

**Early agropastoral settlement and cultural change in Central Tibet in the first millennium BC:
excavations at Bangga**

Hongliang Lu¹, Xinzhou Chen^{2,*}, Zhengwei Zhang^{Error! Bookmark not defined.}, Li Tang³, Ximena Lemoine^{Error! Bookmark not defined.}, Shargan Wangdue⁴, Zujun Chen^{Error! Bookmark not defined.}, Xinyi Liu^{Error! Bookmark not defined.} & Michael D. Frachetti^{Error! Bookmark not defined.}

¹ Department of Archaeology, Sichuan University, Chengdu, P.R. China

² Department of Anthropology, Washington University in St. Louis, USA

³ Max Planck Institute for the Science of Human History, Jena, Germany

⁴ Tibetan Autonomous Region Cultural Relic and Conservation Institute, Lhasa, P.R. China

* Author for correspondence ✉: xinzhouchen@wustl.edu

Received: Revised: Accepted:

Archaeological research demonstrates that an agropastoral economy was established in Tibet during the second millennium BC, aided by the cultivation of barley introduced from north-western China. The exact cultural contexts of the emergence and development of agropastoralism in Tibet, however, remain obscure. Recent excavations at the site of Bangga provide new evidence for settled agropastoralism in Central Tibet, demonstrating a material divergence from earlier archaeological cultures, possibly corresponding to the intensification of agropastoralism in the first millennium BC.

Keywords: Tibetan Plateau, prehistory, agropastoralism, settlement, cultural change

Introduction

Research over the last two decades has yielded important insights into when and how hunter-gatherers successfully settled on the Tibetan Plateau (Brantingham & Gao 2006; Meyer *et al.* 2017; Zhang *et al.* 2018). Tibetan agro-pastoralism—one of the most important subsistence strategies in this high-altitude environment (Rhoades & Thompson 1975; Goldstein & Beall 1990; Bauer 2004)—has also been documented at archaeological sites across various parts of the Plateau (Dong *et al.* 2012, 2016; d’Alpoim Guedes *et al.* 2014, 2015; Chen *et al.* 2015; d’Alpoim

Guedes & Hein 2018; Zhang *et al.* 2019). Compared to the other regions of Tibet, however, archaeological research in the central part of the Plateau is limited to only a small number of systematically excavated sites (see d’Alpoim Guedes & Aldenderfer 2019, Figure 1). Thus, our understanding of local and regional cultural developments is restricted, with many unanswered questions concerning early, high-altitude subsistence economies.

Here, we present evidence from recent excavations at the site of Bangga in Central Tibet—the most comprehensively excavated prehistoric settlement in this region. We argue that the occupants of Bangga relied on an agropastoralist economic strategy, based on the herding sheep/goat and possibly cattle or yak, as well as farming, predominantly of barley. Additionally, the archaeobotanical, zooarchaeological and material cultural remains from Bangga illustrate notable changes from earlier documented sites. These changes suggest a local process of cultural development that correlates with the intensification of agropastoralism in Central Tibet from the end of the second millennium BC to the beginning of the first millennium BC. The local development of agro-pastoralism as revealed in Bangga highlighted

Background

Compared to other regions of the Tibetan Plateau, the material culture and archaeological chronologies on the north-eastern Plateau are relatively well understood (Xie 2002; Luo 2011; Chen 2015). Here, the prevailing regional Neolithic cultures include the Majiayao (3980–2050 BC) and Qijia (2183–1635 BC) Cultures. After the mid-second millennium BC, the Qijia Culture is thought to have declined and split into smaller cultures (Xie 2002). Recent studies suggest that by the first millennium BC, people on the north-eastern and eastern Tibetan Plateau practised diverse forms of subsistence, including pastoralism, wild-animal hunting and agriculture (d’Alpoim Guedes *et al.* 2014, 2015; Chen *et al.* 2015; He 2015; Dong *et al.* 2016; d’Alpoim Guedes 2018; Zhang *et al.* 2019). Although the archaeology of the eastern Tibetan Plateau is relatively well attested, firm conclusions are yet to be reached concerning cultural developments and the origin of agropastoralism in this region (Miehe *et al.* 2009).

