The ancient Chinese classics from prehistory, per Xiao Qi's comment on Wang Jia's *Shi-yi-ji* (Records of Collected Extant Heritage), were written on the jades wrapped by the golden threads, and inscribed using the **bird-scratch-style characters** and **worm-crawl-style characters**, with characters' shape and their underscoring pronunciation mutating along the way of dissipation as a result of the rise and fall of ancient ruling and dynasties.

(晋)王嘉《拾遗记》(梁)[萧绮]录曰：书契之作，肇迹轩史，道朴风淳，文用尚质。降及唐、虞，爰迄三代，世祀遐绝，载历绵远。列圣通儒，忧乎道缺。故使玉牒金绳之书，虫章鸟篆之记，或秘诸岩薮，藏于屋壁；或逢丧乱，经籍事寝。**前史旧章，或流散异域。故字体与俗讹移，其音旨随方互改。**历商、周之世，又经嬴、汉，简帛焚裂，遗坟残泯。详其朽蠹之余，采捃传闻之说。是以“己亥”正于前疑，“三豕”析于后谬。子年所述，涉乎万古，与圣叶同，摘文求理，斯言如或可据。

1) Starting the Forgery Topic from *Guan-zi* (管子轻重篇新诠 By 马非百) to "*Guo Yu*"(《国语》) to YI ZHOU ZHU 《逸周书》 etc

"New Interpretation of the 'Light vs Heavy' Chapter in Guan-zi" 管子轻重篇新诠 By 马非百

Ma Feibai's rebuttal as to the authenticity of the "chapter on light and heavy" in Guan Zhong's book, "*Guan-zi*" (管子轻重篇新诠 By 马非百).

Check out the first 1-4 pages of the said book as to why Ma Feibai thought this book was pretentiously named after *Guan-zi* (《管子》) of the 7th century B.C. Ma Feibai's conclusion was that this book was written by someone from Xin (new) Dynasty, in-between Western Han Dynasty and Eastern Han Dynasty, at the turn of B.C.-A.D., in another word. (Or more likely, *Guan-zi* was being modified during Xin Dynasty.)

On basis of Ma Feibai's research, we could soundly discard the only sentence linking the misnomer Yu-shi (禺氏) to the jade trade, as well as the annotations by the later historians such as Yi Zhizhang in extrapolating on who the misnomer Yu-shi (禺氏), that the faked Guan-zi (《管子》) statement would have implied, would be.

《管子·揆度》尹知章 注：“ 禺氏 ， 西北戎名，玉之所出。”

(Or Yuzhi ['愚知'] in Zhou King Muwang's fictional travelogue, *Mu-tian-zi*: 己亥，至于焉居愚知之平。)

See **http://imperialchina.org/Barbarians.htm** for this webmaster's thorough debunking of the ancient myths.

Ancient Chinese scholars had tried for thousands of years to ascertain the real classics from the fake ones. Someone on http://www.chinahistoryforum.com (with various threads including

http://www.chinahistoryforum.com/index.php?/topic/13682-tarim-mummies-and-the-introduction-of-chariots/page__st__45) brought up the topic as to who wrote "*Guo Yu*"(《国语》) , and when it was written. Other than the question about "*Guo Yu*"(《国语》) , there was the perpetual discussion on the contents of the hallmark Chinese classics "*SHANG SHU*" (《尚书》), all because of the book burning.

