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In the autumn 2006, the Collaborative Archaeological Team of the Early Qin Culture excavated a large-scale “Musical Instrument Pit” nearby the robbed large tomb attributed to certain Duke of Qin, and unearthed complete sets of bronze chime bells and music stones with inscription “Qin Zi 秦子 (Viscount of Qin)”. We plan to discuss in depth the chronology, nature and the relevant issues about this “Musical Instrument Pit” in this paper.

I. The Date and Nature of the “Musical Instrument Pit” of Qin Zi

This “Musical Instrument Pit” was located about 20m to the southwest of the robbed tomb (M2, the so-called tomb of Duke); the musical instruments unearthed from it include three bronze bo �艿-bells, eight bronze yong 甬-bells and their accessories – three bronze tigers and eleven bronze hooks, and two sets of chime stones each consisted of five pieces. The largest bo-bell had a 28-character inscription mentioning “The Viscount of Qin casts the precious and harmonious bells (秦子作宝龢钟)”, because of which we temporarily name it as “Musical Instrument Pit of the Viscount of Qin”. We dated this pit as the early phase of Spring-and-Autumn Period but no detailed reasons given.

Before the discovery of the “Musical Instrument Pit of the Viscount of Qin”, many bronzes looted from the robbed tomb in Dapuzishan Site were smuggled abroad; besides of ritual vessels, musical instruments like the yong- and bo-bells were also seen among them. In addition, three bo-bells (Figure 1) and seven yong-bells with long inscriptions mentioning Duke Wu of the Qin State have been unearthed from Taigongmiao Village, Baoji County, Shaanxi Province; in the illustrated imperial treasure catalog of the Northern Song Dynasty, a

Figure 1. The Bo-bell of Duke Wu of the Qin State Unearthed from Taigongmiao, Baoji, Shaanxi
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bo-bell of Duke Jing of the Qin State bearing inscription with 143 characters was recorded (Figure 2). Then, in total 11 bo-bells and 26 yong-bells in Qin Style have been seen or noted to date, including the newest found three bo-bells and eight yong-bells in Dapuzishan Site.

The basic shape of the bo-bells of the Qin State was originated from that of the bo-bells of the Western Zhou Dynasty, but they had their own characteristics, the most unique ones of which were the four protruding ridges decorated with delicate patterns in openwork, and the thematic motif of the body decoration was dragon designs with heads turning backward. Based on their styles, decorative patterns and the features of inscription, we can figure out the relative sequence and chronology of the discovered and recorded bo-bells.

In the evolution of bo-bells of Qin Style, the most noticeable feature is the ratio between the full height and the major diameter of the mouth. For the bo-bell of the Duke of Qin collected in Shanghai Museum, this ratio is 1.224; for the three bo-bells of the “Viscount of Qin” recently unearthed from Dapuzishan Site, the ratios are 1.304, 1.339 and 1.389, respectively; for the three bo-bells of Duke Wu of the Qin State unearthed from Taigongmiao Site in 1977, the ratios are 1.294, 1.333 and 1.368, respectively, and for the bo-bell of Duke Jing of the Qin State ever collected in Neifu (Imperial Storehouse) of the Northern Song Dynasty, this ratio was 1.506. This change showed us that the bo-bell collected in Shanghai Museum looked relatively squat while the bo-bell ever collected in Neifu of the Northern Song Dynasty looked relatively lank, and the bo-bells unearthed from Dapuzishan and Taigongmiao stayed between them. The bo-bells of Duke Wu (697–678 BCE) and Duke Jing (576–545 BCE) had exact owners and dates; therefore, we can suggest that the evolution tendency of the bo-bells of Qin Style was becoming thinner and taller. Moreover, the sizes and the length of inscriptions were also increasing along with the dates.

