cu-Pb-Sn alloys\(^\text{708}\). As we know, the strength and hardness of the lead alloy is less than the tin alloy. Accordingly, the alloying techniques used in the Yuhuangmiao culture was more developed than those used in the Upper Xiajiadian culture. Meanwhile, the advanced metallurgy should have met the needs of the growing population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lab. No.</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Original no.</th>
<th>Sampling position</th>
<th>Composition (%)</th>
<th>Attribution of alloy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cu</td>
<td>Sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B38</td>
<td>Cover</td>
<td>YYM2:5</td>
<td>Button</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B39</td>
<td>Ding</td>
<td>YYM2:2</td>
<td>Foot</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B40</td>
<td>Axe</td>
<td>YYM13:4</td>
<td>Ring of socket</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B41</td>
<td>Knife</td>
<td>YYM175:3</td>
<td>Blade</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B42</td>
<td>Knife</td>
<td>YYM99:2</td>
<td>Handle</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B43</td>
<td>Knife</td>
<td>YC</td>
<td>Blade</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B44</td>
<td>Adz</td>
<td>YYM95:5</td>
<td>Ring of socket</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B45</td>
<td>Adz</td>
<td>YYM17:7</td>
<td>Blade</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B46</td>
<td>Sword</td>
<td>YXM6</td>
<td>Ear on blade</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B47-1</td>
<td>Belt</td>
<td>282.8</td>
<td>Buckle</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B48-1</td>
<td>Buckle</td>
<td>YYM95:9</td>
<td>Pin stick</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pin stick</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ring</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ring</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Button average</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pin stick average</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B49-1</td>
<td>Buckle</td>
<td>YYM95:9</td>
<td>Pin stick</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pin stick</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ring</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ring</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Buckle average</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pin stick</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Pin stick</th>
<th>21.0</th>
<th>7.3</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>0.9</th>
<th>Cu-Sn-Pb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B50-1</td>
<td>Buckle</td>
<td>YYM95:9 Pin stick</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pin stick</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ring</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Buckle average</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pin stick average</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B51-1</td>
<td>Gild cowrie</td>
<td>YYM2:15 Ring</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B52-1</td>
<td>Arrow head</td>
<td>YYM18:7 Socket</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tang</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Body</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blade</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Body</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blade</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Body</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shoulder</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shoulder</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B53-1</td>
<td>Arrow head</td>
<td>YYM18:7 Tang (II)</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B54-1</td>
<td>Awl</td>
<td>YYM32:6 Body</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blade</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Body</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blade</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Body</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shoulder</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shoulder</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B55-1</td>
<td>Sword</td>
<td>YYM17:2 Blade</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Body</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blade</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Body</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shoulder</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shoulder</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B56-1</td>
<td>Knife</td>
<td>YYM17:4 Blade</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B57-1</td>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>Y YM302:5 Body</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shoulder</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shoulder</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B58-1</td>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>Y YM302:5 Shoulder</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shoulder</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B63</td>
<td>Awl</td>
<td>Y YM34:6 Body</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shoulder</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shoulder</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B64</td>
<td>Awl</td>
<td>Y YM78 Body</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shoulder</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shoulder</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average composition (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adz (3)</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sword (2)</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Knife (4)</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arrowhead (2)</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Awl (3)</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bell (2)</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Buckle (3)</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cover for vessel (2)</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Belt hook (1)</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 52. Compositional analysis of the bronze objects from Jundushan (adapted from He/Jin/Wang 2002, 18-19 Table 1).

5.5 Summary

Compared to the North-central Complex, the bronze cultures in the south of the Yanshan Complex characterized by a mixture assemblage of both northern-style bronzes and central China style bronzes are more continuous (Fig. 136).
From the late Neolithic to the late Western Zhou period, the Datuotou, Weifang III, and Upper Zhangjiayuan cultures developed successively. There is also a cultural discontinuity during the late Western Zhou period to the early Spring and Autumn period (Fig. 136). Remains from the Dongnangou, Xiaohenan, Baifu, Xibozi sites fill in this gap; however, it is difficult to ascribe them to any culture. At the same time, the bronze cultures in the North-central Complex encountered such a break as well. In addition to the inconsistency of the excavation work carried out, this break may have been caused by some accidental disastrous events at that time.

After the Spring and Autumn period, the Yuhuangmiao culture emerged with splendid metal objects. It is interesting to note that the Yanglang, Taohongbala, Maoqinggou, and Yuhuangmiao cultures seemed to flourish simultaneously from west to east in northern China (Map 24). It was a booming time for northern-style bronzes. Meanwhile, the Yuhuangmiao culture presents its individuality in highly developed bronze swords, belt buckles, and horse and chariot fittings. The metallurgical industry of the Yuhuangmiao culture was highly matured.
Chapter 6 Chronological and cultural framework of bronzes in northern China

From chapter 3 to chapter 5, we can see that each cultural complex in northern China displays different cultural aspects. Besides, they show an imbalance of developments. The Northwest Complex took the lead in entering the Bronze Age, however developed much more slowly than the other complexes in the later period. The North-central Complex and south of the Yanshan Complex present a synchronization of processes with the former being slightly superior to the latter (Fig. 136; Map 24). In terms of Figure 136 and cultural relations discussed in previous chapters, each complex can be roughly divided into three periods. It is worth noting that there is a short time lapse between different periods in the Northwest Complex and the other two complexes. Accordingly, in the following sections, the periodic characteristics of each complex will be analyzed respectively in the first place; the North-central Complex and South of the Yanshan Complex will be analyzed as a unit. Thus, the dynamic development of each complex will unfold before us as well as the consequent varying correlations between them (Fig. 136).

6.1 Northwest Complex

6.1.1 From the late Neolithic to the early Shang period (2300-1500 BCE): the continuity of agricultural economics and the rise of the earliest copper/bronze metallurgy

As the Qijia and Siba cultures arose firstly in northwest China, this area entered the Bronze Age (Map 24). Nevertheless, the pottery-making industry was flourishing and prosperous at that time, while the copper/bronze industry was still in its infancy. By the late period of the Qijia culture, the leading subsistence in this area was based on farming. During this period, this area began to connect with north-central China and the Central Plain, meanwhile the local cultural features revealed themselves gradually.

The middle and west of the Gansu Province and east of the Qinghai Province used to be famous for its agricultural economics during the late Neolithic, especially the Majiaoyao-Banshan-Machang period. The Machang type, characterized by the delicately painted potteries spread to the most western part of the Hexi Corridor and the Tenggeli desert in Inner Mongolia. The Qijia culture, born of the Machang system with its highly developed agriculture, appeared to be largely based on settled farming as well until its late period. Previous research believed that the subsistence of the Qijia culture was largely based on animal husbandry.
Firstly, many remains of the settlements have been discovered. For example, in Qinghai, about 430 sites have been confirmed as belonging to the Qijia culture according to the survey. They are densely distributed within a certain area, especially in east Gansu region where better natural conditions are provided. In the Minhe county, 59 settlements have been found. In fact, settlements of many cultures are always discovered together in one site, not only the Qijia culture, but also the Majiaoyao, Kayue, Xindian, and Tangwang-style pottery. Houses were the main component of the settlements, consisting of three types: square houses with white limy clay plastered floor or rectangular houses with burned clay floors, cave dwellings plastered with white limy clay, and houses built with stone walls. The features of the settlements imply that the local people had a relatively settled life at that time.

Secondly, the remains of millet and its impressions on pottery were very common. Thirdly, many tools used for agriculture, including stone knives, axes, sickles, pestles, and mortars were frequently discovered in settlements and rarely seen in burials. Some other tools, such as stone spears, balls, arrowheads, and bone wares imply a certain amount of hunting and fishing at that time. Of the animal bones, pig are the most common; sheep, dogs, cattle and horses come next, indicating that domesticated animals were of great importance. For example, about 800 pig mandibles have been found at the Qijia culture sites, implying a widespread practice of pig-raising and a settled life.

As for the Siba culture, very little information about the structure of the houses and settlements has been published. At the Huoshaogou cemetery, grains of millet were stored in large pottery jars as burial goods, and the remains of sheep, pigs, horses, and cattle were found in large numbers. At the Donghuishan site, carbonized barley, wheat, rye, sorghum, and millet were also found. At the Sibatan site, some pig skulls were uncovered. In general, sheep were most frequently unearthed in the Siba sites. All of the animal and plant remains suggest that the Siba culture was dependent on a mixture of animal husbandry and settled farming.

In fact, scholars hold different opinions on the subsistence of the bronze cultures in the Northwest Complex. Shui Tao proposes that farming economics had totally declined after the late Qijia period, and then the pastoral economics played a leading role in the late bronze cultures in northwest China. In this regard, this study does not agree with him. Farming never bowed out of the Northwest Complex, and the farming subsistence mixed with animal husbandry started from the late Qijia period.

---

710 Including three subtypes: Majiayao, Banshan and Machang.
712 GSB 1979,143.
until the end of the Kayue culture. This opinion is in accordance with Shang Minjie and Zhang Wenli.

Many scholars attribute the change in subsistence to the change of the climate and environment. However, where, when, why, and how much the change of the ancient natural conditions effected the change of subsistence is a difficult issue.

In the metallurgical industry, copper was very popular in the Qijia culture and early Siba culture; arsenic-copper alloy was one of the important characteristics in the late Siba culture as well as tin-copper alloy was very common. This metallurgical process corresponds with Central Asia, however, differs with North-central China, south of the Yanshan, and the Central Plain. In general, the copper/bronze artifacts had not taken the place of potteries. The manufacture and use of the metal objects was still on a small scale.

6.1.2 From the early Shang to the early Western Zhou Period (1500-1050 BCE): the rise of animal husbandry and the initial development of the bronze metallurgy

The Kayue, Xindian, and Siwa cultures were distributed side by side from west to east (Map 24). They coexisted for a long time in northwest China. The second period of the Northwest Complex is equal to the first half part of these three cultures.

After the Kayue culture emerged, this area seems to have had more connections with the outside, in particular with the Central Plain and north-central China. Compared to the first period, the cultural aspects changed greatly. Animal husbandry became more and more important, while pottery remained in daily use and varied from region to region. Bronze metallurgy developed gradually.

As for the subsistence of the Kayue culture, there are four different opinions. One is inclined to believe that the Kayue culture was based on a mixture of farming and fishing, with animal husbandry constituting the main element. Shui Tao believes that the Kayue culture was based on farming in the early period, and animal husbandry in the late period. Some other scholars hold the view that the subsistence of the Kayue culture differs in regions. The regions near Xining, such as the Panjialiang and Shangsunjiazhai sites were based on a farming-pastoral subsistence and farming was relatively weak. The region lying to the west of Xining or far away from Xining represented by the Dahuazhongzhuang site, was supplied by animal

---

715 This will be discussed particularaly in the following section.
717 ZWL 2003, 87-119.
husbandry, and farming played a minor part. By contrast, in the Ahatela region, animal husbandry was the main means of subsistence though farming still played a great role. Some scholars think that the owners of the Kayue culture led a pastoral life.

Zhang Wenli did a comprehensive reanalysis on the subsistence of the Kayue culture, based on the attribution of sites, characteristics of the settlements and potteries, and the assemblage of tools. He concludes that most of the settlements of the Kayue culture were small and discovered from the early to the late period, suggesting a settled life during the whole period. Furthermore, the subsistence differs not only in regions but also in time. Animal victims were more common in the later sites than in the earlier sites. Farming played a bigger role in the east region of the Kayue sites. In this regard, this study prefers to agree with Zhang Wenli.

The earliest copper/bronze metallurgy first appeared in northwest China. However, it developed more slowly than expected. The Kayue, Xindian, and Siwa cultures were distributed side by side from west to east (Map 24). All of them lasted for a long time. Actually, the time from the early Shang to the early Western Zhou period is roughly equal to the first half part of these cultures. In contrast to the contemporary bronze cultures in north-central China and south of the Yanshan, their metal objects discovered so far are much simpler in form and technique.

6.1.3 From the early Western Zhou period to the middle Spring and Autumn period (1050-400 BCE): the prevalence of a mixture of farming and animal husbandry, and the disparate development of bronze metallurgy

This period is roughly equal to the last half part of the Kayue, Xindian and Siwa cultures as well as the time when the Nuomuhong, Tangwang-style pottery and Shajing cultures exist (Map 24).

After the late period of the Kayue and Xindian cultures, the connections with the Central Plain seem to have receded, however, the interactive communications with north-central China and the Xinjiang region grew noticeably. Compared to the second period, the regional cultural differences reduced over time, that is, the cultural aspects show great uniformity in the whole area. The pottery industry was on the wane and the bronze metallurgy developed disparately. The bronze artifacts as a unit display many local features. Animal husbandry became the leading subsistence in some areas.

---

722 ZWL 2003, 94-103.
723 ZWL 2003, 104.
Scholars hold different opinions on the subsistence of the Xindian culture. Some scholars represented by Xie Ruiju\textsuperscript{724} and Zhang Wenli\textsuperscript{725} believed that farming was the leading subsistence in the Xindian culture, animal husbandry was very advanced and hunting also accounted for one part. This study agrees with them because the tools discovered in great numbers at many Xindian sites seem to have been used for farming. Besides, the large quantity of domestic animal sacrifices, including sheep, horses, cattle, dogs, and pigs, suggest that animal husbandry was very developed. The painted potteries of the Xindian culture reached their climax during the late period. However, its bronze metallurgy seems to be inferior to that of the contemporary Kayue culture.

The subsistence of the Siwa culture seems to have been based on a mixture of agriculture and animal breeding. Impressions of grains on the surfaces of pottery, and remains of sacrificed sheep, cattle, goats, and horses provide further evidence\textsuperscript{726}.

It is worth noting that the Nuomuhong, Tangwang-style pottery, and Shajing cultures were born during this period. The Nuomuhong culture experienced both farming and animal husbandry. At the same time, its pottery manufacturing declined after a highly developed stage. Its bronze artifacts show more similarities to those of the Xinjiang region and the Hexi Corridor.

The advanced pottery industry characterized by black painted potteries with purple slip and swirl motifs, and the assemblage of tools suggest that the Tangwang-style pottery should be based on farming. Its bronze metallurgy stays unclear so far.

The Shajing culture is one of the late Bronze Age cultures in the northeast of the Gansu region. Discovery of dwelling sites and cereal as well as stone tools from walled settlements and burials indicate that settled farming was still an important part of the economy\textsuperscript{727}. The bronze metallurgy of the Shajing culture was well advanced. Some of the bronze ornaments display a close resemblance to their counterparts of the late Bronze Age culture in the North-central Complex, suggesting a strong pastoral style.

\textbf{6.1.4 Summary}

Conclusively, 1) the framework of bronzes in the Northwest Complex is complicated and varied. On one hand, it is due to the continuous development of the local cultures:

\textsuperscript{724} XRJ 2002.  
\textsuperscript{725} ZWL 2003, 109-111.  
\textsuperscript{726} Pak Y. J. 1996, 314.  
\textsuperscript{727} Pak Y. J. 1996. 322.
on the other hand, it is attributable to the influence and impact from outside. The local features as a unit are very distinctive from the beginning to the end. After the Qijia culture, local features were passed over through the Siba, Kayue, Xidian, Siwa, and Nuomuhong cultures. In particular, the burial patterns, bronze artifacts, and subsistence display great local characteristics.

2) The subsistence of the Northwest Complex was a mixture of farming, animal husbandry and hunting. The proportion of subsistence changes over time and varies from region to region. Farming never disappeared and animal husbandry increased gradually after the late Qijia culture.

This study does not believe that pastoral subsistence played an important role in the Northwest Complex. As we know, the rise of pastoral subsistence was dependent on lots of domestic horses. Apart from several cases of horse sacrifices in the burials of the late Kayue culture, horses were rarely discovered in the tombs. Moreover, we cannot tell whether the horse that have been found were domestic horses. Besides, horse fittings were hardly found in the burials or settlements. Consequently, we have not enough evidence to prove that the local people relied mainly on the pastoral subsistence at that time.

Regarding the reason or cause for the change of subsistence, scholars hold different views. Zhang Wenli has a good explanation on this issue. It was not only due to the development of the production capability but also to the change of the natural conditions. Advanced agriculture during the Neolithic period may have urged the growth of the population. Once the population expansion exceeds the supporting capacity of the agricultural economics, it will push some people to leave the old settlement in order to explore new settlements or a new means of subsistence. This exploring process will last for a long time. Nevertheless, the change of the climate and environment will promote this process\(^{728}\). For instance, the Liuwan cemetery lasted over 600 years, containing burials from the Banshan period to the Qijia culture. According to Table 53, we can see that the population reached its maximum during the Machang period at the Liuwan cemetery and decreased sharply after the Qijia culture. However, Shui Tao explains this phenomenon in another way. He puts forward that the catastrophic change of climate led to the thorough decline of agriculture as well as the rise and development of animal husbandry\(^{729}\). On this issue, the explanation of Zhang Wenli seems more reasonable. Besides, as discussed before, this study believes that farming played a great role even when the animal husbandry was used as a means of basic subsistence.

\(^{728}\) ZWL 2003, 115-116.
\(^{729}\) Shui T. 2001a, 308-311.
Table 53. Population size during different periods at the Liuwan cemetery (adapted from Shui T. 2001a, 290 Table 18). Remark: 59 bad-preserved tombs are ascribed to single burials.

3) In fact, the development of bronze metallurgy is comparatively slow within the Northwest Complex, though it appeared much earlier in northern China. Bronze artifacts were usually composed of small-scale tools, weapons, and ornaments, including knives, awls, arrowheads, joined beads, plaques, bulbs and so on. Only several big-scale bronze artifacts were found in the late Siwa culture. Of them, the daggers-Ge (Fig. 103b, 35.38) may have been introduced from the Central Plain. The Xigang and Chaiwangang sites of the Shajing culture produced a great number of northern-style bronze ornaments (Fig. 098a-f; Fig 064a-h), implying increasing connections with the North-central Complex. Nevertheless, in general, the bronze artifacts in the Northwest Complex had not taken the place of potteries, and the bronze metallurgy had not reached its climax compared to its eastern regions.

6.2 North-central Complex and south of the Yanshan Complex

6.2.1 From the early Xia period to the late Shang period (1900-1250 BCE): the continuity of the agricultural economics and the rise of copper/bronze metallurgy

The Zhukaigou culture in north-central China was roughly parallel to the Datuotou culture in the south of the Yanshan Complex (Map 24). They share certain common characteristics in subsistence and bronze objects.

The subsistence of the Zhukaigou culture is complicated. A great number of data suggests that agricultural economics played a great role throughout the Zhukaigou culture. For example, pig sacrifices were very common in burials throughout the entire period of occupation at the Zhukaigou site, indicating extensive pig raising and possibly a surplus production of grains for pig feed (Table 54, Table 55). According to Huang Yunping, some bones of pig found at the Zhukaigou site display features of domestic pigs\(^{730}\). In addition, sheep and cattle may have been herded in large numbers. Beside, advanced pottery making and many tools used for farming imply a settled life

\(^{730}\) Huang Y. P. 2000, 400-421.
in the Zhukaigou site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>pig</th>
<th>cattle</th>
<th>sheep</th>
<th>dog</th>
<th>wild animal</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>measured amount</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>expected amount</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discrepancy</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>measured amount</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>expected amount</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discrepancy</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>measured amount</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>expected amount</td>
<td>14.57</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>15.69</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discrepancy</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>-2.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>measured amount</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>expected amount</td>
<td>22.19</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discrepancy</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>measured amount</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>expected amount</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discrepancy</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-2.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 22.685 \]

Table 54. Amount of different animals found at the Zhukaigou site (adapted from Huang Y. P. 2000, 420 Table 13).

![Graph showing animal percentage during different stages at the Zhukaigou site](image)

Table 55. Animal percentage during different stages at the Zhukaigou site (adapted from Huang Y. P. 2000, 420 Fig. 6).

Some scholars believe that agriculture was the main source of subsistence for the local people, from the second to the fourth stage at the Zhukaigou site; meanwhile, animal husbandry kept growing over time. After the fifth stage, semi-agricultural and semi-
pastoral subsistence dominated. However, from Table 54 and Table 55, we can see that the ratio of each animal doesn’t differ much in each period. In fact, the total amount of animals decreased after the fourth stage. Therefore, this study does not think that the animal evidence testifies to the rise of pastoral economics in the late Zhukaigou culture.

The owners of the Datuotou culture may have relied on agriculture, which can be proven in many aspects. 1) the stone tools consisting of spades, sickles, axes, knives, adzes, hammers, chisels, and so on are typically used for agricultural purposes; 2) pig bones were discovered in some sites; 3) the discoveries of some settlements and advanced pottery making suggest a relatively settled life. In addition, the pottery spinning whorls, pottery net plummets, and the burial practice of cattle, sheep, and wild animals, indicate a certain amount of fishing and hunting subsistence as well.

As mentioned before, if we compare the copper and bronze objects found from the Qijia (Fig. 099b) and the Siba cultures (Fig. 104b) to the metal objects found from the Zhukaigou (Fig. 108c) and Datuotou cultures (Fig. 111c), some metal objects show great similarities. For instance, in addition to the bronzes in the Central Plain style (Fig. 108c, 16-19), the bronze knives, arrowheads, and earrings in the Zhukaigou culture (Fig. 108c, 1, 5-12) can be traced back to the Siba culture (Fig. 104b, 1-31). The earrings found in the Qijia and Siba cultures may very well be the prototype of the remarkable earrings found in the Datuotou culture.

Copper, tin-copper alloy and tin-lead-copper alloy were very popular in the Zhukaigou culture. By contrast, copper, arsenic-copper alloy, and tin-copper alloy were popular in the Qijia and Siba cultures. Accordingly, the Zhukaigou and Datuotou cultures may have had their own metallurgical industry, though heavily influenced by the northwest. The discovery of a stone mold for an axe and some slag in the Datuotou culture provides further evidence for this opinion as well.

In general, agricultural subsistence was still very significant for the people of the Zhukaigou culture and Datuotou culture. At the same time, the local metallurgy may have come into being during this period. However, the types and forms of the copper/bronze objects indicate a strong influence from the outside, especially from northwest China.

6.2.2 From the late Shang period to the middle Western Zhou period (1250-900 BCE): the prevalence of a mixture of economics: farming, animal husbandry, and hunting, and the development of the northern-style bronzes

When compared to the first period, the North-central Complex and south of the Yanshan Complex share more similarities in cultural aspects, especially in bronze assemblages. However, the bronze objects had not replaced the role of potteries and pottery making was still very popular and well developed. The mixture of farming, animal husbandry, and hunting seems to have been very prevalent during this period. The Lijiaya, Xicha, Weifang III, and Upper Zhangjiayuan cultures will be included (Map 24).

The people of the Lijiaya culture seem to have led a settled life. Many remains of settlements were discovered, including city walls, houses, and pits. The bronze adzes, stone axes, knives, chisels, bone spades and knives have visible marks for being used on their blades. A 10cm-thick millet was found in the base of one pit. Animal bones were very common in settlements and burials, including horses, cattle, sheep, pigs, dogs, deer, and wild animals. In addition, the patterns of tigers, deer, sheep, snakes, and frogs were frequently adorned on the bronzes. Pottery making was still very popular. All of this data suggests a settled farming subsistence mixed with animal husbandry and hunting. As for the Xicha culture, due to inadequate materials, it is difficult to discuss its subsistence.\footnote{Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 156.}

The subsistence of the Weifang III and Upper Zhangjiayuan cultures are the same as the Lijiaya culture, based on a mixture of farming, animal husbandry, and hunting. Discoveries of some pottery spindle whorls and net plummets in the Upper Zhangjiayuan culture implies a certain amount of fishing as well.

In general, the bronze assemblages of the North-central Complex and south of the Yanshan Complex present striking similarities, especially to the Lijiaya culture and the Weifang III culture. From Fig. 109b and Fig. 112b, the bell-shaped head, animal-shaped head, bow-shaped objects, and ritual vessels were very common in both cultures. It is possible that the local people had not only produced metal objects on a larger scale, but have also grasped skilled manufacturing techniques. The delicate bronze objects characterized by a mixture of styles, and the discoveries of the stone or pottery molds provide strong evidence.

6.2.3 From the early Spring and Autumn period to the end of the Warring States (800-200 BCE): The prosperity of animal husbandry and flourishing of the
After a short break from the late Western Zhou period to the early Spring and Autumn period, a full-scale prosperous time for the northern-style bronzes commenced after the early Spring and Autumn period. Animal husbandry became the basic means of subsistence, and pastoral life was very popular during this period.

The Yanglang culture, Taohongbala culture, Maoqinggou culture, and Yuhuangmiao culture were distributed from west to east (Map 24), and shared many common characteristics, such as animal sacrifice, splendid metal objects in a strong pastoral style, and so on. As discussed before, they distinguished themselves by their burial patterns, bronze assemblages, and subsistence as well. The earth shaft pit with a side pit was only seen in the burials of the Yanglang culture. Another unique feature of the Yanglang culture was an abundance of bone wares, including weapons, horse and chariot fittings, and personal ornaments. So far, no remains of settlements have been identified as belonging to the Yanglang culture. Only a few potteries were found. The metal objects and animal patterns on the metal objects of the Yanglang culture show close relations to the Taohongbala culture, especially in antenna-pommel swords, crane hacks, plaques with animal patterns and so on. However, some iron swords, bronze spears, pole tops, and deer shaped plaques were hardly seen in the Taohongbala culture.

Located in the west and east of north-central China respectively, both the Taohongbala culture and Maoqinggou culture had highly advanced northern-style bronzes with antenna-pommel swords and ornaments with varied animal motifs (Fig. 131b-131c; Fig. 134a-134e). Moreover, they had their own peculiarities as well. For example, in contrast to the large-scale cemetery that was found in the Maoqinggou culture, burials were only scattered in the Taohongbala culture, implying that the people of the Taohongbala culture may have led a more nomadic life. In addition, some tombs lying in a north-south direction at the Maoqinggou site differ greatly from the tombs lying in an east-west direction in both burial patterns and burial goods, and the latter probably belonged to people from the Central Plain. In addition, the Taohongbala culture had more delicate gold and silver objects than the Maoqinggou culture. However, more iron objects were discovered throughout the Maoqinggou culture.

Compared to the Yanglang, Taohongbala, and Maoqinggou cultures, the Yuhuangmiao culture was unique. Firstly, it absorbed certain elements from the Upper Xiajiaidian culture that was located north of the Yanshan, such as the bronze swords with a curved

---

733 The slight difference in subsistence will be discussed in the following Chapter 6.2.3.
blade (Fig. 130c, B 12-14) and the face-masking mortuary practice, which are not seen in the other three cultures. Secondly, many bronze objects were very common in the Central Plain (Fig. 130b), such as the ritual vessels, daggers, horse and chariot fittings, and dragon pattern, implying the impact from the Central Plain. Of course, the northern-style metal objects were very advanced in the Yuhuangmiao culture as well (Fig. 130c).

In addition, animal husbandry was the basic means of subsistence during this period; however, farming had not entirely declined, and it was still used as a part of minor subsistence in the east region. The people of the Yanglang culture and Taohongbala culture seem to have had a pastoral nomadic life. The absence of the settlements and farming tools suggest a decline in agriculture, while animal sacrifice consisting of horses, sheep, and cattle, and many metal horse and chariot fittings point to the importance of animal husbandry at that time. By contrast, the people of the Maoqinggou culture and Yuhuangmiao culture may have led a semi-settled and semi-pastoral life, which can be proven in several aspects. Firstly, a large-scale cemetery is normally related to the settlement, implying a settled life. Secondly, in addition to the horses, cattle, and sheep found, pigs and dogs were also seen in these two cultures, indicating the possibility of farming. Thirdly, the mortuary practices and burial goods of the tombs lying in a north-south direction at the Maoqinggou cemetery were the same as the tombs in the Central Plain, which were dependent on farming.

6.2.4 Summary

In general, 1) It was during the late Western Zhou period to the early Spring and Autumn period that both the North-central Complex and south of the Yanshan Complex encountered a similar cultural discontinuity.

2) The copper/bronze metallurgy of these two complexes appears later than that of the Northwest Complex. Some of the early metal objects display many similarities to those from the Northwest Complex, implying the possible influence from the northwest. However, the early copper/bronze metallurgical techniques differ with those of the northwest. Moreover, the metallurgy industry developed very fast and reached its climax after the Spring and Autumn period.

3) Before the late Western Zhou period, farming was the basic means of subsistence for the local people. Until the Spring and Autumn period, animal husbandry played a leading role; however, not all people led a pastoral nomadic life. For instance, the people of the Maoqinggou and Yuhuangmiao cultures were still based on a semi-pastoral and semi-agricultural subsistence.
4) The contemporary bronze cultures in these two complexes share some common features regarding cultural aspects. In addition, the common features grew over time and reached their maximum from the Spring and Autumn period to the late Warring States period.

6.3 Interactive relations between complexes

In the process of cultural development, bronze cultures in each complex kept communicating with each other. Generally, the relations between the North-central Complex and south of the Yanshan Complex were much closer than the relations between the Northwest Complex and its eastern complexes. The interactive relations between complexes can be roughly divided into two periods.

The early period was approximately from the second millennia BCE to the late Shang period. During this period, the Northwest Complex had more influence on the other two complexes. The Qijia and Siba cultures spread through the Hexi Corridor and Yinshan to the Zhukaigou and Datuotou cultures. The communications were not one-way. Of course, the bronze cultures in north-central China and south of the Yanshan region spread to or influenced the northwest of China too. For instance, Li-tripods with serpent patterns, one of the typical potteries in the Zhukaigou culture (Fig. 108a, 1-5) were also found in the Gansu region.

The late period was roughly from the late Shang period to the late Warring States period. During this period, when the impact from the Northwest Complex reduced, the force of the North-central Complex and south of the Yanshan Complex increased. After the Spring and Autumn period, the North-central Complex reached its climax gradually and the connections between the North-central Complex and south of Yanshan Complex grew. Compared to the North-central Complex and Northwest Complex, south of the Yanshan Complex was more influenced by the Central Plain. In addition, the pastoral nomadic life based on prosperous animal husbandry at that time may have promoted the connections between the cultures. Thus, the contemporary bronze cultures share more common features.
Chapter 7 Relations with the neighboring cultures

As mentioned in the previous chapters, the bronze cultures in each complex kept communicating with each other. They contacted the neighboring bronze cultures in the Central Plain, the Xinjiang region, and the Eurasian Steppe as well. The internal and external associations and exchanges promoted cultural propagation and merging, which can be recognized from archaeological evidence. This chapter will focus on the bronze metallurgy in order to see an overall view of the cultural development in these related regions.

7.1 Relations with the Central Plain

7.1.1 The rise of the dynasties in the Central Plain

Before discussing the relations of northern China and the Central Plain during the 4th and 3rd millennia B. P., it is necessary to have a brief introduction on the foundation and expansion of the dynasties in the Central Plain. The Shang Dynasty was a historic Chinese dynasty and ruled in the northeastern region of an area known as ‘China proper’ in the Yellow River valley (Map 25). The Shang Dynasty followed the quasi-legendary Xia Dynasty and preceded the Zhou Dynasty. The last Shang ruler, a despot according to standard Chinese accounts, was overthrown by a chieftain of a frontier tribe called Zhou, which had settled in the Wei Valley in the modern Shaanxi Province (Map 26). In 771 BCE, the Zhou court was sacked, and its king was killed by invading barbarians who were allied with rebel lords. The capital was moved eastwards to Luoyang. Because of this shift, historians divide the Zhou era into Western Zhou (1027 to 771 BCE) and Eastern Zhou (770 to 221 BCE). With the royal line broken, the power of the Zhou court gradually diminished, and the fragmentation of the kingdom accelerated. Eastern Zhou divides into two sub periods (Map 27). The first, from 770 to 476 BCE, is called the Spring and Autumn Period, after a famous historical chronicle of that time; the second is known as the Warring States Period (475 to 221 BCE). The Warring States Period, in contrast to the Spring and Autumn Period, was a period when regional warlords annexed smaller states around them, in order to consolidate their rule. The process began in the Spring and Autumn period, and by the 3rd century BC, seven major states had become prominent. These Seven Warring States (战国七雄, Zhanguo Qixiong, literally ‘Seven Hegemonial among the Warring States’), were the Qi (齊,齐), the Chu (楚), the Yan (燕), the Han (韓/韩), the Zhao (趙,赵), the Wei (魏) and the Qin (秦) (Map 28). Another sign of this shift in power was a change of title: warlords still considered themselves dukes (公 gōng) of the Zhou dynasty king; but now the warlords began to call themselves kings (王 wáng), meaning they were equal to the Zhou king. 
Information about these dynasties comes from historical records of the later Zhou Dynasty, the Han Dynasty *Shiji* (史记) by Sima Qian, and from Shang inscriptions on bronze artifacts (金文) and oracle bones (甲骨文)—turtle shells, cattle scapulae or other bones on which were written the first significant corpus of recorded Chinese characters. However, on one hand, the inscriptions on bronze artifacts and oracle bones record a meager account on the northern tribes; on the other hand, ancient scholars and scholars of today differ on the account of the northern tribes in ancient documents; some tribes are not even recorded. Therefore, it is hard to understand how central China and northern China communicated with each other in terms of economics, cultures, and so on. In order to solve such difficulties, archaeological evidence is without doubt the best efficient way to do so. This study will place an extra emphasis on the bronze metallurgy.

From Map 25 to Map 28, we can see that north central and south of the Yanshan region borders extensively on the territory of the central dynasties in the south, within the earlier period. During the later period, the subinfeuded Yan State centered in the Beijing region had occupied the northern Hebei region where the south of the Yannan Complex was distributed. Furthermore, the subinfeuded Zhao State had entered the Shanxi and northeast Shanxi region where some bronze cultures of the north-central Complex were located. Moreover, the subinfeuded Qin State controlled the Ningxia and east Gansu region. In fact, how much northern China was influenced by the Central Plain is closely interrelated to how strong the central dynasties were. This can be proven if we compare the elements from the Central Plain in the North-central Complex and South of the Yanshan Complex from the beginning to the end. However, the bronze cultures in the Northwest Complex do not seem to have had any direct contact with the central Dynasties. Therefore, its slightly inconspicuous connections with the Central Plain will not be mentioned here.

