James Mellon MENZIES was born on January 23, 1885 in the Canadian town of Clinton, Ontario. From 1903 to 1907 he studied engineering at the University of Toronto, and worked as a land surveyor after his graduation. However, after just a short time he decided to become a missionary. He attended the Presbyterian divinity school, where he studied Hebrew and Greek. After graduating from the seminary in 1910, he was sent to China as a missionary. Upon his arrival in China, he was first stationed in Wu’an 武安 in northern Henan, and then in 1912 was transferred to Anyang 安陽, where he was stationed long-term. In 1913, he married Annie Belle MENZIES, with whom he had four children, the second of whom, Arthur (1916-2010), would go on to become the Canadian ambassador to China from 1976 to 1980.

Fig. 12: Left: Wedding picture of James Mellon MENZIES and Annie Belle MENZIES; Right: Arthur MENZIES (1916-2010)
In 1917, with the entry of Canada into World War I, Menzies was drafted into the Canadian army and dispatched to France, where he served as an interpreter for the Chinese Labour Corps. The great majority of Chinese workers in the Chinese Labour Corps came from Shandong; they were sent from Tianjin across the Pacific to British Columbia, and then sent by train across Canada, before finally crossing the Atlantic to reach France. This experience further solidified Menzies’ relationship with China, and he would develop a special relationship with Shandong in later decades. In 1921, he returned to China, once again stationed in Anyang, where he would remain for another six years. In 1927, at the time of the Nationalist government’s Northern Expedition, the unsettled conditions in north China made it impossible for Menzies to continue his missionary work in Anyang; his only recourse was to go to Peiping (Beijing), where he received an appointment as an instructor in the North China Union Language School. In 1929, he returned to Canada for a year of home leave, during which time he also traveled to Jerusalem to study archaeology. In 1930, he again returned to Anyang, where he lived for another two years. Just at this time the Institute of History and Philology of Academia Sinica was conducting archaeological excavations at the village of Xiaotun 小屯 near Anyang. Since Menzies’ home was quite near the village, he was a frequent visitor to the excavation site and became well acquainted with most of the archaeologists; he became especially good friends with DONG Zuobin 董作賓 (1895-1963). In all, Menzies lived in Anyang and its vicinity for nearly twenty years. However, in 1932 he moved to Jinan 濟南, Shandong, where he was appointed to be a professor at that city’s Cheeloo University 齊魯大學, where, teaching in Chinese, he taught oracle-bone inscriptions and archaeology. He was also instrumental in establishing the university’s museum, most of the original artifacts coming from Menzies’ personal collection. In 1937, he again returned to Canada, expecting to be there for just one year. However, just as he was to return to China, the Japanese army occupied northern China, making it impossible for Menzies to return. Stranded in Canada, he enrolled once again in the University of Toronto, studying with the famous missionary and Sinologist William Charles WHITE (1873-1960), who had been the Anglican bishop of Henan. In 1941, Menzies submitted a doctoral dissertation entitled “The Bronze Age Culture of China,” but it was not approved. The following year, he re-submitted just the second half of this thesis, now entitled “Shang Ko,” and was awarded a Ph.D.1 This thesis proposed a typology for the 177 Shang-dynasty ge 戈 dagger-axes in the collection of

---

1 This doctoral dissertation was published posthumously as Shang Ko: A Study of the Characteristic Weapon of the Bronze Age in China in the Period 1311-1039 B.C. (Toronto: Royal Ontario Museum, 1967).
the Royal Ontario Museum. Unfortunately, Menzies’s relationship with Bishop White soured and he determined not to remain in Toronto after his graduation. With World War II raging, he went to the United States, where he worked, first in San Francisco and then later in Washington, as a China specialist in the Office of Information. At the end of the war, Menzies retired to Toronto, suffering from heart disease. He died on March 16, 1957, never having been able to return to China.

