The Chinese Mirror From Pazyryk

John F. Haskins

University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

PAZYRYK, a Siberian trading hamlet, is found on the southern slopes of the CHulishman range of the eastern Altai, on the frontier of the autonomous district (*oblast*) of Tuvinsk.[1] The CHulishman range runs roughly northwest by southeast. In the middle CHulishman is a hollow basin, about five thousand feet above mean sea level. This is the Pazyryk valley. It lies south of Lake Teletskoe and its tributaries: the CHulishman and Bashkaus rivers, and is more or less level, seeming to have been the dried bed of a glacial lake. The coordinates of Pazyryk are: 50°44′ north latitude, and 88°03′ east longitude from the Greenwich meridian.[2] The nearest large town is Ust' Ulagan, about fifteen miles to the south-southwest. The cemetery, which takes its name from the village, is about two miles from Pazyryk. For a distance of approximately one-half mile, near the center of a shallow depression, was a chain of twenty six kurgans, or stone covered tomb mounds. Fourteen of the tombs were numbered (K-1 - K-14) and eight have been opened.[3]

Among the lesser tombs at Pazyryk was the sixth kurgan (K-6). It was opened in 1949 by A. V. Adrianov and S. I. Rudenko, while work was in progress on K-5, K-7, and K-8.[4] The sixth kurgan lay about two hundred feet northwest of one of the major tombs, K-5, the seventh kurgan nearly touched the perimeter of the stone mound of K-5, and the eighth kurgan was at the other end of the valley. The stone covering, or

Fig. 1a. Fragment of a bronze mirror, ca. 350 B.C., dia. 11.5 cm. (4.5 inches), found in kurgan number 6, at Pazyryk, High Altai, Siberia. (Photograph courtesy of the State Hermitage, Leningrad, U.S.S.R.)

Fig. 1b. Drawing of the fragment of a bronze Chinese mirror from K-6, Pazyryk, ca. 350 B.C., after Rudenko 1953.

Fig. 2a. Bronze mirror, ca. mid-IV century B.C., dia. 12.3 cm. (4⅞ inches), reputed to be from Hui-hsien, Honan, ex-Lagrelius collection. (Photograph after Karlgren 1941; C:45.)

Fig. 2b. Bronze mirror, ca. mid-IV century B.C., dia. 11.0 cm. (4⅜ inches), reputed to be from Shou-hsien, Anhui, ex-Hellström collection. (Photograph after Karlgren 1941, C:46.)

Fig. 3. Bronze mirror, ca. mid-IV century B.C., dia. 11:5 cm. (4.5 inches), Singer collection, probably from Ch'ang-sha, Hunan. (Photograph courtesy Dr. Paul Singer, Summit, N. J.)

Fig. 4. Rubbing of a bronze mirror, ca. mid-IV century B.C., [dia. 13:2 cm. (5 3/16 inches)] excavated at Wu-li-p'ai cemetery, Ch'ang-sha, Hunan, tomb MO14:2. (Photograph after Wên Wu.)

kurgan, at K-6 was an irregular circle, measuring about 49.2 feet by 45.9 feet across the two diameters; and it was only 2.2 feet above mean ground level to the summit of the mound, as the plunderer's pit had caused the center to sink. When the stone mound had been scraped away the grave pit was found to have been a square, measuring about 11.5 feet on each side, and it was 7.2 feet deep. At the southern side of the pit were the remains of the burial chamber, which was so badly destroyed that only the bare outlines could be measured. The room was little more than a large, nearly square box, 7.2 feet by 7.5 feet on the sides, and only about 1.5 feet high. The northern third of the small pit had been the horse mortuary and held the dismembered remains of skeletons of three saddle horses.[5]

The north and west walls of the chamber had decayed and the roof had fallen in, so that little could be told regarding the original position of the finds. The chamber seemed to have been a single-wall construction of unfinished logs. In the rubble that had been the funerary chamber were the remnants of a single hollow-log sarcophagus, the dimensions of which were not recorded. It contained the skeletons of an adult female, about thirty-five years of age, and that of a young girl, about fifteen years old.[6] The skulls of both women were pronouncedly Europoid. There was no trace of a male occupant and the cause of death was undetermined.

