The Performative Construction of Identity in the Shang and Zhou Dynasties

by

Neil Coomber

Wolfson College

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
University of Oxford
Hilary Term 2011

School of Archaeology
34-36 Beaumont Street
Oxford OX1 2PG

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor Professor Dame Jessica Rawson, for her guidance, support and time during the course of the D.Phil. Her insightful and incisive comments helped to push me to develop my ideas and sharpen my arguments, without which this thesis would not have materialised.

I would also like to thank Professor Chris Gosden, Dr. Daniel Hicks and Dr. Wang Tao for their comments, questions and advice during the transfer and confirmation vivas. I was able to reassess my ideas substantively in the light of your suggestions.

Johann Loh has provided me with many philosophical insights into phenomenology and performativity while also helping me question and critically analyse my own theoretical assumptions.

Chin-Yin Tseng offered many insightful discussions over coffee and provided logistical support, for which I am extremely grateful.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents for their support over the course of the D.Phil.

The Peformative Construction of Identity in the Shang and Zhou Dynasties

Neil Coomber
Wolfson College

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
University of Oxford
2011

Abstract

Judith Butler's theory of performativity can be productively used to analyse how identity at burial would have been created, sustained and rendered coherent through extended periods of time. Moreover, Heideggerean phenomenology offers us insights into the mechanism underlying the process of performing an identity. Using mortuary data from Shang and Zhou burials, I offer (a) an analysis of how the identity of the deceased might have been (re)constructed and (re)produced through structured burial deposits as well as (b) a Heideggerean account of the heritage inherent in the sets of bronze objects interred in graves. These sets of bronze objects would have been used in a performance within the mortuary sphere as part of an elaborate but recognisable process of producing an identity for a tomb occupant. Furthermore, a gendered identity would have also been reified and materialised through burial assemblages. These post-processual analyses might be taken as examples that can be generalised to a method for further investigating other identities, and the processes underlying their production and reproduction, that Chinese archaeologists theorising burials and identity may use to advance the field.

Table of Contents

Tables

Appendices

Chapter One: Theoretical Framework

INTRODUCTION

The identities of the people who lived during the Shang and Zhou periods were in all likelihood radically different from ours. The mechanisms underlying the construction of that identity, however, would arguably be more intelligible to us. My hypothesis is that the formulaic, highly-conventional and repetitive nature of Shang and Zhou burial assemblages and the (re)enactment of depositing such sets in tombs constituted a performative act by the living which (re)created a coherent social identity for the tomb occupant.[1] This notion of performance is based on Judith Butler's work on performativity and its effects on social identity. What I will argue is that grave goods and tomb features and furniture, such as coffins and chambers, were instrumental in the performative construction of an identity for the dead person. Shang and Zhou burials, in this case, were stereotypes actively (re)creating and (re)producing socially *inscribed* identities within the temporally restricted conditions of the funeral. Moreover, these objects included within Shang and Zhou burial assemblages would have been instantly recognisable, being drawn from a relatively restricted group. In turn, Shang and Zhou burials and burial assemblages themselves appear to have been structured and formalised through performativity.

Moreover, I will also argue that gender was (re)created and (re)produced through performances which incorporated a structured material repertoire. Ultimately, there was no *essential* gender identity and gender was materialised and reified through a performance.[2] Thus, mourners actively (re)constructed what it was to be a male or

[1] The bracketed (re) indicates the continual process of repeated performances so as to distinguish it from the non-philosophical use of the word. This convention is used by other archaeologists, such as Rosemary Joyce, when using performance theory.
[2] From henceforth, I will use the term *essential* to refer to the philosophical notion that the entity in question can be defined by an essence which would be constitutive of the entity in question.

female. In effect, this would have been an ontological process of *boying the boy* and *girling the girl.*

This chapter will begin with a consideration of how identity is conceived and conceptualised through mortuary data in Bronze Age China, offering a review of the recent work, followed by an outline of the theory employed within this thesis to interpret burials: performance. The review is intended to not only highlight the depth of work on burials and identity, but also to contextualise the approach taken in this thesis.

IDENTITY IN THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF THE SHANG AND ZHOU PERIODS[3]

Broadly speaking, Western archaeologists working on ancient China focus on two broad themes when discussing social identity as constructed through material culture within the mortuary sphere. These are (a) *status* and (b) *wealth*. In contrast, the dominant approach taken by Chinese archaeologists is to construct a hierarchical pyramid in order to rank tombs based on tomb features. This (c) *hierarchical approach* necessarily includes notions of status, but the primary focus is on correlates and combinations of objects rather than designating the overall number of objects as denoting status. What follows is a discussion of the various approaches and interpretative analyses offered by both Western and Chinese archaeologists.

Status. First, in looking at material culture, the variety, number and quality of grave goods in a Shang or Zhou tomb are considered to be a direct reflection of the social status of the deceased. In his recent analysis of the Zhou cemetery site of Shangma, Falkenhausen lists ten different aspects of mortuary features that, supposedly, helped create an individual and differentiated status identity for the tomb occupant at burial.[4]

---

[3] While the Shang and Zhou dynasties, alongside the major cemetery sites utilised in each chapter, will be introduced and discussed at the start of the three subsequent chapters, for clarity and understanding of how identity is currently conceived in these periods, it is necessary to very briefly introduce both dynasties here. The Late Shang is dated to approximately 1300-1050 BC, with the capital, Anyang, located in Henan Province. The Zhou dynasty is divided into the Western Zhou (1050-770 BC) and the later Eastern Zhou.

[4] These ten features encompass the following: the physical size of the tomb; the presence or absence of a wooden burial chamber; the presence and number of coffins; the presence and number of ritual bronzes or ceramic equivalents; the presence and number of bronze weapons;

Nonetheless, for Falkenhausen, both the *presence* and the *quantity* of an object type in a tomb are important for expressions of individual status.[5] Falkenhausen goes on in his analysis to compare the quantities of ritual bronze vessels in Shangma graves.[6] He notes that, for instance, in paired tombs, males were always provided with a larger vessel set than females. For Falkenhausen, this attests to the higher social standing of men vis-à-vis women. By extension, the number of bronze ritual vessels in tombs is an indicator of the tomb occupant's social status, irrespective of the deceased's sex. By quantifying bronze ritual vessels in this way, such pieces, for Falkenhausen, can provide us with different layers of social status.

Yu Jiang provides a similar analysis of identity in the Zhou period, correlating quantities and types of objects with social status.[7] He, like Falkenhausen, contrasts the number of ritual vessels in tombs suggesting, "the quantity and design when combined also indicated a person's social position". [8] For Yu Jiang there is also a direct correlation between ornament and social status. By extension, an individual buried with ornate pieces held a higher social status than the individual buried with plain, simple pieces.[9]

When contrasting the number of horse and chariot pieces in Zhou tombs, for example, Yu Jiang states:

> "Yubo (the name of a male lineage leader), for example, had eighteen bronze weapons, including *yue* axes and *ge* daggers, and more than 450 bronze chariot

---

the presence and number of jade and stone objects; human and animal sacrifices; horse pits and horse and chariot pits. See Falkenhausen 2001. A condensed version of this article appears in Falkenhausen 2006: 127-154.

[5] That Falkenhausen places emphasis on the presence and number of certain object types somewhat contrasts his insightful observations at the Shangma cemetery site that high rank was not always concomitantly expressed through rich burial goods or a complex constellation of burial chambers and wooden coffins. Inadvertently, Falkenahsuen analysis of the Shangma site contradicts many of the ideas of social status and prestige that are commonly held within Chinese archaeology, and yet Falkenhausen fails to follow up on these ideas or continues these lines of thought.

[6] Alongside Shangma, Falkenhausen has also discussed other Zhou cemetery sites such as Baoji, in Shaanxi Province, and Shangcunling, in Henan Province. As with Shangma, Falkenhausen compares and contrasts the number of bronze ritual vessels in tombs at both sites suggesting that higher numbers of vessels in a tomb correlate with the tomb occupant's social status.

[7] Yu Jiang 2004.

[8] Yu Jiang 2004: 127. In effect, Yu Jiang looks for correlates within the burial data.

[9] This proposition may be overly-simplisitc. For instance, Rawson (1993) has noted that one of the characteristics of bronze ritual vessel sets from elite tombs is variation and difference. That is to say, an elite tomb might contain both highly ornate and plain bronze vessels.

> items. In comparison, Jingji (his consort) had only four pieces, and Er (his concubine) had none. These numbers strongly argue that Yubo held higher status than Jingji and Er".[10]

Yu Jiang also compares the overall grave dimensions of tombs to, once again, attempt to demonstrate a connection between grave size and social status. Here, as with grave goods, the individual with the biggest and deepest grave had a higher social status than an individual with a smaller grave. Yu Jiang concludes that:[11]

> "The distinction between the selection of ritual and familial objects, personal artifacts and the concentration of certain goods over others indicate that humans as social beings were differentiated and that these social dimensions were hierarchically arranged and measured through grave goods".

Wang Ying adopted a similar approach in her study of bone objects in female tombs at Anyang.[12] Noting differences in the number of hairpins in female tombs, she suggested that social status, for elite females, was constituted and constructed through the number of hairpins with which each female was interred. Moreover, Wang Ying also suggested that the number of bone spatulas in a male tomb was also a marker of status, analogous to bone hairpins in female tombs.

Wealth. Second, grave good numbers are also seen as a direct reflection of the tomb occupant's wealth. Linduff suggests that Fu Hao's tomb shows how the consort "amassed great wealth".[13] Based on Zhou period bronze inscriptions, Constance Cook has suggested that the elites increased their wealth through gift exchange.[14] In both cases, Linduff and Cook conceive of Shang and Zhou elites as independent agents seeking to acquire wealth in the form of bronze and other materials, such as jade, with the aim of differentiating themselves from others and increasing their social position. Moreover, both scholars also see objects as having important economic value.

---

[10] Yu Jiang 2004: 133.
[11] Yu Jiang 2004: 45.
[12] Ying Wang 2004: 112.
[13] Linduff 2002.
[14] Cook 1997.

For Falkenhausen, the material differences between tombs of supposedly comparable rank reflect differences in wealth between members of the ranked elites and between lineages generally.[15] He also suggests that the large number of elites buried with items not usually associated with elites reflects a general material poverty. Thus, the absence of certain goods is explained through purely wealth and economic reasons. The difference between the overall numbers of objects in a tomb is, for Falkenhausen, an indictor of wealth, as it is for Linduff.

Yu Jiang goes further than both Linduff and Falkenhausen in his analysis of wealth identity. He sees particular numbers of an object type as reflecting wealth. He suggests that the number of ritual vessels with which a person was interred showed the tomb occupant's wealth and " the more elaborate or complicated the shaped and designs of the bronzes, the more wealth the owner of the bronzes held".[16] In large tombs, associated with housing high-ranking individuals who have no bronze items, Yu Jiang argued that the size of the tomb reflected the deceased wealth in life and, thus, the lack of bronze items can be accounted for on grounds of exclusion.[17] Thus, whereas Linduff and Falkenhausen see the absence of certain objects as reflecting economic poverty, Yu Jiang views the lack of certain objects in large tombs as reflecting some sort of social exclusion.

Hierarchical approach. It is common for Chinese scholars to routinely divide tombs into categories or ranks based on different tomb variables.[18] These categories or

---

[15] Falkenhausen 2001: 121. Falkenhausen bases this analysis on the assumption that all of those individuals interred in wooden burial chambers in the Western Zhou were members of the ranked elites. This assumption is, in turn, taken from Poo's (1990) analysis of pre-Han burial beliefs based on textual sources, where the correlation between chambers and the tomb occupant's rank is discussed. Falkenhausen's work on the Zhou site of Shangma, for instance, shows how tombs with wooden chambers contained vastly different numbers of grave goods, including a large portion of graves without any objects interred therein.

[16] Yu Jiang 2004: 43. Conversely, for Yu Jiang plain and undecorated bronze ritual vessels reflect not only the low status of the tomb occupant, but also their lack of material wealth. He states " in making bronzes of the same shape and design for Jing Ji or Er, excesses were avoided and money was saved". Yu Jiang's concept of *money* here is too modern for Bronze Age studies.

[17] Yu Jiang 2004.

[18] See, for instance, Zou Heng 2000 (Beijing Daxue Kaoguxue Xi Shang Zhou Zu and Shanxi Sheng Kaogu Yanjiusuo 北京大学考古学系商周组－山西省考古研究所); Han Jianye 1997.

ranks supposedly correlate with social status and, therefore, based on this idea one should, hypothetically, be able to reconstruct a hierarchy of tomb occupants.

Han Jianye, as noted above, devised such a ranking system for the tombs at the West Zone. He asserted that it was practically feasible to evaluate the social standing of every tomb occupant. Han employed five variables from which one could assess the rank of the deceased: tomb size, the number of ramps, quantity and types of funeral goods, outer chambers and the number of attendants in death. With regards to the quantity of funerals goods, Han Jianye asserted that the overall numbers of bronze and ceramic vessels and bronze weapons were integral for expressing the social status of the tomb occupant.

The idea that tombs can be ranked or graded in such a way is epitomised by Zhang Liangren's comment that:[19]

> "A salient characteristic of Shang tombs is that the aforementioned variables [see Han Jianye's criterion above] co-vary in unison. The largest tomb would have the largest assemblage of bronze vessels and weapons, the largest number of chariots and axes, and the largest number of sacrificed humans. Down the ladder, all these variables decrease gradually, and one may work out a very fine hierarchical structure…these observations should expel the post-processaulist skepticism over the validity of inferring social hierarchy from mortuary data".

Zou Heng, in his excavation of the Jin state cemetery site of Tianma Qucun, attempted a similar approach to Han Jianye's. Heng's ranking of the tombs is based primarily on vessels. In fact, Zou Heng suggested that tombs with square-shaped vessels (known as *fang*) should form a distinct hierarchy from those tombs without such pieces. Zou Heng subsequently constructed a ranking of tombs based on the raw number of *ding* vessels in each grave. As we shall see, this type of approach may be better suited to tombs dated to the Late Western Zhou than the Early/Middle Western Zhou.

Whereas Han Jianye takes five different variables into account, Liu Yiman focusses on one – weapons – in her extensive study of weapons and burials at the site of

[19] Zhang Liangren 2007: 419. Zhang also states that chariots, bronze axes and attendants-in-death were power symbols, denoting the status of the tomb occupant through the sheer quantity of such pieces deposited in the tomb. The theoretical proposition is that grave goods exactly correlate with the tomb occupant's status. However, this assumption is extremely problematic.

Anyang.[20] For Liu Yiman not only do weapon quantities indicate the social status of the deceased, but also particular combinations of weapon types reflect further issues of status. The internment of large quantities of weapons is seen as indicating the deceased military success or achievements.[21]

These approaches by Chinese scholars demonstrate some similarities and differences with the approaches taken by Western scholars, though they both come under the broad aegis of processual archaeology.[22] Chinese scholars in particular are fond of viewing the burials within a cemetery as being hierarchical or ranked, where their features can be coordinated and categorised according to variables. By contrast, Western scholars are less concerned with ranking tombs, preferring to focus on broader notions of social status, wealth and increasingly gender, and the quantitative role of grave goods in signifying these features of social identity at burial.[23]

Moving away from a processual archaeological framework, one might wish to investigate neither what the objects signified nor how grave features correlate, but rather *how* identities, such as gender, were (re)produced and (re)created through

---

[20] Liu Yiman 2003.

[21] China-based scholars also look for correlates in the mortuary record. For the Late Shang, the number of *gu* and *jue* bronze wine vessels in a tomb is regarded as an indicator of the deceased social position. As such, scholars attempt to rank and contrast tombs based on this criteria. Ch'en Fangmei (2000) has attempted a similar study based not on bronze vessels, but bronze weapons, similar to Liu Yiman.

[22] Processual archaeology of the 1960's and 1970's saw the form of the burial rite as determined in part by the need to represent something of the social persona of the individual, and in part by the extent to which other members of the social group recognised responsibilities towards the deceased. It argued that variations in the structure of mortuary data should reflect, in a fairly direct way, the degree of social complexity characterising the society from which the burial data derives. See Binford 1971; Saxe 1970.

[23] From a post-processual view, the arguments that one tomb occupant held a higher status than another tomb occupant based on the quantity of grave goods in a burial or based on grave and coffin sizes (see the opening section) is somewhat tenuous and social status, as a form of identity, is in need of revision. In the 1980's, the post-processual archaeologists, led principally by Hodder, thoroughly critiqued processual ideas. Hodder's critique of processual archaeology as well as subsequent critiques by later post-processualists is well known within Western archaeological circles. In 1982, Hodder, using ethnography and ethnoarchaeology, argued that the disposal of the dead did not relate directly or simply to the social position of the deceased, let alone the structure of society as a whole. For Hodder, a burial may distort status or rank rather than accurately reflect them. Around the same time, Parker-Pearson argued that the living may manipulate burials and the view of the deceased for their own purposes. Aside from these critiques, the idea that correlates can be found in data presupposes that (a) an objective social reality exists that can be scientifically analysed, and (b) that archaeologists can reconstruct the "meaning" of these correlates as these correlates would have meant or mattered to the ancient society in question.

material culture within the funerary context. In effect, I plan to investigate the *mechanisms* behind the reproduction of identities within the mortuary sphere. Indeed, I will argue that a set or limited number of combinations of bronze objects were employed and repeatedly used in Shang and Zhou burials constituting a peformative act at burial which not only referenced or cited previous burial assemblages but also (re)created and reinforced the coherence of particular social identities. In this way, it is clear that my approach in this thesis differs from existing processual approaches within Chinese archaeology as no scholar has looked at the mechanisms behind the recreation of identity at burial, and advanced the idea that identity in the funerary sphere was (re)produced through performances utilising very structured burial deposits.

GENDER

One of main aims of this thesis is to explore the nature of gender identities in Shang and Zhou burials. Gender, according to Sørenson, can be broadly defined as the way in which culturally specific notions of what it means to be a man or a woman, or various variations on these themes are constructed.[24] Gender is created through rules, exclusion, notions of normality and values. Roberta Gilchrist similarly defines gender as "the cultural interpretation of sexual difference that results in the categorisation of people, artefacts, spaces and bodies".[25] While these definitions may mask an array of controversies around the concept of gender (and the notion of *sex*) in both critical theory and in archaeology,[26] they nonetheless provide us with a platform from which we might start to think about gender as a social or cultural construct.

---

[24] Sørenson 2000: 52.
[25] Gilchrist 1999: 1.
[26] For example, some scholars have tried to draw a distinction between gender and biological sex. Gender was viewed as the social or cultural construct of what it is to be a male of a female, while sex was seen as the biological given, that is to say the category of male and female was determined by the prescence of certain inherent biological characteristics (Sørenson 2000: 54, Gilchrist 1999). However, this distinction has been questioned, with scholars such as Foucault and Judith Butler (1990) arguing that the notion of biological sex is also socially constructed.

Perry and Joyce have offered a summary of the potential aims of gender archaeology, including the pitfalls and limitations.[27] For Perry and Joyce, the archaeology of gender involves a complex balancing act that requires a critical awareness and deconstruction of how gender operates in the present, as well as of the influence of modern-day gender relations on our interpretations of the past. Moreover, our descriptions of the nature of gender and the gendered process in past societies may have been very different from any known histories or ethnographies. Archaeologists may recover material traces of gender that may have no modern, historical or ethnographic counterparts.[28] As such, both Perry and Joyce suggest that gender archaeologists need to be careful about creating simple categories such as "men" and "women" and imposing modern notions of gender onto the past.[29]

Furthermore, as Ruth Whitehouse has aptly pointed out, "gender archaeology" is not the same thing as "the archaeology of women."[30] In studying gender, archaeologists are concerned with gender as a system or structuring principle, concerning both men as well as women. Whitehouse's distinction is important, as it can be unclear within some archaeological literature on gender whether the principal focus is on females or a system of gender encompassing both males and females. Even the pioneering work of Gero and Conkey in the early 1990's, for example, highlights the role of women within a critical framework which seeks to evaluate female agency in major cultural transformations, such as new technologies.[31] In effect, women are the central focus of study and not gender. It should, thus, be made clear that this thesis is concerned with the construction of both male *and* female identities, and this study is not simply an attempt find females in the archaeological record or simply raise awareness of female burials in ancient China.

---

[27] Perry and Joyce 2001: 14.
[28] Perry and Joyce 2001: 15.
[29] As I discuss below, Gideon Shelach notes that some Chinese scholars attempt to read Ming Dynasty notions of gender back into Chinese prehistory. Both Bagley and Falkenhausen have voiced their criticism of using later textual sources to interpret prehistory.
[30] Whitehouse 2007: 27.
[31] Gero and Conkey 1991.

Gender itself has been a relatively recent insertion into archaeological studies. As Sam Lucy has noted, the potential of gender studies was only acknowledged after the publication of Conkey and Spector's article on *Archaeology and the study of gender* in 1984, although it still took some time to filter through to archaeologists' interests.[32] The first studies of gender and material culture were motivated by the desire to find women's past, to locate their roles and contribution in society and to find evidence of their importance.[33] Material culture was treated as passive and representative of social relations.[34] These first studies were also guided by a desire to find evidence of women's rank and wealth in mortuary data. Essentially, this approach searched for correlates in the archaeological record – a rare object found in a tomb, for example, was equated with the importance of that person.

A further emphasis was on the value of women in past societies. More specifically, this took the form of inserting women in spheres or contexts that were traditionally associated with men, most notably warfare.[35] The emphasis in the approach was often formed around theoretical propositions, such as Wright's idea of a gendered division of labour, or it took the form of challenging existing views, as in the case of Balme and Beck's analysis of female contributions to hunting in the Palaeolithic period.[36]

Some European archaeologists investigated idealised notions of warriorhood and masculinity.[37] Härke, for instance, looked at the weapon burial rite in relation to the

---

[32] Lucy 2005: 15. See also Conkey and Spector 1984.
[33] Alison Wylie (1991: 31-32) compared the gradual development of gender studies in archaeology with similar three-stage process of maturement experienced in other discipline: initial critiques of androcentricism; "remedial" research focusing on women, and finally broader reconceptualisations of existing fields which consider gender with other strucuturing factors. See also Sørenson 2000: 35-40.
[34] Sørenson 2000: 54.
[35] Sørenson 2000: 36.
[36] Balme and Beck 1993; Wright 1991. Balme and Beck's (1993) pioneering work argued that the basis for assuming that a gendered division of labour existed in the Paleolithic period stemmed from the social climate of the 1960's, where men "worked" and women stayed at home carrying out domestic tasks. Such ideas formed the cultural basis for theories that suggested a strict division of labour had been present from the very early stages of human evolution.
[37] See Treherne 1995.

construction of masculinity.[38] While he argues that weapons may have carried a range of significations (lineage, descent), Härke also demonstrates the connection between weapon burials and the construction of, what he regards as, an idealised masculine form at burial. The deceased buried with weapons may not necessarily have been a warrior, but rather warfare and combat may have been closely linked to an idealised notion of masculinity.

As Gilchrist has noted, more explicit studies concentrated on the study of gender as a symbolic construction, focusing on studies of space and imagery.[39] At first, gender was addressed as an expression of the structuralist binaries of male and female, exploring male/female opposites such as public/private, political/domestic and culture/nature. While scholars viewed these binary oppositions as being culturally constructed, the wider problems were the creation of these dichotomies themselves (the male and female binary linked to modern notions of biological sex) and the strict rigidity of the divisions employed and investigated.[40]

More recently in European archaeology there has been a shift away from the aforementioned approaches to a concern with the *materiality* of gender. The emphasis on the social construction of gender in the 1990's led to a sharper focus on the media through which gender is constructed, negotiated and experienced. As Sørenson notes, this emphasis has fueled further attention to the characteristics of objects, including discussions of "what they do".[41]

Indeed, Sørenson argues that objects and actions make gender "real" and give material consequences and impact.[42] In other words, it is through objects and their associated practices that gender is enacted, recreated and maintained over time. These arguments have changed the perspective of gender archaeology from a view that saw

---

[38] Härke1990.
[39] Gilchrist 1999: 5.
[40] Gilchrist 1995: 34.
[41] Sørenson 2000: Gosden (2005) inverts this idea by looking at not what objects do, but what objects *want*. Here, Gosden attempts to develop what he calls an "object-centered" approach to agency and uses Britain's incorporation into the Roman Empire as a case study.
[42] Sørenson 2000: 135.

objects as mere things reflecting social norms values and roles to one that approaches objects as dynamic and active, recreating and negotiating gender.

Furthermore, archaeologists have also examined the regulatory modes through which gender was produced and reproduced in prehistoric communities. The impetus for such studies has come from the works of Judith Butler who focuses on the social mechanisms through which gender is produced, performed and regulated in society.[43] And, it is this approach to identity that will be adopted in this thesis. But, before I examine the theory of performance in more detail, and outline how archeologists have utilised it previous studies, I will briefly explore how gender and gender issues have so far been theorised within Chinese archaeology. This discussion will enable us to (a) compare and contrast the prevailing theories of gender within Chinese and European contexts and (b) show how my proposed approach might fit in with the current and extensive literature on gender.

Gender and Chinese archaeology

As Gideon Shelach has comprehensively discussed, as early as 1960, Chinese archaeologists were investigating issues relating to male and females in the Neolithic and Bronze Age.[44] Influenced by a Marxist framework, these archaeologists sought to primarily establish whether societies were patriarchal or matriarchal and, thus, took a somewhat different route from their western counterparts. However, as Shelach also emphasises, for most Chinese archaeologists, gender relations are not a relevant or interesting issue to address.[45] And, those archaeologists who do address gender appear to take a very conservative approach influenced by classical texts.[46] The following analyses of gender within Chinese archaeology (in the Neolithic and Bronze Age in order

[43] Butler 1990.
[44] Shelach 2004: 12-13.
[45] Shelach 2004: 21.
[46] Shelach (2004: 22) shows how some Chinese scholars attempt to draw direct parallels between gender in the Ming and gender in the Neolithic – two periods separated by some 3000 years.

to provide a broad perspective) are based on scholars who have addressed gender through archaeological materials only.

Since the 1960's, the primary concern of Chinese scholars has been establishing whether ancient Chinese societies were matriarchal or patriarchal, and what archaeological evidence can best substantiate this social organisation. Shelach notes that subsequent discussions among archaeologists centred on the types of marriage during these two different social structures.[47] Archaeologists also attempted to address familial relations and gender roles within so-called couples burials containing the skeleton of a male and a female through an analysis of burial goods, tomb features and the position of the skeletons.

Owing to the lack of sexed tombs from the Shang and Zhou period at this time, gender in the Bronze Age was mainly studied through the extensive corpus of oracle bone inscriptions being unearthed from Anyang. In these analyses, Shang scholars noted that royal consorts were mentioned in conjunction with activities such as warfare and hunting, and the cult of the ancestors encompassed both males and females.[48] Nonetheless, scholars still interpreted Shang society as patriarchal and male-centred, with the king and princes assuming a paramount position within the Shang state and the position of lineage leader inherited down the male line.

In the 1980's, the Neolithic matriarchal concept was challenged.[49] Wang Ningsheng refuted most of the evidence for an early matrilineal society in China's prehistory.[50] He argued that there is no clear evidence to connect multi-person collective burials and secondary burials to the matrilineal family. He suggested that skeletons in collective burials could belong to people from a nearby community who died at the same time. Moreover, Wang argued that too much emphasis was placed on collective burials, when in fact most Neolithic cemeteries also contained tombs with only a single tomb occupant. Wang also argued that rich female tombs do not imply that the society was

[47] Shelach 2004: 16.
[48] Keightley 1999.
[49] Shelach 2004: 17.
[50] Wang Ningsheng 1987-1987.

matrilineal. He points out that some male infants also contained very rich tombs and as such, tomb wealth may have been related to the status of the infant's family. Wang, thus, sought to differentiate between ascribed status and achieved status – an important distinction made by New Archaeology.

More recently, analyses of gender identity have shifted away from concerns of patriarchy (although it should be noted that archaeologists still routinely discuss male "power" in ancient China) to a focus on male and female social status and gendered divisions of labour. Wang Ying and Linduff have compared male and female tombs at Anyang, and Ying Yong, Yu Jiang and Falkenhausen have all compared male and female tombs in the Western Zhou.

In the early 2000's, Linduff looked at the social status of females from burial evidence at Anyang.[51] Linduff contrasted royal tombs at the site focussing on grave and coffin sizes, and the general quantities and types of objects from female tombs. She concluded that there was a range of different types of female tombs at Anyang and that females held different positions of status and rank, both of which were manifested in burial goods and tomb size. Linduff was also one of the first scholars to advance the idea that the royal consort Fu Hao, whose lavish tomb was discovered at Anyang in the 1970's, may have originated from the Northern Zone – the area to the north of Anyang, which was occupied by nomadic peoples. The basis for this argument lay in the presence of exotic or unusual objects in Fu Hao's tomb. Linduff's work here paved the way for further investigations into ethnicity and gender during the Shang and Zhou period, of which we are still at the very early stages. Linduff's work also drew attention to the various types of female tombs at Anyang, although armed with this data, Linduff unfortunately painted *male* and *female* as two binary categories seemingly linked to modern notions of biological sex.

[51] Linduff 2002, 2003.

After Linduff, Wang Ying expanded the discussion of female tombs at Anyang.[52] Based on the structure, size and shape of these tombs, Wang Ying attempted to reconstruct a hierarchy of tomb occupants. Moreover, Wang Ying also compared the quantities of grave goods in each tomb, and the level of ornament on bronze ritual vessels. She suggests that "the bronzes in the female sacrificial victim's coffin inside a king's tomb…do not contain any inscriptions or special designs, which shows a lack of both rank and wealth in the deceased interred therein". [53] Wang Ying also suggests that the number of hairpins interred with a female indicated their rank, thus the more hairpins placed in a tomb, the higher the social standing of the female.[54]

In 2004, Ying Yong compared the tombs of the Western Zhou Jin lords and their consorts from the site of Beizhao. Ying Yong divided the analysis into object types (bronze vessels, bells, weapons, jades) and compared various paired male and female tombs, noting the quantitative differences of objects interred therein. She concluded that the Jin lords held a higher social status than their consorts. Moreover, Ying Yong attempts to link burials in with wider political and social processes in the Zhou period. Relying on a tenuous chronology of the Beizhao tombs it should be noted, Ying Yong argues that the treatment of the consorts of the Jin state changed in line with the political circumstances. In the early phases of the site, so Ying Yong suggests, female burials were richer because "the ritual regulations were not full developed."[55] As the ritual system changed over time, so female status declined, which was reflected in their treatment at burial.

However, it should be noted that the chronology used by Ying Yong has been thoroughly discredited by Falkenhausen and Jay Xu.[56] Moreover, a number of the Beizhao tombs were looted, and others have not yet been reported in full, so it is difficult to get any idea of how these assemblages may or may not have changed over time.

---

[52] Wang Ying2004.
[53] Wang Ying 2004: 107.
[54] This idea is based on only three female tombs from Anyang.
[55] Ying Yong 2004: 196.
[56] See Chapter Four for more on the Beizhao chronology.

Owing to the piecemeal fashion in which sites are excavated and reported in China, it is difficult to obtain a firm idea of continuity within a cemetery site.

Also in 2004, Yu Jiang examined gender at the Western Zhou site of Baoji, situated in Shaanxi Province.[57] Yu Jiang looked at three tombs: one male and two female. Adopting the same approach as Ying Wang, Yu Jiang compared the size of the tombs, and argued that the differing measurements of each grave reflected the owner's social status. Yu Jiang also compared the number of ritual vessels, chariot fittings and jade items in all three tombs and concluded that since the male tomb contained more of each object type than the female tombs, the male must have held a higher social status.

Certain bronze items, such as bronze bells, weapons and tools in both the Late Shang and Western Zhou are recognised as being gendered by virtue of their appearance in male tombs only. For Yu Jiang, gendered objects not only reflect the higher social standing of males,[58] but also acted as "power indicators".[59] Such pieces, according to Yu Jiang, were interred in a male tomb to "intentionally differentiate males from females".[60] For Yu Jiang, these gendered grave goods also imply a gendered division of labour based on the associated activities of each object. That is to say, women in the Zhou period were excluded from certain spheres of activity, which was then reflected at burial. Yu Jiang states that females were excluded from playing music, agricultural and industrial work, and, in some states, chariot and horse riding. [61]

Du Fangqin is one of the few scholars to compare male and female tombs in the Shang and Zhou period.[62] Based on differences primarily between female burials in the two dynasties, Du suggested that female status declined over the course of the Bronze

---

[57] Yu Jiang 2004. Yu Jiang's quantitative analysis, which centers on deducing *status*, arguably fails to investigate gender itself and gender construction through material culture.
[58] Yu Jiang (2004: 46) states: "Because Er (a female) was excluded from gender indicators, Er must have been a female too."
[59] Yu Jiang 2004: 45. Ying Yong (2002, 2004: 184) offers a similar interpretation regarding gendered graves goods as Yu Jiang. Ying Yong states that bells and other musical instruments in the Zhou "were markers of male power and rank" (2004: 185).
[60] Yu Jiang 2004: 45.
[61] It may be more productive to theorise the concept of *idealised* notions of males and females as (re)constructed through these objects rather than link the pieces to *actual* divisions of labour.
[62] Du Fangqin 1998.

Age. Du notes that no female tomb in the Zhou has yielded opulence similar to Fu Hao's, and females are mentioned less in relation to court matters in the Zhou than the royal consorts are mentioned in oracle bone inscriptions at Anyang. While Du is correct to point out that gender changes between the Shang and the Zhou, these changes may be less related to status and more linked to different gender conceptions and ideologies.

Overall, one might plot the development, to date, of gender studies within Chinese archaeology in the same way that Alison Wylie, for example, has traced the study of gender within Western archaeology. The first concerns centred on whether societies were patriarchal or matriarchal and how this social structure might be deduced from mortuary evidence. There was also a concern with gendered division of labour. The concerns which emerged in the 1990's centred on finding women in the archaeological record and, more recently, comparing male and female tombs directly to deduce ideas of relative status and wealth. Since the start of 2000, archaeologists have also begun to think about the relationship between ethnicity and gender in the Shang and Zhou periods.

While this broad body of work has laid the foundations for gender studies within the discipline, two important points should be noted. First, Shelach's observations that classical texts provide the framework for interpreting Neolithic or Bronze Age, thereby highlighting a potential deficiency in the study of gender in ancient China, is similar to Perry and Joyce's call for an awareness of how we are influenced within our interpretations of gender. Indeed, texts from later periods of Chinese history are routinely used to aid interpretations of prehistory.[63] Even Ying Yong, in her discussion of the Beizhao tombs, uses textual evidence to link the small bronze knives in female tombs with female participation in silkworm cultivation.[64] Consequently, gender in Chinese archaeology needs to become more reflexive with an awareness of how interpretations are formed and influenced.

---

[63] Bagley (1999) is fiercely critical of the use of later Chinese texts when interpreting the prehistory. Falkenhausen (1993) offers an insightful discussion of the historiography of Chinese archaeology and the overreliance on classical texts.
[64] Ying Yong 2004.

Second, archaeologists studying gender in ancient China still present gender as a male-female binary linked to modern notions of biological sex. This approach is not helped by the fact that scholars choose to compare a few male and female tombs directly. There is little recognition of multiple gender identities and different types of male and female identities at burial. Moreover, little attention is paid to the ways in which material culture was used to (re)negotiate and (re)create different types and notions of gendered identities.

The aforementioned studies of gender and identity appear to assume that gender, and identity generally, is *essential*. By viewing identity in this way, and applying this notion for burials, grave goods are merely become passive objects which reflect an *essential* self. In other words, the living deposited burial goods with the deceased as a means to *reflect* his or her identity rather than (re)create it. One way in which we might explore identity, objects and burials more constructively, and think about these existing assumptions and proposals, is through the theory of performance.

BURIALS AS PERFORMANCE

The large body of work on identity and gender at burial in the Shang and Zhou periods has been instrumental in advancing future research by bringing to the fore the rich data available from cemetery sites. As I have noted above, this thesis will take a different approach from the aforementioned ones. Rather than focusing on the signification of objects in tombs, I will explore how the interment of sets of grave goods with the deceased constituted a performative act which constructed an identity for the deceased. The theoretical underpinnings for this argument come from both critical theory and archaeological theory. I will outline both of these respectively.

Performance in Critical Theory

The philosophical roots of performance theory might arguably be traced back to the phenomenological work of German philosopher Martin Heidegger. Heidegger

undertakes an ontological project of trying to understand our Being-in-the-world [*In-der-Welt-sein*], which for Heidegger is what characterises the relation between our own being and the external world.[65] Indeed, Heidegger argues that Western philosophers have mistakenly identified our own being as being that of a conscious subject who adopts an intentional stance towards a universe of objects. Instead, our *there-being* – or what he calls *Dasein* – first finds itself already in the world which pre-exists our conscious understanding of it.[66]

Being-in-the-world in this sense can therefore be taken to mean our being accustomed to or belonging to our environment, not as conscious subjects, but as subjects who already find themselves there-in a world. We are interested in the things around us which we interact with daily; we handle them and adopt an attitude of what Heidegger would call *care* for them.[67] *Dasein* in this regard entails but also presupposes our close entanglement with the things in our environment. Moreover, for a real and concretely human way of being, knowledge of Being is presupposed. This concrete, non-theoretical knowledge expresses itself in the form of knowing the basic standards by which we can approach things, or be approached by things. Hence, as Dreyfus notes:[68]

> "In sum, the practices containing an interpretation of what it is to be a person, an object, and a society fit together. They are all aspects of what Heidegger calls an understanding of being. Such an understanding is contained in our knowing-how-to-cope in various domains rather than in a set of beliefs that such and such is the case."

It is also worth noting that, for Heidegger, *Dasein* has a temporal dimension to it. This temporal character of *Dasein* is connected with what we might choose to call the structure of human consciousness. *Dasein* becomes aware of itself as being thrown into the world, and it gains self-identity only to find itself already enmeshed in a series of social and material relationships. Indeed, *Dasein-ing* as a practice is only possible as a

---

[65] Heidegger 1962.
[66] Heidegger 1962.
[67] Heidegger 1962: 256-269.
[68] Dreyfus 1991: 18.

bringing together of self and the world.[69] So *Dasein* is already in a set of circumstances, it never has time to take stock of the world before it is thrown into it, and it is always *already-thrown* [*geworfen*] because it never exists without a world.[70]

The character of *Dasein's* disclosure to itself – which can be understood as our pre-theoretical understanding of our own ontology – is that it always finds itself already hedged in with a series of constraints on how it acts, speaks and relates to the world.[71] Of course, these various factors are enabling as well as constraining, and represent the skills for coping with everyday existence.[72] Hence, a useful way of understanding *Dasein* might be to say that, as humans, our ontological being is disclosed to itself as a culturally pre-constructed social being who has to face the world and get on with life.

Having a temporal character, and being positioned in a historical world as well as having characteristics which it has taken on from its culture, Dasein's Being is historical. Given *Dasein's* state of being thrown-in-the-world, and the way that it is always already-in a world, it always has available to it a set of possibilities for future actions, which are described as the "heritage".[73] *Dasein*, since it is not to be understood as a conscious subject with an intentional mental stance towards its world, does not choose these possibilities, but they do not represent a straightjacket either.[74]

Gosden has pointed out that Heidegger developed hermeneutic phenomenology as a means of understanding everyday life and the way in which the senses perceive the world.[75] Indeed, the importance of Heidegger's work for archaeologists interested in performance theory and the reproduction of identity through burials is clearly summarised by Dreyfus here:[76]

> "Another example that brings out the anticognitivism implicit in Heidegger's view even more strikingly is our distance-standing practices. We all have learned

[69] Haugeland 1992: 35.
[70] Thomas 2003: 41.
[71] Thomas 2003: 45.
[72] Blattner 1992:111; Thomas 2003: 42.
[73] Heidegger 1962: 435.
[74] Ricoeur 1988: 74.
[75] Gosden 1994: 108.
[76] Dreyfus 1991: 18.

> to stand the appropriate distance from strangers, intimates, and colleagues for a conversation. Each culture has a different "feel" for the appropriate distances… These practices are not taught by the parents. They do not even know that there is any pattern to what they are doing, or even that they are doing anything. Rather, the children, always imitating the adults without even trying, simply pick up the pattern. There is no reason to think that there are any rules involved; rather, we have a skilled understanding of our culture."

In this Heideggerean sense of Being-in-the-world, a comparable concept would arguably be Bourdieu's *habitus*. The concept of *habitus* emerges from Bourdieu's early work where the notion frames the ways in which the everyday world of social practice is constructed and learned in early childhood.[77] Based on his structuralist accounts of the Berber House, Bourdieu's *habitus* is a way of knowing the world, a set of divisions of space and time, of people and things, which structure social practice. Social practice is a form of a "game" within which the *habitus* is learnt, not as a set of fixed categories but as a set of dispositions to act. The *habitus* is taken for granted rather than consciously conceived, a form of ideology in the sense of a socially constructed vision perceived as natural; in short, it is culture perceived as nature.

For Bourdieu, as with Heidegger, the *habitus* is not cognitively understood on the basis of adopting an intentional stance towards the world, but rather internalised and embodied. The *habitus* is, thus, the condition for the possibility of social practice and the site of its reproduction. (Here, there are some parallels with Giddens' structuration theory and its dialectic relations of structure to agency and with Lefebvre's focus on everyday life.[78] Indeed, Lynn Meskell suggests that structuration theory is simply *habitus* a decade later.[79])

Thus according to Bourdieu "subjects do not, strictly speaking, know what they are doing, [and] that what they do has more meaning than they know."[80] He suggests that common-sense world is constructed, imbued with *objectivity*, secured by a consensus of meaning and reiterated by ongoing practices, eschewing individual agency

---

[77] Bourdieu 1977, 1990, 1990a.
[78] Giddens 1984, Lefebvre 1991.
[79] Meskell 1999: 26.
[80] Bourdieu 1977: 79-80.

in the process. *Habitus* is ultimately the product of history which generates individual and collective practices in accordance with the schemas engendered by history.

If we take Heideggerean ontology and *habitus* seriously, it would appear that the notion of social *identity* that emerges is fundamentally linked to the social practices that are constitutive of subjects. Indeed, Judith Butler has argued convincingly that it is repeated social *performances* that are constitutive of identity.[81] Gender and other forms of social identity, according to Butler, are not stable and unchanging but are continually produced through social performances, what she calls *the stylised repetition of acts*.[82] Although identity may appear stable, the appearance of continuity and stability is an illusion created by an endless series of mimetic repetitions, each repetition separated by a gap or loss.[83] By analogy, Voss asks us to consider our experience of watching a movie at a matinee.[84] Suppose now that we are watching movie characters move seamlessly across the screen. Of course, what we are really seeing are a sequence of still images being projected at a rate so rapid that you do not consciously observe the gaps between each image. This illusion of continuity is produced only because each frame is nearly (but never exactly) identical to the one that came before.

Importantly, Butler does not view gendered performances, or indeed any performance where identity is enacted, as volitional in the sense that an actor might assume the identity of a character that he or she is playing, much like a dress that one can simply put on and cast off at will. Rather, these performances are "a set of repeated acts within a highly regulatory frame."[85] Butler contends that gender does not express an existing psychic reality, but instead that gender and identity are created by and through performance: repetitions that continue and contest the coherence of identity. In her

---

[81] Judith Butler is one of the most important critical theorists of recent times. Butler's work combines feminist theory and philosophy, queer theory and psychoanalysis. Indeed, Butler draws on an eclectic range of theorists and theoretical traditions in her work. Gill Jagger (2008: 5) states that Butler's approach involves analysing the performative production of (sexed) identity, concentrating on the process through which sex and gender come to be conceived as natural extensions of a biological body, rather than taking the biology of the body as a starting point.
[82] Butler 1990: 89.
[83] Butler 1990: 40-43.
[84] Voss 2007: 140.
[85] Butler 1999: 43-44.

reading, gender is not a category but rather ontological Being in the Heideggerian sense: "an ontology of gender whereby the meaning of being a woman or man is elucidated within the terms of phenomenology… the Being of gender is an affect."[86] Gender identity is (re)created through the repetition of postures, gestures, dress and so on, performed as the repeated citation of a gendered norm, in a manner not dissimilar to the *habitus* proposed by Bourdieu.[87]

Moreover, Fowler notes that what is of key interest here is how personal identity is not so much produced *ex nihilo* or replicated identically, but *recited*. Fowler states that "a recital is an action of reflection on past actions, and a generation of future possibilities in the present."[88] Repeated activities – citations – are continual renewals of past activities.

In short, Butler is arguing that there is no such thing as an *essential* identity. Rather, Butler inverts such an essential model of identity by claiming that identities are (re)produced and sustained through reiterated performances.[89] Thus, the coherent and material appearance of identity is no more an illusion – albeit an important one that *matters to us* – produced by the phenomenological experience of a performance.[90]

Performance and archaeology

The theoretical considerations of Heidegger's *Dasein*, Bourdieu's *habitus* and Butler's *performance* provide us with a broad, generalised framework for understanding the mechanisms by which identity might have been (re)created at burial in Bronze Age

---

[86] Butler 1990: 32.
[87] Butler 1990: 32; Gilchrist 1999: 82.
[88] Fowler 2001: 149.
[89] Jagger (2008: 23) notes that Butler's attempt to theorise gender as a performance which is performative is far removed from an understanding of gender as a role undertaken by a pre-existing or *essential* self. Jagger also notes that Butler's performance is a marked departure from sociologist Irving Goffman's account of the performance of roles in the *Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Goffman conceived of a self which assumes and exchanges various "roles" within complex expectations of the "game" of life (Goffman 1959: 528). Butler rejects the idea that acts are expressive of a core identity or of something prior to the acts themselves.
[90] Jagger (2008: 21) states that for Butler, the performance of gender produces the *illusion* of an essential identity or essence. This then becomes a *cultural effect*, a product of particular signifying practices.

China. From such a perspective (and it is one which has been considered in Western archaeological literature for the last thirty years, as I will discuss below) it is possible to consider the interment of a particular grave good assemblage as a performative act. The deposition of these objects would have constituted an ongoing practice which reiterated the coherence of identities at burial. And, the homogenous way in which objects were combined, and the way that they were deposited repetitively over time, would have also been vital to the enactment and reproduction of identities.

Generally, archaeologists have found the aforementioned theoretical approaches useful as they serve as explanatory models for large-scale social practices that focus on reproduction on a grand scale, rather than on individualising strategies.[91] So the approaches are broad and general, seemingly attainable from the long-term archaeological record, as well as being socially determined.[92]

Moreover, as gender performance involves public, repetitive actions of movement, gesture, costume dress, manipulation of space and interaction with objects (all of which may not be open to archaeological study it should be noted), archaeologists are in a position to document gender performance through exploration of these material media. If gender performance is by definition a citation or repetition of a precedent,[93] then the kinds of material regularities that archaeologists discuss and investigate in the media of performance can profitably be viewed as mechanisms for the regulation of gender. Material culture then becomes central to enacting the performance and creating regulated norms. As Sørenson notes, the employment of objects within performances partly act as props directing action at crucial points, and partly memorises stages of enactments.[94]

The proposition that material culture can be understood as a medium of performance has been explored in the funerary context. In the early 1990's, Julian

---

[91] Meskell 1999: 100.
[92] Meskell 1999: 101.
[93] Butler 1993; Perry and Joyce 2001: 65.
[94] Sørenson 2000: 87.

Thomas argued that we might concentrate upon ritual as a practice or performance.[95] Moreover, he also posits that the meaning of burials is not fixed, but has to be actively recreated by those participating in the event.[96] He argued that British Bronze Age beaker burials were standardised and formulaic. The clay beaker served as the constituent element within beaker burials, and other objects were added to this vessel in the tomb. The beaker appeared to relate to the deceased personal identity. Some graves also contained a selection of a few items chosen from a relatively narrow range of objects such as accessory cups, arrowheads, wristguards, daggers, knives and whetstones. Thomas has described beaker burials as formulaic – which may indicate the degree to which identities were presented as socially ascribed in the mortuary sphere. Ultimately, Thomas sees the objects as having different meanings (for different people); the importance of the assemblage is that the pieces were part of a performance which (re)created a socially inscribed mortuary identity for the deceased.[97]

Diaz-Andreu has similarly has argued that cemeteries are key areas of public performance.[98] In them, so Diaz-Andreu argues, appropriate ways to treat the deceased are negotiated, including the definition of categorical identities. More specifically, in 1992, Sørenson argued that in the construction of Early Bronze Age graves in Denmark, a sequence of construction can be seen as it was enacted and marked by the placement of objects and the involvement of particular actions, such as wrapping the body in a cowhide.[99] Using Butler's idea of performance, Sørenson, like Thomas, suggests that the materiality of the objects served to identify stages in an enactment, and in addition, as an important effect of repetition, these pieces made identities concrete.

In 1998, Arwill-Nordbladh looked at Viking-period graves in Norway.[100] Her pioneering study focused not on the objects *per se* but rather how they were incorporated into the tomb, the possible staging of their placement in the grave, and the

[95] Connerton 1989; Barrett 1991.
[96] Thomas 1991a; 2002: 160.
[97] Thomas 2002: 169.
[98] Diaz-Andreu 2005: 39.
[99] Sørenson 1992.
[100] Arwill-Nordblandh 1998.

various associations that the pieces brought to the burial and the tomb owner in their inclusion.[101] Arwill-Nordbladh also drew on Conkey's idea of "contexts of action" to group these objects into spheres of action, spheres of social relations, and the interests that the objects brought to the grave.

More recently, Rosemary Joyce has made extensive use of Butler's ideas both in the funerary and domestic settings of ancient Central America.[102] Joyce, based on Butler, sees material culture as proving a means of reiteration through citation and quotation. For instance, Joyce analysed the way in which children were transformed into adults in prehispanic Aztec society, identifying ear ornaments as particularly significant material media for the materialisation of adult embodiment. Joyce also suggests that Spanish observers regarded the appearance cues of the Aztec state as "sumptuary rules" which controlled male and female clothing, ornaments and hairstyles. Joyce, however, suggests that appearance cues were not dictated by fixed, recorded laws but were a set of practices through which Aztec bodies were gradually given a specific social form. She goes on to suggest that gender performance was shaped by the use of particular forms of dress – perishable clothing and body ornaments of more permanent materials. For instance, ear ornaments that required a long sequence from initial piercing through gradual expansion of the opening of the ear lobe are consistent in size and shape. They imply a conservatism in practices of body modification that would have materially shaped the experience of the body as a gendered performance, in similar ways over three millennia.[103]

Joyce also points out the range of costumes within Aztec burials. Elaborate costume was worn by young women between ages 15 and 25, while older women, between 30 and 45 were buried with less jewellery and had only simple bone or shells beads without other exotic materials such as jade. Joyce sees these patterns as the reiterating notions of female identity in death.

---

[101] Sørenson 2000: 67.
[102] Joyce 2000.
[103] Joyce 2000.

In 2008, Andrew Jones explored some of the current work (in British prehistory – more specifically the Neolithic-Bronze Age transition) on burials in *How the Dead Live*.[104] Although Jones's aim is to explore how artefacts are active components of mortuary rituals that serve to form ties between the living and between the living and the dead, he incorporates some discussion of burials as a *process*. He points out that the placement and positioning of objects in graves (e.g. objects placed around the body of the deceased) and the use of grave space were important for fixing an image of the deceased as being a certain type of person.[105] Indeed, he notes that in the European Bronze Age Europe, objects, and by extension burial assemblages, became the foci for remembrance. Moreover, Jones suggests that funerary architecture, mortuary rite and objects accompanying the deceased are all important as each one serves to identify and emphasise different aspects of the mortuary process.

Another way in which Jones suggests images of the deceased could be retained in memory is through what he calls the "drama of mortuary display".[106] Jones posits that mortuary practices as singular or multi-staged events, with the dressing of the corpse, the construction of tomb or mortuary features were all involved in creating a kind of person. For Jones, the drama of mortuary display is a vehicle for the transformation of the person and the deceased is *captured* in the material form of the artefacts deposited in the grave.[107] In effect, Jones implies that material culture creates a type of person rather than acting as a symbolic reflection of that person, and presumably each stage or event was part of a wider performance at burial. If we agree with Jones's position here, then it would be reasonable to suggest that each stage or event, as part of a performance within the funeral, was integral for fixing and (re)creating the identity of the deceased.

---

[104] Jones 2008.
[105] Paul Treherne's (1995) influential and pioneering study of masculinity in the European Bronze Age stresses a similar idea: grave goods placed around the body of the deceased fixed an image of that person in the minds and memories of the onlookers.
[106] Jones 2008: 195. Jones emphasises here that the deposition of the deceased in the ground and the internment of objects in athetomb were probably only one part within a lager set of mortuary stages. In thinking about the dressing of the corpse within a Zhou context, one may point to the placement of a jade face covering (small pieces of jade assembled in the form of a face, sown onto a textile) placed on the face of the deceased. Such coverings were clearly not utilised in daily life.
[107] Jones 2008: 196.

Clearly, material culture is fundamental within performances and for ithe (re)construction of identites. And, this thesis will attempt to look at burial goods as forming sets or assemblages rather than exploring individual object types in detail. Indeed, as noted above, the approach taken in this thesis allows us to concentrate on large-scale practices rather than explore one or two graves or objects in great detail. Previous studies of identity have focussed on contrasting a limited number of tombs (e.g. Yu Jiang compare three tombs at Baoji; Ying Yong compares twenty tombs at Beizhao), whereas this study will assess the bigger picture. Thus, I am interested in the large-scale processes or mechanism by which identities were (re)produced within the mortuary sphere, rather than focussing on the "personal" identities of the individual tomb occupants through a detailed analysis of individual items in the respective graves.

Indeed, this focus on grave good sets is in fact in the tradition of Rawson's pioneering work on bronze ritual vessels and sets. Rawson has argued that describing individual objects and creating typologies, which are *de rigueur* in Chinese archaeological scholarship, are of little use in pursuit of a wider understanding, as a single item provides us only with a single sequence.[108] Rawson has used the theoretical notion of the 'set' in order to investigate ritual vessel assemblages primarily in the Zhou period.[109] Insightfully, Rawson has discerned a fundamental change in vessel sets, unknown at the time and now known as the Ritual Reform, which occurred around 850 BC, by employing the notion of a set. Rawson has also linked this change in vessel sets to further, wider changes in ritual performance and society.[110]

---

[108] Rawson 1996; 1999: 369.

[109] Rawson (1998: 115) uses the analogy of a tool set for turning employed in nineteenth and twentieth century workshops in order to define the nature of a set. Rawson states " it (set) can be defined either as the complete set made by an individual or group at one time, or as the particular range of blades owned by the craftsmen at any one time". As Rawson discusses the concept of a set in relation to bronze ritual vessels, the notion employed here is of course different from that implied by grave good assemblages. For instance, not all the different components of the assemblage may have been made at the same time. Nonetheless, what is useful for this study is the idea that there are different components (grave goods) that come together to make a set (the assemblage). Sets also enable us to assess frequency and occurrence, two further important factors when considering grave good assemblages.

[110] Falkenhausen's (2006) work on the Ritual Reform is inspired by the original works of Rawson.

Within Western European archaeology, John Barrett has attempted to move beyond studies of individual graves and focus on cemetery sites.[111] While on a different scale from Rawson's analyses of ritual vessels, Barrett's work on cemetery sites has employed a study based on similar lines of thinking, that is, the focus on larger compositions or components of something rather individual or isolated features or objects.

This thesis will continue these approaches by focusing on categories of objects within grave good assemblages across a cemetery site. In this way, such an approach enables us to assess the make-up of such burial deposits (as forming sets) and chart their occurrence and frequency in tombs. Thus, the approach allows us to investigate the way(s) in which identities were reproduced and recreated on a large scale, over time.

More specifically, I will explore the role of bronze items within the performative construction of identity. A Shang or Zhou tomb might contain a vast array of bronze, jade, stone and ceramic objects (to name a few), so it should be stressed that this study – primarily concentrating on bronze objects – is somewhat narrow in its scope. At the same time, the different types of jade objects interred in tombs are little understood and, as Rawson has comprehensively discussed in her analysis of Shang and Zhou period jades, the nomenclatures employed by Chinese scholars are largely insufficient.[112] Moreover, bronze objects can be broadly grouped according to categories – weapons, tools, chariot fittings. However, it is much more difficult to group jade objects in a comparable way without imposing "functions" on the objects for which we have no evidence.[113] Thus, bronze objects are the focus of this study, and, indeed, as I will argue, were paramount within the (re)creation of identities at burial.

CHINESE BURIALS IN CONTEXT: THE AFTERLIFE AND ANCESTORS

[111] It should be noted that Falkenhausen (2001; 2006) has also analysed cemetery sites rather than individual tombs. However, his analyses have focused on bronze ritual vessels.
[112] Rawson 1990.
[113] Rawson 1990.

The theoretical approach to burials and identity set out above requires some understanding of Shang and Zhou beliefs in order to contextualise burials. The context of the Shang and Zhou belief system, in fact, would be constitutive of the social aspect of identity captured in the Heideggerean notion of Being-in-the-world, as well as Bourdieu's *habitus* – setting the stage, as it were, for a *performance*. It is within this context that the afterlife and the ancestors become fundamental.

It is widely accepted among scholars that the ancestors and the afterlife formed the fundamental basis for Chinese ritual beliefs.[114] In the Shang period for example, divination texts reveal that the ancestors were important family members, consulted on all serious family matters.[115] In turn, many analyses of ancient Chinese burials have also incorporated some discussion of the afterlife.[116] There are two main ideas relevant to discussions of the afterlife here: first, that objects were placed in tombs for the tomb occupant's use in the afterlife; second, that mortuary practices created an ancestor. I will discuss these in sequence.