Shortly after Menzies arrived in Anyang in 1912, he was riding on his white horse in the near-by village of Xiaotun when he saw children of the village digging in the ground. Asking the children what they were doing, he was told that they were digging for “dragon bones.” From this moment, he too began collecting oracle bones. In 1917, he published the first fruits of his collecting activities: *Oracle Records from the Waste of Yin* (200110), which included 2,369 pieces. In 1920, when he returned to Anyang from his war service in France, he continued his missionary work, but now devoted himself more and more to his archaeological and paleographic interests. Between 1924 and 1927, he purchased a great many oracle bones, many of which were included in a book that he published in 1928: *Yinxu buci houbian* 殷墟卜辭後編 (Latter edition of Yinxu divination statements). The years from 1930 to 1932, when he moved to Jinan to take up his professorship at Cheeloo University, coincided with the archaeological work conducted by the Institute of History and Philology. We know from Dong Zuobin’s reports, that in addition to the official archaeological excavations going on at this time, private individuals continued to dig in the vicinity, and Menzies presumably also continued to collect oracle bones. Whether he continued to do so after his move to Jinan is hard to say, but he amassed a very considerable collection. According to calculations by HU Houxuan 胡厚宣 (1911-1995), Menzies’s collection totaled 31,516 pieces, which were subsequently dispersed to four separate institutions: 2,390 pieces went to the Nanjing Museum, 8,168 pieces entered the Shandong Provincial Museum, 20,364 pieces went to the Palace Museum in Beijing, and 5,170 went with Menzies to the Royal Ontario Museum in Toronto, though another five pieces are in the Art Gallery of Greater Victoria in Victoria, Canada. Menzies had intended to take his entire collection back to China, in 1947 writing to his son: “How I would have liked to finish my work in Cheeloo, if it only meant handing

---


4 See *Chinese Art from the Rev. Dr. James M. Menzies Family Collection* (Victoria, British Columbia: The Art Gallery of Greater Victoria, 1989).
things over to the university in a proper way, so that archaeology would have its settled place in the curriculum of studies. 5 Unfortunately, with the establishment of the People’s Republic of China in 1949, with which Canada did not have any formal diplomatic relations, it was not possible at that time to fulfill Menzies’ wish. After his death in 1957, his family sold the pieces he had in Canada to the Royal Ontario Museum, which finally published them in 1972 and 1977 as The Menzies Collection of Shang Dynasty Oracle Bones, Volume I: A Catalogue (201120) and The Menzies Collection of Shang Dynasty Oracle Bones, Volume II: The Text (201320). These two volumes were edited by James Chinchsiung HSÜ 許進雄, who was concurrently working on his Ph.D. at the University of Toronto and also serving as curator at the Royal Ontario Museum. In addition to these two volumes, Hsü also edited a new edition of Menzies’ Yinxu buci houbian, which he published in Taiwan in 1972.6

James Menzies is best known for his collecting activities, but this was not his only contribution to the study of oracle bones. Not only did he establish the museum of Cheelloo University, but he also published articles in virtually every issue of that university’s scholarly journal, the Qilu daxue jikan 齊魯大學季刊, from his “Shangdai wenhua” 商代文化 (Shang culture) in the first issue to the fifth issue’s “Zhongguo gudai zhi shangdi” 中國古代之上帝 (Ancient China’s god), written just before he left China in 1936. In his book Jiagu yanjiu chubian 甲骨研究初編 (First edition of studies of oracle bones),7 published in 1933, he provided a comprehensive account of the history of oracle-bone collecting from their first discovery in 1899 until the beginning of scholarly excavations in 1928, said by WANG Yuxin 王宇信 to be the “most accurate, complete and authoritative” account of these activities.8 More than this, Menzies also offered his own research on the genealogy of the Shang kings, which was virtually identical to that offered by GUO Moruo 郭沫若 (1892-1978) in his famous book Buci tongzuan 卜辭通纂, which was published in the same year. After his return to Canada in 1936, even though Menzies received a Ph.D., it proved difficult for him to continue to do research on oracle-bone inscriptions. He left behind a large number of unfinished studies:9

