Unlike the Qing government, which tried to understand and record the customs of local residents during its conquest of frontier regions, the Ming government, differed insofar as it did not leave records done by the central government. Consequently, any understanding of the images and material culture produced by these regions is reliant on records of the later Dynasty. The archaeological discovery of the tombs of the Wang Xi family at Pingwu County, Sichuan Province, served as an archaeological curate’s egg: raising in turn many questions about provided good material for the history of the early Ming while they aroused questions synchronously. If we deal with this group of mortuary objects from a point of view, these mortuary artifacts can be distinguished from those recovered. We will find them being different with other objects from tombs in central China at dating from the same period.

Why are these archaeological findings so surprising? It is very likely due to the fact that we, consciously or not, often fall into the historical memories of central
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China, and these memories further intensify the domination of the central-plain culture as well as the blurred picture of frontier regions at that time. All of the above makes us feel. Hence, we are surprised at the by archaeological findings found in areas originating outside the central plain. In fact, empires in traditional studies have codified this presumption through a "top down" explanation, in which empires define a country tout court are believed to be the dominant forces that define the whole country. Local areas, especially where are not only geographically but also and situated inside the cultural frontiers—however, draw are typically marginalized as typifying the characteristics of the centre, having failed, according to the empire paradigm, to culturally evolve in their own right less scholarly contemplation and often have been simplified as the same as of the centre or as incivility as apposed to the contemporary practice. The sinicization model, which assumed presents a single civilizing vector directed from a China-based imperial centre toward distinct peoples at the margins. Colonization thereby equates to a unilateral process the authority and identity of the locals lost their egos and stayed unconcerned.

Liang Qichao, the a famous renowned scholar in the early Republic of China period, adopted a contrary stance, arguing that once mentioned, "local studies are extremely important when delving into the history of China, since the area of jurisdiction (of China) is too large and different provinces differ in a great deal when it comes to their respective development. The predecessors of Previous historical researchers have take-focused on the central government as their concentration, […], but China's historiography
studying the history of China is not supposed to go follow this path.

Normally, what we referred to as a certain era, or a certain level of development, comes from the metropolitan centre, yet most of the other parts of the country are not like that. If we want to have a comprehensive, in-depth picture of the whole, we have to go for separate local studies. Normally, what we referred to as the circumstance in China’s state of affairs is merely about encompasses its political center, rather than the country as a whole.

Therefore, it is necessary to conduct research do particular researches on the respective provinces. [...] Just put hard efforts, delve into the researches, and investigate By investigating the history, customs, and people of a local district, one shall make a significant academic contribution great achievements with lone work.

Comment [NPH3]: CHECK: I am aware that this lengthy quotation is a translation of a Chinese text, so I have edited it in the hope of not losing the original meaning.
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During its conquest of frontier regions, the Qing government endeavored to understand and record the customs of local residents. The Ming government differed insofar as it did not leave records done by the central government. Consequently, any understanding of the images and material culture produced by these regions is reliant on records from the later Dynasty. The discovery of the tombs of the Wang Xi family at Pingwu County, Sichuan Province, served as an archaeological curate’s egg; raising in turn many questions about the early Ming. Read in terms of central-plain-culture, these mortuary artifacts can be distinguished from those recovered from tombs in central China dating from the same period.

Why are these archaeological findings so surprising? It is very likely due to the fact that we, consciously or not, often fall into the historical memories of central China, and these memories further intensify the domination of the central-plain culture as well as the blurred picture of frontier regions at that time. Hence, we are surprised by archaeological findings originating outside the central plain. Traditional studies have codified this presumption through a "top down" explanation, in which empires define a country tout court. Local areas -- outside the capital and situated inside the cultural frontiers-- are typically marginalized as typifying the characteristics
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of the centre, having failed, according to the empire paradigm, to culturally evolve in their own right. The sinicization model presents a single civilizing vector directed from a China-based imperial centre toward distinct peoples at the margins. Colonization thereby equates to a unilateral process.

Liang Qichao, a renowned scholar from the early Republic, adopted a contrary stance, arguing that, "local studies are extremely important when delving into the history of China, since the area of jurisdiction (of China) is large and different provinces differ a great deal when it comes to their respective development. Previous historical researchers have focused on the central government, […], but China's historiography is not supposed to follow this path. Normally, what we referred to as a certain era, or a certain level of development, comes from the metropolitan centre, yet most of the country is not like that. If we want to have a comprehensive, in-depth picture of the whole, we have to go for separate local studies. Normally, what we refer to as China's state of affairs merely encompasses its political center, rather than the country as a whole. Therefore, it is necessary to conduct research on the respective provinces. […] By investigating the history, customs, and people of a local district, one shall make a significant academic contribution."4
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