The archaeology of the central and western parts of the Tibetan Plateau is much more poorly understood, even though the earliest evidence of human occupation at Chusang, in Central Tibet, dates to the early Holocene (Figure 1; Meyer *et al.* 2017). To date, there are only two occupation sites on the central Plateau with published archaeobotanical or zooarchaeological

analyses: Qugong and Changguogou—both excavated in the late 1990s and early 2000s (Table 3). These two sites were considered to be the earliest Neolithic sites in this area, representing a regional material tradition of the second millennium BC (He 1994; CASS 1999; CASS & TARCRMC 1999). Animal remains from the Qugong site suggest the possible presence of yak and sheep, implying that pastoralism was already being practised at Qugong in the second millennium BC (CASS 1999). At contemporaneous Changguogou, wheat (*Triticum* sp.), barley (*Hordeum vulgare*) and foxtail millet (*Setaria italica*) have been reported (Fu 2001; Liu *et al.* 2016; Lu 2016). In the western and northern regions of the Tibetan Plateau, sacrificial burials of sheep and horses at sites such as Butaxiongqu, Chuvthag and Gurugyam provide clear evidence for the management of herd animals by the late first millennium BC (Zhang *et al.* 2015; CASS *et al.* 2015).

<FIGURE 1, 13.5cm colour>

The Bangga site and excavations

Bangga (29°05'13.66" N, 91°43'15.36" E) is a settlement featuring multiple, large, stone enclosures. The ancient settlement lies adjacent to the modern agropastoral village of Bangga in the Yarlung Valley, approximately 10km north-east of Qonggyai County in the Tibetan Autonomous Region of China. At an elevation of approximately 3750m asl, Bangga is situated on an alluvial terrace, delimited to the south by a 10m-wide gully, and by a low mountain ridge to the north (Figure 2). Directly across this mountain ridge lies the summer pastureland used by residents of Bangga village today.

<FIGURE 2, 13.5cm colour>

The first excavations of the Bangga site took place in 1985, led by the Tibet Autonomous Region Cultural Relics Management Committee (Wangdue & Kang 1986). Subsequent fieldwork led excavators to postulate that Bangga was occupied by agropastoralists, due to the similarities between the site's prehistoric stone architecture and analogous occupations of modern pastoralists in the region (Wangdue & Kang 1986; Li 2001; Wangdue 2001). From 2015–2018, a joint archaeological team of Sichuan University and Tibetan Autonomous Region Cultural Relic and Conservation Institute excavated a total area of 360m² at Bangga. A robust programme of radiocarbon dating (see Table S1 in the online supplementary material (OSM) and Figure 5) and detailed stratigraphic excavation (Figure 3) illustrate two phases of occupation

within the 19 archaeological layers documented at Bangga (Figure 3). The late phase is represented by archaeological layers 1–12, which date from *c.* 400 BC to the modern era. Despite displaying several different colours, the late phase layers (1–12) are relatively homogenous, with a sandy texture. Few artefacts, faunal and botanical remains, or features (e.g. hearths) were recovered from these layers, suggesting relatively low-intensity occupation.

<FIGURE 3,

The earlier occupation phase is characterised by several stone enclosures and layers 13–19. Eight stone enclosures (F1–F8) were revealed by the 2015–2018 excavations (Figure 4). Although their depositional complexity makes them difficult to date precisely, we can distinguish two subphases of construction. The first is characterised by structures F5 and F7, which date to *c.* 1000–800 BC. The second subphase is characterised by the construction and usage of F1, F2, F4, F8, and possibly F3. These date to *c.* 800–400 BC (see Table S1).

<FIGURE 4, 13.5cm colour>

Most of the stone enclosures are concentrated in the northern part of the site, with two large, rectangular enclosures (F2 and F5) dominating the southern portion. The walls, variable in height between 0.10 and 0.80m, were built out of stone slabs, possibly brought in from the vicinity of the site. Multiple depositional layers were identified within the stone enclosures. This, in combination with evidence of refurbishment, such as wall removal and reconstruction, along with radiocarbon dates, provides further evidence that the site was repeatedly used and modified.

The most abundant findings came from the earlier phase of the site's occupation. Over 400 features of various construction phases were recorded within the stone enclosures, including hearths, pits and postholes (Table 1). These will be reported separately and in more detail in a monograph currently being prepared by Sichuan University. All eight of the early-phase enclosures were sealed beneath by layer 14. Layers 15–19 were only present in the eastern part of the site, on the exterior of, but contemporaneous with, the stone enclosures. While these external layers are probably associated with activities that took place outside of the stone enclosures, they yielded very few artefacts.