“Introduction to the Study of Oracle Bones” (1934 draft)
“The Genealogy of Kings and Queens of Shang Dynasty” (1934 printed)

9 For this listing, see DONG, Cross Culture and Faith, p. 195.
“Later Collection of Oracle Records from the Waste of Yin” (n.d.; “ready for publication”)
“A Comparative Study of All the Extant Oracle Bone Sentences” (1936; “in process”)
“The Wars of the Shang Dynasty in the Oracle Bones” (1935; “research partially done”)
“The Shapes of Shang Dynasty Vessels” (1935; “materials collected”)
“The Early Art of China” (1935; draft)
“A Dictionary Index of the Characters in the Oracle Records from the Waste of Yin” (card index completed)
“A Translation with Commentary of the Oracle Records from the Waste of Yin” (commentary incomplete)
“The Religious Conception of the Shang Dynasty” (1936; in process)

In addition to these scholarly studies, he did complete a card catalog index to characters in oracle-bone inscriptions, which however was never published. In his jiaguxue tonglun (Comprehensive discussion of oracle-bone studies), Wang Yuxin provided the following appraisal of James Menzies’ contributions to oracle-bone studies:

Menzies pioneered the use of archaeological methods to explore the periodization of oracle bones, by which he obtained important results. It is unfortunate that this great contribution of his has been largely forgotten, which is unjust.10

From his arrival in China in 1910, James Menzies devoted his entire life to China. In fact, even after his death, his family members continued this dedication to China and Chinese studies. In 1957, they sold his collection of oracle bones to the Royal Ontario Museum in Toronto, using the proceeds of the sale to establish a fellowship for students of Chinese studies in Canada. What is more, in 1999, his descendants donated his personal library, including his personal notes and manuscripts to Shandong University, the successor institution to Cheeloo University, where he had taught, and in the year 2000, FANG Hui, professor of archaeology at Shandong University, published a detailed account of Menzies’s life.11

10 WANG Yuxin, Jiaguxue tonglun, p. 159.
Paul L-M SERRUYS, C.I.C.M. (1912-1999)

Paul L-M SERRUYS, C.I.C.M. was born on November 19, 1912, in the village of Heule-Watermolen in West Flanders, Belgium. In 1931, after graduating from the Catholic university of Louvain, he and his brother Henry SERRUYS, C.I.C.M. (1911-1983) entered the seminary of the order of Congratio Immaculati Cordi Mariae; he was ordained as a priest in 1936. The next year, he was sent as a missionary to China, first studying Chinese for one year in Beijing, and then in 1938 going to the village of Xicetian 西冊田 in northern Shanxi province (halfway between Datong 大同 and Hunyuan 渾源). In 1943, he was arrested by the Japanese army, and was interned for half a year in a Japanese concentration camp in Shandong. He spent the period from August, 1943 until the end of the war under house arrest in Beijing. With the end of the war, he returned to Shanxi, this time to the village of Zhangguantun 張關屯, where he lived for two years. From 1947 until 1949, he studied at Furen University 輔仁大學 in Beijing. However, with the establishment of the People’s Republic of China in 1949, all Belgian missionaries were withdrawn from the country, so that Serruys was compelled to return home. Afterwards, both he and his brother Henry were sent by their order to the United States for graduate study, Henry going to Columbia University in New York where he studied Mongolian, and Paul going to the University of California at Berkeley, where he studied ancient Chinese philology with Peter BOODBERG (1903-1972), Y.R. CHAO 趙元任 (ZHAO Yuanren; 1892-1982), CH’EN Shih-hsiang 陳世驤 (CHEN Shixiang; 1912-1971) and Wolfram EBERHARD (1909-1989). He completed his Ph.D., in 1956, with a dissertation on the Han-dynasty text Fangyan 方言; it was
formally published three years later as *The Chinese Dialects of Han Time According to Fang Yen* (100480). In 1962, he was appointed as professor of Chinese at Georgetown University in Washington, D.C., moving in 1965 to the University of Washington in Seattle, where he would remain until his mandatory retirement in 1981. After retiring from the University of Washington, Serruys went to Taiwan for four years, working at the Institute of History and Philology of Academia Sinica. However, at the end of this time, he returned to the United States for a number of years, before finally returning to Belgium in 1994. He passed away in August, 1999, while living at the C.I.C.M. retirement home at Kessel-lo, on the outskirts of Louvain. He was 87 years old.