### 7.1.2 Relations between North-central China and the Central Plain

#### 7.1.2.1 Ningxia and east Gansu region

The Pre-Zhou culture was first put forward in the 1940s after the remains of the Baoji site in the Shaanxi Province. Since the liberation, similar kinds of remains were found in the Qingyang and Pingliang region, Gansu province. In fact, the main territory of the Pre-Zhou culture was centered in east Gansu (Map 29) where many settlements and burials of the Shang and Zhou culture have been identified.

---

735 Shui T. 2001a, 259.
The Central Plain style bronze objects found in the eastern Gansu and Ningxia region, from the Shang to the Western Zhou period mainly consist of all kinds of cups and vessels (Fig. 137), including cup-Jue, cup-Gu, cup-Hu, tripod-Ding, vessel-Gui, vessel-He and so on. Most of them were discovered from burials. According to Fig. 137, it seems that the influence from Central China reached its climax during the early Western Zhou period, and only a tiny quantity of such bronzes were identified in the middle and late Western Zhou period, which is probably related to the eastwards movement of the political center of the Western Zhou Dynasty.

After the Spring and Autumn period, lots of the Central Plain style metal objects re-emerged in greater numbers in the east Gansu and Ningxia regions. The Chinese scholar, Yang Jianhua, has carried out a comprehensive study on the relations between the Central Plain and northern China, from the Spring and Autumn period to the late Warring States period. She divides northern China into six sub-regions: the Guyuan region, Qingyang region, west Inner Mongolia, east Inner Mongolia, and north Hebei (Fig. 138), which are approximately equal to the Yanglang culture\(^\text{736}\), Taohongbala culture, Maoqinggou culture, and Yuhuangmiao culture respectively as addressed in this study.

According to Fig. 138, some chariot fittings, daggers, belt hooks, and plaques in the Central Plain style were discovered in the Guyuan and Pingliang regions (Fig. 138, 6.10-13.22-25). On the plaques, we can see a merging of the Central Plain pattern with the Kui-dragon design. Furthermore, animal sacrifice, which was quite widespread in the frontier was not found here; instead, the entire horse was frequently buried in the tombs. This data implies that the traditions of this region were somehow connected to those of the Central Plain. However, no bronze ritual vessels have been found so far. As summarized by Yang Jianhua, the Guyuan region was similar to the east Inner Mongolia region in Ge and belt buckles. However, the number of belt-buckles increased in the east Inner Mongolia region.

### 7.1.2.2 The west and east Inner Mongolia region

The west and east of Inner Mongolia was where the North-central Complex was most developed. The Zhukaigou culture, the earliest bronze culture in this complex displays some influence from the Central Plain, which is fully reflected in the remains of a dwelling place, potteries, and bronze objects. In addition to some pots such as Dou and Gui (Fig. 108b, 9-10) bearing the sign of the early Shang style, the bronze vessel-Ding, the gluton motif on bronzes, and straight-bladed daggers (Fig. 108c, 16-19) show great similarities to those in the early Shang culture as well.

---

\(^{736}\) Including both of the Guyuan region in Ningxia and the Qingyang region in Gansu.
Compared to the Zhukaigou culture, the Lijiaya culture shows closer connections to the Shang culture. As counted by Wu En, over 250 bronze artifacts in the Shang style were discovered in the burials and hoards of the Lijiaya culture (Fig. 109b, 27-32). Not only the forms but also the decorative patterns were almost the same as those found at Yinxu. Regarding the source of these bronzes, this study prefers to believe that they were exchanged by trade in a relatively peaceful period between the northern people and central people. In addition, some potteries and bronze arrowheads characterized by the early Western Zhou style indicated the close relations between the Lijiaya culture and the early Western Zhou culture as well.

Until now, no elements from the Shang or Zhou cultures have been identified in the Xicha culture. Furthermore, no high-grade tombs have been excavated. Therefore, it is hard to tell whether there was a spiritual influence from the Central Plain. In short, there is not any direct evidence to prove that Central China affected the Xicha culture.

After a short break during the late Western Zhou period, two typical northern bronze cultures ‘Taohongbala’ and ‘Maoqinggou’ emerged respectively in west and east Inner Mongolia, after the Spring and Autumn period. Compared to the earlier period, the influence from central China reduced. In west Inner Mongolia, except for two bronze vessels in the Eastern Zhou style bronze vessels found in the earlier stage (Fig. 138, 1.2), other influences from the Central Plain culture were rarely seen. Engraving Chinese characters on bronze artifacts (Fig. 138, 7) was a practice of the artisans during the Warring States period (for recording its maker or the weight etc.). It is possible that these objects could have been made by the artisans from the Central Plain who were probably captured by the northern tribes. Such phenomena can be found in historical records. In addition, metal weapons, tools, and ornaments in the Central Plain style were rarely seen.

Only a small quantity of weapon-Ge, arrowheads, and belt hooks characterized by the Central Plain style (Fig. 138, 14.15.26.27) were found in the Maoqinggou culture. However, some tombs in a south-north direction, built with a wood coffin, and buried without animal sacrifices were quite different to other tombs lying in an east-west direction. They probably belonged to the people from the Central Plain.

738 YJH 2004, 217.
739 <史记·赵世家>：赵武灵王‘西略胡地，至榆中，林胡王献马’。The Lord Ling of the Zhao State once invaded the area where the Hu people lived, even into the Yuzhong region. Therefore, the king of the Hu offered horses. This record indicates there were wars between the Hu people and central people. The Yuzhong region is roughly equal to the Ordos region. Consequently, it is possible that the artisans from central China were captured by the northern tribes.
7.1.3 Relations between the South of the Yanshan and the Central Plain

As mentioned before, the bronze artifacts of the Datuotou culture show a strong influence from the Northwest Complex (Fig. 111c). No typical bronze from the Central Plain was found in the Datuotou culture. However, the potteries display close relations to the early, middle, and late Shang culture (Fig. 111a), such as tripod-Li, Gui, Yan, and so on. Yang Jianhua puts forward that the south of the Datuotou culture was more influenced by the Shang culture. By contrast, the north of the Datuotou culture had more local features.

In addition to some potteries in a strong Shang style (Fig. 112a), the bronze artifacts in the Weifang III culture present close connections with the Central Plain as well. Dozens of the bronze ritual vessels have been found, such as Ding, Gui, Yan, Lei, He and so on as well as some Chinese inscriptions on bronzes (Fig. 112b, 17-22). At the same time, some typical northern-style bronzes were found in the Central Plain too, such as socketed axes, animal headed knives, and bow shaped objects with animal or bell heads (Fig. 112c).

The close relations between the Upper Zhangjiayuan culture and the Yan culture of the Western Zhou are mostly reflected in the potteries (Fig. 117a). The bronze assemblages of the Baifu, Dongnangou, Xibozi, and Xiaohenan sites provide evidence for the complicated relations between the south of the Yanshan region and central China.

After the Spring and Autumn period, a large number of the Central Plain style vessels were found in northern Hebei, which was rarely seen in other regions. There were also cart gears, tools, weapons, and decorative patterns such as Ge, arrowheads, swords, knives, and ornaments such as belt hooks (Fig. 139a, 4.5.9.16-21.28; Fig. 130b). It is possible that the ‘Central Plainized’ (中原化) elites of the Hebei region simulated rituals of the Central Plain and used their ritual vessels. As a result, the Yan culture replaced the northern bronze culture gradually in this area.

7.1.4 Political interaction

In general, the cultures in the Northwest Complex were seemingly more connected with cultures to their west, which will be discussed in section 7.3. They never established centrally managed state-level societies, and remained outside the Chinese cultural and political dynastic arena until the Qin conquered these lands circa the fifth century BCE. This area does not seem to have been inspired by the Central Plain, regarding bronze metallurgy or much of anything else detectable in the archaeological record. Their knowledge of horses and of certain metal tools was probably imported.
into the Central Plain eventually\textsuperscript{740}. During the Shang to the late Western Zhou period, the east Gansu and Ningxia regions, and south of the Yanshan region absorbed only bronze ritual vessels from central China. At the same time, the west and east Inner Mongolia region accepted not only bronze ritual vessels, but also weapons. However, after the Spring and Autumn period, only a number of bronze daggers-Ge and belt hooks in the Central Plain style were discovered in the east of the Gansu and Ningxia regions, and the ritual vessels were absent. Simultaneously, not only ritual vessels but also weapons and horse fittings in the central style were found in the west and east of the Inner Mongolia region. Moreover, south of the Yanshan region seems to have been Central Plainized.

This phenomenon can be understood as follows: when the Shang and Western Zhou Dynasty arose, the elite people in the east Gansu and Ningxia regions may have imitated the ceremony systems from central China; however, the people living in the west and east Inner Mongolia may have had more connections with central China via war or trade. After the Spring and Autumn period, the wars between northern China and the Central Plain became more frequent. Therefore, bronze weapons in the central style were very common in northern China. With the development of animal husbandry, the power of the northern people was enforced gradually. Accordingly, it was possible for the north-central people to rob some artifacts or capture some people from central China instead of that the central dynasties invaded north-central China.

Each region might have optionally adapted or borrowed different traits from the Central Plain culture, nevertheless, the widespread of dagger-Ge (Fig. 138, 10-13.1.17.18) suggests that the interactions between northern China and the Central Plain were mainly through warfare. The Great Wall may be the best evidence for this. Political interactions between northern China and the Central Plain were reflected by the construction of the Great wall as well. This showed that the States in the Central Plain used the ‘Wall’ to defend themselves from the ‘horses’ of the northern tribes. From historical records, we know that the construction of the Great Wall by Yan, Zhao, and Qin, took place during the rule of Lord Zhao of the Yan State (燕昭王), the rule of Lord Wuling of the Zhao State (赵武灵王), and Lord Zhaoxiang of the Qin State (秦昭襄王). Therefore, the Great Wall of the Zhao and the Yan State were built during the middle and late Warring States period, and the Great Wall of the Qin State was built during the late Warring States period\textsuperscript{741}.

If we mark the orientation of the Great Wall constructed during the Warring States, as mentioned above, and the geographic locations of sites discovered in northern China

\textsuperscript{740} Linduff et al. 2000, 21.
\textsuperscript{741} YJH 2004, 218.
on the same Map (Map 29), we can observe the association between them: towards the east end, the Great Wall is located further north; towards the west end, the Great Wall is located further south, and the Great Wall in the Guanyuan region had already cut through the middle of northern China.

The orientation of the Great Wall (Map 30) is roughly in accordance with the scale of influence from the Central Plain. In addition, the construction of the Great Wall established the northern zone and became the landmark of the northern frontier belt. On the other hand, it forced northern China, which was dominated by local ethnic cultures to be split into two groups. Cultures located on the south side of the Great Wall became part of the Central Plain culture; while those in the north attached themselves to the Eurasian Steppe cultures, which were located further north, thus a greater tribe confederacy formed in order to deal with the united Qin Empire.

7.2 Relations with the Xinjiang region

7.2.1 The Bronze Age and Iron Age cultures in Xinjiang

Xinjiang, the most western provincial region of China, situated in Central Asia, is well known as an important crossroads on the ancient Silk Route. The central role of Xinjiang in the later prehistory of Eurasia is only gradually being appreciated (Map 31). To many western scholars, it seems at first a very remote region indeed, containing the inhospitable Taklamakan Desert, first made known to western scholars through the explorations of the intrepid Aurel Stein and his contemporaries in the first quarter of the twentieth century. For Chinese scholars also, one suspects, that this area may seem quite remote, far to the west of the major sites of imperial China, and thus peripheral to the heartlands of the empire. Yet Xinjiang was a nub, a focal point in the communication between east and west. Across it, to the north and south of the Taklamakan Desert, lay the most eastern components of the Silk Road.

Before we discuss the relations between Xinjiang and northern China, it is necessary to have a rudimentary grasp of the contemporary cultures in Xinjiang. Chinese scholar, Mei Jianjun offered a coherent study on the later prehistory of Xinjiang and its early development of metallurgy in the Bronze Age. On the basis of previous research, he proposed a cultural framework for Xinjiang (Table 56; Table 57) and summarized the metallurgical connections between Xinjiang and the Northwest Complex. Another

---

742 The term ‘Silk Route’ was first proposed by Richthofen in 1877, and then generally accepted, to describe the trade route between China and the West, which was traditionally thought to be opened during the 2nd century BCE. There is, however, a growing body of archaeological evidence that the Silk Route had served as a bridge of cultural interaction between China and the West long before the date hitherto assumed.

743 MJJ 2000, iii.

744 MJJ 2000.

Chinese scholar, Yang Jianhua, did a comparative study on the relations between Xinjiang and northern China from the Spring and Autumn period to the late Warring States. Therefore, this study will have an all-round discussion based upon the above mentioned research.

Table 56. The cultural framework in Xinjiang proposed by Mei Jianjun (after MJJ 2000, 5 Table 1.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Cultural Groups and Major Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Eastern Pamirs</td>
<td>Suletangha’e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Eastern Rim of the Tarim Basin</td>
<td>Aketala: Halayilergun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Southern Rim of the Tarim Basin</td>
<td>Guamugou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The South Foot of the Tian Shan</td>
<td>Xintala: Qubui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haladun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Turfan Basin</td>
<td>Halakezhua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hami Basin</td>
<td>Tianshanbellu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wupu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yanbulake*: Lafaqioke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The North Foot of the Tian Shan</td>
<td>Narwan*: Lanzhouwanzi;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shirenzi; Ka’ersang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sidaogou*: Banjiegou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shuinichang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Xinjiang:</td>
<td>Aga’ersen: Sazi; Weixiao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacheng &amp; Ili river valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altai Mountains</td>
<td>Ke’ermuqt*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Valleys of the Middle Tian Shan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These sites or cultures could more properly be considered covering the period from late Bronze Age to early Iron Age.

---

746 The northern China proposed by Yang Jianhua is in accordance with the north-central China and south of the Yanshan region in this study.
747 YJH 2004, 150-139.
748 Mei J. J. supposed that the Bronze Age and Iron Age in Xinjiang is corresponding to ca. 2000-1000 BCE and 1000-300 BCE respectively.
Table 57. The chronological sequence for the Bronze Age and Iron Age cultures in Xinjiang (after MJJ 2000, 88 Table 2.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Bronze Age</th>
<th>Iron Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Eastern Pamirs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rim of the Tarim Basin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Southern Foot of the Tian Shan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Turfan Basin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hari Basin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Northern Foot of the Tian Shan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Xinjiang: Tacheng and Yili</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Altai Mountains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Valleys of the Middle Tian Shan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BC 2000</th>
<th>1800</th>
<th>1600</th>
<th>1400</th>
<th>1200</th>
<th>1000</th>
<th>800</th>
<th>600</th>
<th>400</th>
<th>200</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>AD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.2.2 Relations between Xinjiang and northern China

The Northwest Complex shows closer connections to the Xinjiang culture than the North-central Complex and south of the Yanshan Complex. In addition to the affinity between potteries, the bronze objects and metallurgical technology also display similarities.

For example, the Qijia metalworking characterized by hammering and casting, is comparable to the western tradition. According to Mei Jianjun’s opinion, the connections between Xinjiang and Qijia are most likely to have been indirect. So far, the only Bronze Age site that may be related to the Qijia culture is the Tianshanbeilu cemetery in Hami city. This speculation is supported by the resemblance between the knife from Tianshanbeilu, with two projections on its back, (Fig. 139a, A7) and the Qijia knife found in Huangniangniangtai (Fig. 099b, 1). In addition, there may be a relationship between the Qijia mirror (Fig. 099b, 22) and the mirrors found in the Tianshanbeilu burials (Fig. 139a, A5). Although the evidence available so far is extremely scanty, cultural contact between Qijia and the northern Eurasian Steppe through the Tianshanbeilu culture in eastern Xinjiang, and the Siba culture in western Gansu seems quite possible.\(^{749}\)

In comparison to the Qijia culture, the Siba culture may have closer relations with Xinjiang. Though it is impossible to present a full account of the relationship between Siba and Tianshanbeilu, a few preliminary observations have been made by Mei Jianjun, based on the information available.\(^{750}\) Firstly, as revealed by the metallographic examination of some Tianshanbeilu samples, the bronze technologies of the Tianshanbeilu culture are comparable to those of the Siba culture in terms of the use of casting, forging, annealing, and cold working. In addition, the typological similarity between objects from both cultures can be observed in the cases of knives, earrings, and mirrors (Fig. 139a, A). Furthermore, as scientific analysis has shown, the major copper alloy used by the Tianshanbeilu people is tin bronze which contains 16% tin on the average, and Cu-Sn-Pb alloy was used in rather small amounts. This analysis recalls the metallurgical results of the Huoshaogou metal objects, indicating that about half of the analyzed metal samples are Cu-Sn and Cu-Sn-Pb alloys.

So far, arsenical bronze, which has rarely been found within the present boundary of China, has been identified among metal objects from the Siba culture. It is well known that arsenical bronze was produced and used extensively in Eurasia and the Near East during the early Bronze Age of the third millennia BCE. Some scholars have already speculated that the presence of arsenical bronze in the Siba metal objects

\(^{749}\) MJJ 2000, 62.  
\(^{750}\) MJJ 2000, 63.
may imply certain cultural exchanges between Siba and earlier cultures to the west. In this regard, two metal objects found at the Wupu cemetery in eastern Xinjiang have been identified as arsenical copper with 3-4% As. According to the radiocarbon dating, the Wupu arsenical copper can tentatively be placed within the period 1400-1100 BCE, and it is later than the Siba culture. Thus, on the basis of all the above considerations, the existence of links between Tianshanbeilu and Siba with respect to bronze technologies seems most likely.

In the later period, the Yanbulake culture bearing some distinctive features, suggests connections with many other cultures in the Northwest Complex as well. In contrast to a relatively large number of copper and bronze finds from the Yanbulake culture, the Xindian sites have yielded only a small number of bronzes. However, the metal objects of the Kayue culture, such as mirrors, tubes, buttons, and knives (Fig. 101d) can also be found in Yanbulake (Fig. 139a, B). In Mei Jianjun’s opinion, the influence is likely to have come from two directions: whilst the painted pottery of the Kayue or Xindian cultures spread westwards, some bronze forms were transmitted eastwards from Xinjiang into Gansu. Moreover, the first use of iron knives in the later phases of the Kayue culture, may also have been inspired or influenced from eastern Xinjiang, where iron was in use at Yanbulake from the early first millennia BCE. How iron technology was transmitted eastwards from Xinjiang into Central China during the early first millennia BCE also remains largely within the realm of speculation due to a lack of sufficient evidence.

A few iron objects have been discovered in the Shajing culture, which can be dated to 900-600 BCE. In addition to the affinity in pottery forms and painted designs, some bronze forms, such as tubes, knives, mirrors, and axes, which were very typical in the Shajing culture, were found in the Chawuhugou cemetery as well (Fig. 139b).

As stated by Mei Jianjun, cultural interactions between the Xinjiang and Gansu-Qinghai regions during the first half of the second millennia BCE took place largely between the bronze cultures of Qijia, Siba, and Tianshanbeilu. It seems quite clear that there was a two-way traffic of cultural influence, with painted pottery spreading westwards and bronze technologies being transmitted eastwards, though the overall picture of these interactions is still rather obscure. An innovation centre of bronze technologies may have developed in the Gansu-Qinghai region during this period based upon the rich resource of non-metallic ores in the region. The connections between Yanbulake and Kayue-Xindian indicate that interactions between the

---

751 Quoted from MJJ 2000, 63-64.
752 The pottery affinity is not mentioned here.
753 MJJ 2000, 65.
754 MJJ 2000, 65.
Xinjiang and the Gansu-Qinghai region continued during the latter half and early first millennia BCE. However, the context for these interactions was much more complicated than has been realized in the past\textsuperscript{755}.

In general, the prehistoric cultures in Xinjiang bore their own features in potteries and burial practice, which actually indicate more connections with south Siberia, and Central Asia rather than with northern China. Regarding the metal objects, Xinjiang, the Eurasian Steppe, and northern China share some common features especially after the Spring and Autumn period, such as horse fittings, loop headed knives, socketed axes, earrings, animal style plaques, cooking ware-Fu and so on (Fig. 140a; Fig. 140b; Fig. 140e). Mei Jianjun and Yang Jianhua\textsuperscript{756}, have already given an overview of the interactions between Xinjiang and the Eurasian Steppe, so the resemblance of the metal objects between Xinjiang, north-central China, and south of the Yanshan region will not be mentioned here. In fact, of the metal objects, only a small quantity of them show a northern bronze style, including some belt hooks, plaques, tubes, beads, and so on (Fig. 140c). Besides, a few straight bladed knives and flower shaped ornaments represent a particular Xinjiang style (Fig. 140d), which were rarely seen in other regions (Fig. 140d).

7.3 Relations with the Eurasian Steppe

North China is located in the southeastern end of the Eurasian Steppe\textsuperscript{757}, which is an important area for communication between Chinese and Western cultures. The verification of the relationship between the bronze cultures of northern China and the Eurasian Steppe, will not only help us to understand the cultural origin of the bronze wares in northern China and the Yellow River branches, but also give us a better understanding of the formation and development of these ancient civilizations. The close cultural affinities between the Bronze Age cultures of southern Siberia and those of the northern zone of China have been recognized and pointed out in most of the earlier studies\textsuperscript{758}. Chinese scholar, Li Gang, did a comprehensive study on the cultural elements of the Eurasian Steppe in the bronzes of northern China, paying particular attention to the metal objects\textsuperscript{759}. By analyzing and comparing the form, decoration, and usage of the same kinds of bronze wares between northern China and the Eurasian Steppe, he reached the conclusion that there were three times the impact from the Bronze Age cultures of the Eurasian Steppe and Western Asia to the north of China. The first impact spurred on the beginning of the Chinese Bronze Age. The

\textsuperscript{755} MJJ 2000, 66.
\textsuperscript{757} Eurasian Steppes starts from the Danube River in the west, through the West Europe Plain, west Siberia Plain, Kazakhstan mountain ranges, Mongolia Plateau, to the Songliao Plain of China in the east.
\textsuperscript{759} LG 2004.
second impact was manifested by the sudden increase of new bronze weapons, which also meant the expanding scale of war. The third impact can be seen from the influence of a nomadic culture on the cultivation. This opinion differs in some aspects with Pak Yangjin who proposes a three-phase suggestion for the relations between southern Siberia and northern China on the metallurgical development. Based on their research, this study will divide the interaction between the Bronze Age cultures in these two areas into three periods: early, middle, and late.

7.3.1 Early period: 3000-1800 BCE

During this period, the metallurgy of the Eurasian Steppe and northern China was in an incipient stage. In contrast, the western Eurasian Steppe was provided with not only fruitful ore resources but also relatively advanced metallurgy. For example, some copper/bronze axes with a tubular handle, swords, arrowheads, and four-ridged awls have been found in Caucasia, which are made of copper and copper-arsenic alloy. However, in the middle region of the Eurasian Steppe, copper/bronze objects remain unclear. In the eastern Eurasian Steppe, the Afanasieve culture, the earliest copper-working culture of southern Siberia, was primarily confined to the Minusinsk Basin and the Altai region (Map 32). Its metallurgy is remarked by copper needles, awls, and small knives (Fig. 142:1-10). Nevertheless, the stone and bone objects (Fig. 142:11-18) predominate over copper objects, indicating that the role of copper was still somewhat limited. The types of bronzes are much more diverse in the next period of the Okunevo culture, which was distributed in the Minusinsk Basin at the beginning of the second millennia BCE. It includes knives, awls, shaft-hole axes, adzes, chisels, daggers, spearheads, and needles.

In comparison, the diversification of copper/bronze objects in northern China seems to have occurred much later than in the Eurasian Steppe. Until now, only two metal objects have been identified from 3000 to 2300 BCE. The earliest metal object was discovered in Linjia, Dongxiang, Gansu Province, and northwest China, which has been discussed in chapter 2.3.1. It was a bronze knife (Fig. 043b, 1), attributed to the Majiayao culture, containing 6-10% tin. The dendrite-like grains aligning on the edge from the metallurgical observation suggest that it was probably made by cast or wrought. The radiocarbon dates of this site suggest a chronology around 3000 BCE. Another broken knife found in Jiangjiaping, Yongdeng county, Gansu Province is dated to 2330-2055 BCE. In addition to several fragments of slag found at the same

---

761 The northern China defined by Pak Yangjin includes the Xinjiang region and northeast China as well, which is bigger in spatial range than this study.
762 Chernykh (1992, 86-88) ascribed also the stray find of a bronze axe from the Altai into the metal assemblage of the Afanasieve culture.
763 One late Neolithic culture in the Gansu and Qinghai regions.
time, the Gansu Province is provided with an abundance of copper ore, including cassiterite and jewellers putty. All of the evidence implies the possibility of local manufacture.

In addition, it was after the Qijia culture (2300-1800 BCE) that more copper/bronze objects were found in northwest China. They consisted of small ornaments and implements, including: mirrors, rings, axes, knives, awls, and daggers, and so on (Fig. 099b). They were made of copper and copper-tin alloys. It is worth mentioning that the four-edged awl (Fig. 099b, 11) in the Qijia culture was very common in the western Eurasian Steppe, Caucasia, and West Asia. The mirror with two holes on the back (Fig. 099b, 21) was also seen in the Namazaga V culture (2400-2000 BCE) which was distributed mainly in southern Turkmenistan.

In short, in the early period, only the Majiayao culture and Qijia culture in the northwest of China yielded some metal objects made of copper and copper-tin alloys. So far, no metal objects have been found in other regions of northern China. The earliest two metal objects in the Majiayao culture show similarities neither in form nor in composition to those in the Eurasian Steppe. However, similar metal objects of the Qijia culture can be found in the Eurasian Steppe. Today, we are still far from drawing a clear picture of the direct contact between the Eurasian Steppe and northern China.

7.3.2 Middle period: 1800-800 BCE

This middle period is characterized by the sudden growth of bronze weapons in the Eurasian Steppe. The rise of the Andronovo culture marked the beginning of an advanced bronze-using time. The Andronovo culture, centered in the Minusinsk Plain, is a Bronze Age complex that comprised a number of regional variants. It covered an extensive area, stretching from the Urals to the Yenisey, and from the northern border of the forest-steppe to the south of the Pamirs in Tadjikistan (Map 33). Kuzmina dates this culture complex to the period between the 17th and 9th centuries BCE. However, some scholars favor an earlier date of 2000 BCE for the beginning of the Andronovo culture, on the basis of the radiocarbon dates from the Sintashta-Petrovka site in the Ural region. It has been suggested that the Andronovo culture mainly occupied the area between the rivers Ural and Irtysh at first, and extended later as far as the upper Yenisei River to the east, and the desert oasis of western Asia and the Tianshan to the south. In contrast to the Afanasievo culture, a large number of bronze weapons and implements, such as axes, arrowheads, knives, spearheads and awls as well as casting molds, have been found in the Andronovo burials, demonstrating the high level of bronze technology used in the Andronovo culture (Fig. 143, 7-16). Recent studies further suggest that the horse-drawn chariot may have been used by the Andronovo people, and this innovation, as well as the bronze metallurgy, played a

765 Parzinger 2006.
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crucial role in the expansion of the Andronovo culture during the second millennia BCE. As stated by Mei Jianjun, the existence of the Andronovo cultural influence in Xinjiang is, indeed, a part of the Andronovo cultural expansion, a widespread cultural process that was taking place in Eurasia during the second millennia BCE. According to Mei Jianjun’s opinion, the Bronze Age finds in this region, such as the Aga’ersen hoard (Fig. 143), the Weixiao site, and the Sazi cemetery (Fig. 145a), show a close affiliation with the Andronovo culture. This affiliation suggests the existence of a bronze culture that may tentatively be named Aga’eren. The metal artifacts, such as shaft-hole axes, sickles, flanged adzes, socketed celts, gouges and spades (Fig. 145b) have been identified as typical of late Andronovo culture. The Tacheng metal objects have also revealed a technological link with the Andronovo context. The distribution of the Andronovo-type artifacts identified so far in Xinjiang has revealed that northwestern Xinjiang was a pivotal region for the presence and spread of the Andronovo culture (Map 33). In addition, the Altai region, the most northern part of Xinjiang, might be another important area for establishing contact between Xinjiang and Andronovo. Exactly when the Andronovo culture began to enter northwestern Xinjiang is still being questioned. The Andronovo-related material known so far in Xinjiang is primarily associated with the late Andronovo context and is dated to the latter part of the 2nd millennia BCE. Most of the evidence of the Andronovo influence on Xinjiang is from stray finds. This limits our understanding of the nature of the Andronovo-type culture in Xinjiang. For instance, the Aga’ersen, is characterized by a close affiliation with the Andronovo remains in eastern Kazakhstan, that had a relatively high level of bronze metallurgy. However, we know little or nothing about its settlement or economy. We have no idea whether bronze objects of the Andronovo-type were made locally or brought into Xinjiang by immigrants or traders.

At the same time, the Siba culture (1900-1500 BCE), a relatively developed bronze-using culture, arose in northwest China. It has yielded a large number of metal objects, including arrowheads, knives, axes, awls, bracelets, and earrings (Fig. 104b). According to Li Shuicheng, many Siba copper objects show a stylistic connection with the northern Eurasian Steppe. For example, the copper awls with a bone handle (Fig. 104b, 21) are similar to those of the Okunevo culture in southern Siberia. The socketed axes (Fig. 104b, 9-10) also have their parallels in southern Siberia and Ordos. One copper pole-top decorated with four projecting ram-heads (Fig. 104b, 34) found at the Huoshaogou cemetery is unusual, which Bunker considers comparable to the
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Central Asian and ancient Near Eastern designs. Gold and silver rings found at the Huoshaogou cemetery also suggest some connections with distant cultures to the west, though no definite conclusion can be made about specific sources. In the opinion of Fitzgerald-Huber, the larger number of horse bones that have been found in the Siba burials suggest a further link to the steppe.

Some scholars have already speculated that the presence of arsenic copper in the Siba culture may imply certain cultural exchanges between Siba and early cultures to the west. In terms of Mei Jianjun’s elemental analysis, two samples from the Wupu cemetery in eastern Xinjiang have been identified as arsenical copper with 3-4% of As. According to radiocarbon dating, the Wupu arsenical copper can tentatively be placed within the period 1400-1000 BCE, and is later than the Siba finds. Thus, we have a rather complex picture concerning the Siba culture itself, as well as its technological relationship with eastern Xinjiang. Further research is required on the issue of the earliest appearance of arsenical copper in Xinjiang and Gansu.

In the 13th century BCE, the Andronovo culture in southern Siberia was replaced by an entirely different culture, the Karasuk culture (1300-800 BCE), which is characterized by some distinctive bronze forms, such as knives and daggers with handles ending in animal designs (Fig. 145, 1-10). The Karasuk culture is centered in the Minusinsk Basin on the middle of Yenisei, with extensions southwards into Mongolia and the Altai area. The similarity of the style and type of bronze artifacts, between the contemporary bronze cultures in the North-central Complex, south of the Yanshan Complex and Karasuk culture is striking. Bronze knives and daggers with a ring, mushroom-shaped or animal-head pommel, socketed axes, shaft-hole battle axes, shaft-hole halberds-Gi, socketed spearheads, bow-shaped ornaments, and other bronze weapons and tools, have been found in the Minusinsk Plain, and display close stylistic similarity to the so-called ‘Northern-style’ bronzes that have been found in northern China, dated to the late Shang and early Western Zhou period. Such kinds of bronzes were particularly found in the late Shang tombs of Anyang. The focus of the earlier debate was on whether these bronzes originated with the Shang in the Central Plain or in southern Siberia. The growing recognition amongst scholars of the existence of an independent cultural complex in the ‘Northern Zone’ region in China (the northern borderland of the Shang and Zhou China), indicates that the Northern Zone complex played a key role not only in bridging the relationship between the Karasuk and Shang cultures, but also in creating and spreading new bronze forms and decorative patterns throughout the eastern Eurasian Steppe. In addition, as mentioned in chapter 4 and

---
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chapter 5, the bronze objects in the North-central Complex and south of the Yanshan Complex were mainly made of Cu-Sn alloys and Cu-Sn-Pb alloys.

Conclusively, during the middle period, the metallurgical development of the Eurasian Steppe may have pushed the growth of metallurgy in northern China, which is reflected in the similar bronze weapons and implements found from the Eurasian Steppe and northern China. However, there is still a lack of sufficient and direct evidence to prove the origin of the so-called ‘Northern-style’ metal objects.

7.3.3 Late Period: 800-200 BCE

The late period is roughly equal from the Spring and Autumn period to the end of the late Warring States period in the Central Plain, and is contemporary with the decline of the Karasuk culture as well. It is quite remarkable that northern China and the Eurasian Steppe shared more common features after the Spring and Autumn period.

The Eurasian cultures during this time include: the Scythian on the north shore of the Black Sea, the Tagar culture in the Minusinsk Basin of southern Siberia, the Saka culture of Central Asia, the Pazyryk culture of the Altai and Tuva regions, and the stone-slab tomb culture of Trans-Baikal etc.. The Nuomuhong culture, the late period of the Kayue and Xindian cultures, the middle and late Shajing culture, the Yanglang culture, the Taohongbala culture, the Maoqinggou culture, and the Yuhuangmiao culture were distributed in northern China from west to east. There are great similarities between these cultures. The metal objects consisting of weapons, tools, horse and chariot gears (bits), and ornaments (plaques in an animal style and mirrors), cooking ware-Fu (Fig. 141a; Fig. 141b; Fig. 140e), suggest that the horse-riding military of northern China and the Eurasian Steppe were similar to the development of a nomadic lifestyle.

Conclusively, during the early period, the Qijia culture shows a resemblance in its bronze objects to those found from the Namazga V culture, the Caucasia region, and Pit-grave culture, though no credible evidence is provided for their direct contacts. In the middle period, the influence from the Andronovo culture, Karasuk culture, and Deer Stone culture can be observed in the Xinjiang region, Siba culture, and other northern cultures in China.