<TABLE 1>

Material culture

We analysed 7963 ceramic fragments from the 2015, 2017 and 2018 excavations. Pottery from the site is highly fragmented, with only one complete vessel. The upper levels (Layers 1–12) yielded dozens of thick, red sherds (Figure 6: a). This contrasts with a large quantity of relatively thin, brown sherds recovered from the lower levels and from within the stone enclosures (Layers 13–19 & F1–F8), the majority of which are hand-formed coarse ware. The early-phase ceramics demonstrate a decline in the surface-polishing techniques associated with ceramics from the preceding Qugong Culture and documented in the early phases of occupation at Qugong and Changguogou (Figure 6: d–f). Notably, only 4 per cent of ceramics from Bangga’s lower levels are surface-polished (Table S2 & Figure S1). In general, the surface decorations are generally dominated by zigzag and triangular curving lines that are mostly located on the vessels’ shoulders and upper bodies. Although there is a dearth of bases, the pottery from early-phase Bangga primarily comprises round-based vessels. Handles are prevalent in the ceramic assemblage in the early phase, and typically include a lug attached to the middle of the vessel, a feature that is absent in the precedent Qugong Culture. At Bangga, we distinguished two ceramic forms: jars and bowls (Figure 6: b–c), among which the open-mouthed jar predominates.

Twenty-four stone tools were recovered and analysed from the 2015 excavation at Bangga. These include stone weights, stone cores, flakes, grinding stones and millstones (Figure 7). Some of the stone weights and millstones were painted red.

Zooarchaeological and archaeobotanical remains

We collected more than 10 000 faunal remains from Bangga from 2015 to 2018, and zooarchaeological analysis is currently ongoing. Preliminary observations suggest that sheep (*Ovis aries*) and goats (*Capra hircus*) dominate the assemblage. Specimens that can be attributed to large-sized Bovinae, Equidae and wild mammal, including musk deer, antelope and hare are also present. The wild animals, however, comprise a small proportion of the assemblage. The presence of large Bovinae specimens indicates the presence of cattle (*Bos taurus*) or yak (*Bos grunniens*), demonstrating similarities with the Qugong faunal assemblage (CASS 1999).

We recovered carbonised seeds from the 2015–2017 excavation seasons, via flotation. Here, we report the domesticated grains from the stone enclosures and L13 & L14 (Table 2). These include 128 barley (*Hordeum vulgare* var. *vulgare*) grains and 16 wheat grains (*Triticum aestivum*). Intact barley rachises were recovered in 2018, strengthening support for the practice of

barley-dominant agriculture at Bangga. The majority of wheat and barley remains from Bangga were retrieved from stone enclosure F1 in the north of the site, suggesting that F1 may be a domestic structure.

<TABLE 2>

Discussion

Our results illustrate an integrated subsistence economy wherein both farming and pastoralism were used at Bangga throughout the two occupation phases. The multi-resource nature of subsistence at Bangga is also reflected in the site layout and artefact distribution. Across the site, domestic structures are associated both with storage facilities and animal enclosures. In the northern part of the site, large stone enclosures, such as F1, F7 and F8, are interpreted as domestic spaces due to their various internal features, including hearths, pits and postholes. The majority of macro-botanical remains were recovered from this area, and the main enclosures connect, via, doorways to smaller enclosures. These also contain numerous pits, and were probably used as storage facilities. By contrast, domestic evidence is lacking in the southern part of the site. Here, the abundance of animal dung within structures F2 and F5 suggests they were probably used as animal enclosures.

Our findings suggest that Bangga was divided into two functional zones, with domestic, residential areas in the north and animal corrals in the south. This resembles the layout of agropastoralist houses in modern Bangga village, where a domestic area and semi-detached animal enclosures are located within the same compound. Such layouts are also documented in modern pastoral settlements across the Tibetan Plateau, and resonate with Bronze Age agropastoral settlements documented archaeologically from Central Asia and Xinjiang (Frachetti & Mar'yashev 2007; Jia *et al.* 2017).

The faunal assemblage from Bangga comprises primarily domestic herd animals, mainly sheep and goats. Although zooarchaeological research is ongoing, preliminary results show the presence of large Bovinae taxa—probably cattle or yak. The mountain pastures to the immediate north of the site are still used today by sheep and goat herders from modern Bangga village. It is likely that the same strategy would have been used by ancient herders, although this hypothesis remains to be tested through ongoing survey and excavation in these pasture areas, and by intra-tooth carbon isotopic analysis.