Serruys middle school curriculum included mandatory courses in French, German, Greek and Latin. In addition, he grew up in the Flemish speaking part of Belgium, and always thereafter insisted on the importance of Flemish. Given this linguistic background, it is not surprising that during his time as a missionary in Shanxi he was particularly interested in dialects, or that his doctoral dissertation should be on this topic. It was not until he began teaching at Georgetown University in the mid-1960s that he first turned his attention to excavated texts. He himself joked that his interest in oracle-bone inscriptions was entirely a matter of chance. In 1970, the *Journal of Asian Studies* was looking for someone to review the book *Der Kult der Shang-Dynastie im Spiegel der Orakelinschriften: Eine paläographische Studie zur Religion im archaischen China* by CHANG Tsung-tung,¹ and he was the only paleographer who could read German. He published a short review in the *Journal of Asian Studies* (201130), but then two years later published a second, much longer review in the journal *T’oung Pao*: “Studies in the Language of the Shang Oracle Inscriptions” (201210; 1974). This was presented as a book review, but it was essentially Serruys’s own research on oracle-bone inscriptions. It included at least two major innovations in the reading of these inscriptions. First, Serruys for the first time argued that oracle-bone inscriptions should be read as statements, and not as questions. This has been accepted by virtually all western scholars of oracle bones, as well as by many of the leading scholars in China. Second, he pointed out the modal use of the particle *qi 其* in oracle-bone inscriptions, arguing that in paired inscriptions of the reign of King Wu Ding it invariably appears on the side of the pair that is not desired. These two insights marked a great breakthrough in the reading of oracle-bone inscriptions, and should be regarded as the most important western contributions to their study.

Throughout his life, Paul Serruys published only very rarely, and the studies that he did publish were never very easy to read or understand. However, they were invariably filled with insightful explanations of ancient Chinese. What is more, in the 1960s and 1970s, he trained a cohort of students at the University of Washington who would go on to be the leading scholars in various fields of Chinese linguistics and paleography; these included Ting Pang-hsin 丁邦新, Gilbert MATTOS (1939-2002), Ken-ichi TAKASHIMA 高嶋謙一 (see the brief biography appended to this chapter), W. South COBLIN and Axel SCHUESSLER.

David Noel KEIGHTLEY was born on October 25, 1932 in London, England, the son of an English mother and an American father, for which reason he had American citizenship. After the conclusion of the Second World War, the family returned to America, where Keightley completed his high school education at Evanston High School in the suburbs of Chicago. He then attended Amherst College, graduating in 1955. The following year, he earned an M.A. in Modern European History from New York University. Thereafter, from 1956 to 1962 he worked as an editor in the publishing world of New York.

Having decided to study Chinese history, in 1962 he entered the graduate school of Columbia University. He originally intended to study modern Chinese history, but midway through his studies he decided to change his focus to ancient history. This was spurred in large part by the book *Oriental Despotism* by Karl A. WITTFOGEL (1896-1988),¹ which at that time was a topic of vigorous debate among western Sinologists. It was Wittfogel’s thesis that the Ancient Near Eastern states (Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Persia), as well as India and China were “hydraulic societies,” in which the masses of people were pressed by the state into great hydraulic projects. In large measure, Keightley’s doctoral dissertation, “Public Work in Ancient China: A Study of Forced Labor in Shang and Western Chou” (201030; 1969), was a response to this thesis. From 1965 to 1966, Keightley