7.4 Origin of the Chinese bronzes

The emergence of the production of metal objects is a milestone event in human activity. It marks fundamental changes in the social development and working relationships among people. Therefore, research on the origin and development of metallurgy, and on the transition from the Neolithic to the Bronze Age is one of the
most important topics in archaeological studies. The Shang and Zhou dynasties were the peak periods of the Chinese Bronze Age culture. The general use of metal objects, along with the formation of the state, the appearance of sites, and a writing system, are considered basic elements of civilization in world prehistory.\textsuperscript{775}

Articles about the beginning stages of metallurgy in early China, about regional cultures where this can be documented, and about the materials and manufacture of the earliest datable metal artifacts excavated in the last half part of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century have been brought together in \textit{The Beginning of Metallurgy in China} edited in English by K. M. Linduff, Han Rubin, and Sun Shuyun.\textsuperscript{776} In addition, \textit{Metallurgy in Ancient Eastern Eurasia from the Urals to the Yellow River}, also edited by K.M. Linduff,\textsuperscript{777} is a fabulous contribution to the scholarly literature concerning the emergence and spread of metal technology in the Eurasian Steppe during the third and second millennia BCE. Besides their technological significance, resolutions to questions of when and how metal technology spread, illustrate our understanding of social developments throughout this vast region.\textsuperscript{778} Therefore, the debate about the beginnings and uses of metallurgy in antiquity worldwide, especially in China is possible.

Over the past fifty years, many scholars have drawn great attention to the origins and early evolution of copper and bronze metallurgy in China. ‘It was generally assumed among western scholars until recent decades that metallurgy was introduced into China from the outside because primitive stages have, in fact, been discovered nowhere in China up to the present moment.’\textsuperscript{779} Archeological finds in China since 1949, however, have shown clearly that there existed a primitive stage of metallurgy before the emergence of a mature bronze metallurgy in the Shang Dynasty. This led a number of scholars, notably N. Barnard,\textsuperscript{780} Cheng Te-K’un,\textsuperscript{781} Ho Ping-ti,\textsuperscript{782} Sun Shunyun and Han Runbin,\textsuperscript{783} Ke Jun,\textsuperscript{784} and Hua Jueming,\textsuperscript{785} to argue strongly that metallurgy in early China was of an indigenous origin. Some other scholars, however, still considers that ‘so far metal use in north China has not differed much from that of the Turkmenian cultures’ and hints at the existence of possible contact between China and Central Asia since the third millennia BCE’ or ‘it can no longer be maintained that metallurgy began in China in ways radically different from those known elsewhere’.

\textsuperscript{775} An Z. M. 2000, 29.
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\textsuperscript{783} Sun/Han 1981, 287-301.
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In a review of all the known evidence for early copper artifacts in China, An Zhimin\textsuperscript{786}, a leading Chinese archaeologist, is also inclined to claim the introduction of metallurgy to China from the west. He remarks ‘the appearance of early copper artifacts in China was relatively late; at least there were still no copper objects produced during the Neolithic five or six thousand years ago… Early copper artifacts quite possibly originated from or came into China through the prehistoric ‘Silk Road’. There is a long way to go before any consensus can finally be reached about the beginning of metallurgy in China’. Keightley\textsuperscript{787} points out that the origins of Chinese civilizations will not be fully understood until the Neolithic and Bronze Age context of the Eurasian steppe as a whole is clarified\textsuperscript{788}.

\textbf{7.4.1 The earliest copper/bronze objects in China}

Up until now, more than 1700 early copper/bronze objects\textsuperscript{789} dating from 3000-1500 BCE, including ornaments, tools, weapons, ritual vessels and musical instruments, as well as containers have been found from more than 70 places (Map 34). Among them, small ornaments and tools were in large quantities and the places where they were found cover a vast range of area. By contrast, weapons, ritual vessels, musical instruments and containers were in smaller quantities, and located in a limited area. To be specific, the ritual vessels and musical instruments, as well as containers were only found in the Central Plain. Moreover, their shapes are usually quite simple and rarely adorned with designs. As for the chemical composition, these objects were made more of copper than bronze. Sometimes there is a small quantity of arsenic-copper alloy and brass found in the earlier period. Casting and hammering were used simultaneously in making bronzes (Table 58). From these metal objects prior to 1500 BCE, we can see that the cultures where copper as well as alloyed metals were first used and manufactured are located across a large area from the west, across the northern frontier, to the eastern seaboard and to the north of what has been traditionally called China copper. The growth of the industry did not solely, or even primarily, occur in the Central Plain associated with early dynastic China, but in several regions (Map 34). Moreover, preliminary observation on the process by which the places where the technology developed as well as the role of metals and metals objects in these societies suggests that whereas each locus was quite distinct culturally even during the early dynastic period, they were probably interconnected\textsuperscript{790}.

From Map 34, we can see that these sites were clustered in four broad geographical

\textsuperscript{786} An Z. M. 1993, 1117.
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\textsuperscript{789} About 1500 metal objects were found in the Gansu, Qinghai and eastern Xinjiang regions. About 200 pieces were centered to the west of the Henan Province.
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regions, corresponding to their known archaeological cultures.

1. The Central Plain concentrated on the Shanxi, Shaanxi, and Henan provinces of modern China where the Yangshao, Taosi, and Erlitou cultures were distributed. It is noticeable that since the Erlitou culture (1900-1500 BCE) especially the latest two levels (Strata 3 and 4, c. 1700-1530 BCE) that the well-known evidence regarding the ritual use of bronzes can be documented. The metal objects include cast vessels, Jue vessels, chisels, arrowheads, knives, adzes, and other small ornaments. On average the alloys contain 5.55% tin and 1.2% lead. Bronze knives, plaques, and disks are inlaid with stones including turquoise. The use of bronzes in some graves, therefore, is clearly tied to the display of status, and is restricted to use only in the most elaborate graves. At these levels in the site of Erlitou itself, metal tools were scarce and the bronze industry was clearly prescriptive and probably controlled by the political and/or social elite.791

2. In Eastern China centered in the Shandong Province, most of the early metal objects are ascribed to the Longshan and Yueshi cultures respectively, and both of them are dated from 2500-1900 BCE. The metallurgy was limited to the production of simple artifacts such as personal ornaments and tools. In addition, they were found primarily in habitation, and occasionally in burials. So far, the excavated materials do not indicate either in number or technological sophistication the existence of a metal/bronze industry, but rather it is treated as an experimental craft, probably managed at an individual household level.792

3. Northeastern China includes eastern Inner Mongolia, northern Hebei, and western Liaoning. The earliest metal artifacts should be ascribed to the Hongshan culture, which is dated to 3000 BCE. Some copper-rich malachites were found in the Niuheliang region too. The Lower Xiajiadian culture, dating from 1900-1500 BCE in this region produced many metal items such as, tools-copper objects such as awls, chisels, pins, and personal ornaments including small rings with trumpet-shaped terminals, bracelets, rings and pendants. Most of them were copper, and some of them were bronze with up to 10% tin. In addition, several stone and ceramic molds for axes were found. According to the burial customs and settlements, the inhabitants of both eastern China and northeastern China were aware of metal technology in its most primitive form and must have been able to exploit nearby resources of ores, which required limited refining. These regions probably had their own technology, and were not influenced by other regions.793

791 Linduff et al. 2000, 11.
792 Linduff et al. 2000, 11.
4. Located in the northwest of present-day China, in the Gansu, Qinghai and Xinjiang Provinces, the early metal objects found in these areas are quite striking. Several metal objects belonging to the Majiayao culture (3000-2000 BCE) were found in habitation debris. In the subsequent period (2000-1600 BCE), a sharp increase of metal objects were identified as belonging to the Qijia and Siba cultures. The information on these metal objects have been mentioned and discussed in Chapter 3 and Chapter 7.3. Therefore, we can see that the metal objects of the Qijia culture are almost pure copper and bronze. Metallographic analyses of some metal objects show that the people in this region were reducing local copper-zinc ores from as early as about 3000 BCE\textsuperscript{794}, but that the alloying of metals was limited until about 2000 BCE. As for the Siba culture (1900-1600 BCE), the metal objects from the Ganguya, Donghuishan, and Huoshaoogou sites were of Cu-Sn alloys, Cu-As alloys and Cu-As-Sn alloys. Multi-mold casting was in use. The fabrication of arsenical copper from ores containing copper and arsenic in certain sites as well as manufacturing techniques including both casting and forging were typical of this region and set it apart from the metal using cultures of the Central Plain. In addition, the cast objects made from controlled alloys of copper and tin as well as lead do not indicate an experimental stage in metal production, but are artifacts executed by knowledgeable craftworkers who were called upon to produce both ornamental and utilitarian items. The uses and metallic content of these artifacts were clearly regularized as was their typology and function\textsuperscript{795}. As far as the Xinjiang region is concerned, Mei Jianjun has reviewed the information available, which has also been mentioned in Chapter 7.2. The earliest metal objects in Xinjiang are dated from 1800-400 BCE, becoming widespread circa 1000 BCE. The evidence from the earliest period is scant, however it still implies the practice of metal experimentation at that time.

The early metallurgy in China can be determined by four points as proposed by Mei Jianjun\textsuperscript{796}: ‘(1) there is no conclusive evidence for the appearance of metals in China before 3000 BCE, with the controversy over the earliest evidence of brass alloy during the Yangshao period (4400-2500 BCE) still unsettled; (2) there existed an initial phase of bronze metallurgy in the pre-Shang period (before 1600 BCE), the typological features of bronze assemblage from the Erlitou culture (1900-1600 BCE) reveal the origin and early evolution of the Shang bronze metallurgy; (3) it is now firmly established that copper or its alloys came into use in China during the Longshan period (2600-2000 BCE) on the basis of copper finds and copper slag from Henan, Shandong and Inner Mongolia; (4) the Central Plain areas of northern China and eastern Gansu and Qinghai to the northwest, are two major areas where remains

\textsuperscript{794} Linduff et al. 2000, 16.
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of early metallurgy (prior to the Shang period) have been found.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site/Location</th>
<th>Amount (analyzed)/Composition</th>
<th>Date/culture</th>
<th>Site/Location</th>
<th>Amount (analyzed)/Composition</th>
<th>Date/culture culture reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jiangzhai, Shaanxi Province</td>
<td>2 brass (65% Cu, 25% Zn, 6% Pb; 69% Cu, 32% Zn)</td>
<td>Banpo type of Yangshao culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weinan, Shaanxi Province</td>
<td>1 brass (?)</td>
<td>Yangshao culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linjia, Dongxiang, Gansu</td>
<td>1 knife (Cu-Sn)</td>
<td>2900-2740 BCE/Majiaoy type of Majiaoy culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xitai, Aohan, Inner Mongolia</td>
<td>Some pottery molds</td>
<td>Hongshan culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niuheliang, Liaoning Province</td>
<td>1 copper loop</td>
<td>Hongshan culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liangcheng, Yongdeng, Gansu</td>
<td>1 knife</td>
<td>2680-2335 BCE/Machang type of Majiaoy culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiangfen, Shanxi Province</td>
<td>1 bell (97.8% Cu, 1.5% Pb, 0.1 Zn)</td>
<td>Taosi type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jiangzhai 88.
KGB 1989, 1110-1120.
Sun/Han 1997, 75-84.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Metal Composition</th>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Site/Province</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-1600 BCE</td>
<td>Qinghai and Gansu Province</td>
<td>22 Cu; 2 Cu-Sn</td>
<td>Qijia culture</td>
<td>Sanlihe, Jiaoxian, Shandong Province (east China)</td>
<td>2 awls, Brass (20.2-26.4% Zn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dongshui, Minle county, Gansu</td>
<td>12 As-Cu; 2 Cu-As-Sn; 1 Sn-As-Pb-Cu</td>
<td>Siba culture</td>
<td>Zhukaigou site III-V, Inner Mongolia (north China)</td>
<td>5 Cu 10 Cu-Sn; 17Cu-Sn-Pb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ganguya, Jiuquan, Gansu</td>
<td>10 Cu-As; 22 Cu-Sn; 5 Cu-Sn-As</td>
<td>Erlitou, Henan (Central China)</td>
<td>Dongxiafeng, Shanxi Province (Central Plain)</td>
<td>25 Cu-Sn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huoshaogou, Yumen, Gansu</td>
<td>50% copper; 50% Cu-Sn; 13 objects contain As</td>
<td>Yinjiacheng, Sishui, Shandong Province (east China)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 Cu-Sn; 3 Cu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 58. The earliest copper and bronze objects found in China.

805 ZSKKS 1984, 1067-1071.
806 Sun/Han 1997, 75-84; 24 of 45 metal objects have been analyzed.
807 CHW et al. 1977, 266.
808 Some ingots were found in the Henan Province, ascribed to the Longshan culture.
809 Donghuishan 98, 191-195.
810 Li X. H. et al. 1996, 84-93.
811 Of the 44 metal objects found at the Zhukaigou site, 33 objects have been analyzed. Some are determined to contain certain Arsenic.
813 Li/Shui 2000, 36; Sun/Han 1997, 75-84. 46 of 48 metal objects have been analyzed.
816 Sun/Han 1997, 75-84. Over 200 metal objects were discovered at the Huoshaogou site. Of them, 65 have been analyzed.
817 The more detailed information can see in Linduff et al. 2000, 322-353 Table I: Discoveries of and Research on Early Bronzes in China.
7.4.2 The copper-arsenic alloy in northern China and lead-containing ore resources

All of the areas where metallurgy emerged were near metal ore resources. The distribution of these ore sites has been well summarized in *The Beginnings of Metallurgy in China*\(^{818}\) (Map 35-Map 36). Each area developed a taste for items made from copper and copper alloys, and gold items have been found in the northeast and northwest of China. Trumpet-shaped earrings, for instance, have been found all over eastern Asia and northern China and were made from copper and tin-bronze as well as gold and silver according to the local preference. The lack of consistency in formulae suggests that the knowledge was gained from several sources and not through local invention\(^{819}\).

Deposits of non-ferrous metals in Gansu are very common; at present, there are over two hundred sites with mixed deposits of different non-ferrous metal ores. China’s tin deposits occur primarily in the south and in the Hebei and Liaoning; but Gansu, Inner Mongolia, and Xinjiang also have some tin (Map 35, Map 36). Accordingly, the early appearance of bronze in Gansu is quite probable in terms of the required resources. Copper ore is sometimes found together with lead and zinc ore, and occasionally it may even contain a little tin ore. The oxide ores of lead and tin are easily reduced by charcoal and thus can be smelted along with copper to form an alloy, thereby resulting in bronze. As we know, eastern Xinjiang, northern Gansu, and south-central of Inner Mongolia are provided with some early arsenical alloys. Most of the arsenical bronzes contain 1%-6% arsenic, and those found from the Gansu region normally exceed 4% arsenic. Therefore, the people may have intentionally learned the arsenic alloying techniques.

It is well known that the arsenic alloys appeared in Caucasus and Western Asia from the late fifth millennia BCE. After the early second millennia BCE, the arsenic alloy was very popular and seen around the eastern Eurasian Steppe; however, brass was widely used in the Carpathian region. Meanwhile, the arsenical bronzes increased in Central Asia. It is from the middle of the second millennia BCE that tin bronze became very common in the Eurasian Steppe. The use of copper-arsenic alloy in the Siba culture of northwest China was roughly parallel to that in the eastern Eurasian Steppe.

Considering the close contact between the Xinjiang and western cultures such as Andronovo, Karasuk and so forth, many scholars believe that the Xinjiang region may very well have been the entry point for bringing metallurgy knowledge into the Gansu Corridor. However, as mentioned in section 7.2.2, up until now, the appearance of the

\(^{818}\) Linduff et al. 2000.  
\(^{819}\) Linduff 2004, 8.
early metal objects in Xinjiang seems later than that in the Gansu and Qinghai regions. Moreover, two metal objects found in the Wupu cemetery identified as containing arsenic are dated to 1400-1000 BCE, which is later than the arsenical copper in the Siba culture. Therefore, the hypothesis of a western origin of the metallurgy for the Gansu and Qinghai regions are still lacking direct evidence.

There is no question that by the early dynastic period in China, or no later than the Shang Dynasty (ca. 1550-1050 BCE), the ancient Chinese had already considered technological options and made technological choices about metals.\textsuperscript{820} Analysis of these early metal objects, including the metallurgical content of many items and casting technology used, as well as the types and uses of metal artifacts in the period from about 3000 to 1500 BCE has led to some surprising observations about the advent of metallurgy in China, and about its role and development in a complex society. Recent syntheses, which investigate early China usually, view the archaeological landscape during the fourth millennia BCE as a mosaic of regional groups, which interacted with each other.\textsuperscript{821}

\textit{Metallurgy in Ancient Eastern Eurasia from the Urals to the Yellow River}, as mentioned above, is a fabulous contribution to the scholarly literature concerning the emergence and spread of metal technology in the Eurasian Steppe, during the third and second millennia BCE. According to this book, we can see that that many-shared traits in the Eurasian Steppe and China suggest that there was a ‘metallurgical network’ of some type, however loosely connected.\textsuperscript{823} The approximate chronological and cultural time span between the Eurasian Steppe and northern China, which has been discussed in the preceding chapters, implies that the emergence of metallurgy was quite a regional feature.

\textsuperscript{820} Barnard 1961.
\textsuperscript{821} Chang 1986, 234-294.
\textsuperscript{822} Linduff 2004
\textsuperscript{823} Linduff 2004, 10.
Chapter 8 Conclusions

The research described in the preceding chapters has thrown new light on the chronological and cultural framework of bronzes in northern China during the 4th and 3rd millennia B. P. and its inner connections and external interactions with the neighboring regions. The major arguments and their broader implications for understanding the early cultural interactions in the whole Eurasian Steppe have been presented. In this chapter, I shall draw attention to those questions that were put forward in Chapter 1, which may be of importance for future research.

Where, when and what kind of metals were used in northern China? What was the origin of the bronzes in northern China?

In fact, the first and fifth question has been partly answered in Chapter 7.4. Northern China in this study is divided into three sub-regions: northwest, north-central, and south of the Yanshan. Sparse evidence of metal use appeared in the late Neolithic Majiayao culture, in the northwest, during the third millennia BCE. Later, in the Qijia culture (2300-1800 BCE), unalloyed copper was used to produce most items, including small implements and ornaments. In the subsequent Siba culture, quite a number of Cu-As alloys as well as Cu-Sn and Cu-Sn-Pb alloys were used. In addition, Cu-Sn alloys were very common in the Kayue and Xindian cultures.

By contrast, little information on the metal used in north-central and south of the Yanshan region before the second millennia BCE is available. The Zhukaigou culture (1900-1200 BCE), the incipient bronze-using culture in north-central, was dominated by Cu-Sn-Pb alloys and Cu-Sn alloys. In addition, two metals of the Zhukaigou culture have been identified as containing As. Sample 5028:3 Ge (2686) contains 5.4% Sn and 6.8% As; Sample H5003:11 arrowhead (2684) contains 15.7% Sn and 1.4% As. They were probably produced from a CuSnAs oxidized ore, though neither the smelting site nor the mine have been located. As and Sn are similar in that both can be dissolved into Cu to form an α solid solution to make the objects harder. As usually co-exists with oxide ores containing copper, silver, Sn, Cu and Ag. If this oxide ore is smelted in a reducing atmosphere, and the temperate is high (1100°C), As will still not volatilize. As R. F. Tylecote remarked, smelting oxidized ores containing As will result in As in cast...
artifacts. In general, the amount of As remaining in a bronze alloy is lower than 7%. In smelting oxidized ores that contain less than 1-2% As, the retrieval rate of As is almost 100%. In addition, as mentioned in the previous chapters, the metal objects of the Zhukaigou culture show both influence from the northwest and the Central Plain. Located east of the Zhukaigou culture, the Datuotou culture was a contemporary bronze-using culture. Its metallurgy was probably influenced by the Qijia and Siba cultures in northwest China, which is fully reflected in the trumpet-shaped earrings and arrowheads (Fig. 111c).

From the early first millennia BCE or slightly earlier, iron appeared in bronze-using cultures in northern China. Nevertheless, copper and bronze were still widely used and applied extensively in the manufacture of a vast range of objects. It is worth noting that six samples of the 35 analyzed metal objects of the Taohongbala culture are brass, others are made of Cu-Sn and Cu-Sn-Pn alloys. As we know, the earliest metallurgy of the Central Plain is recognized by brass. Therefore, it is possible that the brass technology in north-central may well be related to the Central Plain. By contrast, neither copper nor arsenic and zinc alloy were determined in the Yuhuangmiao culture, which was roughly parallel to the Taohongbala culture. The tri-element alloys with tin as the leading element were popular in the Yuhuangmiao culture, however, the alloys with lead as the main element were only found in two cases. Moreover, the gold and silver items in an animal style were very common in northern China after the Spring and Autumn period. The Taohongbala culture is in particular characterized by rich gold and silver objects.

According to the aforementioned information, it seems that each sub-region of northern China had its own metallurgical process. The metallurgy of northwest China started from copper, arsenical alloy, then to tin alloys, similar with that of western Central Asia and the Eurasian Steppe during the third and second millennia BCE. Though I am inclined towards the view, that there were some technological links between the northwest (Gansu and Qinghai regions), Xinjiang and Central Asia and the Eurasian Steppe, and that the arsenical alloys in Xinjiang appeared later than in the Qinghai and Gansu regions cannot lead us to believe that the western metallurgical techniques were introduced from west through Xinjiang to the Qinghai-Gansu regions. It was probably caused by the sporadic nature of the archaeological discoveries and excavation. Nevertheless, more evidence is hoped from future fieldwork.

The use of metals in north-central and south of the Yanshan region seemed to begin with copper and tin alloys, differing to the northwest. However, the earliest metal objects in
these two regions display a resemblance with the northwest in forms. Considering the availability of copper and tin alloys in north-central China and south of the Yanshan region (Map 34- Map 36), the possibility of local metal production in this region cannot be ruled out.

Ancient metallurgy in the Central Plain was dominated by the production of small tools and weapons from the late Longshan culture to the early Erlitou period, while ornaments were rare. The alloying technology was developed from copper and brass to tin bronze. Clay molds came into use in the Erlitou II period, which laid the foundations for ritual bronze casting and a flourishing bronze-producing technology in the Yellow River valley in later times. In short, the differences between metallurgy in the northwest region, north-central and south of the Yanshan region, and the Central Plain had a certain relationship to their metal resources, economic patterns and cultural traditions as well as east-west exchanges.

What was the cultural context like for northern China during the 4th and 3rd millennia B.P.? What kind of internal cultural connections existed in northern China?

The answer of the second and third question can be found between Chapter 3 and Chapter 6, which is also the main body of this study (see Fig. 136, Map 24). The Qijia, Siba, Kayue, Xindian, Siwa, Nuomuhong, Tangwang-style pottery, and Shajing cultures in the Northwest Complex passed over some distinctive local features, especially in burial patterns, bronze artifacts, and subsistence. From the archaeological and metallurgical evidence available so far, northwest China took the lead in entering the Bronze Age, however developed much more slowly than the other complexes in the later period. Bronze artifacts were usually composed of small-scale tools, weapons, and ornaments, including knives, awls, arrowheads, joined beads, plaques, bulbs and so on. Only several big bronze artifacts were found in the late Siwa culture, such as bronze Ge (Fig. 103b, 35.38), which may have been imported from the Central Plain. The Xigang and Chaiwanggang sites of the Shajing culture produced many northern-style bronze ornaments. One of the most striking features of the Northwest Complex is that the advanced pottery industry never disappeared, namely, the copper/bronze artifacts had not taken the place of the role of potteries. The subsistence of this complex was a mixture of farming, animal husbandry and hunting. Meanwhile, the proportion of subsistence was in a situation of dynamic variation and differed in each region over time. Farming played a big role from the beginning to the end. It was after the late Qijia culture that animal husbandry increased gradually. In addition, pastoral subsistence does not seem to have
taken the lead in the Northwest Complex because evidence of horse-raising and horse-
riding is scarce. The rarity of horse sacrifices and horse fittings found in the bronze-using
cultures of the Northwest Complex bear testament to this hypothesis.

The North-central Complex designates the Zhukaigou, Xicha, Lijiaya, Yanglang, Maoqinggou, and Taohongbala cultures located in south central Inner Mongolia and adjacent areas, including northern Shaanxi, northwestern Shanxi, the Qingyang region in Gansu, and Ningxia. It is also the center of the so-called ‘Ordos bronzes’ and ‘Northern bronzes’. There are two discontinuities in cultural development, respectively from the early and late Shang period (1300-1200 BCE) and from the middle Western Zhou period to the early Spring and Autumn period (about 900-700 BCE). The scarce cultural remains from these two periods may be due to infrequent human activity caused by disastrous events at that time. The flourishing Yanglang, Taohongbala, and Maoqinggou cultures were distributed side by side from the early Spring and Autumn period to the late Warring States period. On one hand, they show some common characteristics, such as animal sacrifice, splendid metal objects with a strong pastoral style, and so on. On the other hand, they distinguish themselves by their burial patterns, bronze assemblages, and subsistence.

The individuality of the south of the Yanshan Complex has been recognized gradually by scholars. It defines the bronze-using cultures distributed within the northern Hebei region and the Beijing and Tianjin regions, including the Datuotou, Weifang III, Upper Zhangjiayuan, and Yuhuangmiao cultures. Compared to the North-central Complex, the bronze cultures in the south of the Yanshan Complex are more continuous, which is recognized by a mixture assemblage of both northern-style bronzes and central China style bronzes. From the late Neolithic to the late Western Zhou period, the Datuotou, Weifang III, and Upper Zhangjiayuan cultures developed successively. There is also a cultural discontinuity during the late Western Zhou period to the early Spring and Autumn period, almost parallel to the second break taking place in the North-central Complex. After the Spring and Autumn period, the Yuhuangmiao culture emerged with splendid metal objects. The Yanglang, Taohongbala, Maoqinggou, and Yuhuangmiao cultures seem to have flourished simultaneously from west to east in northern China. ‘Northern bronzes’ entered a prosperous era.

In general, the copper/bronze metallurgy of these two complexes appears later than that of the Northwest Complex. The earliest metal objects were possibly influenced by or

---

827 The slight difference in subsistence has been discussed in Chapter 6.
imported from the northwest. In comparison, the metallurgy industry developed very fast in the later period and reached its climax after the Spring and Autumn period. At the same time, animal husbandry played a leading role for the north-central and south of the Yanshan people; however, the crucial function of farming cannot be ruled out because the Maoqinggou and Yuhuangmiao cultures were still dependent on semi-pastoral and semi-agriculture subsistence according to the available archaeological evidence.

Of course, the interactions between these three complexes are beyond question. According to the archaeological evidence available, the affinities between the North-central Complex and south of the Yanshan Complex were much closer than the relations between the Northwest Complex and its eastern complexes were. From the second millennia BCE to the middle Shang period, the Northwest Complex had more influence on the other two complexes. The Qijia and Siba culture spread through the Hexi Corridor and Yinshan to the Zhukaigou and Datuotou cultures, which is especially evident in bronze objects. The communications were two-way. From the middle Shang period to the late Warring States period, the impact from the Northwest Complex reduced when the influence of the North-central Complex and south of the Yanshan Complex increased. With the development of the pastoral subsistence, the entire northern China shared more common cultural features after the Spring and Autumn period.

**What kind of external cultural connections and technological interactions existed between northern China and its neighboring regions during the 4th and 3rd millennia B. P?**

The fourth question has already been answered in Chapter 7. The Northwest Complex were seemingly more connected with cultures to their own west, and remained outside of the Chinese cultural and political dynastic area until the Qin conquered these lands around the fifth century BCE. By contrast, south of the Yanshan region seems to be Central Plainized. Each region might have optionally adapted or borrowed different traits of the Central Plain culture. The widespread central-style Ge-daggers found in northern China suggests that the interactions between northern China and the Central Plain were mainly through warfare. The orientation of the Great Wall is roughly in accordance with the scale of the influence from the Central Plain. Consequently, cultures located to the south side of the Great Wall became progressively part of the Central Plain culture; while those in the north attached themselves further into the Eurasian Steppe cultures.

Cultural interactions between the Xinjiang and Gansu-Qinghai regions during the first half of the second millennia BCE largely took place between the bronze cultures of Qijia,
Siba, and Tianshanbeilu. A metallurgical center may have developed in the Gansu-Qinghai region during this period based upon the rich resources of non-metallic ores in the region. From the Spring and Autumn period onwards, the Xinjiang, Eurasian Steppe, and northern China shared some common features that were related to pastoral life, such as horse fittings, loop headed knives, socketed axes, earrings, animal style plaques, cooking ware-Fu and so forth (Fig. 140a; Fig. 140b; Fig. 140c).

In addition to the possible technological links between the Eurasian Steppe and northwest China, evidence of cultural connections between northern China and the Eurasian Steppe cultures are fully reflected in the pastoral metal objects with animal patterns. The cultural elements of the Pit-grave culture, Andronovo culture, Karasuk culture, and Deer Stone culture can be traced to Xinjiang and northern China. It is crucial to realize northern China’s strategic position between the Central Plain and the Eurasian Steppes. Its interaction with its neighbors and its indigenous development make northern China a special area that was open to various cultural influences from surrounding areas, while at the same time, it was isolated enough to make its own developments. The frequent movement of people, goods, and ideas undoubtedly encouraged local innovation, and competition between the various cultures, or tribes with different backgrounds may have stimulated the growth of cultures with strong regional features.828

A leading Chinese scholar, Lin Yun had an amazing description on the cultural exchanges between west and east, ‘the open steppe area in Central Asia is like a wonderful historical whirlpool which integrates different cultural elements with different origins into one united and stable complex; meanwhile, the elements of the complex like spume splash into the surrounding areas.’829

The Future

It is clear that further analysis needs to be done region by region. There is demand for more materials and metallurgical information on the north-central and the south of the Yanshan. Since the technological analysis contributed immeasurably to the discussion of cultural interactions, it is hoped that the technical analysis for published materials will be carried out soon. If more and more sites are excavated and more and more metallurgical information is available, it will be possible for us to draw a more comprehensive picture on the economic, political, and social organization of northern China within the greater background of the Eurasian Steppes.

828 MJJ 2000, 75.
829 Lin Y. 1998c, 280.
Map 1. The physical geography of northern China, 1 Yinshan; 2 Qilianshan; 3 Hexi Corridor; 4 Helanshan; 5 Taihang Shan; 6 Ordos Plateaus; 7 Loess Plateau; 8 Yanshan; 9 Liaohe; 10 Xilamulunhe; 11 Xiliaohe; 12 Yellow River; 13 Weihe.
Map 2. Sub-regions of northern China in this study.
Map 3. Distribution of annual mean temperate (°C) in China (after Pak Y. J. 41 Map 2.6).
Map 4. Distribution of annual precipitation (mm) in China (after Pak Y. J. 1996, 43 Map 2.8).
Map 5. Distribution of aridity indices in China (after Pak Y. J. 1996, 44 Map 2.9).