To begin, some scholars such as Keightly suggest that Late Shang tombs represent a continuation of the *activities* that the tomb occupant performed in life.[117] Based on this idea, it can be suggested that mourners placed objects within the tomb for the tomb occupant's continued use in the next life. Similarly, Hayashi Minao argued that people deposited bronze ritual vessels bearing the inscription "may sons and grandsons eternally treasure this vessel" in tombs with the knowledge that familial members would

---

[114] What is less clear, and what has invoked considerable debate, is the physical locale(s) in which ancestral worship took place. For example, Wu Hung (1995) has argued that during the Zhou we see a shift from the temple to the tomb as the centre of ancestral worship. Wu Hung argues that towards the later part of the Zhou period, tombs came to resemble houses, where the deceased would, presumably, reside in the afterlife. Therefore, he posits that tombs became more important for ancestral veneration than temples. Bagley has fiercely rebuked this idea, arguing that tombs were also used for ancestral worship and, asks, why, if vessels were made for use in temples, were they then subsequently interred in tombs? Bagley prefers to see ancestral worship within different places, and seeks to deemphasise the role of the temple, particularly in the Shang period.

[115] Rawson 1998: 112.

[116] See for example Keightley 2000, Rawson 1993, 1998; Falkenhausen 1999, 2006.

[117] Keightley 1999: 266.

eventually join the tomb occupant in the afterlife, and thus continuously use those ritual vessels to make offerings. Hayashi states:

> "As deduced from texts…it was generally believed during the Eastern Zhou period that after death the spirit continued to exist in the world whereas the physical body perished. Consequently, people believed that the deceased needed to be provided with the necessities of life. This belief characterised Chinese burial practices ever since the Neolithic period when stone and ceramic vessels were buried with the deceased".[118]

Equally, in attempting to interpret ancient Chinese burial patterns, Rawson also employs the hermeneutic device of the afterlife.[119] Indeed, Rawson argues that scholars studying China need to work under a Chinese framework and not impose Western theory onto Chinese data. As such, Rawson approaches the study of Chinese tombs from the perspective that objects were to be used by in the afterlife.

Unfortunately, there is no contemporaneous textual evidence available detailing how the Shang and Zhou conceived of the afterlife, nor how grave goods may relate to these beliefs.[120] Indeed, while scholars like Shaughnessey note that some of the earliest Zhou poems mention the ancestors enjoying their food and drink at ritual banquets and, subsequently, assigning blessings to the living, according to my research no such poems, or other contemporaneous textual sources, mention the ancestors' enjoyment of specific grave goods or objects in the afterlife, or the ancestor's pleasure at the objects provided for him or her at burial.[121] Nonetheless, when exploring Chinese burials, one needs to acknowledge the context in which such events took place, especially in light of the above theoretical discussion highlighting the importance of *habitus* in shaping and structuring the world.

The second point relating to Shang and Zhou burial practices and the afterlife is the ancestralisation of the deceased through mortuary practices. Puett, based on the works of Keightley, has suggested that the aim of the Shang ancestral cult was to

---

[118] Hayashi Minao 1993: 27.
[119] Rawson 1998:120
[120] Rawson 1998: 121.
[121] Shaughnessey 1999.

transform deceased royal members into proper ancestors who could then give aid and blessings to the living.[122] Falkenhausen has similarly argued that Zhou burials sought to transform the social existence of the tomb occupant into a ritual existence thereby creating an ancestor.[123] The parallel between this idea and Puett's idea is that burial practices were about transforming the deceased into an ancestor or the ancestralisation of the deceased.[124]

What I find interesting about Puett's and Faulkenhausen's idea, particularly the transformation of a social existence into a ritual existence, is that the creation of an ancestor or the transformation of the deceased into an ancestor at burial might also be viewed as the creation of an identity for a person into the afterlife.

Moreover, one of the practices of the Shang and Zhou was offering nourishment to the ancestors through food and wine served in bronze ritual vessels.[125] Bronze ritual vessels have been unearthed from Shang and Zhou tombs, and, as I will argue throughout this thesis, were the constituent element within burial assemblages.[126] The pieces themselves and the changes to the vessels in the Zhou period will be discussed in more detail in the following chapters. For now, I will briefly outline some of the conceptual issues relating to ritual vessels and the ancestors with the aim of setting up a context for Shang and Zhou burials and beliefs.

The few bronze vessels that have been scientifically examined from Shang and Zhou tombs have revealed traces of food and wine.[127] One vessel from a well-known tomb at Anyang yielded a tripod containing remnants of petrified pork, possibly from a

---

[122] Puett 2002: 44-54. Puett (2002: 54) states that the aim of the Shang ancestral cult was "to domesticate the spirits and thereby render them controllable". Campbell (2007) also shares Puett's view.
[123] Falkenhausen 2006:160.
[124] Further debates centre on whether the ancient Chinese believed that the tomb occupant would reside forever in his or her tomb or not. These will not be dealt with in this thesis.
[125] See the extensive works of Rawson for more information on bronze vessels.
[126] In noting the lack of Shang and Zhou monuments in the conventional sense of the word - buildings or other permanent memorials remaining for posterity to see in historically significant locales, Wu Hung has, interestingly, tried to expand the definition of "monument" to include bronze ritual vessels. For critiques on Wu Hung's concept of "monumentality", see Falkenhausen in *Early China* 1996.21: 183-199.
[127] See Thorp 2006: 179.

stew, while a wine vessel contained traces of a sweet plum-drink.[128] Bagley has also pointed out that some vessels have soot remnants on the base, suggesting that the pieces were placed over intense heat prior to burial.[129] Thus, food may have been prepared and served at the funeral, possibly in the form of a funerary feast, and (or) was placed with the deceased perhaps for his or her use in the afterlife. In any case, ritual vessels may have been used in some form of food preparation, and certainly held food, at the funeral. In turn, there may have been a ritual ceremony at the funeral using these vessels.

Any ceremony or feast utilising the bronze vessels would have been a chance for relationships between the living and the dead to be maintained.[130] Rawson suggests that the ritual vessels were active participants in the lives of the Shang and Zhou, creating bonds between the living, and perpetuating an ideology of the time that asserted the role of the ancestors. [131] Furthermore, society appears to have been hierarchically ordered by generation, a hierarchy reinforced symbolically each time rituals were performed.[132] Rituals ceremonies were, therefore, creators and perpetuators of these views, as well as being products of them.

As such, while we have no evidence as to who attended funerals, given that such events entailed some offering to the ancestors, it is not unreasonable to posit that some sort of audience was present at the interment of the deceased and burial goods. And, we should not forget that any audience included the ancestors. Indeed, textual evidence from the Zhou suggests that the ancestors descended to consume their food and drink.

---

[128] A recent study undertaken by a collaboration of Western and Chinese scholars looked at wine residues in several Anyang and Western Zhou bronze vessels. The study found that beeswax and wax compounds were absent from the residues implying the absence of honey or plant additives to the wine. In the Anyang wine residues, the team found heavy aromatic compounds, which may have derived from fragrant trees (elemi family) or chrysanthemums. The team also concluded that the types of wine that the ancient Chinese would have made involved "amylolysis fermentation", which is a complicated system of growing specialized fungi reducing the need for sugars or yeast provided by honey and fruit. This study highlights the considerable effort that went into preparing wine for banquets and more tests like these may provide us with clues as to the any differences in food and wine residues in vessels owned by different members of the elites. For details of this study, see *The National Academy of Science* 2004. 101: 17593-17598.
[129] Bagley 1987: 111.
[130] Rawson 2010.
[131] Rawson 2010.
[132] Rawson 2010.

In turn, a burial may have had two audiences: the living and the dead. Thus, both the living and the dead would have witnessed an identity being created for the deceased.

A Shang or Zhou funeral, thus, may have been an occasion which brought together a range of people who then (re)negotiated relationships with one another and the dead in the form of a funerary feast. It is within this context, which I will elaborate on in more detail in the final chapter, where the Shang and Zhou deposited a selection of grave goods with the deceased and where identities were (re)created and reiterated. Furthermore, if ritual ceremonies perpetuated the ideology of the ancestors, then, by analogy, funerals acted a stage where identities were (re)created and (re)negotiated by the living.

BURIALS AS A SOURCE OF EMPERICAL EVIDENCE

Having set out a theoretical model for identity within the funerary sphere, we may now turn to the main source of empirical evidence for previous studies, and this study, of identity – burials and grave goods.[133] It is important to reiterate that this study through mortuary evidence alone forms only one part of a wider understanding of identity in the Shang and Zhou period. As I have discussed above, numerous scholars have made advances in this area.

Given that burials constitute the main source of evidence in this thesis, it is important to briefly comment on the usefulness and limitations of Chinese mortuary data for studies of identity and how one might respond to these issues. For instance, Falkenhausen notes that aside from one or two cemetery sites, most Zhou sites were not excavated in full.[134] The same is also true of the Late Shang.[135] The statistical samples

[133] Falkenhausen 1993. Falkenhausen has discussed burials as the main source of data within Chinese archaeology, and the need for larger and more expansive settlement evidence. Nonetheless, at present mortuary data is the main source of archaeological evidence for the Shang and Zhou periods.
[134] Falkenhausen 2006.
[135] In his study of the Late Shang, Campbell (2007) notes how large cemetery sites such as Liujiazhuang have still not been adequately reported.

that are obtained from most sites, thus, reveal only a partial picture at best.[136] Alongside incompletely excavated cemetery sites, tomb looting poses a further problem, skewing the burial data. As these two issues cannot be remedied by Western archaeologists studying China, one can only remain self- reflexively aware of the limitations they impose on research and scholarship.

Other scholars have thought deeply and productively about the role of the living within mortuary practices in China. Constance Cook notes, for instance, how the living may have sought to raise the rank or status of the tomb occupant through opulent grave goods.[137] Any status expressed in death may not have been one held by the tomb occupant in life. Rawson too has discussed the possibility that families may have been unwilling to bury bronze ritual vessels, among other items, in tombs, perhaps preferring to retain bronze vessels on altars or in temples.[138]

Falkenhausen has observed in numerous Zhou cemeteries that some a surprisingly high percentage of ranked elite tombs did not contain the usual trappings that accompanied other ranked elite tombs.[139] He observes that:[140]

> "…modest assemblages are also seen in the vast majority of tombs with burial chambers, even in those featuring nested coffins. This gives pause to any impulse to equate scarcity or absence of funerary items with lack of status or poverty."

Indeed, he goes on to explicitly argue that the material furnishings in a Zhou tomb cannot be used to judge the wealth or poverty of the tomb occupant. He also posits

---

[136] In excavating a cemetery site, the common archaeological practice within Western methodology is to first define the boundaries of a site before undertaking any detailed excavations. Consequently, scholars are aware of the size of the site and can estimate how many graves lie therein. This practice is in contrast to that within Chinese archaeology. Chinese archaeologists, upon the discovery of a grave, excavate outwards from that grave or point, without defining the limits or extent of the site. As such, discoveries of tombs are made continually at sites over years. These discoveries change the initial understandings of the cemetery. In order to gauge some idea as to the motivation behind Chinese practices, one needs to comprehend the ways in which archaeology has developed in China over the last fifty years. See Falkenhausen 1993 for a detailed analysis of these ways and further pitfalls.
[137] Cook 1997.
[138] Rawson 1993.
[139] Falkenhausen 2001: 120.
[140] Falkenhausen 2001: 121.

that, perhaps, in the later Zhou period, peoples were influenced by Confucian ways of thinking about the dead, which emphasized the wastefulness of interring precious objects to the ground.[141] For Falkenhausen, different social and ritual factors may have influenced the burial and the provision of grave goods in the Zhou period. Falkenhausen's work emphasizes that burials are a social process and are intimately linked to different social factors.

SOURCES

Mortuary evidence forms the main source for this investigation into burials and identity in the Late Shang and Zhou periods. I will, therefore, make extensive use of Chinese archaeological reports. There are two types of reports utilised in this thesis: monographs, which describe large cemetery sites[142] and journal articles, which describe a single tomb.[143] Both monographs and journal reports have similar organisation.[144]

One of the most fundamental criticisms levelled at Chinese reports dealing with cemetery sites is the division of objects into typologies.[145] Falkenhausen has noted how

---

[141] For more on these Confucian ideas and burials, see Poo 1990: 25-62.

[142] Particularly rich tombs, such as the Fu Hao's at Anyang, are usually described in a monograph, rather than in an archaeological journal. Such monographs for single tombs usually follow the same organization as those for large cemetery sites.

[143]The journal reports utilized in this thesis encompass the following, *Kaogu*, *Wenwu*, *Kaogu xuebao*, and *Kaogu yu wenwu*. These reports are written in Chinese, with an English summary at the start. There are also two prominent English language reports: *Chinese Archaeology and The Journal for East Asian Studies*. The former journal contains Chinese articles, which have been translated into English by different scholars, and the latter journal consists of articles written in English.

[144]Usually within journal reports, the location of the tomb within the site is first described. The grave and coffin sizes are discussed, followed by a brief description of where objects were located within the tomb. The objects are then described and categorized based on typologies of material and shape. For instance, the reports may begin by describing bronze objects, which are then divided into ritual vessels, weapons, and tools. Following the bronze objects, jade, stone and bone pieces are then discussed. At the end, most reports usually offer a brief analysis of the tomb's periodisation, the tomb occupant's sex and social status, and a discussion of inscriptions found on any bronze ritual vessels or other grave goods. In monographs on cemetery sites, the location of the site is first described followed by drawings of selected tombs from the site (it is not clear on what basis these tombs are chosen). The objects are then described based on typologies of material and shape, and some analyses of the site is provided at the end of the report.

[145] The Chinese use of typologies follows that of Oscar Montelius where each object type is further divided into subtypes, which are then arranged into chronological sequences according to the perceived progression of their formal features.

Chinese excavation reports are usually written according to a set pattern.[146] This means that the grave assemblage is reported in a fragmentary fashion and objects are separated from the tomb in which they were found. The researcher then needs to reconstruct the burial assemblage by shifting through the typologies and correlating objects with graves. Given that journal reports often describe a single grave, the categorisation of objects in this way is not problematic.

Another criticism levelled at Chinese cemetery reports is the assumption that all objects fit into categories or typologies determined by the excavators. For instance, as Rawson notes, the term "ritual jades" often used in reports implies a function for the jades without any evidence.[147] When the excavators are unsure of an object type, they place it within a typology and category (based on material) without discussing their reasoning. Jay Xu has also critiqued how tombs are often periodised in reports without any explanation or reference to the material.[148]

In spite of these two problems, Chinese archaeological reports are very thorough in their descriptions of the objects and the overall features of the tomb. Moreover, some recent Chinese reports have happily avoided some of these issues. The report *Baoji Yu guo mudi*, by Lu Liancheng and Hu Zhisheng sets out and separates each grave individually at the cemetery site of Baoji alongside the full range of objects found

---

[146] Falkenhausen 2006: 15. Falkenhausen states:

> "Making sense of such data requires skills of the same order as those of textual historian specialised in the study of certain kinds of archival sources, for Chinese archaeological reports constitute a peculiar kind genre of academic writing, governed as they are by their own textual conventions and conveying their information in sometimes idiosyncratic ways. A certain amount of acculturation is often required to discern the scholarly perceptions contained in them".

[147] See also Bagley 1999.

[148] A further problem encountered is the factual accuracy of some reports. The number of bronze ritual vessels in tomb M2009 at the site of Shangcunling serves as a good example of the confusion that can arise due to the sporadic nature in which tombs are reported and the uncertainty over the accuracy of the reports. Tomb M2009 was excavated in the 1990's. Falkenhausen (1999: 472) states "the largest tomb so far found is tomb M2009, which contained multiple sets of *ding*, including one status-defining set of nine specimens". Lu Liancheng (2003: 50) also notes that tomb M2009 contained nine *ding*, by contrast to tomb M2001, which yielded seven *ding* vessels. However, in the recent report on 12 newly excavated tombs at Shangcunling, the opening section, which briefly discusses all of these newly tombs, states that tomb M2009 yielded seven *ding* vessels. In Falkenhausens (2006) most recent analysis of the site, he revises the number of *ding* vessels found in tomb M2009.

therein. In effect, the report is a list of graves and their contents. One is then able to utilise this information without first having to reconstruct the grave by sifting through various typologies. Zuo Heng's fantastic four-volume report on the site of Tianma Qucun follows the same approach.[149] More archaeological reports done in a similar manner would undoubtedly enhance archaeologists' ability to analyse Chinese burials more systematically.

For research on gender a further hindrance is encountered: unfortunately, many Late Shang tombs are unsexed. This is in part due to the unfavourable soil condition in some parts of North China where skeletal remains often decompose. Where skeletons are sexed in Anyang reports, it is often based on inscriptions on bronze ritual vessels found in the tombs, or based on gendered grave goods. Both of these ways of determining the sex of the deceased are problematic.[150] In a few cases, sex is determined through skeletal analysis.[151]

For Western Zhou sites, the sample of sexed tombs is much better than for the Late Shang. At the site of Tianma Qucun, located in Shaanxi province, all 800 or so graves were sexed and aged. However, the decision to sex skeletons is not uniform and appears to vary between different provincial archaeological organisations across China. For instance, at the site of Shangcungling, located in Henan Province, none of the 200 or so skeletons were biologically sexed in spite of the good preservation of skeletal remains as evidenced through photographs of tombs taken at the site. By contrast, at the site of Shangma, located in Shaanxi Province, most of the 1,000 skeletons were both sexed and aged, as at Tianma Qucun. The apparent randomness of which tombs in cemeteries are sexed creates an imbalance into any investigation into gender in the Zhou period. Nonetheless, the excavation teams at Shangma and Tianma Qucun are to be

---

[149] Zou Heng 2000.
[150] Within Zhou archaeology, the presence of bronze weapons in a tomb is usually a reliable indicator in determining the sex of the deceased. In turn, some scholars conclude that individuals buried without weapons were female. This assumption is problematic, as a large number of male tombs (from Tianma Qucun for example) did not contain bronze weapons.
[151] For instance, the excavators of tomb M18 at Xiaotun, Anynag, note in the concluding sections of the report that osteological tests conducted on the few intact pieces of bone found in the grave reveal that the tomb occupant was a female.

praised for both sexing and aging nearly all the recovered skeletons from the cemetery sites, providing scholars with a substantial base for investigating issues of gender and, perhaps in the future, the role of age. This study is ultimately based on the assumption that skeletal remains in reports were accurately sexed.

THESIS STRUCTURE

Chapter Two explores burials in the Late Shang period at Anyang, while chapters three and four examine tombs in the Zhou period. Based on Rawson's pioneering work on the relationships between the Zhou states and the peoples of the Northern Zone, the term used to refer to modern-day Qinghai, Gansu, and Inner Mongolia, alongside the extensiveness of the Zhou state, I have divided Chapters Three and Four into central and regional Zhou states respectively.[152] Rawson has noted that tombs in the peripheral states contain an array of objects associated with, or influenced by, the peoples of the Northern Zone. In this sense, a different material repertoire appears to have been utilised within the funerary performance and, as I will discuss later, exotic objects seem to have played an integral role within the (re)construction of ruling-elite male *and* female identities within the Jin state. The final chapter of this thesis offers a contrast between the Late Shang and Zhou, as well as between the Zhou states themselves, and attempts to draw some broader conclusions about (a) identity and bronze grave good sets as constituting a performative act which (re)created a coherent social identity for the tomb occupant and (b) the mechanisms (citation, re-experiencing) behind the (re)construction of identities at burial.

[152] Rawson 2010. For uses and definitions of the term 'Northern Zone', see Lin Yun 1986: 237-273 and William Watson 1971: 63. See also Di Cosmo 1999: 885-886, 2002.

Chapter Two: The Late Shang

BACKGROUND TO THE LATE SHANG

The discussions of Bronze Age China usually begin with the Erliotu 二里头 culture (1850-1600),[153] as the cast bronze vessels at Erlitou represent the first extravagant use of metal in north-central China.[154] Erlitou is both a type-site which was discovered in 1959 by Xu Xusheng at Yanshi 偃师, near Louyang 洛阳 in Western Henan 河南, and the name given to a culture, perhaps rather problematically, that existed in Henan Province and neighbouring regions in the early second millennium BC.[155] According to Bagley, the Erlitou arose out of the preceding Neolithic cultures.[156]

The Erlitou site lies on the south bank of the Luo 洛 River. Test pits have revealed a number of building foundations; the largest so far excavated is a square terrace more than 100m in length.[157] Two well-reported courtyard are described as the earliest examples in North China of such a palace plan.[158] Around 168 burials have been found at the Erliotu site. Most graves are small, less than 2 meters by 1 meter, and some contained a wooden chamber and either one or two wooden coffins. One particularly large burial has also been discovered, which contained a platform round the burial chamber, known as an *er ceng tai*, and a pit below the waist of the dead, known as a *yao keng*. Both of the features are seen in later Late Shang tombs. Grave goods in the other Erlitou tombs range from 3 to 23 items and 12 graves are reported with bronze ritual

---

[153] Chinese authorities attribute the Erlitou culture to the Xia 夏 dynasty, which is mentioned in the *Shi ji* 史记 (Historical Records) which is dated to around 100 BC. However, western scholars, such as Bagley and Thorp, are reluctant to assign the Erlitou to the Xia dynasty. See Bagley 1999: 133; Thorp 1991: 1-38. Other scholars, such as Allan (2005) doubt whether the Xia dynasty even existed.

[154] Bagley 1999: 141-142; Thorp 2006: 21-25.

[155] For general description of the Erlitou site, see Henan sheng Wenwu yanjiusuo 1994. *Henan kaogu sishi nian*. pp. 170-171; Zhongguo Shehui kexueyuan Kaogu yanjiusuo 1995. *Erlitou taoqi jicui*. Excavations are described in a series of preliminary reports, of which the latest is *kaogu* 2004.11.

[156] Bagley 1999: 145. See also Underhill 2002. Underhill argues that the Erlitou ceramic drinking vessels have Neolithic antecedents.

[157] *Kaogu* 2004:11:24.

[158] See *Yanshi Erlitou* 1999: 152.

vessels. Bagely notes that the *jue* is by far the most common bronze ritual vessel type, with limited of numbers of *jia* 斝, *ding* 鼎, *he* 盉 and *gu* 觚 also found.[159]

The grave goods from the Erlitou burials appear to share a close relationship with the next Erligang 二里岗 phase in Henan. On this basis, the Erlitou culture appears to have been the immediate ancestor of the Erligang.[160]

The Erligang culture (1600-1400 BC) is named after a type-site excavated in 1952 and 1953 at the modern city of Zhengzhou 郑州 in Henan Province (figure 2.1).[161] The site has been divided into two levels: Lower Erligang and Upper Erligang. The Zhengzhou site covers an area of around 25 km² and northwest of this area a palace or ritual complex has recently been discovered.[162] The site appears to have been surrounded by a city wall.[163] Inside the city wall were large buildings; while outside the city wall were workshops and cemeteries. Furthermore, the number of bronze vessel types expanded from around 5 in the Erlitou to around 25 by the end of the Erligang period.

The distribution of Erligang bronze vessels has led some to argue that the Erligang expanded geographically and, in turn, bronze casting spread to other areas such as near the Yangzi River at Panlongcheng 盘龙城, west across the Yellow River at Fucheng, Henan province and Shanxi province.[164] However, this expansion does not appear to have lasted for long, as gradually the bronze vessels in different regions appear to have lost the Erligang period uniformity. As Bagley states 'the next few centuries

---

[159] Bagley 1999: 154.
[160] Qiu Shihua, et al., *Youguan suowei Xia wenhua de tan shisi niandai ceding de chubu baogao* 1983: 10: 923-928; *Kaogu* 1984: 7: 590.
[161] For general surveys of Zhengzhou, see *Henan kaogu sishi nian*, pp. 181-204; and *Zhengzhou Shang cheng kaogu xin faxian yu yanjiu 1985-1992*. 1993.
[162] *Zhongyuan wenwu* 1995:1: 1-8.
[163] For more detail on the wall, see *Wenwu* 1977:1: 21-31.
[164] The 1963 excavations at Panlongcheng are reported in *Wenwu* 1976:1: 49-59, the 1974 excavations in *Wenwu* 1976.2: 5-15. Both reports are summarised in Bagley.1977. Panlongcheng: A Shang city in Hubei. *Artibus Asiae* 39: 165-219. For more on the Erligang expansion see Fong. 1980. *Great Bronze Age of China*, nos. 4-10. See also Lin Yun 1986: 238-241.

witnessed the rise of local bronze-casting cultures…in regions which before the arrival of the Erligang civilisation probably had no knowledge of metallurgy'.[165]

The period between the Erligang and the Late Shang is problematically termed the 'transitional' period (*guodu shiqi* 过渡时期) by Chinese archaeologists.[166] This period saw the demise of the Zhengzhou centre and the rise of a new central site at Anyang (Huanbei), Henan province.[167] A wall, a relatively new discovery,[168] which enclosed an area of about 4.6km², surrounded the site of Huanbei. By comparison, the wall around Zhengzhou enclosed an area of about 13km². Thus it is likely that the Huanbei site exceeded the walled area.[169]

The next period is the principal one under discussion in this chapter: the Late Shang.[170] The late Shang or Anyang period is best known from the site of Anyang (figure 2.2).[171] The chronology of the Late Shang has been dated to around 1250-1046 BC.[172] The site of Anyang, the capital of the last Shang kings, reached around 30 km² at its peak with a moat surrounding a 'palace-complex'.[173] Anyang was of unprecedented size, containing large foundry sites,[174] and a major palace-temple area, known as Xiaotun

---

[165] Bagley 1999: 171.
[166] Bagley 1999: 172.
[167] For more on Huanbei, see *Kaogu* 2003.5. Some scholars date the Huanbei site to the Middle Shang, while others date it to start of the Late Shang. See Tang Jigen 2003.
[168] See, *Gudai wenming yanjiu tongxun* 2003: 54.
[169] For Shaanxi see, *Kaogu* 1980:3: 211-218.
[170] The Shang (1570-1045 BC) is the first Chinese dynasty to have left written sources. However those sources only, cover the period from the reign of Wu Ding, the twenty-first king of the line, to the reign of Di Xin, the twenty-ninth and last Shang king. These nine kings mentioned in the oracle bone inscriptions define the late Shang. The traditional view, which was recorded in the third century AD, is that dynasty's name was Shang prior to Pan Geng's removal of the capital to Yin. Subsequently, the dynasty was Yin. However, this is not supported by contemporary evidence or later use. The divinations of the last two Shang kings, for example, only refer to the *da (tian) yi Shang*, which may be translated as 'the great, or heavenly settlement Shang', or taking the Shang as the name of the core region, as "Shang of the great settlements". There is no reference to Yin.
[171] Trigger (1999, 2003) argues that the Late Shang was a territorial state, like those in Egypt or the Inca. In Trigger (1999) the dispersed nature of Anyang, the lack of agricultural intensity and the fact that the Late Shang kings were recorded as frequently visiting settlements of local rulers are evidence in favour of the territorial state view.
[172] *Xia-Shang-Zhou Duandai Gongcheng Zhuanjiazu* 2000:88.
[173] For a detailed layout of Anyang, see *Yinxu de faxian yu yanjiu*, chapters 4, 5 and 6. For more detail on Xiaotun see *Yinxu de faxian yu yanjiu,* pp. 51-70.
[174] For more on bronze and bone workshops, see *Yinxu de faxian yu yanjiu*, pp. 83-96. Excavations at the bronze-working site of Miaopu Beidi are reported in *Yinxu fajue bagao 1958-1961*.

(figure 2.3).[175] Campbell notes that bronze vessel production far outnumbered Erlitou and Erligang bronzes excavated or in collections around the world.[176] There were major bronze working sites at Xuejiazhuang 薛家庄, Miaopu and Dasicongcun 大司空村, bone-working sites at Dasicongcun and Beixinzhuang 北辛庄 and jade working sites, such as those northwest of Xiaotun.

A brief digression might be helpful. In discussing the history of the Chinese Bronze Age, we should keep in mind that there are several competing narratives.[177] Bagley sees the Erligang as a large conquest state and is fiercely critical of the influence of Chinese historiography on Shang studies.[178] Furthermore, he rejects the idea of Anyang as the main power of the time and prefers to see Erligang/Zhengzhou and Anyang/Shang separately. However, Liu and Chen see the Erlitou as expansive and state centred, followed by another powerful state at Zhengzhou.[179] They argue that both states conquered large parts of North and Central China to acquire resources. The Middle Shang, or transitional period, saw internal fighting and a new, but albeit weaker, state at Anyang. Campbell, however, sees the Erlitou as the basis for much of the cultural practices that defined the Late Shang.[180] He also argues that the Erlitou appear to have served as a model, with a palace-temple district, enclosed courtyard architecture and bronze casting workshops. Campbell, thus, essentially agrees with Chinese archaeologists that "from a material culture point of view, roughly between 1600-1050 BC, the Central Plains show development within a common material cultural tradition."[181] Thus, Campbell opposes Bagley's desire to seperate the Erlitou and Anyang and Liu and Chen's idea of a collapse around the time of the Middle Shang.

---

[175] For a table comparing sites in the Erlitou and Erligang with Anyang, see Campbell 2007: 77, table 4.1.
[176] Campbell 2007: 245.
[177] See Campbell 2007: 67-79 for a detailed analysis of these competing narratives.
[178] See Bagley 1999 for critique of traditional Chinese historiography.
[179] Liu and Chen 2003.
[180] Campbell 2007: 67-79.
[181] Campbell 2007: 80. For a discussion by Chinese archaeologists on the continuity between Zhengzhou and Anyang, see *Kaogu* 1991.10: 936-98.

The Chronology of Anyang

The Late Shang site of Anyang is divided into four ceramic phases and into five oracle bone phases which roughly correspond to the reigns of the Shang kings and to calendrical dates as shown in the following table:

Anyang Ceramic Phases	Oracle bone Phases	Kings	Rough Reign Dates[182]	Rough Reign Dates[183]	Rough C14 Dates BCE[184]	C14 dates BP
IV	V	Di Yi, Di Xin	1105-1045	1101-1046	1087-1036	2942 + 35, 2912+31, 2900 + 35, 2892 + 33, 2932 + 34
III	IV	Wu Yi, Wen Wu Ding	1157-1106	1192-1102	1205-1080	2937 +33, 2962 +35, 2960 + 37, 2888+ 35, 2836 + 35
	III	Lin Xin, Kang Ding				
II	II	Zu Geng, Zu Jia, Late Wu Ding	1188-1158		1255-1195	2964+33, 2944+37, 2908+32
	I		1189	1192		
I		Early Wu Ding	1240	1250	1370-1239	3030+35, 3039+42, 2920+35
		Xiao Xin Xiao Yi		1300-1251		

Table 2.1: The Chronology of Anyang[185]

Using this chronology, an assessment of the development of Anyang can be made. In phase I, some of the large-scale buildings were built in the palace-temple area of Xiaotun, with possible houses in Xiaotun north-east and Xiaotun south. Residential areas dating to this phase are also found outside the palace-temple areas in Miaopu, Sipanmo, Hougang and Dasicongcun. Cemetery areas were generally located near

[182] From Keightley 1999: 240-241, table 9; Shaughnessy 1999: 25, table 1.
[183] *Xia Shang Zhou duandai gongcheng zhujiazu* 2000.
[184] *ibid*.
[185] Adapted from Haapanen 2005:5 (table 1).

settlements and mostly located in Miaopu north, Wuguancun and Dasicongcun.[186] Moreover, at the start of Phase II, a moat was dug around the palace-temple.[187] The graves at the West Zone cemetery mostly date to this phase, and other cemetery sites such as Dasicongcun, Qijizhaung and Guojiazhuang appear to start around this time.[188] During phase III and IV, Anyang reached its peak. The Miaopu bronze foundry expanded to the west and south, doubling in size. The Xiaomintun and Xuejiazhuang foundries as well as the bone workshop date to this phase.

The site of Guojiazhuang

The major Anyang sites under consideration in this chapter are Guojiazhuang 郭家庄 and the West Zone (*xiqu*). The site of Guojiazhuang is located to the southwest of Anyang city.[189] Excavated between 1982 and 1992 by the Institute of Archaeology, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, 191 tombs were uncovered at the site.[190] Of these 191 burials, four were horse and chariot burial pits, two were horse burial pits, one was a sheep burial pit, and 184 were burials of humans. Amongst these 184 human burials, one tomb, labeled M170, contained an entrance ramp, or tomb passage, while the other 183 burials were vertical shaft pits.[191]

The excavators subdivided the cemetery into three sectors: a northern sector, a middle sector and a southern sector (figure 2.4).[192] According to the excavation team,

---

[186] Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan kaogu yanjiusuo (The Institute of Archaeology) 2003: 295. There seems to be some discrepancy between Li Yung-ti's account (2003) and the account of The Institute of Archaeology regarding foundry sites in phase I. The Institute of Archaeology claims that the foundry in the palace-temple area was already in operation during phase I and makes no mention of Dasicongcun having a foundry at all.
[187] Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan kaogu yanjiusuo 1987: 94-96.
[188] Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan kaogu yanjiusuo 2003: 295.
[189] The report for the site is Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan kaogu yanjiusuo.1998.
[190] Owing to the small portion of the site excavated, it is likely that more tombs at the site remain to be found.
[191] As with most other ramped tombs at Anyang, M170 was looted.
[192] Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan kaogu yanjiusuo 1998: 6-8.

the northern sector was reserved for burials of high status individuals, the middle sector housed the petty elite and the southern sector housed lower ranking individuals.[193]

However, there is generally scant evidence to support such a division, with the excavators providing little evidence for their subdivisions of the site. One may surmise that since two of the richest and largest tombs at the site are located in the northern Sector, these being tomb M160 and M172, the excavators based their division of the site on these graves. Still, these tombs are interspersed not only with smaller tombs but also tombs of varying degrees of opulence. It is generally difficult, based on present evidence, to discern how the cemetery site was laid out.

The excavators also divided the tombs into different clusters.[194] Within the Northern Sector, the excavators suggested that there were six clusters and in the Southern Sector 10 clusters. The division of these tombs into clusters was mainly based on ceramic vessel typology. Within each cluster, the tombs span the three main chronological phases, II-IV according to the ceramic seriation set out above, and the graves contain different degrees of wealth.[195]

As with other Anyang cemetery sites, where the division of tombs into clusters is debated, and as I will set out below with regard to the West Zone, the division of the Guojiazhuang tombs into these different clusters is by no means certain. I will, therefore, disregard these clusters and the division into a Northern, Middle and Southern sector and look at the site as a whole. The general lack of understanding regarding tomb clusters and possible familial divisions at Anyang cemetery sites is one of major drawbacks not only for this thesis but also generally for studies of Anyang cemeteries.

---

[193] The excavators do not outline their reasons for dividing the cemetery site in this way, nor do they provide any evidence to support this claim.
[194] Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan kaogu yanjiusuo. 1998: 151-152.
[195] Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan kaogu yanjiusuo. 1998: 154-155.

The West Zone

The West Zone cemetery site is located to the west of the central-palace district of Xiaotun. Primarily excavated between 1969 and 1977, the West Zone site revealed a total of 939 tombs.[196] The excavators of the site, Yang Xizhang and Yang Baocheng, divided the site into eight clusters (figures 2.5-2.7). The division of the site into these clusters was based on tomb orientation, ceramic vessel assemblages and pictograph emblems.[197] Based on these clusters, the excavators divided the site into eight lineages. The clusters contain uneven numbers of graves and with different degrees of funerary wealth.

Ge Yinghui undertook a study of these graves.[198] Ge suggested that there were 41 sub-clusters of tombs at the West Zone and did not link these clusters to any lineage. Zhu Fenghan and Han Jianye also questioned the idea that the eight clusters of grave originally devised by Yang Xizhang and Yang Baocheng are different lineages.[199] Zhu Fenghan looked at Cluster III and sorted out eleven groups whose tombs span the different chronological phases, combining these groups into three lineages. Thus, whereas the original excavators saw cluster III as representing a single lineage, Zhu Fenghan surmised that three or more lineages may have occupied sector III.

Han Jianye divided the 939 tombs into 24 sub-clusters and forty groups. He related the sub-cluster and group to lineages and segments respectively.[200] In his view, the smaller units, the segments, can be compared to extended families. Han Jianye also attempted to divide the tombs into six ranks based on bronze vessel assemblage, tomb size and form, and human sacrifice.[201]

---

[196] The cemetery site was first published in Yang Xizhang and Yang Baocheng 1979.1: 4-79. See also Yang Baocheng 1994, chap. 3 for tomb excavated since the first publication.
[197] Yang Xizhang and Yang Baocheng 1979.1: 45.
[198] Ge Yinghui 1989: 152-183.
[199] Zhu Fenghan 1990; Han Jianye 1997: 62-72.
[200] Zhang Liangren 2007.
[201] See chapter one.

It is clear that the division of the tombs at the West Zone is still not well understood. However, for this chapter, I will adopt the original division of the tombs into eight segments as set out in the original 1979 report. This is due to the fact that this study is not about lineage organisation, and, therefore, the divisions I will use are merely there to provide an idea as to how bronze grave good deposits were structured across different areas of the site.

Finally, it is worth noting that in terms of chronology and dating, among the 939 tombs found here, 242 were not datable; the remaining 697 tombs date to phases II –IV of the ceramic chronology set out above. In general, tombs at this site spread from east to west over time. Tombs of Phase II are concentrated in the eastern pare of Cluster I – III, whereas tombs of Phases III and IV are concentrated in the western part of the Clusters I-III and IV-VIII.

A LATE SHANG TOMB

The common tomb type at both Guojiazhaung and the West Zone, and, indeed, across the Anyang generally was the vertical shaft pit (figure 2.8).[202] At the bottom of the pit, the deceased was placed in a supine position and might be interred in either a single coffin, or a single coffin inside a larger, outer wooden chamber. From the 190 tombs at Guojiazhuang, only seven contained a wooden burial chamber, with most other tombs yielding a single wooden coffin only. Based on the current sample of tombs from the site, wooden burial chambers were seemingly restricted to a few tombs over each phase of Anyang. As I will discuss in more detail in the next chapter, in the Zhou period chambers are said to correlate with the deceased social position as a member of the ranked elite. There is, however, no such evidence that chambers had the same associations at Anyang, and, based on current evidence, it is unclear who was buried in a wooden chamber. Thus, the best we can say about burial structure and tomb furniture at

[202] Rawson (2010) suggests that this feature defined the peoples of the Central Plains from those of the areas to the North, occupied by mobile peoples. Campbell (2007) has also noted that both large and small tombs at Anyang shared this feature, suggesting that there was a shared template for all Shang tombs.

Guojiazhaung (and other Anyang sites) is that there was a repetitive tomb type in which specific items of tomb furniture were deployed.[203]

While there is some variation in tomb size at both sites, generally we can discern a standard tomb size range and highlight the possible ranges of the tombs of the lineages heads. At the West Zone, the average coffin size was about 2.8 meters long and about a meter wide. Some of the largest chambers at the site measured around 4-8 meters long and 4-6 meters wide. At the site of Guojiazhuang, the chambers of the two largest tombs, M160 and M172, measured around 4 meters by 2 meters and 5 meters by 2.8 meters respectively. Most coffins at the site measured about 2 meters by 1 meter, similar in size to the graves at the West Zone. The average tomb size at both sites, thus, falls broadly within the 2-2.5-meter by 1 – 1.5-meter range.

Indeed, previous scholars have observed that Shang tombs follow a common template, which is repeated and replicated consistently over the course of Anyang. In his study of social organisation at Anyang based on cemetery evidence, Campbell looked at burial data from the West Zone, Guojiazhuang and Liujiazhuang.[204] He notes that small tombs at these cemetery sites shared some of the features of the larger burials, most notably, coffins, *yao keng*, grave goods and dog sacrifices. In the burials without bronze vessels at the cemetery sites of the West Zone, Guojiazhuang and Liujiazhuang, roughly 75% of the ceramics were placed either in the outer coffins or in the inner coffin.[205] We might also suggest that in tombs without bronze vessels, ceramic vessels may have played a role analogous to that of bronze vessels.[206]

Based on the above discussion and analysis of the tombs at Guojiazhuang and the West Zone, it is clear that there were fundamental differences between large and

---

[203] A tomb might contain a wooden burial chamber and a coffin, a coffin only or no items of tomb furniture.
[204] Tang 2004. Tang had access to the tomb data from Liujiazhaung, a site not yet published in detail. See also Campbell 2007 for a study of these tombs.
[205] Much of the burial data for Liujiazhuang has not yet been published. I obtained this data from the database for Tang 2004.
[206] This idea is particularly important as sets of grave goods appear to have been structured around either a bronze or ceramic vessel. In any case, the constituent element within Shang tombs was an eating and drinking vessel. See below.

small burials, as no small burial had tombs entrance ramps or an accompanying chariot pit. However, other features such as ritual vessels, whether in bronze or ceramic, cowries, grave furniture and certain tomb features were shared across Anyang tombs.[207]

It would appear that a similar set of practices were observed in tomb construction with a common layout in tombs of different social strata, albeit furnished with differing degrees of grave goods. This set of mortuary practices suggests a similar way of thinking about burial structure and housing the deceased in both large and small tombs. Importantly, for this thesis, Late Shang burials clearly follow a template and the same types of tomb furniture and features are used throughout the course of Anyang.

Furthermore, as I noted in the previous section, the Late Shang burial structure, the vertical shaft pit, and mortuary features, such as *yao keng*, *er ceng tai*, double coffins and dog sacrifices, can be traced back to before the Anyang period, with some of these features occurring in tombs of the Erlitou period.[208] Like the practice of using bronze ritual vessels, the use of vertical shaft pits with the mortuary features discussed previously seems to have long tradition in the Central Plains. In this sense, the burial structure at Anyang was historically situated in a generalised tradition of mortuary practices in the Central Plains.

BURIAL SPACE WITHIN TOMBS AT GUOJIAZHUANG AND THE WEST ZONE

The tombs at Guojiazhuang and the West Zone have a very structured division of space. Moreover, this use of space appeared to remain consistent for most of the Anyang period. As such, when discussing burials, it is hard to divorce the burial structure from the layout as both are structured and appeared to complement each other in some way. In fact, there are two contrasting uses of burial space in Shang tombs. These two ways are divided into graves with burial chambers and tombs without burial chambers.

---

[207] Campbell 2007.
[208] No burials in the Erlitou and Erligang periods have entrance ramps. However, since the large burials of the elites of this period have yet to be uncovered, we can not say whether ramps first make their appearance at Anyang or whether ramps had a long history in the Central Plains.

Campbell suggests that Shang tombs with burial chambers can be divided into four or five zones.[209] Zone I is the space inside the inner coffin; zone II is the space between the outer and inner coffins, zone III is the area around the chamber, including the *er ceng tai*, and zone IV is the area outside of the tomb, including the entrance ramps and the tomb fill. The location of jade and stone items, interred in zone I, sharply contrasts with the placement of other grave goods, in particular bronze items, which were placed in zone II.[210] We therefore have, with regards to burial assemblages, two distinct areas for activity and display - the inner coffin and the space between the wooden burial chamber and the inner coffin (figures 2.9-2.10).

Campbell suggests that zone II was reserved for the deceased's personal possessions, and the division of space in Shang tombs may represent a house for the deceased.[211] However, there is no evidence to suggest that the Shang thought of these tombs as houses where the deceased would reside, nor is there any evidence that the objects inside the tombs were the deceased personal possessions used during his or her lifetime.[212] What we might say instead is that zone II, where the majority of the bronze items were located, was one of the most important for constructing a particular identity for the deceased through a structured deposition of bronze objects.

Crucially, the bronze items in zone II were all placed around the deceased who was interred in the middle of the tomb. It is not clear whether the deceased was on view when these objects were deposited in the tomb. On the one hand, the wooden coffin may have been open at the time when bronze items were placed in the tomb, perhaps after the internment of jade and stone items usually on the body of the deceased. On the other hand, the lid of the coffin may have been closed, perhaps just after the internment of jade items in the inner coffin.

---

[209] Campbell 2007: 235-240.
[210] Campbell 2007: 236.
[211] Campbell 2007: 241.
[212] Bagley (2004) takes this view to its most extreme by arguing that bronze ritual vessels interred in tombs were not used by the tomb occupant during his or her lifetime. Instead, Bagley suggests that ritual vessels bearing inscriptions were cast for the deceased, rather than cast by him or her. While, this view may be controversial, it, nonetheless, challenges commonly-held assumptions.

These two different scenarios present diverging possibilities of the relationship between the deceased and burial goods. If the inner coffin was open at the site when these objects were placed in the tomb, then mourners would have seen a direct association between the body of the deceased in the inner coffin and the bronze items located in the grave. If the coffin was closed at the time of burial, then the objects interred in zone II would have literally acted as foci for remembrance of the deceased. Equally, viewing the body of the person may not have been essential for creating an image of that person.

In tombs without a wooden burial chamber, the division of space is somewhat different. Remembering that the vast majority of tombs at Guojiazhuang did not have a wooden burial chamber, and therefore were not planned according to the division set out above, the division of space outlined below was the dominant form.

If we take a wealthy tomb with a burial chamber, M50, we might divide this tomb simply into two zones.[213] Zone I may be called the space inside the inner coffin, while zone II was the space on the lid of the outer coffin. The majority of objects were located inside the inner coffin. Bronze vessels were placed near the deceased's head and feet, bronze weapons were located in various parts of the inner coffin, including on the body of the deceased, and ceramic objects were similarly located in different parts of the tomb. Jade objects were not placed on the body of the deceased, but in the corners of the tomb. The divided space seen in tombs with burial chambers is absent from those tombs with single coffins only.

Within the space between the inner coffin and wooden burial chamber, and in the wooden coffin, in Guojiazhuang tombs, the bronze items were not grouped according to categories or function. In fact, it is hard to discern a pattern of deposition of bronze objects. In tomb M26, for instance, bronze ritual vessels were placed along the west side of the chamber, intermingled with bronze bells, bronze weapons, and bronze chariot riding paraphernalia. Bronze weapons were also placed alongside the east side of

[213] For a plan of this tomb, see Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan kaogu yanjiusuo 1998: 46.

the tomb, with ceramic vessels placed on the north and south sides of the tombs, mixed with different bronze weapons. A bronze *ding* was placed on top of a bronze bell and a bronze axe was placed on top of a bronze vessel. Given that the chamber rotted away and the tomb had collapsed, the placement may have been distorted in some ways. However, even taking this factor into account, we do not see structured deposition or categorization of objects in tomb M26.

The division of space in tomb M160 at the site further attests to this idea. In this tomb, bronze ritual vessels were placed along the east wall with others possibly placed on top of the inner coffin and or on the lid of the outer coffin. Bronze weapons and bells were also placed alongside the east wall. Other bronze weapons were placed along the south, north and west walls of the tomb and bronze chariot objects were placed in the western part of the tomb.

What we see from tombs M26 and M160 is a shared division of space, but different patterns of grave good internment. This division of space in Shang tombs is particularly significant when we turn to the burial assemblages interred with the deceased, as most of the objects crucial for recreating identity were confined mostly within one zone (zone II). The fixed use of space in Shang tombs suggests that there existed a common template that was employed within each burial and particular area of the tomb was integral for fixing an image of the deceased in the minds of those present.

LATE SHANG BURIAL DEPOSITS

The central component of a Late Shang burial was a selection of eating and drinking vessels. These vessels come in the form of either bronze or ceramic.[214] At Guojiazhaung, taking into account tomb looting, around 19 tombs contained bronze ritual vessels, with most other graves yielding ceramic vessels.[215] Around 18 tombs

[214] It should be noted that towards the end of Anyang, some vessels were cast in lead. Conventionally, lead vessels have been labelled as *mingqi*, or spirit objects, which were made for burial. This term is used in much later textual sources and may have little relevance for the lead vessels of the Shang.
[215] Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan kaogu yanjiusuo 1998: 9.

contained no burial goods.[216] The pattern suggests a concentration of bronze vessels among a small proportion of the buried population. The number of tombs with bronze ritual vessels is relatively equal for each phase of the site, though, as already noted, tomb looting and the incompleteness of the excavation may also be factors that distort these figures.

At the West Zone, the number of individuals buried with bronze ritual vessels varied enormously between the eight different sectors. Taking tomb looting once again into account, in sector I, no tomb, between phases II and IV, yielded bronze ritual vessels, while sector IV contained around seven tombs with bronze ritual vessels. The site has not been excavated fully, and, therefore, these figures can only be seen as approximate indicators. Nonetheless, the number of tombs with bronze vessels varied between sectors at the West Zone, and appears to have restricted to only a few graves within a site. Indeed, Thorp asserts that while bronze ritual vessels, as we shall, are the focus of intense study and have come to characterise the Shang (and the Zhou), only a small portion of tombs across Anyang were buried with these objects.[217] Hence, burials with bronze vessels form a small minority within cemetery sites and Anyang generally.

In thinking about the burial process, the mourners would have interred the deceased in a wooden chamber and an inner coffin, or an inner coffin only, and then interred either an bronze or ceramic vessels. Indeed, neither type of vessel was dependent on a chamber or a coffin at Guojiazhuang or the West Zone.

Bronze ritual vessels[218]

---

[216] Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan kaogu yanjiusuo 1998: 11-14.
[217] Thorpe 2006: 89.
[218] Karlbeck, in 1935, was the first scholar to explain the bronze casting process of Shang vessels. He recognised that the vessels were not cast using the lost wax process, a method employed by casters in most other early cultures of the world. Instead, the Chinese used a process called direct casting or piece-mould technique, in which outer moulds were taken from a clay model in sections and later reassembled for casting. For more on casting, see Karlbeck 1935: 39-60; Shi Zhangru 1954: 95-129; Barnard 1961: 50-53; Bagley 1995: 87-185; Li Yung-ti 2003: 59-61. For an interesting theory on ornament application, see Nickel 2006: 5-38. Bagley (1987: 16-17) notes that these cast vessels required more metal than the beaten vases and cauldrons of the ancient Near East and Mediterranean.

As I outlined in Chapter One, bronze ritual vessels were used by the Shang kings and elites in sets of wine and food containers to make ritual offerings to the ancestors.[219] Nourished through sustenance, the ancestors were believed to aid the living. As Keightley notes, 'the ancestors were…conceived of as having human concerns rather than being transcendentally different entities…the ancestors had jobs to do and it was the role of their living descendants to sustain them'.[220] The vessels probably rested on an altar in a family temple.[221] As I discussed in Chapter One, the general consensus among Shang scholars is that the newly deceased was expected to continue offering food and drink to the ancestors in the afterlife.

Bronze vessels also appear to have been integral to the construction of personal identities. Generally, the number of vessels in a tomb might range from one to fifty (quantities of objects will be discussed in a separate section below),[222] and the variation and different nuances within this set appear to have been integral. Rawson has suggested that size, shape, ornament and decoration were fundamental parts in creating associations and relationships.[223]

All the bronze vessel sets contained matched groups of wine vessels, the *gu* 觚 and *jue* 爵 (figure 2.11).[224] Both Thorp and Bagley have noted that *gu* and *jue* wine pieces formed the constituent element within a Shang vessel set. In other words, vessel assemblages were built around these types of bronze vessels. Furthermore, Rawson has argued that matching sets of *gu* and *jue* were an important visual display of an elite's vessel assemblage.[225]

---

[219] For more on bronze ritual vessel sets, see Rawson 1993, 1993a, 2007. Rawson has also suggested three theoretical levels when looking at sets: physical, institutional and conceptual.
[220] Keightley 1999: 255-256.
[221] Rawson 1993.
[222] One exceptional tomb contained 210 bronze vessels.
[223] Rawson 1993; 2007.
[224] Thorp (2006: 194) notes that the *jue* vessels were for pouring wine and *gu* vessels were for consuming it.
[225] Bagley 1987: 74-75; Thorp 2006: 194-195; Rawson 2007. Previous scholars (Bagley 1987; Rawson 1993; Thorp 2006) have discussed at some length the make-up of Late Shang bronze vessel assemblages, noting that *gu* and *jue* wine vessels formed the core of the vessel set. The *ding* vessel, presumably used for meats and stews was also a fundamental component of the set. The largest and heaviest vessels so far found at Anyang were *ding* pieces.

The most unusual set of wine vessels, however, has come from tomb M160 at Goujiazhuang. The tomb yielded 10 *gu* in square section (known as *fang* vessels), rather than circular section, which were common to most tombs, matched with 10 *jiao* 角, an unusual wine vessel type, which has two pouring troughs (figure 2.12). This combination of vessels is, to date, unique at Anyang. Rawson posits that the set of *fanggu* 方觚, and *jiao* in tomb M160 represent subtle claims to difference by means of a superior version of standard practice.[226]

Square-sectioned vessels appear around phase II of Anyang, and, therefore, stand out as the most up-to-date pieces that a tomb owner could have possessed. They were also usually the largest and heaviest objects within the vessel set. Once again tomb M160 stands out, as over 40% of the tomb occupant's vessel set comprised square-sectioned vessels. These include the ten *fanggu* pieces noted above, and two large *fangding*, two *fangzun*, two *fangjia*, and an unusual square-shaped object- *fangxingqi* 方形器. Moreover, it is noticeable that M160 is one of the few tombs at Guojiazhuang to yield square-sectioned vessels. Overall, Rawson posits that square-shaped vessels may have categorised the deceased in some way, perhaps marking affiliation or belonging to a particular group at a certain moment in time.[227]

From the vessel sets interred in elite tombs, we see a combination of both ornate pieces and plain ones.[228] Indeed, the vessel sets contained pieces with a range of ornament and decoration. Some elite vessel assemblages contained unusual vessel types and ornament, some of which are unparalleled in contemporaneous tombs. The elaborate *you* 卣 wine bucket from tomb M160 is particularly unusual (figure 2.13).[229] The vessel carried large heads with horns at the two ends of the handle, reminiscent of

---

[226] Rawson 2007.
[227] Rawson 2007: 45.
[228] That elite Shang tombs contained bronze vessels carrying a range of ornament, and that the variation in ornament seemed to characterise a bronze vessel set, casts doubt on the proposition that tomb occupants interred with ornate vessels held a higher social status than those individuals interred with plainer pieces.
[229] It was thought that these vessels were first cast in the Early Western Zhou. However, moulds for this piece have been at Anyang, suggesting that such vessels were first cast in the Late Shang, possibly around phase III. For more on these moulds, see Li Yung-ti 2005.

heads seen on chariot fittings, vertical ribbing possibly imitating ceramic decoration and wide flanges. Moreover, the large *fangzun* from the tomb carry small animal heads with large horns. Thus, within any bronze vessel set we see an amalgam of fine, exquisitely decorated vessels and more simple pieces suggesting that sets revolved around difference and variation.

Moreover, Rawson has also noted some ritual vessels show signs of deliberate archaism or reference to the past and/or other types of objects made in different materials.[230] For instance, Rawson observes that the rectangular *fangding* vessel from tomb M160 is rounded and carries an imitation rope handle, which seems to reference ceramic or basket forms. Furthermore, the *ding* carries ornament which harks back to the bronzes of Zhengzhou and the early tombs at Anyang.[231] Combined with the square-sectioned vessels from the tomb, M160 contains pieces which are up-to-date and carry some reference to the past.

Therefore, bronze vessels appeared to categorise the deceased and express some sort of personal and familial identity. At the same time, the objects were also the central element within a burial and within the (re)creation and performance of identities, as other graves goods appear to have been carefully structured and assembled around such pieces. As I will discuss in more detail below, eating and drinking accoutrements were the constituent element within Late Shang burials, and other burial goods were generally *added to* the ritual vessels and never in their stead. A burial assemblage was, therefore, constructed around the ritual vessels.

The structure and formation of Shang burial assemblages

Broadly speaking, burials can be divided into two types based on the grave goods. The first type of burial contained bronze ritual vessels (and ceramic vessels) alongside a selection of other bronze items such as weapons, tools, chariot or riding

[230] Rawson 2007.
[231] Rawson 2007: 58.

pieces and bells (though these objects were necessarily found together and they were deposited in varying quantities in tombs). Essentially, these graves are characterised by the mélange of bronze burial goods (figure 2.14). The second type of tomb yielded ceramic vessels, and might potentially contain a small bronze bell, bronze or lead weapons, such as halberds and spearheads, and bone and jade objects (figure 2.15).[232] Bronze chariot pieces, tools, most weapons types and bells are not found in these tombs.

Consequently, we see a clear difference between tombs manifested chiefly through objects cast in bronze. As I noted above, only a small portion of tombs at Guojiazhuang and the West Zone yielded ritual vessels, and in turn, other bronze items. Most tombs, thus, actually did not contain bronze funerary goods. Nonetheless, as we shall see, bronze objects were central in creating different structured burial deposits and within the performance of identities. Indeed, the formation of Late Shang grave good sets was not random, with the vessel type acting as the ubiquitous and determining element. By this I mean that other bronze objects were only interred in tombs with bronze vessels, thus the vessel almost acted as a prop within the funerary performance signalling how the burial might proceed, e.g. the placement of further bronze items.

At the same time, the constellation of bronze grave goods in tombs were clearly structured so as to (re)produce different types of assemblages, and, hence, identities. Tabulating the make-up of different grave good sets at Guojiazhuang reveals the very structured and conventional nature of Late Shang burial deposits.

[232] The ceramic vessels in tombs usually imitate those pieces in bronze, such as *gu* and *jue*, however, we also see some ceramic pieces not usually cast in bronze such as *guan* and *pen* bowls.