The ancient consensus was that it was done by Zuo Qiuming (Zuoqiu Ming). Some ancient scholars, who looked at the book through the lens of the same stories as carried in "*Zuo-shi Spring & Autumn*" (《左氏春秋》) versus "*Guo Yu*"(《国语》) , concluded that "*Guo Yu*"(《国语》) was wrong, and both books could not be authored by the same persons. The recent historians of the doubt ancient clique had disputes about "*Guo Yu*"(《国语》) as well, but the main focus of the doubt ancient school was on the hallmark Chinese classics "*SHANG SHU*" (《尚书》), i.e., The Remote Ancient Book, not on "*Guo Yu*"(《国语》) -- which was used by communist China's Xia-Shang-Zhou Gap Reign Year Project for ascertaining the year Zhou King Wuwang overthrew the Shang dynasty. The general consensus was that Zuo Qiming had basically bundled up the "wasted films" from "*Zuo-shi Spring & Autumn*" (《左氏春秋》) to make into a "reference" or encyclopedic book called "*Guo-wu*" (《国语》) . From the ancient times, the two books were called by the opposite juxtaposition of an "inner" compendium versus an "outer" compendium, meaning "*Zuo-shi Spring & Autumn*" (《左氏春秋》) was pivoted from the Lu Principality inwardly, while "*Guo-wu*" (《国语》) was pivoted towards the rest of the principalities in an outward way. This was a simplistic compromise. This webmaster would say that "*Guo-wu*" (《国语》) was some kind of sophistry book from the Warring States time period, which was an attempt at copycatting the book "*Zuo-shi Spring & Autumn*" (《左氏春秋》). The copycatting efforts were something to be applauded, though, and is much better than the contexts in another book called "*Zhan Guo Ce*" (《战国策》) , namely, the Warring States Strategies --a sophistry book that was compiled by Liu Xin and Liu Xiang in the late Western Han Dynasty. This webmaster would say the two books "*Guo-wu*" (《国语》) and "*Zhan Guo Ce*" (《战国策》) had some common source of materials or authors. From Sima Qian, we could see some initial bundling of the similar Warring States sophistry materials that were equated to "*Guo-wu*" (《国语》) , and after one century of the Han dynasty's book collection and recompiling efforts, more abundant materials were collected and bundled into "*Zhan Guo Ce*" (《战国策》) . This appeared to be the case about both "*Guo-wu*" (《国语》) and "*Zhan Guo Ce*" (《战国策》) .

"*Zuo-shi Spring & Autumn*" (《左氏春秋》) was upheld as the standard history text, a book that was built on top of the Lu Principality historical chronicle called *Spring & Autumn*" (《春秋》). There was of course dispute about the real author for the book "*Zuo-shi Spring & Autumn*" (《左氏春秋》), with different versions of authors as either Zuoqiu Ming or Zuo Qiuming. At the very beginning, the book was simply called by "Zuo" or "Zuo-shi". There was a similar abridgment for the other double-character clan names, such as

"Ji-shi" for "Ji-sun-shi" clan in the contents of "*Zuo-shi Spring & Autumn*" (《左氏春秋》) --which interestingly contained some double-character surnames for the Qi Principality ministers, like Liangqiu and Lvqiu etc. Qi minister Lvqiu Ming had the the almost same given name as Zuoqiu Ming, if "Zuoqiu" was a double character surname at all. The full name of Zuoqiu Ming, as a double character surname, was seen in the books compiled by Confucius' disciples, mostly the Warring States time period writings, like hundreds of years after Confucius' death. That is, the disciples, following the extravagant writing styles of the Warring States sophists, were developing their imagination to the utmost, with the most dubious writings to do with the purported Confucius' role in the execution of a fake Lu minister called Shaozheng Mao, plus some made-up story about the Confucius entourage' being under the joint siege of the Chen-guo and Cai-guo lords --at a time when the Cai-guo state had already relocated to Zhoulai to seek protection with the Wu state.

In comparison with **YI ZHOU ZHU** 《逸周书》, ***Guo-yu*** **(**《国语》**) appeared to be more accurate than YI ZHOU ZHU** 《逸周书》 **which was said to be some leftover chapters from *Shang-shu*** **(**《尚书》**)**, or the sub-components or the purported "wasted films" (i.e., 《逸周书》etc.) of *Shang-shu*《尚书》 [since *Shang-shu*《尚书》, as discussed below, had been lost and went through forgery when recompiled]. B**efore Qin Emperor Shihuangdi's book burning, there was no real-sense forgery in the Chinese classics**. The writings like "*Guo-wu*" (《国语》) and "*Zhan Guo Ce*" (《战国策》) were just of the Warring States sophistry style, and perhaps some innocent mistake in taking the Warring States fable stories as granted, such as from *Zhuang-zi* (庄子) and *Lie-zi* (列子) [if both or one of the two books were not in the full book shape till the Han dynasty yet]. The forgeries came about in the middle or later Western Han Dynasty, with YI ZHOU SHU(《逸周书》) and SHANG1 SHU (《商书》) being the prime suspects . Throughout the history, some of the forgeries became the standard text, and hence was re-inserted back into the history books during subsequent re-compilation and re-substantiation whenever dynastic substitution led to the destruction of imperial libraries.

