

考古人类学理论导论

2023年春季学期

石涛
四川大学考古文博学院
stoneshitaotao@163.com

课程介绍:

本课程“考古人类学理论导论”主要为考古学理论的进阶学习，为已经有考古学基础的本科学生设计。本课程将从不同的角度探讨西方考古学理论的流派，并且对中国考古学的理论实践进行介绍。本课程涉及的范围可以分为四个单元：

1. 主要考古学流派
 - a. 早期考古学阐释
 - b. 文化历史主义
 - c. 过程考古学（新考古学）
 - d. 后过程主义
2. 考古学推理过程
 - a. 形成过程、中程理论与解释学
 - b. 民族学类比
3. 考古学理论研究专题
 - a. 古代科技研究
 - b. 身份认同研究
 - c. 考古学与历史
4. 中国考古学的理论与实践

课程目标:

使学生对现代考古学基本理论有大致地了解，并对当下考古学研究的方法有大致地了解。使学生对于考古学研究的范式有基本的判断能力。

授课形式、要求与评分规则:

本课程采用教师课堂讲授与学生讨论相结合的形式。课程要求学生参加所有的课程。教师会分发阅读材料给学生，并要求学生在上课时间进行报告，报告时间见课程大纲。

本课程的评分规则包括：

报告：35%

论文：35%

出席：20%

课堂讨论：10%

课程大纲:

第 1 周: 课程导论——考古学理论的重要性

[为什么要研究考古学理论? 考古学理论的重要性? 考古学理论是什么? 考古学理论的层次]

相关阅读材料:

布鲁斯·G·特里格 (Bruce G. Trigger) 著, 陈淳译:《考古学思想史》, 中国人民大学出版社 2010 年: 第 1 章 (1-34 页)。

马修·约翰逊 (Matthew Johnson) 著, 魏峻译:《考古学理论导论》, 岳麓书社 2005 年: 第 1 章: 1-13 页。

【单元 A】主要考古学理论流派

第 2 周: 早期考古学的阐释

[早期考古学阐释的模式是什么样的? 古物学研究的学术旨趣是什么? 考古学类型学是怎样发展起来的? 直线进化论在考古学中的应用是怎样的?]

相关阅读材料:

布鲁斯·G·特里格 (Bruce G. Trigger) 著, 陈淳译:《考古学思想史》, 中国人民大学出版社 2010 年: 第 2——5 章 (40-163 页)。

第 3 周: 文化—历史主义考古学

[什么是文化—历史主义考古学? 文化—历史主义考古学的发展历程是怎样的? 其特点是什么? 文化—历史主义考古学的理论基础是什么? 研究方法是什么? 文化—历史考古学的族属研究是怎样的?]

相关阅读材料:

布鲁斯·G·特里格 (Bruce G. Trigger) 著, 陈淳译:《考古学思想史》, 中国人民大学出版社 2010 年: 第 6 章 (165-238 页)。

第 4 周: 阅读报告

阅读文献:

1. 林沅:《为类型学正名(代序)》, 奥斯卡·蒙特留斯 (Oscar Montelius) 著、滕固译:《先史考古学方法论》, 商务印书馆 2019 年。
段天璟:《导读:〈先史考古学方法论〉与类型学中国道路的开端》, 奥斯卡·蒙特留斯 (Oscar Montelius) 著、滕固译:《先史考古学方法论》, 商务印书馆 2019 年。
2. 奥斯卡·蒙特留斯 (Oscar Montelius) 著、滕固译:《先史考古学方法论》, 商务印书馆 2019 年: 1-28 页。
3. 奥斯卡·蒙特留斯 (Oscar Montelius) 著、滕固译:《先史考古学方法论》, 商务印书馆 2019 年: 29-68 页。
4. 柴尔德著, 陈淳、陈洪波译:《欧洲文明的曙光》, 第 17-19 章、后记 (245-286

页)。上海三联书店。

5. Swartz, B. K., Jr. 1967. A logical sequence of archaeological objectives. *American Antiquity* 32 (4): 487-497.
6. Adams, William Y. 1979. On the argument from ceramics to history: a challenge based on evidence from Medieval Nubia. *Current Anthropology* 20 (4): 727-744.
7. David, Nicholas. 1988. Why pots are decorated. *Current Anthropology* 29 (3): 365-389.
8. Brumfiel, Elizabeth. 1994. Ethnic groups and political development in ancient Mexico. In *Factional competition and political development in the New World*, edited by E. M. Brumfiel and J. W. Fox, pp. 89-102. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
9. Sinopoli, Carla. 1991. Studying archaeological ceramics. In *Approaches to archaeological ceramics*, written by Carla M. Sinopoli, pp. 43-67. New York: Plenum Press.