The crown and the protruding ridges decorated with dragon designs in openwork were the most time-sensitive features of the bo-bells of Qin Style. The crown of the bell collected in Shanghai Museum was rather low and flat, the two ridges linked to it were also flat and the turning angles of the corners between the top and the sides were rather stiff, and tops of the ridges through the broader faces were almost at the same level with the bell head (the same features were also seen on the bo-bells of Qin Style in private collection at Taipei and the United States). The crowns of the recently unearthed “Viscount of Qin” bo-bells were slightly taller, the two ridges linked to it were taller nearby the crown and the turning angles of the corners between the top and the sides were slightly curving and tops of the ridges through the broader faces were also almost at the same level with the bell head (the same features were also seen on the bo-bell of Qin Style in private collection at Taipei and the United States). The crowns of the recently unearthed “Viscount of Qin” bo-bells were slightly taller, the two ridges linked to it were taller nearby the crown and the turning angles of the corners between the top and the sides were slightly curving and tops of the ridges through the broader faces were also almost at the same level with the bell head (the same features were also seen on the bo-bell of Qin Style with dragon designs in Miho Museum, Shiga, Japan). The bo-bell of Duke Wu had even taller crown, the dragon designs forming which smoothly linked to the ridges on the two sides; the outlines of these two ridges from the top to the side looked like arcs, and the other two ridges going through the broader face were higher than the bell head.

The bo-bell of Duke Jing ever collected in Neifu of the Northern Song Dynasty, which has been lost for centuries and the image of which was not drawn exactly to scale, also showed this tendency: the two ridges linked to the crown were higher than the crown itself and they merged together in the shape of delicate openwork designs, and the turning angles from top to side were
curved into semicircular. In the light of this tendency, we dated the bo-bells of the “Viscount of Qin” unearthed recently between the ones collected in Shanghai Museum and unearthed from Taigongmiao, or, they were cast later than the bo-bell of the unknown Duke of Qin collected in Shanghai Museum but earlier than the ones cast in the reign of Duke Wu.

In short, the styles, decorations and inscriptions all showed that the Shanghai Museum bo-bell was the earliest, the Duke Wu bo-bells were later, and the Duke Jing bo-bell was the latest. The recently unearthed Viscount bo-bells were just in the same stage with Duke Wu bo-bells, which was the early Spring-and-Autumn Period. The scientifically unearthed assemblages from Taigongmiao and Dapuzishan implied us it is very possible that the original set of bo-bells of Qin Style might have been a triple assemblage; the two bo-bells in private collections in Taipei and the U. S. have similar shape, style, decorations and sizes to the one collected in Shanghai Museum, and therefore they probably have belonged to a single assemblage and were looted from a large tomb in Dapuzishan Site. The bo-bell collected in Miho Museum is the most similar to the Dapuzishan bo-bells in shape, style, decorations and size, so they ought to have been cast in the same stage, and as well, it belonged to the same set with another bronze bell of Viscount of Qin collected in this museum.

As for the nature of the “Musical Instrument Pit,” we believe that it was not an attendant pit or accessory pit but a sacrificial pit, because the large-scale tombs of the Western Zhou Dynasty to the Spring-and-Autumn Period discovered to date have had only chariot and horse pits accompanied but no musical instrument pits ever found; moreover, four human victim pits, each of which contained one or two human skeletons in flexed position, dug at the same time (beneath the same stratum and intruded same strata) with this musical instrument pit were also discovered and excavated in this fieldwork; of them, K1 was located to the north of the middle of the musical instrument pit and slightly intruded it, which implies that K1 was dug after the musical instrument pit was filled, and the human victims in K1 were used as sacrifices offered to the occupant of the large tomb. Therefore, this musical instrument pit and these four human victim pits were the remains of a single sacrifice offering ceremony. These pits were all dug in the processed mottled earth, which matches the records in the historic literature that “(before the worshipping ceremony was held) a square ground (Shan 坑) would be cleared up (as the altar for ceremony”). The way of worshipping or offering sacrifice with “Musical Instrument Pit” and/or “Ritual Vessel Pit” has been seen in the ruined capital of the Zheng State located at present-day Xinzheng, Henan Province, and their date was middle Spring-and-Autumn Period. The bells of Duke Wu of the Qin State were found in a round pit at Taigongmiao, nearby which no large-scale burials have been found, and therefore they were believed to be the remains of a worshipping ceremony to the deities of mountains and rivers. In short, the “Musical Instrument Pit” has similar nature with the “Musical Instrument and Ritual Vessel Pit” in Xinzheng and the “Bell Pit” at Taigongmiao, all of which were remains of worshipping or sacrifice offering ceremonies; because it was located closely to the tomb of Duke of Qin, this tomb would have been the object of this ceremony.