Near the skeleton of the older woman, along the remains of the south wall, was a large fragment of a broken bronze mirror, *ching,* of Chinest type (Fig. 1).[7] The mirror was made of white metal, having a large tin content. It had a fluted central loop enclosed in a square in the center of the reverse. The marginal band around the rim was rather wide. The diameter of the mirror was 11.5 cm. (about 4.5 inches), and it was very thin—only 1.0 mm. The design consisted of a square central band, from the corners of which projected a heart-shaped leaf. A "stalk" projected from each of the leaves and terminated in another heart-shaped leaf. The background had striped commas on a granulated field, and at the rim, four large "T's" slanting to the left, with the uprights evenly spaced around the edge. The undecorated rim was 0.9 cm. wide and had a raised edge. The mirror fit a large group which Karlgren had isolated as category "C" in his original[8] discussion on pre-Han and early Han mirror types.

More than twenty years ago, Bernhard Karlgren produced his essay: *Huai and Han*; wherein he attempted to clarify the styles of Late (or Eastern) Chou, Ch'in, and Early Han periods in Chinese art.[9] This paper followed his studies on the bronze styles of the Shang (or Yin) and Early Chou Dynasties which he had undertaken at an earlier date.[10] In his discussion on Late Chou styles, Karlgren chose the distinctive Chinese bronze mirror, *ching,* as a means of dating other materials of the same period. He arranged the mirrors in twelve categories (A - L), which he dated from the sixth century B.C. until the first century A.D. Ten of the twenty-eight major states of the Late Chou period had been established along the *Huai* river valley.[11] Thus, the style term *Huai* was selected to describe the art of the late *Ch'un-ch'iu,* or "Spring and Autumn" (*ca.* 771 B.C. - 481 B.C.), and the entire *Chan-kuo,* or "Warring States" (*ca.* 481 B.C. - 256 B.C.) periods of the Late Chou Dynasty, and that of the Ch'in Dynasty (*ca.* 256 B.C. - 206 B.C.). In one sense, this was unfair, for it disregarded the importance of the southern states; among which the *Ch'u,* based along the Yangtze river in Hupei, southern Honan, Anhui, and Hunan was the most powerful politically.[12]

Late in 1963, Karlgren restated his views on mirrors in a recension of his earlier article.[13] Having at hand the mass of material which has been brought to light by actual excavation since 1949 he stated that: — ". . . nothing has happened, so far as I can see, to invalidate the logical scheme proposed . . .".[14] He further stated in a note that some of the recent digs were "dated" by the mirrors themselves that came from these excavations.[15] He also admitted that certain mirrors were hard to date, particularly those from the III century B.C., which on the basis of style could be either Late Chou, Ch'in, or Early Han.[16] There has also been no indication so far from archaeological research which would tend to prove or disprove the earliest dates for Chinese bronze mirrors; nor has any information come to light to indicate when the bronze mirror came to China, if it were an importation, nor when it evolved, if — as is most likely — it were a local development.

For the purposes of this discussion, the most important of Karlgren's classifications is a group in his category "C"; particularly those mirrors which have from three to six large "T's" slanting inward from the rim.[17] The Chinese frequently

call these "mountain mirrors", from the superficial resemblance between the slanted "T" and the modern Chinese character, *shan*,[a] "mountain".[18] In his original discussion, Karlgren listed these mirrors as numbers C:32 - C:56, and dated most of them in IV century B.C.[19] Of particular importance here are two C-type mirrors, which — when compared with others from Siberia — may be dated with some precision. These mirrors are nearly identical to one another, and very similar to the broken mirror from K-6 at Pazyryk (Fig. 2).

The two mirrors were C:45 and C:46, the former from the Lagrelius Collection and the latter from the Hellström Collection.[20] The Lagrelius mirror, C:45, was purported to have come from *Hui-hsien*,[b] in Honan, and the Hellström mirror, C:46, was found in the *Shou-chou*[c] region (*Shou-hsien*), in Anhui.[21] Karlgren originally listed twelve similar mirrors, and in his latest essay he mentioned twenty.[22] As will be shown, there are several others.