第5周：过程主义考古学

[文化—历史主义考古学的问题在哪里？过程主义考古学的逻辑基础是什么？有什么特点？过程主义考古学的研究方法有什么发展和变化？]

相关阅读材料：

布鲁斯·G·特里格（Bruce G. Trigger）著，陈淳译：《考古学思想史》，中国人民大学出版社2010年：第7章，第8章部分（239-334页）。

马修·约翰逊（Matthew Johnson）著，魏峻译：《考古学理论导论》，岳麓书社：第2-5章（14-87页）。

第6周：阅读报告

阅读文献：

1. Hawkes, Christopher. 1954. Archaeological theory and method: some suggestions from the Old World. *American Anthropologist* 56: 155-168.
2. Binford, Lewis R. 1972[1962]. Archaeology as anthropology. In *An archaeological perspective*, pp. 20-32. New York: Seminar Press.
3. Conkey, Margaret W. 1991. Original narratives: the political economy of gender in archaeology. In *Gender at the Crossroads of knowledge: feminist anthropology in the postmodern era*, edited by M. di Leonardo, pp. 102-139. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
4. Child, V. Gordon. 1956[1936]. *Man makes himself*, chapter 6-7. London: Watts and company.
中文版本：戈登·柴尔德 著，安家瑗、余敬东译：《人类创造了自身》，第6-7章。上海：上海三联书店。
5. Binford, Lewis R. 1972[1968]. Archaeological perspectives. In *An archaeological perspective*, pp. 78-104. New York: Seminar Press.
6. Binford, Lewis R. 1965. Archaeological systematics and the study of culture process. *American Antiquity* 31 (2): 203-210.
7. Salmon, Merrilee H. 1976. "Deductive" versus "inductive" archaeology. *American Antiquity* 41 (3): 376-381.
8. Service, Elman R. 1962. *Primitive social organization: an evolutionary perspective*,

Chapter 5 “the social organization of chiefdoms.” New York: Random House.
或

9. Earle, Timothy. 1977. A reappraisal of redistribution: complex Hawaiian chiefdoms. In *Exchange systems in prehistory*, edited by T. K. Earle and J. E. Ericson, pp. 213-229. New York: Academic Press.
10. Brumfiel, Elizabeth M. 1992. Distinguished lecture in archaeology: breaking and entering the ecosystem – gender, class, and faction steal the show. *American anthropologist* 94: 551-567.

第7周：后过程主义考古学

[过程主义考古学的缺点是什么？后过程考古学的研究目标是什么？其主要研究内容是什么？]

相关阅读材料：

布鲁斯·G·特里格（Bruce G. Trigger）著，陈淳译：《考古学思想史》，中国人民大学出版社 2010 年：第 8 章部分、第 9 章（335-396 页）。