-Now, we do have a brilliant example to show how the Warring States sophists, sorcerers or philosophers made up the things from the thin air or the from the electron hole. That would be the book *Mu-tian-zi* (《穆天子》). As far as Zhou King Muwang's fictional travelogue, *Mu-tian-zi* (《穆天子》) *is concerned*, we should said that it was written in perhaps the 4th century B.C.E. as a fiction in the first place, not as history, and that it was the later people who mistook it as real history and then spent lifetime efforts on debating its authenticity - about the book itself and about the contents of the book. The confusion derived from its incidental discovery together with THE BAMBOO ANNALS - the only non-tainted history book of ancient China. This webmaster's point is that should *Mu-tian-zi* (《穆天子》) be a total fiction, what else could be in a similar boat?

Similar to Ma Feibai's rebuttal of *Guan-zi*, we could say that *Yi-zhou-sh*u or *Zhou-sh*u 《逸周书》 was a made-up by the later Chinese writer(s). I found the style of writing as well as the citation to be extremely similar. We could safely discard the statement in *Yi-zhou-shu* or *Zhou-shu* 《逸周书》 as to claims of specialty product like the horses from Yu-shi, i.e., 屠州黑豹，禺氏騊駼, as well as its citation of another forged book, *Shang-[dynasty-]shu* (《商书·伊尹朝献》), which claimed that in the 16th century B.C. around, you had the incredible list of barbarian tribes and vassals (as seen in Han Emperor Wudi's time, 140-87 B.C.E.) coming to Shang China's capital to pay tributes. See the statement for an exhaustive list of alien and barbarian tribes including Yuezhi: 正北空同、大夏、莎车、姑他、旦略、豹胡、代翟，匈奴、楼烦、月氏、□戠犁、其龙、东胡，请令以橐驼、白玉、野马、騊駼、駃騠、良弓为献。.(We could certainly discard the notation on *Yi-zhou-shu* by later historian such as Kong Chao since the base on which the notation was made was a forgery in the first place: 《逸周书·王会》孔晁 注：“ 禺氏 ， 西北戎夷。)

--Whether or not *Yi-zhou-sh*u or *Zhou-sh*u 《逸周书》was forged by the same person as the forged *Guan-zi* (《管子》) is not important. What's important is the demarcation of events prior to the Hun-Yuezhi War of the 3rd century B.C.E. or after the the Hun-Yuezhi War. (For the topic on Yuezhi, refer to http://imperialchina.org/indx.shtml#Yuezhi)

Another word about Ma Feibai (管子轻重篇新诠 By 马非百). Apparently Ma Feibai was not interested in ascertaining the truth about the jade trade, and hence he merely rebutted the authenticity of the book *Guan-zi* without rebutting the 'Yu-shi jade' statements made in the said book. He concurred with Wang Guowei, on pages 11-18, that Yuezhi, before moving on to today's Afghanistan, must have dwelled near Qiemo and Yutian (Khotan). We could not blame him for failure to rebut the jade trade matter since he was living under Mao's communist China, enduring persecutions during the cultural revolution and having limited information on the 'Central Asia' studies going on outside of China. (The Yuezhi people Wang Guowei was referring to would be probably the Lesser Yuezhi, not the Greater Yuezhi who moved to today's Afghanistan through Ili.)

Ma Feibai, however, correctly pointed out on page 18 that Mt Kunlun, the Khotan jade, etc., did not get talked about in China till after the return of Zhang Qian's trip to Central Asia. --I could not discern whether Zhang Qian had the imperial order to trace the origin of the Yellow River, but what Zhang Qian did on his return trip, was to have taken the Khotan route and he very likely did trace the Tarim (Ye-er-qiang) and Khotan rivers. (The ancient Chinese, from the time the book *Yu-gong* [《禹贡》, Lord Yu's Tributes] was written, as well as in the timeframe of the 4th century B.C.E when they authored the book of *Shan Hai Jing* (《山海经》, Book of the Mountains and Seas), had shown extreme interest in the origin of the Yellow River but always had the false view that some river from the Pamirs had disappeared into the Kumtag Desert to flow invisibly under the ground and re-appeared as the source of water for the Yellow River. YU GONG, which was a book that preceded all the geography books, only talked about the desert and the Yellow River, with

no linkage of a so-called Kunlun mountain and the the water of the Yellow River at all; and furthermore, the characters 'kunlun' appeared to be a tribal name, not a mountain name. ER YA, a later dictionary-nature book, had the mythical land of the Kunlun mountain.)