The description of the Pazyryk mirror will serve for those in the C:45 - C:46 categories, save that in the case of the C:45 mirrors there was no rope pattern band around the leaf and stalk pattern, whereas in the case of those in C:46 the rope pattern was present.[23] The mirrors varied in size from about 9.0 cm. (3 and ½ inches) to 12.5 cm. (4 and ⅞ inches) in diameter, and except for the rim, were about 0.15 cm. (1/16 inch) thick. All of the mirrors were of bronze and none had an inscription. As Karlgren pointed out, several similar mirrors have been excavated in China in the past fifteen years.[24]

Of the twenty-odd mirrors of this type, six came from *Ch'ang-sha*,[d] in Hunan, seven from *Shou-hsien*, in Anhui, and one each from *Ch'êng-tu*,[e] in Szechwan, Sian (*Ch'ang-an*), in Shensi and *Hui-hsien*, in Honan.[25] Four were from unkonwn locations.[26] More recently, two have appeared from Siberia.[27] One came from an unlisted site in the western foothills of the Altai mountains, the other was the fragment from K-6 at Pazyryk.[28] There is yet another in the Collection of Dr. Paul Singer, of Summit, New Jersey (Fig. 3).[29] This one probably came from Ch'ang-sha. It is identical in every way with the Pazyryk mirror — and is even the same size (diameter about 4½ inches) — save that the large "T's" slant from left to right instead of from right to left.[30]

Several mirrors of this type have recently been excavated at Ch'ang-sha in Hunan.[31] One of them, mentioned but not illustrated by Karlgren, was from the *Wu-li-p'ai*[f] cemetery (Fig. 4).[32] This mirror was uncovered in 1959 and is listed as M (for *mu*,[g] "tomb") — 014:2 by Chih Pi-jên.[h] This bronze mirror most closely resembles Karlgren's C:45, but was larger than most mirrors in this category: 13.2 cm. in diameter (about 5 3/16 inches); and it was considerably thicker: 0.5 cm. (about 3/16 inch).[33]

Despite its fragmentary condition, the mirror from K-6 at Pazyryk is the most important of the group for it is the only one that has come to light that may be dated with any certainty.[34] While the original provenance of the mirror cannot be ascertained, there are other indications which suggest that — despite its having been found so far to the north — the mirror came from the south; most likely from the state of *Ch'u*.[35] The date of the Pazyryk kurgan will give a *terminus post quem non* for the particular mirror found there, and, combined with other evidence, will provide a relative date for the whole group of slanted-T mirrors.

As we have had occasion to point out in these pages before, both the relative and absolute chonology for the Pazyryk tombs are well established.[36] The relative chonology was based on tree ring analysis, while the absolute chronology — within the usual margins of error — was achieved by radio-carbon (carbon 14) analysis. To date, however, the Soviet scientists have not released the carbon dating; although they have referred to it on more than one occasion.[37] The evidence from tree-rings proved that the first and second kurgans (K-1 & K-2) were done in the same year. The fifth kurgan (K-5) was forty-eight years later than the first two, and the last of the great, or so-called "princely" tombs. The fourth kurgan (K-4) was seven years later than K-1 & K-2, and the third kurgan (K-3) was eleven years earlier than the fifth.[38] Thus, we would have (as of 8 June 1960): —

Kurgan	Tree-ring Chronology	Carbon 14 dating as of 8 vi '60
K-1 & K-2	X	Minus 2,370 years
K-3	X plus 37 years	- - -
K-4	X plus 7 years	- - -
K-5	X plus 48 years	Minus 2,350 years

— plus or minus sixty to one-hundred-thirty years of possible error.[39]

It will be seen that the carbon dating allows only twenty years between K-1 and K-5, while tree-ring analysis shows there to have been forty-eight years. The carbon 14 dates would give *ca.* 410 - *ca.* 390 B.C. with a forty-eight year gap.[40] To put it in round figures then, the great kurgans at Pazyryk would span the first half of the IV century B.C.[41]

K-6 and K-7 were close to K-5 in date and quite possibly were connected with it.[42] As we have seen, K-6 had been the burial of a woman and a girl. K-7 was a child's grave.[43] The woman and the children in K-6 and K-7 may have been the rest of the "family" of the man in K-5.[44] There were six other small tombs clustered around the fifth kurgan, but these were unopened so that it is impossible to tell what they contained. In any case, a date of *ca.* 350 B.C. may safely be assumed for K-6 and its contents, including the mirror. This agrees with the general date of "IV century B.C." given to most of the category C mirrors by Karlgren.[45] It does, however, enable us to date groups C:45 and C:46, the Singer mirror, and the mirror from *Wu-li-p'ai,* near Ch'ang-sha, more closely than has been the case in the past.