马修·约翰逊（Matthew Johnson）著，魏峻译：《考古学理论导论》，岳麓书社：第 6 章（102-118 页）。

第8周：阅读报告

阅读文献：

1. 伊恩·霍德尔著、徐坚译：《阅读过去》，第 1-3 章（1-63 页），第 6-8 章（91-174 页）。岳麓书社 2005 年。（2 部分，2 个小组）
2. Hodder, Ian. 1992. Symbolism, meaning and context. In *Theory and practice in archaeology*, by Ian Hodder, pp. 11-23. London: Routledge.
3. Hodder, Ian. 1992. Part 3 (The processual reaction; Towards radical doubt: a dialogue; The post-processual reaction; Towards a coherent archaeology). In *theory and practice in archaeology*, by Ian Hodder, pp. 145-182. （四篇文章，四个小组）
4. Hodder, Ian. 1992. The domestication of Europe. In *Theory and practice in archaeology*, by Ian Hodder, pp. 241-253. London: Routledge.
5. Cauvin, Jacques. 2000. The symbolic foundations of the Neolithic revolution in the Near East. In *Life in Neolithic farming communities: social organization, identity, and differentiation*, edited by Ian Kuijt, Chapter 10, pp235-252. New York: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
6. Parker Pearson, Mike. 1999. *The archaeology of death and burial*, Chapter 2 (21-44) and Chapter 4 (73-94). College Station: Texas A&M University Press.
7. Pauketat, T. R. and Emerson, T. E. 1991. The ideology of authority and the power of the pot. *American Antiquity* 93: 919-941.
8. Joyce, Rosemary A. 2000. Chapter 1. In *Gender and power in prehispanic Mesoamerica*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
9. Watkins, Trevor. 2004. Architecture and ‘theaters of memory’ in the Neolithic of Southwest Asia. In *Rethinking materiality: the engagement of mind with the material world*, edited by Elizabeth DeMarrais, Chris Gosden, and Colin Renfrew, pp. 97-106. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, University of Cambridge.
10. Gamble, Clive. 2004. Materiality and symbolic force: a Paleolithic view of sedentism.

In *Rethinking materiality: the engagement of mind with the material world*, edited by Elizabeth DeMarrais, Chris Gosden, and Colin Renfrew, pp. 85-95. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, University of Cambridge.

11. Review feature: Yoffee's *Myths of the archaic state*. *Cambridge archaeological journal* 15 (2): 251-268, 2005.

【单元 B】考古学推理过程——阅读+评论

第 9 周：形成过程、中程理论与解释学

阅读文献：

1. Schiffer, Michael B. 1972. Archaeological context and systemic context. *American Antiquity* 37(2): 56-65.
2. Schiffer, Michael B. 1985. Is there a "Pompeii Premise" in archaeology? *Journal of Anthropological Research* 41: 18-41.
3. Schiffer, Michael B. 1983. Toward the identification of formation processes. *American Antiquity* 48(4): 675-706.
4. Binford, Lewis R. 1983[1981] Middle-Range research and the role of actualistic studies. In *Working at archaeology*, pp. 411-422. New York: Academic Press.
5. Binford, Lewis R. 1983[1978] Dimensional analysis of behavior and site structure: learning from an Eskimo hunting stand. In *Working at archaeology*, pp. 287-324. New York: Academic Press. [Original: *American Antiquity* 43 (3): 330-361.]
6. Hodder, Ian. 1992. The Haddenham causewayed enclosure – A hermeneutic circle. In *Theory and practice in archaeology*, by Ian Hodder, pp.213-240. New York: Routledge.
7. Kosso, Peter. 1991. Method in archaeology: middle-range theory as hermeneutics. *American antiquity* 56(4): 621-627.

第 10 周：民族志类比

阅读文献：

1. Ascher, Robert. 1961. Analogy in archaeological interpretation. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 17 (4): 317-325.
2. Binford, Lewis R. 1972[1967]. Smudge pits and hide smoking: the use of analogy in archaeological reasoning. In *An archaeological perspective*, pp. 33-51. New York: Seminar Press.
3. Schrire, Carmel. 1980. Wild Surmises on savage thoughts. In *Past and present in hunter gatherers studies*, edited by Carmel Schrire, pp. 1-25. Orlando: Academic Press.
4. Wylie, Alison. 1985. The reaction against analogy. *Advances in archaeological method and theory* 8: 63-111. Michael B. Schiffer, ed. Orlando: Academic Press.
5. Solomon, Anne. 2008. Myths, making and consciousness: differences and dynamics in the San Rock Arts. *Current Anthropology* 49(1):59-86.
6. Gillespie, Susan D. and Rosemary A. Joyce. 1997. Gendered goods: the symbolism of Maya hierarchal exchange relations. In *Women in prehistory: North America and Mesoamerica*, edited by Cheryl Claassen and Rosemary A. Joyce, pp. 189-207. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
7. Gilman, Patricia A. 1987. Architecture as artifact: pit structure and pueblos in the American Southwest. *American Antiquity* 52(3): 538-564.

【单元 C】考古学理论研究专题

第 11 周：古代科技研究

[古代科技研究主要包含哪几方面的内容？各种不同材质的遗物如何分类？怎样研究遗物的制作技术？技术、人群行为习惯和社会的互动关系怎样进行研究？]

相关阅读材料：

Miller, Heather. 2007. *Archaeological approaches to technology*. Burlington (MA): Academic Press.