Map 7 Distribution of the Qijia culture.
Map 8. The Qijia culture sites that were discovered with bronze objects: 1 Haizangsi; 2 Huangniangniantai; 3 Zongzhai; 4 Shenna; 5 Gamatai; 6 Zongri; 7 Dahezhuang; 8 Qinweijia; 9 Xinzhuangping; 10 Weijiataizi; 11 Xiping; 12 Qijiaaping; 13 Shangguandi, Kangle; 14 Chenqimogou; 15 Xinglin; 16 Huangjiazhai; 17 Shangsunjiazhai; 18 Liuwan; 19 Zhangjiazui, Jijiachuan; 20 Sizuiping; 21 Xinglong town; 22 Haijiawan; 23 Qiao village; 24 Fujiamen; 25 Shizhao, Xishanping.
Map 9. Distribution of the Xindian culture
Map 10. Distribution of the Kayue culture.
Map 11. Distribution of the Siwa culture (after Shui T. 2001a, 221 Fig. 18).
Map 12. Distribution of the Siba culture
Map 13. Distribution of the Shajing culture.
Map 15. Distribution of the Zhukaigou culture and the Xicha culture, 1 Zhukaigou; 2 Erliban; 3 Nanhao; 4 Gaojiaping; 5 Baiaobao; 6 Bainiyaozi; 7 Zhaizita; 8 Yangchangou; 9 Zhuangwoping; 10 Guandi; 11 Haishengbulang; 12 Xicha.
Map 16. Distribution of the Lijiaya culture, 1 Erlangpo; 2 Houlanjiagou; 3 Taohuazhuang; 4 Caojiayuan; 5 Yidie; 6 Xiaxinjiao; 7 Lindeyu; 8 Shangdong; 9 Zhanglangou; 10 Lijiata; 11 Yantou; 12 Hourenjiagou; 13 Xiejiagou; 14 Lijiaya; 15 Yangquanpo; 16 Siyan; 17 Heidouzui.
Map 17. Distribution of the Maoqingga culture, 1 Maoqingga; 2 Fanjiayaozi; 3 Shuijiangoumen; 4 Qiandesheng; 5 Yinniugou; 6 Guoxiayaozi; 7 Goulitou.
Map 18. Distribution of the Taohongbala culture, 2 Nalingaotu; 3 Lijiapan; 4 Waertugou; 5 Sujigou; 6 Aluchaideng; 7 Yulongtai; 8 Hulusitai; 9 Xigoupan; 10 Baohaishe; 11 Shihuigou; 12 Nianfangqu; 13 Ming’anmudu.
Map 19. Distribution of the Yanglang culture, 1 Nidingcun; 2 Langwozikeng; 3 Mazhuang; 4 Yujiacun; 5 Jizhuangchang; 6 Dabeishan; 7 Wangjiaping; 8 Houmocun; 10 Tianwacun; 11 Luzizuigou; 12 Luzigou; 13 Yumengxiang; 14 Baiyangcun; 15 Chenyangchuan; 16 Banzigoucun; 17 Shangdiancun; 18 Danbeicun; 19 Jizhuangchang; 20 Wugoucun; 21 Miaoqucun; 22 Wujiaogouquan; 23 Hongyancun; 24 Mazhai; 25 Fengbaocun; 26 Wulipo; 27 Yujiacun; 28 Houzhuang; 29 Ligou; 30 Tatou; 31 Shangwangjiacheng.
Map 20. Distribution of the Datuotou culture, 1 Dachan; 2 Xiaoguanzhuang; 3 Dachengshan; 4 Xueshan; 5 Zhangjiayuan; 6 Liulidian; 7 Weifang; 8 Liujiahe; 9 Niudaokou; 10 Dongzhuangdian; 11 Guye; 12 Sanguan; 13 Fenghuangshan; 14 Lidarenzhuang; 15 Xiayuegezhuang; 16 Pangjiahe; 17 Tazhao; 18 Jiacun; 19 Qinggongtai.
Map 21. Distribution of the Weifang III culture, 1 Bangjun; 2 Weifang; 3 Mashao; 4 Geshan’gezhuang; 5 Chenshantou; 6 Xiaoshandongzhuang; 7 Liujiahe; 8 Chaodaogou; 9 Guye; 10 Laishui.
Map 22. Distribution of the Upper Zhangjiayuan culture, 1 Zhangjiayuan; 2 Baohaishe; 3 Guye; 4 Liushugou; 5 Niuquanziliang; 6 Dongdaogouxia; 7 Zhenjiangying; 8 Liujiafen; 9 Dongnangou; 10 Baifu; 11 Xibozi; 12 Xiaohenan.
Map 23. Distribution of the Yuhuangmiao culture, 1 Yuhuangmiao; 2 Beixinbao; 3 Ganzibao; 4 Qingzigou; 5 Luotuoliang; 6 Paotaishan; 7 Baimiao; 8 Nihezi; 9 Xiaobaiyang; 10 Lishugoumen; 11 Daolazui; 12 Longqingxia.
Map 24. Bronze-using cultures in northern China during the 4th and 3rd millennia B. P. .
Map 29. Distribution of the Shang, Pre-Zhou and Zhou cultures (after Shui T. 2001a, 258 Fig. 41).
Map 30. Location of the Great Wall during the Warring States and northern culture sites.
Map 31. Cultural influence on prehistoric Xinjiang from the neighboring regions (after MJJ 2000, 78 Fig. 1.1).
Map 32. The locations of the Afanasievo, Andronovo and Machang cultures in Eurasia. The possible directions of the cultural spread are also shown (after MJJ 2000, 161 Map 6.1).
Map 33. Distribution of the Andronovo-related sites found in Xinjiang, 1 Aga’ersen; 2 Lanzhouwanzi; 3 Xintala; 4 Ka’ersang; 5 Urumuchi; 6 Xinyuan; 7 Tacheng; 8 Sazi; 9 Tuoli; 10 Yining; 11 Nieke; 12 Jimusa’er; 13 Qitai; 14 Kuisu; 15 Hami; 16 Wupu; 17 Gumugou; 18 Ke’ermuqiji; Distribution of Bronze Age cultures in Xinjiang: a Gumugou; b Xintala; c Wupu; d Yanbulake; e Nanwan; f Ke’ermuqi; g Haldun; h Aketala (after MJJ 2000, 162 Map 6.3).
Map 34. Early sites yielding metal-by period and type (after Linduff et al. 2000, 273 Map 4).
Map 35. Various metal resources in China (after Linduff et al. 2000, 274 Map 5).
Map 36. Silver and gold resources in China (after Linduff et al. 2000, 277 Map 8).
Fig. 001. Shangbanzhuwa, bronze funeral objects, 1 chisel, L 17.8cm; 2-7 bulb, dm 1-2cm; 9.10 knife, L 14.9cm.12.4 cm; 11.12 bulb, dm 5.1cm.1.4cm; 13. awl, L 3.8cm; 14 bell, dm 2.3cm; 15 joined beads, L 2.6cm; 16-17 battle axe, H 9.8cm.10.3cm (after QHY 1996, 36 Fig. 21; QHY 1998, 59 Fig. 22).

Fig. 002. Xiabanzhuwa, bronze funeral objects, 1 knife, L 10.5cm; 2 joined beads, L 1.6-2cm; 3.4 bulb, dm 1.5-3cm; 5.6 earring, 8cm.4.5cm (after Liu/Dou 1998, 8 Fig. 10, 1-5.7).

Fig. 003. Gangcha, bronze funeral objects, 1 knife, L 12cm; 2 awl, L 4.4cm; 3 tube, L 9.8cm; 4 tube, L ca.5cm (after Wang W. 1990, 18 Fig. 3, 6-8; Gu W. H. 1990, 69 Fig 3, 1).
Fig. 004. Hongshui, bronze arrowhead, L 2.3cm (after Wu H. X. 1994, 10 Fig. 3, 9).

Fig. 005. Shaka, bronze funeral objects, 1.2 joined beads, L 1.8cm.1.3cm; 3 bulb dm 2.6cm; 4 knife, L 10cm (after QHY 2002a, 30 Fig. 30, 3-5. 7).

Fig. 006. Shanjiatou, Tomb M4, robe hook, L 7.8cm (after Ge/Hong 1990, 14 Fig. 10, 6).

Fig. 007a. Zongzhai, funeral objects, 1-2 bronze knife, L 11.4cm.13.5cm; 3 bone awl, L 6.7cm; 4 bone knife (after QHWD 1986c, 314 Fig. 9, 7.8; 313 Fig. 8, 9).
Fig. 007b. Zongzhai, tombs M38 and M39, burial goods (1-8 after QHWD 1986c, 310 Fig. 5, 1; 309 Fig. 4, 12. 2; 310 Fig. 5, 2; 309 Fig. 4, 3.1; 312 Fig. 7, 1.2; 9 adapted from QHWD 1986c, 307 Fig. 3).

Fig. 008. Zong’an temple, stray finds of bronze artifacts, 1 knife, L 28.5cm; 2 dagger-axe, L 13.5cm; 3 knife, L 21cm (after Gao D. L. 1985b, 49 Fig. 2, 1-3).
Fig. 009. Suhusa, bronze funeral objects, 1 joined beads, L 2.6cm; 2-4 bulb, dm 1.6cm. 1.9cm. 5.3cm. (after QHK 1994, 460 Fig. 30, 1-4).

Fig. 010. Chengxi, collected bronze artifacts, 1 bulb, dm 2.15cm; 2 bell, L ca. 2.6cm (after QHY 1990c, 23 Fig. 7, 3.6).

Fig. 011. Shanpingtai, bronze funeral objects, 1 bell, L ca. 2.9cm; 2 knife, L 12cm. (after QHWD et al. 1987, 267 Fig. 22, 12.13).
Fig. 012. Liangjiao, collected bronze artifacts, 1 dagger-axe, L 18.5cm; 2 axe, L 7.2cm; 3 cross axe, L 14.2cm (after Liu/Chen 1990, 83 Fig.1).

Fig. 013. Huangjiazhai, bronze funeral objects (adapted from QHY et al. 1994, 201 Fig 9).
Fig. 014a. Dahuazhongzhuang, bronze funeral objects, 1.6 mirror, dm 10.5cm.9 cm; 3.4.7.12.13 bulb; 5 pole top, L 12cm; 8-11 bell, dm 1.4-2.5cm; 14-17 spear, L 25.5cm.23.6cm.22.38cm; 18 arrowhead, L 5.2cm; 19 awl; 21-23 knife, L ca 14.4-16cm (after QHHYB et al., 1985, 22 Fig. 22; 20 Fig 16, 1-10; 25 Fig. 25, 5.6).
Fig. 014b. Dahuazhongzhuang, graves (after QHHYB et al. 1985, 14 Fig. 4; Fig. 5; 13 Fig. 3; 15 Fig. 6-8).
Fig. 014c. Dahuazhongzhuang, graves (after QHHYB et al. 1985, 18 Fig. 14; 17 Fig. 12; 16 Fig. 9-11; 17 Fig. 13).
Fig. 015a Mobula, plan of house F1 and F2 (adapted from Gao/Xu 1990, 1013 Fig. 2).

Fig. 015b. Mobula, House F3 and F4 (adapted from Gao/Xu 1990, 1014 Fig. 3).
Fig. 015c. Mobula, house F1, 1-3 pottery, L 35 cm, 23 cm, 25 cm; 4 bone, L 9 cm; 5 stone spiral whorl, dm 7.5 cm (after Gao/Xu 1990, 1016 Fig. 6, 3, 6, 8, 9, 12).

Fig. 015d. Mobula, M7, 2-3 pottery, H 16 cm, 14 cm (after Gao/Xu 1990, 1015 Fig. 5; 1016 Fig. 6, 1, 2).
Fig. 016a. Huabiliang and Luanshan, bronze funeral objects (after QHWD et al. 1986b, 886 Fig. 6, 4-9) 1-4 scale 1:2; 5-6 1:4.

Fig. 016b. Huanyuan county, collected bronze objects, 1 bird, H ca.10.8cm; 2 figure, H ca. 6.6cm (after QHWD et al. 1986b, 883 Fig. 2, 1.11).

Fig. 017a. Panjialiang, distribution of the tombs (after QHY 1994b, 30 Fig. 2).
Fig. 017b. Panjialiang, bronze funeral objects (after QHY 1994b, 59 Fig. 35, 4.3.5.8.7.9.10.15.18.16.17.12-14.21.19.20; 57 Fig. 33, 19.20; 58 Fig. 34, 1-3.8-10; 59 Fig. 35, 1.2; 58 Fig. 34, 5-7.4; 57 Fig. 33, 11.12).
Fig. 017c. Panjiangliang, Tomb 117. A. B the person buried alive; C the bones from others; D. E the owners of the tomb (after QHY 1994b, 48 Fig. 26).
Fig. 017d. Panjialiang, Tomb M210 (after QHY 1994b, 49 Fig. 27).

Fig. 017e. Panjialiang, tomb M221 (after QHY 1994b, 49 Fig. 28).
Fig. 017f. Panjialiang, 1 Tomb M144; 2 Tomb M52 (after QHY 1994b, 39 Fig. 12; Fig.13).
Fig. 017g. Panjialiang, Tomb M150: left, lower tomb; right, upper tomb with the person buried alive (after QHY 1994b, 44 Fig. 18).

Fig. 017h. Panjialiang, left, tomb M46; right tomb M47 (after QHY 1994b, 40 Fig. 14).
Fig. 017i. Panjialiang, upper, tomb M43; right, tomb M50 (after QHY 1994b, 61 Fig. 36).
Fig. 017j. Panjialiang, Tomb M202 and Tomb M201 (after QHY 1994b, 62 Fig. 37).
Fig. 018. Collected bronzes, 1-3 found from Huangzhong county; 4 found from Xining, spear, L 61.5 cm (after ZWL 2003, 159 Fig. 4.4, 9.15; 160 Fig. 4.5, 7.5).

Fig. 019. Bronze objects, 1-3 from Gamatai; 4-9 from Zongri (after Shinian 91; QHW et al. 1998, 14 Fig. 35; ZWL 2003, 158 Fig. 4.2, 7.8.12).
Fig. 020a. Fengtai, trench TG1, West Profile (after Xu, X. G. et al. 2003, 91 Fig. 4).
Fig. 020b. Fengtai, trench TG1, East Profile (after Xu. X. G. et al. 2003, 89 Fig. 3)
Fig. 020c. Fengtai, trench TG2, South Profile (after Xu X. G. et al. 2003, 95 Fig. 7).
Fig. 021. Langwozikeng, bronze funeral objects, 1-9 knives, L 10.3-18.7cm; 10 iron sword with bronze handle, L 48.7cm; 11-14 short swords, L 25.9cm, 29.6cm, 25cm, 29cm; 15, 16 arrowheads, L 5.8cm, 3cm; 17 crane hack, L 16.5cm; 18-20 dagger, L 12.5cm, 12cm, 11.6cm; 21 spear, L 15.5cm; 22 adze, L 9.6cm; 23-25 axe, L 19cm, 8.3cm, 5.2cm; 26 chisel, L 10.1cm; 27-28 ornaments, L 10.6cm, 8.8cm; 29-31 awls, L 11.3cm, 10.9cm, 16.4cm; 32-34 gag bits, L 20.5-21.5cm (after Zhou X. H. 1989, 973 Fig. 3, 1-9; 974 Fig. 4, 1-5, 7, 14, 9-13; 975 Fig. 5; 976 Fig. 6).
Fig. 022a. Zhangjie, collected bronzes, 1 adze, L 4.2cm; 2 crane hack, L 10.9cm; 3 dagger, L 10.5cm; 4 Dun, L 8.5cm; 5 Yuan-shaft for cart, L 12.1cm; 6-8 Danglu-chriot fitting, L 10.1-9cm; 9-11 bulb, dm 4.1cm.2.3cm.5 cm; 12-13 pole top, H 3.4cm.6.8cm; 14 belt buckle, L 6.7cm; 15 spade plaque, L 8.1cm; 16-19 bird, L 4.1cm.3.5cm.5.3cm.4.8cm; 20-21 buckle, L 6.3cm.4.5cm; 22 tube, L 7.5cm; 23-24 knife, L 17.8,10cm; 25 buckle, L 6.5cm; 26 chisel, L 5.6cm; 27 tube, L 7.5cm (after Yang/Qi 1999, 29 Fig. 1, 11; 30 Fig. 2, 3.4.1.5; 29 Fig. 1, 8.6.16.12; 30 Fig. 2, 2; 29 Fig. 1, 9.4; 30 Fig. 2, 6; 29 Fig. 1, 13.15.7.10.1.15.14; 30 Fig. 2, 7; NXI et al. 2002, 19 Fig. 7, 2.3; 20 Fig. 10, 4; 19 Fig. 7, 7; Plate 2, 2).
Fig. 022b. Zhangjie, tombs and funeral objects, A. 1-19 funeral objects, 20 Tomb M2; B. 1-17 funeral objects, 18 Tomb M3 A: 1-17 bronzes; 18 pottery; 19 iron; 1 bell, H 6.3cm; 2 chisel, L 3.7cm; 3 axe, L 4.5cm; 4 vessel, H 1.6cm; 5-7 bulb, dm 4.2cm.2.5cm.4cm; 8 loop, dm 6.4cm; 9-12 bird, L 2.8cm.5cm.4.4cm.5.7cm; 13 belt ornament, L 4.5cm; 14-15 plaque, L 6.8cm.7.5cm; 16 Dangu, L 9.7cm; 17 sword, L 25.4cm; 18 pottery, H 4.5cm; 19 sword, L 12.9cm; B. 1-11 bronze; 12 gravel; 13-15 agate; 16 pottery; 17 iron; 1 knife, L 19cm; 2-4 tube, L 11.5cm.9.2cm.6.3cm; 5 loop, dm 4.3cm; 6 polo hop, H 1.5cm; 7-8 bulb, dm 3.2cm.2.8cm; 9-11 plaque, L 3-4.7cm; 12 gravel, L 7.6cm; 13-15 agate, L 1.3cm.1.2cm.2.1cm; 16 pottery, H 11.5cm; 17 iron loop, dm 8.5cm (A after NXI et al. 2002, 19 Fig. 7, 4.6.11; 20 Fig. 10, 1.2.10.16.5; 21 Fig. 11, 3.4.7.1.6.5.10; 20 Fig. 10, 3; 19 Fig. 7, 9; 20 Fig. 10, 14.12; 16 Fig. 3; B after NXI et al. 2002, 19 Fig. 7, 1.8.12.10; 20 Fig. 10, 4; 19 Fig. 7, 5; 20 Fig. 10, 9.15; 21 Fig. 11, 2.6.8; 20 Fig. 10, 7; 22 Fig. 12, 2.3.15; 20 Fig. 10, 13.17; 17 Fig. 4).
Fig. 023. Miyuan, bronze objects, 1-4 bulb, dm 3.6-7.8cm; 5 Jieyue, dm 2.8cm; 6.7 buckle, L 5.9cm.6cm; 8 gag bit L 20.5cm; 9 plaque, L 9.7cm; 10.11 tube, L 9.5cm.6cm;12 bell, H 5.4cm; 13 knife, L16.8cm; 14.15 sword, L 27.6, 15cm; 16 spear L 24cm; 17 arrowhead, L 6.3cm; 18 Danglu, L 5.8cm; 10 figure, L 8.9cm; 20 adze, L 12.4cm (after Yang/Qi 1999, 31 Fig. 3, 1.2.3.13.15.17.18.6.9.19.16.7.5.8.14.10.11.4.20.12).

Fig. 024. Xianma, bronze objects, 1 adze, L 3cm; 2 crane hack, L 10cm; 3 awl, L 12cm; 4-5 short sword, L 25.6cm.17cm; 6 spear, L 15.8cm; 7 arrowhead, L 3.3cm; 8 Danglu, L 5.6cm; 9 Jieyue, dm 2.7cm; 10-11 tube, L 1.4cm.3cm;12 axle, dm 4.4cm; 13-14 horse bit, L 9.1cm.15cm (after Yang/Qi 1999, 33 Fig. 4, 6.2.13.14.1.3.4.5.8.7.12.10.13.11).
Fig. 025. Guantai, bronze objects, 1-2 plaque, dm 10.6cm.4.5-8.1cm; 3-4 Dun, H 9.6cm.9.2cm; 5 awl, H 5.7cm; 6 spear, L 2.6cm; 7 axle ornament, H 12.4cm; 8 sword, L 50cm; 9 bell, H 5.4cm; 10 plaque, L 4.3cm; 11 pole top, L 3.9cm; 12 tube, H 2.5-5.5cm; 13 dagger, L 18.4cm (after Luo/Yan 1993, 18 Fig.1, 1.2.6.10.7.13.14.9.8.13.11.5).

Fig. 026. Baicaowa, bronze objects, 1-2 crane hack, L 14cm.9.1cm; 3 spear, L 16.4cm; 4 Dun, L 6.8cm; 5 Yuan-shaft of the cart, L 5.8cm; 6 pole top, H 4.1cm; 7-8 bulb, dm 7cm.2cm; 9 loop, dm 4.5cm (after Yang/Qi 1999, 34 Fig. 5, 8.1.7.5.6.3.4.2.9).
Fig. 027. Baicha, bronze objects, 1 dagger, L 12cm; 2 Dun, L 11.7cm; 3 Yuan-Shaft of a cart, L 10cm; 4-5 bell, H 10.9cm; 6 plaque, L 11.7cm (after Yang/Qi 1999, 34 Fig. 6, 6.2.4.1.5.3.).

Fig. 028. Dianwa, bronze objects, 1 crane hack, L 10.5cm; 2 Dun, L 10cm; 3 dagger, L 10.8cm; 4 spear, L 16.4cm; 5 arrowhead, L 3cm; 6-7 pole top, L 7.4cm.3cm; 8 gag bit, L 20cm; 9-10 bulb, dm 2.8cm.6.2cm; 11 loop, dm 4cm; 12-13 figure, L 6cm.6.9 cm; 14 belt buckle, L 10cm (after Yang/Qi 1999, 36 Fig. 7, 8.2.6.11.12.7.13.4.3.11.10.9.15).
Fig. 029. Pengyang county, bronze objects, 1-3 from Zhengzhuang, L 19.5cm.7.7cm.12.6cm; 4,19.22 from Baiyanglin, L 22.8cm.8cm.; 5 from Miyuan, L 22.8cm; 6.7.9-11.12.21 from Gucheng, L 15.6cm.14.5cm.15.6-17.4cm.9.3-11.6cm.5-10cm; 8.12-18 from Mengyuan, L 7.9-22.4cm; 20 from Yaohe, L 9cm (after Luo/Han 1990, 404 Fig. 1, 2.5; 405 Fig. 2, 5.6.; 406 Fig. 3, 2.3; 407 Fig. 5, 3.11; 408 Fig. 7, 8.9.1.2.5; 409 Fig. 8, 10; 411 Fig. 10, 9; 412 Fig. 11, 2.5; 413 Fig. 12, 1.2; 415 Fig. 14, 7.13).

Fig. 030. Chenyangchuan, metal objects, 1-15 bronze; 16 silver, 1 Yuan-shaft of cart, L 13cm; 2 horse bit, L15.6cm; 3 Danglu, H 8.2cm; 4-6 bulb, dm 2.2cm.4.2cm.5cm; 7 pole top, H 3.2cm; 8-11 plaques, L 9.2cm.6.1cm.12.2cm.7.1cm; 12 Jiexue, dm 5.1cm; 13-14 tube, L 1.4-1.9cm; 15 loop, dm 6.8cm; 16 plaque, dm 9cm; 18 bird, L 5cm; 19.20 plaque, L 9.6cm.7.8cm; 21 iron sword, L 19cm (after Yan/Li 1992, 574 Fig. 1, 1.2.3.4.12.14.9.8.7.10.11.13; 574 Fig. 2, 3.2; Luo/Han 1990, 415 Fig. 14, 9; 414 Fig. 13, 9.413 Fig. 12, 2.3; 404 Fig. 1, 4).
Fig. 031. Bronze objects, 1-2 from Danbei, L 14.8cm.15.6-17.4cm; 3-5 from Baizigou, L 9.3cm.7cm.9.6cm; 6 from Yuqiao, L 4cm; 7 from Maogou, dm 5cm (after Luo/Han 1990, 405 Fig. 2, 4; 407 Fig. 6, 12; 411 Fig. 10, 4.15; 408 Fig. 7, 3; 414 Fig. 13, 5; 406 Fig. 3, 5).

Fig. 032. Bronze objects, 1-8 from Wugou; 9-11 from Heshenlin; 12-17 from Shatang (after Wang J. Q. 1990, 5 Fig.1; 7 Fig. 3; 6 Fig. 2; Luo/Han 1990, 405, Fig. 2, 3)
Fig. 033. Niding, bronze funeral objects, 1-4 short sword, L 30.03cm.18.3cm.28.4cm.27.4cm; 5-8 axe, L 12cm.11.3cm.9.5cm.7.8cm; 9-10 knife, L 17cm.20.04cm; 11-12 gag bit, L 20.4cm.21.4cm; 13-14, Danglu, L 10.4cm.21cm; 15-16 bell, H 6.1cm.6.5cm; 17 Dun, H 3.7cm; 18-19 arrowhead, L 3cm.4cm; 20-21 mirror, dm 7.4cm.3.5cm; 22-24 loop, dm 9.8cm.8.5cm.4.9cm; 25-26, buckle, L 2.8cm.5.6cm; 27-29 bulb, dm 2.9-1.2cm; 30-32 tube, L 2.3-1cm (after Zhong K. 1987a, Plate 1, 2; 774 Fig. 3, 1-3; Plate 1, 7; 775 Fig. 4, 6; Plate 1, 6; 776, Fig 7; 775 Fig. 5; Fig. 4, 3.4; 774 Fig. 3, 11; 776 Fig. 6, 2; 774 Fig. 3, 15.4.5; 775 Fig. 4, 9; 774 Fig. 3, 13.16.17.10.7.8.9).

Fig. 034. Xijiao, collected metal objects, 1 made of silver, width 3.8-4.9cm; 2-13 made of bronze, 2 pickaxe, L 14cm; 3 adze, L 4.8cm; 4-7 tubular ornament, L 3.4-8.94cm; 9.13 bulb, dm 2.4-2.6cm; 10.12 horse mask, dm 3.9cm.5.2-6.7cm; 14 plaque, L 13.7cm (after Zhong K. 1978, 89 Fig. 9, 1-13).
Fig. 035. Yangwa, bronze objects, 1 sword, L 26cm; 2 dagger, L 17cm; 3 bell, L 7cm; 4 knife, L 20cm; 5 adze, L 6.5cm; 6 chisel, L 4.6cm; 7 buckle, dm 3.7cm; 8 loop; 10-11 plaque, dm 4.2-11.1cm; 12 spear, L 16cm (after Zhong/Han, 1985, 204 Fig. 1, 1-8.10-12; Luo F. 1983, Plate 25, 4).

Fig. 036. Dabeishan, bronze objects (after Zhong/Han 1985, 205 Fig. 2, 12.5.1.2.3; cover).

Fig. 037. Wangjiaping, bronze objects (after Zhong/Han 1985, 205 Fig. 3, 1-10).
Fig. 038. Lüping, bronze objects, 1 dagger, L 22cm; 2 plaque, L 4.2cm; 4 animal, L 8.5cm; 8 bell, L 15cm; 9 buckle, L 7.2cm; 10 shovel shaped plaque, L 10.2-7.8cm (after GYB 1992, 469 Fig. 1, 1-4; 470 Fig. 2).

Fig. 039. Guyuan, collected bronze and gold objects (10.11 gold; others bronze), 1-2 sword, L 29.6cm.22.5 cm; 3-5 crane hack, L 12.8cm.16cm.14.5cm; 19 plaque, dm 3.6-4.8cm; 18 L 3.3-4.5cm; 23-26 sheep, L 5.5-7.5cm; 26 H 3cm (after Zhong/Han 1985, 206 Fig. 4; 207 Fig. 5).
Fig. 040. Ningxia, metal objects, 1.4.9.17.19.20.21.22.29.33.34.35.36.37.38.39.40.43-48.51-59.61.62.64-72.76-79.81.83-88.90.91.94 from Samen; 2 from Lüyuan; 3 from Nanjiao; 7.42.60.63.80.82.89.92.93 from Luzigou; 8 from Siyingshuiku; 9.10.22.75 from Xiijao; 18 from Sanying; 24.31 from Tianwa; 73 from Shangtai, 5.6.11-16.25.26.27.28.32.49.50 collected from Guyuan county, 1-3 sword, L 28.6cm.14.2cm.7.4cm; 4-6 spear, L 16cm.15.2cm.22cm; 7 crane hack, L 9.3cm; 8-9 dagger, 25.3cm.19cm; 10 pole top, dm 4.4cm; 11-16 arrowhead, L 5.8cm.3.9-5.9cm; 17-21 Dun, L 10cm.11.6cm.9cm.11.2cm.5.3cm; 22-29
knife, L 11-22.4cm; 30-31 adze, L 10.2cm,9.3cm; 32 shovel, L7.6cm; 33 chisel, L 2.5cm; 34-
35 bell, L 35-18cm; 44-47 horse bit, L 14.6cm,11cm,8cm,15.6cm; 48 axle, L 12cm; 49-50 gag
bit, L15cm,18cm; 63-69 bulb, dm2.3-5.4cm; 70-72 pole top, dm 4-6 cm; 73 plaque, L 10.6cm;
74-77 figure, L 4.9-8.5cm; 78-83 buckle, L 3-4.8cm; 84-89 tube, L 5.2-6.8cm; 94 hoop, L
5.5cm (after Luo/Han 1990, 404 Fig. 1, 1.3.6; 405 Fig. 2, 1.7.8; 406 Fig. 3, 1.6.7.4; 406 Fig.4,
1-6; 406 Fig. 5, 1-5; 407 Fig. 6, 1.2.4.6.8-10; 408 Fig. 7, 4.10.7; 409 Fig. 8,
8.9.6.7.3.4.5.11.1.2; 410 Fig. 9, 4.1.2.3.5.6.7; 411 Fig. 10, 1.6.7.8.2.3.4.10.12.13.14.5.11; 412
Fig.11, 1.8.7.9.3.4.7.11.12.13; 413 Fig. 12, 5; 414 Fig. 13, 1.2.3.4.6.10.7.8.11.12; 415 Fig. 14,
1.8.12.14.2.15.5.6.10.11.3).

Fig. 041a. Guzhuang, 1 Tomb IIIM1; 2 Tomb IIIM3; Tomb IM4; Tomb IIIM4 (after NXY et
al. 1993, 24 Fig. 12; 25 Fig. 13, 26; 23 Fig. 11; Fig. 14).
Fig. 041b. Mazhuang, bronze funeral objects, 1-3 sword, L 20.2cm.20.2cm.18.8cm; 4-5 spear, L 18.9cm.17.2cm; 6 iron sword with bronze handle, L 18.9cm; 7-8 axe, L 7.4cm.5.5cm; 9-10 chisel, L 6.7cm.4.6cm; 11-14 crane hack, L 9.3cm.7cm.12.6cm.15.6cm; 15 arrowhead, 16-17 dagger, L 19.3cm.19.9 cm; 18-21 knife, L 12.6cm.18.1cm.19.5cm.21.6 cm; 22-28 tube, L 3.2-8.7cm; 29-31 awl, L 5.5cm.4.4cm.7.9cm; 32-34 loop, dm 5.7cm.4.7cm.5.5cm; 35-38 bell, H 2.6-3.5cm; 39-40 earrings, dm 2.2, 1.7cm; 41-42 hook, L 8.4cm.9.7cm; 43-44 spoon, L 7.5, 5.9cm (after NXY et al. 1993, 29 Fig. 16, 1-21; 31 Fig. 17, 1-22).
Fig. 041c. Mazhuang, bronze funeral objects. 45-56 buckle, L 4.2-12cm; 57-72 belt ornament, L 4.6cm.5cm.4.4cm.5cm.5.8cm.4.4cm.4.7cm.3.7cm.4cm.2.9cm.3.8cm.3.6cm.7.7cm.9.5cm. 9.3cm.8.1cm; 73-80 bulb, dm 2.5-8.8cm; 81-82 Jieyue, dm 4.8cm.5.8cm; 83-87 Danglu H 10.8cm.11cm.9.8cm.7.3cm.11cm; 88-90 horse bit, L 13cm.14.8cm.20.1cm; 90-98 pole top, L 8cm.6.2cm.6cm.3cm.3.4cm.3.4cm.3.4cm.6.7cm; 99-100 hoop, dm 1.5cm.1.5cm (after NXY
et al. 1993, 32 Fig. 18; 33 Fig. 19; 36 Fig. 20).

Fig. 041d. Mazhuang, bronze funeral objects, 101-104 plaque, H 12.6cm.6.7cm.6.5cm.8.7cm; 105-108 Wei (軎), H 6.5cm.2.9cm.7.2cm.7.5cm; 109-112 shaft of cart, L 9.8-12.5cm; 113-116 bell, H 7.7-16cm; 117-118 Gu(轂), H 9cm.6.3cm; 119-128 animal figure, H 4.3-7.9cm; 129-132 animal plaque, H 6.6-13.8cm (after NXY et al. 1993, 38 Fig. 22; 41 Fig. 23; 42 Fig. 24).
Fig. 041e. Mazhuang, metal objects, 1-12 iron objects; 13-17 gold and silver objects. 1-2 sword, L 21.5cm.18cm; 3 awl, L 13.7cm; 4 spear, L 43.2cm; 5-6 belt ornament, L 15.4cm.5.9cm; 7 horse bit, L 7.2cm; 8-9 loop, dm 8.9cm.8.5cm; 10 gag bit, L 17.6cm; 11 Cha (锸), L 18cm; 12-13 knife, L 16.1cm.22cm; 14-16, L 7.5cm.5.2cm.3.9cm; 17-18 loop, dm 1.8cm.2.3 cm (after NXY et al. 1993, 25).

Fig. 042. Sunjiazhuang, funeral objects, 1-10 bronze; 11 pottery (after GYG 1983, 984 Fig. 4, 1-4; Plate 2, 1.2.4.3.5.6.7).
Fig. 043a. Linjia, plan of excavation district (after GSG et al. 1984, 114 Fig. 3).
Fig. 043b. Linjia. 1 bronze knife found from F20:18, L 12.5cm; 2 metallurgical structure of the bronze knife (after Sun/Han 1997, 76 Fig. 1; Fig. 2).

Fig. 044a. Donghuishan, bronze objects, 1-3 from dwelling remains; 4-11 from tombs, -1 knife (0155), L 3.15 cm; 2 earring, dm 2.4-3.6cm; 3 earring, dm 4.8-5.9cm; 4-6 knife, L 5.5cm, 5cm, 4cm; 7 awl, L 2.8cm; 8 ornament, dm 0.8cm; 9, 10 earring, dm 7.4-5.8cm (after Donghuishan 98, 7 Fig. 7, 6; 24 Fig. 19, 3.5; 51 Fig. 44, 1-4; 93 Fig. 69, 2.5.4.8).
Fig. 044b. Donghuishan, secondary electron image by scanning electron microscope and metallurgical structure (adopted from Donghuishan 98, Plate 61).
Fig. 044c. Donghuishan, metallographic structure of the bronzes (adopted from Donghuishan, Plate 62).
Fig. 045a. Huangniangniangtai, bronze objects, 1 fragment (H9③), L 6.7cm; 2 knife (T3②), L 6cm; 3 (T2②), 4 (H6⑤), 5 (T6). 6 (T19②), 8 (T10③), 9 (T9③), L 3.8-12cm; 7 loop (T18②), dm 2cm; 10-13 knife, L 11.5cm, 10.8cm, 8cm, 6.7cm; 14 drill (T3⑦), L 5.2cm; 15 awl (T14⑧) (after GSB 1960c: 60 Fig. 4, 1-4; Plate 4, 9.8.12.11.7.3.4; GSB 1978, 437 Fig. 21, 2-4.1).

Fig. 045b. Huangniangniangtai, plan of the fourth excavation (after GSB 1978, 423 Fig. 3).
Fig. 045c. Huangniangniangtai, joint tombs, 1 Tomb M38; 2 Tomb M52; 3 Tomb M76 (after GSB 1978, 429 Fig. 13; Fig. 14; 430 Fig. 15).
Fig. 045d. Huangniangniangtai, plan of House F8 (after GSB 1978, 424 Fig. 4).