NOTES

A portion of this paper was read at the 174th annual meeting of the *American Oriental Society,* in New York, 7 April 1964.

1. S. I. Rudenko, *Kul'tura naseleniia gornogo Altaia v Skifskoe vremia* ("The culture of the populations of the High Altai in the Scythian Period"), Moscow-Leningrad (1953); hereafter Rudenko 1953; 11-12, and 13, fig. 1. See also S. I. Rudenko, *Kul'tura naseleniia TSentral'nogo Altaia v Skifskoe vremia* ("The culture of the populations of the Central Altai in the Scythian period"), Moscow-Leningrad (1960); hereafter Rudenko 1960; 9, fig. 1. For an English summary of part of this material see Karl Jettmar, *The Altai before the Turks,* Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities; hereafter BMFEA; No. 23 (Stockholm 1951), 135-223. See also Edith Dittrich, *Das Motiv des Tierkampfes in der Altchinesischen Kunst,* Asiatische Forschungen, Bd. 13 (Wiesbaden 1963); John F. Haskins, *The Pazyryk Chanfrons, the T'ao-t'ieh and Late Chou China,* Archives of the Chinese Art Society of America; hereafter Archives CASA; Vol. XVI Kansas City and New York 1962), 92-97; and John F. Haskins, *The Pazyryk Felt Screen and the Barbarian Captivity of Ts'ai Wên-chi,*[i] BMFEA, 35 (Stockholm 1963), 141-160.
2. Rudenko 1953, 11.
3. Rudenko 1953, 15, fig. 2 and 25-26.
4. Rudenko 1953, 25 and 375.
5. Rudenko 1953, 375.
6. Rudenko 1953, 62 ff, and 375.
7. Rudenko 1953, Plate XXIX, fig. 6, fig. 85, p. 144, and 356-357. S. I. Rudenko (Lu Chin-k'o), *Lun Chung-kuo yü A-Erh-T'ai pu-lo-ti ku-tai kuan-hsi*[k] (given in English as: "Relations between ancient Altai tribes and China"), Kao-ku Hsüeh-pao ("the Chinese Journal of Archaeology"), hereafter KKHP; vol. 2 (Peking 1957), 37-48, Plate I, fig. 2, and p. 39. Rudenko 1953, 144 and 356, and in KKHP, 2, 1957, 39, refers to the Pazyryk K-6 mirror as *Ch'in;* in this he accepts R. W. Swallow, *Ancient Chinese Bronze Mirrors,* Peking (1937), 16, 39, and 62, and Plate 14. Swallow, quoting Menzies, uses the term *Ch'in,* not for the dynasty, but for the *Ch'in* state: 897 B.C.-206 B.C.
8. Bernhard Karlgren, *Huai and Han,* BMFEA, No. 13 (Stockholm 1941), hereafter Karlgren 1941; 1-125, Plates 1-80, especially 42-53, 118-120, Plates 9-25, and Plate 16, C:45 and C:46. Descriptive terminology used here follows Karlgren except where indicated, see notes 23.
9. Karlgren 1941, 1-2: ". . . *ca.* 650 B.C., there blossomed forth a new grand style, the baroque of the Chinese bronze age, which we call the Huai style . . .".
10. Bernhard Karlgren, *Yin and Chou in Chinese Bronzes,* BMFEA, No. 8 (Stockholm 1936), 9-154; and Bernhard Karlgren, *New Studies on Chinese Bronzes,* BMFEA, No. 9 (Stockholm 1937), 9-117.
11. They were: *Hsü,*[m] *Chêng,*[n] *Han,*[o] *Sung,*[p] *Ts'ao,*[q] *Chu,*[r] *Tsou,*[s] *Chin,*[t] *Ts'ai,*[u] and *Ch'ên;*[v] in the order of their conquest.
12. See Karlgren 1941, 13-14, however. The importance of the Ch'ang-sha region, with its southern affinities, was not as evident in 1941 as it later became. See John F. Haskins, *Ch'ang-sha, the Art of the People of the State of Ch'u,* catalogue for an exhibition for the Chinese Art Society of America, Inc., China House, 125 East 65th Street, New York, March 21-April 19, 1957 (New York 1957), Introduction, *passim.* Bernhard Karlgren, *Some pre-Han Mirrors,* BMFEA, No. 35 (Stockholm 1963); hereafter Karlgren 1963; 161, still believes that the *Shou-hsien* region in Anhui was the provenance for most of the C-type mirrors. See William Watson, *Handbook to the Collections of Early Chinese Antiquities,* the British Museum, London (1963), 62-63 and Plate 22, fig. c.
13. Karlgren 1963, 161-169, and Plates I-XVIII.
14. Karlgren 1963, 161.
15. Karlgren 1963, 161 and note 1.
16. Karlgren 1963, 161.
17. Karlgren 1941, C:32-C:56. Mirrors with 6-"T's" form a six-pointed star, and with 5-"T's" a five-pointed star, while those with 4-"T's" make a square, and 3-"T's" a triangle. In only one case, C:37, are the "T's" out of line. In most instances, the mirrors with 3, 5, or 6 "T's" have a central circle instead of a square. Only four of the 4-"T" mirrors are decorated this way, and most of them are later; see notes 19 & 45.
18. In the Chou period, when the mirrors were manufactured, the character *shan,* "mountain" was not written this way; so it is unlikely that the large slanting "T's" were intended as a mountain symbol. See Bernhard Karlgren, *Grammata Serica Recensa,* reprinted from BMFEA, No. 29 (Stockholm 1957), #193, b & c.[w]
19. Karlgren 1941, 118-119; some of the category C mirrors were dated III century B.C., see n. 45.
20. Karlgren 1963, 164, does not record the present whereabouts of his type specimens.
21. None of these mirrors was excavated and the site attributions for all of them came from dealers. To date, no mirror has actually been excavated from a *Shou-hsien* tomb. See Karlgren 1963, 162.