went to Taiwan to study. While there he met CHAO Lin 趙林, who was a graduate student at the University of Chicago, working on his own dissertation entitled “Shang Government” (201110; 1972), which was based in large part on Shang oracle-bone inscriptions. It was from Chao that Keightley learned the basics of oracle-bone studies. When he returned to the United States to write his own dissertation, he based himself on Shang oracle-bone inscriptions and Western Zhou bronze inscriptions to refute Wittfogel’s main thesis. In his abstract, Keightley stated: “It should be noticed that the large-scale mobilization of labor for warfare and agriculture, and the existence of a proto-bureaucracy to administer it, far precedes any hydraulic role by the government. Historical reasons, rather than the theories of the geographical determinists, explain the development of Shang public work and its continuance by the Chou. The survival of both dynasties, surrounded by hostile tribes, depended upon strong military forces, which in turn required efficient manpower conscription and weapons production. The Shang were the first group to organize their subjects in this way because they were the first group in China to possess the indispensable bureaucratic tool—a written language.”2 After completing his dissertation in 1969, Keightley accepted an appointment as professor of ancient Chinese history at the University of California at Berkeley, where he would continue to work for almost thirty years, focusing throughout on oracle-bone inscriptions and Shang history.

Different from most American scholars, Keightley did not immediately publish his doctoral dissertation. He said that in order to understand fully the major historical issues, it was necessary first to make explicit the historiographical premises. Because of this, he spent the first decade of his career at Berkeley studying the basic questions of oracle-bone studies. Finally in 1978 he published his monumental Sources of Shang History: The Oracle-Bone Inscriptions of Bronze Age China (201490), which provided a comprehensive introduction to the field. This book was David Keightley’s most important work, a model of scholarship that has served as the foundation for virtually all subsequent western study of Shang oracle-bone inscriptions.3 After publishing Sources of Shang History, over the next decade or so Keightley went on to publish at least one major article almost every year, the contents

covering virtually every topic in Shang history, including religion (“The Religious Commitment: Shang Theology and the Genesis of Chinese Political Culture” [201470; 1978], geography (“The Late Shang State: When, Where, and What?” [201910; 1983], archaeology (“Archaeology and Mentality: The Making of China” [202220; 1987], technology (“Craft and Culture: Metaphors of Governance in Early China” [202350; 1989], and many more. During this time, some of his articles were also translated into Chinese and published in Chinese scholarly journals, such as “Zhongguo zhi zheng shi zhi yuanliu: Shang wang zhanbu shifou yiguan zhengque” 中國之正史之源流: 商王占卜是否一貫正確 (The origin of China’s standard histories: Were the Shang king’s divinations always correct?), published in 1986 in the journal Guwenzi yanjiu 古文字研究 (Paleographic studies), “Cong kaogu qiwu kan Zhongguo siwei shijie de xingcheng” (Using archaeological artifacts to see how the Chinese intellectual world formed) published in 1988 in the journal Zhongguo wenhua yu Zhongguo zhexue 中國文化與中國哲學 (Chinese culture and Chinese philosophy), and “Zhongguo gudai de jiri yu miaohao” 中國古代的吉日與廟號 (Ancient Chinese lucky days and temple names) published in 1989 in the inaugural issue of the journal Yinxu bowuyuan yuankan 殷墟博物院院刊 (Bulletin of the Yin museum). Despite this, most of Keightley’s scholarship is still largely unknown to Chinese readers.

Fig. 13: David Keightley attending the 1984 “Yinxu bihui” at Anyang, flanked by the great oracle-bone scholars HU Houxuan 胡厚宣 (l.) and ZHANG Zhenglang 張政烺 (r.)