Fig. 046a. Bronze objects, 1,2 from Sanjiaocheng; 3-8 from Hamadun - 1 knife, L 15.8cm; 2 arrowhead, L 3.4 cm; 3 flaring shaped ornament, dm 2.1cm; 4 bulb, dm 1.8cm; 5 knife, L 12cm (after GSBG et al. 1984, 600 Fig. 3, 1,3; 601 Fig. 4, 1-6).
Fig. 046b. Bronze objects, 1-7 from Sanjiaocheng; 8-41 from Hamadun; 1-6 arrowhead, L 3cm.2.4cm.3.5cm.2.4cm.4.1cm.4.8cm; 7 awl, L 7.7cm; 8-10 tube, L 2.9cm.3.4cm.3.1 cm; 11-15 bell, H 2.2-4.1cm; 16-18 ornament, H 1.9-2.4cm; 19-22 bulb dm 1.2-3.4cm; 23 plaque, L 2.1cm; 24 loop, dm 2.2cm; 25-31, 33-34 bead, H 3.3-5.4cm; 32 animal figure, L 3.3cm; 35 hook, L 2.5cm; 36-41 knife, L 11.5cm.9.7cm.7cm.4cm.7.5cm.12.2 cm; 42 whip, L 55cm; 43 (after GSY 1990, 215 Fig.10, 1-4.8.11.7.5; 226 Fig.19, 1-12.13.11.14.15.22.16.17.29.18.19.20.36.21.35.33.34.23.24.25.26.27.38.39; 229 Fig. 20).

Fig. 046c. Hamadun, distribution of the tombs (after GSY 1990, 217 Fig. 11).
Fig. 046d. Hamadun, Tombs M19 and M18 (after GSY 1990, 219 Fig. 13).

Fig. 047a. Lianhuatai, bronzes objects, 1 awl, L 5.2cm (appraised); 2 knife, L 4.5cm; 3-4 buckles, dm 1.6-1.4cm; 5 dagger, L 2.3cm; 6 knife, L 5cm; 7-10 bronze tubes, L 0.8-1.95cm; 11 buckle, dm 2cm (after Xie R. J. 1980a, 299 Fig. 7, 5.9; 300 Fig. 8, 8.10; 306 Fig. 13, 14.23; GSG et al, 1988, 15 Fig. 12, 1.2.3.8.7).
Fig. 047b. Lianhuatai, 1 plan of tomb M10 and M11; 2-4 potteries from Tomb M10; 5-6 potteries from Tomb M11 (after GSG et al. 1988, 9 Fig. 6; 13 Fig. 13, 5.6; 14, Fig. 11, 4; 11 Fig. 7, 4.6; 12 Fig. 8, 4).

Fig. 048. Zhangjiazui, bronze objects, 1 fragment, 2 spear (after Xie R. J. 1980b, 194 Fig. 9, 4.6).

Fig. 049a. Copper and bronze objects, 1 from Dahezhuang; 2-7 from Qinweijia, 1 knife, L 12.5cm; 2 awl, L 8.2cm; 3 axe, L 4cm; 4 ornament, L 2.5cm; 5-7 fragments (after ZKKG 1974, plate 18, 10; Xie R. J. 1975, 73 Fig. 12, 1.2.3; Plate 12, 17.15.14).
Fig. 049b. Dahezhuang. 1 plan of House F7; 2 recovery of House F7; 3 Plan of F1; 4 pit H10 and H7 (After ZSKKG 1974, 34 Fig. 6; 36 Fig. 7; 38 Fig. 12; 37 Fig. 10).
Fig. 050a. Dahezhuang, the southern part of the cemetery (after Xie R. J. 1975, 60 Fig. 3).
Fig. 050b. Qinweijia, the northern part of the cemetery (after Xie R. J. 1975, 61 Fig. 4).
Fig. 051a. Lanqiao, tombs, 1 Tomb M4; 2 Tomb M6 (after GSG 1987, 681 Fig. 6; 680 Fig. 5).

Fig. 051b. Lanqiao, bronze objects, 1 dagger, L 10.3cm; 2.3 bulb, dm 1.6cm.2.3 cm (after GSG et al. 1987,688 Fig.18, 1.3.5).

Fig. 052. Siwashan, bronze bracelet (after J. D. Anersson 1943, 251 Fig 62).
Fig. 053. Shaoping, bronzes objects, 1 dagger, L 18.1 cm; 2 Dun, H 9.2 cm; 3.4 gag bit, L 13 cm. 12.3 cm; 5 knife, L 19.7 cm; 6.7 sword, L 22 cm. 27 cm; 8.9 bulb, dm 6.8 cm. 4.3 cm; 10.11 tube, L 3 cm. 3 cm; 12 bundle, L 2.4 cm; 13 loop, L 5.7 cm; 14 ornament, L 2 cm; 15 buckle, dm 1.4 cm (after ZLB 2000, 45 Fig. 7, 1-7; Fig. 8, 1-8).

Fig. 054. Xujianian, bronze objects, 1.2.5 dagger, L 16.7 cm. 21.5 cm. 21.5 cm; 3 knife, L 14 cm; 4 arrowhead, L 7.3 cm; 6 spear, L 15 cm; 7 bulb, dm 3 cm; 8 bell, L 4.8 cm (after ZHSKYJ 1982, 558 Fig. 4, 1-6; Fig. 5, 1-3).
Fig. 055a. Jiuzhan, bronzes objects, 1 sword, L 11.2cm; 2-4 dagger, L 17-18cm (4 is collected); 3 knife, L 116cm; 5 bell, dm 5.4cm; 6.9 tube, L1.3cm.0.9cm; 7.8 armlets, L 2.8cm.11.2cm; 10-27 bulb, dm 1.3-3.5cm (after Wang/Shui 1997, 437 Fig. 93, 1-9; 438 Fig. 094, 1-18).
Fig. 055b. Jiuzhai, tombs: A M3; B M17; C M28 and M78; D M36 and M63 (after Wang/Shui 1997, 359 Fig. 39; 360 Fig. 40; 361 Fig. 41; 362 Fig. 42).
Fig. 055c. Jiuzhan, tombs: A M11; B M19; C M32 and M33; D M40 and M71; E M47; F M1 (after Wang/Shui 1997, 368 Fig. 48; 371 Fig. 51; 363 Fig. 43; 364 Fig. 44; 367 Fig. 47; 372 Fig. 52).
Fig. 055d. Jiuzhan, tombs: A M55 B M59; C M64; D M11 (after Wang/Shui 1997, 366 Fig. 46; 369 Fig. 59; 374 Fig. 64; 370 Fig. 50).
Fig. 056. Bronze objects in the Western Zhou style, A from Yu; B from Jiao (after Xu/Liu 1985, Plate 5, 1-5; 351 Fig. 6; Fig. 5; QYB 1989, 25 Fig. 2, 1.10.4.5.6.2.8.11.7; 26 Fig. 3, 2.5.13.19.6.14.3; 25 Fig. 2, 2; 26 Fig. 3, 1.7.11.18.12).
Fig. 057. Yuanjia, bronze object, 1-5 bell, H 9.5cm, 4.5cm, 16cm, 7cm, 4.5cm; 6 silver earring H 5cm; 7 tube, L 10.5-12.5cm; 8 chariot fitting, L 11cm; 9 deer, L 6.1cm; 10 horse head ornament, dm 12.5cm; 12 ornament, L 8cm; 13 buckle, dm 2.5cm; 14, iron spear, L 28cm; 15 sword, L 15.5cm; 16 dagger, L 20.3cm; 17 arrowhead, L 3.5cm (after Liu/Xu 1988, 414 Fig. 2, 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15; 416 Fig. 7, 2).

Fig. 058. Houzhuang, bronze objects, 1 adze, L 6.2cm; 2.8 tube, H: 2.6cm, 9.2cm; 3.4 bell, H 9.5cm, 6cm; 5 Danglu, H 6cm; 6 iron handle of sword, L 9.6cm; 7 chariot fitting, L 9.6cm; 9 deer, H 7cm; 10.11 dagger, L 14.9cm, 18.5cm (after Liu/Xu 1988, 415 Fig. 5; 416 Fig. 7, 1; 421 Fig. 19, 2).
Fig. 059. Miaqu, bronze objects, 1 loop, dm 5.2cm; 2.3 bulb, dm: 2.5-4.9cm; 4.8 tube, L 3.5cm.7.4cm; 5 hack, L 14.3cm; 6 adze, L 7.2cm; 7 belt ornament, H 7cm; 9 knife, L 20.8cm; 10 ornament, L 3.4 cm; 11 H 11cm; 12 chisel, H 43cm; 13 spear, L 12.9cm (after Liu/Xu 1988, 417 Fig. 8).

Fig. 060. Hongyan, bronzes objects, 1 Danglu, H 7.5cm; 2.3 H 11.8cm.9cm; 4.5 ornament, L 3.5cm.4.8cm; 6 tube, L 3.5cm; 7 belt ornament, L 5cm; 10 hack, L 12.6cm; 11 ornament, L 3cm; 12 buckle, dm 2.3cm; 13.14 knife, L 16.6cm.17.1cm; 15 sword, L 24.4cm; 16 dagger, L 17.3cm (after Liu/Xu 1988 418, Fig. 10).
Fig. 061. Wujiagouquan, bronze objects, 1 bulb, L 5.2-3.5cm; 2 bulb, dm 6.4cm; 3 ornament, L 5.2cm; 4 bell, H 3.7cm; 6 deer, H 6cm; 7 bell ornament, L 10.2cm; 8 head of duck, L 7.5cm (after Liu/Xu 1988, 419 Fig. 12; Fig. 13).

Fig. 062. Bronze objects, 1-13.20 from Qingyang region; 14.15 from Mazhai; 16.17 from Ligou; 18.19 from Tatou; 1 head of bird, L 6.3cm; 2.4.9.12 Jieyun, L 3.6cm.5cm.10.5cm.6.1cm; 3 bulb, dm 5.1cm; 5.6 belt ornament, L 9.5cm.7.8cm; 7 axe, L 8.5cm; 8 tube, L 10.1cm; 10 belt ornament, L 4.7cm; 11 deer, H 6cm; 13.14 knife, L 16.7cm.19.2cm; 15.16 sword, L 27.8cm.17.8cm; 17 spear, L 17.7cm; 18-19 ornament, L 10.8cm.5cm (after Liu/Xu 1988, 421 Fig. 18, 1-12; 420 Fig. 15; Fig. 16, 1; Fig. 17, 1-4; 421 Fig. 19, 4).
Fig. 063a. Maojiaping, section plan of the east wall of Square T1 and T2, 1 soil; 2 disturbed soil; 3 gray soil; 4A yellowish gray soil; 4B dark gray soil; 5A gray brown soil; 5B yellow soil; 6 red soil (after GSG 1987b, 360 Fig. 2).
Fig. 063b. Maojiaping, potteries, A Group A; B Group B (after GSG 198b, 379 Fig. 17, 1-22; 382 Fig. 18, 1-8; 383 Fig. 19, 1-11; 384 Fig. 20, 1-6; 390 Fig. 23, 1-8; 391 Fig. 24, 1-5).
Fig. 063c. Maojiaping, bronzes objects, 1-5 from burials of Group A; 6 from dwellings of Group A, 1.3.4 bell, L 4.5cm.4.2cm.4.2 cm; 2 hook, L 6.6cm; 5 sword, L 38.7cm (after GSG 1978b, 385 Fig. 21, 1.2.5.6.11; 374 Fig. 12, 11).
Fig. 064a. Liuping, bronze objects, 1 crane hack, L 12.5cm; 2.3 axe, L 8cm.8 cm; 4-7 knife, L 21cm.16cm.14cm.16 cm; 8-10 Dun, L 15.3cm.14.4cm.19.5cm; 11 sword, L 43cm; 12-17 bulb, dm 4.5-7.6cm; 19-21 horse fitting, H 1.6cm; 22 chariot fitting, H 5.3cm; 23 ornament of axle, H 3.5cm; 24-36 Jieyue, H 2-3.7cm; 27-31 chariot fitting, H 2.6cm.3.4cm.4cm.5.3cm.16.4dm; 32 chariot fitting, H 11.4cm; 33-40 tube, H 1.5-15.5cm; 41-45 chariot fittings, H 9-13.5cm; 46 figure, H 8.3cm; 47-55 plaque, H 2-13.; 56-58 loop, dm 2.3-4.4cm; 59-61 hook, H 10.4cm.10.8cm.15cm; 62-69 hallow-worked plaque, H12-13.8cm; 70-79 buckle, H3.3-8.8cm (after Li/Nan 2003, 5 Fig. 1. 1-6; Fig. 2. 2.1.3.4.5; 6 Fig. 3. 1-21; 8 Fig. 8. 2.5.6.4..1.7.8.3; 7 Fig. 4. 1-5;15 Fig. 6; 13 Fig. 20. 1-9; Fig. 21. 1-6; 14 Fig. 22, 8.7.3.4.1.4.5.6; 15 Fig. 23, 5.1.2.8.8.10.7.3.4.6).
Fig. 064b. Liuping, gold objects, 1-7 ornament, L 3.5-8.4cm (after Li/Nan 2003, 16 Fig. 25, 1-7).
Fig. 065a. Xigang, tombs: A Tomb M194; B Tomb M140; C Tomb M26; D Tomb M365 (adapted from Xigangchaiwangang 2001, 11 Fig. 3; 13 Fig. 5; 14 Fig. 6; 13 Fig. 6; 16 Fig/ 7; 18 Fig. 8).
Fig. 065b. Xigang, tombs: A Tomb M427; B Tomb M281; C Tomb M422; D Tomb M36 (adapted from Xigangchawiwangang 2001, 19 Fig. 9; 22 Fig. 10; 23 Fig. 11; 24 Fig. 12).
Fig. 065c. Xigang, tombs: A Tomb M429; B Tomb M219 (adapted from Xigangchaiwangang 2001, 25 Fig. 13; 27 Fig. 14).

Fig. 065d. Xigang, tombs: A Tomb M15; B Tomb M275; C Tomb M24; D Tomb M442 (adapted from Xigangchaiwangang 2001, 28 Fig. 15; 30 Fig. 16; 33 Fig. 17; 35 Fig. 18).
Fig. 065e. Xigang, tombs: A Tomb M225, M227; B Tomb M313, M314 (from Xigangchawangang 2001, 39 Fig. 19; 40 Fig. 20).
Fig. 065f. Xigang, metal objects: A knife (after Xigangchaiwangang 2001, 61 Fig. 25, 1-15; 62 Fig. 26, 1-12); B 1-16 awl; 17-20 knives; 21 plough; 22-30 buckle; 31,32 rings (after Xigangchaiwangang 2001, 69 Fig. 27, 1-32); C tubes (after Xigangchaiwangang 2001, 82 Fig. 31, 1-28); B 17-21, iron objects; others, bronze objects.
Fig. 065g. Xigang, metal objects: A bead (after Xigang Chaiwangang 2001, 72 Fig. 28, 1-38; 80 Fig. 30, 1-10; 79 Fig. 29, 1-42); B 1-19 tube; 20-35 ornament with holes; 36 ornament (after Xigangchaiwangang 2001,85 Fig. 32, 1-36); C bulb (after Xigangchaiwangang 2001, 92 Fig. 33, 1-23). B19 iron; others, bronze objects.
Fig. 065h, Xigang, metal objects: A 1-18 earrings; 19-20 ornament; 21-24 figures of human beings (after Xigangchaiwangang 2001, 93 Fig. 34, 1-20); B 1-46, 68 plaques; 47-50 spoons; 51 comb; 52-67 needles (after Xigangchaiwangang 2001, 95 Fig. 35, 1-18; 96 Fig. 36, 1-11; 100 Fig. 37, 1-39); C mirrors(Xigangchaiwangang 2001, 101 Fig. 38, 1-12). B 17-20, gold objects; others, bronzes.
Fig. 066. Yushugou, bronze objects, 1-3 plaque, dm 5.8-7cm; 4 spade plaque, H 6.8cm; 5.6, H 5cm.6.5cm; 7 dog-shaped plaque, H 9-10cm; 8 turbo-shaped plaque, dm 6.8cm (after GSBG 1981, 34 Fig. 1, 2.4.5.6; Plate 5, 1.2.6.5.4).

Fig. 067. Qin’an, bronze objects, 1-3 swords, L 21cm.18cm.22.7cm; 4-7 knife, L 16.6cm.13.7cm.14.5cm.18.3cm; 8 spear, L 9cm; 9-11, crane hack, L 6.5cm.12.1cm.9.9 cm; 12 plaque, dm 2.8-3.8cm; 13 tube, L 2.9cm; 14 sheep, H 6.8cm; 15.16 ornament, L 2cm.2.7cm; 17 Fu- cooking ware, L 18cm (after Xu/Guo 1986, 40 Fig. 1, 1-11; 41 Fig. 2, 1-5; 42 Fig. 3).

Fig. 068. Bronze objects, 1-3 from Xinzhuangping; 4-5 from Xinglin; 1 bulb, dm 2cm; 2.3 bracelets, dm 6.4cm.6.3 cm; 4 knife, L 22cm; 5 axe, L 13cm (after GSB 1996, 51 Fig. 6, 1.2.4; Yang Y. M. 1985, 978 Fig. 2, 10.11).
Fig. 069. Bronze objects in the Central Plains style found in the Gansu Province, 1-3 from Yujiawan; 4 from Tianshui; 5-9 from Miaozui (after GSG 1986, 5 Fig. 1-3; Wang B. Q. 1998, 82 Fig. 1; Xu J. C. et al. 1985, 853 Fig. 1; 854 Fig. 2; Fig. 3, 1-3).

Fig. 070. Bronze objects in the Central Plains style, 1-4 from Yaojiahe; 5-7.11 from Dongshan; 8-10 from Xiling (after GSBG 1976, 41 Fig. 4, 1.2; 40 Fig. 2, 3.4; 41 Fig. 4, 4; Plate 6, 2.5.11; 40 Fig. 2, 5; 41 Fig. 4, 1).
Fig. 071a. Baicaopo, burial goods of Tomb M2, 1-28 bronze; 29 jade, 19.20, L 6.2cm.4.7cm (after Chu S. B. 1977, 107 Fig. 7, 1-5; 111 Fig. 10, 2.5.7.8.10.13.14; 113 Fig. 11, 1.2.5.6.8.10; 115 Fig. 14, 1.2; 116 Fig. 15, 1-3.6; 117 Fig. 16, 4.5.9; 118 Fig. 17, 6; 120 Fig. 19, 2; 115 Fig. 13, 1.3).
Fig. 071b. Baicaopo, tombs and burial goods. A Tomb M1; 2 Tomb M7; C chariot pit (A after Chu S. B. 1997, 111 Fig. 10, 3.4.6.9.11.12.15.16; 113 Fig. 11, 7.9; 118 Fig 17, 4; 115 Fig. 13, 4.2; 116 Fig. 15, 4.5; 120 Fig. 19, 1; 117 Fig. 16, 1.3.6.7; B after Chu S. B. 100 Fig. 2; 111 Fig. 10, 1; 113 Fig. 7.9; 118 Fig. 17, 2.5; C after Chu S. B. 1997, 105 Fig. 6; 117 Fig. 16, 2.9; 118 Fig. 17, 1.3.7.8.9).
Fig. 072. Longtoushan, bronzes objects, 1 chisel, L 7.5cm; 2.3 arrowhead, L 7cm,9.2cm; 4 knife, L 9.6cm; 5 awl, L 9.6cm; 6 sword, L 30.5cm; 7 axe, L 5.2cm; 8 ornament, H 1.6cm; 9 belt ornament, H 2.7cm; 10 bulb, dm 2.6cm; 11.12 buckle, L 1.7cm.3.4cm (after NMGY et al. 1991, 709 Fig. 11, 1-5; Fig. 12, 1; Fig. 11, 6.9.8.7.10.11).

Fig. 073. Xiajiadian, bronze objects, 2 awl, L 9.4cm; 4-7 knife, L 6-13cm; 8-10 buckle, dm 3-3.3cm; 11.12 bead ornament, L 4.5-4.7cm; 13.14 arrowhead, L 4.3-5.1cm (after ZKKN 1974, Plate 14, 2.3.4.11.13; 140 Fig. 30, 3; Plate 14, 10.12; 140 Fig. 30, 5.4; ZKKN 1961, Plate 6, 5; ZKKN 1974, Plate 14, 7.5.6).
Fig. 074a. Zhizhushan, bronze objects, 1-3 arrowhead, L 18cm.4.5cm.4cm; 4 sword, L 5.1cm (after ZHSKYN 1979, 238 Fig.19, 10.1.2.6).

Fig. 074b. Zhizhushan, potteries of the four succeeding layers: Hongshan culture, Lower Xiajiadian culture; Upper Xiajiadian culture; the Warring States-early Han (adapted from ZHSKYN 1979, 240 Fig.20).
Fig. 075. Metal objects, 1-3 from Susitai; 4 from Dayingzi (1.2.4 bronze; 3 gold), 1 Fu-cooking ware, H 14cm; 3 plaque, L 7.8cm; 4 Fu-cooking ware, H .67cm (after Wang G. 1997, 462 Fig. 2, 1; Fig. 3, 2.1; Wang G. 1994, 133 Fig. 2).

Fig. 076a. Jinggouzi, tomb excavated in 1996, 2-4 pottery; 5.6 turquoise; 7-10 bronze; 1-3 H 17cm.11.4cm.15cm; 5.6 H 1.8cm.0.8cm; 7 dm 1.2cm; 8.9 L 4.8cm.5cm (after Wang G. 1998, 2 Fig. 2; 3 Fig. 3, 1-3; Fig. 4, 1.3.2.4-6).
Fig. 076b. Jinggouzi, bronzes objects, 1 sword, L 39.8cm; 2.3 knife, L 13cm.11.7cm; 4 awl, L 12.4cm; 5-6 joined beads, L 4.2cm.0.9cm; 7.8 ornament, L 4cm.3.6cm; 9 arrowhead, L 3.4cm; 10-12 ornament, L 2.1cm.1.7cm.4cm; 13.14 earring, dm 2cm.3.6cm; 15 ornament, L 3.6cm; 16 tube, L 1.9cm; 17 varied bird figure, L 2.5cm; 18.19 bell, L 3.8cm.3.9 cm; 20-24 bulb, dm 3.2cm.2.8cm.4.6cm.3.5cm (after Wang L. X. et al. 2004, 13 Fig. 8, 1; 12 Fig. 7, 2.3.1.4.15.5.6.7.8.9.17.10; 13 Fig. 8, 4; 12 Fig. 7, 11.12.16.18.19.13.14; 13 Fig. 8, 2.3).

Fig. 077a. Nanshangen, collected bronzes in 1958, 1 helmet, L 24cm; 2.3 dagger, L 17cm.24cm; 4 plaque, L 4.9cm; 5 axe, L 8.5cm; 6 Zun (鐏), L 10cm; 8 sheath, L 35.5cm; 9 spear, L 38cm; 10-11 sword, L 27.5cm.26 cm; 12 knife, L 22cm (after Li Y. Y. 1959, Plate 276-277, Fig.1-2, Plate 1, 6.7; 276 Fig. 1; 277 Fig. 2, 3.4; Plate 1, 3.4.1.2; 277 Fig. 2, 5.6.7; ZKKN 1975, 138 Fig. 20, 2.4.3.1).
Fig. 077b. Nanshanben, Tomb M3 and M4, A Tomb M4; B Tomb M3 (A, 5 bone; B, 5 pottery whirl; others bronze). A 2.3 spoon, L 9cm.9.8cm; 7-10 bell, L 2.8-4cm; 11 knife, L 25.7cm; 12 tube, L 11.85cm (after ZKKN 1975, 134 Fig. 17; 17 Fig. 19, 1.2.5.8.12.13.14.15.16; Plate 7, 1-3); B 2 knife, L 11.9cm (after ZHYYN 1975, 134 Fig. 16; 137 Fig. 19, 3.4.11.17).
Fig. 077c. Nanshan'gen, Tomb M 101, 2-92 bronzes; 93-95 gold; 96-102 bone; 103-105 stone (after LNZ et al. 1973, 28 Fig. 2; Plate 1-12).
Fig. 077d. Nanshangen, Tomb M102 (1-17 bronze; 18,19 stone; 20-22 bone), 1-3 knife, L 26.2cm.24.2cm.16.2cm; 4 axe, H 7.3cm; 8 adze, L 8cm; 6 awl, L 6.9cm; 7 arrowhead, L 3.5cm; 8 ornament, L 2.5cm; 9-10 bulb, dm: 3.1cm.4cm; 11 horse fitting, L 7.5cm; 12-14 broken object, L 7cm.4cm.7.5cm; 15-16 gag bit, L 16.2cm.19.8cm; 17 mirror, dm 7.8cm; 18 stone axe, L 11.5cm; 19 L 7.7 cm; 21 horn, L 9.4cm; 22 incised bone board, L 34cm (after ZHSKYD 1981, 305 Fig. 2, 1-4.7.5.6; 306 Fig. 4, 1.3.2.4; Fig. 5, 4.5.6; Fig. 4, 5.6.; Fig. 5, 2.1.7.3.8; Fig. 6).
Fig. 077e. Nanshan, distribution of tombs (adapted from ZKKN 1975, 118 Fig. 2)
Fig. 078a. Xiaoheishigou, funeral bronze objects, 1-2 Yi (匜), H 19cm.9.3cm; 3 Ding (鼎), H 26cm; 4-5 Gui (簋), H 25.5cm.17cm; 6 Lei (罍), H 28cm; 7 Hu (壶), H 30.6cm; 8 cover, W 16.6cm; 9 Zun (尊), H 23.8cm; 10 Ding, H 12.4cm; 11 six-joined pot, H 15.6cm; 13 He (盉), H 21cm; 12-31 axe, L 7.2-17.8cm; 32-33 adze, L 7.7cm.7.3cm; 34 hammer, L 9.9cm; 35-40 buckle, dm 2.5-10.7cm; 41 H 15.7cm; 42, L 7.9cm; 43.46-49 awl, L 19cm.7.7cm.9.4cm.15.2cm.10.4cm; 44.45 chisel, L 10.4cm.9cm; 50.51 head of pole, H 6cm.5.4cm; 52 animal head, H 8cm; 53.54 nail, L 3.1-3.6cm; 55-56 gag bit, L 9cm.8.8 cm; 57 joint pot, H 15cm (after Xiang/Li 1995, 8 Fig. 6; 7 Fig. 5, 4; 8 Fig. 6, 6.1; 5 Fig. 5, 2; 8 Fig. 6, 2.4; 7 Fig. 5, 3; 8 Fig. 6, 8; 7 Fig. 5, 1; 8 Fig. 6, 7; 12 Fig. 12; 8 Fig. 6, 5; 13 Fig. 14, 1-5; Fig. 15, 1-6; 14 Fig. 16, 1-12; 16 Fig. 19, 6.7.8; 17 Fig. 21, 2; 16 Fig. 19, 12.13; 15 Fig. 17, 1—7; 16 Fig. 19, 1.2.3.4.9.11; WW 5, 1995, Cover 3, 2).

Fig. 078b. Xiaoheishigou, funeral objects (1-35 bronze; 36-39 gold ware; 40-46 stone ware; 47 bone ware), 2-3, L 5.3cm.7.3cm; 4-5 sword, L 41.5cm.36.7cm; 6 dagger, L 13.5cm; 7 double-jointed scabbard, L 39.3cm; 8 scabbard, L 26.5cm; 9-13 knife, L 18cm.10.6cm.14.4cm.21.9cm.20.5cm; 14-22 plaque, L 2-4.7cm; 23-32 small ornament, L 0.7-2.4cm; 33 round based utensil, H 13.6cm; 34 flat-based vase, H 11.3cm; 35 spoon, W 26.5cm; 36 gold plaque, dm 7.1cm; 37-38 gold loop, dm 4.0-4.1cm; 39 gold ornament, L 1.3cm; 40-42.46 stone axe, L 13.6cm.11.5cm.12.3cm.12cm.10.4cm; 44 knife, W 13cm; 45 millstone, L 5.5cm; 47 bone ware, L 15.8cm (after Xiang /Li 1995, 16 Fig. 20; 17 Fig. 21, 3.5; 17 Fig. 22, 1-6.8.9.7.10; 18 Fig. 23, 1-10.19.12.13.11.17.14.15.16.18; 19 Fig. 1.2; 20 Fig. 26; Fig. 28; 24 Fig. 24, 1-3; 15 Fig. 18, 1-7; 17 Fig. 21, 1).
Fig. 079. Metal objects, A from Beishanzui, Tomb M7501, 1 Gui, H 16cm; 2 helmet, H 22cm; 3-4 sword, L 31.8cm; 6 Yue, H 13.6cm; 7 arrowhead, L 7.25cm; 8 gold loop, L 20.4cm; 9 L 20.4cm (after Jin F. Y. 1985, 25 Fig. 3, 1.2; Fig. 4, 1.2; 26 Fig. 5, 1-5); B from Xiaheishigou, Tomb M8061, 1 sword, L 41.7cm; 2 L 19cm, 16.5cm; 3 gold bracelet; 4-6 bulb, dm 6.3cm, 4.2cm, 2.9cm; 7 arrowhead, L 4.4cm; 8 helmet, L 21.2cm; 9 L 13.4cm; 10 bone bead, L 0.85-1.95cm; 11.12 buckle, L 4.25cm, 3.9cm (after Jin F. Y. 1985, 29 Fig. 11, 1.3.4.6.7.8.2; 28 Fig. 10, 1.2; 29 Fig. 11, 5; 28 Fig. 10, 3.4); C from Wafangzhong, Tomb M791; 1 knife, L 20.65cm; 2 dagger, L 21.65cm; 3 helmet, H 24cm; 4 axe, L 7.9cm; 4 sword, L 23.1cm; 6.7 plaque, dm 5.2-5.4cm; 8.4cm; 8 spoon, L 17cm (after Jin F. Y. 1985, 27 Fig. 7.1-5; 28 Fig. 8);
Fig. 9, 1-3; **D** from Tianjuqua, Tomb M7301, 1 knife, L 28.7cm; 2 gag bit, L 21.7cm; 3 sword, L 26.9cm; 4.5 bulb, dm 3.75cm; 8.3cm; 6, L 18.5cm; 7 mirror, dm 11.5cm (after Jin F. Y. 1985, 30 Fig. 13, 1-2; Fig. 12, 1-3.2; Fig. 13, 3; Fig. 12, 4); **E** from Liangjiayingzi, Tomb M8071, 1.2 arrowhead, L 6.1cm; 4.3cm; 3 knife, L 8cm; 4 awl, L 9.3cm; 5 axe, L 7cm; 6 pot; 7 loop, dm 4.7cm; 8 ornament, L 8.8cm; 9 loop, dm 5.7cm; 10 bulb, dm 7cm; 11 stone, L 9.9cm (after Jin F. Y. 1985, 31 Fig. 14, 1-11); **F** from Sunjiagou, Tomb M7371, 1 knife, L 16.1cm; 2 sword, L 35cm; 3 axe, L 8.5cm; 4 bell, L 16.4cm; 5 awl, L 8.8cm (after Jin F. Y. 1985, 35 Fig. 30, 1; 33 Fig. 23; 35 Fig. 30, 5.42); **G** collected bronzes, 1 Liujiagou, L 9cm; 2.4.11 Ningcheng, L 9.5cm; 31.4cm; 3 Sujiawpub, L 6.9cm; 5.7 Xiaoheshigou, L 30.2cm; 28.1cm; 6 Laocanggou, L 30.4cm; 8 Wangyingzi, L 34cm; 9 Dianzi, L 30.2cm; 10 Sidaopingzi, L 29.9cm; 12 Nanshangen, L 31.7cm; 13 Xiaoyushulini, L 6.7cm (after Jin F. Y. 1985, 38 Fig. 35, 1-4; 37 Fig. 32, 1-4; 38 Fig. 34; Fig. 33, 1-3; 36 Fig. 31; NMGG 1965a, 621 Fig. 4, 1).

Fig. 080. Dapaozi, funeral objects, 1-7 bronze; 8-19 pottery; 1.2 sword, L 41cm; 37cm; 3.4 knife, L 14.5cm; 15.5cm; 5 bead, L 5.5-6.7cm; 6.7 bulb, dm 1.2-1.5cm; 3.4cm; 8-19 pottery, H 7-17.2cm (after Jia H. E. 1984, 52 Fig. 2, 1-7; Fig. 3, 1-5; Fig. 1-3; Fig. 5, 1-4).