22. Karlgren 1941, 47, and Karlgren 1963, 164.

23. Karlgren 1941, 47, uses "quatrefoil" to describe the cardiform leaf, it is really more nearly heart shaped.

24. Karlgren 1963, 164, and Plate 4-a. One of the mirrors that he mentions is our fig. 4; see Chih Pi-jên, Hu-nan-shên po-wu-kuan (Hunan Provincial Museum), *Ch'ang-sha Wu-li-p'ai ku-mu-tsang ch'ing-li chien-pao*[x] ("A report on the arrangement of the ancient tomb burials at Wu-li-p'ai near Ch'ang-sha"), Wên Wu[y] ("Antiquities"), vol. 3 (Peking 1960), 38-50; p. 38; p. 44, and fig. 28: MO14:2.

25. Karlgren 1941, 47; Karlgren 1963, 164. Four of these were excavated, mostly from the Ch'ang-sha region.

26. Karlgren 1941, 47, one in the collection of HRH King Gustav of Sweden, one in Berlin, and two in Japan.

27. Rudenko 1953, 144, fig. 85, and Plate xxix, fig. 6. Rudenko, in KKHP, 2, 1957, Plate I, fig. 2, and p. 39. Rudenko did not write the text for the Chinese article in Chinese himself, and I have not seen this mirror mentioned in Soviet periodical literature. The Chinese text simply says: ". . . from a tomb burial in the western foothills of the Altai mountains came an unbroken mirror exactly like it (the K-6 example) . . .".

28. The photographs in KKHP, 2, 1957, Plate I, figs. 2 & 3 are not too clear, but Rudenko's comparison seems to resemble Karlgren's type C:45.