Bronze vessel Assemblage	Number of tombs
Bronze ritual vessels + Bronze weapons + bronze tools+ bronze chariot objects + bronze bells (*nao*)[233]	2
Bronze ritual vessels + Bronze weapons + bronze chariot objects + tools	1
Bronze ritual vessels + bronze weapons + bronze chariot objects	1
Bronze ritual vessels + bronze weapons	5
Bronze ritual vessels	2+

Table 2.2: Bronze Object Combinations at Guojiazhuang

Ceramic Vessel Assemblage	Number of tombs
Ceramic vessels + bronze weapons + small bronze bell	3
Ceramic vessels + bronze weapons	15
Ceramic vessels + bronze bell	9
Ceramic vessels	68

Table 2.3: Other Types of Burials at Guojiazhuang

The above tabulation of the different burials at Guojiazhuang highlights the different ways in which objects were combined in tombs. We might broadly posit that there were five different types of burial deposits containing bronze objects and four different assemblages built around ceramic vessels and a select few bronze objects (figures 2.16-2.17). Based on this evidence might we further suggest that at the site there were five different types of identities created around bronze ritual vessels and four different identities formed around ceramic vessels.

[233] The term *nao* was adopted by Luo Zhenyu consistent with Han-periods lexicons he consulted. To emit a tone, the bell was struck near the rim, although no mallet has yet been identified. *Nao* bells were also produced by the southern peoples contemporaneous with the Shang, and it is likely that the northern *nao* bells are copies of the southern bells. The burial or deposition context of *nao* bells is different, in the north they are found in burials while in the south (Hunan) they were deposited on mountains, riverbanks or lakeshores. In 1975 article, *The Independent Bronze Industries in the South of China Contemporary with the Shang and Western Zhou Dynasties*. Virginia Kane argued that large bells were a defining artefact of a distinctive Yangtze bronze industry. Bagley (1999) argues that both Anyang and southern *nao* derive from an Erligang proto-type, which inspired monumental artefacts in the south. For example, the largest bell so far reported is at Ningxiang, in Hunan, weighs 220kg. For pictures see Bagley, *Shang Ritual Bronzes* figs 163-165, 167.For tone measurements of Anyang *nao* bells see Falkehausen (1993).

The funerary goods were clearly not put together *ad hoc*. In fact, identities were recreated and expressed through very structured burial deposits with objects combined in set ways. Every tomb at the site contained either a bronze or ceramic vessel. Other bronze burial goods then appear to have been *added to* the bronze vessel to form a structured burial set.

Indeed, the grave good sets are so structured that they can be each characterised by the seemingly "last" object to make up, or the object(s) which differentiated, the composition. For instance, a tomb might contain bronze ritual vessels and weapons, while another tomb might contain bronze ritual vessels, weapons and chariot pieces.[234] No tomb contained vessels and chariot pieces without weapons, thus the chariot pieces not only differentiated the assemblage but also charaterised it. The next type of grave good set might then contain bronze vessels, weapons,[235] chariot fittings and tools.[236] Equally, no tomb contained vessels and tools without chariot fittings and bronze

---

[234] The most common type of bronze chariot, or perhaps horse fitting, found in Late Shang tombs is the bow-shaped object (*gongxingqi* 弓形器).Initially, archaeologists believed it was used for archery, however Lin Yun (1980: 163-165) suggests a connection with chariot riding, and argues that the object may have functioned as a reins holder. Whilst this view is generally accepted among scholars, some have cast doubt on the interpretation. Di Cosmo has cast doubt on the connection with chariot and horse riding by arguing that, in the Northern Zone, bow shaped objects are commonly found in tombs without chariots. Nonetheless, what is clear is that this piece did not originate at Anyang; Sophie Legrand suggests that the piece might have come from the Karasuk culture of Siberia (based on its distinctive features as such jingles and animal-head terminals. Bagley (1999: 198) more generally notes that bow shaped objects appear in the archaeological record at the same time as chariots at Anyang, and thus could have both arrived together.

[235] Not all tombs were equipped with the same types of weapons. Indeed, Shang weaponry evolved over time at Anyang. Some of these changes in weapon types and ornament have been attributed to influence from the Northern Zone (Lin Yun 1983). The most common weapon type throughout the Anyang period was the bronze hafted halberd and the bronze arrowhead. In phase II of Anyang we see bronze spearheads and bronze ring-pommeled and animal-pommeled knives. In this phase, a new type of halberd with a socket emerges. Lin Yun suggests that socketed weapons (such as spearheads) were common to the peoples of the Northern Zone, as were animal and ring-pommels. In phases III and IV, Anyang weapon types encompass both types of halberds, spearheads, arrowheads, and knives. For a comprehensive discussion of Shang weapon types, see Liu Yiman 1983. For the impact of the Northern Zone on the Late Shang, see Lin Yun 1983.

[236] The principal bronze tools types were an adze (*ben* 锛)and chisel (*zao* 凿), with a spade (*chan* 铲)and axe (*fu* 斧) occurring infrequently. Chen Zhida (1989) tabulated the following quantities of bronze tools from Anyang: 60 adzes, 30 chisels, 20 awls and 15 spades. Chen also noted that the overall number of bronze tools excavated from Anyang is far lower than bronze weapons. As I will outline below, bronze tools and bronze weapons were employed in very different quantities in tombs. A tomb might contain a single type of bronze tool, but a seemingly a unrestricted quantity of bronze weapons.

weapons. Therefore, grave goods were not randomly interred in tombs; rather, items were combined in a very formulaic and repetitive way.

By contrast, the most dominant ceramic vessel-based assemblage contained ceramic vessels only, followed by ceramic vessels and bronze weapons – usually the halberd. Small *ling* 铃 bronze bells were also seen in tombs with ceramic vessels.[237] The grave goods sets of ceramic vessels were put together around set compositions, and were not random in their structure. The living appear to have chosen the objects carefully. Therefore, while these assemblages were not as grand as the ones with bronze objects, they should, nonetheless, not be disregarded in discussions of social identity.

As I have noted above, tombs with burial chambers contained bronze vessels (and accompanying bronze objects), while tombs with a wooden coffin only contained both bronze and ceramic-based assemblages. The restricted nature of bronze vessel provision at burial was not seemingly based on tomb furniture.

Similarly, at the West Zone, the following types of assemblages can be seen:

Bronze Vessel Assemblages	Number of Tombs
Bronze vessels + bronze weapons + bronze tools + chariot pieces	1
Bronze Vessels + bronze weapons	6

Table 2.4: Bronze Object Combinations at Sector IV of the West Zone

Ceramic Vessel Assemblages	Number of Tombs
Ceramic Vessels + bronze weapons	
Ceramic Vessels	

Table 2.5: Ceramic Vessel-Based Assemblages at Sector IV the West Zone

[237] The earliest *ling* bells are found in the middle of the Erlitou period. Thorp (2006: 41) notes that along with bronze vessels, *ling* bells were among the first large objects (about 7 cm high) to be cast in bronze in the Erlitou period. Most bells were found near the deceased chest or waist. See *Kaogu* 1986.4: 321 for more on the burial context of *ling* bells in the Erlitou. Falkenhausen (1993: 134) agues that a small bell found outside the Erlitou at Taosi, may have been used and worn by a Shaman. From this, Thorp (2006: 40) argues that Erlitou *ling* bells may have been used in the same way.

Bronze Vessel Assemblages	Number of Tombs
Bronze vessels + bronze weapons + bronze tools + bronze chariot pieces + bronze *nao* bells	1 (possibly 4)
Bronze vessels + bronze weapons + bronze chariot piece + bronze tools	1
Bronze vessels + bronze weapons + bronze tools	1
Bronze vessels + bronze weapons	6

Table 2.6: Bronze Object Combinations at Sector III of The West Zone

Ceramic Vessel Assemblages	Number of Tombs
Ceramic vessels + bronze weapons	21
Ceramic vessels	

Table 2.7 ceramic vessel compositions at sector III of the West Zone

Bronze Vessel Assemblages	Number of Tombs
Bronze Vessels + bronze weapons + bronze chariot pieces+ bronze tools	1
Bronze vessels + bronze weapons	3
Bronze vessels	1
Lead replica / ceramic imitation bronze vessels	2

Table 2.8: bronze vessel assemblages at the West Zone

Ceramic Vessel Assemblages	Number of tombs
Ceramic vessels + bronze tools + bronze weapons	2
Ceramic vessels + bronze weapons +	16
Ceramic vessels	

Table 2.9: ceramic vessel assemblages at sector VI of the West Zone

We can now contrast the range of burial identities at Guojiazhuang with those at the West Zone. Within the West Zone, at sector IV, we see two different types of identities constructed through two very different burial compositions. Again, whether

this is a reflection of incomplete cemetery evidence, or whether this really attests to two principal burial identities is genuinely difficult to say. Out of seven tombs with bronze ritual vessels, six of them contain bronze ritual vessels and a selection of bronze weapons, and a single tomb yielded bronze weapons, bronze tools, and chariot equipment. By contrast, in sectors III and VI there were four and three different types of identities respectively.

The lineages at both sites used largely the same combinations of objects and the same types of grave goods. Just as one is able to characterise grave good sets at Guojizhuang based on the last object interred therein, so we can do the same at the West Zone. Moreover, we see the same broad division between bronze vessel based assemblages and ceramic based assemblages. Bronze *nao* bells and chariot and horse pits accompanied only select tombs at both cemetery sites. The tomb occupants yielding bells have been interpreted as lineage heads and such burials always contained what we might call the full spectrum of bronze burial goods, including bronze vessels, different types of weapons, and a selection of bronze tools.

We also see repetition and continuity over the course of each site. The burial assemblages do not appear to change in the way that objects were combined nor the types of pieces placed in tombs from phases II to IV. For example, the two tombs interpreted as housing lineage leaders at Guojiazhuang, such as M26 and M160, each contained bronze ritual vessels, bronze weapons, tools, chariot equipment and bronze bells. It is also likely that tomb M172, though looted, also yielded a similar selection of bronze objects. If indeed M172 did contain such objects, then it would suggest that three lineage leaders were associated with the same type of burial composition over the three phases of Guojiazhuang.

Equally, at the West Zone, five tombs (four from sector III and one from Sector VII – M92) also contained this burial assemblage. These tombs, each with a single south

facing entrance ramp, might also be said to have housed lineage leaders.[238] Therefore, the same objects interred in a tomb of a lineage leader at Guojiazhuang were also deposited in a lineage head tomb at the West Zone. A point I shall return to later is that based on this similarity in burial compositions, it is likely that there as a fixed notion of what constituted this type of person across Anyang. As such, the burial was replicated consistently building up the coherence of this particular identity.

The quantities of objects deposited in tombs

So far, I have discussed Shang burial goods as forming distinct and repeated assemblages. The objects interred in Late Shang tombs formed a set through a process of additive choices. These additive choices do not appear to have been random, as discussed previously. In order to appreciate the variability and structure of Shang burials, we need some understanding of object quantities in these graves.

In the following table, I have taken the several unlooted tombs with bronze vessel based assemblages to appreciate the scale of grave good interment at Guojiazhuang.

Tomb	Bronze ritual vessels	Weapons	Chariot pieces	Bronze tools	Bronze bells
M26	12	43	1	3	3
M160	43	1000+	1	4	3
M1	4	5	1	-	-
M50	6	14	-	3	-
M53	12	15	-	-	-
M111	1	1	-	-	-
M135	2	3	-	-	-
M001	4	2	-	-	-

Table 2.10: Quantities of Grave Goods in The Guojiazhuang Tombs

[238] It is generally surmised that the large ramped tombs at Anyang contained lineage heads. However, Thorp (2006) notes that tombs in lineage cemeteries used ramps only towards the end of Anyang, implying that some tombs of lineage heads in phases II and III did not have entrance ramps.

From table 2.9, we can see that not all tomb occupants were buried with equal numbers of certain types of grave goods. Indeed, bronze ritual vessels and bronze weapons show the most quantitative variation in tombs at Guojiazhuang. We also see one particularly rich tomb, M160, which contained over 1000 bronze weapons. It should be noted that the quantity of weapons in this tomb is highly unusual. A few Shang tombs have yielded weapon hoards (the royal tombs), but few tombs of the size of M160 have contained such substantial quantities of weapons.

Chariot pieces were interred in single quantities only, while bronze tools ranged from between three to four pieces. No tomb at Guojiazhuang contained more than four bronze tools and no tomb contained a single *nao* bell.[239] Therefore, we appear to see restrictions relating to some object types but not others. Moreover, this situation appears to have been the case for most of the Anyang period.

Certainly, the quantity of vessels and weapons was one way in which the living could manipulate the burial and differentiate the tomb occupant. Bronze tools and chariot pieces were seemingly not used in this way. Moreover, the difference between quantities of objects in tombs implies a pattern which was broadly adhered to and which helped structure the burial in some way. This pattern would have arguably been important in reinforcing the coherence of the burial.

GENDER IDENTITIES IN THE LATE SHANG

Any discussion of gender within the late Shang is bound to be more fragmented than generalised studies of identity at burial, owing to the lack of sexed tombs from major cemetery sites. This means that in order to study gender during this period one needs to piece together sexed tombs from different Anyang sites. In some cases, this may include only a single female tomb from an entire cemetery site. Indeed, it should be

[239] It should be noted that the tomb of Fu Hao (the royal consort) contained five *nao* bells. Inscriptions on these bells suggest that two of them were gifts from another high-ranking elite. We might postulate that Fu Hao was buried with the usual set of three to which two more were added.

noted before I begin this discussion that the same structured sets of bronze objects seemingly related to gender in the subsequent Zhou period (to be discussed next) cannot be discerned from the present burial evidence for the Late Shang period.

Therefore, in order to look at gender in the Late Shang I have assembled five major tombs from which we can make some very tentative conclusions. These tombs include, the tomb of royal consort Fu Hao (M5), tomb M18, tomb AQMM13 and tomb M243 from the West Zone. [240] This is, of course, a very limited sample. However, even these five tombs offer different perspectives on female identity in the Late Shang.

These five female tombs have very different burial assemblages:

The tomb of Fu Hao (M5)	Bronze ritual vessels, bronze weapons, bronze chariot and horse fittings, a selection of bronze tools and bronze bells
M18	Bronze ritual vessels, bronze weapons, jade and bone pieces
M232	Bronze ritual vessels, bronze weapons, jade and bone pieces.
AQMM13	Bronze ritual vessels, jade pieces
M243	Ceramic vessels only

Table 2.11: Grave Goods in Five Female Tombs at Anyang

These five tombs have very different burial assemblages. Given the limited sample of female tombs in the Late Shang, it is hard to say whether the assemblages are representative of female tombs generally, or if they are unique. We can say that assemblages were formed around either bronze ritual vessels or ceramic vessels, as noted previously. Moreover, three female tombs, Fu Hao's, M232 and M18 all yielded a selection of bronze weapons, suggesting that military paraphernalia was confined to

[240] The tomb of Fu Hao is reported in Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan kaogu yanjiusuo 1980; tomb M18 is reported in Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan kaogu yanjiusuo 1984; tomb M232 is partially reported in Shi Zhangru 1973; tomb AQMM13 is described in Linduff 2000, and tomb M243 is reported in Yang Xizhang and Yang Baocheng 1979.1: 34. Generally, very little information is provided in each report as to how the excavators determined the sex of the tomb occupant. For the tomb of royal consort Fu Hao, the sex was determined through bronze vessel inscriptions – 109 bronze vessels bore the inscription Fu Hao or Hao. For tomb M18, the excavators determined the sex through limited osteological testing, while for tomb AQMM13, no information was given regarding the means of sexing the deceased. My study rests on the assumptions that the all five tombs contained female tomb occupants.

male Shang tombs- although whether the internment of bronze weapons in female tombs was a regular feature is also difficult to say. The assemblages in female tombs M232 and M18 are somewhat comparable in their composition, and it is particularly apparent that neither tomb yielded a selection of bronze tools, chariot or horse pieces or bronze bells – all pieces found in Fu Hao's tomb.

Of the female assemblages above, it is Fu Hao's that presents us with the most complex picture. Much has been made of Fu Hao's burial assemblage, particularly as this was one of the few royal tombs not to be looted. However, the richness and opulence of this tomb has perhaps overshadowed the fact that the royal female was buried with all the objects that one might find in a royal male tomb, including a selection of bronze agricultural tools and five bronze bells (figure 2.18). In other words, all the objects that one might associate with masculinity were interred in Fu Hao's tomb.[241] By contrast, female tomb M18, possibly the next richest female tomb at Anyang discovered to date, yielded neither tools, bells nor horse riding accoutrements. This may suggest that the royal consort's tomb was unique in some way. Even if the tomb is unique, this should still not detract from the fact that a female tombs at Anyang yielded many objects found with male lineage head tombs.

The tomb of Fu Hao has also yielded a range of both exotic items and pieces that appear to have foreign influences (figure 2.19). These pieces have been discussed in detail, particularly by Lin Yun, and include Northern ring-handled knives, bronze

[241] The set of bronze objects in Fu Hao's tomb comprises the following categories of objects: bronze ritual vessels, bronze weapons, bronze horse fittings, bronze tools and bronze bells. In effect, this burial deposit is identical to that interred in the lineage head tombs at Guojiazhuang and possibly those of the West Zone (see above). While noting substantial differences between the *types* of objects in Fu Hao's tomb and the lineage head tombs at other sites, the structure of the burial deposit in these tombs is almost identical. Thus, Fu Hao appears to have been interred with a set of bronze burial goods found usually in the tombs of male lineage heads. Given the lack of sexed Anyang tombs, we cannot discern whether Fu Hao's assemblage is unique or commonplace in that other consorts possessed a similar set of objects at burial. We might speculate about two different scenarios. If Fu Hao's assemblage is unique in that no other female tomb contained a similar set of objects, and tombs of lineage heads were usually buried with such a set of items, then for some reason a female was interred with a burial set associated with elite males. Alternatively, if other consorts were buried with Fu Hao's set of bronze objects, then perhaps bronze items played a rather restricted role in creating notions of gender or that gender was a major structuring principle for the interment of bronze burial goods.

mirrors, several bronze chariot riding pieces, horse bridles, and a jingle-shaped awl.[242] Using Rawson's latest research on the interactions between the Shang and the peoples of the North, we might further add that three of Fu Hao's vessels cast in the form of realistic creatures, and the small realistic jade animals, may also pertain to outside influences.[243] Once again, these objects stand out because few tombs have yielded this wide range of foreign objects.[244]

Based on these objects, a view gaining ground within Shang studies, perhaps in tune with Zhou studies, to be discussed in Chapter Four in particular, is that Fu Hao herself was of Northern descent. Linduff is the chief proponent of the idea that Fu Hao originated from outside of the Shang realm and married into the Shang royal family.[245] This view is based on the one-to-one correlation between the tomb occupant and the burial goods – a theoretical approach which is widely refuted within archaeological circles,[246] and Childs-Johnson, in particular, has contested this view arguing that Fu Hao took part in military expeditions in the North and may have received these goods as gifts or tribute.[247]

Both Linduff and Childs-Johnson, however, both assume that these objects represent Fu Hao's personal possessions. In fact, there is no evidence to suggest either way that Fu Hao owned or possessed any of these objects in the modern Western sense. Without DNA testing, we will never know the royal consort's ethnicity, and any argument on it is ultimately doomed to tautology.

CONCLUSION

---

[242] Lin Yun 1981.
[243] Rawson 2010. Rawson indicates the link between Fu Hao's jade animals, in realistic form, and the Northern Zone.
[244] It should be noted that other Shang tomb have yielded small jade animals, although they are less-finely carved that Fu Hao's, and, as in the case of M160 for instance, less realistic in their depictions.
[245] Linduff 1997.
[246] See Jones 1997. The approach to ethnicity within Chinese archaeology fits in with the broader approach set out in the first chapter, which equates objects in a simplistic, correlative way with the deceased – as in social status, for example.
[247] Childs-Johnson 2003.

Thorp asserts that Erlitou and Erligang burials resemble a template which was applied on different scales depending on the tomb.[248] The same idea might be applied to the graves at Anyang. As Campbell and Tang Jigen have noted, Shang tombs share number of constituent elements: tomb structure in the form of a vertical shaft pit, the use of wooden coffins and chambers, tomb features such platform ledges and pits below the waist of the deceased, and the deposition of grave goods. This same tomb type was replicated regimentally across Anyang, with few variations. Of course, some large tombs might have entrance ramps and attendants in death, features not shared with smaller tombs, and the size of the grave and the chambers and the selection of grave goods were ways in which tombs could be differentiated from each other and manipulated by the living.

Moreover, the fixed use of space in Shang tombs also ensured a continuing structure to the burial. There is a clear division between jade and stone objects placed in the inner coffin and bronze items deposited in the space in between the coffin and the wooden burial chamber. Essentially, some of the most important burial goods were placed within the wooden chamber. The use of space in tombs was related to neither the deceased's social position nor the deceased sex. Rather, this common and fixed tomb layout was (re)produced consistently across different tombs. Combined with the burial structure and tomb furniture outlined above, the tomb template ensured a particular (re)experience of what constituted a funeral.

Within this fixed use of space, the Shang deposited very structured grave good assemblages of which bronze ritual vessels formed the core. Other bronze items such as weapons, tools and bells were generally added to the bronze vessels to form a burial deposit. The categories of burial goods were chosen from a rather limited repertoire and the same categories of objects are employed at burial for much of Anyang. The objects could also only be combined in certain ways thereby recreating the notion of very fixed burial deposits. As such, different types of identities were recreated through the

[248] Thorpe 2006: 36.

selection of grave goods placed with the deceased. The coherence of the identities was created and reinforced through the continuing deposition of a fixed type of burial assemblage, which created a new identity for the deceased and referenced an older one in some way. In others words, identities were enacted through the use of a structured tomb template and burial deposit. Clearly, these performances (re)created accepted norms within Shang burials, though they may fall short of sumptuary rules. For tombs to be replicated as such, there must have existed Shang funerary norms, which structured burial structures and identities. Shang people would have, thus, found themselves within a particular world and continued to (re)produce it.

Chapter Three: The Guo and Xing lineages of the Zhou

THE WESTERN/EASTERN ZHOU

A date of around 1050 BC is generally accepted as the time when the Zhou conquered the Shang. The origins of the Zhou come from two sources: traditional accounts and archaeological excavations. Traditional accounts locate the Zhou in present-day Shaanxi province and, at least in comparison with the Shang, as being of western descent, and therefore of "outsiders" in origin.[249] Archaeologically, Zou Heng argues that Proto-Zhou culture (*Xian Zhou wenhua* 先周文化) appears suddenly in the Wei 渭 River Valley without any apparent cultural precedents.[250] Zou Heng traced one of its most notable features – the 'linked crotched *li*' (*liandang li* a lobed tripod with hollow legs)[251] to the Guangshe 光社 culture that extended across the northern parts of present-day Shaanxi and Shanxi provinces, and concluded that this must represent the distinctively Zhou contribution to the Proto-Zhou culture. Since Zou Heng's study, archaeologists from both Shaanxi and Shanxi provinces have debated the origins of the Zhou.[252]

Sites at the metropolitan capital at present-day Xi'an 西安, and at the ritual centre in the counties of Fufeng 扶风 and Qishan 岐山, known as the Zhouyuan 周原 (the plain of Zhou), indicate that large populations were living there from the time of the conquest of the Shang around 1050 BC by King Wu 武王 (figure 3.1).[253] Furthermore,

---

[249] This view has been incorporated in the major modern histories of China; see Guo Moruo 郭沫若 1964, vol. 1: 117-118. In Western literature, this view is best exemplified by Wolfram Eberhard who argued that the Zhou were a proto-Turkic people. See Eberhard 1950: 25. See also Rawson 1988.

[250] Zou Heng. 1980. *Xia Shang Zhou kaoguxue lunwenji* 夏商周考古学论文集. pp. 279-355

[251] The *liandangli* appears to have developed from the *biedangli*, which was invented in the Zhou core area in central Shaanxi during the time contemporary with the Late Shang.

[252] For work supporting the Shaanxi origin see: *Wenwu* 1979.10: 50-59; *Kaogu yu wenwu* 1991.2: 66-69. For work supporting the 'eastern' origin thesis, see *Wenwu* 1989.4: 40-50. For a brief discussion in English, see Rawson 1999: 380-382; Shaughnessy 1999: 303-307. For more on the 'proto-Zhou Culture', see Zou Heng 1980: 297-356; Li Feng 1991; Sun Hua 1994 and Hu Qianying 2000.

[253] There are two traditional dates for the Zhou conquest of the Shang. The first date is 1122 BC and the second is 1027 BC. The date of 1027 BC is based on the *Guben zhushu jinian* 古本竹薯纪

elite families appeared to occupy much of central Shaanxi along the Wei River.[254] The Zhou appear to have consolidated power by establishing the royal descendants and chiefs of allied clans as rulers in the newly conquered areas.[255]

At the Zhouyuan, the Zhou seem to have maintained some sort of religious-cum-residential centre here, quite distinct from their capital near Xi'an.[256] The architectural

---

年 quoted in Pei Yin's commentary to the *Shiji* 史记, a historical text complied in the first century BC, that the interval between the Zhou conquest and the reign of King You 幽王 was 257 years. While some scholars have adopted the date 1027, others have proposed more than a dozen "new" dates. In the West, the date of 1045 BC, based on textual and astronomical evidence, has won stronger support. See Shaughnessy 1991: 217-236.

[254] As Rawson (1999: 377) notes, similarities of vessels in ceramic and bronze, and weaponry suggest that the Zhou spread out and established centers near Houma, Luoyang (the secondary Zhou capital), and Xunxian (Henan province).

[255] Li Feng 2000; 2003. The system the Zhou used to maintain control over the vast area under their rule would come to be referred to as "Fengjian" 封建. This term is often translated as "Feudalism"; see Creel 1970: 322-323; Hsu and Linduff 1986: 150-151. However, as Li Feng has argued, it possible that the term was a Warring States creation used to describe an earlier institution. Shaughnessy (1999: 311) has suggested that we should avoid the term "feudalism" and instead use "colonization" for the Zhou institution. Li Feng (2003) has also argued that Feudalism is the wrong term here, and should be used only to describe the institution of Medieval Europe. Writers on European feudalism indicate that the system was a "new" and separate institution that was overlain onto the existing structure of administration, when the kings and their subordinates decided to enter the relation of vassalage on a contractual term. See Ganshof 1961: 51-52. By contrast, the regional Zhou states were essentially governmental organs that were born from the "Fengjian" system. The fundamental difference, according to Li Feng, is that while a European fief was granted as the means to maintain personal engagement between the lord and the vassal, a Western Zhou state was established as means to rule a certain population in a certain territory. A vassal in Europe had the right to bring his lord to court and terminate their vassalage provided the lord failed to fulfill his obligation. Under the "Fengjian" system, there was never an equal relationship between the Zhou king and the ruler of a regional state. Perhaps more importantly, a Zhou state constituted a small but complete government with a fair degree of autonomy. It had the combined rights of administration, justice and military power, and it was normally passed along a single bloodline. By giving out the vast eastern territories under the authority of the regional lords, the Zhou king renounced his own administrative right to these territories (Li Feng 2003). The ability to command the regional lords ultimately varied from king to king. Perhaps it was the inherent instability in this system that depended on the strength of the king that was one reason for the Zhou's decline.

[256] In 2004, archaeologists working at Qishan, Zhougongmiao 周公庙 discovered a possible royal centre with associated remains of temple-palace structures. The Zhougongmiao site is located about 25 km west of Zhuangbai 庄白, which is located in the Zhouyuan. At Zhougongmiao, archaeologists have found over 500 inscribed oracle bones, rammed-earth walls, bronze foundries and more than six rammed earth architectural foundations. Between 2005 and 2006, around 900 graves within five cemeteries were excavated. The Lingpo 陵破cemetery area has been interpreted as housing the elites as 10 four ramped tombs, 4 two ramped tombs and 4 single-ramped tombs were discovered, with the cemetery area possibly enclosed by a large stamped-earth wall. The tombs have not been reported in much detail, and only one of these large ramped tombs, M18, is very briefly discussed in the report. Tomb M18 is a vertical shaft pit with four sloping entrance ramps, the north and south ramps measure 17 meters each in length, while the west ramp measures 12.4 meters in length and the east ramp measures 7 meters in length. The tomb was about 10 meters deep. Most of the ramped tombs appear to have been looted. The tombs are discussed in Shanxi Sheng Kaogu Yanjiuyuan Shang Zhou Yanjiubu 2008. Some archaeologists (Zuo Heng 2008) have assigned this site to the Duke of Zhou and his descendants, while others have suggested that the tombs could house the Zhou kings. However,

complexes on the Plain of Zhou probably served as the metropolitan residences of major lineages and as their ancestral temples (figure 3.2).[257]

As various scholars, such as Rawson and Bagley, have pointed out before, it is quite likely that the Zhou adopted many Late Shang features, appropriating them for their own political and social purposes.[258] Rawson has argued that the Zhou sought to portray themselves as the true heirs of the Shang who had themselves lost their way.[259] The extent to which the Zhou adopted Shang burial features, and burial assemblage patterns, is largely unknown given that the origins of the Zhou remain unclear. In any case, by the time of the conquest of the Shang, the Zhou were interring people in vertical shaft pit tombs, with features such as wooden coffins, chambers, ramps, *er ceng tai* and burial assemblages which are rather similar to those of the Late Shang.[260]

This chapter will explore burial deposits in two centrally located Zhou sites: the Xing lineage situated at Zhangjiapo (where tombs date to mostly the Early and Middle Western Zhou period) and the Guo state at located at Sanmenxia (where tombs date from the Late Western Zhou period onwards). Three points should be noted before I begin this discussion: first, the tombs at the site of Zhangjiapo were looted heavily, and, therefore, only reveal limited information regarding the structure of Xing burial assemblages. Thus, this study will primarily draw on the tombs from the Guo state, most of which were not looted, and make limited use of the Xing tombs.

Second, it is necessary to briefly define what I mean by "centrally located". In Rawson's recent study of the influence of the Northern Zone on Zhou material culture and society, she suggests that the area around the Zhouyuan, including the area of

---

this view is contested by Shim (2008) who notes that the Zhougongmiao tombs are smaller than the royal tombs belonging to the Shang kings at Xibeigang, Anyang. Moreover, four-ramped tombs have also been found at other Zhou sites, such as Liulihe which housed the Yan state, which is considered in this chapter. Zhang Zhongpei has also been more cautious in assigning the tombs to the Zhou royal family.

[257]Partial information has been published on three such complexes, at Shaochen 召陈 and Yuntang in Fufeng County and at Fengchu 凤雏 in Qishan County. On Fengchu, see Shaanxi Zhouyuan Kaogudui 陕西周原考古队 1979; on Shaochen, see Shaanxi Zhouyuan Kaogudui 1981; on Yuntang, see Zhouyuan Kaogudui 2002.

[258] Rawson 1988, 1999; Bagley 1999.

[259] Rawson 1988.

[260] The early Zhou tombs at the site of Gaojiabao exhibit many Shang burial features.

Zhangjiapo located nearby, and the Sanmenxia area in Henan, might be seen as central, with surrounding states and areas more peripheral or on the edge of the Zhou sphere. Li Feng's detailed study of bronze inscriptions and the political structure of the Western Zhou has also highlighted the importance of central and peripheral states in the Zhou.[261] My division of the states into central (this chapter) and peripheral (the next chapter) broadly follows Rawson's and Hayashi Minao's works.

Third, this chapter and the following chapter discuss tombs, and by extension ritual vessels, which cover most of the Zhou period. As such, I need to briefly outline arguably one of the defining moments of the Zhou period, the Ritual Reform, which took place around the Late Western Zhou period.

The Ritual Reform was first identified by Rawson.[262] Rawson notes that around 850 BC most of the Shang wine vessels (*gu*, *jue*, *jia*, *fangyi*) common in Zhou sets had declined in use and, by this date, had virtually disappeared. The wine vessels which had been popular with the Zhou in the early period (the *you* and *zun*) were changed radically to make various wine flasks, principally the *hu*.

The role of *ding* and *gui* food vessels also changed. Prior to this change, as discussed in the previous chapter, food containers were of different shapes, sizes and decoration. However, *ding* and *gui* vessels now became identical, with extensive repetition of shapes and inscriptions.[263] Indeed, Late Western Zhou and Early Eastern

---

[261] Li Feng 2000: 156-189.
[262] Rawson 1988, 1999.
[263] See Falkenhausen (1999) has suggested that the "abstract" decoration or motifs on the outside of vessels was still derived from zoomorphic imagery seen on Early and Middle Zhou bronze vessels. Falkenahausen notes that the horizontal scale pattern seen on many Late Western Zhou vessels derives from the feather patterns on the bird ornaments ubiquitous on Middle Western Zhou vessels; the Late Western Zhou wave-pattern comes of the earlier mask motif, etc. Falkenhausen goes on to state "the notion that bronzes should properly be decorated with animal motifs thus survived into Late Western Zhou" (1999: 158). Falkenhausen (1999: 159) states that "overall, Late Western Zhou aesthetics changed to pure ornament through patternisation and geometricisation by reducing formerly self-contained surface decoration motifs (masks and animal-bodies in profile)." This new attitude to decoration may have had an ideological connotation. Chang (1983) and Falkenhausen (1999: 159; 2006: 48-49) suggest that animals in bronze decoration were spiritual helpers or companions of shaman-priests in their quest for communion with the spirits. Sarah Allen (1998) and Yan Sun (2002) see different motifs as reflecting myths, spirits, etc. Equally, Max Loehr (1968: 11-14), and later Robert Bagley (1987: 49-50; 1998) have suggested that such motifs were without meaning and ultimately served to mark the vessels as impressive ritual objects. The scholars that see iconography as having

Zhou bronze assemblages were now centered on matching sets of *ding* and *gui*. Another concomitant change is that vessels that had been made of ceramic or bamboo, such as the *li*, *dou* and *xu*, were now cast in bronze, and bronze bell sets became standard.[264]

Furthermore, another important development in the Ritual Reform was the institution of standard sets of vessels that correlated with elite rank according to sumptuary rules.[265] This change is particularly significant because it is arguably the first time in Chinese prehistory where bronze vessel provision was correlated with the owner's social position through actual sumptuary rules.[266]

Generally, Rawson notes that the strong, simple shapes and surface decoration on the *ding* and *gui* after the Ritual Reform, repeated many times, may well have been intended to convey the importance of their owners.[267] Falkehausen also argues that the simplified decoration was intended to enhance the shape of the vessel.[268] The importance of the tomb occupant seems to have been conveyed through the number of

---

"meaning" ultimately rely on ethnographic analogies, and a structuralist approach by comparing motifs to "language" or words that can be "read" (see Allen 1998, Yan sun 2002). Allen (1998: 9) who bases her study on the works of Malinowski and Levi-Strauss, states, "They [bronze vessels] were decorated in a sacred language". If so, then we may ask the following questions: who would have understood this language? Would all those who saw an image share the same understanding of it? Was the "meaning", attributed to a motif by Allen, the intention of the patron? Was meaning homogenous? Did the Late Shang share the same understanding of an image as the Early Zhou? If it is argued that images are akin to language, then such questions need to be addressed.

[264] Rawson has suggested that casting the *li*, *xu* and *dou* in bronze could be related to a desire to reinforce the bronze ritual set with vessels that had a long history, especially among the Zhou, but a history that was outside the range of the earlier use of bronze. See Rawson 1999: 436. The source of some shapes in materials other than bronze is discussed in Rawson (1990), *Western Zhou Ritual Bronzes from the Arthur M Sackler Collection*, vol 1: 105-112.

[265] Chinese archaeologists often draw distinctions of rank among Zhou tombs based on the number of *ding* vessels inteered therein. See Guo Baojun. 1959. *Shanbiaozhen yu Liulige*. pp. 11-13. Shi Ming. 1974. Xi Zhou Chunqiu shidai lizhi de yanbian he Kong Qiu 'keji fuli' de fandong shizhi. *Kaogu* 2: 81-88; Du Naisong. 1976. Cong lieding zhidu kan keji fuli de fandongxing. *Kaogu* 1: 17-21; Wang Shimin. 1986. Guanya Xi Zhou Chunqiu gaoji guizu liqi zhidu de yixie kanfa. *Wenwu yu kaogu lunji*. pp. 168-166; Wang Fei. 1986. Yongding zhidu xingshuai yiyi. *Wenbo* 6: 29-33; Li Ling. 1990. On the typology of Chu Bronzes. *Beitrage zur Allgemeinen und Vergleichenden Archaologie* 11: 57-113; Lin Yun 1990. Zhou dai yongding zhidu shangque. *Shixue jikan* 3: 12-23. For work by western scholars, see Falkenhausen 2006. *Chinese society in the age of Confucius*. pp. 52-53.

[266] Falkenhausen (2006: 56) notes that some Chinese scholars have tried to construct a sumptuary system involving *ding* vessels for before the Late Western Zhou period. He argues, however, that there is little evidence for a system of this sort in the Early and Middle Zhou period.

[267] Rawson 1999: 435; Falkehausen 1993: 167.

[268] Falkenhausen 2006: 56.

ding vessels that he or she was interred with. And, the simple decoration and repetition seemed to enforce this idea.

Therefore, the ritual changes around 850 BC mark a crucial point in the Western Zhou for ritual activity and practice, bronze ritual vessels, and the peoples of the Zhou.[269] Within this chapter, the tombs of Sanmenxia postdate the Ritual Reform, and, therefore, the ritual vessels sets follow the types outlined above. Indeed, as I will discuss below, the number of *ding* vessels in Guo tombs appears to have some sort of importance in relation to the deceased rank.

The Xing lineage at Zhangjiapo (1045-770 BC)

The cemetery site of Zhangjiapo 张家坡 is located in Chang'an county, Shaanxi Province.[270] In the 1980's, the Fengxi Archaeological Team and the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences uncovered around 390 graves at the site. Unfortunately, most of the tombs were heavily looted, but based on the remaining bronze vessels bearing inscriptions the excavators determined that the site belonged to the Xing 井lineage.[271]

---

[269] There are two interesting hypotheses explaining the ritual reform. Falkenhausen suggests that the Ritual Reform was about shoring up the Zhou hierarchy at a time when the Zhou appear to have been under political pressure and faced signs of weakness. Indeed he also sees the Ritual Reform as the reorganization of the elites. By contrast, Rawson (2010) argues that contacts with the peoples along the borderlands saw the introduction of a range of new features. Rawson states (2010: 45) "concurrently, the court and its ritual specialists specified the core range of vessels acceptable for the ritual set, which is termed the Ritual Reform, making use of some of the new types and designs and disregarding others. In addition, further innovations were made possible within a clear framework, although the Reformed vessel set remained the standard assemblage." Essentially, Rawson views pressures and influences from the borderlands as a major driving force for the Ritual Reform.

[270] The excavation report for cemetery site of Zhangjiapo is Zhonggou shehui kexueyuan kaogu yanjiusuo. . 中国社会科学院考古研究所 1999. *Zhangjiapo Xizhou mudi.* Beijing.

[271] The Xing/Jing lineage appear to have derived from a member of the royal family. The lineage seems to have been most prosperous during the Middle Western Zhou but declined during the Late Western Zhou. According to Li Feng (2000) the family line of Xing can be traced back to an ancestor named Muggong 公who was active during the reign of King Mu, appearing in the Yinji *ding* 尹姞鼎and Li *fangzun* 方尊. After Muggong, the family was divided between Xingbo 井伯 and Xingshu 井叔, the sons of Muggong, and was mostly prosperous during the Middle Western Zhou. The Xingshu branch was thereafter divided into at least two sub-branches: the Zheng Xingshu 郑井叔and Feng Xingshu 丰井叔, respectively holding residences at Zheng and at the capital Feng, where burials of three generations of Xingshu were excavated as discussed above. See. *Kaogu* 1986.1: 22-27. See also Zhu Fenghan 1990: 368-369. Inscriptional evidence suggests that the Xing family began to decline from the Late Western Zhou, when other families occupied some blocks of formerly Xing land.

The archaeological teams did not ascertain the boundaries of the Zhangjiapo cemetery site. Thus, we do not know the full extent of the site. It is also difficult to deduce how the cemetery site was organised. There were four large ramped tombs constructed in a single line running east-west. Interspersed with these large ramped tombs were smaller graves, some of which cut into the ramps of the larger tombs. Based on the extent of the cemetery uncovered to date, the ramped tombs were located in the south with hundreds of single tombs to the north. However, this layout may be misleading, as further spreads of tombs may have been located south of the ramped tombs.

The large ramped tombs are said to have housed successive Xing lineage leaders.[272] Bronze inscriptions from these graves, and their accompanying tombs, indicate that tomb M157, located to the west, is the burial of Xingshu Shucai; tomb M152, located in the middle, is the burial of Xingshu Da, and tomb M170, located in the east, is the burial of an anonymous Xingshu. According to the excavation report, the chronological sequence of these tombs is M157-M152-M170.[273] Tomb M163, located near M170, housed a young female who, according to Lu Liancheng, was the spouse of the Xingshu buried in tomb M170.[274]

The fact that large ramped tombs were constructed alongside smaller graves, with additional smaller graves placed around these large tombs later on, may attest to ideas of lineage solidarity rather than an emphasis on rank differences between members of the lineage.[275]

From the 390 tombs uncovered at the site, around 57 were biologically sexed and aged. The excavation report provides little information on how these tomb occupants were sexed, and one can only suppose that sex was determined by skeletal testing, as

---

[272] Zhonggou shehui kexueyuan kaogu yanjiusuo. 1999.
[273] See *Kaogu* 1986.1: 11, 22-27; *Kaogu* 1990.1: 504-510. It should also be noted that an alternative sequence has been proposed by Lu Liancheng who thinks that tomb M152 is the earliest followed by tombs M170 and M157. See Lu Liancheng 1995.
[274] See Lu Liancheng 1995: 3.
[275] Falkenhausen 2006: 36.

many of these tombs did not yield significant quantities of bronze vessels bearing inscriptions.

The cemetery site was divided into five phases based on ceramic seriation and tombs cutting into other tombs.[276] Falkenhausen has equated the five phases of the site with the following date ranges:

Phases	Approximate dates
Phase I	1050-1000 BC
Phase II	1000-920 BC
Phase III	920-870 BC
Phase IV	870-828 BC
Phase V	827-771 BC

Table 3.1: The Chronology of Zhangjiapo

The bulk of the Xing tombs appear to date to from around Early and to the Middle Western Zhou, thus the graves are pre-Ritual Reform in date.[277] This observation ties in with Li Feng's more textual analysis of this period. Li Feng observes that the Xing lineage was its height around the Middle Western Zhou period and subsequently declined in the later period.[278]

The Guo state at Sanmexia (850/800-655 BC)

In the Late Western Zhou, the Guo state was located near Sanmenxia, Henan Province.[279] The cemetery site of the Guo is located on a gradual slope named Shangcunling at the northern edge of present-day Sanmenxia City, on the south bank of the Yellow River. In 1957, the archaeological team of the Yellow River reservoir

[276] See Zhangjiapo xizhou mudi 1999: 339-369. The excavation team noted that the *dou* ceramic vessel gradually became shorter, with the stem becoming narrower and the mouth much wider by phases III and IV, compared to the taller and narrow-mouthed *dou* in phases I and II. The *guan* also, over time, became shorter with a wider body. For pictures of these changes and more detail, see Zhangjiapo xizhou mudi 1999: 355-358.
[277] Zhangjiapo xizhou mudi 1999: 371.
[278] Li Feng 2000: 56.
[279] Li Feng has suggested that the Guo migrated from Shaanxi area to Henan. Falkenhausen (2006: 92) notes that unlike the Jin state, located in Shanxi, the Guo lineage heads did not rule over a border polity as marquises (*hou*), rather, the Guo possessed territories in the central part of the Zhou realm.

excavated 234 tombs at the cemetery site.[280] From these tombs, 38 of them yielded bronze ritual vessels. As a consequence of looting, the Institute of Archaeology and The Archaeological Team of Sanmenxia excavated additional tombs from the northern section of the site between 1990 and 1991. Twelve of these tombs have been published in two-volume report, while another report on seven additional tombs is in progress. Additional tombs, which were not part of the two-volume report, have been published sporadically in archaeological journals.[281]

The Institute of Archaeology and The Archaeological Team of Sanmenxia divided the cemetery site into a northern sector and a southern sector (figure 3.3).[282] The northern sector is said to have belonged to the Guo kings or lineage heads and other high-ranking individuals, while the southern sector housed tombs of lower ranks.[283] However, this division into a northern and southern sector appears to be inaccurate.

---

[280] The excavation report is Lin Shoujin. 1959. Shangcunling Guo guo mudi: Huanghe shuikubaogao zhi san. Kexue Chubanshe, Beijing. See also Lin Shoujin. 1978. Shangcunlin fajue de xueshu gongxian. Xianggang Zhongwen Daxue Zhongguo Wenhua Yanjiusuo xuebao 9: 1-15; Lin Shoujin.1991. Xian Qin kaoguxue.. pp. 23-57. For other work on this material, see Wang Shimin. 1984. Xin Zhongguo de kaogu faxian he yanjiu, pp. 285; Li Xueqin, Eastern Zhou and Qin civilizations, pp. 80-84.

[281] The most recent report is Henan Sheng wenwu yanjiusuo and Sanmenxia shi wenwu gong zuodui. 1999. *Sanmenxia guo guo mudi*. 1999. Wenwu chubanshe. Beijing. This report is volume one and deals with 8 tombs. A second volume, dealing with another 10 tombs from the northern part of the site is awaiting publication. Two tombs from the northern part of the cemetery, not in the 1999 report, are reported in *Henan Sheng Wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo and Sanmenxia shi wenwi gong zuodui* 2000.12; 2006.4.

[282] This division appears to be based on differences in the number of *ding* vessels each tomb contained and possible royal titles, as seen on bronze ritual vessels, attributed to specific tomb occupants. The following table tabulates these titles in relation to the tomb occupants:

Tomb	Rank based on inscriptions
M2009	King Guo Zhong
M2001	King Guo Ji
M2011	Crown Prince
M1052	Yuan, The Crown Prince
M2012	Liang Ji - Consort to King Guo Ji
M2010	Ranking official
M2013	Chou Jiang - wife to a nobleman
M2006	Meng Ji, Noblewoman

[283] The excavators also suggest that the cemetery site measured 590 meters from north to south and 550 meters from east to west, occupying an area of 32.45 square meters (Henan Sheng Wenwu Kaogu Yanjiusuo and Sanmenxia Shi Wenwu Gongzuodui 1999: 54). However, the excavators may be too presumptuous in outlining the overall size of the cemetery site, as it remains unclear whether further tombs exist beyond the excavated area. Falkenhausen (2006) has also questioned whether the boundaries set out by the report are correct and whether all the

Based on the limited archaeological work conducted in the Northern sector of the cemetery site, we can see that this area not only yielded the tombs of Guo kings, but also other non-royal tombs. Thus, based on current evidence, in the northern sector the tombs of the kings, consorts and princes were interspersed with the tombs of lower ranking Guo elites. Moreover, as Falkenhausen has noted, this area has not yet been fully excavated and, therefore, we only have partial information about this area of the site.

A similar pattern to that in the Northern sector is seen in the southern parts of the cemetery site. Falkenhausen has noted how, in the layout of the area of the cemetery excavated in the 1950's, paired large tombs form a north-south row at the centre, with small tombs clustered around them in more or less orderly rows.[284] Thus, the large tombs may belong to heads of a branch of the Guo lineage, with surrounding tombs belonging to lower-ranking relatives.

The western part of the southern sector excavated in the 1950's contained two tombs, both of which had accompanying chariot pits located adjacent to the tomb. One of these tombs was interpreted as housing a crown prince.[285] These two tombs appear to have been located away from the four main clusters in the south, and outside of the northern area excavated in the 1990's. If the northern sector were reserved for high-ranking individuals only, then one needs to account for the elite tombs located to the south of the Northern Sector. Moreover, it is unclear how these two tombs relate to the larger clusters of tombs located nearby.

Overall, the patterns of tombs at Sanmenxia suggest that the site was not divided into distinct zones depending on social class, but rather, the tombs appeared to form clusters encompassing graves of differing sizes and degrees of wealth centered on paired tombs of possible lineage founders. Even the limited excavations in the Northern sector

---

tombs within the area explored in the 1990's have been recorded. Indeed, the sporadic publishing of additional tombs in archaeological reports since the 1999 report may suggest that not all the tombs in the northern area have been recorded or published yet.

[284] Falkenhausen 2006: 54.

[285] Tomb M1052. See Lin Shoujin. 1959: 56. The title of the tomb occupant was based on inscriptions from bronze ritual vessels interred in the tomb.

show the tombs of king and consorts surrounded by lower ranking elite (and perhaps even non-elite) tombs.

The four-paired tombs appear to have been constructed in a sequence. Each set of paired tombs alongside other smaller tombs clustered around them appears to have represented one generation.[286] As such, based on current evidence, we see four generations buried at Sanmenxia.

The four-paired tombs also contained bronze ritual vessels. Within each of the four clusters in the southern sector of the cemetery site we see an unequal number and distribution of tombs with bronze vessels within each clusters of graves. While some of these tombs with vessels are dispersed, others appear to form somewhat distinct groupings within each cluster. Nonetheless, within each cluster of tombs, we see tombs with vastly different quantities and types of grave goods.

Chronology

The bronze ritual vessels unearthed from the Guo tombs at Sanmenxia suggest that the tombs date from around the Late Western Zhou/Early Eastern Zhou.[287] The vessels themselves follow the sets of uniform *ding* and *gui* as instituted by the Ritual Reform, discussed above. It is also generally noted that the conquest of the Guo by the Jin in 655 BC provides a *terminus ante quem*.[288] Thus, the tombs at Sanmenxia span a time period of around 150 years.

The internal chronology of the Guo tombs is more difficult to reconstruct.[289] Li Feng proposed the first periodisation of the tombs at Sanmenxia based on bronze ritual vessels in 1988.[290] Li Feng's periodisation encompassed three periods. Period I included bronze ritual vessels that tend to be upright and heavy, with their decoration executed in a "clear and delicate fashion". The *ding* and *gui* food pieces have deep bellies and the *hu*

[286] Falkenhausen 2006: 96-97.
[287] Lin Shoujin 1961; Li Feng 1988; Li Jiuchang 2003.
[288] Falkenhausen 2006: 45.
[289] Both excavations reports on the Guo tombs fail to provide any information or criteria on internal chronology.
[290] Li Feng 1988.11, 2000: 78-88.

has a slim body and long neck. Period II includes bronze vessels that, according to Li Feng, have new features, which were intensified in Period III.

In spite of Li Feng's periodisation of the bronze vessels from select tombs at Shangcunling, a large number of graves have not been assigned phases. Without viewing the original bronze vessels, it is somewhat difficult to apply Li Feng's dating criteria to tombs based solely on limited pictures from excavation reports. Nonetheless, this chapter will adopt Li Feng's periodisation of the few dated tombs at the site, although in reality, assessing continuity at the site is particularly difficult.

The overall chronological span of both the tombs at Zhangjiapo and Shangcunling allows us to investigate how different identities were constructed at burial over a period of some 400 years in two centrally located Zhou cemetery sites, albeit in different geographical locations from each other. Given the skewed nature of the archaeological evidence, however, the primary emphases will be on the Guo state.

BURIAL STRUCTURE AND TOMB FEATURES

Looking at burial structure and mortuary features at both sites can best open an investigation into burials. As noted above, paired burials acted as possible foci at Sanmenxia. Based on current excavations, only four pairs of these graves have been uncovered, and coupled with the fact that they yielded bronze ritual vessels, we might suggest that such burials contained privileged tomb occupants. In any case, clearly the location of the tomb within the cemetery site and whether it was a joint burial or not were important features of the grave and may have indicated the deceased genealogical position in some way.[291]

The standard tomb type found across Zhangjiapo and Sanmenxia was the vertical shaft pit. At the bottom of the pit, the deceased was usually buried in a supine position, interred in either one of two wooden inner coffins. In some cases, the inner coffin(s) were located inside a larger, outer wooden burial chamber. Some tombs also

[291] Falkenhausen 2006: 67.

had a stamped earth platform which ran around the sides of the tomb known as an *er ceng tai*.

At Sanmenxia, of the 234 tombs excavated, 59.4 % have a burial chamber.[292] All of the 38 bronze-yielding tombs without exception had burial chambers, demonstrating a clear connection between chambers and vessels. However, it should also be noted that not all the tombs with wooden coffins had burial chambers, an important point that I will return to later. At Zhangjiapo, of the 398 tombs, 258 of them, or around 64%, have a burial chamber.

Bronze ritual vessels are found only in tombs with wooden chambers, and both Poo and Falkenhausen surmise that this tomb furniture denoted the tomb occupant as being a member of the ranked elite.[293] The correlation between wooden chambers and bronze ritual vessels is seen throughout the 150 years of the Sanmenxia site. And, as I will discuss below, the association between vessels and wooden chambers was reinforced through the constant repetition of depositing bronze vessels in such tombs.

Moving on to the number of coffins, at Sanmenxia, of the 234 tombs with burial chambers, 208 contained single coffins and 26 contained nested coffins. Of the 95 tombs lacking a burial chamber, 89 had a single coffin and 6 have neither a burial chamber nor a coffin. Furthermore, among the 38 tombs that yielded bronze ritual vessels, 19 yielded double coffins and 11 contained single coffins. At Zhangjiapo, from 258 tombs, only 36 of them had double coffins, while 5 tombs had double coffins without a burial chamber. The rest of the tombs had single coffins.

It is near impossible to deduce the significance of coffin numbers at both sites in terms of social identity. All we can say, thus, is that in constructing an image of the deceased, the living could choose from no coffin, a single coffin, or a double coffin burial. And, wooden coffins and chambers appear to have been constituent elements

---

[292] Among the 38 male and female tombs with bronze ritual vessels, chamber sizes ranged from 5 meters in length down to 2.5 meters in length. There seems to be no obvious discernable hierarchy from chamber and coffins sizes, with some rich male and female tombs containing smaller chamber and coffin sizes than poorer tombs.
[293] Poo 1990; Falkenhausen 1999, 2006.

within these burials. Therefore, such tomb furniture may have been essential for (re)creating a notion of what constituted a Xing or Guo burial. And, the continual deployment of this tomb furniture ensured a coherent burial structure, which can be seen for some 400 years across both sites.

Only the four male tombs of the supposed Xing lineage heads were buried with tomb entrance ramps. As in the Late Shang, tomb entrance ramps, usually south-facing, ran from ground surface to the top of the wooden burial chamber. These entrance ramps might extend anywhere between 5 and 11 meters in length. However, while the Xing lineage leader tombs had entrance ramps, the tombs of the Guo kings were vertical shaft pits only with the usual wooden burial furniture. In this case, ramps clearly had differed significance for the Guo and Xing states. Moreover, the difference between the Xing and Guo tomb lies not just in that the former had entrance ramps and the latter did not, but in the difference within the role of entrance ramps in mortuary performances.

This role can be gauged somewhat from the burial goods found on Xing entrance ramps. Entrance ramps on the Zhangjiapo tombs appeared to act as foci for the display and eventual burial of chariots. Bronze chariot pieces were also deposited with the chariot itself. The ramp may have also been used to facilitate the movement of the deceased into the tomb along with the burial goods.[294] Separate horse pits were located next to the ramped tombs. It is clear that the burials of the Xing lineage heads must have been spectaculars and protracted event, incorporating a variety of stages within the performance.

All in all, we might say that ramps appear to have been more important at Zhangjapo than at Sanmenxia for creating the image of a, presumably, lineage leader. The variation in the number of ramps on the four Zhangjiapo tombs implies that they were subject to change, although the reasons are unclear. Nonetheless, the use of either one or two tomb ramps for successive Xing lineage heads implies that a certain tomb

[294] See *Zhongyuan wenwu* 2009.2: 45-51.

feature was integral to (re)producing the notion of what constituted a certain type of person at burial.

BURIAL SPACE

The next key point to consider is how these various compositions of burial goods relating to the tomb occupant's identity were laid out in the tomb in relation to the deceased. In other words, how did burial space facilitate the reproduction and citation of identities and how did was used within the performance of burials?

Based on the Xing and Guo tombs with bronze vessel assemblages, a structured division of burial space can be seen that changed very little over time and varied little between cemetery sites. We might posit four zones in Guo tombs, similar to Late Shang tombs discussed in the previous chapter.[295] Zone I was the area inside the inner coffin. Zone II was the space between the first and second inner coffin (if the second one was present), zone III was the space between the inner coffin (s) and the wooden burial chamber. Zone IV might include the fill of the tomb and the area immediately around the grave. At Shangcunling, chariot and horse pits were positioned within close proximity to the grave. In the case of a select few tombs at Zhangjiapo, zone IV might also comprise tomb entrance ramps, some of which yielded vast numbers of chariots and horses.

Inside the inner coffin (zone I) the deceased was sometimes adorned with bead and jade body sets, alongside with a variety of jade and stone objects. Very rarely were objects placed in the space between the two inner coffins. In the space between the second inner coffin (or the one inner coffin in tombs with only one coffin) and the wooden burial chamber (zone II) we find the vast majority of bronze items, such as ritual vessels, tools, chariot and horse fittings and weapons. Few objects appear to have been placed on the *er ceng tai*. In some of the richer tombs, a few objects were

[295] The idea of zones was inspired by Campbell's study of Shang tombs, as outlined in the previous chapter.

sometimes placed in the fill of the tomb, such as bronze bells or bone pieces. The implication here is that people were depositing objects in the grave as it was being filled in.

Thus, the location of jade and stone items forms an interesting contrast to the location of other grave goods, particularly bronze objects. Indeed based on the division of space set out above, we appear to have two distinct areas of activity and display within the grave: the inner coffin and the space between the inner coffin(s) and the wooden burial chamber. In the inner coffin we see the decoration of the deceased, while in the chamber we see the deposition of various bronze grave goods.