II. A comprehensive Examination to the Qin Zi bo-bells and all of the Bronzes with Qin Zi Inscription

Among the 11 bronze bells composing entire sets, only one bo-bell, the largest, had a 28-character inscription: “The Viscount of Qin casts the precious and harmonious bells; three of them are bo, which sound sonorous and booming. The Viscount of Qin is solemnly and cautiously (?) on his post, and is enjoying boundless longevity [秦子作宝钟, 以其三镈, 乃音鏘鏘呴呴, 秦子執轡在位, 眉寿萬年無疆].” It mentions “three of them are bo [以其三镈]” behind “The Viscount of Qin casts the precious and harmonious bells [秦子作宝龢鐘]”, and exactly three bo-bells were unearthed. Read from the context, the “precious and harmonious bells [龢鐘]” was the name of the whole set of chime bells, and the bo was the term specially referring to the three bells with ring-shaped crowns rather than the yong-shanks; however, the bo-bell collected in Shanghai Museum call itself as zhong 钟 (bell) in the inscription. The bronze and stone instruments unearthed from this pit compose a complete set of percussion instruments belonging to certain Viscount of Qin, although only one piece of them had inscription announcing this. This set of bronze musical instruments were cast with superb techniques and no visible use wear or damage have been found, which means that they were cast just for burying or were buried soon after they were finished.

Before the discovery of this set of bronzes, many cases
of bronzes with inscription “Qin Zi 秦子 (Viscount of Qin)” have been seen in previous records, the main ones of which are five weapons, two ritual vessels and four musical instruments. The styles, decorations and inscriptions showed that all of these bronzes were made in the early Spring-and-Autumn Period, and the recently unearthed Qin Zi bronze musical instruments were also not exceptions. All of these bronzes would have belonged to the same “Qin Zi”; however, that who this Qin Zi was has not got an agreement so far. The diverse suggestions could be attributed into two categories: that the Qin Zi was a crown prince and that the Qin Zi was a monarch. The suggestions belonging to the former category include the hypotheses of “Duke Xiang 襄 before enthroned”, “Duke Wen 文 before enthroned”, “Duke Jing 靖 (posthumous name, never enthroned)” and “Duke Xian 宪 before enthroned”; the suggestions belonging to the latter category include the hypotheses of “Chu Zi 出子 (Viscount Chu)”, “Duke Xuan 宣” and “the title of certain monarch at the early Spring-and-Autumn Period when he was just enthroned” and so on. Of all of these suggestions, the hypothesis of “Monarch Chu Zi” was the prevailing one.

The “Qin Zi” bronzes represented by the inscribed bo-bell unearthed from Dapuzishan Site were the first case of scientifically discovered Qin Zi bronzes, whose context revealed the facts not reflected by their handed down or gathered counterparts. They not only evidenced that the new-seen Qin Zi bronzes at home and abroad were looted from the large tomb at Dapuzishan Site, but also proved that the robbed large tomb was tightly related to Qin Zi. Therefore, when we explore who the Qin Zi was, we have to consider the reasons why the bronzes of Qin Zi were dug out from the robbed tomb as well as excavated from the “Musical Instrument Pit”. That is, the final identification of this Qin Zi relies on the answers to the questions that when the robbed large tomb was buried, who the tomb occupants were and who the officiator of the sacrifice offering ceremony creating this “Musical Instrument Pit” was.

We suggest that this Qin Zi was a crown prince and he was most probably Duke Jing 静 (posthumous name, died before being enthroned). Our reasons are the following:

First, in pre-Qin historic literatures, the records of calling the crown prince and other princes as “Qin Zi” are usually seen. In the early and middle periods of the Qin State, the position of the monarch was not precisely succeeded by the eldest son of the passed away monarch but more frequently by younger brothers of the passed away monarch. Because of this tradition, the post of crown prince might not be arranged as a rule, and therefore the addressing customs of the Qin State were different from its contemporary counterparts. Now that so many princes could be called as “Qin Zi”, why was the title “Qin Zi” only seen on the bronzes cast at the early Spring-and-Autumn Period but not on those made in other times? This paradox was one of the reasons for many scholars to believe that the owner of the “Qin Zi” bronzes was Chu Zi 出子, a dethroned and assassinated monarch of the Qin State. In fact, according to the bronze casting authority and style of inscription manner, neither common princes nor crown princes had the authority to cast bronzes bearing their own names and titles, and therefore this “Qin Zi” must have had special status.