29. I wish to thank Dr. Paul Singer for the photograph of the mirror from his collection illustrated here and for giving me all the information that he had regarding it. Dr. Singer has what is probably the largest collection of Ch'ang-sha material anywhere in the world. Swallow 1937, Plate 14, illustrates an identical mirror, which he calls *Ch'in,* and lists as a "black enamel" mirror: *hei-ch'i-ku.*[z]

30. In most instances, it is only mirrors with a central circle instead of a square wherein this is true. C:46, however, and the Singer mirror have "T's" slanting to the right. See also Swallow 1937, Plate 14.

31. *Ch'u Wên-wu t'u p'ien-chi*[aa] ("An illustrated catalogue of art treasures from Ch'u"), Hunan Archaeological Commission, Ch'ang-sha (1958), p. 32, fig. 24, it is similar to Karlgren's C:40. See also Chih Pi-jên, Wên Wu, 3, 1960, p. 44, fig. 28.

32. Karlgren 1963, 164.

33. Chih Pi-jên, Wên Wu, 3, 1960, 38. The site was open from 24 August-6 November 1959, and the tombs were numbered M001-M015, these numbers were only for the sequence of excavation and had nothing to do with dating.

34. The Chinese simply call them *Chan-kuo,* "Warring States", even the recent Ch'ang-sha sites were not dated.

35. See the Chinese silk shabrack from horse #5, at Pazyryk, K-5; Rudenko 1953, Plate CXVIII, pp. 215-218, figs. 129-132, and pp. 212-214; M. I. Griaznov and A. Bulgakov, *Drevnee Iskusstvo Altaia,* ("l'art ancien de l'Altaï"), Leningrad (1958), Plates 52-53; E. I. Lubo-Lesnichenko, *Drevnie Kitaĭskie Shelkovye Tkane i Vyshivki* ("Ancient Chinese Silk Textiles and Embroideries"), Leningrad, the Hermitage (1961), Plates XLIX-L, #42, p. 50, embroidery 1687/10. The curvilinear motives on this silk embroidery are closest to lacquer ware from Ch'ang-sha, one of the major art centers of *Ch'u.*

36. Haskins, Archives, CASA, XVI, 1962, 93, 95, and note #7, p. 96.

37. S. I. Rudenko, *Iskusstvo Altaia i Perednei Azii* ("The art of the Altai and the Ancient Near East, 1st Millenium B.C."), Moscow (1961), p. 62, states emphatically that: ". . . we know from subsequent scientific researches that the Pazyryk kurgans may be dated from the VI to the IV centuries B.C. . . .". I wish again to thank Professor M. I. Artamonov, and his staff at the State Hermitage Museum in Leningrad, and Professor S. I. Rudenko, and his staff at the Soviet Institute of Archaeology at Leningrad for their information, advice, and assistance.

38. I. M. Zamotorin, *Otnositel'naia khronologiia Pazyrykskikh kurganov* ("The relative chronology of the Pazyryk kurgans"), Sovetskaia Arkeologia ("The Soviet Journal of Archaeology"), Vol. I (Moscow-Leningrad 1959, 21-30; Guitty Azarpay, *Some Classical and Near Eastern Motifs in the Art of Pazyryk,* Artibus Asiae, XXII/4 (Ascona 1959), 313-339; Edith Dittrich, *Das Motiv des Tierkampfes,* 1963, 15-47, particularly p. 27; and Haskins, Archives CASA, XVI, 1962, 92-97.

39. Haskins, Archives CASA, XVI, 1962, note #7, p. 96. This information was given to me 8 July 1960 by the Soviet Institute of Archaeology in Leningrad; I wish again to thank them for their kindness.

40. The dates for the major kurgans given to me (as of 1960) were:—"Bashadar I, minus 2,500 years; Tuekht I, minus 2,450 years; Katanda, minus 2,420 years; Pazyryk I & II, minus 2,370 years; and Pazyryk V, minus 2,350 years, plus-or-minus 60-130 years". Using the widest possible margin of error, we would have *ca.* 670 B.C. (much too early), to *ca.* 260 B.C. (much too late) for the Altai tombs. Tree-ring analysis is much more accurate as a means of "close" dating, so that the forty-eight year gap is probably accurate; while *ca.* 410 B.C.-*ca.* 390 B.C. seems reasonable as a base date for the Pazyryk complex.