During just the three years from 1999 to 2001, in the prime of his career Keightley published a number of important scholarly works, including “Shamanism, Death, and the Ancestors: Religious Mediation in Neolithic and Shang China (ca. 5000-1000 B.C.)” (203090; 1999); “The Shang: China’s First Historical Dynasty” (203100; 1999), which was a chapter in The Cambridge History of Ancient China; “Theology and the Writing of History: Truth and the Ancestors in the Wu Ding Divination Records” (203110; 1999); “At the Beginning: The Status of Women in Neolithic and Shang China” (203070; 1999); The Ancestral Landscape: Time, Space, and Community in Late Shang China (ca. 1200-1045 B.C.) (203160; 2000); “The Diviners’ Notebooks: Shang Oracle-Bone Inscriptions as Secondary Sources” (203270; 2001); and “The ‘Science’ of the Ancestors: Divination, Curing, and Bronze-Casting in Late Shang China” (203280; 2001). Unfortunately, just at this time, he began to have health problems, which influenced his ability to work. Nevertheless, he persevered, and after nearly ten years of work, in 2012 published the book Working for His Majesty: Research Notes on Labor Mobilization in Late Shang China (ca. 1200-1045 B.C.), as Seen in the Oracle-Bone Inscriptions, with Particular Attention to Handicraft Industries, Agriculture, Warfare, Hunting, Construction, and the Shang’s Legacies (203780), which on the one hand was the formal publication of his doctoral dissertation more than forty years earlier, but on the other hand also marked the culmination of his life’s work.

Aside from his own scholarship, David Keightley made many other contributions to western Sinology. Certainly the most important of these contributions was the journal Early China, which he founded in 1975 and of which he served as the first editor. Early China has earned the respect of all western scholars, and to a great extent this is due to the efforts of David Keightley. In addition to Early China, Keightley was also a dedicated reviewer of the works of others, publishing nearly a score of important book reviews, in all of which he displayed the highest standards of scholarly criticism.4

---

Ken-ichi TAKASHIMA 髙嶋謙一 was born in 1939 in Tokyo, Japan. He attended Sophia University in Tokyo, studying Chinese, English and German, as well as comprehensive phonology. After two years there, he transferred to the University of Washington in the United States, where he received B.A. (1965), M.A. (1967), and Ph.D. degrees (1973). His Ph.D. dissertation was entitled “Negatives in the King Wu-ting Bone Inscriptions” (201160). Even before he had completed his Ph.D. degree, he already began teaching, in 1971 being appointed to teach in the East Asian Languages department of the University of Arizona. In 1973, he transferred to the University of British Columbia in Vancouver, Canada, where he would remain throughout his career, except for several years (1985-1989) when he had a concurrent appointment at the Institute of Oriental Culture (東方文化研究所) at the University of Tokyo 東京大學. In 1989, he was promoted to full professor at both institutions. In 2014 he retired from the University of British Columbia, returning to Japan, where he has continued his research.

Takashima published his first scholarly article in 1977, and almost every year since then has published lengthy studies of linguistic issues concerning oracle-bone inscriptions. He has intensively studied the oracle bones discovered in June 1936 in pit YH 127 at Anyang, all of which date to the reign of the Shang king Wu Ding. During the 1950s and 1960s, scholars at the Institute of History and Philology of Academia Sinica made great efforts in reconstructing the original turtle plastrons, piecing together the 17,000 fragments into which these plastrons had broken, publishing a series of catalogs entitled Xiaotun: Yinxu wenzi, Bingbian 小
Takashima has argued that what makes the inscriptions on these plastrons particularly valuable for scholarly research is that they all stem from a single period of time, and thus can represent the linguistic usage of that single time, which can then serve as a benchmark for subsequent changes in the language. Throughout his career, he has been steadfastly interested in the morphology of the oracle-bone inscriptions, particularly the negatives and also the particle qi 其. In this he has been heavily influenced by the work of his teacher Paul L-M SER- 
RUYS (1912-1999, see the brief biography appended to this chapter), but he has also developed these ideas much further. In 1981, upon his retirement from teaching at the University of Washington Serruys went to Taiwan, where he began to translate Xiaotun: Yinxu wenzi, Bingbian. However, when, in 1985, he was forced to discontinue this project because of health issues, Takashima agreed to complete it. According to his own account, he had already submitted a preliminary draft of the translation to the Institute of History and Philology in 1988, and in 1990 that Institute agreed to publish it. However, due to various reasons, this translation was finally published only twenty years later as Studies of Fascicle Three of Inscriptions from the Yin Ruins (203730; 2010). This finished translation incorporated substantial revision from the original draft, all the work of Ta-
kashima himself. Nevertheless, he very generously retained Fr. Serruys’s name as co-author.