第 12 周：阅读报告

阅读文献：

1. Lemonnier, Pierre. 1986. The study of material culture today: toward an anthropology of technical systems. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 5: 147-186.
2. Lemonnier, Pierre. 1993. Introduction. In *Technological choices: transformation in material cultures since the Neolithic*, edited by Pierre, Lemonnier, pp. 1-35. London: Routledge.
3. Zuckerman, Sharon, David Ben-Shlomo, Penelope A. Mountjoy, Hans Mommsen. 2010. A provenance study of Mycenaean pottery from Northern Israel. *Journal of archaeological science* 37: 409-416.
4. Arnold, Jeane E. 2011. Technological decision making: fused shale tool production in California. *North American Archaeologist* 32: 15-48.
5. Costin, Cathy L. 1991. Craft specialization: Issues in defining, documenting, and explaining the organization of production. In *Archaeological method and theory*, Vol.3, edited by Michael B. Schiffer, pp. 1-56. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
6. Dobres, Marcia-Anne and Christopher R. Hoffman. 1994. Social agency and the dynamics of prehistoric technology. *Journal of archaeological method and theory* 1 (3): 211-258.
7. Eerkens, Jelmer W. and Robert L. Bettinger. 2001. Techniques for assessing standardization in artifact assemblages: can we scale material variability? *American antiquity* 66 (3): 493-504.
8. Hagstrum, Melissa B. 1985. Measuring prehistoric ceramic craft specialization: a test case in the American Southwest. *Journal of field archaeology* 12 (1): 65-75.
9. Hastrum, Melissa B. 2001. Household production in Chaco Canyon society. *American Antiquity* 66 (1): 47-55.
10. Inomata, Takeshi. 2001. The Power and Ideology of Artistic Creation: Elite Craft Specialists in Classic Maya Society. *Current Anthropology* 42(3): 321-349.
11. Goodby, Robert G. 1998. Technological patterning and social boundaries: ceramic variability in southern New England, A.D. 100-1675. In *The archaeological of social boundaries*, edited by Miriam Stark, pp. 161-182. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.
12. Kenoyer, Jonathan M. Massimo Vidale and Kuldeep Kumar Bhan. 1991. Contemporary stone beadmaking in Khambhat, India: patterns of craft specialization and organization of production as reflected in the archaeological record. *World archaeology* 23 (1):44-63.

13. Longacre, William A., Kenneth L. Kyamme and Masashi Kobayashi. 1988. Southwestern pottery standardization: an ethnoarchaeological view from Philippines. *Kiva* 53 (2): 101-112.
14. Peregrine, Peter N. 1991. Some political aspects of craft specialization. *World archaeology* 23 (1): 1-11.
15. Pfaffenberger, Brian. 1992. Social anthropology of technology. *Annual review of anthropology* 21: 491-516.

第 13 周：考古学中的身份认同研究

[考古学中的身份认同包括哪些？对古代族属的研究方法包括哪些？怎样理解本体论和工具论？对于考古学材料所体现的性别差异该如何理解？是否可以通过考古学研究古代儿童、同性恋、残疾人等的社会生活？]