Bangga's prehistoric economy was also characterised by local barley farming, as supported by the recovery of barley rachises, the by-products of crop processing (particularly de-husking). It is also notable that two domesticated crops that originated in North China, broomcorn and foxtail millet, are absent at Bangga. Thus, the Bangga assemblage differs from those studied at Qugong cultural sites on the central Tibetan Plateau, such as Changguogou (1513–842 BC), where wheat and barley (south-west Asian crops), as well as the foxtail millet, were identified (Fu 2001). The presence in Central Tibet of both eastern and western Asian crops during the second and the first millennium BC should be understood in the wider context of the trans-Eurasian exchange of cereal crops (Frachetti 2012; Liu *et al.* 2019). Nevertheless, the distinction in cropping systems between Bangga and Changguogou was likely driven by a variety of social and ecological factors, including issues related to crop cold-tolerance and seasonal flexibility (d'Alpoim Guedes *et al.* 2015), but also culinary choice, a potential driver that has been discussed elsewhere (Liu *et al.* 2016).

We also document differences between the material cultural assemblages from second-millennium BC Qugong cultural sites (i.e. Qugong and Changguogou) and first-millennium BC Bangga. Indeed, the ceramic and lithic assemblages from Bangga exhibit aspects of both continuity of, and divergence from, the precedent Qugong Culture. At Qugong, the excavators divided the occupation into three: the early, late and 'stone-cist burial' phases (Table S1; Table 3; CASS 1999). Early-phase Qugong material culture is characterised by its distinctive black fabric and finely polished surfaces, which comprised approximately 22 per cent of the Qugong ceramic assemblage (CASS 1999). Ceramics at Bangga, however, appear to belong to a different pottery tradition, with the near absence of surface-polished sheards (only four per cent). This resonates with the final occupational phase at Qugong, in the first millennium BC. In addition, the ring-based vessels with hollowed-out triangle decorations that are common at Qugong are completely absent in Bangga. Although these distinctions indicate changing material traditions between the second and the first millennia BC in Central Tibet, we also observe aspects of continuity between Qugong and Bangga, such as in the diamond-shaped, curving-line decorations found at both sites. A new style of lug decoration on the handles, however, characterises pots at Bangga. Given the lack of evidence to suggest that these material changes resulted from external contact, we attribute them to local communities of practice, specifically within the context of ceramic production (Doumani 2014).

<TABLE 3>

Ethnoarchaeological research across the globe has linked residential mobility to ceramic manufacturing time, and hence the overall investment of labour (Simms *et al.* 1997; Eerkens 2003). Eerkens (2003), for example, argues that the quantity of ceramics with roughed surfaces, which increases the heat efficiency of the ceramics and reduces the manufacturing time, is usually positively correlated with residential mobility and *vice versa* (Schiffer 1990; Eerkens 2003). From this perspective, the decrease of labour input in association with the lack of surface-polished ceramics at Bangga potentially signals higher residential mobility associated with increasing investment in pastoralism. This interpretation is consistent with the zooarchaeological evidence showing herding animals predominating the faunal assemblage.

Although stone tools are scarce at Bangga, three elements stand out when compared to the Qugong Culture (Figure 5). First, the absence of microblades at Bangga is notable, and may indicate a final stage in the decline of microlithic traditions in this region (CASS 1999). Microblades are present at both the Qugong and Changguogou sites, although in small numbers (He 1994; CASS 1999). Microblade technologies first appeared in East Asia during the late Pleistocene, and represent a very long and homogeneous technological tradition in the region until the middle of Holocene (e.g. Yi *et al.* 2013). Comparatively, microblade technology is often viewed in terms of its economic advantages, particularly for the hunting and processing of large- and medium-sized game animals (Elston & Kuhn 2002). One possible explanation for the discrepancy in the presence of microblades between Qugong and Bangga is that hunting was the focus of animal-based subsistence at Qugong, whereas the inhabitants of Bangga engaged more intensively in herding. Despite this economic difference, however, there are also similarities between the Bangga and Qugong lithic assemblages.

<FIGURE 5, 13.5cm greyscale>

First, red-painted stone stools are documented at both sites. Approximately 20 per cent of the Qugong stone tools were painted red, compared to 13 per cent at Bangga. That no red-painted stone tools have been found at contemporaneous sites in other parts of the Tibetan Plateau may indicate continuity in stone tool decoration traditions between Qugong and Bangga. Second, grinding stones were recovered from Bangga and from the early phase at Qugong and Changguogou. Such stones can be used in multiple food-production contexts, although a primary function is for making flour, typically from cereals originating from south-western Asia, such as

wheat and barley. By contrast, East Asian cereals, such as millet and rice, were most often cooked by boiling and steaming. This deeply rooted distinction between East and West Asian culinary practices has been explored by various scholars, particularly in the context of early food globalisation (e.g. Fuller & Rowland 2011; Liu *et al.* 2016).