.

2) Yi-zhou-shu (《逸周书》)

The reason that *Yi-zhou-shu* or *Zhou-shu* 《逸周书》 could be a made-up by the later Chinese, probably at about the same time as the forged *Guan-zi* (《管子》), is that the contents in regards to the barbarian and alien tribes and states could not have existed earlier than Han Emperor Wudi's campaigns. It was said to be the sub-components or the purported "wasted films" (i.e., 《逸周书》etc.) of *Shang-shu*《尚书》when Confucius (551-479 B.C.E.) left out those contents. See Liu Xiang's comment below:

刘向：“周诰誓号令也，盖孔子所论百篇之余也。”

The book *Zhou-shu* 《周书》, however, did get cited by other pre-Qin works such as *Zuo-zhuan*《左传》, *Guo-yu*《国语》, *Mo-zi*《墨子》, and *Zhanguo-ce*《战国策》etc., either as ***Zhou-shu*** 《周书》**or *Zhou-zhi*** 《周志》.

《史记·苏秦传》: “苏秦乃闭室不出，出其书偏观之……于是得《周书》、《阴符》，伏而读之。”

《汉书·艺文志·书类》：“《周书》七十一篇，周史记。” (颜师古注说：“今之存者，四十五篇”。)

《新唐书·艺文志》: “《汲冢周书》十卷。” (*disputed by Wang Yinglin*)

(唐)刘知几: “时有浅末恒说，滓濊相参，殆似后之好事者所增益”（《史通·六家》）。

《宋史·艺文志》: “《汲冢周书》十卷，晋太康中于汲冢得之。孔晁注。”

(宋)王应麟《困学纪闻》：“《周书》，《隋》、《唐志》系之汲冢，而《束晳传》及《左传正义》引王隐《晋书》所载竹书之目无《周书》，然则系于汲冢误矣。”

清《四库全书总目》：“《晋书·束晳传》载竹书75篇，具有篇名，无所谓《周书》。”

(清)朱右曾《逸周书集训校释序》: “此书虽未必果出文、武、周、召之手，要亦非战国秦汉人所能伪托。何者?庄生有言：圣人之法，以参为验，以稽为决，一二三四是也。周室之初，箕子陈畴，《周官》分职，皆以数记，大致与此书相似：其证一也。《克殷篇》所叙，

非亲见者不能；《商誓》、《度邑》、《皇门》、《芮良夫》诸篇，大似今文《尚书》，非伪古文所能仿佛：其证二也。称引是书者，苟息、狼晖、魏绛，皆在孔子前：其证三也。”

In *Han-shu* (《汉书·艺文志·书类》), there was a reference to the existence of *Zhou-shu* 《周书》, but those chapters were later lost. Later, in the tomb excavation during the Jinn Dynasty, from that of Wei Principality King Xiangwang (?-296 B.C.E.), ten chapters of *Zhou-shu* 《周书》were found together with *the Bamboo Annals* (《竹书纪年》) and *Zhou King Muwang's Legends*(《穆天子》), which came to be known as *Yi-zhou-shu* 《逸周书》, i.e., the extant version of *Zhou-shu*. Wang Yinglin, however, disputed the Ji-zhong tomb excavation to have contained any chapters of *Zhou-shu* among the 75 bamboo chapters from Wei King Xiangwang's era (?-296 B.C.E.)

The most likely scenario could be what Yan Shigu stated during Tang Dynasty, namely, by Tang Dynasty, there existed 45 chapters of *Zhou-shu*, with possible recompiling on top of materials from the Ji-zhong tomb excavation. Liu Zhiji from Tang Dynasty succinctly pointed out that **the later 'trouble-maker' scholars could have added to the original *Zhou-shu* book**, yielding to what this webmaster said earlier as to the fallacy of Shang China or Zhou China's contacts with the barbarian and alien tribes and statelets which were only known to China at the time of Han Emperor Wudi.