相关阅读材料：

希恩·琼斯著，陈淳、沈辛成译：《族属的考古》，上海古籍出版社 2017 年。
林嘉琳、孙岩主编：《性别研究与中国考古学》。北京：科学出版社 2006 年。

第 14 周：阅读报告

阅读文献：

1. 王明珂：《华夏边缘：历史记忆与族群认同》，第一部分（7-95）、第四部分（321-406）。台北：允辰丛刊 1996 年。
2. Margaret W. Conkey and Janet D. Spector. 1984. Archaeology and the study of gender. *Advances in Archaeological method and theory* 7: 1-38.
3. Joan M. Gero. 1985. Socio-politics and the woman-at-home ideology. *American Antiquity* 50: 342-350.
4. Joyce, Rosemary A. 2000. Chapter 6. In *Gender and power in prehispanic Mesoamerica*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
5. Bernardini, Wesley. 2005. Reconsidering spatial and temporal aspects of prehistoric cultural identity: a case study from the American Southwest. *American Antiquity* 70 (1): 31-54.
6. Holly, Donald H. Jr. 2005. The place of “others” in hunter-gatherer intensification. *American Anthropologist* 107(2): 207-220.
7. Papadopoulos, John K. 2000. Skeletons in well: towards an archaeology of social exclusion in the ancient Greek world. In *Madness, disability and social exclusion: the archaeology and anthropology of “difference”*, edited by J. Hubert, 96-118. London and New York: Routledge.
8. Gilchrist, R. 2000. *Gender and archaeology: contesting the past*. London and New York: Routledge. (Chapter 1, 3, 4, 5, 6)
9. Tubb, Jonathan N. 2000. Two examples of disability in the Levant. In *Madness, disability, and social exclusion: the archaeology and anthropology of difference*, edited by Jane Huber, pp. 81-86. London and New York: Routledge.
- Jeffreys, D. and John Tait. 2005. Disability, madness, and social exclusion in the ancient Greek world. In *Madness, disability, and social exclusion: the archaeology and anthropology of difference*, edited by Jane Huber, pp. 87-95. London and New York: Routledge.
10. Meskell, Lynn L. 1995. Goddess, Gimbutas and “New Age” archaeology. *Antiquity* 69: 74-86.

11. Meskell, Lynn L. 1998. An Archaeology of Social Relations in an Egyptian Village. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 5: 209-243.
12. Lyons, D. 1998. Witchcraft, gender, power and intimate relations in Mura compounds in Dela, northern Cameroon. *World archaeology* 29: 344-362.
13. 郭立新:《墓葬情境分析与身份标识:以博罗横岭山墓地为例》,《中山大学学报(社科版)》2006年第5期。
14. Green, M. J. 1997, Images in opposition: polarity, ambivalence and liminality in cult representation. *Antiquity* 71: 898-911.

延伸阅读:

林永昌:《晋系墓葬性别的考古学研究》,北京大学硕士学位论文,2008年。

Baxter, Jane E. 2005. *Archaeology of childhood: children, gender and material culture*. Walnut Creek: Altamira Press.

王明珂:《羌在汉藏之间》。台北:联经出版公司2003年。

第15周:物质与文字

[物质与历史的关系?怎样研究古代的历史?世界各地对于历史(包括口述史)的考古学研究有什么相同和不同之处?]

相关阅读材料:

Andrén, Anders. 1998. *Between artifacts and texts: historical archaeology in global perspective*. New York: Plenum.

【单元D】中国考古学的理论实践——阅读+评论

第16周:考古学文化、类型学与景观

(1) 考古学文化、陶器分类与地层学

1. 俞伟超:《关于考古地层学问题》,《考古学是什么》,第1-47页,北京:中国社会科学出版社1996年。
2. 严文明:《考古学遗址的发掘方法》,《考古学研究(二)》,第249-266页。北京:北京大学出版社。
3. Renfrew and Bahn 2008. Where? Survey and excavation of sites and features. In *Archaeology: Theories, Methods, and Practice*, pp. 73-120. Thames and Hudson, London. The section on excavation. (中文版)
4. 夏鼐:《关于考古学文化的定名问题》,《考古》1959年第4期:169-172页。
苏秉琦:《陕西省宝鸡县斗鸡台发掘所得瓦鬲的研究》,《苏秉琦考古学论述选集》,第91-136页。北京:文物出版社。
5. 苏秉琦、殷玮璋:《关于考古学文化的区系类型问题》,《文物》1981年第5期:10-17页。
苏秉琦、殷玮璋:《地层学与器物形态学》,《文物》1982年第4期:1-7页。
俞伟超:《关于考古类型学问题》,《考古类型学的理论与实践》,第1-35页。北京:文物出版社。
6. 严文明:《考古资料整理中的标型学研究》,《考古与文物》1985年第4期:30-40页。

7. 邹衡：《夏商周考古学论文集》。北京：文物出版社。

比较视野：

Adams, William Y., and E. Adams. 1991. *Archaeological typology and practical reality: a dialectical approach to artifact classification and sorting*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