The bronze items and the space in between the inner coffin and wooden burial chamber, therefore, were integral to the creation of identities in these Zhou tombs. It was in this space that various objects were placed around the deceased who was interred in the inner coffin. However, it is unlikely that the deceased was on view when objects were interred in the grave. Tomb M2011, for instance, had several stone halberds placed on the lid of the inner coffin, while tomb M2001 had a variety of jade objects placed on the inner coffin lid.[296] Therefore, the sealing of the inner coffin must have taken place prior to the internment of bronze items in the tomb. Thus, it is likely that bronze items were deposited in the chamber with the inner coffins closed.

Nonetheless, the objects in this space made sense because they were relational to the deceased who was located in the centre of the grave. Moreover, it was also within this area where transactions between the living and the deceased took place through the deposition of objects. The various zones in Guo tombs appeared to help structure the burial and the interment of grave goods. And, it was in zone II where structured deposits of bronze items were placed that perpetuated and reinforced a certain type of identity for the deceased. In effect, not only did tomb space help structure the performance, but it also ensured the reproduction of a particular performance.

[296] Sheng wenwu yanjiusuo and Sanmenxia shi wenwu gong zuodui. 1999: 56-58.

Within the space between the inner coffin and wooden burial chamber in Guo tombs, bronze items do not appear to have been grouped according to categories or function. While in some tombs vessels were placed together alongside any wall of the chamber, in other graves vessels were separated and placed in different parts.[297] Other bronze items were also scattered around the chamber with no discernable pattern. What is particularly noticeable in the bronze vessel deposits of the Guo tombs, simply by virtue of these tombs yielding more objects than ceramic vessel tombs, is that most objects - though scattered around the tomb – were usually located around the walls of the burial chamber. Very few objects were placed near or around the inner coffin itself.

There are a few instances of seemingly more 'structured' depositions in tombs. In tomb M2010 at Shangcunling, we can broadly divide the grave goods into three distinct clusters.[298] Each cluster contained either one or two *ding* vessels, one or two *gui* vessels, chariot pieces and weapons, and chariot pieces, weapons and tools. The clusters within this tomb appear to have been structured and may attest to different groups of people placing objects in the tomb. Tomb M2011 also has two broad clusters of burial goods, although they are uneven and somewhat less defined, when compared with those from tomb M2010, in the size and types of pieces.[299]

There are also a few instances of variations in the use of space in some of the larger tombs at Zhangjiapo. Inside the grave pit of tombs M152 and M170, a square space was located adjacent to the inner coffins. This space measured around 1.5 meters long and 2-2.5 meters wide. Although the tomb was looted, we can see that some bronze items were placed in the space between the inner coffin and chamber, as discussed above, while others were possibly placed inside the *touxiang* 头厢. The items in this area include ritual vessels and chariot pieces, alongside ceramic vessels. The full extent of the types of objects interred in this area is unknown due to looting.

---

[297] See the plan of tomb M2013 in Sheng wenwu yanjiusuo and Sanmenxia shi wenwu gong zuodui 2007.
[298] See the plan of tomb M2010 in Henan Sheng wenwu yanjiusuo and Sanmenxia shi wenwu gong zuodui 2006.
[299] See Sheng wenwu yanjiusuo and Sanmenxia shi wenwu gong zuodui. 1999: 256.

Nonetheless, the *touxiang* 头厢 as a burial space is unique to tombs M152 and M170 at Zhangjiapo. The use of space in this tomb was not only different to others at the site and indeed at Sanmenxia, but it also suggests that people engaged with the deceased differently at burial. Was there, for instance, a difference between objects placed in the *touxiang* 头厢 and those placed in the space between the inner coffin and burial chamber? Could only select people place objects in this area? These types of questions in relation to the *touxiang* 头厢 have implications for how the identities of the deceased were recreated at burial and how these tombs differed from the usual tomb which did not have this space.

A further contrast between the use of space in Xing tombs vis-à-vis Guo tombs is related to the deposition of the chariot. In some tombs at Zhangjiapo, chariots were placed on top of the wooden burial chamber. The location of the chariot here suggests that the chamber was closed; thus, the deceased and the grave goods were hidden from view, with the image of the deceased fixed in the minds of the onlookers through burial goods and the chariot later deposited on the lid. In these tombs, the chariot would have provided the one of the final comments on the deceased.

By contrast, at Shangcunling, not one tomb contained a chariot placed on top of the burial chamber. Rather, such objects were usually placed in pits located within close proximity to the main tomb. We cannot be certain whether chariots were placed in pits before or after the funeral, nor comment on the general temporal link between burying the deceased and burying the chariot. Nonetheless, the different treatment of the chariot at burial attests to different ways of using space to make comments about the deceased.

In spite of these differences, which attest to instances of variations within the mortuary ritual between these two states, the division of space in graves remained the same over time. This space continued to act as the focus for remembrance of the tomb occupant buried with the different types of grave goods as set out above.

SETS OF BRONZE OBJECTS IN GUO TOMBS

Unfortunately, the looted tombs at Zhangjiapo tell us very little about the way that burial goods were put together and the frequency of the different combinations. We can say that, following Zhou burial assemblages generally, bronze ritual vessels were the major constituent element in tombs at Zhangjiapo and Sanmenxia. However, an important distinction between the vessels at these two sites needs to be outlined before I continue with this discussion.

As noted in chapter one, the bronze vessels changed dramatically after the Ritual Reform, with *ding* and *gui* food vessels cast in matching sets, with identical shapes and highly simplified decoration.[300] The wine vessels *jue, zhi, fangyi* and *gu* generally disappeared and in their place were taller wine *hu* wine flasks. The vessel sets at Sanmenxia follow the types instituted by the Ritual Reform (post 850 BC), while those at Zhangjiapo are pre-Reform types. Given that the intact tombs at Sanmenxia are more informative than the looted ones at Zhangjiapo, I will focus on the former graves for my analysis. To open this analysis I will briefly outline the bronze ritual vessels from Sanmenxia.

Guo tombs have been broadly divided into "ranks" based on the number of *ding* vessels interred therein. Indeed, Falkenhausen has comprehensively discussed the ritual vessel sets in Guo tombs.[301] He initially divided the Guo tombs into six ranks, with the highest-ranking *ding* privilege of nine, and the lowest ranking privilege of one.[302] He noted that one tomb contained nine *ding*; two tombs contained seven *ding*, four tombs contained five *ding*; four tombs contained three *ding*, five tombs contained two *ding* and 22 tombs contained a single *ding*.[303] Those tombs with other kinds of bronze ritual

---

[300] See Rawson 1990, vol. I: 111-13.
[301] It should be noted that Rawson has approached the ritual vessels in the Guo state from a different angle. Rawson suggests that the vessel sets at Sanmenxia contain few pieces which carry foreign influences, unlike those of the Jin state discussed in the next chapter. The Guo appear to have been more conservative than the Jin in the types of vessels in their sets.
[302] Falkenhausen 1999: 2006: 52-53.
[303] Two different general ranking systems are proposed by Yu Weichao and Gao Ming, and Li Xueqin based on later textual data. The reconstruction by Yu Weichao and Gao Ming put the correlates rank, social position and vessel privilege as follows: the king possessed nine *ding* and

vessels, but no *ding* vessels, were seemingly not included in this hierarchy. Based on the possibility that tomb M2009 contained seven *ding*, rather than nine *ding*, Falkenhausen later revised this ranking. Nonetheless, even with revisions, the approach and the results are still the same.[304]

Li Jinchang argued for a similar type of ranking system at Sanmenxia.[305] With the benefit of additional excavated tombs since Falkenhausen's analysis, and with further adjustments to this system of rank based on inscriptions supposedly denoting the deceased title, Li Jinchang set out six ranks based on *ding* provision. The first rank comprised the tombs with seven *ding*. These two tombs, according to Li Jinchang, were the Guo kings. The second rank also comprised two tombs with seven ding (M1052, M2011). The bronze vessels in these tombs carried inscriptions, which can be translated as "crown prince", and, therefore, in spite of similar *ding* privileges to tombs M2001 and M2009, Li Jinchang posited that tombs M2011 and M1052 formed a lower, separate rank. The third rank comprised four tombs with 5 *ding* and the fourth rank encompassed four tombs with three *ding*. The fifth rank included 20 tombs with two and one *ding*, while the sixth rank comprised the 200 or so tombs without bronze ritual vessels. These tombs yielded mostly ceramic vessels and stone objects. Thus, for Li, the tombs with ceramic assemblages formed one homogenous rank.

The number of *ding* vessels clearly has some sort of significance in Guo tombs. The four tombs that contained seven *ding*, appear to comprise members of the royal family, though the king and the princes were not differentiated through the number of *ding* that their tombs contained. Moreover, through the number of *ding* vessels in each tomb, one is able to construct broad divisions of tomb occupants, which may have been

---

eight *gui*, rulers of subordinate polities possessed seven *ding* and six *gui*, ministers possessed five *ding* and four *gui*, lower magnates possessed three *ding* and two *gui*, and gentlemen possessed two *ding* and one *gui*. By contrast, the sumptuary distinctions set out by Li Xueqin reconstruct the privileges as follows: the king possessed twelve *ding* and ten *gui*, rulers of subordinate polities possessed nine *ding* and eight *gui*, ministers possessed seven *ding* and six *gui*, lower magnates possessed five *ding* and four *gui*, and gentlemen possessed either three or two *ding* and either two or one *gui*. See Yu Weichao and Gao Ming 1979; Li Xueqin 1985.

[304] Falkenhausen initially surmised that the tomb occupant interred with 7-*ding* was the lower-ranking brother in the family.

[305] *Wenwu* 2003.6.

one of the intentions of the Reform. Indeed, these broad divisions may have translated into some sort of expression of rank. As such, the number of vessels appears to have been important for expressing the deceased personal identity in some way.

The structure of Guo grave good sets

At Sanmenxia, approximately 57 tombs to date contained bronze ritual vessels and over 180 graves yielded ceramic vessels.[306] At Zhangjiapo, the number of tombs with these vessels is impossible to determine due to tomb looting. As noted previously, and discussed extensively by Falkenhausen,[307] the tombs with bronze vessels and other bronze items all contained wooden burial chambers. No tomb at the site yielded bronze objects without a wooden chamber. Both Poo and Falkenhausen suggest that wooden chambers demarcated the deceased as being a member of the ranked elites.[308] If so, then the provision of bronze objects in a tomb appears to have been contingent upon the tomb owner's membership of the ranked elites (though as also noted by Falkenhausen, not all tombs with wooden burial chambers yielded bronze objects).

By contrast, ceramic vessels (with no accompanying bronze vessels) were found in the tombs of the ranked elite and non-ranked elites (or in those graves with and without wooden burial chambers). As such, it is clear that the deposition of bronze objects in graves correlate with ranked elite status, but it does not follow that all members of the ranked elite were buried with such objects. Consequently, there is a clear difference between those ranked elites buried with bronze vessels, and the ranked and non-ranked elites buried with ceramic vessels.

---

[306] It should also be noted that several tombs also contained lead vessels (see table). These vessels, as Rawson has discussed, were primarily cast in the form of older Shang and Early Western Zhou vessels – pieces which had seemingly be made obsolete by the Ritual Reform. Rawson (2010) has suggested that these vessels served to illustrate the long-history, and thus pedigree, of the tomb occupant. Certainly, around the time of the Late Western Zhou, there seems to have been a renewed interest in older wine vessels no longer in use in contemporary vessel sets. In terms of this study, tombs that contained lead vessels, also yielded a set of bronze vessels, and, therefore, the former vessel types were not used to replace the latter in the grave. As such, as with other bronze objects, lead vessels were *added to* bronze vessels and not used to replace them.

[307] Falkenhausen 1999; 2001; 2006.

[308] Poo 1993; Falkenhausen 2001, 2006.

Guo tombs might be said to contain two very contrasting sets of grave goods that were built around bronze vessels and ceramic vessels respectively. Indeed, there is a sharp difference between those assemblages centered on bronze ritual vessels and ones formed around ceramic vessels. Tombs with bronze ritual vessels also contained additional bronze items such as bronze weapons, bronze tools, bronze chariot and horse fittings, and bronze bells (figure 3.4). Perhaps surprisingly, those elite and non-elites interred with ceramic vessels were buried with a much more limited repertoire of objects than those ranked elites buried with bronze ritual vessels. Within tombs with ceramic assemblages we see stone halberds and jade ear ornaments (*jue*) as the primary additional items. In very few of these tombs do we see bronze items of any type. The division can be broadly simplified as follows:

Bronze vessels, bronze weapons, bronze tools, chariot pieces, bronze bells, jade objects, stone objects.	Ceramic vessels, stone halberds, jade pieces.

Therefore, Guo tombs can be largely divided into two clear groups: graves with bronze items and graves without bronze items. The former group, based on the current statistical sample from Sanmenxia, was in the minority and restricted to tombs with wooden chambers.

Whether in bronze or ceramic, eating accoutrements were the constituent element within a Guo burial. And, if we suggest that bronze ritual vessels and ceramic vessels were the ubiquitous element in Guo tombs (as well as other Zhou tombs), an idea bolstered by the work of Falkenhausen and Li Jinchang as noted above, then the decision to inter certain other types of grave goods was built around these pieces. By this I mean that burial goods were *added to* the eating and drinking vessels in, as we shall see, a very structured way so as to create a formulaic and conventional set of objects.

The looted tombs at Zhangjiapo tell us little about identities at burial. As such, the most comprehensive data comes from the Guo tombs at Sanmenxia, and it is primarily these tombs that I will discuss. Based on the assemblages found in the 45

tombs with bronze ritual vessels at the site, we see structured and repetitive combinations of burial goods in different tombs over the course of the site. The following table tabulates the different burial combinations and their frequency at Sanmenxia:

Burial Assemblage	Number of Tombs
Bronze vessels	37+
Bronze vessels and chariot objects[309]	8+ ?
Bronze vessels + weapons + chariot objects	13
Bronze vessels + weapons + chariot objects + tools	3
Bronze vessels + weapons + chariot objects + tools + bells[310]	4

Table 3.2: Combinations of Bronze Grave Goods at Sanmenxia

The first thing to note is that there were four different types of burials formed around bronze items. By this I mean that based on the above table there appear to have been four distinct ways of combining bronze burial goods in tombs. In this sense, four different types of person were (re)created at burial. Furthermore, the different types of grave good combinations were not distributed equally across tombs. In fact, as more bronze items were added to the burial, so the identity became more restricted. For instance, 24 tombs contain a selection of bronze rituals only, while 13 graves yielded vessels, weapons and chariot and horse fittings. Only two tombs contained vessels, weapons, chariot fittings, tools and bells. In this sense, the seemingly restrictive nature of the these burial assemblages, and the repetition over time, might have reinforced the message that the deceased was a certain type of person.

Therefore, the structure of Guo grave assemblages indicates that their composition was by no means random, and that the various items that make up the

[309] As I will outline below, this set of bronze objects is found only in female tombs at the site.
[310] It should be noted that the tombs of the lineage heads / kings of the Guo state (M2001 and M2009) were primarily differentiated from the tombs of the princes (M1052 and M2011) through elaborate bead and jade body sets and a jade face covering. All four tombs, however, contained similar categories of bronze objects.

repertoire were not chosen amongst each other equally (and tombs, as I will discuss below, yielded different quantities of these bronze burial goods). In this sense, tombs could be differentiated from each other based on the presence or absence of certain object types.

Moreover, the burial goods were clearly put together in tombs according to specific combinations. For instance, no tomb contained bronze ritual vessels and a selection of bronze tools without any other bronze pieces. No tomb at the site contained chariot pieces and bronze tools without the inclusion of bronze weapons in the tomb, and no tomb contained vessels and bells without weapons, tools, or chariot pieces.

In fact, Guo burial assemblages appear to be rigidly structured in the way that bronze pieces were combined. Every grave containing bronze items yielded bronze vessels. Some graves have vessels only, while the next type of assemblage encompasses vessels, chariot pieces and weapons. To the next, we add another category of objects, tools. Lastly, bells are the final category of objects that can be added to the entire assemblage.[311] Therefore, from table 3.2, it would seem that there is a distinct sequence in which objects occur within assemblages.

Moreover, objects within these tombs seem to follow a graded "hierarchy" – certain objects cannot appear within an assemblage if others are not present. This implies that we can categorise each type of assemblage by the last object in the hierarchy that was added to the assemblage – for instance, a tomb might contain, vessels, chariots fittings and weapons, while another grave might yield vessels, chariot fittings, weapons and tool. Thus, the latter burial would be primarily identified by the last object, tools, which were added to the sequence and differentiated the grave.

The continuity of these very structured burials was an integral part of the coherence of identities. By repeating the same combinations in tombs, the burial

[311] At the site, bronze bells and chimestones occur in only 3 of the 12 male bronze vessel assemblage tombs: M2001, M2011 and M1052. The bells can be divided into four types: *yongzhong*, *niuzhong*, *zheng* and *ling*. Tomb M2001 had the largest number of *yongzhong* (9), while tomb M1052 had the largest number of *niuzhong* (9). Both tombs also contained 1 *zheng* bell each. Tomb M2011 also contained one *zheng*, but no *yongzhong* or *niuzhong* bells. However, only tombs M2001 and M2011 contained chimestones, 10 and 18 respectively.

performance and the material culture would have reinforced the established norms as well as creating an identity for the deceased, which cited previous burials and identities. Consequently, the types of people created through these compositions were highly formulised and somewhat homogenous.

The homogeneity of the burial identities is further seen through the make up of the different "categories" of objects interred in tombs. First, every tomb with chariot and horse fittings contained bronze wheel pieces, such as axle caps, and bridles. Even the additional bronze fittings such as *luan* horse bells and horse decorative pieces occur in just under half of those male and female tombs with chariot and horse pieces.

Second, a bronze weapons assemblage in all elite male tombs without exception contained halberds, spearheads and arrowheads. No tomb contained a single weapon type in isolation. It should be noted that tombs contained different quantities of the same weapon types, a point I will elaborate on below.

Third, the bronze ritual vessel assemblages were, mostly, formed around set compositions in tombs - the common two bronze types in all tombs was a *ding* and either a *pan* or *yi*.[312] The sets of vessels in these tombs generally conform to those as instituted by the Ritual Reform.

As a result, the types of objects would also have been crucial to the enactment and recreation of identity. Not only did they make identity real and tangible, but they also reinforced the coherence of the identity, structuring how the burial should be put together in the present and in the future.

The grave goods were not deposited in equal quantities in Guo tombs. Thus, while two tombs may share the same selection of bronze items (e.g. vessels, weapons and chariot fittings) the graves may contain vastly different quantities of these objects. In this way, some sort of difference and inequality between graves was constructed at burial. For instance, Guo tombs shared the same three types of principal bronze weapons – halberds, spearheads and arrowheads. However, the numbers in which the

[312] See Rawson 1988, 1999, for more on vessels sets before and after the Ritual Reform.

objects were deposited in graves shows considerable variation.[313] Similarly, the overall number of ritual vessels in a tomb also varied. Some tombs might contain a single vessel, while high-ranking elite tombs (such as M2001 and M2012) might yield anywhere between 30-40 vessels of different types. And, chariot and horse fittings show the same fluctuations between graves.[314]

At the same time, some bronze items were interred only in single quantities irrespective of the tomb occupant's social position or the overall quantities of grave goods placed in the tomb. Bronze tools (the principal types being the adze, chisel, axe and scraper) and bronze swords, where present in graves, are found in single numbers. Thus, while a tomb may have varying quantities of vessels, chariot fittings, horse pieces and weapons, the grave always had, where present and without exception, a single type of tool and single bronze sword. In this case, we can draw a quantitative contrast between the number of vessels, weapons, and chariot and horse fittings, and the number of bronze tools and bronze swords interred in graves. Moreover, these differences suggest that there existed some sort of structured deposition where the quantity of certain objects placed in tombs was restricted in some way. From the limited chronology of the tombs at Shangcunling, it seems as if these patterns were continued throughout the course of the site. In this way, not only do we some sort of continued pattern relating to the quantities of objects interred in tombs which helped structure the burial in some way, but also the living were only able to manipulate the quantities of certain types of objects at burial.

Tombs with ceramic vessels

---

[313] For example, tomb M2001 contained 14 halberds, 5 spearheads, 1 sword and over 200 bronze arrowheads; tomb M2011 contained 7 halberds, 5 spearheads, 1 sword and 57 arrowheads; M1052 yielded 4 halberds, 6 spearheads, 1 sword and 41 arrowheads; M1705 yielded 2 bronze daggers, 1 spearhead, 1 sword and 15 arrowheads.

[314] Tomb M2001 contained 28 linchpins *(xia)*, 22 *luan* bells, 24 yoke or collar fittings, over 100 *xian*, and over 60 bridles, while tombs of M2010 contained 22 chariot fittings (8 *wei*, 8 linchpins and 4 *luan* bells) and over 320 horse fittings, and M1810 contained around 36 horse and chariot fittings combined (4 *wei*, 10 *xian*, and 22 bridles). Tomb of M1602 contained 2 *wei*, 4 *xian* and 3 bridles.

As I have noted above, a distinct and clear division exists between tombs with and without bronze items. Bronze weapons, tools, and chariot and horse fittings occur exclusively in tombs with bronze vessels. Based on the current excavated sample of tombs at the site, around 180 graves contained ceramic vessels without any bronze objects. Alongside the ceramic vessels, a stone halberd and/or jade ear ornaments were also interred with the deceased. A few tombs also contained bone items. The composition of this assemblage within the 180 or so tombs with ceramic pieces appears to have been largely unchanged over the course of the site.

Moreover, all of the 180 tombs contained relatively similar types of ceramic vessels and in somewhat comparable quantities. The vast majority of tombs at Sanmenxia, therefore, contained identical burial assemblages with little to no differentiation based on the types of pieces placed in the grave and quantities of objects. It is tempting to see these tombs as forming one distinct group based on the homogeneity of the grave good interred therein. And, certainly, the uniformity of these tombs is startling, as is the continuity over time.

As Falkenhausen points out, ceramic vessel occur in tombs with a wooden burial chamber with double coffins, a wooden burial chamber with a single coffin and a single coffin with no chamber. Therefore, if burial chambers were linked to the deceased social position as a member of the ranked elite, then a proportion of the 180 tombs with this homogenous set of grave goods were high-ranking individuals. Moreover, the uniformity of these burial goods across various tombs implies that people of different social position were provided with identical sets of burial goods. Any differentiation of tomb members may have revolved around tomb furniture.

GENDER AND SETS OF BRONZE OBJECTS

The limited sample of sexed tombs at Shangcunling enables us to make some observations about gender within the Guo state. Both males and female shared the same tomb structure in the form of the vertical shaft pit. The body of the deceased was always placed in a supine position. Moreover, male and females tombs contained the same range and types of tomb furniture, such as a chamber and a coffin, and the same division of space within the grave. In other words, male and female graves shared largely the same array of features with no notable or obvious differences. Gender does not appear to have been an important structuring principle with regards to these features of the tomb.

Moving onto the burial goods, previous scholars have already noted that the number of *ding* ritual vessels appears to have had some sort of significance for (re)creating gender difference. Falkenhausen suggests that the highest *ding* privilege was reserved for the Guo lineage heads and that wives had a *ding* privilege which was one notch lower than their husband's.[315] Thus, the male tomb in tomb M2001 had a 7-*ding* privilege, while his wife had a 5-*ding* privilege. The male in tomb M2010 was buried with 5 *ding*, while the female in tomb M2013 was interred with 3 *ding*. Thus, the number of *ding* vessels in male tombs ranged from one to seven, while the number ranged in females tombs ranged from one to five.

Therefore, if *ding* numbers did correlate with distinct ranks, and the highest number of *ding* vessels that a female could be buried with was five, then females had a reduced hierarchy vis-à-vis their male counterparts. But, as Falkenhausen also suggests, perhaps females had a different hierarchy from males. In any case, that only males could be interred with 7 *ding* vessels, and that this rank might have only comprised men, implies that *ding* were used to create boundaries of exclusion and some sort of gender difference.

[315] Falkenhausen 2006: 146.

We might now follow up these observations, by looking at the different types of male and female grave good sets at Shangcunling. The following tabulates the burial assemblages within those male and female tombs.

Male Assemblages	Number of male tombs	Tombs	Female Assemblages	Number of tombs	Tombs
Bronze vessels	1+	-	Bronze vessels	1+	
Bronze vessels + weapons + chariot objects	8		Bronze vessels + chariot objects + jades	3 (5)	M2013 M2006
Bronze vessels + weapons + chariot objects + tools	3	M1810 M2010 M1706	Bronze vessels + chariot objects + jades + beads and jade sets	2	M2012 M1820
Bronze vessels + weapons + chariot objects + tools + bells	2 (4)	M1052 M2011			
Bronze vessels + weapons + chariot objects + tools + bells+ treatment of body with jades and beads.	2	M2001 M2009			

Table 3.3: Gender and Bronze Grave Good Sets at Sanmenxia

For both males and females we see a clear difference between the range of grave goods interred in a male or female tomb and, hence, the way in which pieces were combined. Based on table 3.3, we might advance the idea that there were four different types of male identities and two different types of female identities at Shangcunling.

Furthermore, for males, aside from the unknown quantity of tombs with bronze vessels only, which one may assume constituted the largest type of assemblage, the combination of bronze vessels, bronze weapons and bronze chariot fittings was most frequently seen at the site (figure 3.5). With the addition of bronze tools and bronze bells, so the type of male created through these objects became more “restricted.”

Essentially, there are two different types of female burials with bronze items. The first type contained a selection of bronze vessels only, while the second type yielded

bronze vessels and chariot and horse fittings (figure 3.6). Two points might follow on from this burial structure.

First, there were no categories of objects that were confined to the consort's tomb, *contra* the tombs of royal males, which contained bronze bells or an object type which differentiated the tomb of a consort from other elite female tombs. However, the combination of bronze vessels and chariot fittings was only found in a female tomb. By contrast, a male tomb might contain ritual vessels, chariot fittings and bronze weapons. Hence, perhaps the structural deposit of bronze vessels and chariot and horse fittings (re)produced gendered female identity.

Second, a selection of bronze ritual vessels only (as forming one burial deposit) was interred in both male and female tombs. In this case, gender does not appear to have been brought into play. One might then wonder, based on this shared assemblage, whether gender was even a structuring principle in these tombs.

Moreover, one of the most striking features of female burials in the Guo state is the homogeneity in the burial compositions between females of seemingly different social positions. The consort in tomb M2012, for instance, yielded the same set of objects as the females interred in tombs M1820 and M2006. Therefore, two compositions comprising bronze vessels, and bronze vessels and bronze chariot and horse fittings, were integral for female identities at burial irrespective of the possible rank or social position of the female.

Broadly speaking, both chariot and horse pits are found with both male and female tombs. The occurrence of these pits, however, was not found equally across Sanmenxia: only two female tombs (M2012 and M2013) had accompanying horse and chariot pits. Given that large parts of the site remain unexcavated, these figures are surely not representative for the whole cemetery site.

Falkenhausen has suggested that the number of chariots in a pit was graded according to the deceased's *ding* privilege.[316] On the one hand, this would appear to be accurate, as the 7- *ding* tomb of M1052 had double the number of chariots than 5-*ding* tomb M1810. On the other hand, we might suggest that Falkenhausen fails to consider the two female tombs with chariot pits. Tomb M2012 had 5- *ding* and 19 chariots, while tomb M2013 had 3- *ding* and 1 chariot. Falkenhausen's idea of graded provision would appear to be accurate for male tombs, but not for female tombs. It is important to note that while it would appear that all males tomb of 7- *ding* and 5- *ding* had an accompanying chariot pit, only one female tomb out of two female tombs with 5- *ding*, and one female tomb from three female tombs with 3- *ding* had a chariot pit. Thus, the assignment of chariot pits for females followed different sumptuary rules than for males. Furthermore, the provision of chariots pits for females suggests that some other structuring principle was at work other than gender, social position and *ding* privilege.[317] Based on the data, we might argue that chariots and chariot and horse fittings were an integral part within different, wider burial compositions, which created different types of male and female identities.

[316] Falkenhausen 1999: 345.

[317] Furthermore, while the chariot pit of tomb M2012 contained the highest number of chariots at Shangcunling, the pit itself is the smallest among the eight chariot pits. For example, the pit of tomb M2012 measured 10.6 meters in length, while the pit of tomb M2001 measured 47 meters in length, the pit of tomb M1052 measured 29 meters in length, the pit of tomb M2011 measured 21.8 meters in length and the pits of tombs M1810 and M1706 each measured 15 meters in length. Furthermore, it is clear than the dimensions of the chariot pits do not always correlate with the number of chariots. The pit of tomb M2011 was the second largest among the 8 pits, but contained the least number of chariots. As noted above, the pit of female tomb M2012 was the smallest despite containing the highest number of chariots. Alongside differences in chariot numbers, the number of horses each pit contained is also different. The pit of male tomb M2001 contained 64 horses, the pit of tomb M1706 contained 20 horses and the pit of tomb M1052 and M1810 contained 20 and 10 horses respectively. Interestingly, the two 7-*ding* male tombs contained contrasting numbers of horses, 64 and 20, which suggests that both chariot and horse provision went beyond the deceased *ding* privilege. Furthermore, the pit accompanying female tomb M2013 contained 6 horses, while the number of horses in pit of tomb M2012 has not yet been reported.

Gendered objects at Zhangjiapo and Shangcunling

Particular bronze grave goods were central for recreating gendered masculine identities in both the Guo and Xing states. Certainly, some male and female assemblages are notably different with regard to the types of bronze items interred in each grave. Moreover, different male burial assemblages can be categorised according to these gendered objects. It would almost appear as if the addition of a particular bronze item in male tomb *boyed* a different boy at burial.

The selection of bronze tools found in a few elite male tombs might include a chisel, an adze, a small chopping axe and a scraper, possibly for hides or leather.[318] The two tombs of the Guo kings yielded all four of these tool types, while a few other elite tombs included one or two of these pieces.[319] That the two tombs of the Guo kings yielded the same set of tools suggests that the internment of these pieces and in that particular combination was by no means random.

Furthermore, as I have noted above, all of the male tombs at the site with bronze weapons contained an identical assemblage of bronze halberds, bronze arrowheads and bronze spearheads.[320] Although the quantities of each item placed in a tomb might be different, individual bronze weapon types were not used to differentiate different types of males at Shangcunling. We might even think of some sort of weapon set or package within the Guo tombs that centred on the halberd, spearhead and arrowhead.

Thus, we can identify certain objects that were only deposited in particular elite male tombs, including bronze weapons, bronze tools and bronze bells. By contrast, there

---

[318] At Shangcunling, the 12 male tombs with bronze vessel assemblages produced a total of 5 fu axes, 3 adze and 4 chisels. The largest number of bronze tools came from the largest male tomb, M2001, which contained 1 *fu* axe, 1 adze and 2 chisels, and male tomb M2010, which contained 1 *fu* axe, 1 chisel and 1 adze. Less than half of the bronze vessel tombs surveyed contained bronze tools, which heavily contrasts bronze weapons, which were found in all 12 bronze assemblage tombs. The decoration on the bronze tools is also noteworthy. The bronze tools from tombs M2001 and M2010 contained ornament almost identical to that seen on bronze vessels from both tombs, such as *gui* and *he*.

[319] For example, tomb M2010 contained a chisel and an adze.

[320] The 12 bronze vessel assemblage male tombs produced a total of 43 bronze *ge* daggers, 25 spearheads, 6 *jian* swords and over 388 bronze arrowheads.

does not appear to have been an object type restricted to female tombs at either site, although I have noted above that only vessels and chariot fittings as one deposit were found in a female tomb. Therefore, we might posit that male identities was reified materially through specific individual objects within a structured deposit, while a *combination* of vessels and chariot and horse pieces may have been used in the performance of a female identity.

At the site of Zhangjiapo, there is also evidence of gendered objects, however, they offer a slight contrast to those from the Guo state. Bronze weapons and bronze tools were only found in male tombs, in line with Shangcunling.[321] However, in contrast to the female graves at Shangcunling, chariots were not found within female tombs at Zhangjiapo, while two large bronze bells were found in female tomb M163 (figure 3.7).[322]

The occurrence of these bells in tomb M163 is particularly unusual and according to my research, no other female tomb in a centrally located state yielded such pieces. Based on heavy tomb looting, I am hesitant to pursue the idea that objects were gendered in the Xing state; it is unclear whether bronze bells were a frequent occurrence in consort tombs, or whether tomb M163 is exceptional in some way. The tomb contains other bronze pieces which suggest that the female interred therein may have held some sort of special status. One particular bronze vessel from the tomb, as noted by Falkenhausen, appears to show influences from Western Asia.[323] The vessel is in the form of a winged beast standing on four legs, with three-dimensional creatures on the beast's back and neck. Rawson has observed that the form of these creatures is frequently seen in the Northern Zone.[324] Bronze chariot fittings also from tomb M163 are in the form of unusual creatures, perhaps again pertaining to some outside influence.

---

[321] A total of 138 bronze *ge* daggers, 187 bronze arrowheads and 9 spearheads were recovered from the 390 looted burials
[322] See Zhangjiapo xizhou mudi 1999: 76.
[323] Falkenhausen 1993.
[324] Rawson 2010:

Nonetheless, based on the limited evidence, we can see that the bronze bells may have carried different gender importance in the Guo state vis-à-vis the Xing state. *Mutatis mutandis*, the same is true of chariots and chariot pits, which accompanied both male and female tombs in the Guo state.

It is also worth noting at this point that the bead and jade sets usually placed on the body of the deceased were largely gender-neutral in Guo tombs. The male in tomb M2001 and the female in M2012 were both buried with a bead and jade set composed around sequences of *huang*.[325] In other Guo male tombs such as M1052 and M2011, and female tombs such as M1820 and M2013, the deceased were adorned with necklaces and bracelets only.[326] If the inner coffin was open at any time of the funeral and the deceased was visible, then there would have been no visual difference within the Guo tombs between the adornments on a man and the adornments on a woman.

Given this observation, the gendered bronze objects mentioned previously literally took on an even greater importance for (re)creating gendered identities. Particular categories of bronze items, therefore, were more important for a gendered identity, rather than distinct ways of dressing or adorning the body of the deceased.

Gender Identity and ceramic vessel based assemblages

The gender identities outlined in those tombs with bronze vessel based assemblages deeply contrasts with the 180 or so tombs with ceramic based assemblages. The set compositions of ceramic kitchen vessels, stone halberds and jade ear pieces (*jue*) is seen in both male and female tombs, with a chamber and two inner coffin; a chamber and a single inner coffin and a single inner coffin only. Based on the burial assemblages in these tombs, one cannot discern from the archaeological evidence any distinction between assemblages and tombs based on burial evidence. In this regard, gender does

[325] This type of bead combination in discussed in Rawson 2010. Rawson has also noted that one particular set, with a central jade or stone plaque and strings of beads occurs only in female tombs. This observation is supported at Shangcunling, with female tomb M1820 yielding this type of set.
[326] Observation of Rawson 2010.

not appear to have been an important structuring principle at burial within tombs with ceramic assemblages. Therefore, gender, as a structuring principle, might be classed as a feature of tombs with bronze grave goods only. The desire to mark out gender only within a certain type of tomb, namely one with bronze items, and not within the majority of tombs (those with ceramic vessels) offers a fascinating contrast. With regards to these 180 tombs with ceramic vessels, the implication is that gender was not an important structuring principle at burial, and that men and women of differing ages and social position were provided with the same selection of grave goods.

CONCLUSION

The Guo tombs clearly followed a fixed pattern or template which was replicated over the course of the site. What this means is that a structured burial structure existed, features of which might be manipulated by the living.

All tombs were vertical shaft pits with an array of wooden burial furniture and grave goods. The tombs of the Guo lineage heads did not yield ramps or attendants-in-death. Moreover, the tombs also shared a fixed division of space which saw jade and bone object deposited in the inner coffin and bronze objects placed primarily in the space between the inner coffin and the burial chamber. Thus, the same burial structure, types of tomb furniture and the division of space within a grave were shared between tomb occupants of seemingly different social position and gender. In effect, the same tomb type was essentially (re)produced throughout the entire course of the site. This reproduction came from the (re)experiencing of a set of tomb features which were constitutive of a particular funerary practice.

The size of the tomb and chamber and the number of coffins placed in a grave were ways in which the living might manipulate the burial. Furthermore, grave goods were another feature of the tomb which could be altered. There is a strict division between tombs with bronze grave goods and tombs with ceramic vessels and jade, stone and bone objects only. Within the small minority of tombs containing bronze burial

goods, five different combinations can be discerned. The burial assemblages are very structured, formulaic and repetitive. Even the quantities of objects speak of some structure – vessels, weapons and chariot and horse fittings might be deposited in varying numbers, while tools and swords were placed in single figures. So, options were open to the living, but mourners acted within a wider set of structures which determined and restricted features of the burial (e.g. the way objects could be combined, the quantities of tools).

Gender appears to have been a somewhat important structuring principle at burial. This aspect of social identity was reproduced not through tomb type, furniture or layout, but rather the (re)enactment of gender identities took place primarily through the repeated deposition of burial assemblages. In some cases tombs contained bronze weapons, tools, and bells – objects which were associated with (re)creating different masculinities. For male and females, we see four and two types of burial compositions respectively. Male and female burials changed very little over time and the coherence of these different types of gendered identities was maintained and reproduced through structured and repetitive grave good sets. At the same time, some male tombs contained vessels only with none of the bronze burial goods associated with masculinity. Clearly, gender was marked in some tombs but not in others. Therefore, some funerary performances appeared to emphasise masculinity through a specific group of bronze items which may or may not occur together, while other performances did not. Of course, this situation does not mean that one male was manlier than another male. Rather, gender was made more explicit through the deposition of certain bronze items which, through a (re)experiencing of the objects as being linked to male identities, the living associated with masculinities. Therefore, without a gendered performance through depositing bronze grave goods, presumably the identity being performed was not gendered.

Chapter Four: Identity in The Yu and the Jin States of the Zhou

BACKGROUND

In the previous chapter I explored the construction of identity in two centrally-located Zhou states. This chapter seeks to provide a contrast to these states by examining burials in two peripheral Zhou states – the Yu and the Jin. Indeed, the large statistical sample from the Jin state allows us to examine features such as gender in more detail than in the states discussed previously.

The site of Baoji

The region of Baoji is located in the western part of the Central Shaanxi plain (figure 4.1). From the winter of 1974 to the autumn of 1981, the Baoji Municipal Museum excavated three cemetery sites of Zhifangtou 紙坊頭 (referred to as Baoji Locus I),[327] Zhuyuangou 竹園溝 (Baoji Locus II) and Rujiazhuang 茹家莊(Baoji Locus III).[328] The sites are located around 80km west of the Zhouyuan (figure 4.2).

The bronze inscriptions from the cemetery sites indicate that all three areas belonged to the Yu lineage,[329] which is not mentioned in any written sources.[330] Locus I consisted of a single tomb, probably part of what may once have been a larger cemetery, now mostly destroyed, locus II had 22 tombs, including 3 lineage heads each buried with a concubine, and locus III had 4 tombs, including the paired tombs of a lineage head, his

---

[327] Recently two more Yu tombs were excavated from Zhifangtou, 2003BZFM2 and 2003BZFM3. Although the tombs had been partially destroyed by a collapsed cave, both still yielded bronze ritual vessels among other objects. The excavator's noted that some bronzes contained Yu inscriptions. The report for the tombs is in Baoji Shi Kaogu Yanjiusuo 宝鸡市考古研究所2007.8: 28-71.

[328] The excavation report is Lu Liancheng 卢连成 and Hu Zhisheng 胡智生 1988. *Baoji Yu guo mudi* 宝鸡弓鱼国墓地. Rather than grouping objects together based on a supposed typological or functional similarity, the excavation report lists all the objects associated with each tomb.

[329] Wei Jinwu (1993: 218-226) argues that the Yu material bears close resemblance to the material of ancient Sichuan and therefore, it is possible that the Yu people migrated from Sichuan to the southwest of Shanxi. Other scholars have suggested that the Yu were a different ethnic and cultural group from the Zhou. While some Yu material does appear to show some contact with the south, Rawson has noted that other aspects may have come from the north. See Rawson 2010. Falkenhausen (2006) has also pointed out that no bronze vessels bearing the Yu lineage have been found outside of the Baoji area. Moreover, the inscriptions on Yu vessels are somewhat different to those from contemporaneous Zhou states. For example, none of the vessels mention the Zhou king, a common theme in the inscriptions from other states.

[330] The *Shiji* records the Zhou and many sub-states, such as Yan, Jin, Chen and Qi, but not Yu.

concubine and his wife, as well as another likely tomb of a male lineage head (figure 4.3).[331]

The tombs from locus I and all but three of the tombs from locus II date from the Early Western Zhou and the graves at Locus III and the remainder of those at Locus II date from the first part of the Middle Western Zhou.[332] There are no tombs from the site that date from the Late Western Zhou, thus the Yu lineage disappears from the archaeological record.[333]

The lineage head tombs are from Baoji locus II, are BZM13, BZM7 and BZM4, and at locus III tomb BRM1. As noted above, these tombs consist of a principal male tomb occupant accompanied with his concubine, within a vertical shaft pit. Tomb BRM2, which was a separate grave cut into the western wall of tomb BRM1, contained the presumed wife of the male tomb occupant in BRM1 (figure 4.4).

The names of both the principal tomb occupant and the concubine in tomb BRM1 can be ascertained from inscriptions on bronze ritual vessels interred in each coffin respectively. Around eight of the principal tomb occupant's bronzes vessels bear the inscription Yu Bo (弓魚) 伯 (Lord Bo),[334] while a few other bronzes were simply inscribed "Bo".[335] The excavators concluded that the deceased was Yu Bo.[336] The five

---

331 Lu Liancheng and Hu Zhisheng (1988 vol. 1: 425-426) note the similarity to the burial custom of the Early Bronze Age Qijia 齐家 culture in Gansu 甘肃and Qinghai青海, west of this area. However, Debaine-Francfort (1995: 267) notest that tombs of couples are one of the characteristics common to Qijia culture, which might constitute a very indirect link to Baoji. Huber (1995) has posited an association between the burial custom and the Indo-European custom of widow sacrifice (the suttee).

332 Gao and Liu (1996: 11-16) estimate that the materials at the site covered a span of about four generations, lasting about 100 years.

333 For a full discussion on the bronze vessel types and dating, see Lu Liancheng and Hu Zhisheng 1988: 470-530; Rawson 1999.

334 On a round *ding*, for example, the inscription reads, "Lord Yu made this *ding gui* for self use". See Lu Liancheng and Hu Zhisheng 1988: 418-420.

335 Some scholars (Linduff and Hsu 1988; Yu Jiang 2004) have argued that the title 'Bo' can be identified with the status of 'Earl' and forms one of five ranks in the Western Zhou. In the following descending order of rank they comprise : Gong 公 (duke), Hou 侯(marquis), Bo 伯 (earl), Zi 子(baron) and Nan 男(vice baron). Yu Jiang (2004: 42), thus, argues that the occupant in tomb BRM1 was a high-ranking nobleman, in the position of Earl. However, while these terms were used in the Eastern Zhou to rank rulers of the regional states, some scholars have argued that they were not a Western Zhou institution. Li Feng (2003) suggests that newly excavated bronze inscriptions show how rulers in the east are predominantly referred to as *hou* and seldom *bo*, while by contrast, the aristocratic families in the royal area of Shaanxi never used the title

ding and four *gui* in the concubine's tomb were inscribed with the name "Er".[337] In tomb BRM2, around eight of the bronze vessels were inscribed Xingji 邢姬, the presumed occupant of the tomb.[338] The name Xingji designates "a Ji-clan woman from Xing".[339] Therefore, we might conclude that Yu Bo was interred with Er, his concubine, and Xingji, his principal wife.

The Jin State

Traditional accounts indicate that Tangshu Yu 唐叔虞, one of the brothers of King Cheng 成王, established the Jin state.[340] The Jin centre appears to have been located near Houma 侯马 at Tianma Qucun (figure 4.5).[341] The site of Tianma Qucun is located in the eastern part of Quwo 曲沃 County and the western part of Yicheng 翼城 County, about 25 kilometers northeast of Houma.

---

hou. *Hou* was essentially a military commander stationed to govern conquered populations, but was still granted the full rights of government. The term *bo* is related to the practice of primogeniture, that gives the oldest brother a better chance to be the head of an aristocratic family and serve in the government. *Bo* essentially referred to birth order. We, therefore, have no evidence that *bo* was ever used during the Western Zhou as a rank in the system that *did* use the titles *gong* and *hou*. As a result, Yu Bo, was probably not an 'Earl', but the oldest brother in a family. The five titles above had different origins and were not integrated into a single consistent system during the Western Zhou. This system of ranking probably developed as a result of political reorganization during later times.

[336] Lu Liancheng and Hu Zhisheng 1988: 420.

[337] Lu Liancheng and Hu Zhisheng 1988: 425.

[338] Lu Liancheng and Hu Zhisheng 1988: 426

[339] Ji appears to have been the family name of the royal Zhou clan. See Chang 1983: 278; Yang 1995: 197-210.

[340] *Shi ji*, 39, pp. 1635. The Jin's development and decline in the Spring and Autumn period is portrayed in the narratives of the *Zuo zhuan* 左传 and *Guoyu* 国语, of which considerable portions refer to the Jin. Some scholars have argued that the state of Jin was founded in order to contain Northern peoples, with whom the Jin shared a close relationship. Recently, this view has been somewhat contested, primarily by Shim, who argues that the Jin was founded in order to contain pro-Shang elements near southwestern Shanxi. Shim, consequently, argues that in the Early and Middle Western Zhou, the Jin did not share a close relationship with people from the north. See Shim 2002: 1-26. Nonetheless, the Jin state appears to have been founded during the middle part of the Early Western Zhou, somewhat later than other states.

[341] Su Bingqi 苏秉琦 (1987: 44-54) proposes that Jin should be classed as an archaeological sub-specialty, not only in the Eastern Zhou, but also from the Taosi 陶寺periods, as early as 3000 BC. Wang Kelin (1981: 3) supports Su's idea, dividing the Jin into four phases: the pre-Jin (Taosi), the early Jin (*Dongxiafeng* 东下冯), the middle Jin (Western Zhou/Spring and Autumn Period) and the late Jin (the Warring States period). However Liu Xu (1993: 85-86) criticizes this idea arguing that there were cultures preexisting in southwestern Shanxi before the establishment of the Jin. Furthermore, Liu Xu notes that it is very difficult to find cultural connections between these three preceding cultures and that of the following Tianma Qucun site in the Western Zhou period.

The Archaeology Department of Beijing University and the Institute of Archaeology of Shanxi Province started to explore this site in 1979 (figures 4.6-4.7).[342] In total, around 660 tombs were excavated, with 64% dated to the Early Western Zhou, 22% to the Middle Western Zhou and 14% to the late Western Zhou.[343] The chronology of these tombs will be discussed in more detail below. These tombs were interpreted as belonging to lineage members of non-ruling aristocratic and commoner status.[344]

Beizhao

In 1992, the Beizhao 北赵 cemetery, located east of Tianma Qucun, was excavated.[345] The site contained 19 large paired tombs,[346] belonging to the rulers (*hou*

[342] The excavation report for Tiama Qucun is in Beijing Daxue Kaoguxue Xi Shang Zhou Zu and Shanxi Sheng Kaogu Yanjiusuo 北京大学考古学系商周组－山西省考古研究所 (Zou Heng). 2000, *Tianma-Qucun 1980-1989, Vol. II*. Nearly all of the tombs from the site were sexed and aged. From the 47 bronze assemblage tombs, 27 were sexed as male and 20 were sexed as female. From the 407 ceramic assemblage tombs, 208 were sexed as male and 199 were sexed as female. A complete inventory of all 600 tombs from the site, including tomb sizes, grave sizes and accompanying grave goods can be found in the appendix.
[343] Zou Heng 2000: 335-918.
[344] Falkenhasuen (2006) notes that the excavators identified the occupant of tomb M6081 at Tianma Qucun as Tang Shu Yu, the Jin founder (Beijing Daxue Kaoguxue Xi Shang Zhou Zu and Shanxi Sheng Kaogu Yanjiusuo (Zou Heng [ed.] 2000, vol.3: 1133). He states that this identification is almost certainly wrong as only a small portion of the cemetery site was excavated, and it is, therefore, impossible to know whether Tomb M6081 really was the wealthiest Early Western Zhou tomb in the cemetery. He also goes on to note that the discovery of tombs M113 and M114 at Beizhao appeared to contain bronzes possibly connected with Tang Shu Yu, and, therefore, undermines the excavator's hypothesis about tomb M6081 at Tianma Qucun. Moreover, the excavators also constructed a hierarchy of tombs based on the number of *ding* in each tomb (see chapter one). See Falkenhausen (2006) for a critique of this hierarchy.
[345] There are six preliminary reports: Beijing Daxue Kaogu Xi 北京大学考古系 and Shanxi Sheng Kaogu Yanjiusuo 山西省考古研究所 1993.3: 11-30; Beijing Daxue Kaoguxue Xi 北京大学考古学系 and Shanxi Sheng Kaogu Yanjiusuo 山西省考古研究所 1994.1: 4-28;1995.7: 4-39; Shanxi Sheng Kaogu Yanjiusuo 山西省考古研究所 and Beijing Daxue Kaoguxue Xi 北京大学考古学系 1994a; 1994b; Beijing Daxue Kaogu Wenboyuan 北京考古文博院 and Shanxi Sheng Kaogu Yanjiusuo 山西省考古研究所 2001.8: 4-21. For articles about some bronzes from the tombs sold on the international antiquities market, see Ch'en Fangmei 2000. The proceedings volume of a 2002 conference at the Shanghai Museum assembles a range of papers on the Beizhao tombs.
[346] Jay Xu (1996) notes that the excavators used the term *hezang* 合葬 which can be translated as "joint burial", to describe the pairs of tombs at Beizhao. However, this has led to the misleading idea that the ruler of Jin and his consort were buried at the same time, which, in turn, has created misconceptions about the chronology of these tombs. Moreover, unlike at Baoji, where the tomb lord and his concubine were interred in the same tomb, at Beizhao, the ruler of Jin and his consort were buried in separate tombs. Jay Xu (1996: 200) suggests that the adjacent burials of males and females may be a Zhou mainstream tradition, as adjacent burials of males and females are found in various Zhou cemetery sites.

侯) of the Jin,[347] and their consorts, most with a single entrance ramp (figure 4.8).[348] Eight of the nineteen tombs had been plundered before excavation.[349]

The chronology of Beizhao and Tianma Qucun

The excavation team at Tianma Qucun divided the tombs into six phases based on ceramic *li* seriation. The team also divided the tombs into those with bronze vessels and those with ceramic vessels, and placed them into a six stage chronology, as follows:[350]

[347] Furthermore, recent preliminary excavations at a cemetery site in the south of Yangshe 羊舌 village, Shanxi province, revealed two large, unfortunately mostly looted, double ramped tombs, M1 and M2. The excavation team dated these graves to the Spring and Autumn Period and the team concluded that both belonged to a Marquis of Jin and his consort. Furthermore, tomb M1 is larger than any of the Beizhao tombs. The grave pit measured 6.7 meters long, while the chamber measured 5.28 meters by 3.6 meters. The outer coffin measured 3.2 meters by 1.4 meters and inner coffin measured 2.3 meters by 1 meter. The north ramp measured 15.1 meters long and the south ramp measured 26.5 meters long. The excavation team concluded that tomb M1 is the largest Jin grave discovered in Shanxi to date. See Shanxi Sheng Kaogu Yanjiusuo 山西考古研究所 2009.1: 4-26.

[348] Of the 19 tombs excavated at Beizhao, 16 of them had a single entrance ramp; two tombs, M63 and M93 had two ramps, while one tomb, M102, had no ramps. In Beizhao tombs that post-date the Ritual Reform we see stone and charcoal lined burial pits (*jishi jitan* 积石积炭) which became a Jin burial feature, seemingly not shared by contemporaneous Zhou states, akin to the double burials in the tombs at Baoji, which were also not shared by other Zhou states. Stone footings were also found in tomb M1 at Yangshe Village. Rawson (2010) has drawn parallels between the stone-lined footings in Beizhao tombs and graves in Inner Mongolia at Ningcheng Nanshangen and similar sites. After the break-up of the Jin polity in the fifth century BC, we commonly find stone and charcoal layered burial pits in major aristocratic tombs of the Jin successor states. For an interesting critique of the relationship between entrance ramps and rank, and the grave/tomb dimensions and rank at the site of Beizhao, see Jay Xu 1996: 199-200. The tombs at Tianma Qucun and Beizhao also contradict the provision of coffins in relation to rank as set out in the later historical texts. Paired tombs M8 (male) and M31 (female) typify some of the discrepancies in burials at Beizhao. For example, tomb M8 yielded more ritual vessels than tomb M31, and yet, the occupant of the latter tomb was encased in three coffins, while the occupant of the former tomb had one coffin.

[349] The looted tombs at Beizhao are as follows: M114, M1, M2, M6, M7, M33, M8, M32.

[350] Beijing Daxue Kaoguxue Xi Shang Zhou Zu and Shanxi Sheng Kaogu Yanjiusuo 2000 : 334-335.

Phase	Bronze Vessel Assemblage Tombs	Ceramic Vessel Assemblage tombs
I	19 Tombs: M6054, M6069, M6080, M6081, M6105, M6121, M6126, M6127, M6131, M6179, M6190, M6195, M6197, M6204, M6210, M6214, M6242, M7004, M7161	87 Tombs
II	10 Tombs: M6123, M6130, M6231, M6235, M6243, M6308, M6372, M7003, M7146, M7185	109 Tombs
III	8 Tombs: M6071, M6384, M6434, M7014, M7052, M7092, M7164, M7176	83 Tombs
IV	3 Tombs: M7029, M7095, M7113	45 Tombs
V	2 Tombs: M6390, M7070	38 Tombs
VI	2 Tombs: M5150, M5189	45 Tombs

Table 4.1: The Chronology of Tianma Qucun

The lack of phase V and VI tombs from the site is probably the result of the small sample of tombs excavated here.[351] Falkenhausen has attempted to equate the phases outlined in the above table with phases from the Western Zhou.[352] Thus, phase I on the above chronology relates to the 'early' early Western Zhou; phase II relates to the 'late' early Western Zhou; phase III relates to the 'early' Middle Western Zhou' phase IV relates to the 'late' Middle Western Zhou' phase V relates to 'early' Late Western Zhou and phase VI relates to the 'late' Late Western Zhou.

The chronology of the Beizhao tombs also rests upon ceramic *li* seriation. Before the excavations of tombs M91, M92, M93 and M102 in 1995, the archaeologists who excavated the graves posited that the paired tombs in the northern area of the site were earlier than those to the south and that, in each cluster, the paired tombs to the east were earlier than those to the west.[353] With the excavation of four more tombs in 1995, the excavators proposed the following chronological ordering of the graves: M9: M13 –

[351] Zou Heng (2000) estimates that the entire cemetery site consists of up to 20,000 tombs.
[352] Falkenhausen 2006: 90.
[353] Falkenhausen 2006: 346.

M6: M7 – M32: M33 – M91: M92 – M1: M2 – M8: M31 – M64: M62: M63 – M93: M102.[354]

However, the idea of east-west ordering was questioned when tombs M113 and M114 were discovered. These tombs were missed in the original survey and excavations of the site.[355] Tombs M113 and M114 were dated as the earliest tombs of the site and, therefore, the excavators placed them before tombs M9: M13 in the above chronology.[356]

Both Jay Xu and Falkenhausen have critiqued the excavator's chronological ordering of the Beizhao tombs.[357] Both have pointed out the flaws in the excavator's reliance upon the typology of the *li* pottery vessel to estimate relative dates.[358] Jay Xu has also argued that the proposed sequencing rests on the assumption that the graves of consorts can be dated to that of the grave lord.[359] In fact, there seems very little evidence to suggest that wives were put to death when their husbands died,[360] and if we cannot assume that husbands and wives were buried together at the same time, we cannot treat each pair of burials as a unit that precedes the next pair.[361]

---

[354] See Beijing Daxue Kaoguxue Xi 北京大学考古学系 and Shanxi Sheng Kaogu Yanjiusuo 山西省考古研究所 1995.7.

[355] Some scholars have still tried to reconstruct the sequence of burials based on tomb geography and cemetery layout. For example, Zhang Changshou (1998) argues that within each row, tombs to the east are earlier than those to the west, and within each column, tombs to the north are earlier than those to the south. However, as Falkenhausen notes, further burials may still exist on the fringes of the cemetery, which may contradict the theories of tomb rows.

[356] Beijing Daxue Kaogu Wenboyuan 北京考古文博院 and Shanxi Sheng Kaogu Yanjiusuo 山西省考古研究所 2001.8.

[357] See Jay Xu 1996; Falkenhausen 2006: 85-89.

[358] For example, Jay Xu (1996) notes that in the excavator's sequence, they estimated the time difference between the tombs of M1and M2, and tombs of M8 and M31, three of which were looted, at only one generation. In deciding which pair to put earlier the excavators relied on a comparison of the *li* vessels alone. Falkenhausen notes that when juxtaposing the proposed *li* sequence for Beizhao with those reported from Tianma Qucun, it becomes clear that if the *li* sequences are correct for Tianma Qucun, then the Beizhao sequence is in error.

[359] Jay Xu 1996: 197.

[360] In fact if we compare the ceramic *li* vessels from paired tombs M113 and M114, both of which were treated as one unit and dated to the Early Western Zhou by the excavation team, we see that the ceramic *li* in tomb M113 is markedly different from the one from tomb M114. If we juxtapose the ceramic *li* from tomb M113 with other ceramic *li* from Tianma Qucun, we arrive at a date of around the Early Western Zhou, however, if we make the same comparison for the *li* in tomb M114, we arrive at a date of the Middle Western Zhou. See Beijing Daxue Kaogu Wenboyuan and Shanxi Sheng Kaogu Yanjiusuo 2001. 8; Falkenhausen 2006: 86-87, for an interesting table comparing different *li* vessels from Beizhao and Tianma Qucun.