Second, when Chu Zi was on his monarch post, he did not have reason to disregard the title of “Duke”, so the bronzes cast for his sake would have mentioned him as “Duke” rather than “Viscount”. Chu Zi might have usurped this post illegally, but to be “illegal” or not was the opinion of the later people; when he was on the throne, he and his subjects had to announce his position was succeeded legally. Therefore, he must use the “Duke” title when he was on his post. Chu Zi (lit. Viscount Dethroned) was a posthumous name, in which “Chu 出” meant “to be dethroned or to be ousted”; we cannot infer his title when he was alive and on the monarch position based on the title given to him after his death. Actually, Chu Zi was really called “Chu Gong 出公 (Duke Chu)” in Gu Jin Ren Biao 古今人表 (Table of the People in the Past and Present) of Han Shu 汉书 by Ban Gu.

Third, the so-called “Shou Ming Lu 受命鲁” in the inscription on the lid of Qin Zi Ji Gui-(vessel was explained by some scholars as only monarch had the authority to “Shou Ming 受命 (receive mission or assignment)” and the owner of this Gui-vessel was the only monarch with “Zi” title, who was Chu Zi absolutely. However, of these four characters, only Shou 受 was legible, Lu 鲁 could be barely identified and the other two were severely eroded and hardly identifiable. Therefore, it is doubtful to interpret the four characters as “to receive mission or assignment from certain Lu”. Even this interpretation was reliable, the “Shou Ming” mentioned here may not necessarily refer to a monarch.
to “receive mission or assignment”. The records about “Shou Ming” from a monarch, from a master or from ancestral temple can be frequently seen in bronze inscriptions and pre-Qin historic documents, which means that he who was not a monarch could also “Shou Ming 受命 (receive mission or assignment)”. Moreover, to explain the Qin Zi Ji 秦子姬 mentioned in the inscription of that Gui-vessel as Qin Zi’s mother was not correct either. This title should refer to Qin Zi’s wife. Chu Zi was still a child at his death, so he could not have wife; therefore the “Qin Zi” mentioned in the inscription of the Gui-vessel lid could not be Chu Zi, and the “Qin Zi” mentioned in other bronzes could not be Chu Zi either.

Fourth, the comprehensive coring exploration conducted in 2006 did not discover other large-scale burials except for the two robbed Φ -shaped tombs and chariot and horse pits. The two chariot and horse pits were roughly in same sizes and just suitable for attending the two large-scale tombs respectively; however, during the Western and Eastern Zhou period, the couple of monarch only had one chariot and horse pit when they were buried in separate graves. This means that these two large tombs must have been that of two Qin Dukes but not one Duke and his wife. Chu Zi died by violence; according to the burial system, he could not use Φ -shaped tomb and could not be buried in this mausoleum precinct.

Fifth, over a dozen of bronzes bearing the “Qin Zi” title had been found in collections and gathered from society before 2006; in our excavation to Dapuzishan Site in 2006, over another dozen bronzes of “Qin Zi” represented by the Qin Zi bo-bell were archaeologically unearthed. Chu Zi was enthroned when he was five and assassinated just six years later, after which the Qin court fell in turmoil: it is hardly credible that so many bundles and pieces of valuable and symbolic bronzes could be cast in such short time. Moreover, the inscriptions on spearheads and ge-dagger axes bearing Qin Zi title showed that this Qin Zi was in charge of the noble clan troops, and this important position did not match Chu Zi’s status.

Sixth, the inscriptions of the bronzes made in the Qin State found to date showed that only in the Warring-States Period, under the rule of “Wu Le Gong Ming 物勒工名 (every article should have its maker’s name engraved)”, some bronzes could be made (actually made under the supervision) by Xiangbang 相邦 (counselor-in-chief), prefecture governor or other officials, and in the Spring-and-Autumn Period, most of the bronzes bearing inscriptions were made by the Dukes of Qin. In other words, if the estimation that the “Qin Zi” was indeed certain crown prince, then this crown prince must have had very special status and could not be the title of any Duke of Qin before being enthroned. If any crown prince really had had the authority to cast bronzes bearing “Qin Zi” as their title before being enthroned, there would have been many bronzes cast in different times across a rather long time span. But in fact, the “Qin Zi” bronzes found so far were cast in a very short period, for which we can reasonably believe that all of these bronzes were cast by only one Qin crown prince with special status. Then, this Qin Zi could improbably be Dukes Xiang, Wen or Xian before they were enthroned.