Fig. 081. Toupaizi, bronzes, 1 Yan, H 66cm; 2 Li H 67cm; 3 Li, H 54cm; (after Su H. 1982, 1 Fig1, 1-3).
Fig. 082. Tiejiangou, burials goods. A tomb M1; B tomb M2; C tomb M3; D collected. A: (1-15 bronze; 16 pottery) 1-2 knife, L 19.8cm.17.8cm; 3-4 ring plaque, dm 4.6-4.8cm.4.9cm; 5 belt hook, L 3.8cm; 6-8 animal shaped plaque, L 5.9cm.4.8cm.6cm; 9 bird shaped ornament, L 3.1 cm; 10-13 bulb, dm 3.4cm,2.9cm,3cm.2.1 cm; 14 ornament, L 5.1cm; 15 bead, L 1cm; 16 pottery, L 30cm (after Shao G. T. 1992, 86 Fig. 6, 1.2; 88 Fig. 8, 1.3.2; 87 Fig. 7, 2.1.3.4; 89 Fig. 9, 3.7.6.8; 88 Fig. 8, 8; 87 Fig. 7, 5; 85 Fig. 4, right); B: 1 bell, H 3cm; 2 bulb, dm 2.3cm; 3 belt ornament, L 3.3cm; 4-5 earring, dm 3.2cm.2.3cm; 6 bird figure, L 2.4cm; 7 mussel; 8-10 pottery, H 7.8cm,13cm.58cm (after Shao G. T. 1992, 88 Fig. 8, 7; 89 Fig. 9, 2; 88 Fig. 8, 6.4.5; 90 Fig. 10, 6; 86 Fig. 5, 3.5.4; 85 Fig. 4, left); C: 1-3 bulb, dm 4.6cm,3.1cm,3.3 cm; 4 pot, H 25cm; 5 arrowhead, L 2.2cm (after Shao G. T. 1992, 89 Fig. 9, 5.2.4; 86 Fig. 5, 1; 90 Fig. 10, 7); D: 1 belt hook, L 4.7cm; 2 arrowhead, ca. 3.8cm (after Shao G. T. 1992, 90 Fig. 10, 8.9).
Fig. 083a. Zhoujiadi, funeral objects, A: 1, Tomb M43; 2 Tomb M16 (after ZHSKYN 1984, 419 Fig.5; Fig. 6); B: funeral bronzes, 1-3.13 bulb, dm 1.5-3.7cm; 4 earring, dm 4.2cm; 6 awl, L 7.7cm; 7 knife, L 7.65cm; 8.9 beads, L 4.7cm.4cm; 10 arrowhead, L 4.2cm; 11.12 plaque, L 1.3cm.2cm; 14 ornament, L 1.45cm; 15 earring, dm 5.3cm (after ZHSKYN 1984, 421 Fig. 9, 3.5.7.12.17.16.9.13.15.4.8.422 Fig. 10 7.15.12.1.2).
Fig. 083b. Zhoujiadi, funeral objects of Tomb M45 (1-V Plan after ZHSKYN 1984, 418 Fig. 2; Fig. 3; Plate 5, 2.1; Plate 6), 1-6 bronze; 7 pottery; 8-20 bone (after ZHSKYN 1984, 421 Fig. 9, 1.2.10.11.14.18; 420 Fig. 7, 3; 423 Fig. 12, 2; Fig. 11, 1-6).
Fig. 084a. Yinniugou, tombs: 1 97YM1; 2 97YM2; 3 97YM3; 4 97YM6; 5 97YM5; 6 97YM4; 7 97YM7; 8 97YM8; 9 97YM9 (after NMGY et al. 2001, 286 Fig. 4; 287 Fig. 5; 288 Fig. 6; 291 Fig. 9; 290 Fig. 8; 289 Fig. 7; 292 Fig. 10; 293 Fig. 11; 295 Fig. 13).
Fig. 084b. Yinniugou, tombs: 1 97YM10; 2 97YM11; 3 97YM12; 4 97YM13; 5 97YM14; 6 97YM16; 7 97YM17 (after NMGY et al. 2001, 296 Fig. 14; 298 Fig. 15; 299 Fig. 17; 300 Fig. 18; 301 Fig. 19; 304 Fig. 21; 305 Fig. 22).
Fig. 084c. Yinniugou, tombs: 1 97Y18; 2 97Y19; 3 97YM20; 4 97YM21; 5 97YM 22; 6 97YM 23 (after NMGY et al. 2001, 306 Fig.23; 307 Fig. 24; 308 Fig. 26; 309 Fig. 27; 310 Fig. 28; 311 Fig. 29).
Fig. 084d. Yinniugou, funeral objects (1-6.13 bronze; 7-12 iron), 1-12 belt hook, L 12cm 9.9cm. 7.3cm. 10.5cm. 6.7cm. 10.7cm. 5.2cm. 5.2cm. 4.7cm. 3.3cm. 3.3cm. 3.7cm; 13 ornament, L 2.5cm (after NMGG et al. 2001, 313 Fig. 30, 1-12; 315 Fig. 32).
Fig. 084e. Yinniugou, distribution of tombs (82E: the first excavation; others were excavated in 1997 (after NMGY et al. 2001, 284 Fig. 3).
Fig. 085a. Maoqinggou, tombs and funeral goods, 1-7 Tomb M2; 8 Tomb M1; 9 Tomb M4; 10.11 Tomb M7; 12-16 Tomb M5; 17.18 Tomb M3; 19-31 Tomb M6; 32-35 Tomb M8; 36-41 Tomb M9; 42-48 Tomb M18; 49 Tomb M20; 50-52 Tomb M11; 53-55 Tomb M12; 56.57 Tomb M18; 58-61 Tomb M21; 62 Tomb M2; 63 Tomb M30; 64 Tomb M29-2.3 beads, L 4.3cm.4.1cm; 4 tube, L 2.4cm; 5.6 plaque, L 3.8cm.2.4cm; 7 animal shaped ornament, L
2.4cm; 8.9 belt hook, L 11.2cm; 6cm; 10 plaque, L 3.3cm; 11 bead, dm 0.3cm; 15 tube, L 8.9cm; 16 plaque, L 10.7cm; 18 pottery, H 30.8cm; 20 iron sword L 29.5cm; 21.22 bronze arrowhead, L 5.4cm; 5.4cm; belt buckle, L 6.6cm; 24-27 buckle, dm 1.4-3.9cm; 28.29 tube, L 5.1cm; 4.1cm; 30 bone buckle, L 5cm; 32.33.34 buckle, dm 2.4cm; 1.4cm; 1.1cm; 35 plaque, L 3.2cm; 36 pottery, H 20.8cm; 37 tube, L 6.9cm; 38.39 bone ware, L 8.4; 7.4cm; 41 buckle, L 5.2cm; 43.44 tube, L 8.9cm; 3.3cm; 45 bead, dm 0.3cm; 47.48 plaque, L 3.1cm; 2.3cm; 49 belt hook, L 14.5cm; 50 pot, H 28.8cm; 51 belt buckle, L 6.4cm; 52 crane hack, L 2.7cm; 53 belt buckle, L 6.5cm; 54 plaque, L 3.6-5.4cm; 55 bird shaped plaque, L 3.5cm; 57 iron sword, L 29.8cm; 59 stone ware, L 5.6cm; 60 belt hook, L 6.8cm; 61 pottery spindle, dm 3.8cm; 62.63 pot, H 27.4cm; 24cm; 64 iron sword, L 28.2cm (after NMGG 1986, 241 Fig. 11; 277 Fig. 43, 1.2; 285 Fig. 47, 6; 272 Fig. 40, 3; 277 Fig. 43, 5.4; 245 Fig. 15; Plate 2; Plate 77, 1; 284 Fig. 46, 7; 281 Fig. 45, 1); 243 Fig. 13, left; 255 Fig. 28, 2; 239 Fig. 8; 260 Fig. 31, 1; 263 Fig. 34, 1.4; 266 Fig. 36, 6; 278 Fig. 44, 10.4; 284 Fig. 46, 1; 278 Fig. 44, 2; 286 Fig. 48, 3; 278 Fig. 44, 6.1.5; 275 Fig. 42, 8; 256 Fig. 29, 3; 284 Fig. 46, 6; 286 Fig. 48, 1.2; 275 Fig. 42, 7; 266 Fig. 36, 6; 236 Fig. 7, left; 284 Fig. 46, 8.4; 264 Fig. 35, 2; 277 Fig. 43, 6.7; 270 Fig. 38, 4; 255 Fig. 28, 6; 266 Fig. 36, 8; 285 Fig. 47, 5; 266 Fig. 36, 5; 272 Fig. 40, 4; 275 Fig. 42, 4; 250 Fig. 23; 261 Fig. 32, 2; 251 Fig. 26; 286 Fig. 48, 5; 270 Fig. 38, 1; 286 Fig. 48, 4; 255 Fig 28, 4.5; 261 Fig. 32, 1).
Fig. 085b. Maoqinggou, tombs and funeral goods, 1-2 Tomb M23; 3 Tomb M25; 4-6 Tomb M27; 7-8 Tomb M31; 9-11 Tomb M38; 12 Tomb M33; 13 Tomb M35; 14 Tomb M41; 15-17 Tomb M37; 18-20 Tomb M42; 21-28 Tomb M39; 29.30 Tomb M44; 31-34 Tomb M43; 35-39 Tomb M43; 40-44 Tomb M45-1 pot, H 18.4cm; 6 iron knife, L 18.4cm; 7 plaque, L 4.6cm; 10 iron crane hack, L 19.6cm; 11 iron sword, L 28cm; 12-15.18-20 pot, H 15.2cm,22cm,26.4cm,20.8cm,22.5cm,12.8cm; 16.17 plaque, L 3.6-5.4cm; 21 pot-Li, H 12.8cm; 22.23 bead, dm 1cm,2.3cm; 24.25 bell, H 3.7cm,3.9cm; 26 loop, dm 2.4cm; 29 pot, H 28cm; 30 plaque, L 4.7cm; 32 buckle, dm 5.2-6.5cm; 33 plaque, 3.6-5.4cm; 34 pot, H 30cm 36 sword, L 27.8cm; 37 plaque, L 4.6-5.3cm; 38 buckle, L 6.3cm; 39 pot, H 28cm; 41 bronze
plaque, L 2.9cm; 42 buckle, dm 1.6cm; 43.44 bead, dm 1.2cm.1.4cm (after NMGG 1986. 256 Fig. 29, 4; 234 Fig. 5; 235 Fig. 6; 246 Fig. 17; 262. Fig. 33, 4; 273 Fig. 41, 6; 233 Fig. 3; 246 Fig. 16; 262 Fig. 33, 5; 261 Fig. 32, 3; 256 Fig. 29, 2.9; 255 Fig. 28, 1.5; 272 Fig. 40, 12; 273 Fig. 41, 2; 254 Fig. 27, 8; 256 Fig. 29, 6.10.11; 264 Fig. 35, 6.9; 285 Fig. 47, 2.3; 270 Fig. 39, 2; plate 113, 9; 270 Fig. 38, 2; 254 Fig. 27, 6; 275 Fig. 42, 5; 244 Fig. 14 left; plate 57, 6; 272 Fig. 40, 6; 254 Fig. 27, 5; 247 Fig. 19; 258 Fig. 30, 6; 273 Fig. 41, 4; 266 Fig. 36, 3; 254 Fig. 27, 2; 242 Fig. 12; 275 Fig. 42, 6; 278 Fig. 44, 3; 264 Fig. 35, 7.4).

Fig. 085c. Maoqinggou, tombs and funeral goods, 1-7.19 Tomb M58; 8 Tomb M49; 9 Tomb M53; 10-18 Tomb M59; 20.21 Tomb M60; 22-32 Tomb M63; 34-38 Tomb M55; 39-43 Tomb M61; 44.45 Tomb M62; 46 Tomb M64; 47 Tomb M77; 48-51 Tomb M66; 52-54 Tomb M70;
55 Tomb M74; 56-60 Tomb M71; 61.62 Tomb M67; 63.64 Tomb M75; 65-68 Tomb M81; 69-71 Tomb M65 — 1.13 sword, L 30cm. 27.3cm; 2 dagger, L 20.5cm; 4.5 hook, L 10.7cm. 9.4cm; 6.11 pot, H 12.4cm. 20cm; 8.9.14.2cm. 13.4cm; 12 buckle, L 5.5cm; 14 gag bit, L 20cm; 15 arrowhead, L 4.8cm; 18 loop, dm 6.5cm; 21.37 sword, L 26.6cm. 25.2cm; 22.44 pot, H 29cm. 25.6cm; 23 loop, dm 4.5cm; 24-29.39-41 plaque, L 3.3-5.4cm; 35 plaque, L 10.3cm; 44.46.47 pot, H 27cm. 17.6cm. 14.2cm; 45 bell, L 4.6cm; 55 plaque, L 11cm; 56-58 plaque, L 3.6-5.4cm; 59 buckle, dm 1.1cm; 53 sword, L 27.8cm; 54 arrowhead, L 3.3cm; 63 bronze spear, L 18.7cm; 67 bone bracelet, dm 4cm; 68 belt hook, L 13.4cm (after NMGG 1986, 258 Fig. 30, 4; 262 Fig. 33, 1; plate 113, 6; 269 Fig. 37, 1.2; 256 Fig. 29, 5; 238 Fig. 9; 270 Fig. 38, 3; 269 Fig. 37, 4; 249 Fig. 21; 254 Fig. 27, 3; 266 Fig. 36, 1; 258 Fig. 30, 1; 287 Fig. 49, 2; 263 Fig. 34, 3; 275 Fig. 42, 1; 287 Fig. 49, 1; plate 77, 4; 262 Fig. 33, 2; 248 Fig. 20; 260 Fig. 31, 2; 254 Fig. 27, 9; 270 Fig. 39, 3; 273 Fig. 41, 1; 272 Fig. 40, 11. 273 Fig. 41, 3; 272 Fig. 40, 10.13; plate 80, 13; plate 51, 2 right, left; 266 Fig. 36, 2; 250 Fig. 24; 28266 Fig. 36, 5; plate 77, 3; 284 Fig. 46, 2; 264 Fig. 35, 3; 260 Fig. 31.3; 281 Fig. 45, 3; 272 Fig. 40, 8.9; 275 Fig. 42, 2; 273 Fig. 41, 5; 256 Fig. 29, 1; 254 Fig. 27, 1; 285 Fig. 47, 1; 256 Fig. 29, 7.8; 270 Fig. 39, 1; 284 Fig., 46, 5; 277 Fig. 43, 3; 264 Fig. 35, 5; 247 Fig. 18; 258 Fig. 30, 2; 263 Fig. 34, 2; 281 Fig. 45, 2; 272 Fig. 40, 1.5.4; 278 Fig. 44, 8; 249 Fig. 22; 251 Fig. 25; plate 113, 7; 262 Fig. 33, 2; 240 Fig. 10; 233 Fig. 4; plate 77, 2.7; 268 Fig. 37, 6; plate 52, 1; 285 Fig. 47, 4; 275 Fig. 42, 3).
Fig. 085d. Maoqinggou, plan of cultural remains (adapted from NMGG 1986, 229 Fig. 1).
Fig. 085e. Maoqinggou, distribution of the tombs (after NMGG 1986, 231, Fig. 2)
Fig. 086a. Guoxianyaozi, tombs and funeral goods. 1-5 Tomb M1; 6-9 Tomb M2; 10 Tomb M4; 11-16 Tomb M5; 17-19 Tomb M3; 20-27 Tomb M6; 28-30 Tomb M7; 31-39 Tomb M8; 40-44 Tomb M9; 45-47 Tomb M10; 48 Tomb M11; 49-56 Tomb M12; 57-63 Tomb M14-1: 1.7.11.12.17.21.29.32.41 pot, H 22cm.26.8cm.26.2cm.20cm.24.4cm.19.2cm; 2 bronze loop, dm 5.3cm; 5.8.14.38 plaque, L 3.3cm.3cm.3.3cm.2.1cm; 4 ring, dm2.2cm; 5 tube, L 2.9cm; 6 bone bow-end, L 24.3cm; 9 loop, dm 2.2cm; 10.30.33. 34 turquoise, L 1.6cm.1.8cm.1.4cm.0.95cm; 13.18 buckle, L 5.4cm.7.1cm; 14 plaque, L 3.3cm; 15 crane hack, L 3.4cm; 19.36 bell, L 5cm.4.7cm; 22 buckle, dm 4.7cm; 23 bone ornament, dm 3.2cm; 25 arrowhead, L 4.2cm; 27 button, dm 2.7cm; 35 buckle, L 6cm; 42 loop, dm 3.6cm; 39 knife, L 12.6cm; 43 bead, L 5.1cm; 44 tube, L 2.2cm; 46.48.50 pot, H 27.6cm.24.4cm.23.2cm; 51 loop, dm 8.2cm; 52 buckle, L 5.2cm; 53 tiger plaque, L 7.6cm; 54.55 button, dm:1.6cm.2.7cm; 56 plaque, L 3.1cm; 58 bone arrowhead, L 9cm; 59 bone buckle, L 6.3cm; 60 bone ornament, dm 2.7cm; 61.62 bone tube, L 2.2cm.2.6cm; 63 stone loop, dm: 2.7cm (after NMGY 1989, 64 Fig. 10, 7; 69 Fig. 12, 5; 66 Fig. 11, 5.30; 72 Fig. 14, 13; 64 Fig. 10, 8; Fig. 11, 1; 69 Fig. 12, 2019).
Fig. 086b. Guoxianyaozi, tombs and funeral goods. 1-2 Tomb M13; 3 Tomb M15; 4 Tomb M17; 5-8 Tomb M19; 9-10 Tomb M20; 11-15 Tomb M24; 16-27 Tomb M22; 28-32 Tomb M21; 33 Tomb M23; 34 Tomb M25; 35 Tomb M26; 36 Tomb M27; 38 Tomb M29; 39.40 Tomb M30; 41-43 Tomb M31---1-3.8.10.17.29.33-38 pot, H 25cm.20cm.28cm.16.4cm.20cm.30cm.8cm.27.6cm.25.6cm.14.4cm.28.6cm.12.4cm.28cm.23.2cm; 8.18.19 loop, dm 3.2cm.8.2cm.5.3cm; 20.21 bead, L 4.8-5.1cm; 23 bell, L 4.8cm; 30 arrowhead, L 4.7cm; 11 plaque, L 4.1cm; 12 loop, dm 2.8cm; 13.14 tube, L 3.6cm.4.8cm; 42, L 5.2cm; 43 loop, dm 2.4cm (after NMGY 1989, 63 Fig. 9, 9; 64 Fig. 10, 3.9; 61 Fig. 7; 60 Fig. 6; 63 Fig. 9, 10; 69 Fig.12, 6; 63 Fig. 9, 11; 60 Fig.5; 63 Fig. 9, 12; 69 Fig.12, 13.2; 66 Fig. 11, 19.21.23.33.25; 71 Fig. 13, 6.4; 66 Fig. 11, 34; 59 Fig. 2; 64 Fig. 10, 12; 72 Fig. 14, 3; 69 Fig. 12, 9; 66 Fig. 11, 28; 63 Fig. 9, 3; 64 Fig. 10, 10.5; 63 Fig. 9, 6; 64 Fig. 10, 6.13; 66 Fig. 11, 20.17; 69 Fig. 12, 12; 66 Fig. 11, 8; 69 Fig. 12, 8).
Fig. 086c. Guoxianyaozi cemetery, plan of tombs (adapted from NMGY 1989, 58 Fig. 1)
Fig. 087. Taohongbala, tombs and funeral goods, 1-26 TM1; 27-33 TM2; 34-40 TM5; 41-48 GM1-1-4. 38-40 tube, L 2.1-6.6cm; 5 bronze bead, L 5cm; 6.22 bone ware, L 3.3cm.2.7cm; 7 brush handle, L 6.3cm; 8 horse mask, L 15cm; 9.49 awl, L 10.6cm.8.6cm; 10 loop, dm 1.5cm; 11.12.47 plaque with double birds, L 3.4cm.3.2cm.4.6cm; 13.16.44 button, L 2.1cm.1.5cm. 2.1cm; 14 arrowhead, L 4.8cm; 17 bronze gag bit, L 20cm; 18.19.31.36.37 loop, dm 3.8-6.4cm; 25 bone loop, dm 3cm; 24.43 crane hack, L 14.3cm.14cm; 25 horse mask, dm 7.5cm; 23.33.48.52 pot, H 14cm.13.5cm.6.5cm.14.5cm; 26 pole head, L 4.2cm; 32 stone cup, H 10cm; 35 plaque, L 4.4cm; 41 sword, L 25.3cm; 45, L 3.2cm; 46 chisel, L 4.8cm; 50 horse mask, L 12.5cm; 51 axe, L 6cm (after Tian G. J. 1986, 212 Fig. 7, 1.5.8.9.13; 215 Fig. 8, 4.7.1; 216 Fig. 3; 208 Fig. 4; 210 Fig. 5, 2, 7, 311 Fig. 6, 3.5; 212 Fig. 7, 15; plate 47, 1; 212 Fig. 7, 6.10; plate 99, 4; 211 Fig. 6, 2; plate 76, 2; plate 7, 2; 215 Fig. 8, 5.6; 216 Fig. 9, 1; plate 39, 2; 215 Fig. 8, 2; 207 Fig. 3; 208 Fig. 4; 210 Fig. 5, 2, 7; 211 Fig. 6, 6; plate 76, 3; 216 Fig. 9, 5.2; 210 Fig. 5, 9; 211 Fig. 6, 1; plate 76, 4.1; 212 Fig. 7, 5.2.4; 210 Fig. 5, 11.8.10; 212 Fig. 7, 14; 210 Fig. 5, 3.6; 211 Fig. 6, 4; 216 Fig. 9, 4; 210 Fig. 5, 5; 215 Fig. 8, 3; 210 Fig. 5, 1; 216 Fig. 9, 3).
Fig. 088. Aluchaideng, metal objects, 1-22 gold objects; 23-24 silver objects; 25 stone necklace: 1-2 crown ornament, H 7.3cm, weight 192g; 3 crown belt, L 30cm, weight 1202g; 4-5 plaque with tiger and ox biting and fighting, L 12.6cm; weight 220.6g; 6 earring, L 8.2cm, weight 14.2g; 7 torch shaped needle, L 7.5cm; 9 necklace, L 1.3m; 10 bead necklace, weight 71g; 11 sheep ornament, L 5.3cm; 12 tiger ornament, L 3.9cm; 13 plaque with tiger and bird, L 4.5cm; 14 bird ornament, L 3.2cm; 15-16 sheep ornament, L 2cm.1.8cm; 17-19 button, L 2.2cm.1.9cm.2.4cm; 20 hedgehog, L 4.5cm; 21-22 tiger head shaped ornament, L 3cm.1.6cm; 23 tiger head, H 2.8cm, weight 16.4g; 24 ornament, L 4.5cm (after Tian/Guo 1980, plate 10, 1-5; plate 12, 4; 335 Fig. 3, 4; plate 12, 6.14.7; 335 Fig. 3, 1.6.11.3.7.8.14.15.9.12. 10.2.13.5; plate 12, 11).
Fig. 089. Xigoupan, tombs and funeral objects, 1-3 Tomb M1; 4-14 Tomb M3; 15-46 Tomb M2, 1-2.42-46 iron ware, L 11.3cm.10.2cm.51.2cm.8.8cm.11.2cm.8.8cm.11.2 cm; 15-33 gold plaque and ornament; 15-17, L 12cm.9cm.6.3cm; 19-31, L 13cm.13cm.12.9cm.9.6cm.11.7cm.9.1cm.9cm.7.6cm.7.6cm.3.4cm.4.7cm.2cm.19.8cm; 33, L 14.2cm; 6 pottery, H 6.5cm; 34 lead bird, L 6cm; 38 lead ware, L 2.7cm; 35 silver Jieyue, L 5.5-6cm; others are bronzes: 4-5 bird-head, L 5.1cm.5.4cm; 7 bird plaque, L 2.9cm; 8 belt buckle, L 5.5cm; 9-10.39 button, dm 4.5cm.1.9cm.4.8cm; 11 tube, L 3.3cm; 12.37 arrowhead, L 3.5cm.4.9cm; 13 knife, L 21.5cm; 14 sword, L 20.8cm; 36 pole top, L 18cm; 40 buckle, L 4.7cm; 41 deer, L 7.3cm (after YKW et al. 1986, 362 Fig. 10, 1.2; 363 Fig. 11, 1; 361 Fig. 9, 6.2; 363 Fig. 11, 2; 361 Fig. 9, 3.1; 360 Fig. 8, 10.11; 361 Fig. 9, 5; 360 Fig. 8, 5.3.2; 356 Fig. 4, 1.3.4; YKW et al. 1980, 7 Fig.17; YKW et al. 1986, 353 Fig. 2; 356 Fig. 4, 2.5.6; 356 Fig. 4, 6; 357 Fig. 5, 5; YWK et al. 1980, 3 Fig. 4, 1.2; YKW et al. 1986, 357 Fig. 5, 4.6.3.1; plate 4, 2; plate 55, 3; 357 Fig. 5, 6; 358 Fig. 7; 360 Fig. 8, 14.6.8; 357 Fig. 6, 1.2; 362 Fig. 10, 4.6.3.5).

Fig. 090. Baihaishe, bronze objects, 1-2 Dou, H 30.2m.14.4cm; 3 cover, dm 17.4cm; 3 slide, L 15.7cm; 5 knife, L 23.5cm; 6 axe, L 11cm; 7.8 chisel, L 10.5cm.6.7cm; 9.10 loop, dm 6.2cm.4.8cm; 11 beads, H 2.8cm.2.5cm; 13 tube, H 3.7cm; 14 plaque, H 3.5cm; 15 bulb, dm 2.1cm; 16 belt buckle, L 8.9cm; 17.18, L 2.2cm.2.3cm (after YKW 1987, 80 Fig. 3, 1.3.2; Fig. 4; Fig. 6, 1.2.3.4.14.6.8.10.9.7.13.5.11.12).
Fig. 091. Yulongtai, funeral objects, 1-16, 23-29 bronze; 17 bone; 19 iron; 20-22 stone – 1 axe, L 10cm; 2 Dun, L 10cm; 3 belt buckle, L 5.4cm; 9 joint beads, L 5.1cm; 6.7 plaque, L 2cm; 3.4cm; 8 knife, L 19.4cm; 9 head of axle, L 8.6cm; 10 arrowhead, L 4cm; 11 loop, dm 3.6cm; 12-14 button, dm 5cm.1.4cm.4.9cm; 15, L 5.3cm; 16 plaque, dm 15.3cm; 23-25 figure, L 14.4cm.6.6cm.11.4cm; 26 animal figure, L 19.5cm; 28.29 deer, L 9cm.17.4cm; 17 gag bit, L 8.2cm; 18 ornament, L 5.4cm; 19 crane hack, L 23.5cm; 20-22 stone beads, L 2.4cm.0.9cm.2.6cm (after NMGB et al. 1977, 112 Fig. 2, 1.2.4; 113 Fig. 3, 7.8; 112 Fig. 2, 3; 113 Fig. 3, 6; 112 Fig. 2, 7.10; 113 Fig. 3, 1.9; 112 Fig. 2, 8; 113 Fig. 3, 5.11.10; 112 Fig. 2, 9; 113 Fig. 3, 2.3.4; Plate. 2, 2; plate 3, 5; plate 2, 1; plate 3, 1.4.3.1).
Fig. 092. Sujigou, bronze objects, 1-4 deer, H 16.7 cm, 12.4 cm, 12.5 cm, 7.7 cm; 5, H 16.5 cm; 7-8 beak of bird, L 30.5 cm, 14.1 cm; 9 animal head, L 24.8 cm (after Gai S. L. 1986, Plate 1; Plate 11; Plate 109; Plate 103, 1.2; plate 102, 2).
Fig. 093. Funeral objects, 1-19 from Mingsanmu; 20-31 from Shihuigou; 32-34 from Hanjiayaozi (1-15, 27, 28, 30-34 bronze; 19 pottery; 20-25 silver objects) - 1 axe, L 13cm; 2 hack, L 11.2cm; 3 bell, L 7cm; 4 knife, L 19cm; 5 gag bit, L 20.8cm; 6-8 tube, L 3.5cm, 2.6cm, 5.5cm; 9-10 button, dm 1.4cm, 1.6cm; 11, 12 tube, L 3.3cm, 3.7cm; 13-15 loop, dm: 5-7.4 cm; 16-17, L 6.3cm, 6.8cm; 18 pottery cup, H 8cm; 19 pot, H 17.8cm; 20-25 button, L 3.8 cm, 3.3 cm; 21 hedgehog, L 6.8cm; 22 tortoise ornament, dm 5.3cm; 23-24 plaque, L 10.4-9.8cm, 8.65-8.85cm; 26 bird head, L 22.2cm; 27 deer, L 7.9cm; 28 animal, L 18.3cm; 29 insole-shaped ornament, L 25.2cm; 30 gag bit, L 12.6-12.9cm; 31 ornament, L 9.85cm; 31 sword, L 25cm; 33 plaque, L 5cm; 34 Ge, L 18.3cm (after YKW et al. 1992, 79 Fig. 1, 1-5; 80 Fig. 80, Fig. 4, 1.3.2.5.6.4.7; Fig. 6, 5.4.6.7.3.2.1; YKW 1992, Fig. 1, 1.3.4.5.6; 93 Fig. 3, right; 92 Fig. 1, 2; 93 Fig. 2, 2.1.3.4.5; Li Y. Y. 1986, Plate 29, 1; Plate 66, 9; Plate 43, 3).

Fig. 094. Nianfangqu, gold and silver objects from hoard, 1-14, 31 golden objects; 15-22 turquoise beads; 23-30, agate; 32 pottery--1 plaque, L 13.8cm; 2-3 earring, L 9.6cm, 9.6cm; 4 ornament, L 5.3cm; 5-8 bead, L 0.6-1cm; 10-13 tube, L 2.7cm, 2.9cm, 1.1cm; 13 gold plated agate ornament, L 1.8-3.3cm; 14 gold plated iron animal shaped ornament, L 2.65cm; 15-29 bead, L 1.9-6cm; 30 agate loop, dm 5.3cm; 32 pot, H 26cm (after YKW 1991, 406 Fig. 2; Fig. 3, 1-8; 407 Fig. 4, 1.2.5-12.3.4.13-22; 406 Fig. 3, 9; 408 Fig. 5, middle; 406 Fig. 3, 10).
Fig. 095. Xiyuan, tombs and funeral objects, 1-3 Tomb M2; 4-9 Tomb M3; 10 altar pit; 11-19 Tomb M5; 20-26 Tomb M6; 27-33 Tomb M6; 34.35 Tomb M7 (3.16.18.19.34 bone; others bronze) - 3.16.18.19.34 bone ware, L 2.7cm.2.7cm.6.8cm.14cm.9cm; 2.23.24 bulb, L 2.6cm.2cm.2.9cm; 4.21 button, dm 3-3.3cm; 5 plaque, L 3.4cm; 6.14 earring, dm 4cm.3cm; 7 loop, dm 3.6cm; 12 belt hook, L 3cm; 13 arrowhead, L 2.5cm; 15 tube, L 2.6cm; 22 loop, dm 3.4cm; 25 bell, H 3.5cm; 26 spoon, L 9cm; 28 buckle, dm 3.4cm; 29 button, dm: 5cm; 30.33 tube, L 1cm.1.8cm; 31 stone ornament, L 1cm (adapted from Liu H. Z. 1991, 20 Fig. 8, 11; 18 Fig. 5, 10; 21 Fig. 9, 7; 18 Fig. 5, 1; 19 Fig. 6, 1; 18 Fig. 5, 13.4; 17 Fig. 4; 19 Fig. 6, 7; 18 Fig. 5, 15.14.12.6; 21 Fig. 9, 3.6.1.8; 15 Fig, 2, right; 18 Fig. 5, 3.5.11.9; 19 Fig. 6, 4; 15 Fig. 2, left; 19 Fig. 6, 2; 18 Fig. 5, 2.6; 21 Fig. 9, 5; 18 Fig. 5, 7; 19 Fig. 6, 5; 21 Fig. 9, 4).