The presence of grinding stones and the absence of pottery vessels for boiling or steaming at Bangga hints at a flour-based culinary tradition. Such a cooking preference could have consequences for the selection of grain quality, with high gluten content being the priority. This is consistent with archaeobotanical evidence showing barley to have been the main crop at Bangga.

While current archaeological data are insufficient to illustrate comprehensively the changes in subsistence and material cultural traditions in Central Tibet and across the Tibetan Plateau, our excavations at Bangga provide evidence for important differences (and similarities) between this site and the Qugong cultural sites in Central Tibet. Bangga yielded distinct botanical and faunal assemblages that show diversity in subsistence strategies, variations in labour-input in ceramic manufacturing that indicate differences in residential mobility, and evidence for culinary practices focused on the preparation of flour-based food. The absence of microblade technology indicates less reliance on hunting and game animals. How, then, can we explain these differences in a wider regional perspective?

The climate of this part of the Plateau has changed significantly during the Holocene, and has been explored in the context of variations in Asian Monsoon patterns (e.g. Wang *et al.* 2005). We do not, however, consider the environment to have been a primary driver of the material changes at Bangga, as there was no drastic climatic shift in Central Tibet around 1000 BC (e.g. Duan *et al.* 2012). Furthermore, Chen *et al.* (2015) have demonstrated that environment was only one factor, among several, which induced shifts in prehistoric subsistence and settlement elsewhere on the Tibetan Plateau (e.g. Chen *et al.* 2015). Rather, we have framed the differences between Qugong and Bangga in the context of shifting cultural paradigms between the second and the first millennium BC, particularly in relation to subsistence and material craft traditions. We argue that the differences were primarily driven by regional diversities, as populations move fairly readily between distinct modes of subsistence, combining those different modes in a variety of innovative ways, as illustrated in other parts of Tibet (e.g. Zhang *et al.* 2019).

Conclusions

The emergence and development of agropastoralism on the Tibetan Plateau has recently received increased attention from archaeologists (Chen *et al.* 2015; d’Alpoim Guedes & Hein 2018). The results from our recent excavations at Bangga illuminate this line of inquiry, especially in Central Tibet. The architecture, material culture, zooarchaeological and archaeobotanical evidence from Bangga offers a detailed case study of settled agropastoralism in the first millennium BC, and illustrates innovations and continuities from earlier sites. Further questions remain regarding the seasonal regimes of pastoral mobility, and plant and animal management practices at Bangaa. To understand the seasonality inof the herding strategies, we are currently conducting sequential isotopic analysis of modern and archaeological sheep and goat tooth enamel from the site, as well as continuing archaeological survey and excavation at the prehistoric highland pastoral sites close to Bangga.

Acknowledgments

Archaeobotanical and zooarchaeological identification was conducted at Sichuan University. Special thanks to Ha Bibu, Qiangba Ciren, Jixiang Song, Feng Yang, Xiaowen Zhang, Mao Zhou, Fang Han, Zhen Zhao, Hailun Xu, Dan Zhao and Bangga villagers, who all contributed to the research of the Bangga site.

Funding statement

The fieldwork was jointly funded by Tibetan Autonomous Region Cultural Relic and Conservation Institute and Sichuan University. This research was also partially funded by Archaeological Research Program of the Tibetan Plateau Silk Road of Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China and Strategic Priority Research Program of the Chinese Academy of Sciences (grant XDA20040000). We would also like to acknowledge the National Science Foundation in supporting the flora and fauna studies and the isotopic analysis at the site under grants 1826727 (The Origins and Spread of Millet Cultivation) and 2017247 (Animal-based Subsistence Strategy in Prehistoric Central Tibet, 3000–2000 BP).