(2) 聚落与景观：

1. 张光直著，胡鸿保、周燕译：《考古学中的聚落形态》，《华夏考古》2002年第1期。
2. Wu, Hung 2002. Rethinking Warring State cities: an historic and methodological proposal. *Journal of East Asian archaeology*, 3(1): p. 237-257.
3. 陈星灿、刘莉等：《中国文明腹地的社会复杂化进程——伊洛河地区的聚落研究》，《考古学报》2003年第2期。
4. 叶斐、李旻：《王权、城市与国家：比较考古学视野中的中国早期城市》，《多维视域——商王朝与中国早期文明研究》，荆志淳等编。北京：科学出版社 2009年：276-290页。
5. 许宏：《曲阜鲁国故城遗址再研究》，《先秦城市考古学研究》，北京：燕山出版社 2000年：171-186页。
6. 石家河考古队：《石家河遗址调查报告》，《南方民族考古》第5辑：213-294页。
7. Underhill, Anne, et al. 2008. Changes in regional settlement patterns and the development of complex societies in southeastern Shandong, China. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 27(1): 1-29.
8. 严文明：《我与考古学》，《走向21世纪的考古学》，第191-229页。西安：三秦出版社。

比较视野：

1. Blanton, R. E. 1983. *Ancient Mesoamerica*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Barker, G. 1996. Regional archaeological projects: trends and traditions in Mediterranean Europe. *Archaeological Dialogues* 3(2): 160-75.
2. Smith Monica 2003. Introduction. In Monica Smith (ed.), *The social construction of ancient cities*, pp. 1-36. Smithsonian Books, Washington, DC.
3. Marcus, Joyce and Jeremy A. Sabloff 2008. *The Ancient City*. School for Advanced Research Press, Santa Fe, NM.

第17周：社会结构与权力

(1) 墓葬与社会结构：

1. 北京大学历史考古教研室：《元君庙仰韶墓地》。北京：文物出版社 1983年。
2. 汪宁生：《仰韶文化葬俗和社会组织的研究——对仰韶母系社会说及其方法论的商榷》，《文物》1987年第4期。
3. Pearson, Richard. 1988. Chinese Neolithic burial patterns: problems of method and interpretation. *Early China* 13: 1-45.
4. Kim, S.O. et al. 1994. Burials, pigs, and political prestige in Neolithic China. *Current Anthropology* 35 (2): 119-141.
5. Fung, Christopher. 2000. The drinks are on us: ritual, social status, and practice in Dawenkou burials, North China. *Journal of East Asian Archaeology* 2 (1-2): 67-92.

6. 罗泰:《中国北方氏族共同体的个案研究(约前 800-450 年)》,《宗子维城——从考古材料的角度看公元前 1000 至前 250 年的中国社会》。上海:上海古籍出版社 2017 年。
7. 宿白:《唐永泰公主墓发掘简报》,《文物》1964 年第 1 期。
《唐懿德太子墓发掘简报》,《文物》1972 年第 7 期。
《唐章怀太子墓发掘简报》,《文物》1972 年第 7 期。

比较视野:

1. O'Shea, John M. 1996. Villagers of the Maros: A Portrait of an Early Bronze Age Society. Plenum, New York.
2. Parker Pearson, M. 2000. The Archaeology of Death and Burial. Texas A&M, College Station.
3. Morris, Ian. 1992. Death-Ritual and Social Structure in Classical Antiquity. Key themes in ancient history. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
4. Conkey, Margaret W. and Janet Spector 1984. Archaeology and the study of gender. In Archaeological method and theory 7:1-38. Academic Press, New York.

(2) 文字、艺术与权力

1. 罗泰:《引论》,《宗子维城——从考古材料的角度看公元前 1000 至前 250 年的中国社会》,第 1-27 页。上海:上海古籍出版社。
2. Wu Hung 1992. Art in its Ritual Context: Rethinking Mawangdui. *Early China* 17: 111-45.
3. 张光直:《美术、神话与祭祀》。辽宁教育出版社 2002 年。
4. Flad, Rowan. 2008. Divination and Power: A multiregional view of the development of oracle bone divination in early China. *Current Anthropology* 49 (2): 403-437.
5. 李旻《重返夏墟:社会记忆与经典的发生》,《考古学报》2017 年第 3 期: 287-316 页。

扩充阅读:

1. Lai, Guolong. 2002. The Baoshan tomb: Religious transitions in art, ritual and text during the Warring States. PhD dissertation, UCLA.
2. Andrén, Anders. 1998. Between Artifacts and Texts: Historical Archaeology in Global Perspective. New York: Plenum.