Fig. 096. Hulusitai, funeral objects, 1-10 Tomb M2; 11 Tomb M1; 12 Tomb M3 (1 pottery; others bronze) -1 pot, H 26.5cm; 2-4.11 horse mask, L 5.9cm.12.8cm.5.9cm.6.3cm; 5 buckle, L 2.6cm; 6 handle, L 13.8cm; 9 crane hack, L 18.5cm; 10 deer, L 9.5cm; 12 sword, L 26.7cm (after Ta/Liang 1986, Plate 95, 2; Plate 100, 3.4.5; 224 Fig. 1, 3.2.1.5.4.6.7; Plate 28, 3).
Fig. 097. Metal objects, 1 from Salaqi; 2-8 from Shuijiangoumen; 9-12 from Goulitou; 13 from Nanpaoziya; 14-34 from Chenbaerhuqi (26-32 iron; 33-34 gold; others bronze) - 1 knife L 19cm; 8 deer, L 11cm; 9 sword, L 25cm; 10, L 2cm; 11, dm 2cm; (after Shi Y. T. 1997, 18, Fig. 1; Zheng L. 1965, 51 Fig. 2, 1-6; Fig. 1; 9; Cui L. M. 1994, 473 Fig. 1, 1; Fig. 2, 1-3; after Hao W. B. 1996, 13 Fig. 2, 4; NMGG 1965b, 279 Fig. 8, 1-12; 280 Fig. 9, 1-7; 281 Fig. 10, 17.18).
Fig. 098a. Chaiwangang, tombs and funeral objects, A Tomb M72; B Tomb M4 (after Xigangchaiwangang 2001, 117 Fig. 42; 118 Fig. 43; 119 Fig. 44; 120 Fig. 45).
Fig. 098b. Chaiwangang, tombs and funeral objects, A Tomb M122; B Tomb M123; C Tomb M8 (after Xigangchaiwangang 2001, 122 Fig. 46; 123 Fig. 47; 125 Fig. 48; 126 Fig. 49).
Fig. 098c. Chaiwangang, tombs and funeral objects. A Tomb M50; B Tomb M44; C Tomb M53; D Tomb M75 (after Xigangchaiwangang 2001, 127 Fig. 50; 129 Fig. 52; 131 Fig. 53; 133 Fig. 55; 132 Fig. 54).
Fig. 098d. Chaiwangang, metal objects: A weapons and tools (13, iron; others, bronze) (after Xigangchaiwangang 2001, 149 Fig. 60); B buckles (after Xigangchaiwangang 2001, 151 Fig. 61). C ornaments (26–27, gold; others, bronze) (after Xigangchaiwangang 2001, 169 Fig. 65).
Fig. 098e. Chaiwangang, metal ornaments (after Xigangchaiwangang 2001, 153 Fig. 62; 157 Fig. 63; 162 Fig. 64).
Fig. 098f, Chaiwangang, metal objects: A 1-3 mirror; 4-17 bell; 18-20 horse fitting (after Xigangchaiwangang 2001, 174 Fig. 66, 1-17; 182 Fig. 69, 15-17); B tube; C plaque (after Xigangchaiwangang 2001, 178 Fig. 68; 177 Fig. 67).
Table 1: Relative Periodization of Qijia Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 099a. Qijia culture, relative periodization of sites: Liuwan, Huangniangniangtai, Qinweijia and Dahezhuang (adapted from Shui T. 2001a, 197 Fig. 3; 199 Fig. 4; 201 Fig. 5; 202 Fig. 6; 203 Fig. 7; 204 Table 4).
Fig. 099b. Qijia culture, copper and bronze objects, 1.4.7.8.9.10.11.13 from Huangniangniangtai; 2.3.6 from Zongzhai; 5 from Dahezhuang; 12.20 from Qinweijia; 14.15.22 from Gamatai; 16.18.23 from Zongri; 17.19.21 from Xinzhuangping; 24 from Weijiataizi; 25 from Shangguandi; 26.27 from Xinglin; 28.29 from Qijiaping.
Fig. 099c. Qiia culture and Upper Changshan culture, potteries. Q, Qiedaoba cemetery; L, Liuwan cemetery; H, Huangniangniangtai cemetery (adapted from Shui T. 2001a, 275 Fig. 49).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>Shanjiatou</th>
<th>Lianhuatai</th>
<th>Yanchang</th>
<th>Xindian (etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Shanjiatou Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Lianhuatai Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Yanchang Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Xindian Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Shanjiatou Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Lianhuatai Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Yanchang Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Xindian Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II</th>
<th>Shanjiatou</th>
<th>Lianhuatai</th>
<th>Yanchang</th>
<th>Xindian (etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Shanjiatou Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Lianhuatai Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Yanchang Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Xindian Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Shanjiatou Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Lianhuatai Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Yanchang Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Xindian Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III</th>
<th>Shanjiatou</th>
<th>Lianhuatai</th>
<th>Yanchang</th>
<th>Xindian (etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Shanjiatou Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Lianhuatai Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Yanchang Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Xindian Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Shanjiatou Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Lianhuatai Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Yanchang Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Xindian Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Shanjiatou Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Lianhuatai Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Yanchang Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Xindian Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 100a. Xindian culture, periodization of the sites: Shanjiatou, Lianhuatai, Yanchang, Xindian (adapted from Shui T. 2001a, 208 Fig. 9; 210 Fig. 10; 212 Fig. 11; 213 Fig. 12; 214 Fig. 13; 215 Fig. 14; 218 Table 9).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jijiachuan</th>
<th>Zhangjiazui</th>
<th>Hetaozhuang</th>
<th>Tang Wangchuan</th>
<th>Shang Sunjiazhai</th>
<th>Boji Zhang</th>
<th>Liuwan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Vessels" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Vessels" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>5</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Vessels" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Vessels" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Vessels" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Vessels" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Vessels" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 100b. Xindian culture, periodization of the sites: Jijiachuan, Zhangjiazui, Hetaozhuang, Tangwangchuan, Shangsunjiazhai, Liuwan (adapted from Shui T. 2001a, 216 Fig. 15; 217 Fig. 16; 219 Fig. 17; 218 Table 9).
Fig. 100c. Xindian culture, Xiaohandi potteries (adapted from ZWL 2003, 146 Fig. 3.6).
Fig. 100d. Xindian culture, potteries, 1-6 Liuwan; 7-17 Bojizhang; 18-23 Bianjiang; 24-29 Zhongchuan (collected); 30 Dongdapo; 31-33 Zhuandao; 34 Shanghandi; 35 Erfang; 36-38 Zongzhai M32; 39-42 Batan (after ZWL 2003, 147 Fig. 3.8).
Fig. 100e. Xindian culture, bronze objects, 1-2 from Zongzhai; 3-9 from Lianhuatai; 10,11 Tuchangtou; 12 Shuangerdongping; 13 Shanjiatou (after Pak Y. J. 1996, 290 Fig. 6.7, 1-9; ZWL 2003, Fig. 4.1, 1-4).
Fig. 101a. Kayue culture, periodization of the Huangshui valley sites: Panjialiang, Xinxihe, Huangjiazhai and Dahuazhongzhuang (adapted from Shui T. 2001a, 234 Fig. 26; 233 Fig. 25; 241 Fig. 30; 239 Fig. 29; 240 Table 14).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Ahatela</th>
<th>Shangbanzhuwa</th>
<th>Shanpingtai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I 1</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II 2</td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III 3</td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image9.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><img src="image10.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image11.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image12.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><img src="image13.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image14.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image15.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><img src="image16.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image17.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image18.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 101b. Kayue culture, periodization of the Yellow River region sites: Ahatela, Shangbanzhuwa and Shanpingtai (after Shui T. 2001a, 231 Fig. 24; 236 Fig. 27; 237 Fig. 28; 240 Fig. 14).
Fig. 101c. Comparing the early Kayue culture with the late Qijia culture, 1 Panjiliang; 2-5 Shangbanzhuwa; 6-10.15-18Liuwan; 11 Suhusa; 12 Ahatela; 13-14 Kayue (adapted from ZWL 2003, 155 Fig. 3.16).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Shang Dynasty</th>
<th>Western Zhou</th>
<th>Eastern Zhou</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 1600-1251 BC</td>
<td></td>
<td>1046-771 BC</td>
<td>Spring-Autumn period 771-475 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 1251-1046 BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Warring States period 475-221BC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Container**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Shang Dynasty</th>
<th>Western Zhou</th>
<th>Eastern Zhou</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weapon**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Shang Dynasty</th>
<th>Western Zhou</th>
<th>Eastern Zhou</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>axe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Shang Dynasty</th>
<th>Western Zhou</th>
<th>Eastern Zhou</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dagger axe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapon</td>
<td>spear</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sword</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrow head</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mirror</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool</td>
<td>Knife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

392
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tube</th>
<th>Bell</th>
<th>Plaque</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Tube" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Bell" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Plaque" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are images of different artifacts, labeled from 64 to 105, with corresponding numbers next to each image.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Loop hairpin</th>
<th>Bulb</th>
<th>Bead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>109-111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119-122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123-126</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128-131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132-134, 135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136-138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143-150?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>151-153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 101d. Kayue culture, copper and bronze objects, 1 Baojiazhai; 2.25-27.40.42.47.55.65.70.90.118.126.134.136-138.157 from Dahuazhuangzhuang; 3.8.17.43.50.59.88.119.122.131.151 from Shangbanzhuwa; 4 from Ahatela; 6.9.10.11.14.33.36.44-46.48.49.51.53.54.64.69.77-79.81.82.83.111.117.130.143.149.150 from Panjialiang; 5 from Liangjiao; 7 from Qianying; 15.18.28 from Huangzhong; 13.15.16.19.20.34.35.39.56.63.68.71-73.75.76.80.84.85.89.91.92.96.98.100-110.112-116. 121.123.125.127.133.135.139-142.144-147.150.152.153.155.156.158.163.164 from Shangsunjiazhai; 12 from Chuankou; 21 from Xiazhiquan; 22 from Dongcun; 23 from Dong’anshi; 24 from Shenna; 30 from Huabiliang; 31 from Guanting; 32.58 from Zong’an; 41 from Datong; 52.86 from Luanshan; 57.99 from Shanpingtai; 60.87.132 from Dongcun; 61 from Shangzhiquan; 62.67 from Gangcha; 66.74. 93.94.97.124.161 from Huangjiazhai; 95 from Wangyufutian; 120.147 from Suhusa; 159.160 from Huangyuan; 162 from Huangzhong.
Fig. 102. Bronze spears with tubular handle found in China and south Siberia, 1 Shenna; 2 stored in the Shaanxi Province Museum; 3 stored in the Shanxi Province Museum; 4-8 south Siberian (after Mei J. J. 2001, 17 Fig. 3).
Fig. 103a. Siwa culture, periodization of the sites: Siwashan, Xujianian and Jiuzhan (adapted from Shui T. 2001a, 223 Fig. 19; 224 Fig. 20; 225 Fig. 21; 227 Table 12).
Fig. 103b. Siwa culture, copper and bronze artifacts, 1-27 Jiuzhan; 28-30 Lanqiao; 31 Siwashan; 32-40 Xujianian (after Fig. 055a; Fig. 051b; Fig. 052; Fig. 054).
Fig. 104a. Siba culture, periodization of the sites: Donghuishan and Huoshaogou (adapted from Shui T. 2001a, 248 Fig. 34; 245 Fig. 32; 247 Fig. 33; 249 Fig. 35; 250 Table 15).
Fig. 104b. Siba culture, copper and bronze objects (after Li/Shui 2000, 37 Fig. 1, 1-14; 38 Fig. 2, 1-4.6-9.13.12.14.17.15.16.18.19.10.11; 39 Fig. 3).
Fig. 105a. Shajing culture, periodization of the sites: Shajing, Hamadun and Sanjiaocheng (adapted from Shui T. 2001a, 254 Fig. 38; 255 Fig. 39; 256 Fig. 40; 257 Table 16).
Fig. 105b. Shajing culture, periodization of the sites: Xigang and Chaiwangang (after Xigangchaiwangang 2001, 182-1 Fig. 70).
Fig. 105c. Shajing culture, metal objects: A Sanjiaocheng; B Hamadun; C Yushugou (A after Fig. 046a, 1-2; Fig. 046b, 1-7; B after Fig. 046a, 3-8; Fig. 046b, 8-41; C after Fig. 066).
Fig. 105d. Shajing culture, metal objects, Xigang (after Fig. 065f; Fig. 065h).
Fig. 105e. Shajing culture, metal objects, Chaiwangang (after Fig. 098d; Fig. 098e).
Fig. 105f. Shajing culture, metal objects, I Xigang; II Chaiwangang (after Fig. 065h; Fig. 098f).
Fig. 106a. Nuomuhong culture, periodization of the Dalitaliha site (after Shui T. 2001a, 271 Fig. 48).
Fig. 106b. Comparing the Nuomuhong culture, Qijia culture and Kayue culture: C, collected; L, Liuwan site; G, Gangcha county; D Dahuazhongzhuang; S Shanpingtai site (adapted from ZWL 2003, 156 Fig. 3.17.1; Fig. 3.17.2).

Fig. 106c. Nuomuhong culture, copper and bronze artifacts: 1-8 Dalitaliha; 9 Buha; (after ZWL 2003, 158 Fig. 4.3).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Tangwang-style-pottery, periodization of the sites at Suhusá, Ahatela, Gongbeitái, Shangsunjiazhai, and Zhangkashan: S - Suhusá; A - Ahatela; G - Gongbeitái; SH - Shangsunjiazhai; Z - Zhangkashan (adapted from ZWL 2003, 157 Fig. 3.18).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Pottery Vessels IV" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Pottery Vessels III" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Pottery Vessels II" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Pottery Vessels I" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 107b. Tangwang-style-pottery, comparing potteries from other cultures (adapted from ZWL 2003, 157 Fig. 3.19).
Fig. 108a. Zhukaigou culture, periodization of the potteries, 1 Baoniyaoozi; 2-14 Zhukaigou (adapted from Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 74 Fig. 33).
Fig. 108b. Zhukaigou site, potteries (after Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 75 Fig. 34, 1-8; 82 Fig. 39, 5.6).
Fig. 108c. Zhukaigou culture, metal objects: 1-19 bronze, from Zhukaigou; 20 gold, from Tebuxiwula (after Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 76 Fig. 35, 1-15; 82 Fig. 39, 1-4; 78 Fig. 36).
Fig. 108d. Zhukaigou site, back reflected electron image of the bronze artifacts (adapted from Li/Han 2002, 255 Plate 1).
Fig. 108e. Zhukaigou site, metallurgical structure of the bronze artifacts (adapted from Li/Han 2002, 256 Plate 2).
Fig. 108f. Zhukaigou site, metallurgical structure of the bronze artifacts (adapted from Li/Han 2002, 257 Plate 3).
Fig. 108g. Zhukaigou site, metallurgical structure of the bronzes (adapted from Li/Han 2002, 258 Plate 4).
Fig. 108h. Zhukaigou site, metallurgical structure of the bronzes (adapted from Li/Han 2002, 259 Plate 5).
Fig. 108i. Trans-Baikal area, snake-motif potteries (after Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 85 Fig. 42).

Fig. 109a. Lijiaya culture, potteries, 1-2.6-8 from Lijiaya; 3-5 from Xuejiaqu (after Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 150 Fig. 67).
Fig. 109b. Lijiaya culture, metal objects, 1.10.12.26 Caojiayuan; 2.7.24. Gaohong; 3 Qutou in Yanchuan, 4 Qinjian; 5.22 Zhujiayu; 6.9.14.23 Houlanjiagou; 8.27-29 Yantou; 13 Shaodao in Yanchuan; 15. Nanhe in Shilou; 16 Heidouzui in Chunhua; 17.18. Taohuazhuang; 20 Xiaxinjiao; 19.21.30-32 Linzheyu; 22 Zhujiayu; 25 Xiejiagou (after Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 152 Fig. 68, 1-16; 153 Fig. 69, 1-10; 157 Fig. 72, 1-6).
Fig. 110. Xicha culture, bronze objects, 1.2.5.6 Xicha; 3.4 Laoniuan; 7 Maiwenyan (after Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 87 Fig. 43).

Fig. 111a. Datuotou culture, periodization of the sites, 1 Fenghuangshan; 2 Sanguan M2008:1; 3 Liulihe M1: 1; 4 Sishilipo II28:11; 5 Datuotou F1:8; 6 Zhangjiayuan 65T2④:1; 7 Weifang T2③: 9; 8 Xueshan H109:7; 9 Zhangjiayuan 79T1③:13; 10 Weifang T3③:13; 11 Datuotou F2:14; 12 Qianbao F1:7; 13 Zhangjiayuan T2②:8; 14 Datuotou F2:1; 15 Datuotou F1:5; 16 Weifang H3:2; 17 Guye 18 Xiaoshu :3 19 Datuotou F1:6; 20 Qinggongtai M1:22; 21 Datuotou H2: 16; 22 Datuotou H2: 17; 23 Sanguan H2022: 26; 24 Liulidian M1:3; 25 Qinggongtai M1:8; 26 Sanguan H2071:7.
Fig. 111b. Xueshan II, potteries, 1 H66:7; 2 H66:32; 3 H66:228; 4 H66:233; 5 H66:231 (after Han J. G. 1992, 299 Fig. 2).

Fig. 111c. Datuotou culture, metal objects, 1.8 Weifang; 2.12 Lijiadian; 3 Tazhao; 4.10.11 Zhangjiayuan; 6 Sanguan; 7 Xiayuegezhuang; 9 Datuotou; 13 Qinggongtai (after Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 53 Fig. 21, 1.4.8.6.11.5.9.12.2.3.10.7.13).
Fig. 112a. Weifang III culture, potteries, 1 Beifudi; 2 Guye; 3.6.7 Weifang; 4.5.8 Jiancun (after Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 126 Fig. 56).
Fig. 112b. Weifang III culture, metal objects, 1-12, 18-23 bronze; 13-17 gold; 1 Zhangjiakou; 2-5, 10 Chaodaogou; 6, 9, 16 Xiaoshandong; 7, 11 Jiancun; 8 Weifang; 12 Chenshantou; 13, 15, 17, 20-22 Zhangjiayuan; 14 Liujihe; 18, 19 Mashao (after Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 127 Fig. 57, 1-12; 132 Fig. 61, 1-4; 134 Fig. 62, 1-6).
Fig. 112c. Northern bronzes found in central China during the Yinxu period, 1.3.9 Yinsu; 2.7.8 Dasikong; 4-6 Anyang (after Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 135 Fig. 63).
Fig. 113a. Baifu cemetery: A tomb M2, B tomb M3 (after BJWG 1976, 247 Fig. 2; Fig. 3).
Fig. 113b. Baifu cemetery, bronze objects, 25.26 helmet, H 23cm (after BJWG 1976, 252 Fig. 7, 1-14; 252 Fig. 8, 1-5; 253 Fig. 9, 1-5; 253 Fig. 10, 1-2).
Fig. 113c. Baifu cemetery, bronze objects, 7-9 shield, diameter, 10.5-15cm (after BJWG 1976, 253 Fig. 11, 1-6; 254 Fig. 12, 1-3; 254 Fig. 13, 1-7; 257 Fig. 18, 1-7; 257 Fig. 19, 1-5; 257 Fig. 20, 1.3.4).
Fig. 114. Xiaohenan, bronze objects (after Wang F. 1990, 58 Fig. 2, 1-9).

Fig. 115. Xibozi, bronze objects (after BJWG 1979, 229 Fig. 4, 1-21; 228 Fig. 2, 1-3).
Fig. 116. Dongnangou cemetery, tombs and funeral goods, A tombs, 1 M10; 2 M4; 3 M8; 4 M6 (after Zheng S. Z. 1977, 52 Fig. 2, Fig. 3; 53 Fig. 4, Fig. 5); B bronze objects (after Zheng S. Z. 1977, 54 Fig. 7, 1-3; 54 Fig. 8, 1.2.8.10; 53 Fig. 6, 1-2).

Fig. 117a. Upper Zhangjiayuan culture, potteries, 1.4.9.10.14.15 Zhangjiayuan 2.8.12.13 Guye; 3.5.6.7 Tanshan; 11 Donggoudao (1.4 after TJW 1979, 168 Fig. 11, 1.3; 2.3.5-8.12-15 after Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 260 Fig. 119, 10.1.2.4.3.7.5.9.5.8; 9.10 after TJLBK 1993, 319 Fig. 8, 6.1; 11 after Bai G. 1999, 26 Fig. 14).
Fig. 117b. Upper Zhangjiayuan culture, bronze objects and molds. 1-6 bronze objects; 7-12 stone molds; 1-8 Donggoudaoxia; 9-12 Baoshenmiao (after Bai G. 1999, 25 Fig.9, 6.3.5.1.2.4; 25 Fig. 10, 1.2; An Z. M. 1954, 83 Fig. 3, Fig. 4; 84 Fig. 5, Fig. 6).
Fig. 118. Beixinbao, metal objects, B 9.10 gold; others bronze, A-M1 (after HBWW 1966, 235 Fig. 6, 1.2.7.3.6; 236 Fig. 7, 1-4; 237 Fig. 8, 1.2.6.4.7.3.5.8-10; 238 Fig. 9, 6.4.9.8.2.3; 234 Fig. 5, 1-2); B-M2 (after HBWW 1966, 240 Fig. 12, 1-2; 241 Fig. 13; Fig. 14, 1.2.5.3.7.8.6).

Fig. 119. Qingzigou, bronze objects, A 76M18; B 76M16 (after Zheng S. Z. 1984, 45 Fig. 7, 1-3, 6-10; 46 Fig. 9, 1-9).
Fig. 120. Luotuoliang, bronze objects (after Zheng S. Z. 1984, 46 Fig. 8, 1-8.10).
Fig. 121. Paotaishan, bronze objects (after Zheng S. Z. 1983, 69 Fig. 4; 70 Fig. 5, 18.1-3.14.13.6.7.9.10; 71 Fig. 7, 5.6.4; 70 Fig. 5, 4.5.15-17; 72 Fig. 11, Fig. 12, Fig. 8-10, Fig. 15; 73 Fig. 16; 72 Fig. 13).
Fig. 122a. Ganzibao, bronze ritual objects (after He/Liu 1993, 24 Fig. 2, 1-6; 25 Fig. 3, 1-4; Fig. 4, 1-5; 26 Fig. 5, 1-9).
Fig. 122b. Ganzibao, bronze objects (after He/Liu 1993, 29 Fig. 7, 1-10; 28 Fig. 6, 1-3; 30 Fig. 8, 1-6; 32 Fig. 11, 1-6; 32 Fig. 12, 2-7).
Fig. 122c. Ganzibao, metal objects, 7.13 gold; others, bronze (after He/Liu 1993, 31 Fig. 9, 1-19; Fig. 10, 1-10; 37 Fig. 16, 1.2.10.11.7.3.4.8.5.9; 33 Fig. 13, 2.3.7.9; 35 Fig. 14, 1-12; Fig. 15, 1-14).
Fig. 123. Baimiao, bronze objects (after ZJKW 1985, 28 Fig. 9, 2-4.7.5.6).

Fig. 124. Nihezi, bronze objects (after Zhang/Tao, 1983, 94 Fig. 5, 1-4; 95 Fig. 6, 1-4).
Fig. 125. Xiaobaiyang, bronze objects (after Tao Z. Y. 1987, 46 Fig. 13, 1-25; 48 Fig. 15. 1-31; 47 Fig. 14, 1.5.11.14.16).
Fig. 126a. Lishugoumen, bronze objects, 1-15.30-33 sword; 16-29.34-37 knives (after CDW et al. 1994, 21 Fig. 7, 1-15; 22 Fig. 8, 4-8.11.10.9; 23 Fig. 9, 11-14.17.16; LPB 1995, 11 Fig. 5, 1-5.7.6.8).
Fig. 126b. Lishugoumen, bronze objects, 1-2 Ge; 3.9-14 adz and axe; 4-8 awl; 15-29 arrowheads (after CDW et al. 1994, 22 Fig. 8, 1-3; LPB 1995, 12 Fig. 6, 5-6; CDW et al. 1994, 24 Fig. 10, 2.3.1; 23 Fig. 9, 19-21; LPB 1995, 11 Fig. 5, 9.10; CDW et al. 1994, 24 Fig. 10, 6-16; LPB 1995, 1-4).
Fig. 126c. Lishugoumen, bronze objects (after CDW et al. 1994, 25 Fig. 11, 1-18; LPB 1995, 13 Fig. 7, 2-4.1.5-12; CDW et al. 1994, 26 Fig. 1-25; 27 Fig. 13, 1-8; 24 Fig. 10, 4.5).
Fig. 127. Daolazui, metal objects, 1-5 bronze; 6 gold - 1 Dou, H 16.7cm; 2 vessel, H 8.4cm; 3 Ge, L 20.8cm; 4 knife, L 15cm; 5 figure; H 5.4cm; 6 necklace, H 37cm (after Chen X. 1999, 31 Fig. 1, 3.4.5.6.1.2).

Fig. 128a. Longqingxia, metal objects, 1-5 gold; 6-25 bronze (after BJWY 1994, 37 Fig. 6, 1-5; 38 Fig. 9, 1-6; 39 Fig. 10, 1-4; 37 Fig. 6, Fig. 9; 40 Fig. 11, 1-8).
Fig. 128b. Longqingxia, bronze objects (after BJWY 1994, 41 Fig. 12, 1-18).
Fig. 129a. Yuhuangmiao cemetery, bronze objects (after Jin F. Y. 2001, 204 Fig. 3, 1-6; 207 Fig. 5, 1-3; 205 Fig. 4, 1-7; 208 Fig. 6, 1-2; BWS 1989, 28 Fig. 18 1-7; 30 Fig. 22, 1-2.4-6).
Fig. 129b. Yuhuangmiao cemetery, bronze objects (after Jin F. Y. 2001, 203 Fig. 2, 1-6; BWS 1989, 31 Fig. 25, 2-4; 31 Fig 24, 1-7).

Fig. 130a. Yuhuangmiao culture, potteries, 1.2.6 Yuhuangmiao; 3.5.7 Lishugoumen; 8 Xiaobaiyang; 4.9 Hulugou (after Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 284 Fig. 130).
Fig. 130b. Yuhuangmiao culture, bronze objects in the Central Plains style, 1.5.10 Beixinbao; 2.4.6.7.8 Ganzibao; 3.11-14 Yuhuangmiao; 9 Paotaishan (after Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 294 Fig. 135).
Fig. 130c. Yuhuangmiao culture, metal objects: A vessels and tools; B weapons; C ornaments; D horse fittings. C 2-6, 14, 28, gold; others, bronze (after Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 285 Fig. 131; 286 Fig. 132; 287 Fig. 133; 288 Fig. 134).
Fig. 131a. Maoqinggou culture, potteries, 1-6 Maoqinggou; 7-8 Guoxianyaozi (after Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 307 Fig. 140).
Fig. 131b. Maoqinggou culture, metal objects: 1-9, 15, 18-20, 26, 27, 31-40, 43 Maoqinggou; 10, 13, 16, 20-23, 28-30 Gauoxianyaozi; 11 stored in Inner Mongolia Museum; 12 Liangcheng; 17 Fanjiayaozi; 24 Huhehaote; 14 Shuijiangoumen; 41, 42 Yinniugou; 7-9, 40-43 iron, objects; others, bronze (after Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 308 Fig. 141, 1-9; 313 Fig. 145, 1-22; 309 Fig. 142, 1-5, 7, 8, 13, 6, 9, 10, 12).
Fig. 131c. Maoqinggou culture, metal objects, 1-2 Fanjiayaozi; 3-8 Shuijiangoumen; 9-12 Goulitou; 13-25 Yiniugou—19-24, iron; others, bronze (after Fig. 093, 32.33; Fig. 097, 2-12; Fig. 084d, 1-13)
Fig. 132. Metal objects, 1-15 Nalingaotu; 16-22 Lijiapan; 23 Laolongchi; 24 Majiagaigou-1 iron handle; 3.6-9,11.12.14 silver; 4-5 gold; 10,13.15-24 bronze (after Dai/Sun 1983, 24 Fig. 2, 1-5; 29 Fig. 11; 25 Fig. 4, 1-9; 26 Fig. 5, 1-7, Fig. 6, Fig. 7).

Fig. 133. Waertugou, bronze figures (after NMGXJ 63, 54 Fig. 80, Fig. 81; 55 Fig. 82, Fig. 83).
Fig. 134a. Taohongbala culture, metal objects, 19 iron; others, bronze - 1.13.17.55 Gongsuhao; 7.9-11.14-16.23.24.26-28.31-33.37.38.52.54.57 Taohongbala; 2. 25 Hulusitai; 3-6.20.39.42. 44 Xigoupan; 8.12.29.50.51 Baohaishc; 18.49 Yulongtai; 21.22.34.36.56 Yikezhaoaeng; 30.35 Lijiapan; 40.43 Sujigou; 41.45.46 Waertugou; 53.58.59 Shihuigou (after Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 328 Fig. 147, 1-20; 330 Fig. 148, 1-19; 331 Fig. 149, 1-10; 338 Fig. 154, 3-12).
Fig. 134b. Taohongbala culture, gold belt ornaments, 1 Xigoupan; 2 Aluchaideng (after Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 333 Fig. 151, 1.2).
Fig. 134c. Taohongbala culture, gold ornaments - 1.3.6.7.9.12-16 Aluchaideng; 
2.4.5.8.11.17.19.20 Xigoupan; 18 Nianfangqu; 21.22 Nalingaotu (after Beifangcaooyuan 2007, 
334 Fig. 152, 1-18; 340 Fig. 155, 2.6; Dai/Sun 1983, 24 Fig. 2, 4.5).
Fig. 134d. Taohongbala culture, gold crown, 1-4 Aluchaideng; 5 Nalingaotu (after Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 332 Fig. 150, 1-4; 340 Fig. 155, 1).
Fig. 134e. Taohongbala culture, silver objects, 1.3.13 Shihuigou; 2.4.6.8.11.12 Nalingaotu; 5.7 Aluchaideng; 9.10 Xigoupan; (after Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 337 Fig. 153, 1; Dui/Sui 1983, 29 Fig. 11; Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 337 Fig. 153, 3-13).

Fig. 135a. Yanglang culture, potteries, 1.6 Niding; 2-5 Yujiachuang (after Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 366 Fig. 166).
Fig. 135b. Yanglang culture, bronze objects, 1-17 weapons, 18-31 tools, 1 Mazhai; 2.9.10.25.28.29.31 Mazhuang; 3 Ligou; 4.8 Samen; 5 Wangjia; 6.16.21 Xianma; 7 Yangwa; 11.18.20 Miaoqu; 12.13.30 Qin’an; 14.19 Miyuan; 15 Guyuan county; 17 Niding; 22.23.26 Yujiazhuan; 24.27 Zhangjie (after Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 367 Fig. 167,1-17; 369 Fig. 168, Fig. 168, 1-14).
Fig. 135c. Yanglang culture, bronze objects, 1-14 chariot and horse fittings; 15-23 belt ornaments- 1,2,4,5,12,13,15,20,22,23 Mazhuang; 3,10 Zhangjie; 9,14 Niding; 6 Miyuan; 7,8 Yuanjia; 11 Xianma; 16,21 Chenyangchuan; 17 Baiyanglin; 18 Yaohe; 19 Guyuan county (after Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 370 Fig. 169, 1-14; 371 Fig. 170, 1-9).
Fig. 135d. Yanglang culture, metal objects, 1-47 bronze; 48-54 iron-1Miaoqu; 2.12.15.29.32.33.47 Yujiachuang; 3.4.13.22 Zhangjie; 6-8.19.27.39.40.41.42.43.45.46.48-54 Mazhuang; 5 Yuqiao in Xijie county; 14.18.37 Chenyangchuan; 30 Tatou; 34 Pengyang county; 35.45 Qin’an county; 36 Wangjiaping; 9.10.28 Miyuan; 11.38 Samen; 16 Guyuan county; 26 Xianma (after Beifangcaoyuan 2007, 372 Fig. 171, 1-37; 377 Fig. 174, 1-10; 374 Fig. 172, 1-7).
Fig. 136. Chronological and cultural framework of the bronzes in northern China.
Fig. 137. The bronze objects in the Central Plains style found in Ningxia and east Gansu from the Shang to the Western Zhou period, 1 Suanliping; 2.3 Yujiaowan; 4.8 Miaozhuang; 5 Zhifangwan; 6 Jingchuan; 7 Pingliang; 9-23 Baicaopo; 24 -29, 37-39 Pingliang region; 30.34-36 Tuergou; 31-33 Miaozui; 40 Xiejia (adapted from Shui T. 2001a, 260 Fig. 42; 261 Fig. 43; 263 Fig. 44; 264 Fig. 45; 267 Fig. 46).
Fig. 138. The metal objects in the Central Plains style found in northern China during the Spring and Autumn period to the late Warring States (adapted from YJH 2004, 135 Fig. 70).
Fig. 139a. Xinjiang, copper and bronze objects: A Tianshanbeilu; B Yanbulake (after MJJ 2000, 89 Fig. 2.10; 90 Fig. 2.13).
Fig. 139b. Xinjiang, metal objects found in Chawuhugou cemetery: A.B.C copper and iron objects; D iron and gold objects (after MJJ 2000, 99 Fig. 2.31, Fig. 2.32; 100 Fig. 2.33, Fig. 2.34).
Fig. 140a. Similar metal objects found in Xinjiang and the Eurasian Steppes, 1.3.10.13.14.17.24 Chawuhu; 2.5.15.16.1.20 Qunbake; 23 Banfanggou; 24 Xiangbaobao; 3.6-9.17.18.26 Central Asia; 11.12.22 Black Sea; 14.21 Siberia. Remark: 新疆地区-Xinjiang region; 欧亚草原-Eurasian Steppes (after YJH 2004, 151 Fig. 74).
Fig. 140b. Similar metal objects found in Xinjiang, Eurasian Steppes, and northern China, 1.3.4. Siberia; 2 Tianshanbeilu; 5.25 Qunbake; 6 Banfanggou; 7 Yanbulake; 8.9.24 Chawuhu; 10 Altai; 11.15 Ahaqi; 12.14 Alagou; 13.18 Jiaohegucheng; 16.21 Mulei town; 17 Aidinghu; 19.20 Kazakstan; 23 Mongolia; 26.27 Kurletuhu, remark: 新疆地区-Xinjiang region; 欧亚草原-Eurasian Steppes (after YJH 2004, 153 Fig. 75).
Fig. 140c. Xinjiang, metal objects similar to those in northern China, 1-4, 7-9 Chawuhu; 5 Aidinghu; 6 Hanqigou; 10 Yanbulake (after YJH 2004, 155 Fig. 76).

Fig. 140d. Xinjiang, metal objects with local style, 1 Yanghai; 2, 4, 8, 9 Alagou; 3 Xiangbaobao; 5 Aidinghu; 6 Subashen; 7 Ahaqi (after YJH 2004, 156 Fig. 77).
Fig. 140e. Bronze cooking ware-Fu and square plate found in Xinjiang, Eurasian Steppes, and northern China: 1 Huocheng; 2.5 Gongliu 3.7 Eurasian Steppes; 4 Wulumuqi; 5 Alagou; 7 Balikunhongshan; 10 Yili; 11 Qitai; 12 Lanzhouwanzi; 13.14 Balikun; 15 Tianshan; 16 trans-Caucasia; 17 Kazakstan; 18 Yanqing; 19 Qishan; 20 Ural; 21 Siberia; 22 Black Sea; 23 Fengxiang (after YJH 2004, 158 Fig. 78).
Fig. 141a. Similar metal objects found in the Eurasian steppes and northern China (adapted from YJH 2004, 145 Fig. 72B).
Fig. 141b. Similar metal objects found in the Eurasian Steppes and northern China (adapted from YJH 2004, 144 Fig. 72A).
Fig. 142. Funeral objects from Afanasieve graves in southern Siberia and the Afanasievo-related objects from Altai and Xinjiang, 1-18 pottery, stone and bone of Afanasievo culture found in southern Siberia; 19 bronze axe from Altai; 20 pottery jar recovered at Kan’erzi in Qitai, Xinjiang (after MJJ 2000, 164 Fig. 6.1).
Fig. 143. Andronovo culture, pottery, bronze and stone objects (after Masson 1992, 349 Fig. 4).