In the opinion of Lu Xun who cited Han Dynasty scholar Ying Shao, **the "original" *Zhou Shu* was a pure fiction** similar to what Han Dynasty writer Yu Chu did to the book *Yu-chu* (《虞初》). However, Lu Xun, after checking into **the "modern" *Zhou Shu***, which was from King Xiangwang's Ji-zong tomb, said that **four chapters (《克殷》《世俘》《王会》《太子晋》) sounded like fiction whereas the rest of the chapters appeared non-fictional**. That is, the widely-cited chapter "*Wang Hui*" (《王会》, i.e., King's gathering of vassals) was a fiction, meaning whatever the talk on the horses of Yu-shi (禺氏), as well as the misnomer Yuezhi (月氏) as cited in *Shang-[dynasty-]shu* (《商书·伊尹朝献》), was fictional, as well.

Guo Moruo claimed that only two to three chapters in YI ZHOU SHU were credible, including SHI FU. Manchu Qing Dynasty scholar Zhu Youceng pointed out that another chapter of YI ZHOU SHU, namely, KE YIN (conquering the Shang dynasty), could be ancient. Note that even though the SHI FU section of YI ZHOU SHU carried the dates that conformed with WU-CHENG in regards to Zhou King Wuwang's conquest of Shang, and even though Edward Shaughnessy believed in SHI FU carrying some archaic language, it did not mean SHI FU of YI ZHOU SHU was as ancient as WU-CHENG. Similarly, even though MU-TIAN-ZI ZHUAN carried the non-disrupted calendrical sexagenary dates for Zhou King Muwang's off-road travel lasting one to two years, it did not mean the king actually travelled to the Kumtag desert and the Blackwater Lake.

Comment by Lu Xun: "汉应劭说，《周书》为虞初小说所本，而今本《逸周书》中惟《克殷》《世俘》《王会》《太子晋》四篇，记述颇多夸饰，类于传说，余文不然。至汲冢所

出周时竹书中，本有《琐语》十一篇，为诸国卜梦妖怪相书，今佚，《太平御览》间引其文；又汲县有晋立《吕望表》，亦引《周志》，皆记梦验，甚似小说，或虞初所本者为此等，然别无显证，亦难以定之。"

In deed, in the latter part of Zhou Dynasty, there was a flurry of activities by scholars of the Hundred Schools of Thoughts in the authoring of various philosophical works. The typical philosophical book, such as *Zhuang-zi* (庄子) and *Lie-zi* (列子), appeared to be hypothetical but were later taken as historical truth.

The Ji-zong Tomb Excavation:

《晋书·武帝纪》：咸宁五年（279）冬十月"汲郡人不准掘魏襄王冢，得竹简小篆古书十余万言。"《晋书·束晳传》："其《纪年》十三篇，记夏以来至周幽王为犬戎所灭，以事接之，三家分，仍述魏事至安釐王之二十年。……《琐语》十一篇，诸国卜夢妖怪相书也。……《穆天子传》五篇，言周穆王游行四海，见帝台、西王母。……又杂书十九篇：《周食田法》、《周书》、《论楚事》、《周穆王美人盛姬死事》。"

.

3) More on the Fallacy of the Yuezhi Jade Trade & the Aryan Bearer of the Chinese Civilization

Now comes the interesting writing by someone from Mt Qilianshan area, with no name shown.
http://www.cc.ccoo.cn/webdiy/558-77179-17983/newsshow.asp?id=77179&cateid=663802&nid=805696
What this author did was to use the comprehensive evidence from the Chinese classics to prove that Mt Kunlun, in ancient China, meant for Mt Qilianshan, with Kunlun meaning magnificent and heavenly, which the later Huns called by a similar name in their term, i.e., Qilian, a word meaning 'Heaven'. Everything we had talked about in regards to the Queen Mother of the West could be found at the Qilian Mountain.