[361] Jay Xu (1996). Jay Xu (1996: 196) also points out that when dating the grave pair M1-M2, the excavators, for reasons they do not explain, chose to date the pair by the *li* from M2 and the disregard to *li* from tomb M1. However, the *li* vessels from both tombs are visibly different, and

Both Jay Xu and Falkenhausen have also pointed out that the flaws in the excavator's use of the *Shiji* to further determine the chronology of the tombs.[362] None of the names on bronze vessels from the tombs correspond to the names listed in Sima Qian's *Shiji* genealogy of Jin rulers.[363] Only the posthumous names of rulers who are mentioned as dedicatees of vessels have equivalents, but there are only one or two of these.[364] Therefore, the *Shiji* appears to be inaccurate and unreliable, and, as Falkenhausen notes, the use of bronze inscriptions to identify the tomb occupant is problematic several tombs contain vessels bearing the same name. Thus, a person named in the inscription on a bronze vessel from a tomb cannot be assumed to be the tomb occupant.[365]

In short, the construction of a linear sequence of Beizhao tombs is extremely difficult, if not impossible. This chapter will, therefore, adopt the division of the Beizhao tombs set out by Falkenhausen who has divided them into an early group and late group, with the early group beginning at the late Early Western Zhou/Middle Western Zhou, and the late group reaching into the Spring and Autumn period,[366] the dividing

---

therefore are most probably of different dates, which implies the tombs should also be dated differently, rather than being treated as one unit dated to the same phase.

[362] Jay Xu 1996: 198-199. Jay Xu (1996: 198-199) disagrees with the excavator's conclusion that tomb M8 is earlier than tomb M64 and argues that tomb M64 is earlier than tomb M8. However Shim (1998) argues that Jay Xu is too hasty in deciding on the chronology of M8 and M64, based on incomplete material. Shim also argues that Jay Xu overlooks important inscriptional evidence.

[363] See Qiu Xigui 1994; Li Xueqin 1995, for a discussion of the names of Jin rulers in the historical texts and the names from bronze inscriptions.

[364] Shim (1998) suggests that the Jin Hou names listed in the *Jin Shijia* might be the honourable names officially given by the Zhou court, possibly with their posthumous titles, to commemorate the achievements the Jin lords had had in their lifetimes. Furthermore, Shim argues that the names on the Beizhao bronzes might be the original names of the rulers received from their parents.

[365] Falkenhausen 2006: 90. Falkenhausen notes that those identified as *hou* in their own inscriptions include Dui (vessels found in tombs M1, M2 and M92), Pi (tomb M8), Su (tomb M8), Boma 㚔馬(tombs M33, M91 and M92), Bangfu 邦父(tomb M64) and Xifu 喜父(tombs M91 and M92). Moreover, Shu Ze 叔夨, the donor of a *fangding* vessel found in tomb M114 (Li Boqian 2001), is regarded by some scholars as identical with Tang Shu Yu, the founder of the Jin polity. The same name also appears on a *ding* vessel from adjacent female tomb M113 (Beijing Daxue Kaoguxue Xi and Shanxi Sheng Kaogu Yanjiusuo 2001: 19). The term *Shu* 叔, indicating junior, was one of several terms used to indicate an individual's position of seniority among his or her siblings (Falkenhausen 2006: 70, 110).

[366] The Spring and Autumn period is the name give to the first three centuries or so of the Eastern Zhou, starting around 770 BC and ending around 440 BC. During this time, the royal Zhou resided at their Eastern capital of Luoyang 洛阳. Falkenhausen (1999: 450-451) notes that during

line being the 850 BC Ritual Reform. Furthermore, Falkenhausen also suggests a date of around 700 BC for the end of occupation of Beizhao.[367] According to Falkenhausen's division, the Beizhao tombs can be grouped as follows:

Pre-Ritual Reform tombs (pre 850 BC)	Post-Ritual Reform tombs (post 850 BC)
M114 (M) M113 (F) M9? (M) M13? (F)	M6 (M), M7 (F), M33 (M), M32 (F), M91 (M), M92 (F), M1 (M), M2 (F), M8 (M), M31 (F), M64 (M), M62 (F), M63 (F), M93 (M), M102 (F)

Table 4.2: The Division of the Beizhao tombs into Pre-Reform and Post-Reform

The Jin site of Shangma

The Jin site of Shangma 上马 is located in southern Shanxi, near Houma City. Investigated between 1961 and 1973, and from 1978 to 1987, Shangma, as Falkenhausen notes, is the first Bronze Age cemetery in China to have been excavated almost completely.[368] The site's 1387 reported tombs are dated around 850 to 430 BC.[369] This period broadly covers the Late Western Zhou through to the Warring States. Therefore, this site postdates the earlier Jin site of Tianma Qucun and may overlap with the site of Beizhao. The relationship between these sites is not clearly understood at present.

The excavators subdivided the cemetery into six sectors that correspond to natural subdivisions within the terrain (figures 4.9-4.12). Within each of these sectors, the tombs are arranged into clusters. The excavators regard the site as housing an extended kin group, or what Falkenhausen regards as a lineage, and the excavators take

---

this period the ritual system established in the course of the Late Western Zhou Ritual Reform was implemented in large portions of the Zhou culture area. He goes on to argue that this period is characterized, for the most part, by the consolidation of earlier trends. For a comprehensive discussion of the political developments during this time, see Cho-Yun Hsu 1999: 545-587

[367] Falkenhausen 2006: 90-91. The date of 700 BC not only appears stylistically plausible but also seems roughly compatible with the historical circumstances, for in 679 BC, according to the *Shiji*, a junior line of the Jin ruling house usurped the government. For possible complications with the date of 700 BC, see Falkenhausen 2006: 91.

[368] See Shanxi Sheng Kaogu Yanjiusuo. 1994. Shangma mudi. Beijing. Wenwu Chubanshe. An earlier report can be found in Shanxi Sheng Wenwu Guanliweiyuanhui Houma Gongzuozhan. 1963. Kaogu 5: 229-245. The excavators were helped by eminent archaeologists Professor Su Bingqi and Zhang Zhongpei.

[369] There are nine phases to the Shangma site, which correspond to the subdivisions of Hayashi Minao's comprehensive chronology of bronzes (Hayashi 1984, 1988). Falkenhausen (2001: 92) notes that it is difficult to estimate the duration of each phase. Moreover, he also notes that the chronology may be in need of revision.

the six sector subdivisions and the various clusters of tombs within them as reflecting subordinate kin-based units, with proximity in the cemetery indicating closeness in blood relationships.[370]

Within tomb clusters there are some instances of paired tombs that may have been those of married couples; however, as Falkenhausen notes, these joint burials, as at the site of Shangcunling discussed previously, seem to have been the privilege of a minority of relatively well-provided individuals.

BURIAL STRUCTURE AND TOMB FEATURES

At both the Yu and Jin sites, the standard burial form was the vertical shaft pit. The deceased was usually interred in a supine position inside a wooden burial chamber with either one or two wooden coffins, or a wooden coffin only. All of the tombs at Beizhao had wooden burial chambers, with between one and three wooden coffins inside, while 36% of the 660 tombs at Tianma Qucun yielded a wooden burial chamber. The double-occupant tombs at Baoji also had wooden burial chambers.

Falkenhausen has calculated that at the site of Shangma, wooden burial chambers are present in 187 instances amounting to around 13.5% of all tombs at the site.[371] In the vast majority of tombs, however, the coffin was placed directly into the burial pit, with funerary items sometimes placed in a small niche in the pit walls. Moreover, most tombs at Shangma – whether they have a burial chamber or not – have a single coffin. Only 1.4% of graves feature two or more coffins, or nested coffins.

There is considerable overlap in tomb sizes in both states. At Tianma Qucun, tomb sizes ranged from 1.8 m^2 up to 14.2 m^2, while those at Beizhao ranged from 15m^2 up to 38m^2. At Baoji, the double occupant tombs were significantly larger, as one would

[370] Falkenhausen notes that the situation may actually be somewhat more complicated. Sector IV is by far the last densely-occupied of the six sectors, and may represent parts of the nighbouring branch lineage, rather than a branch lineage of its own. See Falkenhausen 2001: 93-94.
[371] Falkenhausen 2001: 107.

expect, than the single occupant tombs. It is noticeable, however, that burial chambers were of relatively equal dimensions, averaging about three meters long.[372]

At the site of Beizhao, both male and female tombs had a south facing entrance ramp, with two cases of a male and female tomb with a north- and south-facing ramp.[373] None of the tombs at either Tianma Qucun or Shangma yielded this feature. At the site of Baoji, we see an interesting change in the use of entrance ramps between the lineage head tombs at Locus II and the tomb of Yu Bo at Locus III. None of the double-occupant lineage head tombs at Baoji locus II contained an entrance ramp, while at Locus III, the tomb of Yu Bo and his consort, Xingji, both had south facing ramps. The entrance ramps at Beizhao and the two ramps at Locus III appear to have been important in denoting the deceased as a certain type of person. It should also be noted that why certain tombs at Beizhao yielded two ramps and others one, and why one tomb (M102) did not have a ramp, is unclear.

A further important burial feature confined to the site of Baoji is the double occupant lineage head tombs consisting of the lineage head and his concubine (figure 4.14). At Locus II we see three tombs with type of burial, as well as the tomb of Yu Bo at Locus III. This feature continued, therefore, at Baoji from the Early Western Zhou through to the Middle Western Zhou and appears to have been the reserve of lineage heads.

We might suggest analogously that the joint burials at Beizhao and Shangma, that is to say those burials where the male and female were buried in separate tombs and pits but were aligned adjacently to each other, reflect some sort of similarity to those burials at Baoji. As Falkenhausen notes, joint burials, but with separate tombs, appear to be confined to a few tombs at Shangma, and are commonplace at the Jin ruler's site of Beizhao, attesting to the construction of a type of person, with some importance.

---

[372] Yu Bo's chamber was 3.2 meters long by 2.4 meters wide, while Xingji's chamber measured 3.2 meters long by 2.1 meters wide. At Beizhao, chamber lengths were between 3 and 4 meters (Ying Yong 2004).

[373] These ramps range from 7 meters to 20 meters long.

Therefore, some features such as entrance ramps and attendants-in-death were restricted to a few tombs (those of lineage heads) at both Baoji and Beizhao. Equally, all tombs in the Yu and Jin site shared some common elements, such as the general form of the grave (the vertical shaft pit), the use of wooden coffins and chambers, and deposition of grave goods. The burial furniture deployed, and the form of the tomb itself, was repeated consistently over time in both states.

THE DIVISION OF SPACE IN TOMBS

As set out in the previous chapters, the next point to consider is how the various burial assemblages were placed in a tomb and the use of grave space to create identity. First, studying burials at Beizhao and Tianma Qucun, there are some clear general trends in the placement of grave goods at these sites. Ceramic vessels were usually placed on the *er ceng tai*, and in tombs without an *er ceng tai*, ceramics were placed on top of the outer or inner coffin, or near the wall at the head of the tomb. Bronze vessels were usually placed in the burial chamber or inside the inner coffin, either at the deceased head or feet. In very rare cases, a bronze *ding* was sometimes placed on the *er ceng tai*. Bronze weapons, chariot and horse pieces and tools were placed in the burial chamber, while in tombs with only one coffin, bronze items were placed therein. Jade and stone objects, alongside beads, were placed in the inner coffins of tombs of different strata, suggesting a similar way of conceiving these objects in tombs despite rank and status differences. The layout of the tombs at Tianma Qucun, which yielded bronze vessels and other bronze objects, is very similar to the layout of the Beizhao tombs. Indeed in the Beizhao tombs and Tianma Qucun bronze vessel yielding tombs, there appears to be a fixed layout of grave space.

In the paired tombs at Baoji locus II and locus III, ceramic vessels were placed to one side of the grave owner on the *er ceng tai,* while bronze vessels were also placed on

the opposite side of *er ceng tai*, or between the outer and inner coffins.[374] Bronze weapons, tools and other objects were placed on top of the outer coffin; in the space between the inner and outer coffin, and sometimes inside the inner coffin. Jade, stone and bone objects were nearly always placed inside the inner coffin either on or near the body of the deceased.

Following the division of Shang and centrally located tombs into zones, we might employ the same type of approach to Yu and Jin tombs. Zone I is the space inside the inner coffin. In both Yu and Jin tombs, jade, stone, bone and other ornaments were placed in this zone. Zone II might include the space in between the inner coffin and the burial chamber. Once again, in Yu and Jin tombs, bronze vessels, weapons, tools, and other bronze objects were deposited here. Immediately, not only do these zones offer a direct contrast, but the burial space is identical to that observed at Zhangjiapo and Shangcunling discussed in the previous chapter. Therefore, the tomb space structured the burial.

Comparing these Yu and Jin burials we see some common features, such as the placement of jade, stone and bone objects, along with sets of beads, in the inner coffins in tombs of both states, and the placement of ceramic vessels on the *er ceng tai*. The position of bronze objects in Yu tombs, however, appears to be more variable than that of bronzes seen in the Jin tombs. The *er ceng tai* in Yu tombs also appears to be much more of a focus than in Jin tombs, with bronze vessels and bells commonly placed thereon. The bronze food vessels were placed along the *er ceng tai* in a row. In turn, it is possible that the vessels were used for a funerary banquet, which took place at the surface of the grave, and the vessels were then, subsequently, placed on the *er ceng tai*, which, according to the excavation report, was about one meter below surface level. Indeed, the placement of these vessels on the *er ceng tai,* contrasts with the placement of such pieces within the wooden chamber in Jin tombs. Another important area of

[374] In the large Baoji tombs, the bronze food vessels were placed along the *er ceng tai* in a row. In turn, it is possible that the vessels were used for a funerary banquet, which took place at the surface of the grave, and the vessels were then, subsequently, placed on the *er ceng tai*, which, according to the excavation report, was about one meter below surface level.

focus in Yu tombs appears to be the lid of the outer and inner coffin, with chariot fittings, weapons, bells, and other bronze items all placed on it. This area appears to have been more of a focus for activity in Yu tombs than in Jin tombs.

Furthermore, in the Beizhao cemetery, some chariot pits were located near the tomb, while some tombs, such M114 and M113, had chariot wheels placed on the *er ceng tai* and on top of the chamber. Similarly at Tianma Qucun tombs chariots were also placed in the fill of the tomb on top of the chamber. At Baoji, chariot wheels were placed on the *er ceng tai* in the tomb of Yu Bo and chariots were placed in pits, which were located near the tomb. Overall, we see a similar interment patterns for chariots in Yu and Jin tombs.

At Beizhao, some ramps were used for animal sacrifices. For example, the ramp on tomb M13 contained a cow, the ramp on M6 contained dogs, the ramps on tomb M64, M63 and M62 contained horses, and the ramp on tomb M93 contained horses, dogs and cattle.

Looking at the various patterns that have emerged from the data and putting them all together, an interesting picture of the division of space in Yu and Jin tombs emerges. Just as Campbell has argued in the Late Shang, so we might suggest here that Yu and Jin burial followed a fixed template from which few deviants were made. There was a clear distinction in terms of the features between large and small burials, in some cases the differences were categorical and in others it was scalar. Large tombs had entrance ramps, some had attendants in death and chariot pits. In other cases, features such as ceramics, some jade and stone objects, were held in common, distinguished only in terms of quantity and quality, alongside tomb furniture, dog sacrifices and mortuary features such as *er ceng tai* and burial chambers. This ultimately suggests that there existed common templates for Yu and Jin tombs.

SETS OF BRONZE OBJECTS

As in the Late Shang and the Guo state, in the Yu and Jin states, burial deposits were built around either a bronze or ceramic vessel. At the site of Baoji, most of the 24 tombs yielded bronze ritual vessels.[375] That few of the tombs contained ceramic vessels without bronze vessels should be treated cautiously as this no doubt reflects the lack of detailed exploration of Yu site. The best evidence for the division between tombs with bronze vessels and ceramic vessels comes from Shangma. Out of the 1390 tombs at the site, only around 20 of them contained bronze ritual vessels, amounting to around 1.4% of the total number of graves. The other tombs at Shangma were provided with an assemblage centered on ceramic vessels, the significance of which will be explored later. At Tianma Qucun, based on the limited sample of excavated tombs, around 43 of the 660 or so tombs yielded bronze ritual vessels, with the other tombs containing either ceramic vessels or no burial goods at all. Therefore, bronze ritual vessels were seemingly restricted to a few tombs in the Jin state, with the vast majkorioty of graves void of ritual vessels, and, as we shall see, other bronze burial goods.

The division between pre-Reform and post-Reform vessels discussed in the previous chapter is also applicable to this one. Broadly speaking, the tombs at Baoji and around 44 tombs at Tianma Qucun, and four at Beizhao, yielded vessel sets typical of the pre-Reform period. The tombs at Shangma and most of those at Beizhao contained vessel of the post-Reform period. The tombs at Baoji and Tianma Qucun allow us to examine pre-Reform bronzes in more detail than the looted tombs at Zhangjiapo outlined in the previous chapter.

At Baoji, the difference between the tombs of lineage heads and those of their lesser-ranking relatives is most clearly manifest in the absolute number of bronze ritual

375 Here, I differentiate between tombs with bronze vessels and those with replica lead vessels. At Baoji, two tombs had a lead replica *ding* and *gui* each. The excavation report labels these as *mingqi*, a problematic term found in much later textual sources. For a critique of this term, see Rawson 1998.

vessels.[376] Almost every vessel assemblage includes *ding* tripods and *gui* tureens, and the richer tombs differ from the more modest ones primarily through the number of 'wine' vessels they contain. At Tianma Qucun and Beizhao we see somewhat similar quantitative differences between tombs. The two early tombs, M113 and M114, at Beizhao yielded 29 and 14+ vessels respectively, while the richest excavated tombs at Tianma Qucun yielded around 12 vessels each (M6081 and M6231).

Looking more closely at the vessels from Baoji, we see considerable variation in types, sizes, shapes and ornament.[377] Indeed, such nuances within the ritual vessels sets appear to have been ways in which the owner manipulated the objects to express some sort of identity. Rawson has also pointed out that some tombs at Baoji had antiquities among their bronzes, possibly inherited from earlier members of their families.[378] These antiquities often carry inscriptions, naming different owners and ancestors. The tombs at Baoji include vessels formerly belonging to the Ge family. As such, the ritual vessels may have helped locate the deceased within a web of social relationships.

By contrast, most of the Beizhao tombs, dated to after the Ritual Reform of 850 BC, contain the uniform and matching sets of *ding* and *gui*, and the graves adhere to the sumptuary rules of the Reform: most male tomb occupants are accompanied by a set of five *ding*, one tomb occupant contained seven *ding*;[379] vessels of other types, such as *gui*

---

[376] For example, from the Baoji tombs dated to the Early Western Zhou, the three elite males in the paired tombs were interred with between 14 and 23 vessels each, while those in single tombs contained between 9 and a single vessel each.

[377] Tomb BZM13 contained seven *ding* vessels, five in circular section and two in square section. The five circular *ding* measured between 16.1 cm in height to 25.2cm in height, while the two *fangding* measured 26.4cm and 21cm in height. None of the *ding* vessels from the tomb were of equal height. At the same time, the three *gui* vessels from the tomb measured between 14 cm in height and 25.9cm in height. This variation is also seen among the vessels in tombs BZM7 and BZM4. The emphasis on difference in early vessel sets is also noticeable in vessel ornament and decoration. The vessel sets from the Baoji and Tianma Qucun tombs contain contrasting ornament, combining both ornate pieces and plain pieces. The *you* wine bucket from tomb BZM7 at Baoji serves as an example of an elaborate piece. The vessel's handle carries four realistic animal heads; two at the base of the handle and two near the top. The body and lid carry wide projected flanges and contain intricate decoration. Tomb BZM13 contained a very ornate *gui* vessel, sitting on a large square base.

[378] Rawson 1999: 369.

[379] This tomb, M91, which contained seven *ding*, and the consort tomb, M92 which contained two *ding* stand out from the other tombs at Beizhao, not only because of this *ding* provision, but also because they were the only tombs to face South, whereas all the other tombs at the site faced North.

tureens and *hu* flasks, also conform to standard groupings. The predominantly five *ding* provision in male tombs at Beizhao suggests that this privilege was hereditary.

Moreover, Falkenhausen has comprehensively discussed the bronze ritual vessel sets at the site of Shangma. He suggests that the Shangma bronze vessels from twenty-three tombs at the site all conform to the sumptuary rules of the Ritual Reform. A single tomb contained seven-*ding* vessels, while two tombs contained five *ding*. There all seven tombs with three *ding* vessels and thirteen ones with a single *ding*. More generally, a tomb at the site might contain anywhere between twenty to a single vessel.

The structure of burial deposits

Having highlighted some of the main differences in the ritual vessels sets in the Yu and Jin states, we might now start to think about how grave good assemblages were structured and formalised in these peripheral Zhou tombs. The types of burial goods that were placed alongside either bronze or ceramic vessels are markedly different. At Tianma Qucun, a tomb with bronze vessels might also contain bronze weapons, a selection of bronze tools, and chariot and horse pieces. By contrast, a tomb with ceramic vessels might contain jade objects, but no bronze tools, chariot and horse fittings or bells. Equally, at Shangma bronze items are only found in tombs with bronze vessels. Therefore, we see a clear divide in the Jin state between tombs with bronze vessels accompanied by bronze weapons, tools, and chariot and horse pieces and graves with ceramic vessels and jade objects. Thus, tombs with ceramic vessels exhibit a very limited repertoire of objects.

At Shangma and Tianma Qucun, tombs with bronze vessels (and other bronze objects) all contained a wooden burial chamber without exception. As in the Guo state discussed in the previous chapter, in the Jin state the deposition of bronze vessels in tomb seems to have been contingent upon the deceased position as a member of the ranked elite. Equally, not all tombs with chambers contained bronze items. Therefore,

while bronze burial goods were exclusively deposited in tombs with chambers, not all tombs with chambers contained these items.

Nonetheless, the clear correlation between bronze items and tombs with wooden chambers is significant for it helped perpetuate this ideology within the funerary context, which, in turn, helped structure burials themselves. Once again, the repetition would have been crucial for the coherence and experiencing of the burial identity.

Bronze Vessel Assemblage	Number of tombs
Bronze Vessels	6
Bronze vessels + weapons	2
Bronze vessels + weapons + chariot fittings	2
Bronze vessels + weapons + chariot fittings + tools	3
Bronze vessels + weapons + chariot fittings + tools + bells	4

Table 4.3: Bronze Grave Good Combinations at Baoji

Bronze Vessel Assemblage	Number of tombs
Bronze vessels	3
Bronze vessels + weapons	3
Bronze vessels + weapons + chariot fittings	4
Bronze vessels +chariot fittings	1
Bronze vessels + weapons + chariot fittings + tools	3
Bronze vessels + weapons + chariot fittings + bells	2

Table 4.4: Bronze Grave Good Combinations at Shangma

Bronze Vessel Assemblage	Number of tombs
Bronze vessels	17
Bronze vessels + weapons	15
Bronze vessels + chariot fittings	2
Bronze vessels + weapons + chariot fittings	5
Bronze vessels + weapons + chariot fittings + tools	4

Table 4.5: Bronze Grave Good Combinations at Tianma Qucun

Bronze Vessel Assemblage	Number of tombs
Bronze vessels + weapons + chariot pieces + tools + bells	Male
Bronze vessels + chariot fittings	Female

Table 4.6: Bronze Grave Good Combinations at Beizhao

From table 4.3, we can identify a set number of burial deposits in the Yu and Jin states: five and six respectively (figures 4.15-4.21).[380] The restricted number of deposits immediately suggests that the constellation of bronze objects in these tombs was

[380] There were five deposits at Tianma Qucun and a single, differentiated deposit (featuring bronze bells) at Beizhao, making six different structured burial assemblages in the Jin state.

structured in some way. Indeed, the way in which the objects were combined in Yu and Jin graves was standardised and highly formulaic. As such, the objects do not appear to have been grouped together on an *ad hoc* basis. The grave goods are structured in such a way as to allow us to categorise and differentiate each grave based on the "last" object type. For example, at all three sites, we see tombs with bronze ritual vessels only. The next group of graves encompasses bronze vessels and chariot pieces and bronze vessels, chariot pieces and weapons. The next group of graves includes vessels, weapons, chariot pieces and tools. Hence, a sequence can be ascertained from the distinguishing and differentiating final bronze object, which almost appears to catergorise the tomb in some way.

Indeed, the burial of a lineage leader in both the Yu and Jin states is set apart from a few other elite burials by bronze bells only. In other words, a few other elite male tombs contained ritual vessels, weapons, chariot pieces, and a selection of bronze tools, as did the tomb of a lineage head, but no non-lineage head tomb contained bronze bells.[381] Thus, bronze bells characterise a lineage leader's tomb.

By extension, there appear to have been set ways in which objects could be combined in tombs. For instance, no tomb at Baoji, Tianma Qucun or Shangma contained bronze vessels and a selection of bronze tools only. At Baoji, no tomb contained bronze ritual vessels and chariot fittings only, by contrast to that at Shangma and Tianma Qucun. As such, the process of creating different identities through burial compositions, thus, in both states was through a series of additive choices to the burial assemblage. In this way different compositions could be built up and distinguished from each other.

Moreover, the structured nature of Jin and Yu burials suggests that objects could only be added to the assemblage if other pieces were present. Bronze tools, for instance, would not be added to the grave without the set also including vessels, weapons and

[381] For a discussion of the sources of Late Western Zhou bells in the south and their possible transmission by way of Shaanxi, see Rawson, *Western Zhou Ritual Bronzes from the Arthur M. Sackler Collections*, vol. III: 123-129. For a comprehensive discussion of bronze bell types during the Zhou, see Falkenhausen 1993.

chariot pieces. Thus, the objects were added to the tomb in a very structured way to as to reproduce the highly conventional grave good sets discussed above.

The Jin burial evidence also allows us to say that the combinations of bronze objects to form a burial assemblage changed very little over the course of the Western Zhou through to the Eastern Zhou. The same formulaic grave good sets seen at Tianam Qucun can still be seen at the much later site of Shangma. In effect, the way that the living were formulating a set of objects to be interred with the deceased remained the same for some five hundred years or so.[382]

Quantities and types of objects in tombs

Even though Yu and Jin burials were highly structured and conventional, and contained the same categories of grave goods (weapons, tools) the overall quantities of grave goods in tombs varied enormously. As I have noted above, a tomb at Tianma Qucun might contain up to 12 ritual vessels, while the Beizhao tombs contain up to 30 vessels.

Moreover, weapon numbers also varied. At Baoji, a tomb might contain a single weapon (usually a halberd), while the tombs interpreted as housing lineage heads (BZM13, BZM4, BZM7) yielded up to 20 weapons encompassing four main types: halberds, spearheads, arrowheads and axes.[383] It should be noted that while these four types of weapons were found in the tombs of the lineage heads, smaller graves contained one or two types. Chariot and horse fittings also occur in differing quantities, with between two and fifty pieces deposited in a tomb.[384]

---

[382] That the same combinations were employed in the Jin state for this extensive period of time also suggests that the Ritual Reform, while having a profound impact on the vessel sets, did little to change the way in which grave good sets were put together for burials.

[383] For example tomb BZM13 contained three spearheads, five bronze arrowheads, six halberds and one sword. Tomb BZM7 yielded one sword 10 halberds and three spearheads. Tomb BZM8 yielded three halberds one sword.

[384] Tomb BZM13 yielded five *wei* 軎, five *luan* 銮bells, twenty horse fittings, and several nodes. Tomb BZM7 yielded seven bronze bridles, two *wei*, and several horse fittings. Tomb BZM4 contained two *wei*, three *luan* bells, three bridles, and a range of horse fittings.

At Tianma Qucun, weapon quantities range from twelve to a single piece (halberd). The tombs also contained various types of weapons, though not in equal quantities. The principal weapon type at the site was the bronze hafted halberd, with spearheads, arrowheads and bronze *jian* swords interred in smaller quantities.[385] Similarly, the Tianma Qucun graves also contained differing quantities and types of chariot and horse fittings.[386]

By contrast, at Baoji, Tianma Qucun and Shangma bronze tools in the form of an adze, chisel, scraper and small axe were deposited in tombs in single quantities. This means that where present and without exception a tomb always contained a single type of bronze tool. Therefore, tools seemingly followed different patterns of interment than vessels, weapons and chariot and horse pieces. Consequently, these patterns provided further structure to the burial alongside the formulaic way in which the burials were put together.

At Tianma Qucun, chariot pits accompanied those tombs with a selection of bronze tools, weapons and chariot and horse fittings, while we see that the lineage leaders and their consorts were routinely buried with horse and chariot pits.[387] At Tianma Qucun, four tombs had chariots placed not in burial pits, but on the roof of the tomb chamber. Moreover, the excavators associate those chariot pits at Tianma Qucun with nearby *pairs* of large tombs, which comprise the burial of a male and female, which

---

[385] Not all tombs contained these four types of weapons. For example, tomb M6081 yielded three halberds; tomb M6195 yielded seven halberds and one spearhead; tomb M6201 contained five halberds, one spearhead and one arrowhead; tomb M5189 contained a single bronze arrowhead and tomb M6231 yielded eight halberds, three bronze arrowheads and a single bronze short sword.

[386] For example, tomb M5189 contained 24 bridles, 15 nodes and *luan* bells, tomb M6231 contained 4 *wei*, 10 linchpins, 22 bridles, 8 nodes and 10 *luan* bells, tomb M6214 contained 2 *wei*, 2 linchpins, 4 bridles and 10 nodes and tomb M6081 contained 4 linchpins, 8 bridles, 2 nodes, 6 *luan* bells and 8 yokes or collars.

[387] Male tomb M8 at Beizhao is reported to have several different types of chariots in the accompanying chariot pit. The Shanxi Archaeological Research Institute, the excavators of the new Jin tombs at Yangshe village, have noted a substantial chariot pit at the site, measuring around 24 meters in length, which may contain as many as 50 chariots and over 100 horses (personal communication). At Beizhao, tomb M9 contained seven chariots on the entrance ramps. Most other tombs yielded a singe chariot only.

presumably constitute a husband and wife.[388] Although I will discuss gender in more detail below, it is interesting to note that shared chariot pits appear to have been a feature of the Jin state throughout the Zhou period. Nonetheless, within the above sequence, we might posit that at Tianma Qucun, pits accompanied tombs after the most restricted type of item at the site, bronze tools, was interred in tombs. Moreover, the deposition of bronze bells was not dependent on chariot pits, or vice versa, suggesting that chariot pits, alongside a composition featuring vessels, weapons and bells was standard for a Jin lineage leader.

At Baoji, chariot pits accompanied only the tomb of Yu Bo at Locus III. By contrast, none of the lineage leaders at Locus II were buried with accompanying chariot pits. Therefore, we appear to see some change in what constituted the creation of a lineage leader's identity at burial over time at Baoji. Moreover, we also see, through these chariot pits, more investment in the funerary process and what people were willing to commit to the ground.

GENDER IDENTITY

The Jin tombs at Tianma Qucun, Beizhao and Shangma provide us with ample data from which we can investigate gender identities over a period from the Early Western Zhou through to the Warring States in this state. Due to poor skeletal remains and the fact that only seven tombs (out of 22 in total) were sexed, the data at Baoji is less useful than the Jin data. Nonetheless, where possible, I will try and utilize the Yu data within the analysis.

The first issue to address with regards to gender is how male and female tombs were structured. To begin with, males and females in the Jin state shared the same tomb

[388] At Tianma Qucun, pit J4.2, which contained two chariots and ten horses, accompanied tombs M6080 (male) and M6231 (female), both of which yielded sets of bronze ritual vessels. Another pit accompanied tombs M6197 (male) and M6195 (female), both of which, again, yielded sets of ritual vessels. One pit, J.4, contained a chariot and eight horses, along with a thirty-year-old male, interred on a raised step behind the chariot. Given that few of these pits contained chariot fittings, and in those that do such pieces were interred in single quantities, it is likely that the large quantities of bronze chariot fittings in male and female tombs at Tianma Qucun equipped these chariots and horses.

type and tomb furniture. In other words, a male and a female were interred in a vertical shaft pit with potentially a wooden chamber and between one and three wooden coffins. At Beizhao, both male and female tombs had entrance ramps, alongside attendants-in-death and animal sacrifices. The layout of the tomb was also not seemingly gendered. As noted in the previous chapter, gender was not reified through tomb furniture or features, nor through the positioning of the body within the grave.

The burial deposits reveal that gender was in fact (re)produced through a structured burial assemblage which encompassed particualar categories of bronze items. The table below tabulates the different contents of male and female graves at the site of Tianma Qucun:

Male Assemblages	The Number of Tombs	Tombs	Female Assemblages	The Number of Tombs	Tombs
Bronze vessels + weapons + chariot and horse pieces + tools + chariot on roof of tomb	4	M6081, M6231, 6130, 6384	Bronze vessels + chariot and horse fittings	3	M6069, M6080, M6124
Bronze vessels + weapons + chariot and horse pieces	3	M6195, M5189, 6071	Bronze vessels	10	M5150, 6054, 6121, 6126, 6131, 6190, 6235, 6390, 7005, 7167
Bronze vessels + weapons	14	6105,6179, 6204, 6242, 6243, 6372, 6496, 7052, 7095, 7146, 7165, 7176, 7185, 7070			
Bronze vessels	5	M6434, 7003, 7014, 7004, 6127			

Table 4.7: Bronze Objects Desposited in Male and Female Tombs at Tianma Qucun

Bronze vessels + weapons + chariot pieces + tools + bells	Male
Bronze vessels + chariot fittings[389]	Female

Table 4.8: Gender and Bronze Objects a Beizhao

From the tables 4.7 and 4.8, we might posit that there were five different types of combinations for males and two different types for females (figures 4.21-4.25). Given that only a small portion of the Tianma Qucun site was excavated, and given the

[389] This deposit does not include the presence of "exotic" bronze objects in some female tombs. These objects will be explored in more detail in the subsequent sections.

unknown quantities of tombs remaining, we can only speak very generally about the number of tombs with the different burial assemblages. Nonetheless, clearly we see a wider range of burial types for men than for women.

Based on the above sample of excavated tombs, the most common male burial assemblage consisted of bronze vessels and one or more bronze weapons. In most cases, the most common weapon type found in these tombs was the bronze halberd, followed by the bronze arrowhead. In male tombs with a richer burial assemblage comprising chariot and horse fittings and tools, the grave might also include bronze spearheads and a bronze *jian* short sword.[390]

Limited numbers of male tombs contained bronze chariot and horse fittings and a selection of bronze tools. The distinguishing aspects of male tombs, or those objects which differentiated different types of male identities at burial, were primarily chariot and horse fittings and the selection of bronze tools. The Jin ruler's tomb contained vessels, weapons, chariot fittings, tools and bronze bells. The bells not only differentiated the Beizhao assemblages from those at Tianma Qucun, but they also served to categorise the burial set of the Jin ruler.

As at Sanmenxia discussed in the previous chapter, weapons, tools and bells were not only used in the performance of a gendered identity, but the objects also served to categorise male tombs in some way. Thus, Jin burials are structured, like Guo burials, in such a way that bronze objects could only be added if others were already present and the pieces were combined in formulaic ways.

There were primarily two different burial types for females. The first centered on bronze ritual vessels only, while the second comprised a combination of bronze vessels and chariot and horse pieces. The interment of chariot and horse pieces, therefore, was central in differentiating female identities into these two types. Moreover, the combination of vessels and chariot fittings may also have been integral within the

[390] For more on the *jian* short sword see Lu Liancheng and Hu Zhisheng 1988: 245-248. The short sword seems to have originated in the Northern Zone (possible around the Gansu area).

performance of a female identity, as this constellation of objects appears to have only been placed with a female. This situation is reminiscent of that in the Guo state discussed previously.

Moreover, it is noticeable that both males and females were deposited with bronze vessels only. In other words, these tombs contained a similar burial assemblage. As such, clearly some tombs (perhaps the majority, though such a claim cannot be substantiated because of incomplete cemetery evidence) did not contain a deposit featuring objects which one might associate with the creation of a gendered identity. Therefore, the living clearly chose not to emphasise gender as a part of the tomb occupant's identity.

As such, if we suggest that a burial yielding bronze vessels only did not appear to recite gender, then perhaps the *combination* of bronze vessels and chariot and horse fittings did (re)produce some sort of female identity. If so, then one of the most striking features of burials with this constellation of burials goods is their homogeneity. Essentially, females of any social position were interred with bronze vessels and chariot fittings. The Jin consorts at Beizhao and non-ruling elite females buried in chambers and in wooden coffins only were interred with this structured deposit.

Moreover, we might also draw parallels here with female tombs at Sanmenxia. Females in the Guo state were interred with the same categories of objects (vessels and vessels and chariot pieces) as those at Tianma Qucun. Although it should be noted that the vessels themselves were very different (at Tianma Qucun we see pre-Reform vessels), the same combination of these objects was employed repeatedly in Jin and Guo tombs.

By contrast, the tombs of the lineage heads were differentiated from the non-ruling elite male tombs through the deposition of bronze bells. The other categories of objects (weapons, tools) are found at both Beizhao and Tianma Qucun. Moreover, given that a few of the lineage head tombs have yielded bronze bells (such as M64, M93), we might speculate that the other tombs of the lineage heads would have been furnished

with these objects.[391] Therefore, bronze bells clearly created a difference between males of alternate social positions and were integral within the (re)creation of a particular social identity seemingly related, though perhaps not limited to, gender and social position. In any case this structured deposit was clearly restricted, as was the identity being performed.

Perhaps one of the most striking features of the Jin state is the provision of joint chariot pits for males and females.[392] Such pits occur at Beizhao and Tianma Qucun.[393] Moreover, at Beizhao, both male and female tombs had chariots deposited on the entrance ramps. While most tombs had a single chariot, tomb M92 is reported to have had seven chariots placed side-by-side along the entrance ramp.[394] Clearly, the interment of chariots both in pits and along tomb entrance ramps at Beizhao constituted an important part of the funerary process.

Moreover, Ying Yong has noted an importance reoccurring difference in the way that chariots were deposited in the tombs of the lineage heads vis-à-vis the graves of the consorts. In male tombs, the chariots were usually placed on the ramp disarticulated, while the ones in female tombs were placed intact.[395] We might tentatively (given the fragmentary nature of the evidence from Beizhao to date) posit that the way in which the chariot was interred in a tomb of a lineage head and a consort related to the (re)enactment of a gendered identity. Presumably, either interring a chariot intact or taking it apart before or at the time of burial, would have invariably involded a

---

[391] We still await the full publication of the Beizhao tombs.
[392] Jay Xu 1996: 45.
[393] At Tianma Qucun, pit J4.2, which contained two chariots and ten horses, accompanied tombs M6080 (male) and M6231 (female), both of which yielded sets of bronze ritual vessels. Another pit accompanied tombs M6197 (male) and M6195 (female), both of which, again, yielded sets of ritual vessels. One pit, J.4, contained a chariot and eight horses, along with a thirty-year-old male, interred on a raised step behind the chariot. Given that few of these pits contained chariot fittings, and in those that do such pieces were interred in single quantities, it is likely that the large quantities of bronze chariot fittings in male and female tombs at Tianma Qucun equipped these chariots and horses.
[394] It should be noted these figures are provisional, pending the full archaeological report of the tombs.
[395] The wheels on the chariots in male tombs measured around 140-150 cm, while those in female tombs measured around 100-110 cm. Ying Yong (2004) has also suggested that chariot fittings for female tombs were more intricate than those pieces for male tombs. However, as many of the pits have not yet been excavated at Beizhao, we should be cautious about these ideas at present.

somewhat difference funerary performance. This difference may have only been minor when placed in the wider context of a Jin lineage head burial, which must have in itself been a spectucualr event. Nonetheless, this, perhaps subtle, change within the funerary performance may have had significant implications, for the manner of the chariot's disposal not only differentiated the tomb of a lineage head and a consort, but was also integral withint the experience of that identity at burial.

The disposal of the chariot and the interment of bronze tools, weapons and bells, were not the only differences between the tomb of a lineage head and his consort. Indeed, one of the main differentiating features of a Jin consort's tomb was the internment of, what we might term, "exotic" or unusual bronze object types. And, given that female burials, and identities, were largely homogenous in the Jin state, these exotic objects seem to take on even more significance for the tombs of the Jin consorts.

Before I explore these "exotic" bronze pieces in female tombs, and the ramifications for gender and, indeed, possible cases of ethnic identity, I will first tabulate the different male and female identities from the tombs at Shangma in order to provide us some sense of continuity in the construction of gender identities in the Jin state.

Male Assemblages	Number of tombs	Tomb Numbers	Female Assemblages	Number of tombs
Bronze vessels + weapons + chariot and horse objects + bronze bells	2	M1004, 5128	Bronze vessels + chariot and horse fittings	7+
Bronze vessels + bronze weapons + chariot and horse pieces + tools	4	M1010, M2008, 63H, M13	Bronze vessels	2+
Bronze vessels + bronze tools + chariot and horse pieces	3	M1015, 4078, 4094		
Bronze vessels + chariot and horse pieces	1	M1026		
Bronze vessels + weapons	3	M1033, 1287, 2148		
Bronze vessels	2	M1006, 4090		

Table 4.9: Bronze Objects Deposited in Male and Female Tombs at Shangma

The situation at Shangma provides us with an interesting contrast to that at Tianma Qucun. As Shangma is the only site to be excavated in full, so far, we are unable to determine whether it is unique or representative of this later period generally.

To begin with, it is worth noting that Falkenhausen has made some observations about gender difference at Shangma. He notes that, as at Shangcunling discussed in the previous chapter, the highest *ding* privilege is found in male tombs. Where pairs of tombs can be identified, the female usually has a lower privilege than her, supposed, husband's.[396] However, Falkenhausen also notes a rather extraordinary case of a female tomb yielding a higher *ding* privilege than her husband's tomb.[397]

[396] Falkenhausen 2006: 236.
[397] Falkenhausen 2006: 245.

Broadly speaking, there are six structured burial deposits in male tombs and two in female tombs at Shangma. Female burial assemblages remained remarkably similar to that seen at Tianma Qucun. In fact, from the time of the Early Western Zhou right through to the Eastern Zhou, and beyond until the Warring States Period, there were only two types of female burial assemblages containing bronze vessels, and bronze vessels and chariot and horse pieces. If bronze objects were central in creating and negotiating identities, then the way that female were conceptualised at burial in the Jin state changed very little over the course of the Zhou period.

The shared elements within a male and female burial, within the Jin state tombs, always centered on bronze vessels and bronze chariot and horse fittings. A further shared element at Shangma, in line with Beizhao, and Tianma Qucun, was the provision of shared chariot and horse pits for male and females. The excavators noted four instances of shared chariot and horse pits at Shangma.[398]

Gender at Baoji

Most of the discussion so far has centered on the Jin state tombs, owing to the large sample of excavated graves, and the detailed work on the skeletons post excavation, which ascertained sex and age. However, it is also worth noting that based on the number, albeit limited, of sexed Yu tombs, which encompass the lineage heads only, we can see an obvious difference between the objects from a tomb of a Yu lineage head and those from the tomb of a concubine or, in the case of BMR1, concubine and consort. As I discussed in chapter I, Yu Jiang has noted that weapons, tools and bells were restricted to the tombs of lineage heads.

Indeed, the lineage heads were buried with bronze vessels, bronze weapons, a large selection of bronze tools, bronze decorative utensils (such as hairpins), bronze chariot and horse fittings and bronze bells. This assemblage is seen in the three tombs at Locus II and tomb BRM1 at Locus III. We can, therefore, surmise that between the Early

[398] See Shanxi Sheng Kaogu Yanjiusuo 1994: 257-259.

Western Zhou and the Middle Western Zhou, this formulaic burial composition formed the standard set for a Yu lineage head (as it did, interestingly, for a Jin lineage head).

The burial assemblages of the four concubines, three in tombs BZM13, BZM4 and BZM7, alongside BRM1, were also standardised. The reduced burial set in these tombs comprised bronze vessels and bronze utensils only.[399] The tomb of Xingji, consort of Yu Bo interred at Locus III, also contained bronze ritual vessels and bronze decorative pieces only. In the case of tomb BRM1, the difference between the assemblage of the concubine and the consort did not centre on the provision of bronze items. Due to the limited number of other female tombs at the site, we cannot ascertain whether an assemblage focused solely on bronze ritual vessels characterized a female tomb. However, given the replication of the composition over the course of Locus II and Locus III, and the presumed social standing of the female tomb occupants, it would not unreasonable to posit that a female burial set consisted primarily of bronze ritual vessels.

Thus, while some females in the Jin state were interred with bronze chariot and horse fittings, no known Yu female tomb had these burial items within their assemblage. Moreover, while the Jin consorts were buried with chariots alongside their husbands, Xingji, the consort of Yu Bo, was not. Chariot pieces and the chariot itself was an integral part of ruling elite female identity in the Jin state, by contrast to the Yu state. Therefore, clearly chariot and horse fittings played different roles negotiating gender in the Yu and Jin.

The absence of chariot and horse fittings in female Yu tombs is significant given that in the Jin state, as discussed above, there are two principal ways in which "females" were buried, one of which is a combination of bronze ritual vessels and horse and chariot fittings. The other type of burial contained bronze vessels only, which may indicate that gender was not reified materially in these tombs. Essentially, and I can

[399] The concubine in tomb BZM13 was buried with three ritual vessels, a bronze comb and five bronze hairpins; the female buried in tomb BZM4 was interred with seven ritual vessel, a single bronze comb and seven bronze hairpins; the female buried in tomb BZM7 was interred with four ritual vessels, a single bronze comb and ten bronze hairpins.

only speculate at present, there may have been only one principal type of female burial at Baoji, encompassing bronze ritual vessels and bronze ornaments. Indeed, the five richest female tombs at the site (BZM13, BZM7, BZM4, BRM1 and BRM2) all yielded a set of bronze grave goods built principally around these two object types. Therefore, we might conclude that a female identity was not overtly expressed materially within a Yu burial.

Gendered objects in the Jin and Yu states

By contrast to the aforementioned situation with female burials in the Yu state, distinct male identities in both the Yu and Jin burials were performed and (re)experienced by three categories of bronze objects within a wider structured burial deposit. In the Jin state, there were three types of objects that appear to be confined to male tombs: bronze bells, bronze tools and bronze weapons (these objects do not always occur together in male tombs). The first of these, bronze bells, were only found in the tombs at Beizhao, or at Shangma, in only two male tombs. Bronze tools had a slightly wider distribution: they are found in four male tombs at Tianma Qucun and in the rulers' tombs at Beizhao. At Shangma, bronze tools were only found in seven male tombs. Bronze weapons were found in 21 male tombs at Tianma Qucun; an uncertain number of tombs at Beizhao, all of which were male; and in nine graves at Shangma.[400]

The Jin rulers' tombs usually had a larger selection of bronze tools than those at Tianma Qucun. At the latter site, the most common tool type was the bronze chisel, with only one tomb yielding a small chopping axe. At the former site, tomb M93, for instance, yielded a chisel, a scraper, a small chopping axe and an adze. Similarly, those tombs with bronze tools at Shangma also yielded a chisel only. In this case, bronze chisels seem to have been the standard tool type interred in most graves where tools were part of the burial.

[400] The male tombs at Tianma Qucun yielded 86 bronze halberds, four spearheads, three arrowheads and several short swords. At Shangma, most of the weapons were bronze halberds, alongside three Zhou ring-pommeled knives. Tomb M13 yielded an unusually ornate bronze spearhead, but this was the only individualized weapon at the site.

As I briefly mentioned above, the bronze halberd was a ubiquitous weapon type within a weapon assemblage.[401] After this, a male might be interred with, in order of increasing restrictiveness, a bronze arrowhead, a bronze spearhead and a bronze *jian* sword. The *jian* sword was no longer a component of the weapon assemblage in male tombs at Shangma, which suggests that it might have gone out of fashion by the Eastern Zhou period.

However, not all male tombs contained the same array of bronze items: some burials might contain weapons only and others might contain weapons and tools. The tombs of the lineage heads always contained weapons, tools and bells without exception. The combination of these bronze items within the structured burial deposit appeared to create different types of male identities.

As I have noted above, and to reiterare, not all male burials contained bronze weapons or tools. At Tianma Qucun and Shangma, five and two tombs respectively, all sexed as males of different ages (see appendix), contained a selection of bronze ritual vessels only. As such, some men were not interred with bronze items which acted as fundamental parts of other male burials.

At the site of Baoji, we see a somewhat comparable situation to that of the Jin state cemeteries. Bronze bells, bronze tools and bronze weapons were all found in male tombs only, as were a selection of bronze chariot and horse fittings.[402] Indeed, the

---

[401] The different conception of weaponry in the Jin state compared with the Yu and Yan states is also seen in the treatment of bronze weapons at burials. At Tianma Qucun and Beizhao, most weapons were deliberately broken or bent before internment in the tomb. Jing Zhongwei (2006) has recently discussed this fascinating practice. Jing Zhongwei suggests that bending or breaking weapons appears to have been an important ritual practice that was largely confined to bronze weaponry. From the tombs at Tianma Qucun, 84 bronze halberds, 25 bronze arrowheads, 4 spearheads and 3 short swords were either bent or broken. Such pieces are found in the tombs of the ruling and non-ruling elites, suggesting a widespread phenomenon. There appears to have been three separate acts of 'destroying' the weapon: bending the piece at the centre, bending the tip, or breaking the weapon in half. Each of these acts effectively rendered the weapon unusable. Jing Zhongwei attempts to trace this practice back to the Late Shang; however, there is little evidence to suggest that destroying weapons was a Shang practice.

[402] The Yu tombs contained two types of bronze halberds. The first type is large, around 20 cm long, while second type is much smaller, around 6 cm long. The excavation reports, along with subsequent scholars, have labeled the small halberds as *mingqi*. However, conventionally, *mingqi* pieces are supposed to act as stand-ins for "real", usable pieces, possibly, as suggested by Falkenhausen (2006: 302) in the tombs of people too poor to afford real ones or, as in the case of the later Beizhao tombs, which contained replica pre-Reform vessels, to create ideas of status by

depositon of bronze chariot and horse fittings in male tombs only at Baoji is distinctly different to the use of these objects to seemingly create both male ande female identities in the Jin state. As I will set out in the following chapter, this difference suggests that gender discourse was not uniform across the Zhou state, and, indeed, when discussing gender such divergences need to be acknowledged to appreciate the fluidity of gender.

Turning to female graves, aside from the exotic objects to be discussed below, there are no instances of individual categories of objects that formulated a female identity in the same way that bronze weapons, tools and bells recreated male identity. As I have noted above, perhaps by virtue of the fact that bronze weapons were not interred in female tombs, the *combination* of bronze vessels and bronze chariot and horse fittings seems to have taken on some sort of gendered significance in (re)creating female identity.

Exotic objects

The situation regarding gendered objects in the Jin state is a little more complex with regards to the consort tombs at Beizhao. In these tombs we *do* appear to see a type of bronze item that was only deposited in the tombs of Jin consorts. Although it is not my intention in this thesis to discuss single objects in great length, the importanc of these objects is such that they deserve more individual exploration, especially in light of Rawson's recent work in the interaction between the Zhou and the people to the north, and the underestimated influence that the latter appears to have had on the former.

Three tombs at Beizhao yielded miniature bronze boxes, while tomb M63 and M31 also contained unusual cylindrical bronze pieces or unusually ornate bronze vessels.[403] No such pieces are found in the male tombs at Beizhao. These pieces neither

showing ones descent through several generations (Rawson 2007). In fact, Rawson has advanced the term replica pieces rather than *mingqi*. As "real" bronze halberds always accompany the small halberds in the Baoji tombs, the argument that the small pieces are substitutes does not hold up. Nor does the idea that the occupants were too poor to have "real" pieces. The small halberds in the Baoji tombs cannot be simply explained away as *mingqi* pieces.

[403] The ornate boxes were about 8-10 cm long.

appear in the tombs at Tianma Qucun nor in those at Shangma.[404] In this case, the unusual pieces suggest that some sort of restricted identity was created through their regular internment in a consort's tomb at Beizhao. Furthermore, in light of my earlier observation that essentially the burial of a consort, with vessels and chariot and horse fittings, is similar in structure to non-ruling female burials at Tianma Qucun, these exotic objects would appear to take on even more importance in differentiating the Beizhao tombs. Perhaps, we might even draw a broad parallel between these objects and the bronze bells deposited in the tombs of the lineage heads in (re) creating a restricted identity. If so, then these objects assumed a paramount importance within the burial performance, and, in turn, within the (re)production of an identity.

Several scholars have pointed out that some aspects of the ornate boxes (*nongqi* 弄器[405]) found in tomb M64 may have been influenced through contact with the Northern Zone.[406] Ester Jacobsen and later Jessica Rawson suggested that the realistic creatures, or "naturalism", seen on the boxes and *yiding,* are a common stylistic form of the Steppe nomads.[407] Such small boxes and other unusual bronze items have no real tradition within the central plains, and are notably absent from tombs dating to the Early Western Zhou, for instance. Rawson has also observed that the occurrences of iron and gold during the Late Western Zhou period coincide with the first appearance of these bronze boxes in female tombs.[408]

These ornate boxes are not the only types of pieces from female tombs at Beizhao with foreign or outside influences. Female tomb M113 at Beizhao yielded a number of pieces, most notably, two bronze vessels not ordinarily seen among Zhou ritual pieces:

---

[404] As Rawson (2010) notes these bronze pieces do not appear in female tombs of the centrally-located Guo state.
[405] For more on this generic term, see Huang Mingchong 2001.6: 66-88.
[406] For a discussion of the relationship between the Jin state and the Northern Zone as seen through textual evidence, see Shim 1998.
[407] Jacobson 1988: 218-220. See also Rawson 2010. Whereas Jacobsen argues that "naturalism" appears in China in the seventh century BC, as seen in the bronzes at Shangguo, Rawson has argued that figures in the form of realistic creatures appear in the Late Shang at Anyang, coinciding with the introduction of the chariot into the Shang, thereby pushing Jacobsen's date back some 400 years.
[408] Rawson 2010.

the three-footed urn (*sanzuweng* 三足甕) and the double-handled jar (*shuang'erguan* 双耳罐).[409] As Lu Liancheng notes, in ceramic forms these two types were well established among the peoples who resided in Shanxi, southern Inner Mongolia and northern Shaanxi.[410] The tomb also yielded a realistic animal-shaped vessel and a grooved *gui*, both pieces of which may have had influences from outside of the Zhou realm. Ying Yong also suggests that four *gui* vessels from female tomb M13 pertain to northern influences, carrying geometrical decorations seen on mirrors from the Qijia culture. She also points out that tomb M13 yielded chariot pieces with realistic animal terminals.

At the same time, it should be emphasised that male tombs at Beizhao also yielded objects with apparent *exotic* influences. Male tomb M114 yielded a bronze raptor-shaped vessel, while male tomb M8 yielded three bronze hare and rabbit-shaped wine vessels. The Jin Hou Dui-*xu* 晋侯对盨 vessel from looted male tomb M1 at Beizhao, contained several features identified by Rawson as being of foreign influence.[411] Some of the earliest uses of gold occur in Beizhao tombs M114 and M9, dated to before the Ritual Reform. The tombs contained an, at present, unreported number of objects wrapped in gold leaf. The post-Reform tombs of M91, M8 and M64 all contained gold belt ornaments.

---

[409] While the bronze *sanzuweng* from tomb M113 is unusual, it is not unique.

[410] Lu Liancheng 1993. In ceramic form, *sanzuweng* are found at Baoji, Tianma Qucun and Beizhao. At Baoji, a ceramic *sanzuweng* was found in tomb BZFM1, dated to the very Early Western Zhou, but not examples have been recovered from later tombs at Locus II and Locus III. At Liulihe, two *sanzuweng* were found in tomb M54. The excavators labeled the piece, wrongly, as a *jia* ceramic vessel. The largest number of ceramic *sanzuweng* are found at Tianma Qucun, where six tombs yielded this piece. At Beizhao, tombs M113 and M92 also yielded this ceramic type. In all cases, *sanzuweng* appear in ranked elite tombs, and appear most common in the Early Western Zhou. The piece in tomb M92, dated to the Late Western Zhou, at Beizhao, is an exception. Ch'en Fangmei (2002) has suggested that these pieces reflect foreign females who married into the Zhou state. At Tianma Qucun, the *sanzuweng* appears only in elite female tombs. These tombs yielded a burial chamber, with a large selection of ceramic vessels, but no bronze ritual vessels. As such, there is a clear contrast between females who were interred with ritual vessels and no *sanzuweng*, and females who were buried with ceramic pieces only, including *sanzuweng*.

[411] For example, the vessel carries small ring-handles on the lid and deep grooves. Both features may have been introduced from the North. The vessel is also supported by four crouching human figures, which Rawson interprets as foreigners. See Rawson 2009a: 94, catalogue number 34, for a description of the Jin Hou Dui-*xu* vessel.

Therefore, the Jin rulers and their consort were buried with select items that have some reference to the peoples and areas outside of the Zhou realm. And, there do appear to be gender differences: some men were buried with gold belt ornaments and some females were deposited with small bronze boxes. The different exotic pieces, thus, appeared to have been an important part of the performance of a gendered identity. At the same time, other exotic objects such as realistic animal-shaped vessels were placed in both male and female tombs. In short, different types of exotic objects or items with exotic influence were used within the peformance of gender identities. With regards to the small and ornate bronze boxes, these objects may have related to social position (as discussed by Falkenhausen) and even ethnicity (as posited by Ch'en Fangemi). Moreover, Wang Tao has also linked such pieces to private ceremonies or rituals possibily performed by elite females. Whatever these objects signified, the repeated interment of them in the tombs of the Jin consorts would have constituted a performative act that (re)produced the association between these females and these objects.