Supplementary material

To view supplementary material for this article, please visit XXX

References

- BAUER, K.M. 2004. *High frontiers: Dolpo and the changing world of Himalayan pastoralists*. New York: Columbia University Press. <https://doi.org/10.7312/baue12390>
- BRANTINGHAM, P.J. & G. XING. 2006. Peopling of the northern Tibetan Plateau. *World Archaeology* 38: 387–414. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00438240600813301>
- CASS (Chinese Academy of Social Science). 1992. Radiocarbon dating report 19. *Archaeology* 7: 655–62.
- 1996. Radiocarbon dating report:23. *Archaeology* 7: 66–70.
- 1999. *Qugong in Lhasa*. Beijing: Science Press.
- CASS & TARCRMC (Chinese Academy of Social Science & Tibet Autonomous Region Cultural Relics Management Committee). 1999. Changguogou Neolithic site in Gongga County, Tibet Autonomous Region. *Archaeology* 4: 1–19.
- CASS, TARCRCI, NBR & ZBR (Chinese Academy of Social Science, Tibetan Autonomous Region Cultural Relic and Conservation Institute, Ngari Bureau of Relics & Zanda Bureau of Relics). 2015. The Gurugyam cemetery and Chuvthag cemetery in Ngari Prefecture, Tibet Autonomous Region. *Archaeology* 7: 29–50.
- CHEN, F.H. *et al.* 2015. Agriculture facilitated permanent human occupation of the Tibetan Plateau after 3600 BP. *Science* 347: 248–50. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1259172>
- CHEN, W. 2015. *The East Foothill of the Qinghai-Tibet Plateau in the pre-Qin Period*. Beijing: Science Press.
- D’ALPOIM GUEDES, J. 2018. Did foragers adopt farming? A perspective from the margins of the Tibetan Plateau. *Quaternary International* 489: 91–100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2016.12.010>
- D’ALPOIM GUEDES, J. & A. HEIN. 2018. Landscapes of prehistoric northwestern Sichuan: from early agriculture to pastoralist lifestyles. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 43: 121–35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00934690.2018.1423830>
- D’ALPOIM GUEDES, J. & M. ALDENDERFER. 2019. The Archaeology of the early Tibetan Plateau: new research on the initial peopling through the Early Bronze Age. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 28: 339–392. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10814-019-09137-6>

- D'ALPOIM GUEDES, J., H. LU, Y. LI, R.N. SPENGLER, X. WU & M.S. ALDENDERFER. 2014. Moving agriculture onto the Tibetan plateau: the archaeobotanical evidence. *Archaeological and Anthropological Sciences* 6: 255–69. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12520-013-0153-4>
- D'ALPOIM GUEDES, J., H. LU, A.M. HEIN & A.H. SCHMIDT. 2015. Early evidence for the use of wheat and barley as staple crops on the margins of the Tibetan Plateau. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA* 112: 5625–30. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1423708112>
- DONG, G., X. JIA, C. AN, F. CHEN, Y. ZHAO, S. TAO & M. MA. 2012. Mid-Holocene climate change and its effect on prehistoric cultural evolution in eastern Qinghai Province, China. *Quaternary Research* 77: 23–30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yqres.2011.10.004>
- DONG, G., L. REN, X. JIA, X. LIU, S. DONG, H. LI, Z. WANG, Y. XIAO & F. CHEN. 2016. Chronology and subsistence strategy of Nuomuhong Culture in the Tibetan Plateau. *Quaternary International* 426: 42–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2016.02.031>
- DOUMANI, P.N. 2014. Bronze Age potters in regional context: long-term development of ceramic technology in the eastern Eurasian Steppe zone. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Washington University in St. Louis.
- Duan, K., T. Yao, N. Wang & L.G. Thompson. 2012. The unstable Holocene climatic change recorded in an ice core from the central Tibetan Plateau. *Sci Sin Terrae*, 42: 1441–1449.
- EERKENS, J.W. 2003. Residential mobility and pottery use in the western Great Basin. *Current Anthropology* 44: 728–38. <https://doi.org/10.1086/379262>
- ELSTON, R.G. & S.L. KUHN. 2002. *Thinking small: global perspectives on microlithization*. Arlington (VA): American Anthropological Association.
- FRACHETTI, M.D. 2012. Multiregional emergence of mobile pastoralism and nonuniform institutional complexity across Eurasia. *Current Anthropology* 53: 2–38. <https://doi.org/10.1086/663692>
- FRACHETTI, M.D. & A.N. MAR'YASHEV. 2007. Long-term occupation and seasonal settlement of eastern Eurasian pastoralists at Begash, Kazakhstan. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 32: 221–42. <https://doi.org/10.1179/009346907791071520>
- FU, D. 2001. Discovery, identification and study of the cereal grains at Changguogou site, Tibet Autonomous Region. *Archaeology* 3: 66–74.