This author further pointed out that Qilian did not get recorded in China till Sima Qian's Shi-ji, and Huan-nan-zi, an earlier book which shared similar style with *Shan Hai Jin*g, had no such term. Yan Shigu of Tang Dynasty pointed out that Qilian=Heaven.
"祁连"一词最早见于司马迁《史记》中，而稍早于《史记》的刘安的《淮南子》中尚无此词。颜师古云"匈奴谓天为祁连"，匈奴语"祁连"和汉语"昆仑"语义相同。

Of course, this author did not read Ma Feibai's rebuttal, and hence continued the statement about Yu-shi and the Jade trade in citing the forged records of Guan-zi and Shang-[dynasty-]shu:

《管子•轻重乙》"玉出于禺氏之旁山"。

So the conclusion is that the ancient Chinese, at the time of B.C.-A.D. turn, made up some

books using the terminology as available to them after Han Dynasty defeated the Huns and extended influence to the western territories. The records about Yu-shi (禺氏) and the jade was made up. The traditional Chinese records talked about the Queen Mother of the West and her jade tributes to the Sinitic China. More, physics/chemistry research already shown, as detailed at http://www.cc.ccoo.cn/webdiy/558-77179-17983/newsshow.asp?id=77179&cateid=663802&nid=805696, that the Shang Dynasty jades were related to the jade mine at Mt Qilianshan, i.e., the ancient Kunlun Mountain.(For the topic on Yuezhi, refer to http://imperialchina.org/indx.shtml#Yuezhi)

The actual statement about Shang Dynasty jade is:
中原殷商妇好墓等夏商周三代古墓中曾出土大量玉制礼器。经化验，这些玉非辽宁岫岩玉、南阳独山玉等内地玉，据其地质成分，学者们认定应产自西北。看法是对了，但后来找玉的方法却大错特错了，结论可想而知。中央电视台联同中国社科院，组织几位考古和地质学者，直奔新疆和田与出和田玉的那座昆仑山，浮光掠影看了一回，拍了一部大型纪录片《玉石之路》。学者和记者们在塔里木沙漠找到几枚玉片，在甘肃马鬃山戈壁也找到一些，在电视中就说从和田经塔里木、居延海、雁门关到内地（"内地"大约指北京）有一条"玉石之路"。这种判断的根源在于，记者和学者们想当然地认为妇好墓中的玉是和田玉。记者、学者们不知道古籍中的"昆山玉"、"昆冈玉"、"昆仑玉"均指的是祁连玉。

More at http://www.chinahistoryforum.com/index.php?/topic/13682-tarim-mummies-and-the-introduction-of-chariots/page__st__45; http://www.chinahistoryforum.com/index.php?/topic/37329-evidence-of-jade-silk-road-4100-to-3500-years-old/page-4#entry5018849

(Yang Boda was apparently a non-scholar. More, he is a con artist who certified a Han Dynasty jade clothes that was used for swindling the banks 1000 million RMB. He spent 4 years in communist colleges during the 1945-1950 civil wars, and was assigned to the forbidden city in 1956 as a party branch secretary. He acknowledged repeatedly himself that he was not someone who had a college degree in 'jade'.)

Summary at http://imperialchina.org/Barbarians.htm

4) Possible forgeries in other chapters of *Guan-zi*: 《管子·五行篇》& 《管子·封禅篇》

Ma Feibai rebutted 《管子·轻重篇》. Parts of *Guan-zi* 《管子》, which was edited by Liu Xiang [刘向], could be forgeries, as we said, and it did not have to be that Liu Xiang was the initial forgery writer, but someone prior to Liu Xiang's review of the said book. Historian Ma Feibai rebutted the 16 chapters of 《管子轻重》 as forgeries made in Xin Dynasty. He spent his lifetime studying the 16 chapter of this *Guan-zi* book on the so-called "weighing the light and the heavy" to find the truth. Now, Ma Feibai did not get to rebut the other chapters. That does not mean Ma Feibai believed the other chapters were real.

Sima Qian's *Shi-ji* (i.e., Historian's Records) had the comment on the following books in *Guan-zi*:

《史记》“读管氏《牧民》、《山高》、《乘马》、《轻重》、《九府》，.....其书世多有之”。Could someone after Sima Qian had modified the originals ? Or could someone had inserted the said statements into Sima Qian’s *Shi-ji*《史记》?