BURIALS WITH CERAMIC VESSELS

So far, I have examined tombs with bronze burial goods. I will now briefly discuss those tombs with ceramic vessels. At the site of Tianma Qucun, from the excavated sample, around 600 or tombs yielded grave goods which included ceramic vessels, jade, stone and bone objects. At the site of Shangma, over 90% of tombs yielded a comparable set of grave goods which encompassed one or more pottery vessels, such as a *li*, *dou* or *pen* and a jade or bone piece.[412] It should also be noted that the Tianma Qucun tombs shows some variation in the quantity of pieces interred therein. A tomb at the site might contain a upwards of 20 ceramic vessels of different types.[413]

---

[412] Shanxi Sheng Kaogu Yanjiusuo 1994: 145-178.
[413] The types of ceramic vessels in tombs include *gui* and *li* food pieces and *zun* and *dou* drinking objects. Tomb M6080, of a young female aged between 14-17, contained 15 ceramic vessels: three *li*, a single *gui*, five *dou*, three *guan*, one *zun*, one covered jar and one wide-mouthed *dou*. *By contrast,* tomb M6231 contained a single ceramic *li*.

None of these tombs yielded the types of bronze pieces, such as weapons and chariot and horse fittings, found in those tombs with bronze ritual vessels. As such, a large proportion of the tombs at Shangma, and we might tentatively add Tianma Qucun, contained no bronze grave goods. Therefore, there is a clear divide in the Jin state, as in the Guo state discussed previously, between tombs with and without bronze items.

Moreover, the tombs with ceramic vessels and jade objects contained a range of burial furniture. At the site of Shangma, Falkenhausen has noted that tombs with a burial chamber and double coffins, a burial chamber and a single coffin and a single coffin only (with no burial chamber) all contained ceramic vessels and no bronze items.[414] As such, assuming that burial chambers correlate with the deceased social positions as member of the ranked elite, a large proportion of ranked elites at Shangma and at Tianma Qucun were provided with this formulaic assemblage.[415] In turn, individuals of different social position must have been interred with identical burial assemblages.

Furthermore, gender does not appear to have been a structuring principle within these tombs. Both men and women of different ages at both Jin sites were provided with ceramic vessels and jade objects. Thus, whereas in those tombs with bronze pieces, where gender was recognised and marked through the deposition of bronze weapons, tools and bells, in tombs with ceramic vessels gender does not appear to have featured as structuring principle. In turn, gender difference took place only in tombs with bronze objects and appears to have been a feature of these graves.

The continuity of graves with the homogenous and highly-conventional ceramic assemblage is also startling. From the Early Western Zhou period, as indicated by the graves at Tianma Qucun, through to the Warring States period, as show by the tombs at Shangma, within the Jin state at least, the combination of ceramic vessels and jade

[414] Falkenhausen 2001, 2006.
[415] See Falkenhausen 2001 for a discussion of these tombs.

objects remained unchanged. Thus, such burials continued over a period of around 600 years.

In sum, a large proportion, in the case of Shangma 90%,[416] of graves contained an extremely formulaic and standardised set of grave goods. This set changed little over time and did not appear to make any recognition of the deceased social position or gender. As such, there is little differentiation between tombs. This combination of objects almost resembles a fixed template that was applied repeatedly and formulaically to tombs over a considerable period of time.

CONCLUSION

Despite being on the periphery, the Yu and Jin states shared many of the burial features seen in the centrally located tombs discussed in the previous chapter. The Yu and Jin tombs were vertical shaft pits with different types of burial furniture – wooden chambers and coffins. Some tombs contained entrance ramps and attendants in death, while most tombs yielded burial goods in some form. Two notable differences that suggest burial structure might be manipulated to create a localised notion of identity include the double-occupant tombs at Baoji and the use of stone foundations in several Beizhao tombs.

Nonetheless, tombs in both states show a remarkable homogeneity in burial features, the types of tomb furniture employed and the division of space in graves. As in the Guo state, jade and bone objects were deposited in the inner coffin while bronze funerary goods were placed in the space between the inner coffin and the wooden burial chamber. The identity of a lineage head in the Yu and Jin state was also recreated the use of a specific type of tomb, namely one with ramps and attendants in death, which was replicated consistently. This tomb ensured the coherence and reproduction of a particular lineage head tomb type.

[416] Based on Falkenhausen's calculation.

There was clearly a structured tomb type and layout from which few deviations were made. Equally, the size of the tomb and the coffins, the number of coffins and whether to inter a burial chamber were all decisions to be made which could manipulate the burial in some way.

The fixed burial structure and layout is mirrored by the very formulaic burial assemblages, which comprised a set number of ordered object combinations. There is a clear division between tombs with and without bronze burial goods. Those graves with bronze item make up a very small portion of tombs at Tianma Qucun and especially Shangma. Bronze items were essentially grouped together in five or six different ways. Forming a burial set was through a series of additive choices to the grave, but these choices took place within a structured framework which determined what grave good sets could comprise.

The quantities of objects also appeared to follow some loose pattern. Bronze vessels, weapons, and chariot and horse fittings were placed in various quantities in tombs, while tools were placed in single figures.

Gender identities were manifested principally through the interment of structured burial assemblages that included three types of grave goods: weapons, tools and bells. In the Jin state, we see five different types of male burials and two different types of female burials. The male burials were differentiated from each other through the three types of aforementioned bronze objects, while female tombs were differentiated through the use of chariot and horse fittings. In fact, the two types of female burials changed little over time from Tianma Qucun through to Shangma.

There are instances at Beizhao where some female tombs contained exotic bronze items. Essentially, these items were added to a set of grave goods which encompasses ritual vessels and chariot and horse fittings, resulting in a differentiated female tomb. Interestingly, we can notice the difference between the tomb of a Jin consort and the tomb of a non-ruling elite female because the grave goods interred in

each burial are so conventional and uniform. In this sense, the females buried with exotic objects are different because their burials go against the norms for Jin women.

One notable contrast between Yu and Jin tombs is that chariot fittings occur in male tombs in the former state and both male and female tombs in the latter state. In this sense, the way in which grave good sets were structured differed between these states, as did the enactment of identity through the deposition of burial goods which (re)created gender notions.

Chapter Five: Conclusion

INTRODUCTION

Before discussing the ramifications of the data from Chapters Two to Four for studies of identity within Bronze Age China, it is necessary to briefly recapitulate my hypothesis and theoretical position. In Chapter One, I argued that while existing approaches have concentrated on the signification of grave goods in relation to the identity of the deceased, focusing primarily on notions of social status through comparisons of quantities and types of objects in tombs, the approach of this thesis allows for an analysis of the *mechanism* by which identities were (re)created and (re)produced in the Shang and Zhou periods. One possible way of thinking about this mechanism, I argued, is through Judith Butler's theory of performance.

I also attempted to contextualise the theory of performance, arguing that Heidegger's *Dasein* and Bourdieu's *habitus* are philosophical precursors to Butler's theory of performance and provide the necessary theoretical framework for understanding a performative act. In short, Butler suggests that the action of gender requires a performance that is *repeated*. This repetition is at once a (re)enactment and a (re)experiencing of a set of meanings which are already socially pre-established, historically situated within discourse. Identity is then tenuously constituted in time and instituted in a space through the *stylised repetition of acts*. In turn, material culture is a constituent element within the enactment and performance of identities. Objects not only make identities real and tangible, but they also allow identities to be negotiated and constructed in different ways.

Throughout this thesis, the emphasis has been placed on bronze funerary goods as forming distinct assemblages or sets. Indeed, I would suggest that the use of sets of objects in the context of a performance at burial is an extremely productive way of further advancing Rawson's previous work on sets. Whereas Rawson looks at the make-

up of bronze ritual vessel sets, and the types of vessels within each set, I have followed Rawson's methodology by analysing the structure of burial deposits looking at the categories of objects within tombs. Indeed, I have argued throughout this thesis that a fixed number of burial deposits form distinct sets which can productively be identified as the mechanism by which identity is (re)cited and (re)created. In the light of performativity, then, these sets would play an essential role in structuring repeated performances spaced temporally, thereby ensuring the integral coherence of an identity over time.

PERFORMANCE, SETS AND IDENTITIES

The burial of a single person in the Shang and Zhou as a distinct event suggests that descent was an important principle of social ordering. Moreover, that clan or lineage insignia was routinely inscribed on bronze vessels, suggests that group membership was also of vital importance.[417] The bronze *fangding* from tomb M114 at Beizhao, for instance, carried the title *shu*, possibly indicating junior, which was one of the terms used to indicate an individual's position of seniority among his or her siblings.[418] Falkenhausen has also noted that the vessels from tomb M2001 at Sanmenxia indicate that the tomb occupant was a junior member of a branch lineage.[419] Moreover, *Bo* designated the oldest brother within the lineage and *fu* as a wife.[420] Hence, a person was located within a specific web of social and familial relationships formed around the lineage and the family. In this sense, social identity took on a narrative form from where each person was located in a genealogy leading back to the past and a person's identity must have been (re)created and (re)produced through these sets of family and lineage relationships.

[417] See Keightley 1978; Zhu 1991; Campbell 2007. Campbell's discussion of lineage organisation offers both a review of existing models of organisation and a reinterpretation.
[418] Falkenhausen 2006: 78.
[419] Falkenhausen 1999: 319.
[420] Li Feng 2000: 35.

Indeed, the double-occupant burials at Baoji, and the burials of a male and female in adjacent tombs at Shangma, Sanmenxia and Beizhao, suggest that people were part of a wider set of social relationships, which were marked in a structured way at burial through the location of the grave in proximity to other temporally earlier, burials. For instance, the tomb of Xingji was cut into the western wall of Yu Bo's grave suggesting that memory and remembrance, as well as keeping the deceased within some sort of genealogy, was integral to burial rites in the Yu state. Moreover, the various tombs often dispersed around a central pair of tombs, as at Sanmenxia for example, further attests to the idea that burial reestablished and continued genealogies, which placed the tomb occupant within very specific set of social relationships.

Therefore, family relationships and genealogy were in part (re)produced within the mortuary sphere by locating graves within close proximity to other ones, thereby setting up a link between the newly dead and the ancestors. In effect, a family or lineage identity was brought into play through a specific act of locating the deceased in relation to others within the cemetery site.

Moreover, as discussed in the first chapter, a funeral is itself an event which may bring together a distinct group of people, affirming, transforming or recreating a set of social relationships with the deceased.[421] While we have no evidence detailing who organised and participated in Shang and Zhou funerals, the evidence for funerary feasting and for the exchange of bronzes, perhaps as burial goods, implies that such occasions might have brought different people together. Certainly, bronze vessels, with different inscribed lineage and personal names, found in both Shang and Zhou tombs, hint at possible gift-giving and exchange at funerals. The tomb of Fu Hao contained vessels with the names of other lineages, high-ranking elites, and possibly other consorts.[422] Lu Liancheng and Hu Zhisheng note that the double-occupant tombs of the

[421] Thomas 1991.
[422] The inscriptions included Fu Hao's name in life (*Fu Hao* and *Hao* 婦好／好), her ritual name in death (*simuxin* 司母辛), names of other members of her lineage or possibly the name of another consort, and names of other high-ranking officials associated with the Shang and with regions outside of Anyang (*Ya Qi* 亚其 / 亚启).

Yu lineage heads yielded vessels inscribed with over 20 different polities, while Falkenhausen has also discussed the wide range of inscriptions from the Beizhao tombs.[423] Of course, such pieces could have been exchanged during important ceremonies or rituals. But, we cannot rule out the possibility that bronze vessels, among other objects, were also exchanged at funerals. If so, then we might think about funerals as active events where perhaps people came to the funeral with different objects for the tomb occupant.

That Shang and Zhou burials were single rite graves, within a standard tomb type (the vertical shaft pit), utilising different wooden burial furniture (such as chambers and coffins) and tomb features (such as ramps and attendants-in-death – particularly in Late Shang tombs), suggests that burials were episodic. It is also clear that some Shang and Zhou funerary events would have been quite spectacular. The burials of the Jin lords and their consorts, for example, not only utilised vast numbers of material items, but also included a funerary feast, chariots, animals, such as dogs and horses, and striking body and sometimes face decoration adorning the deceased. The sheer numbers of grave goods in Fu Hao's tomb, alongside those of the Xing lineage heads, for instance, also suggests that a burial took place over an extended period of time. So, if Shang and Zhou burials took the form of discrete episodes, it might follow that these episodes and the deceased's identity was linked through a chain of events: a narrative.[424]

As such, the understanding of time involved in these events would have been linear and irreversible.[425] The burial features and the assemblage, therefore, were the final *comments* that were made about the deceased. Importantly, this final opportunity meant that the grave goods deposited with the deceased were fixed in the minds of the onlookers.[426]

---

[423] Falkenhausen 2006.
[424] Thomas 2002.
[425] Thomas 1991, 2002; Jones 2008.
[426] Treherne 1995; Thomas 1999; Jones 2008.

Therefore, we might expect a Shang or Zhou funeral to be an occasion at which deliberate effort was made to construct a social identity for the tomb occupant within a limited duration. Within this context, the material setting, and most crucially the various bronze burial assemblages or sets and the ceramic vessel-based deposists discussed at length in this thesis, would have been critically important. And, it is within this context that the repetitive and formulaic nature of both Shang and Zhou burial assemblages is also significant.

The bronze burial goods placed in the tomb ensured the (re)production and (re)creation of a socially inscribed identity at burial. The grave goods not only created a new identity for the deceased, but they also referenced burials temporally prior to the burial in question, functioning as a citation that reestablished the appearance of a coherent identity. Butler's term for this is *reexperiencing*, which amounts to a claim that the agents who participate in this performance (re)experience the (re)constructed identity as a continuous and coherent one. The severely restricted sets of objects seem so rigidly delineated and so easily recognizable that the entire overall pattern of distinct sets may very well have constituted a *constellation* of identities that would have been instantly recognized by a viewer. For example, the lineage leaders at Guojiazhuang (in tombs M26, M160), Beizhao, Baoji, and Sanmenxia were buried with the same categories of objects – ritual vessels, weapons, chariot and horse fittings, a selection of bronze tools and bells, even though the graves of such individuals were, in some cases vastly, temporally different. As such, this constellation of objects, and in particular sets of bronze bells, almost characterises the tomb of a lineage head. Therefore, through the *continual* deposition of a structured set of grave goods, a coherent identity for a lineage head was (re)produced and (re)created at burial.

The constituent element within Shang and Zhou tombs was an eating or drinking vessel, which was either cast in bronze or made out of ceramic. The bronze and possibly

the ceramic eating and drinking vessels were combined to form sets, as discussed throughout this thesis.[427] The importance of the vessels can be seen in two ways.

First, the bronze vessels of the Shang and Zhou appeared to serve as a means by which people were categorised and identified.[428] As Rawson has discussed extensively, vessels appear to have been closely related to their patrons, and, subsequently, might have been closely related to the individual identity of the deceased.

Second, and, just as importantly, Shang and Zhou burial deposits were structured around bronze ritual vessels. Particularly in the Zhou period, there was a pronounced divide between tombs with bronze vessels and other accompanying grave goods and tombs with ceramic vessels and a small selection of jade, stone or bone objects. In other words, tombs with ceramic vessels rarely contained bronze weapons, tools or bells.

In the cases where other categories of objects (bronze weapons, bronze tools, bronze bells, stone objects, jade objects) occurred in a grave, they were generally *added* to the bronze or ceramic vessel, where applicable, rather used in its stead. It seems that

---

[427] Vessel sets of the Late Shang are characterised by differences in size, weight, shape and ornament.
While the sets of the Early and Middle Zhou differ from those of the Shang in structure – the Zhou placed more emphasis on food pieces rather than wine vessels – overall we see the same variation in types, shape, size and ornament. By contrast, the sets of the Late Zhou, those of the Ritual Reform, are markedly different to those belonging to the Late Zhou's predecessors. The *ding* and *gui* were cast in matching sets and the wine vessels of the Shang all but disappeared. Vessels became heavier and more homogenous in shape, size and ornament. The *effect* of Shang and Zhou funerals, using these vessels within some sort of funerary feast, must have been different, as was the way in which the vessels related to identity. Indeed, the *experience* of a Shang and Zhou funeral would have certainly been different. Rawson (2010) has noted that Late Shang/ Early Western Zhou ceremonies would have involved personal engagement with the ritual vessels. And, given that the ornament on the pieces is so intricate, one can only appreciate the object when standing close to it. Rawson suggests that Late Shang elites physically engaged with the pieces and movements or actions with bronzes not only offered food, but also provided a physical reference to a continuity of relationships between the living and the dead. It is clear from inscriptions in the early Western Zhou that pieces were cast by powerful members of the elite for offerings to specific ancestors. In this sense, a banquet at a funeral would have made reference to both ancestors and descendants. The bronzes of the Ritual Reform tell a quite different story. Aside from categorising the owner within some sort of hierarchy, as expressed through *ding* privilege, the new bronzes after around 850 BC had a very different effect than their predecessors. The new vessels were much larger and heavier than bronzes in the early Zhou. People would not have been able to manipulate these larger and heavier pieces by hand in the same way that they did the earlier vessels. Rawson posits that under the flicker of light, the extensive repetition and uniformity of these vessels would have been extremely imposing on those present at a ceremony or even funeral.

[428] Rawson 1993, 2010. Rawson also notes the various ways in which the materiality of the vessels could be nuanced (ornament, shape) to underline reciprocal relationships and express group or individual identities.

while bronze ritual vessels in particular were connected with personal or familial identity, (and perhaps secondary connotations of eating, drinking, affiliation and the ancestors) other bronze objects served to qualify or build up this message. Amongst those tombs with bronze items, quite distinct burial assemblages or sets can be easily distinguished.[429] For example, in the Guo state of Sanmenxia, there were five combinations of categories of bronze objects; in the Jin state, there were six combinations; and in the Yu state, there were also six combinations. Each combination formed a distinct burial deposit and bronze grave good set.

Moreover, the Shang and Zhou burial deposits were rigidly structured in the way that objects were combined to form a grave good set or assemblage. As such, each grave can be characterised by the "last" object in the set. By this I mean that a tomb might have ritual vessels only, ritual vessels and weapons, and ritual vessels, weapons, and chariot fittings. In these three cases, the second assemblage is categorised by the weapons, while the third constellation can be classified by the chariot fittings. In Shang and Zhou tombs, tools and bells were also used to create different types of grave good sets, although it should be noted that these were restricted on a few tombs. Only tombs of the lineage heads in both dynasties contained sets of bronze bells. As such, these pieces appeared to categorise the burial of a lineage head.

Furthermore, while assemblages were created through a process of adding bronze items to the grave, based on the structured nature of these burials deposits, objects could only be combined in certain ways and other objects had to be present before new ones could be added. For example, no tomb in the Shang or Zhou contained vessels and tools only, without weapons and chariot fittings. Every tomb that contained a selection of tools, for instance, always yielded vessels, weapons and chariot fittings, while tombs that contained bells contained vessels, weapons, chariot fittings, and a selection of tools. In short, the deceased was interred with a very structured and

[429] Owing to the large sample of unlooted tombs from Zhou cemeteries, such as Tianma Qucun, Shangma, and Sanmenxia, it is easier to categorise bronze burial sets for the respective lineages of the Zhou than it is to group such burial deposits in the Late Shang.

formulaic set of grave goods. And, these sets were replicated consistently over the course of the Shang and Zhou periods. While it is generally difficult to assess continuity within a single cemetery site (for the reasons discussed in Chapter One), it is noticeable that the same combinations of objects were employed from the time of the early Western Zhou at Tianma Qucun and Baoji (the Jin and Yu states respectively) to the time of the Late Western Zhou at Sanmenxia and Shangma (the Guo and Jin states respectively). Therefore, we might tentatively posit that the bronze grave good assemblages changed little in structure over the course of the Western Zhou period and possibly into the Early Eastern Zhou.

As I discussed in Chapter One, for Butler, identity is not so much produced *ex nihilo* or replicated identically, but (*re)cited* – by which I mean that each performance is a *renewed citation* of a prior performance, rather than an a perfectly *replicated citation*. The content of the citation itself may vary in each particular burial, but the category of objects (weapons, tools, chariot fittings etc.) is fully constitutive of the citation's ability to reference a previous performance. For instance, suppose we consider two Shang tombs A and B, both of which contain a fixed burial deposit forming a set consisting of vessels and weapons. Suppose, moreover, that Tomb A is earlier than Tomb B. Tomb A might contain wine vessels such as *jue* and *gu*, and food vessels such as *ding*. The tomb also contains halberds and spearheads. Tomb B contains a larger selection of wine vessels such as *gu*, *jue*, *zun* and *fangyi*, and food vessels such as *ding*, *gui* and *yan*. The grave also contains arrowheads and knives. Despite the manifest differences in object types and the lack of an identical replication of objects, the performance associated with the set in Tomb B would still be a citation of the performance associated with the set in Tomb A, as the content of the particular citation is not constitutive of its reference to a previous performance. The suggestion here is that the fine-grained distinctions between both graves in terms of *particular object types* is not what matters as far as the creation of a coherent identity – an identity spaced temporally across particular citations – is concerned. What constitutes it as a citation, instead, would be the *abstract combination*

of object categories which comprise distinct sets. A more contemporary example may illustrate the point more clearly. Consider the case of two different marriage ceremonies. The first, Marriage A, is conducted in Victorian England with diamond-encrusted rings. The second, Marriage B, is conducted in contemporary England with plain wooden rings from Nepal. Though fine-grained distinctions between the rings used can be clearly drawn up, the latter ceremony is nevertheless a citation of the earlier one due to the category of objects deployed in the performance – the rings. We understand Marriage B to be a *(re)citation* of Marriage A insofar as the rings have been deployed in a performance, though the rings themselves differ particularly.

The astute archaeologist might note that there is a strange tension or contradiction between the fixity of the sets of bronze burial goods, and the enormous variations of types of objects within these sets.[430] However, I would suggest that this tension can be readily and productively identified as the tension inherent in the Heideggerian ideas of heritage and its constraints, as well as the future possibilities available to us as free ontological agents, as I discussed briefly in Chapter One. The fixed number of burial deposits in form of sets could be identified as the very structure that makes a particular performance intelligible and recognisable, thus creating a fundamental identity for the deceased as a particular *category* of person. Being the very structure that makes this performance and identity publicly intelligible, it would come as no surprise that the permissible combinations of items would be severely restricted or fixed. Nevertheless, the variation in types of objects interred would reflect the possibility of further individuation of identity *from within* the historically situated constraints imposed by the sets of bronze objects – creating, as it were, a more individuated identity as a particular *type* of person. The performance at burial, then, would reflect the historically constrained identity of the deceased as a category of person

[430] For example, within the category of bronze ritual vessels in the Late Shang period, one might find wine vessels such as *gu*, *jue*, *zun*, *fangzun*, *jia*, *fangjia*, *fangyi* and *zhi*, and food vessels such as *ding*, *gui*, and *yan*, alongside more individual vessels, such as Fu Hao's triple *yan* steamer (s*anyanlian*). Within the category of weapons, one finds arrowheads, halberds, spearheads, and large knives. Some of these objects might also carry ornament and decoration.

– a category likely unchanged for some 400 years, as the sets of objects were – as well as the subtle and fine-grained individuated identity of the deceased through the use of particular object types. The tension between the severe fixity of the sets of bronze burial objects and the enormous variation in the object types interred in tombs would reflect the Heideggerian tension between the straitjacket-like constraints of a past, continuous, coherent and publicly intelligible and recognisable identity, and the individuated, particular identity of the deceased. And, it is within this context of individuation that one might think about the various nuances within objects, particularly bronze ritual vessels.

For instance, Rawson has considered the ritual vessels from tomb M160 at Guojiazhuang.[431] The pieces from this tomb are so unique that not only do they differ from vessels in other graves at Guojiazhuang, but they also differ from vessels in other burials across Anyang. As noted in Chapter Two, whereas other Shang tombs usually contain *jue* and *gu* wine vessels in matching sets, tomb M160 yielded matching sets of *jiao* (a vessel with two pouring troughs) and *fanggu* – square sectioned (rather than circular) *gu* vessels. Rawson also notes that some of the larger square-sectioned wine vessels, such as the *fangzun* and *fangjia*, carried both unusual and exquisite ornament. The vessels from this tomb are so individualised that they must relate very specifically to the tomb occupant in some way.[432] Therefore, the nuanced distinctions within the sets of bronze objects would have allowed for an unusually individuated identity to be performed while nevertheless being recognised as still being a particular category of person through the set itself.

Alongside the structured and formulaic burial sets, a crucial part of the performance of identities was the burial structure and tomb layout. Generally, Shang and Zhou burial structure remained largely unchanged. The essential features of a

[431] Rawson 2010.
[432] Another example might be Fu Hao's ritual vessels, some of which have never been found in other Anyang tombs. For instance, the tomb contained two large zun wine vessels in the form of owls and two gong vessels also in realistic animal form. The grave also contained a unique triple steamer.

Shang tomb – deep, vertical shaft pit, a wooden burial chamber, wooden coffins, a ledge or platform, tomb ramps, and attendants in death – are seen in Zhou tombs, whether located in the centre or on the periphery. The same tomb type, furniture and features (such as entrance ramps in some tombs) would have ensured the intelligible and easily recognisable reproduction of an identity within a coherent and structured burial structure.

Furthermore, the way of organising the tomb and the grave goods interred therein also remained consistent throughout the Late Shang and Zhou periods. In both dynasties, the deceased was placed in a supine position inside the middle of a wooden coffin. Jade, stone and bone objects were all located near or on the body of the deceased. Importantly, in both Shang and Zhou tombs, bronze items, including ritual vessels, tools, weapons, bells and chariot pieces (where included in a tomb) were all positioned in the space either between the inner coffin and the wooden burial chamber or inside the single wooden coffin.

As Campbell has noted, and as I have discussed in Chapter Two, there is a common template for a Shang tomb which was replicated consistently throughout the course of Anyang.[433] Both small and large tombs essentially share most of the same features, aside from tomb entrance ramps and attendants in death. The same type of argument might be made about Zhou tombs. While some differences exist within lineages, essentially, the Zhou peoples shared the same tomb template. In the Jin state, the tombs of the Jin rulers were differentiated from the graves of the non-ruling elites through entrance ramps and attendants in death. The common tomb type at Tianma Qucun and Beizhao consisted of a vertical shaft pit with coffins, chambers and grave goods. At Sanmenxia, the tombs of the Guo lineage heads are identical to other tombs with and without bronze vessels at the site, attesting to the homogeneity of burial structure here. In short, the Shang and Zhou employed the same burial template throughout their respective periods, and both large and small tombs shared some

[433] Campbell 2007.

fundamental elements. Therefore, the deposition of a very structured set of grave goods in a Shang or Zhou tomb occurred alongside a standardised tomb template which was replicated continually over time in both the Shang and Zhou.

Equally, just as variations within object types allowed for individuation within burial assemblages in both the Late Shang and the Zhou, so feature within tombs also created a more individualised burial structure. For instance, some of the Beizhao tombs contained stone-lined footings, rather than stamped earth foundations. At Baoji, the four tombs of the lineage heads contained the lineage leader as the principal tomb occupant and his concubine interred within the same burial chamber but in separate coffins. At Zhangjiapo, two tombs contained separate burial spaces (known as head cabinets) located adjacent to the wooden coffin in which the Xing lineage head was interred. While these unique, individual variations are confined to the respective tombs of that specific lineage, and while they seem to relate primarily to the tombs of lineage heads, clearly some features of the tomb could be manipulated to express some sort of difference.

Essentially, (re)experience and (re)production were central to the construction of identities within the mortuary sphere. The performance of the funeral would have been a context in which the significance both of the grave goods and the newly deceased were created anew. Yet, we might also argue that a particular constellation of signification and resonance was brought into play through the deployment of these particular items. The bronze ritual vessels relate to offerings and the ancestors (with perhaps secondary associations of community and group identity); bronze weapons are connected with violence in the form of warfare or hunting; bronze chariot and horse riding paraphernalia relate to riding, driving and possibly warfare and hunting; various bronze tools refer to manual labour including, though perhaps not limited to, agriculture, chariot repair or craftwork and bells perhaps relate to rituals and thr ancestors. These are no more than tentative suggestions regarding what the elements of the assemblage

might imply in a very generalised sense. Nonetheless, the connotations here may relate to *idealised* or *ideological* notions of different types of people at burial.

Of course, we should recognise that in the Guo and Jin states the majority of tombs did not contain bronze items. This observation is possible within these two states due to the large sample of tombs which have not been looted. As such, one might suspect, but cannot substantiate a claim, that a similar situation occurred in the Xing and Yu states. The tombs without bronze items primarily contained ceramic vessels and a selection of jade and bone objects. This combination was applied extensively and ruthlessly over a sustained period of time. Within the grave good selection, there is no recognition of social class, hierarchy or even gender. The generic assemblages seem to have interred in graves akin to a fixed template, which was repeated many times over. And, there are few deviations within template. The fixed nature of these assemblages is in line with the fixed structure of the bronze assemblages – in the Jin state only two types of female burials can be seen. But, of course, the bronze grave goods, especially the ritual vessels, allow for much more personalisation and categorisation of tomb occupants. Nonetheless, as with bronze assemblages, the repetition is key as it served to cite a previous burial and create the identity of the deceased, which, in turn reinforced the norm and signaled how a burial should be performed and structured at future burials.

The associations that the objects brought to the grave are perhaps more difficult to speculate on than the connotations of the bronze burial goods. Certainly, the ceramic vessels appeared to offer little recognition of the deceased personal identity in the same way that bronze vessels did. It is also unclear of what function these ceramic vessels played. One might assume food preparation and perhaps even offerings. In this sense, these vessels do somewhat tie these type burials in with tombs with bronze vessels – the shared element being food and drink containers.

GENDER

Given the very limited sample of Late Shang female tombs, it is difficult to assess patterns to burials and analyse different grave goods sets.[434] Most of this discussion will, therefore, focus on the Zhou tombs and sets of bronze burial goods discussed in chapters three and four. Indeed, the division between male and female tombs is more notable in the Zhou than in the Late Shang. By this I mean that bronze weapons, bronze tools and, for the most part, bronze bells were deposited (in different combinations and not always together) only in select elite male tombs.[435] Whereas the tomb of Fu Hao offers us a puzzling exception in the Late Shang, no such female tomb in the Zhou yielded similar object types associated with masculinity. Given this observation, we might label weapons, tools and bells as gendered objects in the Zhou period.

It should be made clear that these objects assume a paramount position within the performance of gender by virtue of the fact that few other aspects of the grave itself appeared to have materialised gender. Male and female tombs were vertical shaft pits, with the body positioned in a supine pose. Furthermore, chambers, coffins, in some cases ramps, and features such as *er ceng tai*, were all seemingly not related to gender. In short, males and females shared a common tomb template and burial structure. Thus, unlike in Bronze Age Europe for example, where there are binary gender distinctions with males lying on their right and women lying on their left, in Bronze Age China no such divisions can be seen.[436] If the male/female and right/left dichotomy is evidence of a highly-gendered society where gender was performed and reproduced through the body itself, then presumably the similar positioning of the body in Zhou tombs, alongside the range of shared burial features and tomb furniture, points towards a different situation to that in Europe. We might posit that clearly gender was not created and emphasised through these features of the tomb. Moreover, the different zones within a tomb, which I have emphasised throughout this thesis, are also similar for both

---

[434] Consequently, it has not been possible within this thesis to establish the same structured and repetitive sets of bronze burial goods in the Late Shang as I have argued for in the Zhou.
[435] Note that female tomb M163 from Zhangjiapo contained two bronze bells. This tomb constitutes an exception however.
[436] See Harding 2000 for more a brief introduction to gender in across Bronze Age Europe.

males and females throughout the Zhou sphere. In other words, in both male and female tombs, bronze items were placed in the zone between the inner coffin and burial chamber, and jade items were placed around the deceased body inside the inner coffin. Generally, the tomb type, various tomb features and furniture, and the layout of the burial were not gendered in that these features did not appear to relate to expressions of gender.

By contrast, gender was reified through formulaic sets of bronze objects. In the Jin and Guo states, which give us the best empirical evidence for gender in the Zhou, there was a range of structured burial deposits which (re)created different male identities. Females were buried with essentially two different types of bronze burial good sets: bronze ritual vessels or bronze ritual vessels and chariot and horse fittings. The numbers and types of pieces varied between burials, but essentially two main categories of objects were employed in female tombs. Two points might follow. First, the interment of bronze ritual vessels without other bronze objects is not exclusive to female tombs. In the Guo and Jin states, male and female tombs contained ritual vessels only. Therefore, gender does not always seem to have been a structuring principle at burial. Clearly, the living chose not to materially mark out this part of the deceased's social identity. Furthermore, grave good interment does not always appear to have been linked to biological sex.

Second, and in turn, if we assume that an assemblage comprising bronze ritual vessels only was *genderless* in the sense that it did not (re)produce a gendered identity for the deceased, then a burial containing ritual vessels and chariot and horse fittings was the only type which seemed to relate to a female identity. No male tomb so far excavated at Sanmenxia nor Tianma Qucun contained vessels and chariot fittings only. In fact, at both of these sites, chariot and horse fittings appear alongside weapons as a structured burial deposit (re)creating a male identity.

Moreover, females of different social position were buried with a rigid combination of ritual vessels and chariot and horse fittings. Indeed, the replication of

this burial assemblage across female tombs in the Jin and Guo state is astounding. Essentially, the Jin consorts were provided with the same categories of bronze objects as the non-ruling elites at Tianma Qucun. Similarly, the Guo consorts were also interred with the same bronze objects as lower ranking females, though, as already noted above, the quantities of the items might vary considerably. In addition, this burial type was replicated over the course of Sanmenxia, Beizhao and possibly Tianma Qucun (it is impossible to infer continuity within the Xing lineage at Zhangjiapo). Therefore, we might suggest that the process of *girling a girl* took place through a replicated constellation of burial goods, with repeated performance (re)creating a coherent gendered identity.[437] While the objects may carry different ornament or inscriptions, the *structure* of the female burial remained unchanged.

By contrast, in both the Jin and Guo states, there were five principal types of male burials within the select group of graves with bronze items. The five types include: bronze ritual vessels; bronze ritual vessels and weapons; bronze ritual vessels, weapons and chariot and horse fittings; bronze ritual vessels, weapons, chariot and horse fittings and tools; and bronze ritual vessels, weapons, chariot and horse fittings, tools and bells. Based on these combinations of objects, clearly bronze weapons, tool and bells within a clearly structured burial deposit were integral in (re)creating male identities. As with female graves, male graves in all states show variations in the quantities of objects deposited in the tomb and the types.

Male and female burials were, thus, highly structured and formulaic, with objects combined in set ways. For instance, no male tomb contained both ritual vessels and tools without weapons or chariot fittings. Moreover, it seems as if an object type could only be deposited in a grave provided that other object types were already part of the assemblage. As such, the constellation of grave goods in tombs was by no means random.

---

[437] And, this burial set appeared to make no reference to the deceaded social position.

Therefore, gender identities were (re)created and brought into play through a specific group of bronze object types. To be more specific, the performance or act of depositing a selection of bronze items with the deceased (re)produced the notion of a gendered identity. The objects themselves would have given these gendered identities a material and tangible form. These burials in form, organisation and grave good selection seemed to reference a similar, previous burial thereby reinforcing and re-essentialising gender norms and reinforcing the coherence of gendered identities. The living essentially created historically situated gendered identities at burial based on a preexisting notion or heritage of what constituted male and female identities. The burial was an experience of a new identity for the deceased and a reexperience of gender norms at burial.

Of course, we should equally acknowledge that a large number of male tombs did not contain such gendered objects. As I have noted above, in the Guo and Jin states, some males were deposited with bronze vessels only. As such, gender does not seem to have been reified materially in these tombs. In other words, the identity being performed at burial does not seem to be gendered. Clearly, gender was brought into play in some burials and not in others. As such, it might be fair to suggest that without the necessary performance of depositing bronze weapons or tools in tombs, a gendered identity was not brought into *existence* at burial.

Thus, people and objects (re)created gender identities at burial. Bronze tools and weapons were not passive reflections of gender because they carried associations with men. Rather, the objects were woven into a wider performance where gender was (re)produced, (re)created and perpetuated. The repeated interment of these objects ensured that coherence of male identities in the funerary sphere. What I mean by coherence is that the gender identities were seen as gendered identities because the performance ensured a (re)experiencing of these gender norms which were brought into play through specific constellations of grave goods that included bronze weaponry and tools.

At the same, it should be emphasised that these male and female identities were not *essential* in the sense that they had to take particular form. Indeed, the different way in which gender was brought into play, (re)negotiated, and (re)experienced is evident in the deposition of chariot and horse fittings in Yu tombs vis-à-vis Jin, Guo and Xing tombs. To reiterate, bronze chariot and horse fittings, such as bridles, finials, wheel hubs and various decorative pieces were deposited in a few male tombs only in Yu tombs. By contrast, these bronze items were instrumental in constructing one of the two principal female identities in the other states. Equally, female tomb M163 at Zhangjiapo contained two bronze bells which must have been part of a much larger set. No female tomb to date in the Zhou sphere has yielded bronze bells, which were in fact a central part of a lineage head's burial.

As such, the burial performance, including the material media, not only created alternating notions of what constituted gendered identities in these Zhou states, but it also changed the way in which gender was *experienced* by mourners. In other words, clearly the Yu would have found the Jin, Guo or Xing practice of placing chariot and horse fittings in the tombs of females "alien". Hence, the performance ensured a particular (re)experience of a socially inscribed gendered identity.

The structure of female burials is such that when, as in the case of a few female tombs at Beizhao, "alien" grave good accompany the deceased difference is immediately noticeable. Clearly, the exotic objects interred in the tombs of a few Jin consorts were not part of the conventional types of pieces deposited with females. Whether the objects were connected with status (*a la* Falkenhausen), ethnicity (*a la* Ch'en Fangmei) and gender (*a al* Ying Yong), a different sort of identity was brought into play through the deposition and inclusion of these unusual bronze objects.

CONTRASTING SHANG AND ZHOU BURIALS

Aside from a discussion of bronze ritual vessels, I have discussed the structure of Shang and Zhou burials in a generalised way. I now wish to explore some of the nuances

between the burials of these two dynasties. Both Shang and Zhou burials were formulated around similar structures. That is to say, Shang and Zhou burials were formulated through the process of additive choices of bronze objects. Both dynasties also appeared to use the same combinations of objects in tombs. No Shang or Zhou tomb I surveyed contained bronze weapons or tools without bronze vessels. No tomb contained bronze tools and bronze vessels without bronze weapons or chariot pieces.

The Shang and Zhou both used the same types of objects (for the most part) to build up a burial assemblage. And, the burials are conventionally structured in such a way that they can be categorised by the final or differentiating object in the set. Furthermore, in both dynasties we see comparable patterns relating to object quantities in tombs. Bronze ritual vessels, bronze weapons and bronze chariot pieces might be interred in seemingly any number in a grave, while bronze tools were placed in single quantities. In addition, the Shang and the Zhou both deposited the same tool types, a chisel, an adze, a spade and an axe, in tombs. Moreover, the tombs of lineage heads in both dynasties were provided with grave good types, namely ritual vessels, weapons, chariot pieces, tools and bells. The object which differentiated these tombs from lower ranking tombs was the bronze bells.

Equally, there are significant differences between the two dynasties. The two most notable of these are the correlation between tombs with wooden chambers and ritual vessels and the wider deposition of chariot fittings in Zhou tombs. I will explore each difference respectively.

In the Late Shang, at the sites of West Zone and Guojiazhuang at least, bronze ritual vessels were interred in tombs with and without wooden burial chambers. In other words, tombs with a single wooden coffin contained a selection of bronze vessels alongside other bronze objects, such as weapons and tools. By contrast, in the Zhou period bronze objects are found exclusively in tombs with wooden burial chambers. Poo

argues that chambers correlated with the deceased ranked elite status, and, as such, bronze items were restricted to members of the ranked elite at burial.[438]

Those who were disenfranchised from bronze objects at burial, however, do not just include people who were not part of the ranked elite. As I have noted in both the Guo and Jin states, and as Falkenhausen has discussed with regards to the Jin at Shangma, tombs with wooden burial chambers yielded ceramic vessels only. Therefore, both elites and non-elites were buried with the very uniform ceramic vessel assemblage. Overall, the division between the elites with bronze objects and the elites and non-elites with ceramic objects is much clearer in the Zhou than it is in the Shang.

The second difference is in the deposition of chariot and horse fittings. The Zhou interred a much wider selection of bronze chariot and horse fittings in tombs than their predecessors. In the Late Shang, the bow-shaped object was interred in particularly wealthy tombs, and chariot and horse pits were dug near larger tombs, possibly those belonging to lineage heads, such as M160 at Guojiazhaung. It is very rare to find a Late Shang tomb with the actual bronze fittings from a chariot. One notable exception is the tomb of Fu Hao which contained two bronze horse cheek-pieces.

By contrast, from the start of the Western Zhou, as seen in the tombs at Baoji, Zhangjiapo and Tianma Qucun, a plethora of bronze horse and chariot pits were interred in tombs. These include wheel hubs, linchpins, decorative pieces, finials, bridles and other ornaments. Moreover, bronze chariot and horse pieces were not restricted to a few well-provided tombs. In the Yu, Jin and Guo states, for instance, from the five possible different compositions of grave goods, bronze chariot and horse pieces are found in four of them. At Tianma Qucun, they are found in the tombs of teenage girls and older adult men, highlighting the breadth of their interment in Jin tombs at least. The large deposition of such objects, and the scale on which the Zhou buried chariots in or near their tombs, has also been highlighted by Rawson.[439] Indeed, Rawson has recently highlighted that the Zhou were much more familiar with the chariot than their

[438] Poo 1990.
[439] Rawson 2010.

Shang predecessors, which may, in turn, be reflective of their origins as outsiders. Certainly, the Zhou used chariot and horse fittings on grand scale in their tombs and the objects were a constituent part of the burial.

As such, the enactment of this distinct Zhou identity (though it may not have been recognised as being *Zhou*) took place through a somewhat different funerary performance. Bronze ritual vessels were only interred in tombs with chambers and chariot and horse fittings were deposited in significant quantities in tombs. Both acts of interment would have (re)produced a specific socially inscribed identity at burial.

Differences within The Zhou Sphere: Chariots

Just as I have drawn comparisons between the Late Shang and the Zhou, and highlighted important differences at burial, so I also wish to explore the contrasts between the Zhou states discussed in this thesis. These contrasts and comparisons suggest that while identity was enacted and reproduced through structured burial assemblages, the understanding of what those assemblages entailed may have been different between some Zhou states.

Generally, there is a remarkable homogeneity in the way that burials were structured and formulated across the Zhou. By this I mean that the Zhou states used the same combinations of grave goods in tombs and maintained the strict division between tombs with and without bronze objects. This uniformity should not be surprising given that the Zhou shared the same types of ritual vessels with similar ornament suggesting wide scale contact and transmission. Moreover, the Ritual Reform was instituted across the Zhou sphere and the changes to the ritual vessel set were swift and uniform. As such, one might envisage a situation of close contact between states within the Zhou sphere.

However, there are some anomalies which suggest that some states diverged from the Zhou norm at burial. This difference is most notably seen in the Jin state. Rawson has already some of these differences when discussing the influence of the

people of the Northern Zone on the states of the Zhou periphery.[440] The use of stone-footings in some Beizhao tombs, the deployment of face coverings with jade pieces, the large sets of carnelian beads placed on the bodies of the jin lords and their consorts, and the casting of bronze vessels and jade pieces in the shapes of animals all suggest that the Jin incorporated Northern Zone features or practices. And, these practices became a part of Jin mortuary practices.

On top of these features, we might also add the use of chariots at burial in the Jin state as a further aspect of contrast. At Baoji and Zhangjapo, only large tombs, or rather those interpreted a housing lineage heads, had accompanying chariot burials. In effect, chariots were restricted to a few rich tombs.

By contrast, the Jin state appears to be something of an oddity, as chariots are found routinely with the tombs of the Jin lords and their consorts, and with smaller tombs at Tianma Qucun and Shangma, suggesting a long practice of interring chariots with different tombs. At Tianma Qucun, seven tombs had chariots placed on top of the outer wooden chamber, and four pairs of tombs had shared chariot pits. It would appear that from the time of the Early Western Zhou, the Jin state appears to have followed a different route with regards to chariot provision at burial than other contemporaneous states.

Moreover, as scholars such as Ch'en Fangmei, Wang Tao and Rawson have discussed, and as I have noted in Chapter Four in this thesis, some of the tombs of the Jin consort yielded unusual bronze objects, which are unlike that seen anywhere in the Zhou sphere. That such objects occur in several female tombs, suggests a continued practice of depositing exotic or unusual bronze items in these tombs.

If the Jin state is notable for its exotica, then, as Rawson argues, the Guo state is remarkable for its more conventional Chinese influence. The ritual vessel sets conform

[440] Rawson 2010.

to the types instituted by the Ritual Reform with few oddities.[441] There is little contrast between the types of vessels in female tombs and the types found in male tombs.

There are two pivotal implications of this difference that are of relevance here. First, while identity in the Jin and Guo states was centred on formulaic and conventional sets of grave goods, the inclusion of exotic pieces in Jin tombs suggests a possible different understanding of what constituted a type of person. In effect, different emphases on what objects or types of objects were important for the enactment and citation of identities.

Second, the Jin and Guo burials took place within quite different contexts. By this I mean that the Jin and Guo may have understood the world in differing ways. The use of stone footings in some Beizhao tombs would have arguably be seen as a unusual practice by the Guo who maintained vertical shaft pits with earth foundations. Moreover, even when the Guo do appear to take on foreign influence in their burials, such as the two jade coverings from tombs M2001 and M2009, it is utilised in a different way. Jade face coverings are found exclusively in two male tombs in the Guo state, but routinely found with both male and female tombs (at Beizhao) in the Jin state. The differing practices of interment must have arguably brought somewhat different notions of identity into play.

Comparing gender in the Late Shang and Zhou

The tomb of Fu Hao is one of the most discussed Late Shang tombs being the only royal tomb to be found intact. While the tomb offers archaeologists fantastic material, it should be placed into perspective when reviewing gender. Moreover, while the tomb is undeniably opulent and unusual in that it contains most of the objects associated with masculinity, we are unable to contrast the grave with other elite female ones. Evidence suggests, for example, that tomb M260 at the royal site of Xibeigang may

[441] Rawson 2010.

even been grander than Fu Hao's.[442] Nonetheless, Fu Hao's tomb is unusual and should be noted not only for its grandeur, but also for the types of objects interred therein. By this I mean that the tomb yielded an array of objects which were usually associated with male tombs, and have never been found, so far, in a Zhou female tomb.

Fu Hao's tomb contained over ninety bronze halberds, several bronze knives, thirty arrowheads, five *yue* axes, five bronze bells, several bronze tools and two horse cheek-pieces. In effect, the tomb contained weapons, tools, bells and horse items. And, the weapons were placed in significant quantities in the tomb. Alongside these objects, the tomb, as pointed out by Rawson, contained exotica in the form of vessels in the shape of realistic animals, bronze mirrors, knives of northern origin and carnelian beads most probably from the north.[443] Therefore, the tomb of Fu Hao is more than just a rich grave; it is a burial of a female with objects associated with masculinity and with objects from outside the Shang sphere. Due to the absence of comparable graves, we cannot say whether this tomb is exceptional or whether it resembles other tombs of consorts. Nonetheless, the tomb and its occupant point towards a complex understanding of gender in the Late Shang. For instance, the consort's name denotes her as a wife, but the weapons, tools and bells suggest activities or associations within a masculine context. Perhaps different contexts and relationships determined one's gender. In this case, gender may have been fluid and the rigid male/female binary oppositions, which are taken as a starting point for gender studies in Bronze Age China, may have to be re-thought.

With regards to comparisons between the Shang and Zhou, we can say that the object types used to create male identities, namely weapons, tools and bells, remained the same. Of course, we should acknowledge that the types of weapons changed over the course of the period, as did ritual vessels for example, but essentially the same categories of objects were used in male tombs in the Shang and Zhou.

---

[442] Tomb M260 contained one of the largest bronze vessel ever recovered from Anyang.
[443] Rawson 2010.

One notable difference in female tombs is the inclusion of chariot and horse fittings in the Zhou period. Generally, chariot objects, in the form of the bow-shaped object, were found in a few select male tombs (though Fu Hao's tomb also contained several bow-shaped objects). And, chariots themselves usually accompanied the tomb of male lineage heads.

By contrast, from the Early Western Zhou, not only did the graves contain a wide mélange of chariot and horse fittings, but also tombs in which the objects were placed encompassed both males and females. The types of chariot fittings include wheel hubs, linchpins, ornamental plaques, and finials. Furthermore, the provision of these objects was not restricted to a few elite male tombs. Females at Zhangjiapo, Tianma Qucun and Shangcunling were all routinely buried with chariot and horse fittings, in some cases with significant quantities. In fact, chariot and horse fittings were a constituent element of female Zhou burials with bronze items.

Moreover, some female tombs also had accompanying horse and chariot pits. However, it is on the provision of chariot pits with female tombs that we some contrast within the Zhou sphere. At Zhangjiapo and Baoji, chariots were associated with the tombs of male lineage heads. In the case of Zhangjiapo, over ten chariots were deposited with the large ramped tombs. By contrast, in the Jin and Guo states, a few female tombs had their own accompanying chariot pits. At Beizhao, Tianma Qucun and Shangma, a joint chariot pit was provided for pairs of tombs, while at Shangcunling, tombs M2012 and M2013 each had a chariot pit. In the case of tomb M2012, the pit yielded over 15 chariots – more than her presumed husband's chariot and horse pit.

The chariots and the manner in which they were placed in tombs at Beizhao require a little more discussion. As I outlined in Chapter Four, Jay Xu and Ying Yong suggest that the Jin leaders and their consorts had a joint accompanying chariot pit. Moreover, along the tomb ramps, chariots were also deposited. Based on the current sample of published tombs from the site, Ying Yong has observed that chariots were

placed disarticulated in male tombs and intact in female tombs.[444] Therefore, chariot interment on tomb ramps at Beizhao appears to have been highly-gendered.

CONCLUSION

This thesis has explored and investigated the possible mechanisms by which identity was recreated, reproduced and reexperienced at burial. It has also focused more specifically on one form of social identity – gender. The purpose of applying Judith Butler's theory of performance is to look beyond just what objects may have signified, and consider the ways in which burial goods were embedded within a funerary process. This approach also perhaps just as crucially takes into account the role of the living within the burial. By this I mean that people are not simply passive bystanders depositing objects with the deceased, but rather that mourners are actively engaged in the creation of identity. And, it was through this creation and experience at the funeral which then perpetuated and sustained notions of culturally specific notions of identity and gender. Moreover, we are now in a better position to not simply state what constituted a possible identity, but to also provide an explanation as to how identity was *reproduced* in both the Shang and Zhou dynasties.

The archaeological study of gender has provided us with an example that might generalize as to how one might explore more specific notions of identity. One criticism of this thesis might be the privileging of gender over other forms of social identity. Such criticism, as Sorenson notes, has been levelled at gender archaeologists for a long time.[445] Indeed, it is clear that gender *was* a structuring principle in Shang and Zhou burials (although perhaps it was more prevalent in Zhou burials than Shang ones), although, as I have emphasised throughout this thesis, it was not perhaps not as important as one might expect. Given that gender identities were only manifested in tombs with bronze objects (not all tombs it should be noted), and such tombs form only a small portion of graves at a cemetery site, then it is clear that gender was materialised

444 Ying Yong 2004: 115.
445 Sørenson 2000: 56.

in only a limited number of graves. Even based on the discussion within this thesis, one might conclude that a range of overlapping identities was performed in both Shang and Zhou burials, and I am not proposing that gender was the most important or definitive structuring priniciple at burial.

It is worth reiterating that this thesis has emphasised the experience of identity at burial. Shang and Zhou burials would have involved different experiences and effects, especially those of the post-Ritual Reform when a different vessels set was in use. Moreover, there are further more subtle differences between the Shang and Zhou and between the Zhou states and lineages themselves, which emphasises the degree of cultural specificity and local discourse on the construction of identities at burial.

Lastly, as more tombs are reported pre- and post-Shang and Zhou, one might hope that we may gain more insights into the performative construction of identity and thus explore further the mechanisms by which identities are (re)created and (re)produced in other periods of prehistoric China.

Bibliography

Allan, S., 1993. Art and Meaning. In: Whitfeld, R., ed. *The Problem of Meaning in Early Chinese Ritual Bronzes*. Colloquies on Art and Archaeology in Asia, no. 15. London: University of London.

Allan, S., 2005. *From Erlitou to Anyang: The Formation of Cultural Hegemony*. Paper presented at the Workshop of Early Chinese Civilization, March 10-12, 2005. University of British Columbia.

Andreu-Diaz, M., 1998. Ethnicity and Iberians: The Archaeological Crossroads between Perception and Material Culture. *European Journal of Archaeology* 1.2: 199-218.

Andreu-Diaz, M., 2005. Gender Identity. In: Diaz-Andreu, M. and Lucy, S., eds. *The Archaeology of Identity: Approaches to Gender, Age, Status and Ethnicity*. pp. 13-43. Routledge: New York.

Arwill-Nordbladh, E., 1998. *Archaeology, Gender and Emancipation*. Gothenburg: Gothenburg University Press.

Bagley, R., 1977. P'an-lung-ch'eng: A Shang City in Hupei. *Artibus Asiae* 39: 165-219.

Bagley, R., 1987. *Shang Ritual Bronzes in the Arthur M. Sackler Collections: Ancient Chinese Bronzes in the Arthur M. Sackler Collections, vol. 1*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Bagley, R., 1990. Shang Ritual Bronzes: Casting Techniques and Vessel Design. *Archives of Asian art* 43: 6-20.

Bagley, R., 1999. Shang Archaeology. In: Lowe, M. and Shaughnessy, E., eds. *The Cambridge History of Ancient China*, pp. 124-232. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Balme, J. and Beck, W., 1993 The Origins of the Division of Labour: A comparison of feminist and archaeological ideas. In: Du Cros, H. and Smith, L. J., eds. *Women in*

Archaeology: a Feminist Critique 1991. pp 61 - 74 Department of Prehistory, RSPac. S. Australian National University.

Baoji Shi Kaogu Gongzuodui., 1993. Baoji shi Yimencun erhao chunqiu mu fajue jianbao 宝鸡市益门村二号春秋墓发掘简报 . *Wenwu* 1993. 10: 1-14.

Baoji Shi Kaogu Gongzuodui., 1993a. Baoji Shi Yimencun Qin mu fajue jiyao 宝鸡市益门村秦墓发掘记要. *Kaogu yu wenwu* 1993. 3: 35-39.

Baoji Shi Kaogu Yanjiusuo., 2007. Shaanxi Fufeng wujun xicun Xi Zhou qingtongqi jiaocang fajue jianbao 陕西扶风五郡西村西周青铜器窖藏发掘简报 . *Kaogu yu wenwu* 2007. 4: 4-27.

Baoji Shi Kaogu Yanjiusuo., 2007a. Shaanxi Baoji zifang tou Xi Zhou zaoqi muzang qingli jianbao 陕西宝鸡纸坊头西周早期墓葬请理简报 . Wenwu 2007. 8: 28-71.

Barnard, N., 1961. *Bronze Casting and Bronze Alloys in Ancient China*. Monumenta Serica Monograph 14. Canberra: Australian National University.

Barret, J.C., 1991. Towards an Archaeology of Ritual. In: Garwood, P., Jennings, D., Skeates, R. and Toms, J., eds. *Sacred and Profane*: *Proceedings of a Conference on Archaeology, Ritual and Religion*. pp. 1-9. Oxford: Oxford Univeristy Committee for Archaeology.

Beijing Daxue Kaogu Wenboyuan and Beijing Daxue Gudai Wenming Yanjiu Zhongxin 北京大学古代文明研究中心 (eds)., 2002. *Jijin zhu guoshu: Zhouyuan chutu Xi Zhou qingtongqi jingcui* 吉金铸国史：周原出土西周青铜器精粹 . Beijing: Wenwu Chubanshe.

Beijing Daxue Kaogu Wenboyuan and Shanxi Sheng Kaogu Yanjiusuo., 2001. Tianma Qucun yizhi Beizhao Jin Hou mudi diliuci fajue 天马－曲村遗址北赵晋侯墓地第六次发掘. *Wenwu* 2001. 8: 4-21, 55.

Beijing Daxue Kaogu Xi and Shanxi Sheng Kaogu Yanjiusuo., 1993. 1992 nian Tianma Qucun yizhi muzang fajue 1992 年天马－曲村遗址北赵墓地发掘 . *Wenwu* 1993. 3: 11-30.

Beijing Daxue Kaoguexue Xi and Shanxi Sheng Kaogu Yanjiusuo., 1994. Tianma Qucun yizhi Beizhao Jin Hou mudi di'erci fajue 天马－曲村遗址北赵晋侯墓地第二次发掘 . *Wenwu* 1994. 1: 4-28.

Beijing Daxue Kaoguexue Xi and Shanxi Sheng Kaogu Yanjiusuo., 1995. Tianma Qucun yizhi Beizhao Jin Hou mudi diwuci fajue天马－曲村遗址北赵晋侯墓地第五次发掘 . *Wenwu* 1995. 7: 4-39.