Takashima visited mainland China for the first time in 1981, to attend the conference of the Association for the Study of Chinese Paleography. At this conference, he presented a paper entitled “Wen ‘ding’ 問「鼎」 (Asking about ‘cal-
dron’; later published in English as “Settling the Cauldron in the Right Place: A Study of 鼎 in the Bone Inscriptions” [202230; 1987]), which was subsequently published in the journal of the association, Guwenzi yanjiu 古文字研究 (Paleo-
graphic studies).² From this time on, he frequently visited China, and has been a visiting professor at both East China Normal University 華東師範大學 and Anhui University 安徽大學. In 2005, together with ZHANG Deshao 張德劭 of East China Normal University, he co-edited the handbook Jiaguwen jin yi leijian (Han Ying 
duizhao) 甲骨文今譯類檢 (漢英對照) (A conspectus of modern translations of


oracle-bone inscriptions [Chinese and English compared]). After this, in 2013 Anhui University Press published a four-part collection of translations of Takashima’s own studies: *Anhui daxue Han yuyan wenzi yanjiu congshu: Gaodao Qianyi juan* 安徽大學漢語言文字研究叢書: 高嶋謙一卷 (Anhui University collectanea of studies on Chinese linguistics and writing: Takashima Ken-ichi volume). The studies in this collection are divided into four major topics in Oracle-Bone Studies: “Methodology,” “Syntax and Grammar,” “Etymology and Word Roots,” and “Copulas and Other Words and Culture.” The contents provide a good summation of Takashima’s scholarship over the preceding forty years (here listed according to the titles of the original English-languages publications):

Part One: Oracle-Bone Studies: Methodology

“Toward a More Rigorous Methodology of Deciphering Oracle-Bone Inscriptions” (203180; 2000)
“How to Read Shang Oracle-Bone Inscriptions: A Critique of the Current Method” (203460; 2004)
“Placement of Inscriptions on Oracle-Bone Plastrons as a Guide to Decipherment” (203490; 2005)
“The Use of the Synchronic Evidence Method: Reconstructing the Shang Mat- ing Sacrifice”

Part Two: Oracle-Bone Studies: Syntax and Grammar

“An Emphatic Verb Phrase in the Oracle-Bone Inscriptions” (202310; 1988)
“On the Quantitative Complement in Oracle-Bone Inscriptions” (202000; 1984)
“The Structure of Words with 「乍」 and with 「史」 Components”
“Morphology of Negatives in Oracle-Bone Inscriptions” (202320; 1988)

Part Three: Oracle-Bone Studies: Etymology and Word Roots

---

3 GAODAO Qianyi 高嶋謙一 (TAKASHIMA Ken-ichi) and ZHANG Deshao 張德劭 ed., *Jiaguwen jin yi leijian (Han Ying duizhao)* 甲骨文今譯類檢（漢英對照） (Guizhou: Guangxi Jiaoyu chubanshe, 2005).
“A Few Morphological Functions of the Suffix *-s in Shang Chinese” (203850; 2013)
“Jisi 祭祀: A Reconstruction of the Ji Sacrifice and the Si Ritual in Ancient China” (203690; 2009)
“Etymology and Palaeography of the Yellow River hé 河” (203800; 2012)
“Two Competing Interpretations: Cóng 从 or Bi 比 in Oracle-Bone Inscriptions” (203910; 2014)

Part Four: Oracle-Bone Studies: Copulas and Other Words and Culture

“A Study of the Copulas in Shang Chinese” (202500; 1990)
“Some Ritual Verbs in Shang Texts” (203380; 2002)
“The Graph  in Shang Oracle-Bone Inscriptions” (203550; 2006)
“The Graph for the Word ‘Time’ in Zhou Bronze Inscriptions” (303050; 2006)
“Literacy to the South and East of Anyang in Shang China: Zhengzhou and Daxinzhuang” (203770; 2011)