Fig. 144. Aga'ergen, Gongliu, Xinjiang, copper and bronze artifacts (after MJJ 2000, 94 Fig. 2.22).
Fig. 145a. Bronze implements of Andronovo-type recovered in the Tacheng region, Xinjiang, 1-2 shaft-hole axes, L 25cm.11.8cm; 3-5 sickles, L 24cm.22.3cm.14.8cm; 6 flanged adze, L 17.3cm; 7 socketed celt, L 9.5cm; 8 spade, L 14cm (after MJJ 2000, 95 Fig. 2.24)

Fig. 145b. Copper and bronze objects of Andronovo-type recovered in the central part of Xinjiang: 1 Spade from Urumuqi, L 12.4cm; 2 flanged axe from Urumuqi, L 14.7cm; 3-4 shaft-hole axes from Jimusa’er and Qitai L 18cm.23cm (after MJJ 2000, 96 Fig. 2.26).
Fig. 146. Karasuk culture, metal and pottery objects, 1-10 metal objects; 11-18 potteries (after MJJ 2000, 169 Fig. 6.11).
### Appendix: List of the Radiocarbon dates. Dates are calibrated by Cal 510 (Stuiver et al., 2005).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Site coordinates (E/N)</th>
<th>Laboratory No.</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Radiocarbon age B.P.(5730)</th>
<th>Calibrated age BC (probably 68.3%)</th>
<th>Calibrated age BC (probably 95.4%)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Published cultural allotment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahatela, Xunhua, QH</td>
<td>102°24', 35°48'</td>
<td>SK81028</td>
<td>M158 wood ash</td>
<td>2630±100</td>
<td>914-748</td>
<td>1003-486</td>
<td>C14 91, 289</td>
<td>Kayue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahatela, Xunhua, QH</td>
<td>102°24', 35°48'</td>
<td>SK81030</td>
<td>M256 wood ash</td>
<td>2860±100</td>
<td>1133-909</td>
<td>1311-818</td>
<td>C14 91, 289</td>
<td>Xindian/Kayue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahatelashan, Xunhua, QH</td>
<td>102°24', 35°48'</td>
<td>SK81026</td>
<td>M12 wood ash</td>
<td>3230±80</td>
<td>1541-1430</td>
<td>1692-1372</td>
<td>C14 91, 289</td>
<td>Kayue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahatelashan, Xunhua, QH</td>
<td>102°24', 35°48'</td>
<td>SK81027</td>
<td>M207 wood ash</td>
<td>3450±80</td>
<td>1884-1681</td>
<td>1955-1602</td>
<td>C14 91, 289</td>
<td>Kayue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baifu, Changping, BJ</td>
<td>116°8', 40°19'</td>
<td>SK75052</td>
<td>M1-5 coffin wood</td>
<td>2980±90</td>
<td>131 8-1111</td>
<td>1422-975</td>
<td>C14 91, 16</td>
<td>Western Zhou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baifu, Changping, BJ</td>
<td>116°8', 40°19'</td>
<td>WB77-05</td>
<td>M1 coffin wood</td>
<td>2810±100</td>
<td>1058-841</td>
<td>1224-802</td>
<td>C14 91, 16</td>
<td>Western Zhou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baimiao, Zhangjiakou, HB</td>
<td>115°23', 40°59'</td>
<td>ZK0765</td>
<td>M64 coffin wood</td>
<td>2910±150</td>
<td>129 7-926</td>
<td>1447-804</td>
<td>ZSKKS 1982,</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changshan, Zhenyuan, GS</td>
<td>107°8', 34°40'</td>
<td>ZK 830</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>4260±80</td>
<td>2943-2851</td>
<td>3 039-2619</td>
<td>ZSKKS 1981,</td>
<td>Qijia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahezhuang, Yongjing, GS</td>
<td>103°22', 35°54'</td>
<td>ZK15</td>
<td>F7:2 charcoal</td>
<td>3580±95</td>
<td>2037-18 64</td>
<td>2153-1689</td>
<td>ZKK 1972, 55</td>
<td>Qijia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahezhuang, Yongjing, GS</td>
<td>103°22', 35°54'</td>
<td>ZK23</td>
<td>F7:2 charcoal</td>
<td>3540±95</td>
<td>1979-174 8</td>
<td>2137-1636</td>
<td>ZKK 1972, 55</td>
<td>Qijia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahuacun, Huangyuan, QH</td>
<td>101°18', 36°42'</td>
<td>ZK1323</td>
<td>coffin wood</td>
<td>1780±80</td>
<td>AD 135-268</td>
<td>AD 69-421</td>
<td>C14 91, 289</td>
<td>Kayue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayukou, Guinan, QH</td>
<td>100°44', 35°35'</td>
<td>ZK1325</td>
<td>coffin wood</td>
<td>2720±115</td>
<td>1028-77 8</td>
<td>1215-727</td>
<td>C14 91, 287</td>
<td>Kayue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianjiangtai, Chifeng, NMG</td>
<td>118°54'; 42°12'</td>
<td>ZK2649</td>
<td>T112H37 charcoal</td>
<td>2525±46</td>
<td>64 6-551</td>
<td>801-509</td>
<td>ZSKKS 1993,</td>
<td>Upper Xiajiadian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianjiangtai, Chifeng, NMG</td>
<td>118°54'; 42°12'</td>
<td>ZK2650</td>
<td>T106H35 charcoal</td>
<td>2515±48</td>
<td>64 9-546</td>
<td>797-505</td>
<td>ZSKKS 1993,</td>
<td>Upper Xiajiadian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>County, Region</td>
<td>Coordinates</td>
<td>Sample Code</td>
<td>Lab Code</td>
<td>Age (bp) ± Error</td>
<td>Bayesian Age (cal BP)</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Nearest Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianjiangtai, Chifeng, NMG</td>
<td></td>
<td>118°54', 42°12'</td>
<td>ZK2651</td>
<td>T103(3)</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>3253±58</td>
<td>1563-1491</td>
<td>1666-1418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fengtai, Huzhu, Huzhu</td>
<td>Fengtai, Huzhu, Huzhu</td>
<td>101°95', 36°84'</td>
<td>Bin5413</td>
<td>M41</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>2564±36</td>
<td>802-754</td>
<td>80 7-740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fengtai, Huzhu, Huzhu</td>
<td>Fengtai, Huzhu, Huzhu</td>
<td>101°95', 36°84'</td>
<td>Bin5414</td>
<td>M41</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>2690±34</td>
<td>848-807</td>
<td>90 3-802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fengtai, Huzhu, Huzhu</td>
<td>Fengtai, Huzhu, Huzhu</td>
<td>101°95', 36°84'</td>
<td>Bin5415</td>
<td>M41</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>2729±36</td>
<td>903-833</td>
<td>93 5-809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fengtai, Huzhu, Huzhu</td>
<td>Fengtai, Huzhu, Huzhu</td>
<td>101°95', 36°84'</td>
<td>KIA16585</td>
<td>M41</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>2950±25</td>
<td>1213-1126</td>
<td>1262-1110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fengtai, Huzhu, Huzhu</td>
<td>Fengtai, Huzhu, Huzhu</td>
<td>101°95', 36°84'</td>
<td>KIA16586</td>
<td>M41</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>2880±25</td>
<td>1060-1012</td>
<td>1130-976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fengtai, Huzhu, Huzhu</td>
<td>Fengtai, Huzhu, Huzhu</td>
<td>101°95', 36°84'</td>
<td>KIA16587</td>
<td>M41</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>2615±25</td>
<td>808-791</td>
<td>8 20-774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fengtai, Huzhu, Huzhu</td>
<td>Fengtai, Huzhu, Huzhu</td>
<td>101°95', 36°84'</td>
<td>KIA16588</td>
<td>M41</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>2870±25</td>
<td>1058-1004</td>
<td>1126-974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fengtai, Huzhu, Huzhu</td>
<td>Fengtai, Huzhu, Huzhu</td>
<td>101°95', 36°84'</td>
<td>KIA16589</td>
<td>M41</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>2885±25</td>
<td>1089-1018</td>
<td>1131-979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fengtai, Huzhu, Huzhu</td>
<td>Fengtai, Huzhu, Huzhu</td>
<td>101°95', 36°84'</td>
<td>KIA16591</td>
<td>M41</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>2730±25</td>
<td>897-840,</td>
<td>920-819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fengtai, Huzhu, Huzhu</td>
<td>Fengtai, Huzhu, Huzhu</td>
<td>101°95', 36°84'</td>
<td>KIA16593</td>
<td>M41</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>2755±30</td>
<td>923-887</td>
<td>9 77-827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fengtai, Huzhu, Huzhu</td>
<td>Fengtai, Huzhu, Huzhu</td>
<td>101°95', 36°84'</td>
<td>KIA16594</td>
<td>M41</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>2915±30</td>
<td>1132-1048</td>
<td>1213-1012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganguya, 98°49', 39°73'</td>
<td>Ganguya, 98°49', 39°73'</td>
<td>BK87060</td>
<td>M63, M64</td>
<td>M41</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>3390±70</td>
<td>17 71-1607</td>
<td>1880-1523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Longitude, Latitude</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Age (BP)</td>
<td>Lower Range</td>
<td>Upper Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiuquan, GS</td>
<td>98°49', 39°73'</td>
<td>BK87063</td>
<td>M32, M48</td>
<td>3220±60</td>
<td>1534-1425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganguya, Jiuquan, GS</td>
<td>98°49', 39°73'</td>
<td>BK89028</td>
<td>M92</td>
<td>3130±60</td>
<td>1460-1371</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaquding, Guinan, QH</td>
<td>100°44', 35°35'</td>
<td>BK77052</td>
<td>F101 charcoal</td>
<td>3700±90</td>
<td>2205-1852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guantang, Guinan, QH</td>
<td>100°44', 35°35'</td>
<td>ZK1326</td>
<td>coffin wood</td>
<td>2980±75</td>
<td>1317-1111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamatun, Yongchang, GS</td>
<td>101°58', 38°14'</td>
<td>ZK789</td>
<td>wood</td>
<td>2645±80</td>
<td>915-761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huoshaogou, Yumen, GS</td>
<td>97°42', 39°57'</td>
<td>BK77008</td>
<td>T42 (3):3 charcoal</td>
<td>3250±100</td>
<td>1636-1422</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huoshaogou, Yumen, GS</td>
<td>97°42', 39°57'</td>
<td>ZK0408</td>
<td>M84 charcoal</td>
<td>3300±85</td>
<td>1686-149 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huoshaogou, Yumen, GS</td>
<td>97°42', 39°57'</td>
<td>ZK0409</td>
<td>T1(2):F charcoal</td>
<td>3490±100</td>
<td>1940-1689</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiuzhan, Heshui, GS</td>
<td>108°8', 35°48'</td>
<td>BK85025</td>
<td>T64CH6 charcoal</td>
<td>2960±120</td>
<td>1 316-1018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiuzhan, Heshui, GS</td>
<td>108°8', 35°48'</td>
<td>BK85027</td>
<td>M33 charcoal</td>
<td>2390±140</td>
<td>370-383</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanqiao, Xihe, GS</td>
<td>105°12', 34°</td>
<td>BK83028</td>
<td>human bone</td>
<td>3010±120</td>
<td>1410-1113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lianhuatai, Linxia, GS</td>
<td>108°8', 35°48'</td>
<td>BK 84103</td>
<td>M3 human bone</td>
<td>2540±120</td>
<td>807-512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linjia, Dongxiang, GS</td>
<td>103°21', 35°39'</td>
<td>ZK521</td>
<td>H19 charcoal</td>
<td>4235±85</td>
<td>2816-26 70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

285 Pak Y. J. 1996, Siba
286 C14 91, 286 Qijia
287 C14 91, 287 Kayue
274 C14 91, 274 Shajing
272 C14 91, 272 Siba
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
<th>ZK</th>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Radiocarbon Age</th>
<th>Calibrated Age 1</th>
<th>Calibrated Age 2</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linjia, Dongxiang, GS</td>
<td>103°21', 35°39'</td>
<td>21 millet</td>
<td>ZK522</td>
<td>F21</td>
<td>105±95</td>
<td>2762-2571</td>
<td>2903-2463</td>
<td>C14 83, 134</td>
<td>Majiayao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linjia, Dongxiang, GS</td>
<td>103°21', 35°39'</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>ZK523</td>
<td>F20</td>
<td>4540±80</td>
<td>3245-310</td>
<td>3384-3010</td>
<td>C14 83, 134</td>
<td>Majiayao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linziliang, Haiyuan, NX</td>
<td>105°36', 36°30'</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>ZK2226</td>
<td>T3(3C)F3(2)</td>
<td>3725±95</td>
<td>2234-2013</td>
<td>2368-1893</td>
<td>ZSKKS 660</td>
<td>Majiazao-Qijia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linziliang, Haiyuan, NX</td>
<td>105°36', 36°30'</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>ZK2227</td>
<td>T5(3C)H5</td>
<td>3935±150</td>
<td>2627-2199</td>
<td>2874-2111</td>
<td>ZSKKS 660</td>
<td>Majiazao-Qijia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linziliang, Haiyuan, NX</td>
<td>105°36', 36°30'</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>ZK2236</td>
<td>T2(4)H10</td>
<td>3555±55</td>
<td>19 74-1872</td>
<td>2034-1743</td>
<td>ZSKKS 660</td>
<td>Majiazao-Qijia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linziliang, Haiyuan, NX</td>
<td>105°36', 36°30'</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>ZK2237</td>
<td>T3(3C)F3Y1</td>
<td>4025±110</td>
<td>2701-2457</td>
<td>2883-2283</td>
<td>ZSKKS 660</td>
<td>Majiazao-Qijia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linziliang, Haiyuan, NX</td>
<td>105°36', 36°30'</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>ZK2238</td>
<td>T3(3E)</td>
<td>3760±55</td>
<td>2214 -2129</td>
<td>2347-2019</td>
<td>ZSKKS 660</td>
<td>Majiazao-Qijia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linziliang, Haiyuan, NX</td>
<td>105°36', 36°30'</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>ZK2239</td>
<td>T3(3F)F6</td>
<td>3805±55</td>
<td>23 10-2191</td>
<td>2460-2131</td>
<td>ZSKKS 660</td>
<td>Majiazao-Qijia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linziliang, Haiyuan, NX</td>
<td>105°36', 36°30'</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>ZK2475</td>
<td>T6(4)F10</td>
<td>3695±100</td>
<td>2 207-1941</td>
<td>2351-1873</td>
<td>ZSKKS 660</td>
<td>Majiazao-Qijia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linziliang, Haiyuan, NX</td>
<td>105°36', 36°30'</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>ZK2476</td>
<td>T18(3A)F13Y2</td>
<td>3700±80</td>
<td>2202-2007</td>
<td>2345-1883</td>
<td>ZSKKS 660</td>
<td>Majiazao-Qijia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linziliang, Haiyuan, NX</td>
<td>105°36', 36°30'</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>ZK2477</td>
<td>T18(3A)F13</td>
<td>3750±100</td>
<td>2300-2022</td>
<td>2466-1919</td>
<td>ZSKKS 660</td>
<td>Majiazao-Qijia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linziliang, Haiyuan, NX</td>
<td>105°36', 36°30'</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>ZK2478</td>
<td>T9(3A)F9(2)</td>
<td>3760±105</td>
<td>2214-2129</td>
<td>2347-2019</td>
<td>ZSKKS 668</td>
<td>Majiazao-Qijia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linziliang, Haiyuan, NX</td>
<td>105°36', 36°30'</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>ZK2479</td>
<td>T22(2B)F11</td>
<td>3825±90</td>
<td>2356-2195</td>
<td>2492-2025</td>
<td>ZSKKS 668</td>
<td>Majiazao-Qijia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linziliang, Haiyuan, NX</td>
<td>105°36', 36°30'</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>ZK2480</td>
<td>T22(2B)F11</td>
<td>3675±80</td>
<td>2145-1946</td>
<td>2295-1876</td>
<td>ZSKKS 668</td>
<td>Majiazao-Qijia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linziliang, Haiyuan, NX</td>
<td>105°36', 36°30'</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>ZK2481</td>
<td>T9(3A)H44</td>
<td>3685±120</td>
<td>2209-1901</td>
<td>2370-1769</td>
<td>ZSKKS 668</td>
<td>Majiazao-Qijia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linziliang, Haiyuan, NX</td>
<td>105°36', 36°30'</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>ZK2482</td>
<td>T7(2B)F12</td>
<td>3840±125</td>
<td>2473-2135</td>
<td>2626-1928</td>
<td>ZSKKS 668</td>
<td>Majiazao-Qijia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liujiafen, Jixian, TJ</td>
<td>117°18', 40°</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>ZK2153</td>
<td>T194-5</td>
<td>2770±75</td>
<td>999-836</td>
<td>1119-802</td>
<td>C14 91, 19</td>
<td>Western Zhou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liujiafen, Jixian, TJ</td>
<td>117°18', 40°</td>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>ZK2154</td>
<td>T82(2)</td>
<td>2980±75</td>
<td>1317-1114</td>
<td>1408-1008</td>
<td>C14 91, 19</td>
<td>Western Zhou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJ</td>
<td>Liujiafen, Jixian, TJ</td>
<td>117°18', 40°</td>
<td>ZK2155</td>
<td>T86(2) charcoal</td>
<td>2920±80</td>
<td>1219-10 09</td>
<td>1320-915</td>
<td>C14 91, 19</td>
<td>Western Zhou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJ</td>
<td>Liuwan, Ledu, QH</td>
<td>102°30', 36°30'</td>
<td>BK346</td>
<td>coffin wood</td>
<td>3560±80</td>
<td>1849-1773</td>
<td>2065-1730</td>
<td>ZSKKS 1978, 286</td>
<td>Machang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QH</td>
<td>Liuwan, Ledu, QH</td>
<td>102°30', 36°30'</td>
<td>BK75010</td>
<td>M266 coffin wood</td>
<td>3730±90</td>
<td>2234-2019</td>
<td>2351-1907</td>
<td>BDS 1976, 84</td>
<td>Qijia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QH</td>
<td>Liuwan, Ledu, QH</td>
<td>102°30', 36°30'</td>
<td>ZK347</td>
<td>M392 coffin wood</td>
<td>3470±140</td>
<td>1965-1615</td>
<td>2141-1488</td>
<td>ZSKKS 1978, 286</td>
<td>Qijia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QH</td>
<td>Maluyuan, Yongjing, GS</td>
<td>103°22', 36°54'</td>
<td>BK84106</td>
<td>2)H9 charcoal</td>
<td>3080±95</td>
<td>1449-1212</td>
<td>1530-1045</td>
<td>C14 91, 275</td>
<td>Xindian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QH</td>
<td>Maluyuan, Yongjing, GS</td>
<td>103°22', 36°54'</td>
<td>BK84108</td>
<td>3)H35 charcoal</td>
<td>2920±110</td>
<td>12 70-976</td>
<td>1406-894</td>
<td>C14 91, 275</td>
<td>Xindian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNG</td>
<td>Maoqiongou, Liangcheng, NMG</td>
<td>112°31', 40°32'</td>
<td>BK80005</td>
<td>M23 coffin wood</td>
<td>2470±90</td>
<td>571-507</td>
<td>791-402</td>
<td>C14 91, 59</td>
<td>Maoqiongou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNG</td>
<td>Maoqiongou, Liangcheng, NMG</td>
<td>112°31', 40°32'</td>
<td>BK80006</td>
<td>M25 charcoal</td>
<td>2330±90</td>
<td>392-19</td>
<td>425-42</td>
<td>C14 91, 59</td>
<td>Maoqiongou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNG</td>
<td>Maoqiongou, Liangcheng, NMG</td>
<td>112°31', 40°32'</td>
<td>BK80026</td>
<td>Y1 charcoal</td>
<td>2550±70</td>
<td>349-546</td>
<td>818-484</td>
<td>C14 91, 59</td>
<td>Maoqiongou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHX</td>
<td>Nianzipo, Changwu, SHX</td>
<td>107°45', 35°8'</td>
<td>ZK1230</td>
<td>T807③ charcoal</td>
<td>2690±75</td>
<td>915-797</td>
<td>1048-754</td>
<td>ZSKKS 1986, 656</td>
<td>Pre-Zhou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QH</td>
<td>Nuomuhong, Dulan, QH</td>
<td>96°24', 36°27'</td>
<td>ZK0061</td>
<td>wooden post</td>
<td>3670±90</td>
<td>2148-1931</td>
<td>2301-1862</td>
<td>C14 83, 142</td>
<td>Nuomuhong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QH</td>
<td>Nuomuhong, Dulan, QH</td>
<td>96°24', 36°27'</td>
<td>ZK0062</td>
<td>woolen cloth</td>
<td>2720±115</td>
<td>1028-78</td>
<td>1215-727</td>
<td>C14 91, 285</td>
<td>Nuomuhong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QH</td>
<td>Panjialiang, Huangzhong, QH</td>
<td>101°6', 35°7'</td>
<td>ZK1327</td>
<td>M78 human bones</td>
<td>2660±115</td>
<td>996-7 51</td>
<td>1057-483</td>
<td>ZSKKS 1986, 659</td>
<td>Kayue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB</td>
<td>Qianbao, Yuxian, HB</td>
<td>114°53', 39°58'</td>
<td>ZK2015</td>
<td>IM203 charcoal</td>
<td>3340±170</td>
<td>1781 -1440</td>
<td>2050-1254</td>
<td>C14 91, 27</td>
<td>Datuotou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Qiaocun, Lingtai, GS</td>
<td>107°37', 35°5'</td>
<td>ZK741</td>
<td>H4 charcoal</td>
<td>3675±60</td>
<td>2139-1973</td>
<td>2205-1893</td>
<td>C14 83, 136</td>
<td>Qijia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Qijia, Guanghe, GS</td>
<td>104°34', 35°28'</td>
<td>ZK410</td>
<td>T1③ charcoal</td>
<td>4010±105</td>
<td>2678-2430</td>
<td>2876-2282</td>
<td>C14 91, 134</td>
<td>Qijia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB</td>
<td>Sanguan, Yuxian, HB</td>
<td>114°47', 39°55'</td>
<td>WB82-22</td>
<td>F119 charcoal</td>
<td>3810±90</td>
<td>2350- 2138</td>
<td>2487-2014</td>
<td>C14 91, 25</td>
<td>Datuotou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Latitude, Longitude</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Reported Age ± Margin</td>
<td>Radiocarbon Age ± Margin</td>
<td>Radiocarbon Age ± Margin</td>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanguan, Yuxian, HB</td>
<td>114°47', 39°55'</td>
<td>WB82-39</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3160±80</td>
<td>1522-1372</td>
<td>1624-1256</td>
<td>Datuotou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanguan, Yuxian, HB</td>
<td>114°47', 39°55'</td>
<td>WB82-40</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3560±195</td>
<td>2146-1664</td>
<td>2463-1492</td>
<td>Datuotou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanguan, Yuxian, HB</td>
<td>114°47', 39°55'</td>
<td>WB84-18</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3180±85</td>
<td>1534-1376</td>
<td>1666-1260</td>
<td>Datuotou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanguan, Yuxian, HB</td>
<td>114°47', 39°55'</td>
<td>WB84-30</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3180±70</td>
<td>1528-1387</td>
<td>1621-1295</td>
<td>Datuotou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanguan, Yuxian, HB</td>
<td>114°47', 39°55'</td>
<td>ZK2016</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>3155±105</td>
<td>1532-1292</td>
<td>1670-1152</td>
<td>Datuotou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saojiaocheng, Yongchang, GS</td>
<td>101°58', 38°14'</td>
<td>BK79030</td>
<td>Charcoal</td>
<td>2530±90</td>
<td>395-539</td>
<td>81 5-407</td>
<td>Shajing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saojiaocheng, Yongchang, GS</td>
<td>101°58', 38°14'</td>
<td>BK79062</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>2650±95</td>
<td>333-752</td>
<td>103 0-509</td>
<td>Shajing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saojiaocheng, Yongchang, GS</td>
<td>101°58', 38°14'</td>
<td>BK79063</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>2600±125</td>
<td>395-540</td>
<td>1 001-403</td>
<td>Shajing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saojiaocheng, Yongchang, GS</td>
<td>101°58', 38°14'</td>
<td>BK79064</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>2500±90</td>
<td>776-522</td>
<td>79 9-407</td>
<td>Shajing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saojiaocheng, Yongchang, GS</td>
<td>101°58', 38°14'</td>
<td>BK79065</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>2870±160</td>
<td>1264-895</td>
<td>1462-767</td>
<td>Shajing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saojiaocheng, Yongchang, GS</td>
<td>101°58', 38°14'</td>
<td>BK79066</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>2770±90</td>
<td>1013-821</td>
<td>1 134-792</td>
<td>Shajing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saojiaocheng, Yongchang, GS</td>
<td>101°58', 38°14'</td>
<td>ZK739</td>
<td>Bottom of ash</td>
<td>2600±100</td>
<td>549-73 2, 651-544</td>
<td>928-411</td>
<td>Shajing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shangsunjiazhai, Datong, QH</td>
<td>101°40', 36°56'</td>
<td>BK77013</td>
<td>Coffin wood</td>
<td>4320±90</td>
<td>3097-28 71</td>
<td>3136-2836</td>
<td>Majiayao</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shangsunjiazhai, Datong, QH</td>
<td>101°40', 36°56'</td>
<td>BK77014</td>
<td>Coffin wood</td>
<td>2860±90</td>
<td>11 31-912</td>
<td>1294-830</td>
<td>Tangwang-style pottery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shangsunjiazhai, Datong, QH</td>
<td>101°40', 36°56'</td>
<td>BK80011</td>
<td>Coffin wood</td>
<td>2510±80</td>
<td>78 7-705, 695-539</td>
<td>797-477</td>
<td>Kayue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shangsunjiazhai, Datong, QH</td>
<td>101°40', 36°56'</td>
<td>BK80012</td>
<td>Coffin wood</td>
<td>2430±80</td>
<td>5 56-404</td>
<td>774-393</td>
<td>Kayue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shangsunjiazhai, Datong, QH</td>
<td>101°40', 36°56'</td>
<td>BK80013</td>
<td>Coffin wood</td>
<td>2580±80</td>
<td>9 24-736</td>
<td>897-486</td>
<td>Kayue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shangsunjiazhai, Datong, QH</td>
<td>101°40', 36°56'</td>
<td>BK80014</td>
<td>Coffin wood</td>
<td>2930±80</td>
<td>1222-1018</td>
<td>1323-923</td>
<td>Kayue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Latitude</td>
<td>Longitude</td>
<td>Sample Code</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Carbon 14 Dates</td>
<td>Other Dates</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Author and Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datong, QH</td>
<td>101° 27', 36° 2'</td>
<td>ZK1105</td>
<td>M19 wood</td>
<td>2640±70</td>
<td>899-769</td>
<td>943-729</td>
<td></td>
<td>C14 91, 288</td>
<td>Kayue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shapingtai, Guide, QH</td>
<td>101° 27', 36° 2'</td>
<td>ZK1107</td>
<td>M44 wood</td>
<td>2610±60</td>
<td>942-752</td>
<td>906-726</td>
<td></td>
<td>C14 91, 288</td>
<td>Kayue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shizhaocun, Tianshui, GS</td>
<td>105°42', 34°36'</td>
<td>ZK1283</td>
<td>T104 charcoal</td>
<td>3760±80</td>
<td>2292-2112</td>
<td>2411-1975</td>
<td></td>
<td>C14 91, 282</td>
<td>Qijia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shizhaocun, Tianshui, GS</td>
<td>105°42', 34°36'</td>
<td>ZK1371</td>
<td>T403H1 charcoal</td>
<td>3790±85</td>
<td>2346-2129</td>
<td>2469-2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>C14 91, 282</td>
<td>Qijia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taohongbala, Hanjin, NMG</td>
<td>109°40', 39°55'</td>
<td>ZK0266</td>
<td>M1 wood</td>
<td>2540±105</td>
<td>803-537</td>
<td>848-400</td>
<td></td>
<td>C14 91, 54</td>
<td>Taohongbala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xigang, Yongchang, NMG</td>
<td>101°58', 38°14'</td>
<td>ZK792</td>
<td>M26 wood</td>
<td>2620±90</td>
<td>902-748</td>
<td>944-501</td>
<td></td>
<td>C14 91, 274</td>
<td>Shajing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xishanping, Tianshui, GS</td>
<td>105°42', 34°36'</td>
<td>ZK2149</td>
<td>T1(3) charcoal</td>
<td>3500±215</td>
<td>2056-1604</td>
<td>2466-1380</td>
<td></td>
<td>C14 91, 283</td>
<td>Qijia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xishanping, Tianshui, GS</td>
<td>105°42', 34°36'</td>
<td>ZK2150</td>
<td>T1(4) charcoal</td>
<td>3860±155</td>
<td>2496-2131</td>
<td>2703-1901</td>
<td></td>
<td>C14 91, 283</td>
<td>Majiayao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xishanping, Tianshui, GS</td>
<td>105°42', 34°36'</td>
<td>ZK2205</td>
<td>T10(3) charcoal</td>
<td>3640±80</td>
<td>2064-1912</td>
<td>2208-1858</td>
<td></td>
<td>C14 91, 284</td>
<td>Qijia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xujianian, Zhuanglang, GS</td>
<td>105°54', 35°21'</td>
<td>ZK0901</td>
<td>M79 humen bone</td>
<td>2320±80</td>
<td>516-3 51</td>
<td>595-191</td>
<td></td>
<td>C14 91, 280</td>
<td>Siwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xujianian, Zhuanglang, GS</td>
<td>105°54', 35°21'</td>
<td>ZK0902</td>
<td>M81 humen bone</td>
<td>2590±80</td>
<td>883-7 40</td>
<td>904-501</td>
<td></td>
<td>C14 91, 280</td>
<td>Siwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xujianian, Zhuanglang, GS</td>
<td>105°54', 35°21'</td>
<td>ZK0903</td>
<td>M82 humen bone</td>
<td>2400±90</td>
<td>557-3 93</td>
<td>789-357</td>
<td></td>
<td>C14 91, 280</td>
<td>Siwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuhuangmiao, BJ</td>
<td>115° 96', 40° 36'</td>
<td>BK87101</td>
<td>M25 charcoa l</td>
<td>2720±80</td>
<td>934-804</td>
<td>1088-769</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pak Y.J. 1996</td>
<td>Yuhuangmiao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuhuangmiao, BJ</td>
<td>115° 96', 40° 36'</td>
<td>BK90046</td>
<td>M282</td>
<td>3625±8 0</td>
<td>2057-1889</td>
<td>2202-1766</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pak Y.J. 1996</td>
<td>Yuhuangmiao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuhuangmiao, BJ</td>
<td>115° 96', 40° 36'</td>
<td>BK90049</td>
<td>M156</td>
<td>2795±1 00</td>
<td>1056-828</td>
<td>1219-796</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pak Y.J. 1996</td>
<td>Yuhuangmiao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuhuangmiao, BJ</td>
<td>115° 96', 40° 36'</td>
<td>BK90050</td>
<td>M129</td>
<td>2465±9 0</td>
<td>669-506</td>
<td>790-401</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pak Y.J. 1996</td>
<td>Yuhuangmiao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhizhushan, Chifeng, NMG</td>
<td>118°57', 42°20'</td>
<td>ZK0176</td>
<td>H42 charcoal</td>
<td>3850±90</td>
<td>2549-22 63</td>
<td>2498-2113</td>
<td></td>
<td>C14 91, 55</td>
<td>Lower Xiajiadian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zhukaigou, NMG</th>
<th>110°3', 39°36'</th>
<th>BK79053</th>
<th>IIT23(5) charcoal</th>
<th>4320±90</th>
<th>3097-2871</th>
<th>3136-2836</th>
<th>C14 91, 59</th>
<th>Zhukaigou</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zhukaigou, NMG</td>
<td>110°3', 39°36'</td>
<td>BK80028</td>
<td>(2)H5018 charcoal</td>
<td>3320±70</td>
<td>1684-1522</td>
<td>1755-1437</td>
<td>C14 91, 60</td>
<td>Zhukaigou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhukaigou, NMG</td>
<td>110°3', 39°36'</td>
<td>WB84-76</td>
<td>(3)H1071 charcoal</td>
<td>3220±70</td>
<td>1536-1420</td>
<td>1670-1379</td>
<td>C14 91, 60</td>
<td>Zhukaigou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhukaigou, NMG</td>
<td>110°3', 39°36'</td>
<td>WB84-77</td>
<td>(3)H1055 charcoal</td>
<td>3190±75</td>
<td>1533-1390</td>
<td>1658-1292</td>
<td>C14 91, 60</td>
<td>Zhukaigou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhukaigou, NMG</td>
<td>110°3', 39°36'</td>
<td>WB84-78</td>
<td>IT288(4) charcoal</td>
<td>4680±80</td>
<td>3525-3368</td>
<td>3645-3329</td>
<td>C14 91, 60</td>
<td>Zhukaigou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhukaigou, NMG</td>
<td>110°3', 39°36'</td>
<td>WB84-79</td>
<td>(4)H1058 charcoal</td>
<td>3420±70</td>
<td>1778-1629</td>
<td>1894-1598</td>
<td>C14 91, 60</td>
<td>Zhukaigou</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Bibliography**

**Abbreviations Used in Reference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Chinese Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BDXB</td>
<td>Beijing daxue xuebao 北京大学学报</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFWW</td>
<td>Beifang wenwu 北方文物</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJWB</td>
<td>Beijing wenbo 北京文博</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJKY</td>
<td>Bianjiang kaogu yanjiu 边疆考古研究</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJWK</td>
<td>Beijing wenwu yu kaogu 北京文物与考古</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMFEA</td>
<td>Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GXYJ</td>
<td>Guoxue yanjiu 国学研究</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GJK</td>
<td>Gugong xueshu jikan 故宫学术季刊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGWWYK</td>
<td>Gugong wenwu yuekan 故宫文物月刊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGYK</td>
<td>Gugong bowuyuan yuankan 故宫博物院院刊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HXKG</td>
<td>Huaxia kaogu 华夏考古</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHKG</td>
<td>Jianghan kaogu 江汉考古</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG</td>
<td>Kaogu 考古</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KGTX</td>
<td>Kaogu tongxun 考古通讯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KGXB</td>
<td>Kaoguxuebao 考古学报</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KGXJ</td>
<td>Kaoguxue jikan 考古学集刊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KWL</td>
<td>Kaoguxue wenhua lunji 考古学文化论集</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KY</td>
<td>Kaoguxue yanjiu 考古学研究</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KYW</td>
<td>Kaogu yu wenwu 考古与文物</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHW</td>
<td>Liaohai wenwu xuekan 辽海文物学刊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYY</td>
<td>Lishi yuyan yanjiusuo jikan 历史语言研究所集刊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMGW</td>
<td>Neimenggu wenwu kaogu 内蒙古文物考古</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMGWK</td>
<td>Neimenggu wenwu kaogu wenji 内蒙古文物考古文集</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMGWX</td>
<td>Neimenggu chutu wentuxuanji 内蒙古出土文物选集</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYKG</td>
<td>Nongye kaogu 农业考古</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QHKH</td>
<td>Qinghaisheng kaogu xuehuihuikan 青海省考古学会会刊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QHWW</td>
<td>Qinghai wenwu 青海文物</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nianhui 8 Zhongguo kaoguxuehui di ba ci nianhui lunwenji 中国考古学会第一次年八次年会论文集

Nianhui 1 Zhongguo kaoguxuehui di yi ci nianhui lunwenji 中国考古学会第一次年一次年会论文集
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NMGWK | Neimenggu wenwu kaogu wenji 内蒙古文物考古文集 |
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NYKG | Nongye kaogu 农业考古 |
QHKH | Qinghaisheng kaogu xuehuihuikan 青海省考古学会会刊 |
QHWW | Qinghai wenwu 青海文物 |
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