- FULLER, D.Q. & M. ROWLANDS. 2011. Ingestion and food technologies: maintaining differences over the long-term in West, South and East Asia, in S. Sherrat, T.C. Wilkinson & J. Bennet (ed.) *Interweaving worlds: systematic interactions in Eurasia, 7th to 1st millennia BC*: 37–60. Oxford: Oxbow. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvh1dr2k.9>
- GOLDSTEIN, M.C. & C.M. BEALL. 1990. *Nomads of western Tibet: the survival of a way of life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- HE, K. 2015. Prehistoric cultures and subsistence of Haxiu site, Barkam County and discussions on the subsistence of Majiayao Type in the upper reach region of Min River. *Archaeology* 5: 72–82.
- HE, Q. 1994. A report on the investigation of the Neolithic sites in Changguogou, Gongga County, Tibet. *Journal of Tibetan Archaeology* 1: 1–29.
- JIA, P.W., A. BETTS, D. CONG, X. JIA & P.D. DUPUY. 2017. Adunqiaolu: new evidence for the Andronovo in Xinjiang, China. *Antiquity* 91: 621–39. <https://doi.org/10.15184/aqy.2017.67>
- LI, L. 2001. New archaeological discovery and preliminary analysis for the Bangga relics in Lhoka in the Neolithic Age. *Journal of Tibet University* 4: 10.
- LI, T., X. REN, Y. LIAO, D. MO, C. E, P. LU, J. XU, Y. WU & S. DU. 2020. Paleoenvironmental analysis of the middle reaches of Yarlung Zangbo River and Changguogou site. *Quaternary Science* 40: 547–55.
- LIU, X. *et al.* 2016. The virtues of small grain size: potential pathways to a distinguishing feature of Asian wheats. *Quaternary International* 426: 107–19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2016.02.059>
- LIU, X. *et al.* 2019. From ecological opportunism to multi-cropping: mapping food globalisation in prehistory. *Quaternary Science Reviews* 206 : 21–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quascirev.2018.12.017>
- LU, H. 2007. A report on the excavation of the Dingdong site in Ali, Tibet. *Archaeology* 11: 36–46.
- 2016. Colonization of the Tibetan Plateau, permanent settlement, and the spread of agriculture: reflection on current debates on the prehistoric archeology of the Tibetan Plateau. *Archaeological Research in Asia* 5: 12–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ara.2016.02.010>
- LUO, E. 2011. *Culture, society, ecology and population: a study on the stone-cist graves in the Qinghai-Tibetan Plateau*. Beijing: Science Press.

- MEYER, M.C., M.S. ALDENDERFER, Z. WANG, D.L. HOFFMANN, J.A. DAHL, D. DEGERING, W.R. HAAS & F. SCHLÜTZ. 2017. Permanent human occupation of the central Tibetan Plateau in the Early Holocene. *Science* 355: 64–67. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aag0357>
- MIEHE, G., S. MIEHE, K. KAISER, C. REUDENBACH, L. BEHRENDEN, L. DUO & F. SCHLÜTZ. 2009. How old is pastoralism in Tibet? An ecological approach to the making of a Tibetan landscape. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 276: 130–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.palaeo.2009.03.005>
- REIMER, P.J. *et al.* 2013. IntCal13 and Marine13 radiocarbon age calibration curves 0–50 000 years cal BP. *Radiocarbon* 55: 1869–87. https://doi.org/10.2458/azu_js_rc.55.16947
- RHOADES, R.E. & S.I. THOMPSON. 1975. Adaptive strategies in alpine environments: beyond ecological particularism. *American Ethnologist* 2: 535–51. <https://doi.org/10.1525/ae.1975.2.3.02a00110>
- SCHIFFER, M.B. 1990. The influence of surface treatment on heating effectiveness of ceramic vessels. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 17: 373–81. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-4403\(90\)90002-M](https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-4403(90)90002-M)
- SIMMS, S.R., J.R. BRIGHT & A. UGAN. 1997. Plain-ware ceramics and residential mobility: a case study from the Great Basin. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 24: 779–92. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jasc.1996.0160>
- SONG, J., H. LU, Z. ZHANG & X. LIU. 2018. Archaeobotanical remains from the mid-first millennium AD site of Kaerdong in western Tibet. *Archaeological and Anthropological Sciences* 10: 2015–26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12520-017-0521-6>
- WANG, Y. *et al.* 2005. The Holocene Asian monsoon: links to solar changes and North Atlantic climate. *Science* 308: 854–57. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1106296>
- WANGDUE, S. 2001. Investigation and excavation of the Neolithic site Bangga. *China's Tibet* 4: 2.
- WANGDUE, S. & L. KANG. 1986. *Qiongjie Wenwu Zhi*. Lhasa: Tibet Autonomous Region Cultural Relics Management Committee.
- XIE, D. 2002. *Prehistoric archaeology in Gansu and Qinghai Provinces*. Beijing: Cultural Relics.
- YI, X.L. *et al.* 2013. Microblade technology and the rise of serial specialists in north-central China. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 32: 213–223. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaa.2013.02.001>

ZHANG, X.L. *et al.* 2018. The earliest human occupation of the high-altitude Tibetan Plateau 40 thousand to 30 thousand years ago. *Science* 362: 1049–51.