Seventh, analyzed in typological methods, the styles, decorations and inscriptions all showed that the new-discovered Qin Zi bo-bells were later than the bo-bell collected in Shanghai Museum and those collected in Taiwan and the United States, but slightly earlier than Duke Wu bo-bells (later phase of early Spring-and-Autumn Period). Up to now, all of the scholars agreed that the bronzes from the Duke of Qin tombs in Dapuzishan Site could not be earlier than Dukes Xiang and Wen, so the Qin Zi bo-bells could not be earlier than the times before Duke Xiang was enthroned, which was the late period of the Western Zhou Dynasty, and before Duke Wen was enthroned, which was the earlier phase of early Spring-and-Autumn Period. Meanwhile, because the new-discovered Qin Zi bo-bells were slightly earlier than Duke Wu bo-bells, this Qin Zi could only be earlier than Duke Wu of the Qin State; as for Duke Xuan, who was the son of Duke De 德 (the younger brother of Duke Wu), he was enthroned in the middle Spring-and-Autumn Period and could not be this Qin Zi either.

Eighth, some scholars hold the viewpoint that the commentary to Chunqiu 春秋 (Spring-and-Autumn Annals) had the notes saying “the feudal lords were called ‘Zi’ when they were in mourning”, therefore this “Qin Zi” might be the title of certain Duke of Qin in the early Spring-and-Autumn Period when he was just enthroned; but even that was correct, a monarch’s mourning period was not longer than several months, during which so many valuable and symbolic bronzes could hardly be cast.

Ninth, the crown prince “Duke Jing 静 (posthumous name, never enthroned)” had very special status, there-
fore this Qin Zi was the most probably Duke Jing. Duke Wen 文, Duke Jing’s father, had the reign as long as fifty years and Duke Jing could not succeed his position and died before Duke Wen. In the later period of Duke Wen’s reign, he assigned important state affairs to his crown prince; Duke Wen relied on him gravely and entitled him as Duke Jing when he died before his father – Duke Wen himself, and enthroned Duke Jing’s son as the succeeding monarch. As a never enthroned prince, Duke Jing enjoyed etiquettes for monarchs, which was very rare in the history of the Qin State; only a “Viscount” like him was able to cast this many valuable and symbolic bronzes and be in charge of the noble clan troops.

Tenth, in the inscription of the new-found Qin Zi bronzes, the words 父在位 [solemnly and cautiously (?) on his post] were seen, and some scholars believed that the “Zai Wei 在位 (to be on the post)” should have meant the monarch “was on his post (throne)”. However, in the pre-Qin historic literatures, the term “Zai Wei 在位” might also mean officials or other people on their post like that mentioned by Confucius, but was not monopolized by paramount rulers. Therefore, as a crown prince, Duke Jing absolutely had the right to use the term “Zai Wei 在位”, let alone the words like 父在位 have become stereotyped phrase in the Qin State bronze inscriptions.

In short, our opinion is that this “Viscount of Qin” would the most likely be Duke Jing 静, the never enthroned crown prince. Even if this supposition was true, we still have to answer who the occupants of the robbed large tombs were, and who the officiator of the sacrifice offering ceremony was.

III. The Issues on the Bronzes Robbed from the Duke Tombs and the Occupants of the Tombs

The bronzes and gold artifacts robbed from the Qin Duke tombs in 1992 were sold and smuggled at home and abroad. To date, the known ritual vessels of these bronzes include the types of ding鼎 - tripod, gui簋 - vessel, hu壶 - vase and pan; the musical instruments include bo镈 and yong-bells; the gold artifacts are mainly coffin decorations made of gold foils. In 1994, Gansu Provincial Institute of Cultural Relics and Archaeology conducted a rescue recovering to the robbed Dapuzishan Site, in which two Φ- shaped large tombs (M2 and M3) were excavated, two chariot and horse pits (M1 and M4) were found and one of them was excavated. Also in this fieldwork, nine small- and medium-scale tombs were excavated.