Beijing Daxue Kaoguxue Xi Shang Zhou Zu and Shanxi Sheng Kaogu Yanjiusuo 北京大学考古学系商周组－山西省考古研究所 (Zou Heng)., 2000. *Tianma Qucun 1980-1989* 天马－曲村 1980－1989. 4 vols. Beijing: Kexue Chubanshe.

Beijing Shi Wenwu Yanjiusuo., 1995. *Liulihe Xi Zhou Yan guo mudi 1973-1977* 琉璃河西周燕国墓地 1973－1977. Beijing: Wenwu Chubanshe.

Beijing Shi Wenwu Yanjiusuo and Beijing Daxue Kaoguexue Xi., 1996. 1995 nian Liulihe yizhi muzangqu fajue jianbao 1995 年琉璃河遗址墓葬区发掘簡报 . *Wenwu* 1995. 6: 16-27.

Binford, L., 1971. Mortuary Practices: Their Study and Potential. In: Brown, J., ed. *Approaches to the Dimensions of Mortuary Practices*. Memoir 25, Society for American Archaeology, pp. 6-29.

Blattner, W., 1992. Existential Temporality in Being and Time. In: Dreyfus, H. and Hall, H., eds. *Heidegger: A Critical Reader*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Bourdieu, P.,1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P., 1990a. *The Logic of Practice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P., 1990b. *In Other Words: Towards a Reflexive Sociology*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Brown, J., 1995. On Mortuary Analysis – with Special Reference to the Saxe-Binford Research Progam. In: Beck, L., ed. *Regional Approaches to Mortuary Analysis*, pp. 3-23. New York: Plenum Press.

Bruck, J., 2001. Monuments, Power and Personhood in the British Neolithic. *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 7. 4: 649-667.

Bruck, J., 2004. Material Metaphors. *The Journal of Social Archaeology* 4: 307-333.

Bunker, E., 1993. Gold in the Ancient Chinese World: A Cultural Puzzle. *Artibus Asiae* 53.1/2: 27-50.

Butler, J., 1990. *Gender Trouble*. London: Routledge.

Butler. J., 1993. *Bodies that Matter*. New York: Routledge.

Butler. J., 2004. *Undoing Gender*. New York: Routledge.

Campbell, R., 2007. *Blood, Flesh and Bones: Kinship and Violence in the Social Economy of the Late Shang*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Harvard Universtiy.

Cao Dingyun 曹定云., 1986. Lun Yinxu Houjiazhuang 1001 haomu muzhu 论殷墟侯家庄1001号墓墓主. *Kaogu yu wenwu* 1986.2: 44-50.

Cao Wei., 2004. *Zhouyuan yizhi u Xi Zhou tongqi yanjiu* 周原遺址與西周銅器研究. Beijing: Kexue Chubanshe.

Chang, Kwang-Chih., 1977. *The Archaeology of Ancient China*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Chang, Kwang-Chih., 1980. *Shang Civilization*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Chang, K.C., 1983. *Art, Myth and Ritual. The Path to Political Authority in Ancient China*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Chang Yuzhi 常玉芝., 1987. *Shangdai zhouji zhidu* 商代周祭制度. Beijing: Zhongguo Shehui Kexue Chubanshe.

Chapman, R., 2003a. Beyond the Archaeology of Death. *Historiae Mortis*, 1: 1-12.

Chapmen, R., 2003b. Death, Society and Archaeology: The Social Dimensions of Mortuary Practices. *Mortality* 8 (3): 308-315.

Ch'en Fangmei., 1997. *The Bronze Weapons of the Last Shang period*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. London University.

Ch'en Fangmei., 2000. Jin Hou Dui fu: Jianlun tongfu de chuxian ji qi lizhi yiyi 晋侯对铺：兼论铜铺的出现及其礼制意义 . *Gugong xueshu jikan* 17.4: 53-108.

Ch'en Fangmei., 2002. Jin hou mudi qingtongqi suojian xingbie yanjiu de xin xian suo 晋侯墓地青铜器所见姓别研究的新线索 . In: Shanghai Bowiguan., eds. *Jinhou mudi chutu qingtongqi guoji xueshu yan taohui lunwenji*. pp. 157-196. Shanghai: Shanghai Shuhua Chubanshe.

Chen Jianli, Yang Junchang, Sun Bingjun and Pan Yan., 2009. Manufacture technique of bronze-iron bimetallic objects found in M27 of Liangdaicun Site, Hancheng, Shaanxi. *Science in China Series E: Technological Sciences* 52.10: 3038-3045.

Chen Mengjia., 1956. *Yinxu buci zongshu* 殷墟卜辞综述. Beijing: Kexue Chubanshe.

Chen Quanfang. 1988. *Zhouyuan yu zhou wenhua* 周原与周文化. Shanghai: Shanghai Renmin Chubanshe.

Chen Zhida., 1989. *Yinxu wuqi gaishu* 殷墟武器概述. *Qingzhu Su Bingqi kaogu wushiwu nian linwenji*. pp 326-337. Beijing: Wenwu Chubanshe.

Conkey, M. and Gero, J., 1991. Tension, Pluralities and Engendering Archaeology. In: Conkey, M. and Gero, J., eds. *Engendering Archaeology*. pp. 3-31. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Conkey, M. and Spector, J., 1984. Archaeology and the Study of Gender. In: Schiffer, M., ed. *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory*, vol. 7.

Connerton, P., 1989. *How Societies Remember*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cook. C, 1993., Myth and Authenticity: Deciphering the Chu Gong Ni Bell Inscriptions. *Journal of American Oriental Society* 113.4: 539-550.

Cook, C., 1996. Scribes, Cooks, and Artisans: Breaking Zhou Tradition. *Early China* 20: 241-277.

Cook, C., 1997. Wealth and the Western Zhou. *The Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studie*s 60.2: 253-294.

Creel, G., 1970. *The Origins of Statecraft in China. Volume One: The Western Chou Empire*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Csorba, M., 1996. *Identification of Non-Dynastic Burials Practices involving a Northern Tool Tradition in China's Dynastic Frontier*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. University of Pittsburgh.

Dant, Tim., 2004. *Materiality and Society*. London: Open University Press.

Debaine-Francfort., 1995. *Du neolithique a l'age du bronze en China du Nord-Ouest: La culture de Qijia et ses connexions*. Memoires de la Mission Archaeologique Francaise en Asie Centrale, vol. 6. Paris Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations.

Di Cosmo, N., 1999. The Northern Frontier in Pre-Imperial China. In: Lowe, M. and Shaughnessy, E., eds. *The Cambridge History of Ancient China*. pp. 885-967. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Di Cosmo, N., 2002. A*ncient China and its Enemies: The Rise of Nomadic Peoples in East Asian History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dobres, MA., 1995. Gender and Prehistoric Teachnology: On the Social Agency of Technical Strategies. *World Archaeology* 27. 1: 25-49.

Dobson, W.A.C.H., 1962. *Early Archaic Chinese: A Descriptive Grammar*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Dong Zuobin., 1945. *Yinli pu* 殷历谱。2 vols. Nanqi, Sichuan: Academica Sinica.

Dreyfus, H., 1991. *Being-in-the-World: A Commentary on Heidegger's Being and Time*. USA: MIT Press.

Du Fangqin 杜芳琴., 1998. Shangzhou xingbie zhidu yu guizu funu diwei zhi bijao 商周性别制度与贵族妇女地位之比较 . In: Fangqin Du., ed. *Zhongguo shehui xingbie de lishi wenhua xunzong*. 中国社会性别的历史文化寻踪 . pp. 67-94. Tianjing: Tianjing Shehui kexue chubanshe.

Du Naisong杜迺松., 1976. Cong lieding zhidu kan keji fuli de fandongxing从列鼎制度看克己复礼的反动性. *Kaogu* 1976. 1: 17-21.

Du Zhengsheng., 1992. *Gudai shehui yu guojia* 古代社会与国家. Taipei: Yunchen Wenhua.

Eberhard, W., 1977. *A History of China*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Erdy, M., 1995. Hun and Xiongnu Type Cauldron Finds Throughout Eurasia. *Eurasian Studies Yearbook* 67: 5-94.

Falkenhausen, L. V., 1993a. On the Historical Orientation of Chinese Archaeology. *Anitquity* 67: 839-849.

Falkenhausen, L .V., 1993b. *Suspended Music: Chime-Bells in the Culture of Bronze Age China*. California: University of California Press.

Falkenhausen, L.V., 1993c. Issues in Western Zhou Studies. *Early China* 18: 139-226.

Falkenhausen, L.V., 1996. Review of Monumentality in Early Chinese Art and Architecture. *Early China* 21: 183-199.

Falkenhausen, L.V., 1999. Late Western Zhou Taste. *Etudes chinoises* 18.1/2: 143-178.

Falkenhausen, L.V., 1999. The Waning of the Bronze Age: Material Culture and Social Developments, 770-481 BC. In: Loewe, M. and Shaughnessy, E., eds. *The Cambridge History of Ancient China*. pp. 450-544. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Falkenhausen, L.V., 2001. Shangma: Demography and Social Differentiation in a Late Bronze Age Community in North China. *The Journal of East Asian Archaeology* 3-4: 91-172.

Falkenhausen, L.V., 2005. Forerunners of the Houma Bronze Styles: The Shangguo Sequence. *Gugong xueshu jikan* 2005. 23.1: 111-174.

Falkenhausen, L.V., 2006. *Chinese Society in The Age of Confucius*. Los Angeles: The University of California.

Fitzgerald-Huber, L., 1995. Qijia and Erlitou: The Question of Contacts with Distant Cultures. *Early China* 20: 17-68.

Fong, W (ed.)., 1980. *The Great Bronze Age of China: An Exhibition from The People's Republic of China*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art.

Foucault, M., 1978. *The History of Sexuality, vol. 1*. London: Vintage.

Foucault, M., 1988. Technologies of the Self. In: Martin, L., Gutman, H. and Hutton, P., eds. *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michael Foucault*. pp. 16-49. London: Tavistock.

Fowler, C., 2001. Personhood and Social Relations in the British Neolithic. *Journal of material Culture* 6.2: 137-163.

Franklin, U.M., 1983. On Bronze and Other Metals in Early China. In: Keightley, D., ed. *The Origins of Civilization*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Fu Xiunian., 1981. Shaanxi Qishan Fengchu Xi Zhou jianzhu yizhi chutan: Zhouyuan Xi Zhou jianzhu yizhi yanjiu zhi yi 陕西岐山凤雏西周建筑遗址初探：周原西周建筑遗址研究之一. *Wenwu* 1981. 1: 65-74.

Fufeng Xian Bowuguan., 2007. Shaanxi Fufengxian xin faxian yi pi Shang Zhou qingtongqi 西扶风县新发现一批商周青铜器 . *Kaogu yu wenwu* 2007. 3: 3-10.

Gao Ciruo and Liu Mingke., 1996. Baojishi Rujiazhuang xin faxian tongqi jiaocang 宝鸡市茹家庄新发现的铜器窖藏 . *Kaogu yu Wenwu* 1996. 4: 11-16.

Gao Quxun., 1967. Daofuzang zhong de tongdao. 刀俯葬中的铜刀. *Zhongyang yanjiuyuan lishi yuyan yanjiusuo jikan* 中央研究院历史语言研究所集刊 37: 368-375.

Gao Zhixi., 1992. Shang and Zhou Period Bronze Musical Instruments from South China. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 55: 262-271.

Gell, A., 1998. *Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Giddens, A., 1984. *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gilchrist, R., 1999. *Gender and Archaeology*. London: Routledge.

Gillespie, S.D., 2001. Personhood, Agency and Mortury Ritual: A Case Study from the Ancient Maya. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology*. 20.1: 73-112.

Goffman, E., 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. USA: Doubleday.

Gosden, C., 1994. *Social Being and Time: An Archaeological Perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Gosden, C., 2005. What Do Objects Want? *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*. Vol 12.3: 193-221.

Guo Baojun., 1959. *Shanbiaozhen yu Liulige Liulige* 山彪镇与琉璃閣. Kaoguxue zhuankan Series II, vol. 11. Beijing: Kexue Chubanshe.

Guo Baojun and Lin Shoujin., 1955. Yijiuwu'ernian qiuji Luoyang dongjiao fajue baogao 一九五二年秋季洛阳东郊发掘报告. *Kaogu* 1955. 9: 91-116.

Guo Morou., 1930. Zhongguo gudai shehui yanjiu 中国古代社会研究. Shanghai: Lianhe shudian. Here quoted after the last revised version of 1965, published in Guo Moruo quanji, Lishi bian, 郭沫若全集，历史编 1981, vol. 1: 1-312. Beijing: Renmin Chubanshe.

Gou Peng., 2004. Yinxu qingtong bingqi yanjiu 殷墟青铜兵器研究. *Kaoguxue jikan* 考古学集刊 2004. 15: 129-174.

Haapanen, M., 2005. *From a Community to Communities of Practice. The Late Shang Dynasty Site of Miaopu Locus North at Anyang, Henan Province, China*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Univeristy of California, Los Angeles.

Hall, D. and Ames, R., 1995. *Anticipating China: Thinking Through the Narratives of Chinese and Western Culture*. New York: State University of New York.

Han Jianye., 1997. Yinxu xiqu mudi fenxi 殷墟西区墓地分析. In: Li Boqian., ed. *Shang wenhua lunji.*商文化论集. pp.333-346. Beijing: Wenwu Chunanshe.

Han Kangxin., 2003. Yinxu rengu xingbie nianling jianding yu fushen zang wenti 殷墟人骨性别年铃鉴定与俯身葬问题 . In: Li Boqian., ed. *Wenwu Shang wenhua lunji* 商文化论集 pp.347-355. Beijing: Wenu Chubanshe.

Harding, A., 2000. *European Societies in The Bronze Age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Härke, H., 1990. Warrior Graves? The Background of the Anglo-Saxon Weapon Burial Rite. *Past and Present* 126: 22-43.

Hastorf, C., 1991. Gender, Space and Food in Prehistory in Engendering Archaeology. In Conkey, M. and Gero, J., eds. *Engendering Archaeology*. pp. 132-163. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Haugeland, J., 1992. Dasein's Disclosedness. In: Dreyfus, H. and Hall, H., eds. *Heidegger: A Critical Reader*. pp. 27-44. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hayden, B. 1995., Pathways to Power: Principles for Creating Socioeconomic Inequalities. In: Price, T. and Feinman, G., eds. *Foundation of Social Inequality*, pp. 15-85. New York: Plenum.

Henan kaogu sishi nian *(1952-1992)* 河南考古四十年., 1994. Henan sheng Wenwu yanjiusuo. Zhengzhou: Henan Renmin.

Henan Sheng wenwu yanjiusuo., 2001. *Zhengzhou Shang cheng 1953 nian – 1985 nian kaogu fajue baogao* 郑州商成：1953年 — 1985年考古发掘报告. Beijing: Wenwu Chubanshe.

Henan Sheng wenwu yanjiusuo 河南省文物研究所 and Sanmenxia shi wenwu gong zuodui. 三门峡市文物工作队., 1999. *Sanmenxia guo guo mudi.* 三门峡国虢墓地Beijing: Wenwu Chubanshe.

Henan Sheng wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo and Sanmenxia shi wenwu gong zuodui., 2000. Sanmenxia guo guo mudi M2013 de fajue qingli 三门峡虢国墓地m2013的发掘清理 *Wenwu* 2000. 12: 23- 37.

Henan Sheng wenwu kaogu yanjiusuo and Sanmenxia shi wenwu gong zuodui., 2006. Sanmenxia guo guo mudi M2010 de qingli 三门峡虢国墓地m2010的清理*Wenwu* 2006.4: 4-22.

Heidegger, M., 1962. *Being and Time*. Trans. J. Macquarrie and E. Robinson. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hodder., I., 1982. *Symbols in Action. Ethnoarchaeological Studies of Material Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hsu, Cho-yun. and Linduff, K., 1988. *Western Chou Civilisation*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Hu Houxuan 胡厚宣., 1944. Yindai fengjian zhidu kao 殷代封制度考. In *Jiaguxue yu Shangshi luncong*.甲骨学与商史论丛. Vol 1:1-36. Qila daxue guoxue yanjiusuo

Hu Qianying., 2000. *Hu Qianying Zhou wenhua kaogu yanjiu xuanji* 胡谦盈周文化考古研究选集. Chengdu: Sichuan Daxue Chubanshe.

Huang Mingchong 2001. Yin dai u Dong Zhou zhi 'nonqi' ji qi yiyi 殷代与东周之"弄器"及其意义., *Gu jin lunheng* 2001. 6: 66-88.

Huang Xiquan and Yu Bingwen., 1995. Shanxi Jin Hou mudi suo chu Chu Gong Ni mingwen chushi 山西晋侯墓所出楚公逆铭文初释 . *Kaogu* 1995. 2: 170-178.

Huaxia Kaogu 华夏考古., 1997.2: 28-45. 1995-1996 nian Anyang Liujiazhuag Yindai yizhi fajue baogao. 1995-1996 年安阳刘家庄殷代遗址发掘报告 .

Huber, L., 1996. Qijia and Erlitou: The Question of Contact with Distant Culture. *Early China* 20: 17-67.

Jagger, G., 2008. *Judith Butler: Sexual Politics, Social Change, and The Power of the Performative*. New York: Routledge.

Jenkins, R., 2004. *Social Identity*. Routledge. London.

Jing Zhongwei., 2006. Xi Zhou muzhong "huibing" zangsu de kaoguxue guancha 西周墓中"毁兵"葬俗的考古学观察 *Kaogu yu wenwu* 2006. 4: 47- 59.

Jones, A., 2008. How the Dead Live: Mortuary Practices, Memory and the Ancestors in Neolithic and Early Bronze Age Britain and Ireland. In: Pollard, J., ed. *Prehistoric Britain*. pp. 177-202. Oxford: Blackwell.

Jones, S, 1997. *The Archaeology of Ethnicity: Constructing Identities in the Past and Present*. New York: Routledge.

Joyce, R., 2000. *Gender and Power in Prehispanic Mesoamerica*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Kane, V., 1975a. A Re-examination of Anyang Archaeology. *Ars Orientalis* 10: 93-110.

Kane, V. 1975b. The Independent Bronze Industries in the South of China Contemporary with the Shang and Western Zhou Dynasties. *Archives of Asian Art* vol. 28: 77-107.

Kaogu 考古.,1972. 4：29－30. Shanxi shilou yidie faxian shangdai tongqi.山西石楼发现商代铜器.

Kaogu 考古.,1977.2:57-96. Anynag Yinxu wuhao mu de fajue 安阳殷墟五号墓的发掘.

Kaogu 考古., 1981.3: 211-212. Shanxi Liulin xian Gaohong faxian shangdai tongqi 山西柳林县高红发现商代铜器.

Kaogu 考古., 1983.8: 679-694, 713. Liaoning Jianpingxun de qingtong shidai muzang ji xiangguan yiwu. 辽宁平县的青铜时代墓葬及相关遗物 .

Kaogu 考古., 1986.2: 112-124,137. Anyang Miaopu beidi yizhi fajue jianbao 1980-1982. 安阳苗圃北地遗址发掘简报。

Kaogu 考古., 1986.8: Anyang Yinxu 1713 hao mude fajue. 安阳殷墟1713号墓的发掘.

Kaogu 考古 1986.12: 1067-1072. Anyang Xuejiazhuang dongnan Yin mu fajue jianbao 安阳薛家庄东南殷墓发简报。

Kaogu 考古., 1988.10: 941. Hebei Huai'an shizikou faxian shangdai lushoudao 河北怀安狮子口发现商代鹿首刀.

Kaogu 考古., 1989. 2: 123-137. 1984 nian qiu Anyang Miaopu Beidi de Yinmu fajue jianbao. 1984 年秋安阳苗圃北地的殷墓发掘简报 .

Kaogu 考古., 1989. 1987 nian Anyang Xiaotun dongbei di de fajue 年安阳小屯东北地的发掘.

Kaogu 考古., 1997.1: 62-72. Yinxu xiqu mudi fanxi 殷墟西区墓地分析.

Kaogu 考古., 1998. 10: 23-35. Henan Anyang shi Huanbei Huayuanzhuang yizhi 1997 nian fajue jianbao. 河南安阳市洹北花圆庄遗址 1997年发掘简报.

Kaogu 考古., 2004. 5: 8-16.Henan Anyangshi wangyukou nandi Yindai yizhi de fajue 河南安阳王裕口南地殷代遗址的发掘.

Kaogu tongxun 考古通讯., 1958. Henan Anyang Xuejiazhaung Yindai yizhi muzang he Tang mu fajue baogao 河南安阳薛家庄殷代遗址墓葬和唐墓发掘报告 .

Kaogu yu wenwu 考古与文物., 1995.4: 38-43, 66. Yinxu buci suo jian Shangdai de wangji 殷墟卜辞所见商代的王畿.

Kaogu xuebao 古学报., 1955. 9: 25-79. 1953 nian Anyang Dasicongcun fajue bagao. 1953 年安阳大司空村发掘报告.

Kaogu xuebao 考古学报., 1979.1: 27-146. 1969-1977 nian Yinxu xiqu muzang fajue baogao. 1969-1977 年殷墟西区墓葬发掘报告。

Kaogu xuebao 考古学报., 1987.1: 99-118. Yinxu 259, 260 hao mu fajue baogao 殷墟250，260 号墓发掘报告。

Kaogu xuebao 考古学报., 1991. 3: 325-352. Yinxu qijiazhuang dong 269 hao mu 殷墟戚家庄东269号墓。

Kaogu xuebao 考古学报., 1992. 1: 97-128+plates. 1987 nian Anyang Huayuanzhuang nandi fajue baogao. 1987 年安阳花圆庄南地发掘报告 .

Karlbeck, O., 1935. Anyang Molds. *Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities* 7: 39-60.

Karlgren, B., 1950. The Book of Documents. *BMFEA* 22: 1-81.

Keightley, D., 1969. *Public Work in Ancient China. A Study of Forced Labour in the Shang and Western Zhou*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Columbia University.

Keightley, D., 1978. *Sources of Shang History. The Oracle-Bone Inscriptions of Bronze Age China*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Keightley, D., 1979-1980. The Shang State as Seen in the Oracle Bone Inscriptions. *Early China* 5: 25-34.

Keightley, D., 1983. The Late Shang: When, Where and What? In: Keightley, D., ed. *The Origins of Chinese Civilisation*. pp. 523-565. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Keightley, D., 1993. Clean Hands and Shining Helmets: Heroic Action in Early Chinese and Greek Culture. In Siebers, T., ed. *Religion and Authority*. pp. 13-52. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Keightley, D., 1999a. The Shang: China's First Historical Dynasty. In: Lowe, M. and Shaughnessy, E., eds. *The Cambridge History of Ancient China*. pp. 232-289. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Keightley, D., 1999b. At the Beginning: The Status of Women in Neolithic and Shang China. *Nan Nu* 1: 1-63.

Keightley. D., 2000. *The Ancestral Landscape: Time, Space and Community in Late Shang China (1200-1045 BCE*). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kiselev. S.V., (Киселев. С.В.) 1951. *Drevniaia istoriia Iuzhnoi Sibiri*. Moscow: Nauka.

Kristiansen, K., 1987. Centre and Periphery in the Ancient World. In: Earle, T., ed. *Chiefdoms: Power, Economy and Ideology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kuzmina, E., 1994. Horse, Chariots and the Indo-Iranian Steppes. In: Genito, B., ed. *The Archaeology of the Steppes, Methods and Strategies*. pp. 31-71. Naples: Instituto Universitario Orientale.

Laqueur, T., 1990. *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud*. Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Legrand, S., 2006. The Emergence of the Scythians: Bronze Age to Iron Age in South Siberia. *Antiquity* 80. 310: 843-879.

Lefebvre, H., 1991. *The Critique of Everyday Life, Volume 1*. London: Verso

Li Boqian., 1997. Jin Hou Su Zhong de niandai wenti 晋侯稣钟的年代问题. *Zhongguo wenwu bao*.

Li Boqian., 2001. Shu Ze fangding mingwen kaoshi 叔矢方鼎铭文考释. *Wenwu* 2001. 8: 39-42.

Li Chaoyuan., 2002. Jinhou mudi chutu qingtongqi zonglan 晋侯墓地出土青铜器综. In: Shanghai Bowuguan., eds. *Jinguo Qizhen Shanxi Jinhou muqun chutu wenwu jingpin*. pp. 28-35. Shanghai: Shanghai Renmin Meishu Chubanshe.

Li Feng., 1988. Guo guo mudi tongqi qun de fenqi jiqi xiangguan wenti 虢国墓地铜器群的分期及其相关问题. *Kaogu* 1988.11: 1035-1043.

Li Feng., 1991. Xian Zhou wenhua de neihan ji qi yuanyuan tantao 先周文化的内涵及其渊源探讨. *Kaogu Xuebao* 1991.3: 265-284.

Li Feng., 1997. Ancient Reproductions and Calligraphic Variations: Studies of Western Zhou Bronzes with Identical Inscriptions. *Early China* 22: 1-41.

Li Feng., 2000. *The Decline and Fall of the Western Zhou Dynasty*. Unpublished PhD thesis. The University of Chicago. Illinois.

Li Feng., 2003. Feudalism and the Western Zhou. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*. 63.1: 115-144.

Li Ji., 1958. You jixing yanbian suojian de Xiaotun yizhi yu Houjiazhuang zhi shidai quanxi 由笄型演变所见的小屯遗址与侯家庄之时代关系. *Zhongyang yanjiuyuan lishi yuyan yanjiusuo jikan* 1958. 29: 809-816.

Li Ji., 1959. Jixing balei jiqi wenshi zhi yanbian 笄型八类及其纹饰之演变. *Zhongyang yanjiuyuan lishi yuyan yanjiusuo jikan* 1959.30: 1-69.

Li Ji., 1977. *Anyang*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Li Mengcun and Chang Jincang., 1983. Tang Shuwu fengdi zhushuo zhengwu bianxi 唐叔虞封地诸说正误辨析. *Jinyang xuekan* 4: 93-98.

Li Mengcun and Li Shangshi., 1999. *Jinguoshi* 晋国史. Taiyuan: Shanxi Guji Chubanshe.

Li Xinxing., 1984. Cong Qishan Fengchucun fangji yizhi kan Xi Zhou de jiazu gongshe 从岐山凤雏村房基遗址看西周的家族公社. *Kaogu yu wenwu* 1984. 5: 70-75.

Li Xueqin., 1979. Xi Zhou zhongqi qingtongqi jiaocang de zhongyao biaochi: Zhouyuan Zhuangbai, Qiangjia liangchu qingtongqi jiaocang de zonghe yanjiu 西周重期青铜器的重要标尺：周原庄白，强家两处青铜器窖藏的综合研究. *Zhongguo Lishi Bowuguan guankan* 1: 29-36.

Li Xueqin., 1995. Shilun Chu Gong Ni bianzhong 试论楚公逆编钟. *Wenwu* 1995. 2: 69-72.

Li Xueqin., 1995a. Shiji Jin shijia yu xin chu jinwen 史记晋世家与新出金文. *Xueshu jilin* 4: 160-170.

Li Xueqin., 1996. Jin Hou Su bianzhong de shi, de, ren 晋侯稣编钟的时地人. *Zhongguo wenwu bao*.

Li Xueqin., 2003. Mei Xian Yanjgjiacun xinchu qingtongqi yanjiu 眉县杨家村新出青铜器研究. *Wenwu* 2003. 3: 66-73.

Li Yung-ti., 2003a. *The Anyang Bronze Foundries. Archaeological Remains, Casting Technology and Production Organization*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Harvard Univerity. Department of Anthropology.

Li Yung-ti., 2003b. On the Function of Cowries in Shang and Western Zhou China. *Journal of East Asian Archaeology* 5: 1-14.

Liang Siyong and Gao Qushun., 1962. *Zhongguo kaogu baogaoji – Houjiazhuang 1001 hao damu* 中国考古报告集－侯家庄 1001号大墓. Taipei: Academica Sinica.

Liang Siyong and Gao Qushun., 1967. *Zhongguo kaogu baogaoji – Houjiazhuang 1003 hao damu* 中国考古报告集－侯家庄 1003号大墓. Taipei: Academica Sinica.

Liang Siyong and Gao Qushun., 1968. *Zhongguo kaogu baogaoji – Houjiazhuang 1217 hao damu* 中国考古报告集－侯家庄 1217号大墓. Taipei: Academica Sinica.

Liang Siyong and Gao Qushun., 1970. *Zhongguo kaogu baogaoji – Houjiazhuang 1004 hao damu* 中国考古报告－集侯家庄 1004号大墓. Taipei: Academica Sinica.

Liang Siyong and Gao Qushun., 1974. *Zhongguo kaogu baogaoji – Houjiazhuang 1500 hao damu* 中国考古报告集－侯家庄 1500号大墓. Taipei: Academica Sinica.

Liang Siyong and Gao Qushun., 1976. *Zhongguo kaogu baogaoji – Houjiazhuang 1550 hao damu* 中国考古报告集－侯家庄 1550号大墓. Taipei: Academica Sinica.

Liang Siyong and Gao Qushun., 1997. *Zhongguo kaogu baogaoji – Houjiazhuang 1567 hao damu* 中国考古报告集－侯家庄 1567号大墓. Taipei: Academica Sinica.

Lin Yun., 1986. A Re-examination of the Relationship between Bronzes in the Shang Culture and of the Northern Zone. In: Chang, K.C., ed. *Studies in Shang Archaeology*. pp. 237-273. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Lin Yun., 1990. Zhou dai yongding zhidu shangque 周代用鼎制度商榷. *Shixue jikan* 3: 12-23.

Linduff, K., 1997. An Archaeological Overview. In: E, Bunker, *et al*., eds. *Ancient Bronzes of the Eastern Eurasian Steppe from The Arthur M. Sackler collections*. New York: Arthur Sackler Foundation.

Linduff, K., 2002. Women's Lives Memorialized in Burial in Ancient China at Anyang. In: Nelson, S. and Rosen-Ayalon, M. eds. *The Pursuit of Gender: Worldwide Archaeological Approaches*. pp. 257-287. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.

Linduff, K., 2003. Many Wives, One Queen in Shang China. In: Nelson, S., ed. *The World of Queens*. pp. 59-76. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.

Linduff. K. and Hsu Cho-yun., 1988. *Western Chou Civilisation*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Liu Kefu (Mikhail V. Kryukov)., 2002. Beizhao Jin guo mudi ji Jin hou mu' yi shuo zhiyi 北赵晋国墓地即晋墓‘一说质疑 . In: Shanghai Bowuguan., eds. *Jin Hou mudi chutu qingtongqi guoji xueshu yantaohui lunwenji*. pp. 53-74. Shanghai: Shanghai Shuhua Chubanshe.

Liu Li. 1987., Tongfu kao 铜鍑考. *Kaogu yu wenwu* 1987. 3: 60-65.

Liu Qiyi., 1979. Xi Zhou jinwen zhong yuexiang ciyu de jieshi 西周金文中月相词语的解释 . *Lishi jiaoxue* 6: 21-26.

Liu Qiyi., 1997. Jin Hou Su bianzhong shi xuanwang shi tongqi 晋侯稣编钟是宣王时铜器 . *Zhongguo wenwu bao*.

Liu Yiman and Xu Guangde., 1998. Lun Anyang Hougang yin mu 论安阳后冈殷墓. In: The Institute of Archaeology., eds. *Yanshi guoji Shang wenhua taolunhui lunwenji* 偃师国际商文化讨论会论文集 . Beijing: Zhongguo Dabaike.

Liu Yiman., 1997. Anyang Yinxu chutudi ji qi xiangguan wenti 安阳殷墟甲骨出土地及其相关问题. *Kaogu* 1997. 5: 51-61.

Liu Yiman., 2003. On the Combinations of Bronze Weapons in Yin Tombs at Anyang. Trans. Mo Runxian. *Chinese Archaeology* 3: 166-169.

Liu Xu. 1993., Jin yu Jin wenhua de niandai wenti 晋与晋文化的年代问题 . *Wenwu jikan* 1993. 4: 83-87.

Liu Xu and Xu Tianjin., 2002. Guanyu Tianma-Qucun yizhi jinguo muzang de jige wenti 关于天马－曲村遗址晋国墓葬的几个问题 . In: Shanghai Bowuguan., eds. *Jinhou mudi*

chutu qingtongqi guoji xueshu yan taohui lunwenji. pp. 41-51. Shanghai: Shanghai Shuhua Chubanshe.

Loehr, M., 1949. Weapons and Tools from Anyang and Siberian Analogies. *American Journal of Archaeology* 53: 126-144.

Loehr, M., 1953. The Bronze Styles of The Anyang Period. *Archives of the Chinese Art Society of America* 7: 42-53.

Loehr, M., 1956. *Chinese Bronze Age Weapons*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Loehr, M., 1968. *Ritual Vessels of Ancient China*. New York: The Asia Society.

Lu Liancheng and Hu Zhisheng., 1988 *Baoji Yu guo mudi* 宝鸡弓鱼国墓地. Beijing: Wenwu Chubanshe.

Lu Liancheng., 1993. Xian Zhou wenhua yu zhoubian diqu de qingtong wenhua 先周文化与周边地区的青铜文化. In: Kaoguxue yanjiu: Jinian Shaanxi Sheng Kaogu Yanjiusuo chengli sanshizhounian. pp. 243-279. Xi'an: San Qin Chubanshe.

Lu Liancheng., 2003. Guoguo mudi muzang zhidu shulun 虢国墓地墓葬制度述论. *Kaogu yu wenwu* 2003. 6: 50-56.

Luo Xizhang., 1980. Fufeng Chutu de Shang Zhou qingtongqi 扶风出土的商周青铜器. *Kaogu yu wenwu* 1980. 4: 6-22, 25.

Lucy, S., 2005. The Archaeology of Age. In: Diaz-Andreu, M. and Lucy, S. eds. *The Archaeology of Identity: Approaches to Gender, Age, Status and Ethnicity*. pp. 43-67. Routledge: New York.

Ma Chengyuan., 1988. *Shang Zhou qingtongqi mingwen xuan* 商周青铜器铭文选. Beijing: Wenwu.

Ma Chengyuan., 1996. Jin Hou Su bianzhong 晋侯稣编钟. *Shanghai bowuguan jikan* 7: 1-17.

Mauss, M., 1938. A Category of the Human Mind: The Notion of Person; The Notion of Self. In: Carrithers, M., Collins, S. and Lukes, S., eds. *The Category of the Person*. 1985, pp. 1-26. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McGovern, P. et al., 2002 Fermented Beverages of Pre-and Proto-historic China. *The National Academy of Science* 101.5: 17593-17598.

Meskell, L., 1999. *Private Life in New Kingdom, Egypt*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Meskell, L., 2005. *Archaeologies of Materiality*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing.

Miller, D., 1987. *Material Culture and Mass Consumption*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Minao, H., 1993. Concerning the Inscription: "May Sons and Grandsons Eternally Use This [Vessel]". *Artibus Asiae* 53.1: 51-53+55-58.

Moore, H., 1994. *A Passion for Difference*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Moorey, R., 1967. Some Ancient Metal Belts: Their Antecedents and Relatives. *Iran*, vol. 5: 83-99.

Nickel, L., 2006. Imperfect Symmetry: Re-thinking Bronze Casting Technology in Ancient China. *Artibus Asiae* Vol. LXVI.1: 5-39.

Pader, E.J., 1980. Symbolism, Social Relations and the Interpretation of Mortuary Remains. *British Archaeological Reports Series cxxx*. Oxford.

Pan Qifeng., 1985. *Anyang Yinxu tougu yanjiu* 安阳殷墟头骨研究. Beijing: Wenwu Chubanshe.

Parker-Pearson, M., 1982. Mortuary Practices, Society and Ideology: and Ethnoarchaeological Study. In: Hodder, I., eds. *Symbolic and Structural Archaeology*, pp. 99-113. Cambridge: Cambridge Unversity Press.

Parker-Pearson, M., 1993. *The Archaeology of Death and Burial*. Texas: Texas A&M University Press.

Perry, E. and Joyce, R., 2001. Interdisciplinary Applications: Providing a Past for "Bodies That Matter": Judith Butler's Impact on the Archaeology of Gender. *International Journal of Sexuality and Gender Studies* 6.1: 63-76.

Piggot. S. 1974., Chariots in the Caucasus and in China. *Antiquity* 48: 16-24.

Poo Mu-Chou., 1990. Ideas concerning death and burial in pre-Han China. *Asia Major*, Third Series 3.2: 25-62.

Puett, M., 2002. To Become a God: Cosmology, Sacrifice and Self-Divinization in Early China. *Harvard-Yenching Institute Monograph Series 57.* USA.

Rawson, J., 1989. "Statesmen or Barbarian? The Western Zhou as seen through their Bronzes." *Proceedings of the British Academy* 75: 71-95.

Rawson, J., 1990. Western Zhou Ritual Bronzes from the Arthur M. Sackler Collections, 2 parts. *Ancient Chinese Ritual Bronzes in the Arthur M. Sackler Collections, vol 2*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Rawson, J., 1993. Ancient Chinese Ritual Bronzes: The Evidence from Tombs and Hoards of the Shang and Zhou period. *Antiquity* 67: 805-823.

Rawson, J., 1995. *Chinese Jade from the Neolithic to the Qing*. London: British Museum Press.

Rawson, J., 1998. Chinese Burial Patterns: Sources of Information of Thought and Beliefs. In: Renfrew, C. and Scarte, C., eds. *Cognition and Material Culture: The Archaeology of Symbolic Storage*. pp. 107-133. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.

Rawson, J., 1999. Western Zhou Archaeology. In: Loewe, M. and Shaughnessy, E. eds. *The Cambridge History of Ancient China*. pp. 352-449. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rawson, J., 2007. Reviving Ancient Ornament and the Presence of the Past: Examples from Shang and Zhou Bronze Vessels. In: Wu Hung., ed. *Reinventing the Past:*

Archaism and Antiquarianism in Chinese Art and Visual Culture, Chicago. pp. 47-76. USA: The University of Chicago.

Rawson, J., 2009. *Treasures from Shanghai*. London. British Museum Press.

Rawson. J., 2010. Carnelian Beads, Animal Figures and Exotic Vessels:
Traces of contact between the Chinese States and Inner Asia, ca. 1000-650 BC. *Archäologie in China, vol. 1, Bridging Eurasia*: 1-42.

Rawson, J. and Bunker, E., 1990. *Ancient Chinese and Ordos Bronzes*. Hong Kong: The Oriental Ceramics Society of Hong Kong.

Ricoeur, P., 1988. *The Human Being as the Subject Matter of Philosophy*. Philosophy and Social Criticism 14.2: 203-215.

Rong Mengyuan., 1956. *Zhongguo lishi jinian* 中国历史纪年. Beijing: Sanlian.

Rong Geng and Zhang Weichi., 1984. *Yin Zhou qingtongqi tonglun* 殷周青铜器通论. 2nd ed. Beijing: Wenwu Chubanshe.

Saxe, A. A., 1970. *Social Dimensions of Mortuary Practices*. Michigan: Ann Arbor, University Microfilms.

Shaanxi sheng kaogu yanjiusuo., 1995. *Gaojiabao Ge guo mu* 高家堡戈国墓. Xi'an: San Qin.

Shanxi Zhouyuan Kaogudui., 1978. Shaanxi Fufeng Zhuangbai yihao Xi Zhou qingtongqi jiaocang fajue jianbao 陕西扶风庄白一号西周青铜器窖藏发掘简报 . Wenwu 1978. 3: 1-18.

Shanxi Zhouyuan Kaogudui 陕西周原考古队., 1979. Shaanxi Qishan Fengchu cun Xi Zhou jianzhu jizhi fajue jianbao 陕西岐山凤雏村西周建筑址发掘简报 . *Wenwu* 1979. 10: 27-37.

Shanxi Zhouyuan Kaogugui., 1980. Fufeng Yuntang Xi Zhou guqi zhizai zuofang yizhi shijue jianbao 扶风云塘西周骨器制造作坊遗址试掘简报 . *Wenwu* 1980. 4: 27-35, 37.

Shanxi Zhouyuan Kaogudui., 1981. Fufeng Shaochen Xi Zhou jianzhuqun jizhi fajue jianbao 扶风召陈西周建筑群址发掘简报 *Wenwu* 1981. 3: 10-22.

Shanxi Sheng Kaogu Yanjiusuo., 1994a. *Shangma mudi* 上马墓地. Beijing: Wenwu Chubanshe.

Shanxi Sheng Kaogu Yanjiusuo., 1994b. 1976 nian Wenxi Shangguocun Zhou dai muzang qingliji 1976 年闻喜上郭村周代墓葬清理记 . *San Jin Kaogu* 1994. 1 : 123-138.

Shanxi Sheng Kaogu Yanjiusuo., 1994c. Wenxi xian Shangguocun 1989 nian fajue jianbao 问喜县上郭村1989年发掘简报. *San Jin Kaogu* 1994. 1: 139-153.

Shanxi Sheng Kaogu Yanjiusuo., 2006. Shanxi Hengshui jiangxian Xi Zhou mu fajue jianbao 山西绛县横水西周墓发掘简报 . *Wenwu* 2006. 8: 4-18.

Shanxi Sheng Kaogu Yanjiusuo., 2009a. Shanxi Quwo Yangshe Jin Hou mudi fanjue jianbao 山西曲沃羊舌晋侯墓地发掘简报 . *Wenwu* 2009. 1: 4-26.

Shanxi Sheng Kaogu Yanjiusuo., 2009b. Shanxi Hancheng shi Liangdaicun Ruiguo mudi M28 de fajue 陕西韩城市梁带村芮国墓地 M28的发掘. *Kaogu* 2009. 4: 4-16.

Shanxi Sheng Kaogu Yanjiusuo and Weinan Shi Wenwu Boahu Kaogu Yanjiusuo., 2007. Shanxi Hancheng Liangdaicun yizhi M19 fajue jianbao 陕西 韩城 梁带村遗址M19发掘简报. *Kaogu yu wenwu* 2007. 2: 3: -14.

Shanxi Sheng Kaogu Yanjiusuo and Weinan Shi Wenwu Boahu Kaogu Yanjiusuo., 2007a. Shanxi Hancheng Liangdaicun yizhi M27 fajue jianbao 陕西 韩城 梁带村遗址M27发掘简报. *Kaogu yu wenwu* 2007. 6: 3-22.

Shanxi Sheng Kaogu Yanjiusuo and Weinan Shi Wenwu Boahu Kaogu Yanjiusuo., 2008. Shanxi Hancheng Liangdaicun yizhi M26 fajue jianbao 陕西 韩城 梁带村遗址M26发掘简报. *Wenwu* 2008. 1: 4: 21.

Shanxi Sheng Kaogu Yanjiuyuan Shang Zhou Kaogu Yanjiubu., 2008. Shanxi Xia Shang Zhou Kaogu faxian yu yanjiu 陕西夏商周发现考古与研究 . *Kaogu yu wenwu* 2008. 6: 66-95.

Shanxi Sheng Wenwu Guanliweiyuanhui Houma Gongzuozhan., 1963. Shanxi Houma Shangmacun Dong Zhou muzang 山西侯马上马村东周墓葬 . *Kaogu* 1963. 5: 229-245.

Shaughnessy, E., 1982. Recent Approaches to Oracle Bone Periodisation. *Early China* 8: 1-13.

Shaughnessy, E., 1988. Historical Perspectives on The Introduction of the Chariot into China. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic studies* 48.1: 189-237.

Shelach, G., 1996. The Qiang and the Question of Human Sacrifice in the Late Shang Period. *Asian Perspectives* 35.1: 1-26.

Shelach. G., 2004. Marxist and Post-Marxist Paradigms for the Neolithic. In: Linduff, K and Sun Yan., eds. *Gender and Chinese Archaeology*. pp. 11- 26. AltaMira Press: California.

Shi Ming., 1974. Xi Zhou Chunqiu shidai lizhi de yanbian he Kong Qiu 'keji fuli' de fandong shizhi 西周春秋时代礼制的演变和孔丘克己复礼的反动实质 *Kaogu* 1974. 2: 81-88.

Shi Zhangruv 1955. Yindai de zhutong gongyi 殷代的铸铜工艺 .*Zhongyuan yanjiuyuan lishi yuyan yanjiushuo jikan* 26: 95-129.

Shi Zhangru., 1957. Yindai toushi juli 殷代头饰举例. *Zhongyuan yanjiuyuan lishi yuyan yanjiushuo jikan* 28: 611-670.

Shim. J., 1998. *The Early Development of the State of Jin*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Chicago: The University of Chicago.

Shim. J., 2002. The Political Geography of Shanxi on the Eve of the Zhou Conquest of Shang: An Alternative Interpretation. *T'oung Pao* 2002. 88. 1/3: 1-126.

So. J., 1995. Eastern Zhou Ritual Bronzes from the Arthur M. Sackler Collections, A*ncient Chinese Bronzes in the Arthur M. Sackler Collections, vol. 3*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

So. J. and Bunker, E., 1995. *Traders and Raiders on China's Northern Frontier*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Sofaer-Derevenski, J., 2002. Engendering Context. Context as Gendered Practice in the Early Bronze Age of The Upper Thames Valley, UK. *European Journal of Archeology* 5 (2): 191-211.

Sørenson, M.L.S., 1991. Gender construction through appearance. *In The Archaeology of Gender*. D. Walde and N. D. Willows (eds.), pp. 121-129. Calgary: University of Calgary.

Sørenson, M.L.S., 1992. Gender Archaeology and Danish Bronze Age Studies. *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 25: 31-49.

Sørenson, M.L.S., 1997. Reading Dress: the construction of social categories and identities in Bronze Age Europe. *Journal of European Archaeology* 5:93-114.

Sørenson, M.L.S., 2000. *Gender Archaeology*. Oxford: Polity Press.

Su Bingqi, 1987., Tan 'Jin wenhua kaogu' 谈晋文化考古. *Wenwu yu kaogu 1987.* 44-54.

Sun Ji, 1998., Zhoudai de zu yupei 周代的组玉佩. *Wenwu* 1998. 4: 4-14.

Tang Jigen., 1993. Zhongguo yetieshu de qiyuan wenti 中国冶铁术的起源问题. *Kaogu* 1993. 6: 556-565, 553.

Tang Jigen., 1998. *The Social Organization of Late Shang China: A Mortuary Perspective*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. London: University of London.

Thomas, J., 1991a. *Rethinking the Neolithic*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univserity Press.

Thomas, J., 1991b. Reading the Body. In: Garwood, P., Jennings, D., Skeates, R. and Toms, J., eds. *Sacred and Profane: Proceedings of a Conference on Archaeology, Ritual and Religion*. pp. 33-51. Oxford: Oxford University Committee for Archaeology.

Thomas, J., 2002. *Understanding the Neolithic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thomas, J., 2003. *Archaeology and Modernity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thorp, R., 1985. The Growth of Early Shang Civilization: New Data from Ritual Vessels. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 45: 5-75.

Thorp, R., 1988. The Archaeology of Style at Anyang Tomb 5 in Context. *Archives of Asian Art* 41: 47-69.

Thorp, R., 1991. Erlitou and The Search for the Xia. *Early China* 16: 1-38.

Thorp, R. 2006., *China in the Early Bronze Age: Shang Civilization*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Tian Jianwen., 1993. Houma Shangma mudi M13, M2008 chutu de Beifang qingtongqi 侯马上马墓地m13, m2008 出土的北方青铜器. *Kaogu* 1993. 2: 167-168.

Tian Guangjin and Guo Suoxin., 1986. *E'erduosi qingtongqi* 鄂尔多斯青铜器. Beijing: Wenwu Chubanshe.

Treherne, P., 1995. The Warrior's Beauty: The Masculine Body and Self-Identity In Bronze Age Europe. *Journal of European Archaeology* 3.1: 105-144.

Trigger. B. 1989. *A History of Archaeological Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Trigger, B., 2003. *Understanding Early Civilization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Underhill, A., 2002. *Craft Production and Social Change in Nothern China*. New York: Klumer Academic.

Vandermeersch, L., 1977. *Wangdao ou la voie royale: recherches sur l'Espirit des institutions de la Chine archaique. Tome I: structures cultuelles et structures familiales*. Paris: Ecole Francaise D'extreme-Orient.

Voss, B., 2007. Feminisms, Queer Theories and the Archaeological Study of Past Sexualities. In: Insoll, T., ed. *The Archaeology of Identities: A Reader*. pp 124-137. New York: Routledge.

Wang Entian., 1981. Qishan Fengchu cun Xi Zhou jianzhuqun jizhi de youguan wenti 岐山凤雏村西周建筑群址的有关问题 . *Wenwu* 1981. 1: 75-80.

Wang Fei王飛., 1986. Yongding zhidu xingshuai yiyi 用鼎制度兴衰异议. *Wenbo* 1986. 6: 29-33.

Wang Guangyao., 1995. Cong xinchutu zhi Yangjihu kan Yangguo 从新出土之杨壶看杨国. *Guguong bowuyuan yuankuan* 2: 82-85.

Wang Kelin., 1981. Jinguo jianli qia jindi wenhua de fazhan 晋国建立前晋地文化的发展 . *Zhongguo kaogu xuehui sanci nianhui lunwenji*. pp. 195-206. Beijing: Wenwu Chubanshe.

Wang Ningsheng., 1987. Yangshao wenhua zangsu he shehu zuzhi de yanjiu – Dui Yangshao muxi shehuishuo jiqi fangfalun de shangque 仰韶文化葬俗和社会组织的研究－对仰韶母系社会说及其方法的商榷 *Wenwu* 1987.4: 36-43.

Wang Shimin王世民., 1986. Guanya Xi Zhou Chunqiu gaoji guizu liqi zhidu de yixie kanfa 关于西周春秋高级贵族礼器制度的一些看法 . pp. 168-166. *Wenwu yu kaogu lunji*.

Wang Tao., 2002. Liang Zhou zhiji de qingtong yishu – yi Jinhou mudi chutu de qingtongqi weili 两周之际的青铜器艺术 -以晋侯墓地出土的青铜器为例 . In Shanghai Bowuguan., eds. *Jinhou mudi chutu qingtongqi guoji xueshu yan taohui lunwenji*.pp. 384-410. Shanghai: Shanghai Shuhua Chubanshe.

Wang Xuerong., 2004. Anyang shi Xiaomintun Yinxu xiqu 安阳饰小孝民屯殷墟西区 . In *Zhongguo kaoguxue nianjian*. 中国考古学年鉴 (eds.), Zhongguo kaogu xuehui. Beijing: Wenwu.

Wang Xuerong and He Yuling., 2007. Anyang Yinxu Xiaomintun yizhi de kaogu xinfaxian ji xiangguan renshi 安阳殷墟孝民屯遗址的考古新发现及相关认识 。 *Kaogu* 2007. 1: 54-63.

Wang Ying., 2004. Rank and Power among Court Ladies at Anyang. In: Linduff, K. and Yan Sun., eds. *Gender and Chinese Archaeology*. pp. 95-117. California: AltaMira Press.

Wang Zhankui., 1996. Jin Hou Su bianzhong niandai chutan 晋侯稣编钟年代初探 . *Zhongguo wenwu bao*.

Watson, W., 1971. *Cultural Frontiers in Ancient East Asia*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Wenwu 文物., 1976.2: 5-15. Panlongcheng shangdai erligangqi de qingtongqi 盘龙城商代二里冈期的青铜器.

Wenwu 文物., 1985.8: 25-40. Zhongguo gu duzhou mache de jiegou 中国古独辀马车的结构.

Wenwu 文物., 1986.11: 1-18.Shanxi lingshi jingjie cun shang mu 山西灵石旌介村商墓 .

Wei Jinwu., 1993. Shaannan Bashu wen hua de kaogu faxian yu yanjiu – jian tun shu yu Shangzhou de guanxi 南巴蜀文化的考古发现与研究－简论蜀与商周的关系 . *Sanxingdui yu Bashu wenhua*: 218-226.

Whitehouse, R., 2007. Gender Archaeology and Archaeology of Women: Do We Need Both? In: Hamilton, S., Whitehouse, R. and Wright, R., eds. *Archaeology and Women. Ancient and Modern Issues*. pp. 27-40. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press (Institute of Archaeology series).

Wood, N., 1989. Ceramic Puzzles from China's Bronze Age. *New Scientist* 18: 50-53.

Wright, R., 1991. Women's Labour and Pottery Productions in Prehistory. In M. Conkey and J. Gero (eds.), *Engendering Archaeology*. pp. 194-224. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Wylie, A., 1991. Feminist Critiques and Archaeological Challenges. In: Walde, D and Willows, N., eds. *The Archaeology of Gender*, Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Chacmool Conference. pp. 17-23. The Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary, Calgary.

Wu En 乌恩., 1978.Guanye woguo beifang de qingtong duanjian 关于我国北方的青铜短剑. *Kaogu* 1978. 5:324-333.

Wu En 乌恩., 1981. Wo guo beifang gudai dongwu wenshi 我国北方古代动物纹饰 *Kaogu xuebao* 1981. 191.1: 45-61.

Wu Hung., 1995. *Monumentality in Early Chinese Art and Architecture*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Wu Zhenlu., 1972. Baode xian xin daxian de Yindai tongqi. 保德县新发现的殷代铜器. *Wenwu* 1972.4: 62-66.

Xia Shang Zhou duandai gongcheng zhuanjiazu. 夏商周断代工程专家组., 2000. Xia Shang Zhou duandai gongcheng 1996-2000 nian jieduan chengguo baogao 夏商周断代工程1996－2000年阶段成果报告. Beijing: Shijie Tushu.

Xie Duanju., 1987. Shilun woguo zaoqi tudongmu 试论我国早期土洞墓. *Kaogu* 1987. 12: 1097-1104.

Xinzhong Yao., 1996. Self-construction and Identity: The Confucian Self in Relation to Some Western Perceptions. *Asian Philosphy* 6: 179-195.

Xu, J., 1996. The Cemetery of the Western Zhou Lords of Jin. *Artibus Asiae* 56. 3/4: 193-231.

Xu Lianggao and Wang Wei., 2002. Shaanxi Fufeng Yuntang Xi Zhou jianzhu jizhi de chubu renshi 陕西扶风云塘西周建筑基址的初步认识 . *Kaogu* 2002. 9: 795: 803.

Xu Shunzhang., 1962. Yangshao shiqi yi jinru fuxi shizu shehui 仰韶时期已进入父系氏族社会. *Kaogu* 1962.5: 256-261.

Yan Sun., 2000. Bronzes, Mortuary Practices, and Political Strategies of the Yan during the Early Western Zhou Period. *Antiquity* 77: 761-770.

Yan Yiping., 1979. *Jiaguxue*. 甲骨学. Taipei: Yiwen.

Yang Baocheng., 1994. Yinxu fajue gaishu 殷墟发掘概述。In *Yinxu de faxian yu yanjiu*. 殷墟的发现与研究. Edited by The Institute of Archaeology. Beijing: Kexue.

Yang Bojun., 1981. *Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu* 春秋左传注. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju.

Yang Hongxun., 1981. Xi Zhou Qi yi jianzhu yicun de chubu kaocha 西周 岐邑建筑遗存的初步考察. *Wenwu* 1981. 3: 23-33.

Yang Kuan., 1982. Xi Zhou Chunqiu shidai dongfang he beifang de kaifa 西周春秋时代东方和北方的开发. *Zhonghua wenshi luncong* 4: 109-132.

Yang Ximei., 1995. Lun Xian-Qin xingzu he shizu 论先秦姓族和氏族. In: *Zhongguo Sheshui Kexueyuan Kaogu Yanjiusuo*., eds. Xian-Qin wenhuashi lunji, pp. 197-210. Beijing.

Yang Xizhang., 1983. Yindai de mudi zhidu 殷代的墓地制度. *Kaogu* 1983. 10: 929-934.

Yang Xizhang., 1986. The Shang Dynasty Cemetery System. In: Chang , K.C., ed. *Studies of Shang Archaeology: Selected Papers from The International Conference on Shang Civilisation*. pp. 49-64. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Ye Xiangkui., 2003. Henan Anyang Huayuanzhuang dongdi chutu de guijia yanjiu 河南安阳花圆庄东地出土的龟甲研究 . In *Yinxu Huayuanzhuang dongdi jiagu* 殷墟花园庄东

地甲骨. In Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan kaogu yanjiusuo (eds.), 中国社会科学院考古研究所. pp. 1904-1910. Kunming: Yunan Renmin Chubanshe.

Yin Shengping (ed.)., 1992. Xi Zhou Wei shi jiazu qingtongqiqun yanjiu 西周微氏家族青铜器群研究. Beijing: Wenwu Chubanshe.

Yin Weizhang and Cao Shuqin., 1990. Lingshi Shang mu yu Bing guo tongqi. 灵石商墓与丙国铜器。*Kaogu* 1990. 7: 628-630.

Ying Yong., 2002. Jin Hou fufumu zhi bijiao ji Jin guo gaoji guizu funu shehui diwei shixi 晋侯夫妇墓之比较及晋国高级贵族妇女社会 地位试析. In: Shanghai Bowuguan., eds. *Jinhou mudi chutu qingtongqi guoji xueshu yan taohui lunwenji*.pp. 197-208. Shanghai: Shanghai Shuhua Chubanshe.

Ying Yong., 2004. Gender, Status, Ritual Regulations, and Mortuary Practice in the State of Jin. In: Linduff, K. and Yan Sun., eds. *Gender and Chinese Archaeology*. pp.161-204. California: AltaMira Press.

Yinxu Xiaomintun Kaogudui 殷墟孝民屯考古队., 2007. 2003-2004 niandu Anyang Xiamintun Shangdai fangzhi fajue jianbao 2003-2004. 年度安阳孝民屯商代房址发掘简报. *Kaogu* 2007. 1: 3-13.