<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aat8824>

ZHANG, Z., X. WANGDUI, H. LU. & D. N. SODNAM. 2015. Identification and interpretation of faunal remains from a prehistoric cist burial in Amdo County, northern Tibet. *Journal of Tibetology* 12: 1–18.

ZHANG, Z., Z. CHEN, F. MARSHALL, H. LÜ, X. LEMOINE, T. WANGYAL, T. DORJE & X. LIU. 2019. The importance of localized hunting of diverse animals to early inhabitants of the Eastern Tibetan Plateau at the Neolithic site of Xiaomenda. *Quaternary International* 529: 38–46.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2019.09.019>




Figure 1. The main prehistoric sites in Central Tibet discussed in the text.



Figure 2. View of the Bangga site on an alluvial terrace, facing north-east (photograph by Z. Zhang).




Figure 3. Stratigraphy of the Bangga site, north wall. L=layer; F=stone enclosure; H=pit. Calibrated radiocarbon dates (at 95.4% confidence) are presented with the layers (Photograph by H. Xu; dates calibrated using the IntCal13 calibration curve; Reimer et al. 2013).




Figure 4. Plan of the Bangaa site. Features within the stone enclosures were not drawn. F=Household; F2 overlays F5; F8 overlays F7 (photograph by H. Xu).




Figure 5. Calibrated radiocarbon dates for Bangaa (using Oxcal 4.3 and IntCal13 calibration curve; Reimer et al. 2013); F=stone enclosure; H=pit; L=layer; R=room; T=trench; Z=hearth. (Photograph by H. Xu)




Figure 6. Ceramics at Bangga (a–c), compared with Qugong Culture ceramics from the Changguogou site (d–f): a) late-phase red ceramics from Bangga; b) early-phase open-mouthed jar from Bangga; c) early-phase bowl from Bangga; d) surface-polished, open-mouthed jars collected from the surface at Changguogou; e) rim sherd of a surface-polished, ring-based jar collected from the surface at Changguogou; f) ring base collected from the surface at Changguogou. (Photograph by X. Chen, Z. Li and X. Zhang)




Figure 7. Early-phase stone tools from Bangga: a) millstones; b) stone weight; c) grinding stone; d) stone core; e) flake. (Photograph by Z. Li)

Table 1. Number of features discovered in the stone enclosures at Bangaa

Stone enclosure	Size (m ²)	Hearths	Postholes	Oval pits	Ash pits	Total
F1	52	3	167	64	44	278
F2	60	1	13	0	5	19
F3	7.8	0	7	0	1	8
F4	12.9	1	6	6	6	19
F5	68.8	0	1	0	1	2
F6	20	0	0	0	0	0
F7	64.4	1	37	20	4	62
F8	34.1	1	42	18	25	86
Total	320	7	273	108	86	474

Table 2. Domesticated grains from L13 & L14 and stone enclosures, from the 2015–2017 excavations at Bangga.

Taxa	Quantity	%
<i>Triticum aestivum</i>	16	5.8%
<i>Hordeum vulgare</i> var. <i>vulgare</i>	128	46.0%
<i>Cerealia</i>	134	48.2%
Total	278	100%

Table 3. Comparison of prehistoric sites in Central Tibet: Qugong, Changguogou and Bangga.

Site	Qugong (early phase)	Changguogou	Qugong (late phase)	Qugong (stone-cist burial phase)	Bangga (early phase)
Culture	Qugong	Qugong	N/A	N/A	N/A
Date	Approximately twentieth to thirteenth centuries BC	Sixteenth to ninth centuries BC	Around tenth century BC	Eighth to fifth centuries BC	Tenth to third centuries BC

Ceramic form	Open-mouthed jar; ring-based jar; lug on the handles absent	Open-mouthed jar; ring-based jar; lug on the handles absent	Open-mouthed jar; ring-based jar; lug on the handles present	Open-mouthed jar; bowls; lug on the handles present	Open-mouthed jar; bowls; lug on the handles present
Surface-polished ceramics (%)	22	N/A	N/A	N/A	4
Microbaldes	✓	✓	×	×	×
Crops	N/A	Barley; wheat; foxtail millet	N/A	N/A	Barley; wheat
Domesticated animals	Cattle or yak; sheep	N/A	N/A	N/A	Cattle or yak; sheep; goats
References	CASS 1992; 1999	He 1994; CASS 1996; CASS & TARCRMC 1999; Fu 2001; Liu <i>et al.</i> 2016; Lu 2016	CASS 1992; 1999	CASS 1992; 1999	This article