On the issues of who were the owners of the Qin Gong秦公 (Duke of Qin) bronzes and the occupants of the two robbed large-scale tombs, scholars are still in disagreements. For the first issue, the suggestions are Duke Zhuang庄 at the later period of the Western Zhou Dynasty, Dukes Xiang 襄, Wen 文, Jing 静, Xian宪 in the early Spring-and-Autumn Period, even Duke Xuan 宣 in the middle Spring-and-Autumn Period. For the second issue, the opinions are that they were the couple of certain Duke of Qin, and they were two Dukes; in short, just as the suggestions about the owner(s) of the Qin Zi bronzes, agreements are far from being got.

In the above analyses, we have drawn the conclusion that one of the robbed tombs belonged to Duke Jing 静, the never enthroned crown prince, and the other belonged to his father, Duke Wen 文. To detail, the M2 closer to the Musical Instrument Pit and smaller in size was Duke Jing’s tomb and the M3 to the north of M2 and larger in size was that of Duke Wen. Duke Jing was buried before Duke Wen, therefore the officiator of the sacrifice offering ceremony, which left the remains including the Musical Instrument Pit, was Duke Wen.

It is recorded in Qin Benji 秦本纪 (Annals of the Qin State) of Shiji that Duke Wen stayed in Xichui Palace and was buried in Xichui, but no records about the burial location of Duke Jing. Duke Wen favored Duke Jing very much, and they were very likely buried in the same mausoleum precinct. Duke Jing did die a crown prince, but he was given posthumous name as a “Duke” and listed into the lineage of the monarchs of the Qin State, so he completely had the authority to use Φ- shaped tombs with two ramp passages. Two large tombs were corresponded by two chariot and horse pits, and the two pits were arranged closer than the two tombs: this means that the entire mausoleum yard had a comprehensive plan. Considering Duke Wen was in very old age when his son – Duke Jing – died, we could infer that by designing Duke Jing’s mausoleum, Duke Wen also arranged his own mausoleum and chariot and horse pit beforehand. The messages showed that both of the large tombs have yielded “Qin Gong” bronzes. The styles, decorations and inscriptions all showed chronological differences among these bronzes, but so trivial that we cannot tell their attributions by tomb from these differences. However, we suggest that the Qin Gong...
bronzes from both tombs were cast in Duke Wen’s reign. M2 was Duke Jing’s tomb, which would be the source of the Qin Zi bronzes scattered at home and abroad. After the death of Duke Jing, it was his father, Duke Wen, who managed funeral affairs for him, because of which it makes sense that Duke Jing’s tomb yielded both bronzes cast by Qin Zi as well as Qin Gong. Duke Wen died and was buried later indeed, but the bronzes accompanying him could be cast much earlier, because Duke Wen had his reign as long as fifty years and some of the Qin Gong bronzes might have been cast in the early and middle phases of his reign; his son, Duke Jing, died and buried two years earlier than his father, but the bronzes bearing his title “Qin Zi” would have been cast when he was in charge of the state affairs, which was the last years of Duke Wen’s reign. Therefore, it is not uncanny that these Qin Zi bronzes were made later than the coexisting Qin Gong bronzes. Now that Duke Jing died before Duke Wen, the sacrifice offering ceremony which created the “Musical Instrument Pit of the Viscount of Qin” should be officiated by Duke Wen (according to the procedure noted in Zhouli [Rites of Zhou], the executive officiator was Dazongbo [Minister of Rites]). Duke Jing’s accidental death was a critical loss to the Qin State, which was on the turning point of driving away the Rong (Western Barbarians) tribes and recovering the old capital vicinity of the Zhou Dynasty, and a heavy blow on Duke Wen, who had been in twilight years of his life; moreover, Duke Wen might think that his crown prince’s death was a misfortune to the future of the Qin State. Under this deep grief for his son and concern for his state’s future, it was reasonable for Duke Wen to pay heavy sacrifice, including entire sets of precious musical instruments cast by the Viscount of Qin, to the god of the land for asking the deities to bless his descendents and his state.
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