Yinxu Xiaomintun Kaogudui 殷墟孝民屯考古队., 2007a. Henan Anyang shi Xiaomintun Shangdai muzang 2003-2004 fajue jianbao 河南安阳市孝民屯商代墓葬 2003－2004 发掘简报. *Kaogu* 2007. 1: 26-53.

Yu Jiang., 2004. *Statecraft and Cemetery in Early Dynastic China: Yu Funerary Arts in the Zhou*. PhD. Thesis. University of Pittsburgh.

Yuan Guankuo and Zeng Xiaomin., 2005. Relationship Between the Inner and Outer Walls at the Zhengzhou Shang city. Trans. Rod Campbell. *Chinese Archaeology* 5: 188-191.

Yuan Jing and R, Flad., 2004. New Zooarchaeological Evidence for Changes in Shang Dynasty Animal Sacrifice. *Journal of East Asian archaeology* 24: 252-270.

Zhang Changshou., 1998. Guanyu Jin hou mudi de jige wenti 关于晋侯墓地的己个问题. *Wenwu* 1998. 1: 41-44.

Zhang Liangren., 2007. *Ancient Society and Metallurgy: A Comparative Study of Bronze Age Societies in Central Eurasia and North China*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. The Unversity of California Los Angeles.

Zhang Zhenglang., 1986. A Brief Discussion on Fu Tzu. In: Chang, K.C., ed. *Studies in Shang Archaeology*. pp. 103-121. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Zhang Zhongpei., 1985. The Social Structure Reflected in the Yuanjunmiao Cemetery. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 4: 19-33.

Zhao Yongfu., 1984. 1961-1962 nian Fengxi fajue jianbao 1961－1962年沣西发掘簡报. *Kaogu* 1984. 9: 784-789.

Zheng Hongchun and Jiang Zudi., 1986. Chang'an Fengdong Xi Zhou yicun de kaogu diaocha 长安沣东西周遗存的考古调查. *Kaogu yu wenwu* 1986. 2: 1-6.

Zheng Ruokui., 1995. Yinxu 'Da Yi Shang' zuyi buju chutan. 殷墟 '大邑商' 族邑布局初探. *Zhongyuan Wenwu* 1995. 3: 84-93.

Zheng Shaozong., 1962. Hebei Qinglongxian daogou faxian yipi qingtongqi 河北青龙县道沟发现一批青铜器.

Zheng Zhenxiang., 1986. Yinxu wenhua fengqi ji xiangguan wenti 殷墟文化分期及相关问题. In: Wang Zhongshu. and An Zhimin., eds. *Zhongguo kaoguxue yanjiu*. 中国考古学研究. Beijing: Wenwu Press.

Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan kaogu yanjiusuo 中国社会科学院考古研究所., 1977. Anyang Yinxu nuli jisikeng de fajue. 安阳殷墟奴隶祭祀坑的发掘. *Kaogu* 1977. 1:20-36.

Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan kaogu yanjiusuo 中国社会科学院考古研究所., 1980. *Yinxu Fuhaomu*. 殷墟妇好墓. Beijing: Wenwu Chubanshe.

Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan kaogu yanjiusuo 中国社会科学院考古研究所., 1981. *Anyang Xiaotuncun bei de liangzuo Yindaimu*. 安阳小屯村北的两座位殷代墓 .

Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan kaogu yanjiusuo 中国社会科学院考古研究所., 1984. *Xin Zhongguo de kaogu faxian he yanjiu*. 新中国的考古发现和研究. Bejing: Wenwu Chubanshe.

Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan kaogu yanjiusuo 中国社会科学院考古研究所., 1987. *Yinxu fajue baogao*. 殷墟发掘报告。 Beijing: Wenwu Chubanshe.

Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan kaogu yanjiusuo 中国社会科学院考古研究所., 1994. *Yinxu de faxian yu yanjiu*. 殷墟的发现与研究. Beijing: Kexue Chubanshe.

Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan kaogu yanjiusuo 中国社会科学院考古研究所., 1998. *Anyang Yinxu Guojiazhuang Shangdai muzang 1982 nian – 1992 nian kaogu fajue baogao*. 安阳殷墟郭家庄商代墓葬 1982年 — 1992年考古发掘报告 Beijing: Kexue Chubanshe.

Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan Kaogu Yanjiusuo 中国社会科学院考古研究所., 1999. *Zhangjiapo Xi Zhou mudi* 张家坡西周墓地. Zhongguo tianye kaogu baogaoji, Kaoguexue zhuankan, Series IV, no. 57. Beijing: Zhongguo Dabaikequanshu Chubanshe.

Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan kaogu yanjiusuo 中国社会科学院考古研究所., 2002. *Xiaotun*. 小屯. Beijing: Shijie tushu chuban gongshe.

Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan kaogu yanjiusuo 中国社会科学院考古研究所., 2003. *Zhongguo kaoguxue: Xia Shang juan*. 中国考古学：夏商卷. Beijing: Zhongguo Shehuikexue Chubanshe.

Zhongguo shehui kexue Kaogu Yanjiusuo., 2004. *Zhongguo Kaoguxue Liang Zhou juan* 中国考古学·两周卷.

Zhou Dao and Liu Dongya., 1963. 1957 nian qiu Anyang Gaolouzhuang Yindai yizhi fajue 1957 年秋安阳高楼庄殷代遗址发掘 . *Kaogu* 1963. 4: 213-216, 220.

Zhouyuan Kaogudui 周原考古隊., 2002. Shaanxi Fufeng xian Yuntang, Qizhen Xi Zhou jianzhu jizhi 1999-2000 niandu fajue jianbao 陕西扶凤县云塘西周建筑址 1999－2000 年度发掘简报. *Kaogu* 2002. 9: 771-794.

Zhouyuan Kaogudui 周原考古隊., 2004. Shaanxi Zhouyuan yizhi faxian Xi Zhou muzang yu zhutong yizhi 陕西周原遗址发现西周墓葬与铸铜遗址 . *Kaogu* 2004. 1: 3-6.

Zhu Fenghan., 1990. *Shangzhou jiazu xingtai yanjiu* 商周家族形态研究. Tianjin: Tianjin Guji.

Zhu Qixin., 1994. Bujian wenxian jizai de shishi 不见文献记载的史实. *Zhongguo wenwu bao*. 中国文物报.

Zou Heng.,1964. *Shilun Yinxu wenhua fengqi* 试论殷墟文化分期. Beijing daxue xuebao 4-5. 北京大学学报 *4—5*.

Zou Heng., 1980. *Xia Shang Zhou kaoguxue lunwenji* 夏商周考古学论文集. Beijing: Wenwu.

Zou Heng., 1994. Lun zaoqi jin du. 论早期晋都. *Wenwu* 1994. 1 : 29-32, 34.

Blank Page

Table 1: Bronze Object Type in The Tombs at Guojiazhuang

Tomb Number	Period	Bronze vessels	weapons	chariot fittings	tools	Bells
1	3	jue gu ding gui	halberd spearhead	bow-shaped object	NONE	
6 (looted)	4	?	halberd arrowheads 1	?	?	
25 (looted)	3	gu 1 jue 1 gui 1	?	?	?	
26	2	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
50	4	gu jue gui ding you	halberd spearhead arrowhead	bow-shaped object	adze chisel	
53	4	gu jue gui ding yan you zhi jia zun gong	halberd spearhead arrowhead knife	pao?		
97 (looted)	3	gu jue	halberd	?	?	
111	2	jue gu	halberd	NONE	NONE	
135	3	jue gu	halberd spearhead arrowhead	NONE	NONE	
160	3	fangding ding yan gui fangzun fangjia jiao fanggu zhi	1000+ weapons	bow-shaped object	chisel adze	3 nao
202	4	jue gu	NONE	NONE	NONE	
203	4	jue gu	NONE	NONE	NONE	
220 (looted)	4	gu jue	?	?	?	
247	2	gu jue	halberd	NONE	NONE	
289	2	gu jue	halberd	NONE	NONE	

001	3	jue gu you zhi	spearhead halberd	NONE	NONE	

Table 2: Bronze Grave Good Sets at Guojiazhuang

Tomb Number	Sex	Bronze Ritual Vessels	Bronze Weapons	Bronze Chariot and Horse Fittings	Bronze Tools	Bronze Bells	Chariot Pit
1	?	X	X	X			
26	?	X	X	X	X	X	
50	?	X	X	X	X		
53	?	X	X	X?			
111	?	X	X				
135	?	X	X				
160	Male	X	X	X	X	X	X
202	?	X					
203	?	X					
247	?	X	X				
289	?	X	X				
001	?	X	X				

Table 3: Tombs Sizes at Sanmenxia

Tomb number	Sex	Pit	Chamber	Inner Coffin	Period
2001	M	5.3 x 3.55 5.4 x 3.7 x 11	4.72 x 3.06 - 1.8	2.7 x 1.36 2.2 x 0.82	
2012	F	5.3 x 7.74 5.3 x 3.92 x 10.93	4.2 x 2.9 x 1.66	2.64 x 1.26 x 0.9 2.29 x 0.82 x 0.6	
2011	M	5.64 x 4.34 5.74 x 4.42 x 11.3	5.22 x 3.72 x 1.26	2.82 x 1.44 2.35 x 1.02	
1052	M	5.8 x 4.25 4.9x 3.2 – 13.3	4.78 x 3.08 x 1.2	2.4 x 1.24 2.08 x 0.56	II
2010	M	5.4 x 3.9	4.3 x 3.1	2.7 x 1.3 2.1 x 0.7	
1810	M	4.4 x 2.93 – 2.1 4.4 x 2.93 – 15.2	4.2 x 2.75 x 1.7	2.15 x 1.2 x 0.5 ?	I
1706	M	4.4 x 3.3 – 1.67 4.5 x 3.3 – 11.56	4.1 x 3.08 – 1.75	2.3 x 1.07 x 1 2.1 x 0.74 x?	II
1689 (1640)	M	4.8 x 3.64 – 1.7 4.8 x 3.64 – 11.3	4.15 x 3.64 – 2.2	2.4 x 1.42 x 1.7 1.9 x 0.81 x 1.2	II
1640	F	4.65 x 3.3 4.2 x 3.4 – 8.8	3.86 x 2.7 x 1.1	2.15 x 0.92 1.98 x 0.6	II
2006	F				
1820	F				I
2013	F		4.3 x 2.6	2.2 x 0.8	
1602	M	4.6 x 3.2 – 1.55 4.25 x 2.76 – 10.5	3.9 x 2.34x?	2.47 x 0.96 x? 2.16 x 0.7 x?	I
1601 (1602?)	F?	4.4 x 3.1 x 1.5 4.35 x 2.9	3.3 x 2.4 x 0.98	2.22 x 0.97 x 0.64	I
1705	M	3.62 x 2 – 1.6 3.77 x 2.48 – 9.15	3.72 x 2.3 – 0.95	2.12 x 0.77 - -.35	III
2013	F				
1721 (1711/1701)	M	4.2 x 2.7 – 1.4 4.35 x 2.95 – 8.5	3.8 x 2.7 x 0.7	1.73 x 0.67 x?	III
1711	M	4.1 x 2.5 – 1.4 3.95 x 2.5 - 9	3.45 x 2.45 x 1.4	2.15 x 0.85 x 1.05 1.85 x 0.52 x 0.7	
1777	F	3.75 x 2.5 – 1.6 3.94 x 2.6 – 7.1	3.3 x 2 x 1.4	1.95 x 0.68 x 0.95	
1715	M	3.67 x 2.34 – 1.6 3.67 x 2.34 - 7	3.39 x 2 x 1.1	2.09 x 0.75 x 0.55	I
1691	F?	4.2 x 2.8 – 2.4 4.2 x 2.8 – 7.3	3.55 x 2.21 x 1.25	2.2 x 0.9 x 1.05	I
1612	F?	2.82 x 1.7 – 1.6 2.88 x 1.74 – 6.1	2.54 x 1.24	1.75 x 0.56	

1819	F?				I
1704	F?	3.2 x 2 – 1.4 3.3 x 2.07 – 7.35	2.65 x 2.2 x 1.3	2.1 x 0.9 x 0.92	
1761	F?	4.5 x 2.6 – 1.9 4.5 x 2.6 – 9.8	3.28 x 2.1 x 1.2	2.3 x 0.94 x 0.95 1.81 x 0.6 x 0.5	II
1701	F?	4.6 x 2.85 – 0.95 4.6 x 2.85- 7.35	3.9 x 2.55 x 1.35	2.5 x 1.1 x 1.2 2.18 x 0.9 x 0.7	II
1702	F?	4 x 2.7 – 1.35 4.15 x 2.95 – 8.4	3.3 x 2.8 – 1.15	2.12 x 0.77 x? 1.83 x 0.58 x?	III
1714	F?	3.25 x 1.95 x 0.63 3.25 x 1.95 x 7.12	3.2 x 1.8 x 1.24	2 x 0.8 x 0.7	
1744	F?	4.4 x 3.05 x 1.6 4.12 x 2.86 x 9.4	3.95 x 2.7 x 1.8	2.5 x 1.36 x? 2.22 x 0.86 x?	III
1767 (1765)	M	5.15 x 3.25 x 1.3 5.1 x 3.48 x 10.1	3.94 x 2.46 x 1.1	3.72 x 2.18 x 0.9 2.6 x 0.86 x 0.7	
1720	F?	3.5 x 2.1 x 1.3 3.75 x 2.22 x 5	3.8 x 2.7 x 0.7	1.73 x 0.67 x?	
1765	F	5.25 x 3.05 5.42 x 3.37- 11.1	4 x 2.8 x 1	? ?	I
1601	F?	4.4 x 3.1 – 1.5 4.35 x 2.9 – 10.1	3.3 x 2.4 x 0.98	2.22 x 0.97 x 0.64	I
1634	M	4 x 2.65 x 1.6 3.75 x 2.6 x 6.7	3.35 x 2.24 x 0.85	2.2 x 1.09 x 0.65 1.9 x 0.75	
1747	M	4.46 x 3 x 1.65 4.36 x 2.9 x 8.2	3.8 x 2.6 x 1.6	2.6 x 1.64 2.1 x 0.61 x 0.4	
1803 (ceramic vessels)	M	3 x 1.7 x 5.1	2.46 x 1.2x 1.1	1.8 x 0.72 x 0.6	

Table 4: Bronze Grave Goods from Sanmenxia

Tomb Number	Sex	Bronze Ritual Vessels	Bronze Weapons	Bronze Chariot and Horse Fittings	Bronze Tools	Bronze Bells	Chariot Pit
M2001 (Guo king / lineage head)	Male	7 + 3 m ding 8 li 6 + 3 m gui 4 xu 2 hu 2 fu 2 fanghu 2 circular hu 3 m jue 2m zhi 3m zun 2m fangyi 1 + 3m pan 1 + 2m he	14 + 1m halberd 5 mao spearheads 250+ arrowheads 1 iron sword	28 wei 22 luan bells 100+ xian 50+ bridles 1000+ ornaments	1 fu 1 adze 2 chisels 2 knives	9 yongzhong 1 zheng 10 chimestones	YES
M2012 (married into Guo from Liang lineage)	Female	5 + 6 m ding 8 li 1 yan 4 + 6m gui 4 xu 2 hu 2 fu 2 fanghu 4m jue 1m gu 6m zhi 5m fangyi 1 + 6m pan 1 + 5m he 1m yi 2 xiaogun	NONE	4 luan bells 4 nodes 8 bridles	NONE	NONE	YES
M2011	Male	7 + 2m ding 8 li 1 yan 8 gui 1 pen 1 fu 2 hu 2 fanghu 1 pan 1 yi	7 halberds 5 *mao* spearheads 57 arrowheads 1 *jian* sword	22 wei 4 luan bells 66 bridles 8 yokes	1 chopping axe 1 scraper	1 *zheng* 18 chimestones	YES
M1052	Male	7 ding 6 li 1 yan 6 gui 1 fu 2 fanghu 1 pan 1 he 1 xiaogun	4 halberds 6 mao spearheads 2 jian swords 41 arrowheads	17 xian 2 bridles 150+ ornaments 328 wei	?	9 nuizhong 1 zheng	YES

M1810	Male	5 ding 4 li 1 yan 4 gui 1 fu 2 fanghu 1 pan 1 yi 1m he	2 halberds 1 mao spearhead	4 wei 10 xian 8 bridles 3000+ ornaments	?	NONE	YES
M1706	Male	5 ding 4 li 4 gui 1 fu 2 fanghu 1 pan 1 yi	2 halberds 2 mao spearheads 50+ arrowheads	6 wei 9 xian	?	NONE	NO
M2010	Male	5 ding 4 gui 1 yan 2 fanghu 1 yi 1 pan	2 halberds 2 *mao* spearheads 28+ arrowheads	8 linchpins 20 wei 4 luan bells 300 + horse objects (20+ bridles)	1 fu 1 adze 1 chisel	NONE	NO
M2006 (Married into Guo from Shou lineage)	Female	3 ding 4 li 1 yan 2 xu 1 hu 2 hu 1m jue 1m zhi 1m zun 1m fangyi 1m he 1 pan	NONE	?	NONE	NONE	?
M1820 (Married into Guo from Su lineage of Qi clan)	Female	3 ding 2 li 1 yan 4 gui 2 hu 1 fu 1 guan 2 fanghu 1 pan 1 yi 1 xiaoguan	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	NO
M1602	Male	3 ding 2 li 4 gui 1 pan 1 yi	1 halberd 1 mao spearhead 22 arrowheads	2 wei 4 xian 3 bridles (bone)	1 fu	NONE	NO
M1705	Male	3 ding 4 gui 2 fanghu 1 pan 1 yi 1 xiaoguan	2 halberd 1 *mao* spearhead 1 *jian* sword 15 arrowheads	1+ ornament 3 bridles (bone)	1 small knife	NONE	NO
M2013 (Married	Female	3 ding 2 gui	NONE	2 wei 2 luan	NONE	NONE	YES

into Guo)		1 yi 1 xu 1 pan		bells 16+ bridles 100+ horse fittings			
M1721	Male	3 ding 1 pan 1 yi	1 halberd 1 *mao* spearhead 20 arrowheads 1 *jian* sword	5 xian 1 bridle	NONE	NONE	
M1711	Male	2 ding 1 pan 1 yi	2 halberds 1 mao spearhead 1 arrowhead	3 xian 4 bridles 9+ ornaments	NONE	NONE	
M1715	Male	2 ding	2 halberds 14 arrowheads	4 xian 3 bridles	NONE	NONE	
M1612	?	2 ding	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M1704	?	1 yiding 1 li 1 dou	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M1761	?	1 ding 1 pan 1 yi	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M1701	?	1 ding 1 pan 1 yi	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M1702	?	1 ding 1 pan 1 yi	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M1767	Male?	1 pan 1 yi	2 halberds 40+ arrowheads	1 wei 10+ bridles	NONE	NONE	
M1765	?	1 ding 2 spoons	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M1714	?	1 ding 1 pan 1 yi	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M1744	?	1 ding 1 pan	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M2119 (damaged)	Male?	1 fanghu	1 halberd	2 bridles	NONE	NONE	
M2008 (looted)	Male	1 li 2 gui 1m gui 1 fanghu 1 pan 1 yi 2m fangyi 1m jue	6 halberds 10 arrowheads	4 wei 12 bridles 150+ horse fittings	NONE	NONE	
M1634	Male?	1 ding	1 arrowhead	NONE/?	NONE	NONE	
M1661	?	1 ding	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M1671	?	1 ding	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M1692	?	1 ding	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M1701	?	1 ding	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M1707	?	1 ding	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M1708	?	1 ding	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M1714	?	1 ding	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M1720	?	1 ding	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	

M1743	?	1 ding	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M1753	?	1 ding	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M1762	?	1 ding	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M1763	?	1 ding	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M1777	?	1 ding	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	

Table 5: Bronze Grave Good Sets from Sanmenxia

Tomb Number	Sex	Bronze Ritual Vessels	Bronze Weapons	Bronze Chariot and Horse Fittings	Bronze Tools	Bronze Bells	Chariot Pit
M2001	Male	X	X	X	X	X	X
M2012	Female	X		X			X
M2011	Male	X	X	X	X	X	X
M1052	Male	X	X	X	?	X	X
M1810	Male	X	X	X			
M1706	Male	X	X	X			
M2010	Male	X	X	X	X		
M2006	Female	X		?			
M1820	Female	X					
M1602	Male	X	X	X	X		
M1705	Male	X	X	X	X		
M2013	Female	X		X			X
M1721	Male	X	X	X			
M1711	Male	X	X	X			
M1715	Male	X	X	X			
M1615	?	X					
M1704	?	X					
M1761	?	X					
M1701	?	X					
M1702	?	X					
M1767	Male?	X	X	X			
M1765	?	X					
M1714	?	X					
M1744	?	X					
M2119 (damaged)	Male?	X	X	X	?		
M2008 (looted)	Male	X	X	X	?		
M1634	Male?	X	X	?			
M1611	?	X					
M1671	?	X					
M1692	?	X					
M1701	?	X					
M1707	?	X					
M1708	?	X					
M1714	?	X					
M1720	?	X					
M1743	?	X					
M1753	?	X					
M1762	?	X					
M1763	?	X					
M1777	?	X					

Table 6: Tombs with Ceramic Vessels and Other Objects at Sanmenxia

Tomb Number	Chamber/Coffin	Ceramic Vessels	Weapons/Tools	Other Objects
M1055	?	li		
M1603	Inner coffin	li, pen, guan		stone jue
M1604	Chamber Inner Coffin			stone ge (17) beads, jade jue, stone bi
M1605	Chamber Inner Coffin		bronze ge	stone ge, jade jue
M1607	Chamber Inner Coffin	li, dou, guan,		stone ge
M1608	Inner Coffin	li, dou, pen, guan		stone ge jade jue, stone huang
M1609	Inner Coffin	li, pen, guan		jade jue
M1610	Chamber Inner coffin	li, dou, pen, guan		
M1611	Inner Coffin	pen		bone arrowhead Sstone jue
M1615	Chamber Inner Coffin	ding, dou, pen, hu, other ceramics		stone ge, jade jue
M1616	Inner Coffin	li, dou, pen		stone ge, jade jue
M1618	Chamber Inner coffin			stone ge, stone object
M1619	Chamber Inner Coffin			stone ge, jade jue, beads
M1622	Chamber Inner coffin			stone ge, jade jue
M1623	Inner Coffin			stone ge
M1624	Chamber Two coffins			stone ge, beads, jade jue, ceramic beads
M1626	Inner Coffin	li, pen, guan		jade jue
M1627	Inner Coffin			jade jue
M1628	Inner coffin			stone ge, jade jue
M1629	Inner Coffin	li, dou, pen, guan		
M1630	Chamber Inner Coffin	li, guan		stone ge, jade jue, splinter
M1631	Chamber Inner Coffin	bronze li		stone ge, jade jue, stone huang
M1632	Chamber Inner Coffin	li, pen, guan		jade jue, splinter, silk worms
M1633	Inner Coffin			stone ge,

				jade jue
M1635	Inner Coffin	li, dou, pen, guan		jade jue
M1636	Chamber Inner Coffin	li, dou, pen, guan		stone ge, jade jue
M1637	Inner Coffin			jade huang
M1638	Chamber Inner Coffin	li		jade jue
M1641	Inner Coffin	li, dou, pen		stone ge, jade jue
M1642	Chamber Inner coffin	li, dou, pen, guan		stone ge, jade jue
M1643	Chamber Inner Coffin	li, dou, guan		jade jue
M1644	Inner Coffin			jade jue
M1645	Inner Coffin	li, dou, pen, guan		stone ge, jade jue
M1646	Chamber Inner Coffin		bronze arrowheads 8	beads
M1647	Chamber TWO coffins		bronze adze	stone ge, beads, jade jue,
M1648	Inner Coffin	dou, guan		stone ge, stone jue
M1649	Inner Coffin	li, dou, ceramic piece		jade jue
M1650	Chamber Inner Coffin	li, dou, pen, weng, ceramic pieces 4		stone ge
M1652	Chamber Inner Coffin	li, dou, pen, guan, pan, ceramic piece		stone ge, jade jue
M1653	Chamber Inner Coffin	li, dou, pen, guan		jade jue, stone object
M1654	Chamber Inner Coffin	li, dou, pen, guan		stone ge, jade jue
M1655	Chamber Inner Coffin	li, dou, guan, pen		stone ge, beads, jade jue, stone object
M1656	Chamber Inner Coffin	li, dou, guan, ceramic object		stone ge, jade jue
M1659	Chamber Inner Coffin			stone ge, bone ge, beads, jade jue, bone object
M1662	Chamber Inner Coffin			beads, jade jue, stone bi,
M1663	Chamber Inner Coffin	li, pen, guan		stone jue
M1664	Inner Coffin	li		
M1665	Inner Coffin	li, dou, pen, guan	bronze Knife	jade jue
M1666	Inner Coffin	li, dou, pen,		jade jue,

		guan		splinter
M1667	Inner Coffin			jade jue, stone object
M1668	Inner Coffin	li, pen, guan, ceramic piece		jade jue, splinter
M1669	Inner Coffin	li, dou, guan, ceramic piece		jade jue
M1670	Inner Coffin	li, guan, ceramic piece		MOP ge
M1674	Inner Coffin	li, dou, guan		jade jue
M1675	Inner Coffin	dou, pen, guan		dtone ge, jade jue
M1676	Inner Coffin	dou, pen, guan		jade jue
M1677	Chamber Inner Coffin	li, dou, pen, guan		jade jue
M1678	Chamber Inner Coffin	li, pen 6, hu, ceramic object 6		jade jue
M1679	Inner Coffin	li, dou		jade jue
M1680	Inner Coffin	li, pen, guan		stone ge, stone bi
M1681	Chamber Inner Coffin			stone ge, jade jue
M1682	Inner Coffin	li, pen, guan		jade jue
M1683	Chamber Inner Coffin			stone ge beads, jade jue
M1684	Inner Coffin	li, dou, guan		stone ge, jade jue
M1685	Inner Coffin	li, guan		jade jue
M1686	Chamber Inner Coffin	dou, pen, guan		stone ge, jade jue
M1687	Chamber Inner Coffin	li, dou, pen, guan		jade jue
M1688	Inner Coffin	li		jade jue
M1690	Inner Coffin	li, dou, guan		beads, jade jue
M1694	Inner Coffin	li, dou, pen, guan		jade jue
M1695	Inner Coffin	li pen, guan		
M1696	Chamber Inner Coffin	li, dou, pen, guan		stone ge, bone ge, jade jue
M1697	Inner Coffin	dou, guan		stone ge, jade jue
M1698	Inner Coffin	dou, pen, guan		
M1703	Chamber Inner Coffin		bronze arrowheads 17	stone ge
M1709	Chamber Inner Coffin	li, dou, guan		stone ge, jade jue
M1710	Chamber Inner Coffin	li, dou, guan, pen		stone ge, beads, stone bi
M1712	Chamber Inner Coffin			jade jue
M1713	Chamber Inner Coffin	li, dou, guan, pen		

M1717	Inner Coffin			jade jue
M1718	Inner Coffin			jade jue
M1719	Chamber Inner Coffin	li, pen, guan		stone jue
M1722	Inner Coffin	li, dou, pen, guan		jade jue
M1723	?	li		stone ge jade jue
M1724	Inner Coffin	li, dou, pen, guan		jade jue
M1725	Inner Coffin	li, dou, pen, guan		stone ge, jade jue
M1726	Inner Coffin			jade jue
M1728	Inner Coffin			stone ge
M1729	Inner Coffin			jade jue
M1730	Chamber Inner Coffin	pen, guan, ceramic piece		
M1731	Inner Coffin			jade jue
M1732	Inner Coffin	li, dou, pen		
M1733	Inner Coffin			stone ge, jade jue
M1734	Chamber? Inner Coffin			stone ge, jade jue, stone huang
M1735	Inner Coffin			jade jue
M1736	Inner Coffin	li, dou, guan, ceramic object		jade jue
M1737	Inner Coffin	li, dou, pen, guan		jade jue
M1738	Inner Coffin	li, pen, guan		jade jue
M1739	Inner Coffin	li, dou, pen, guan		jade jue
M1740	Inner Coffin	ceramic object		stone ge, jade jue
M1741	Inner Coffin	pen, guan		jade jue
M1742	Inner Coffin	li, dou, guan		stone ge, jade jue
M1745	Inner Coffin			beads, jade jue
M1748	Chamber Inner Coffin			stone ge
M1749	Chamber Inner Coffin			stone ge, jade jue
M1751	Inner Coffin	li, dou, pen, guan		jade jue
M1752	Chamber Inner Coffin	dou		
M1753	Chamber Inner Coffin	ding?		stone ge
M1754	Inner Coffin	li, dou, pen, guan, ceramic object		jade jue, ceramic pou
M1755	Inner Coffin	li, dou, pen, guan		jade jue
M1756	Chamber Inner coffin	dou, pen, guan		jade jue

M1757	Inner Coffin	li, dou, pen, guan		
M1758	Chamber Inner Coffin	ceramic objects		stone ge
M1759	Chamber Inner Coffin			stone ge
M1760	Chamber Inner Coffin			stone ge beads
M1764	Chamber Inner Coffin	li, guan		jade jue
M1766	Chamber Inner Coffin			stone ge, bone ge, MOP deer
M1768	Chamber Inner Coffin	pen, dou, guan		stone strips
M1770	Chamber TWO coffins	li		stone ge, beads
M1772	Chamber Inner Coffin	ceramic pieces		stone ge, beads, jade jue
M1773	Chamber Inner Coffin	guan		stone ge
M1774	Chamber Inner Coffin	li, dou, pen, guan		beads, jade jue
M1776	Chamber Inner Coffin			stone ge, jade jue
M1778	Inner Coffin			jade jue
M1779	Chamber Inner Coffin			stone ge
M1780	Chamber Inner Coffin	dou, pen		beads, jade jue
M1781	Chamber Inner Coffin			jade jue
M1785	Chamber TWO Coffins			stone ge, bone arrowhead, ceramic beads
M1786	Inner Coffin			jade jue
M1787	Inner Coffin			jade jue
M1788	Chamber TWO coffins			jade jue
M1789	Chamber Inner Coffin	li, guan		stone ge, jade jue
M1793	Chamber Inner Coffin	li		jade jue
M1794	Chamber Inner Coffin	li, guan		stone ge, jade jue
M1795	Chamber Inner Coffin	li, dou, guan		strip
M1796	Chamber Inner Coffin	li, dou, guan, pen	bronze arrowhead	MOP ge
M1798	Inner Coffin			stone ge, jade jue
M1799	Inner Coffin			jade jue
M1801	Chamber			jade jue

	Inner Coffin			
M1802	Chamber Inner Coffin	li, dou, guan		jade jue
M1803	Chamber Inner Coffin	dou, pen, guan	bronze arrowhead	strip
M1804	Inner Coffin	dou, guan		jade jue
M1805	Chamber Inner Coffin	pen, guan		MOP ge, jade jue
M1806	Chamber Inner Coffin	li, dou, pen, guan		stone ge, jade jue
M1807	Chamber Inner Coffin			jade jue
M1808	Chamber Inner Coffin			jade jue
M1809	Chamber Inner Coffin	dou, pen, guan		
M1812	Chamber Inner Coffin	li, dou, guan		jade jue
M1814		dou, pen, guan		
M1826	Inner Coffin	li, pen, guan		
M1827	Chamber Inner Coffin			jade jue
M1828	Inner Coffin	li, guan		stone ge
M1829	Chamber Inner Coffin			stone ge, jade jue
M1830	Chamber Inner Coffin			stone huang bone strip
M1832	Inner Coffin	li		jade jue
M1833	Inner Coffin			MOP ge
M1834	Chamber Inner Coffin			jade strip
M1838	Chamber Inner Coffin		bronze arrowhead	jade jue
M1839	Chamber Inner Coffin	dou, pen		stone object
M1840	Chamber Inner Coffin			stone ge jade jue
M1841	Inner Coffin			MOP ge
M1842	Inner Coffin	guan		jade jue
M1843	Inner Coffin			jade jue
M1844	Chamber Inner Coffin	dou		MOP ge
M1845	Chamber Inner Coffin	ceramic object		stone ge
M1846	Inner coffin	dou		
M1847	Chamber Inner Coffin	pen		
M1849	Chamber Inner Coffin	li, guan		stone ge, jade jue
M1850	Chamber Inner Coffin		bronze arrowhead	stone piece

Table 7: Tomb and Grave Sizes at Zhangjiapo

Tomb Number	Phase	Sex/Age	Grave Dimensions	Outer Coffin	Inner Coffin
2	?	Male 25-30	5.1 x 3.75 – 8.9	3.6 x 2.8 – 1.5	
6	I	Female 14-16	2.86 x 1.08 – 1.24		2.3 x 0.68 – 0.38
7	IV	Male 55	3.12 x 1.66 – 2.5	2.6 x 1.24 – 0.7	2.18 x 0.68
8	I	Male 45	3.38 x 1.68 – 1.56	2.6 x 1.1 + 0.46	2.26 x 0.7
9	I	Female 20	2.88 x .52 – 2.04	2.56 x 1.1 + 0.44	2.3 x 0.7
10	?	Female 20-22	3.17 x 1.66 – 3.86	2.36 x 1.14 + 0.68	2 x 0.76
15	?	Male 45-55	3.13 x 2 – 1.86	2.32 x 1.42 + 0.72	1.96 x 0.76 + 0.42
16	II	Female	2.6 x 1.47 – 2.2		2.16 x 0.94 + 0.2
17	IV	Female 50-55	3.3 x 2 - 3.85	2.5 x 1.2 + 0.8	1.84 x 0.68
28	?	Male 25-30	2.74 x 1.3 – 1.1		2.1 x 0.74 + 0.2
35	I	Male 25-35	2.82 x 1.6 - 1		2.3 x 0.8 + 0.4
38	I	Male 17-18	2.84 x 1.74 – 4.38		2.08 x 0.7
39	?	Male 13	2.68 x 1.3 – 3.52		2.24 x 0.78
40	?	Male	3 x 1.6 – 1.2		2.28 x 0.98 + 0.08
41	IV	Female 40	2.36 x 1.1 – 1.24		1.96 x 0.75 + 0.4
43		Male 20-22	3.7 x 2.5 – 2.92	2.8 x 1.52	2 x 0.6
44	II	Female	4.3 x 3 – 9.3	3.1 x 2.15 + 1	2.4 x 1.1
46	I	Female	3.06 x 1.68 – 5.95	2.3 x 0.96	2 x 0.54
55	?	Male	3.3 x 2.25 – 6.2	2.6 x 1.23	2.2 x 0.96
56	II	Female 35-40	3.08 x 1.88 – 7.52	2.76 x 1.3	1.96 x 0.64
60	?	Female 16-17	3.76 x 2.46 – 7.06	2.64 x 1.26	2.38 x 0.7
61	II	Female 20-25	3.9 x 2.6 – 10.52	3.06 x 1.94 + 1.02	
63	II	Male	2.64 x 1.2 – 3.5		2 x 0.52 + 0.36
71	IV	Female 50	2.72 x 1.22 – 2.33	2 x 0.9	1.9 x 0.6
72	II	Male 20-22	3 x 1.5 – 1.82	2.2 x 0.9 + 0.74	1.9 x 0.6
73	III	Male 35-40	3.14 x 1.74 – 2.52	2.34 x 1 + 0.72	1.9 x 0.74
75	III	Female 25-30	2.8 x 1.4 – 1.12	2.2 x 0.72	1.86 x 0.6
76	II	Female 25	3.04 x 1.5 – 2.4	2.28 x 0.94	2 x 0.62

80	I	Female 35	3 x 1.4 – 0.76	2.24 x 0.88	1.6 x 0.5
87	?	Male 14	2.5 x 1.1 - 3	2.02 x 0.7 + 0.61	1.64 x 0.5
88	IV	Male 40-45	2.5 x 1.04 – 0.6		1.82 x 0.54
91	V	Male 35-40	2.78 x 1.74 – 5.05	2.14 x 1.08 + 0.95	1.8 x 0.66
93	III	Male	2.62 x 1.32 - 3	2.1 x 0.92	1.9 x 0.64
145	II	Male	3.38 x 2.08 – 2.9	2.38 x 0.94	1.98 x 0.74
152 1 ramp	III	Male 40	3.35 x 2.75 – 5.4 5.9 x 4 – 8.2	3.4 x 2.02 + 1.17 Sep. square: 1.4 x 2.12 + 1.7	2.7 x 1.6 + 0.8 2.3 x .1.05 + 0.75
157 2 ramps	III	Male 50	18.2 x 4 – 5.05 11.7 x 1.3 – 4.9 5.5 x 4.3 – 8.24	3.95 x 2.6 + 1.84	2.9 x 1.3 + 0.6 2.05 x 0.9
163	III	Female 25-30	5.65 x 3.9 – 9.6	3.95 x 2.6 + 1.8	2.5 x 1.15 + 0.64 2.03 x 1 + 0.44
165	IV	Male 22-24	5.05 x 3.8 – 8.8	3.6 x 2.2	2.7x 1.22
176	IV	Female 35-40	4.68 x 3 – 7.5	3.2 x 2.06 + 1.1	2.4 x 1.22 2 x 0.77
183	?	Male 25-30	3.2 x 1.8 – 5.5 2.7 x 1.62 – 5.8		2.1 x 0.67
M199		Male ?	4.5 x 3.8	3.2 x 2.06	2.7x.16 2.4 x 1.1
215	II	Female 50 - 55	2.3 x 1.35 – 1.8 2.25 x 0.88 – 1.8		1.97 x 0.6
216	IV	Male 25-30	3.35 x 1.98 – 3.6	2.46 x 1.36 + 1	1.98 x 0.59
221	?	Male 30	3.4 x 1.9 – 2.95	2.55 x 1.13	2.31 x 0.86
222	IV	Female 25	2.3 x 1.28 – 1.28		1.96 x 0.61
223	?	Female 25	2.7 x 1.48 – 2.7	2.22 x 0.85 + .075	1.74 x 0.6
224	IV	Male 30-35	3.02 x 1.92 – 3.45	2.43 x 1	1.88 x 0.62
225	?	Male 25-30	2.62 x 1.4 – 2.78		2 x 0.72
227	IV	Male 45-50	2.65 x 1.7 – 3.25	2.4 x 1.05 + 0.6	1.97 x 0.88
228	IV	Male 35-40	2.9 x 1.58 – 3.7	2.52 x 1.24	1.89 x 0.77
230	?	Female 25	3.4 x 1.96 – 4.45	3.05 x 1.6 + 0.95	1. 2.28 x 1.16 2. 1.95 x 0.75
232	IV	Male 25	3.4 x 2.15 – 3.25	2.57 x 1.14	1.9 x 0.66
235	?	Male 50	2.1 x 0.6		1.85 x 0.6
240	IV	Male 40-50	2.5 x 1.34 – 3.3		2.18 x 0.78
242	IV	Male 35-40	2.7 x 1.98 – 3.1	2.22 x 1.4 + .075	1.92 x 0.84
243	V	Male 45	2.54 x 1.23 – 0.5		2.08 x 0.66 + 0.66

244	?	Male 40-45	4.65 x 3.64 – 5.25	3.16 x 2 + 1.4	1. 3.04 x 1.5 2. 2.12 x 0.88
249	IV	Male	3.12 x 2 – 4.6	2.72 x 1.46 + 0.6	2.08 x 0.8
251	III	Male 40	2.58 x 1.42 – 1.9		2.02 x 0.76
253	IV	Male 35	3.58 x 2.34 – 4.7	2.54 x 1.4 + 0.8	1. 2.04 x 1 2. 1.76 x 0.6
254	III	Male 30	3.8 x 2.46 – 4.9	2.5 x 1.4 + 0.8	2.34 x 1.1
259	III	Male 50	2.74 x 1.5 – 2.5 2.3 x 1.1 – 2.5		1.96 x 0.74 + 0.54
260	II	Female 20-25	3.4 x 1.85 – 4.15	2.3 x 0.92 + 0.62	2 x 0.5
263	?	Female 25	3.6 x 2.4 – 2.9	2.54 x 1.44 + 0.8	
297	?	Male 40-45	2.8 x 1.5 - 4	2.54 x 1.04	2 x 0.6
325	?	Male 40-50	3.06 x 1.52 – 4.12	2.72 x 0.9	1.8 x 0.58
332	?	Male 50	2.74 x 1.6 – 6.95	2.42 x 1.5	1.9 x 0.68
333	?	Male 35-40	3.2 x 2.06 – 4.7	2.6 x 1.44 + 0.65	1.6 x 0.6
346	V	Female 45	2.8 x 1.76 – 5.39	2.5 x 1.42 + 0.64	1.5 x 0.6
347	III	Male 40	2.76 x 1.38 – 3.43	2.26 x 0.8 + 0.73	1.96 x 0.52
349	IV	Male 45-50	3.34 x 2.12 – 5.5	2.57 x 1.96	2.1 x 1.04
356	?	Male 45-50	2.5 x 1.58 – 3.3	2.38 x 1.46	2.16 x 1.02
368	?	Male 35-40	3.4 x 2.1 – 1.66	2.88 x 1.57	2.36 x 1.16

Table 8: The Chamber and Coffin Sizes of Tombs with Bronze Objects at Tianma Qucun

Tomb number	Sex/Age	Chamber	Inner Coffin
M6081	Male	2.75 x 1.30 x 1	2. x 0.60
M6069	Female	2.8 x 1.35 x 0.75	2 x 1.05
M6195	Male 30-35	2.9 x 1.50 x 1.42	?
M6210	Male 55-60	2.95 x 1.54 x 1.10	2.08 x 0.90 x 0.80
M5189	Male 30-35	3.80 x 3.00 x 1.50	2.58 x 1.14
M6080	Female 14-15	3.20 x 2.90 x 0.87	2.05 x 1.00
M6197	Female 25-30	2.76 x 2.10 x 1.20	1.88 x 0.82 x 0.65
M6231	Male 35-40	3.00 x 1.81 x 1.50	2.10 x 0.80
M5150	Female 20-25	3.64 x 3.56 x 1.20	1. 2.79 x 1.41 2. 2.17 x 0.98
M6054	Female	3.00 x 1.51	2.24 x 0.91
M6071	Male	2.30 x 1.20	1.80 x 0.60
M6105	Male	2.53 x 1.08 x 0.70	2.10 x 0.59
M6121	Female 25-30	2.23 x 0.95 x 0.73	1.87 x 0.65
M6126	Male 20-22	2.32 x 1.08	1.98 x 0.70
M6127	Male 30-35	2.65 x 1.32	2.35 x 0.98
M6130	Male	2.63 x 1.40 x 1	1.96 x .076
M6131	Female 45-50	2.48 x 1.06 x 0.87	2.03 x 0.72
M6179	Male 30-35	2.12 x 0.78 x 0.62	2.00 x 0.63 x 0.55
M6190	Female 40-45	2.12 x 0.78 x 0.62	2.00 x 0.63 x 0.55
M6204	Male 55+	2.17 x 1.08 x 0.80	1.98 x 0.80
M6235	Female 30-35	2.06 x 0.88	1.78 x 0.60
M6242	Male 40-45	2.50 x 0.90	?
M6243	Male 15-20	2.40 x 0.90 x 0.78	?
M6384	Male	2.58 x 1.10 x 0.93	2.08 x .972
M6390	Female	2.64 x 1.42	2.04 x 0.88
M6434	Male 45-50	2.70 x 1.30 x 1	?

M6496	Male	?	2.00
M7003	Male 35-40	2.22 x 1.00	1.91 x 0.76
M7004	Male 35-40	2.35 x 1.00 x 0.50	1.91 x 0.62
M7005	Female 50-55	2.30 x 1.04 x 0.83	1.83 x 0.50
M7014	Male 25-30	2.30 x 1.06 x 0.83	1.98 x 0.60 x 0.28
M7029	Female	2.24 x 0.94 x 0.70	1.68 x 0.60
M7052	Male 25-30	2.15 x 0.85	1.95 x 0.60
M7092	Male 50-55	2.80 x 1.55 x 1.65	2.24 x 0.90 x 1.15
M7095	Male 35-40	2.27 x 1.39 x 1.14	2.12 x 0.79 x 0.74
M7113	Female 20-25	2.46 x 1.50 x 1.00	1.97 x 1.07
M7146	Male 45-50	2.38 x 0.93	2.00 x 0.63
M7164	Male 30-35	2.37 x 0.95	2.00 x 0.64
M7165	Male 22-24	2.05 x 0.85	?
M7176	Male 22-24	2.41 x 1..01	1.95 x 0.68
M7185	Male 35-40	2.40 x 0.80	2.14 x 0.63
M6123	Child 6	1.57 x 0.68	?
M7070	Male 55-60	2.40 x 1.04 x 0.60	2.16 x 0.80
M7161	Female 25-30	2.65 x 1.42 x 1.33	2.34 x 0.70 x 0.55
M6214	Female 50-55	2.75 x 1.37 x 1.30	2.12 x 0.87

Table 9: Bronze Grave Goods at Tianma Qucun

Tomb Number	Sex: Age	Bronze Ritual Vessels	Bronze Weapons	Bronze Chariot and Horse Fittings	Bronze Tools	Bronze Bells	Chariot Pit
M6081	Male	1 fangding 3 ding 1 yan 2 gui 1 jue 1 zhi 1 zun 1 you 1 pan	3 halberds 2 axes	4 linchpins 6 bridles 6 luan bells 400+ ornaments	1 chisel	NONE	
M6069	Female	3 ding 1 li 1 yan 1 gui 1 zhi 1 you	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M6195	Male: 30-35	3 ding 1 li 1 yan 2 gui	7 halberds 1 *mao* spearhead	8 wei 8 linchpins 4 luan bells 200+ornaments/ horse fittings	NONE	NONE	
M6210	Male: 55-60	3 ding 1 yan 2 gui 1 li 1 jue 1 zhi 1 you 1 spoon	5 halberds 1 mao spearhead 4 arrowheads	2 wei 4 linchpins 8 bridles 4 luan bells 250+ horse fittings / ornaments	NONE	NONE	
M5189	Male:30-35	2 ding 2 gui 1 pan 1 he	1 arrowhead	24 bridles 150+ chariot and horse fittings	NONE	NONE	
M6080	Female: 14-15	2 ding 1 li 2 gui	NONE	2 wei 3 bridles 2 linchpins 15+ ornaments	NONE	NONE	
M6197	Female: 25-30	2 ding 2 li 2 gui	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M6231	Male: 35-40	2 ding 2 li 1 yan 2 gui 1 jue 1 zhi	8 halberds 3 arrowheads 2 axes	4 wei 10 linchpins 10 luan bells 22 bridles 150+ ornaments /	2 chisels 1 small knife 1 small chopping axe	NONE	

		1 zun 1 you 1 hu		horse fittings			
M5150	Female: 20-25	1 ding 1 gui 1 he 1 pan	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M6054	Female	1 ding 1 gui	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M6071	Male	1 ding 1 gui	2 halberds 4 jian swords	Horse fittings?	NONE	NONE	
M6105	Male (adult)	1 ding	1 halberd	Horse fittings?	NONE	NONE	
M6121	Female: 25-30	1 ding 1 gui 1 jue 1 zhi	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M6126	Female 20-25	1 ding	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M6127	Male 30-35	1 ding 1 gui	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M6130	Male	1 ding 1 yan 1 gui	3 halberds 1 spearhead 2 axes	2 wei 2 linchpins 8 bridles 50+ horse fittings	NONE	NONE	
M6131	Female 40-45	1 ding 1 gui	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M6179	Male 30-35	1 ding	1 halberd	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M6190	Female 40-45	1 ding 1 gui		NONE	NONE	NONE	
M6204	Male 55+	1 ding	1 halberd	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M6235	Female 30-35	1 ding		NONE	NONE	NONE	
M6242	Male 40-45	1 ding	2 arrowhead	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M6243	Male 17-20	1 ding 1 gui	2 halberds	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M6384	Male	1 ding 1 yan 1 gui 2 jue 1 gu 1 he 1 zun 1 you 1 pan	3 halberds 1 spearhead 3 arrowheads	3 linchpins 12 bridles 2 luan bells 100+ horse fittings	1 fu (axe) 1 Shu 1 Zuo	NONE	
M6390	Female	1 ding	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M6434	Male 40-45	1 ding 1 gui	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M6496	Male	1 (lead) ding 1 (lead) gui	1 halberd 1 arrowhead	NONE	NONE	NONE	

M7003	Male 35-40	1 ding	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M7004	Male 35-40	1 ding	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M7005	Female 50-55	1 (lead) ding 1 (lead) gui	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M7014	Male 25-30	1 ding 1 li	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M7029	Female	1 ding	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M7052	Male 25-30	1 ding	1 halberd	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M7092	Male 50	1 ding	2 halberds	2 wei 8 bridle 4 luan bells 8 chariot pieces	NONE	NONE	
M7095	Male 35-40	1 ding	NONE?	2 bridles	NONE	NONE	
M7113	Female 20-25	1 ding 1 gui	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M7146	Male 45	1 ding	1 halberd	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M7164	Male 30-35	1 ding 1 pen	1 halberd	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M7165	Male 22-25	1 (lead) ding 1(lead) gui	1 Halberd	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M7176	Male 22-25	1 ding 1 pen	1 halberd 2 arrowheads	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M7185	Male 35-40	1 ding	1 halberd	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M6123	Child - 6	1 li	1 halberd	NONE	1 axe	NONE	
M7070	Male 55-60	1 gui	1 halberd	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M7161	Female 25-30	1 gui 1 (lead) gui		NONE	NONE	NONE	
M6214	Female 50-55	2 ding 1 li 1yan 2 gui 2 zhi 1 you	NONE	2 wei 2 linchpins 4 bridles 10 nodes	NONE	NONE	

Table 10: Bronze Grave Good Sets at Tianma Qucun

Tomb Number	Sex	Bronze Ritual Vessels	Bronze Weapons	Bronze Chariot and Horse Fittings	Bronze Tools	Chariot
M6081	Mal e	X	X	X	X	X
M6096	Female	X				
M6195	Male	X	X	X		
M6210	Male	X	X	X		
M5189	Male	X	X	X		
M6080	Female	X		X		
M6197	Female	X				
M6231	Male	X	X	X	X	
M5150	Female	X				
M6054	Female	X				
M6071	Male	X	X	?		
M6105	Male	X	X			
M6121	Female	X				
M6126	Mal e	X				
M6127	Male	X				
M6130	Mal e	X	X	X	X	
M6131	Female	X				
M6179	Male	X	X	?		
M6190	Female	X				
M6204	Male	X	X			
M6235	Female	X				
M6242	Male	X	X	X		
M6243	Male	X	X			
M6283	Male	X	X	X	X	
M6390	Female	X				
M6434	Male	X				
M6496	Male	X	X			
M7003	Male	X				
M6214	Female	X		X		
M7004	Male	X				
M7005	Female	X				
M7014	Male	X				
M7029	Female	X				
M7052	Male	X	X			
M7092	Male	X	X	X		
M7095	Male	X				
M7113	Female	X				
M7146	Male	X	X			
M7164	Male	X	X			
M7165	Male	X	X			
M7176	Male	X	X			
M7185	Male	X	X			

Table 11: Bronze Grave Goods at Baoji

Tomb Number	Sex:	Bronze Ritual Vessels	Bronze Weapons	Bronze Chariot and Horse Fittings	Bronze Tools	Bronze Bells	Chariot Pit
BZM13	Male	2 you 1 zun 1 zhi 1 jue 7 ding 3 gui 1 dou 1 hu 1 pan 1 yan	3 spearheads 5 halberds 5 arrowheads 1 sword	100+	2 chisels 1 adze 1 tool	1 nao	
BZM13	Female	2 ding 1 gui	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
BZM7	Male	4 ding 1 gui 2 you 1 zun 1 zhi 2 jue	1 spearhead 3 halberds 1 ji 1 sword	100+	1 chisel 1 adze 1 small knife	3 nao	
BZM7	Female	1 ding 1 gui 1 zun 1 zhi	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
BZM4	Male	1 fangding 3 ding 1 you 1 zun 2 zhi 1 jue 1 ju 1 li 2 gui 1 yan	1 sword 6 halberds 2 spearheads	YES	1 chisel 1 adze 1 axe	3 nao	
BZM4	Female	3 ding 1 zhi 1 li 1 fangli 1 gui	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
BZM8	?	1 ding 1 gui 1 zun 2 you 1 jue 1 zhi 1 lie	3 halberds 1 ji 1 sword	YES	1 adze		
BZM20	?	2 ding 2 gui	5 halberds 1 jian 8 arrowheads	YES	1 adze 1 chisel 1 small knife		
BZM1	?	1 ding	1 sword	YES	NONE	NONE	

9		1 gui 2 guan 1 pan	3 halberds 1 small knife?				
BZM14	?	1 ding 1 gui 2 guan 1 pan 1 ladle	2 halberds 1 sword	NONE	NONE	NONE	
BZM11	?	1 ding	1 halberd 1 sword 1 small knife?	NONE	NONE	NONE	
BZM18	?	1 ding 1 gui	1 spearhead 3 halberds 1 sword	YES	1 chisel 1 axe		
BZM9	?	1 ding 1(lead) ding 2 (lead) gui	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
BZM12	?	2 guan 1 spoon 1 ladle	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
BZM3	?	1 ding 1 gui	2 halberds	YES	1 axe		
BRM1	Male	8 ding 2 pan 1 you 5 gui 2 zun 2 hu 1 zhi 1 yan 3 bird vessels 1 ladle 3 dou 2 jue	7 halberds 1 sword	100+	4 adzes 4 axes 1 chisel	3 nao	YES
BRM1	Female	5 ding 5 gui 2 dou	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
BRM2	Female	6 ding 5 gui 3 li 1 pan 2 sppons 1 yan 1 bird object	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	

Table 12: Bronze Grave Good Sets at Baoji

Tomb Number	Sex	Bronze Ritual Vessels	Bronze Weapons	Bronze Chariot and Horse Fittings	Bronze Tools	BELLS	Chariot
BZM13	Male	X	X	X	X	X	
BZM13	Female	X					
BZM7	Male	X	X	X	X	X	
BZM7	Female	X					
BZM4	Male	X	X	X	X	X	
BZM4	Female	X					
BZM8	Male?	X	X	X	X		
BZM20	Male?	X	X	X	X		
BZM19	Male?	X	X	X			
BZM14	Male?	X	X				
BZM11	Male?	X	X				
BZM18	Male?	X	X	X	X		
BZM9	?	X					
BZM12	?	X					
BZM3	Male?	X	X	X	?		
BRM1	Male	X	X	X	X	X	X
BRM1	Female	X					
BRM2	Female	X					

Table 13: Bronze Grave Goods at Shangma

Tomb Number	Sex:	Bronze Ritual Vessels	Bronze Weapons	Bronze Chariot and Horse Fittings	Bronze Tools	Bronze Bells	Chariot Pit
M1002	?	1 ding 1 dou 1 bowl	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M1006	Male 50-55	2 ding 1 pan 1 bowl 1 yi 1 gui	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M1007	Female	1 ding	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M1011	?	1 ding	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M1013	Male	1 ding 1 gui 1 bowl	2 arrowheads	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M1015	Male?	2 ding 1 pan 1 yi 1 bowl	2 swords	2 chariot pieces	NONE	NONE	
M1026	Male?	1 ding 1 pan 1 yi 1 bowl	NONE	2 chariot pieces	NONE	NONE	
M1027	Female	3 ding 1 pan 1 yi 1 bowl	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M1284	Male	3 ding 1 pan 1 yi	2 halberds 1 zun standard?	4 chariot fittings	NONE	NONE	
M1287	Male	3 ding 1 pan 1 yi	2 halberds 3 arrowheads	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M2008	Male	3 ding 1 pan 1 yi 1 bowl 1 yan	25 arrowheads 3 battleaxes 1 spearhead	4 chariot pieces	1 chisel 1 spade a small knife 4 chopping axes	NONE	
M2148	Male	1 ding 1 dowl	1 halberd 1 arrowhead	NONE	NONE	NONE	
63H	Male	3 ding 2 dou 2 hu 1 yan 1 pan 1 yi	5 halberds 8 arrowheads 1 spearhead 1 axe	11 chariot piece	1 chisel		
M4006	Female ?	3 ding 1 pan		2 chariot pieces	NONE	NONE	

		1 yi 1 bowl					
M4078	Male?	3 ding 1 pan 1 yi 1 gui	3 halberds 16 arrowheads	YES			
M4090	Male 35-40	2 ding 1 pan 1 yi 1 dou	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	
M4094	Male?	1 ding	8 arrowheads	YES	NONE	NONE	
M5128	Male 30-40	5 ding 2 dou 2 hu 1 pan 1 yan 2 gui 2 li	8 halberds 4 arrowheads 1 sword	YES	?	13	
M13	Male	7 ding 5 gui 1 li 1 pan 2 hu 1 yan	2 spearheads 50 arrowheads 4 knives	YES	3 adzes 2 chisels	9	

Table 14: Bronze Grave Good Sets at Shangma

Tomb Number	Sex /Age	Bronze Ritual Vessels	Bronze Weapons	Bronze Chariot and Horse Fittings	Bronze Tools	BELLS
M1002	?	X				
M1006	Male 50-55	X				
M1007	Female	X				
M1011	?	X				
M1013	Male	X	X			
M1015	Male	X	X	X		
M1026	Male?	X		X		
M1027	Female	X				
M1284	Male	X	X	X		
M1287	Male	X	X			
M2008	Male	X	X	X	X	
M2148	Male	X	X			
63H	Male	X	X	X	X	
M4006	Female?	X		X		
M4078	Male	X	X	X		
M4090	Male 35-40	X				
M4094	Male	X	X	X		
M5128	Male	X	X	X	X?	X
M13	Male	X	X	X	X	X