41. John F. Haskins, *Pazyryk, the Valley of the Frozen Tombs,* Bulletin of the Needle and Bobbin Club, Vol. 40, Nos. 1 & 2 (New York 1956), 3-47, particularly p. 43. I have long contended that the Pazyryk kurgans were the tombs of the Massagetae, the *Ta Yüeh-chih*[bb] of the Chinese Sources; see Ssŭ-ma Ch'ien, *Shih Chi* ("The Historical Record"), 123, 4a ff.; Pan Ku, *Ch'ien Han-shu* ("History of the Former Han Dynasty"), 96 A, 14a ff.; Fan Yêh, *Hou Han-shu* ("History of the Later Han Dynasty"), 118, 5 b ff.; and Herodotus, *The Histories,* I, 201-216. Rudenko, on the other hand, calls the Pazyryk graves "Scythian", while assigning the graves at Noin-ula to the *Hsiung-nu,*[cc] whom he believes to have been the Huns. See S. I. Rudenko, *Kul'tura KHunnov i Noinulinskie kurgany* ("The culture of the Huns and the Noin-ula kurgans"), Moscow-Leningrad (1962), 23-38. For the most recent excavated material related to the *Hsiung-nu,* see Sun Shou-tao,[dd] *Hsiung-nu Hsi-ch'a-kou Wên-hua, Ku-mu-ch'ün ti fa-hsien*[ee] ("Discovery of a Hsiung-nu Culture in Ancient Tombs from Hsi-ch'a-kou"), Wên-wu, 8/9 (Peking 1960), 25-35. This find was at *Hsi-fêng-hsien,*[ff] in Liaoning. See *Hsin Chung-kuo-ti K'ao-ku Shou-huo*[gg] ("Archaeology in New China"), the Wên-wu Press, Peking (1961), p. 86, fig. 43, and n. 235; and Tsêng Yung, *Liao-ning, Hsi-fêng, Hsi-ch'a-kou, ku-mu-ch'ün Wei Wu huan Wên-hua i-chi lun*[hh] (in English as: "Preliminary identification of the ancient cemetery at Hsi-ch'a-kou, Hsi-fêng county, Liaoning, as the remains of the Wu-huan Tribe"), Kaogu (K'ao-ku,[ii] "Archaeology"), 6 (Peking 1961), 334-336.

42. Rudenko 1953, fig. 2, p. 15. The numbers assigned to the graves at Pazyryk had nothing to do with anything other than the sequence in which they were opened. It was purely fortuitous that K-1 proved to be the earliest tomb, all of the major burials had satellite graves clustered around them.

43. Rudenko 1953, 375; the child was also female, but the age was not given.

44. Rudenko 1953, 62-67 and Plate XVIII. The mummified nude corpse of a woman about forty years of age, and of Europoid type was found buried beneath the nude corpse of the man in the sarcophagus in K-5. It is possible, however, that all of the female members of the "family" were slaughtered off when the chieftain died. The woman in K-5 would seem to have been poisoned; she may have been the chief wife or concubine.

45. Karlgren 1941, 118-119: C:48-C:54, C:67-C:85 are given as III century B.C. with no real grounds for doing so, see note 19.

Chinese Characters

a 山

b 輝縣

c 壽州

d 長沙

e 成都

f 五里牌

g 墓

h 執筆人

i 蔡文科

j 魯金科

k 論中国與爾阿泰部落的古代關係

l 考古學報

m 許

n 鄭

o 韓

p 宋

q 曹

r 邾

s 鄒

t 莒

u 蔡

v 陳

w 山, ⩊, 屮

x 湖南省博物館長沙五里牌古墓蔡清理簡報

y 文物

z 黑漆古

aa 楚文物圖片集

bb 大月氏

cc 匈奴

dd 孫守道

ee 匈奴西岔沟文化古墓群的發現

ff 西丰縣

gg 新中国的考古收获

hh 曾庸辽宁西丰西岔古墓群為烏桓文化遺迹論

ii 考古