Ma Feibai did point out that there could be forgeries inserted into Sima Qian's *Shi-ji* in later dynasties to make *Guan-zi* appear to be corroborated by historian Sima Qian. Isn't that incredible?

Ma Feibai found out the loophole in the purported *Guan-zi*'s juxtaposition of five ancient mountains, including Hengshan (pp. 812-816), which was validated to be a non-sacred mountain, between the Huai-shui River and the Yangtze, that was postulated to be one of the sacred mountains to the south of the Yangtze in the most recent 2000 years. More, Ma Feibai pointed out that it was *Guan-zi* who copied Sima Qian and Heng Kuan [author of *the Debate on Salt & Iron*] (pp. 34-38).

First is about 《管子·五行篇》. (*Haan-fei-zi*《韩非子·十过篇》shared the same topics as *Guan-zi*《管子·五行篇》. Was that coincidental? Did not appear so to me.)

Now, about *Guan-zi*'s other book, "conferral, sainthood and sacrifice on Mt Taishan" (《管子·封禅》).

Sima Qian felt fuzzy about things beyond Huangdi, and touched upon the ancient overlord Fu-xi briefly. Sima Qian was said to have cited *Guan-zi* as to how the ancient Chinese paid pilgrimage to ancient lords on Mt. Taishan. **The wording was almost exact the same as the statement in *Guan-zi*.** Could someone after Sima Qian had modified the originals ? Or could someone had inserted the said statements into Sima Qian’s *Shi-ji*《史记》? For details, check out **《史记·卷二十八·封禅书第六》.**

***Guan-zi*’s forged statements in the chapter on the Mt. Taishan pilgrimage [《管子·封禅篇》] were very self-apparent**. In the same passage, the geography in regards to Da-xia [or Bactria as claimed after Zhang Qian's trip to Central Asia] was wrong. The real Da-xia was in today's central Shanxi Province. While we could not tell whether *Guan-zi* had personally written the chapter on "conferral, sainthood and sacrifice on Mt Taishan" --even if we gave him the benefit of doubt that *Guan-zi* actually possessed some lost classics that nobody else had --we, people of the 21st century A.D., could tell from geography that *Guan-zi*'s statement on Qi Lord Huan'gong westward

campaign against Da-xia by trekking the Kumtag Desert was a fancy-land tale. Hence, the credibility of the whole chapter is at stake, in my opinion.

During the Han dynasty, scholars could have recompiled the book GUAN ZI to make a wild assertion to the effect that the Qi army having trepassed the Jinn Princiaplity's land to reach the Yellow River inflexion area to conquer the barbarians in the 'da-xia' [grand Xia] land, coined with the phrases of crossing the 'liu sha' [quick sand] and climbing the 'bei-er' [?Zhongtiao] mountain. This webmaster believed that what the records stated about Qi Lord's trekking 'liu sha' or the flowing sand could be nothing more than wading the sandy Sha-he River to climb the Mt. Bei-er-shan of today, not what 'liu sha' [moving sand/quick sand] historically referred to as the Kumtag Desert. Further, Qi Huan'gong might have never intruded into today's central Shenxi at all, with the 'liu sha' [moving sand/quick sand] sentence being a latter-day forgery. Per QI YU of GUO YU, the Qi lord could have reached the Yellow River inflexion line, where the Bei-er Mountain was said to be located; however, the path to reach the inflexion point was not clear in QI YU of GUO YU, but was described by GUAN ZI as a sensational campaign of crossing the 'liu sha' [quick sand] and climbing the 'bei-er' [?Zhongtiao] mountain. That was in fact an aborted mission on the part of the Qi lord in the competition with the Qin lord for escorting some competing Jinn prince to the Jinn throne.

See section on Yandi for comments on the forged statement about Qi Lord Huang'gong trekking the Kumtag Desert to campaign against Da-xia (Bactria). [《管子·封禅篇》:桓公：“寡人北伐山戎，过孤竹；西伐大夏，涉流沙，束马悬车， 上卑耳之山；南伐至召陵，登熊耳山以望江汉。].

劉向《說苑·尊賢》:春秋之時，天子微弱，諸侯力政，皆叛不朝；眾暴寡，強劫弱，南夷與北狄交侵，中國之不絕若線。桓公於是用管仲、鮑叔、隰朋、賓胥無、甯戚，三存亡國，一繼絕世，救中國，攘戎狄，卒脅荊蠻，以尊周室，霸諸侯。《春秋公羊傳·僖公四年》: 夏，許男新臣卒。楚屈完來盟于師，盟于召陵。屈完者何？楚大夫也。何以不稱使？尊屈完也。曷為尊屈完？以當桓公也。其言盟于師、盟于召陵何？師在召陵也。師在召陵，則曷為再言盟？喜服楚也。何言乎喜服楚？楚有王者則後服，無王者則先叛。夷狄也，而亟病中國，南夷與北狄交。中國不絕若線，桓公救中國，而攘夷狄，卒帖荊，以此為王者之事也。其言來何？與桓為主也。前此者有事矣，後此者有事矣，則曷為獨於此焉？與桓公為主，序績也。 --Qi Lord Huan'gong, who did not cross the Kumtag Desert, did campaign against the land of 'Jing' or the Chu Principality. [(左傳僖公四年桓公伐楚) 管仲：“爾貢苞茅不入，王祭不共，無以縮酒，寡人是徵。” 屈完：“貢之不入，寡君之罪也，敢不共給？”] Though, the Qi lord possibly touched the edge of the Xiong'er-shan (bear ear) mountain. This webmaster doubted that Qi Lord Huan'gong ever climbed the Mt. Xiongershan, the place the Chinese Communists interrupted the Rectification Movement to send in the second-tier commanders, like Pi Dingjun, Haan Jun, Wang Shusheng and et als. [who were chasing women in Yenan and conducting the brainwashing for years], to occupy the Xionger-shan and Funiushan (lie-low ox) mountains by taking advantage of the Japanese Ichigo Campaign of 1944. Similarly, the Qi lord did not climb the Bei'er mountain, either, not to mention ever going to today's southern Manchuria to campaign against the Guzhu (lonely bamboo, a word that originally meant some kind of bamboo materials for music instruments) state.

Similarly, historian Yuan Ke, in commenting on the book *Shan Hai Jing*, pointed out that later people had apparently added the word "hai" (sea) to Sima Qian's entry about the original book *Wu Zang Shan Jing*, which was abbreviated as "shan" (mountain) "jing" (book).

5) The [纬] 'Wei'-Suffixed Forgeries (Jing versus Wei was what we Chinese termed the Longitude and Latitude.)

http://www.scribd.com/doc/11960312/%E6%98%A5%E7%A7%8B%E7%BA%AC

Among the list of **'Wei'-Suffixed Forgery** books, there were about seven categories, with the "spring & autumn" category numbering about thirteen books. One such book, [《春秋(纬)·命历序》], talking about the ancient overlords, could have become the base for Huangfu Mi of Jinn Dynasty and Sima Zhen of Tang Dynasty to write their books -- should *Zhuang-zi* [approx. 369-286 B.C.E.] (《庄子》) be actually be ascertained to be a partial forgery as well --unless *Zhuang-zi* (《庄子》) did precede all others in the writings on the ancient overlords and was to become the input for the forged 《春秋(纬)·命历序》. As said earlier, *Zhuang-zi* (庄子) and *Lie-zi* (列子), mostly fables and proverbs similar to ***The Collection of Aesop's Fables***, appeared to be hypothetical but were later taken as historical truth. (There were indeed corroborations of Zhuang-zi and Lie-zi through the silk and bamboo excavations.)

The claim was that those **'Wei'-Suffixed Forgeries** books were written by someone like Confucius. People in late Western Han wrote the '**Wei'-Suffixed** books to purportedly explain the cause and effect of the natural disasters and astronomical/geological upheavals as carried in Confucius's annals "Spring & Autumn". (For a history of forgeries done by scholars in late Han Dynasty, Xin (New) Dynasty and Eastern Han Dynasty, check the linked article above to see the postulation that the forgery started from Han Emperor Aidi and Pingdi's eras.)

The famous forged **'Wei'-Suffixed** books included He-tu ("河图": the map from the Yellow River dragon-horse) and Luo-shu ("洛书": the book from the Luo-he River turtle).

《水經注》卷十五引《竹書紀年》說:"黃帝東巡河過洛，修壇沉璧，受龍圖于河，龜書于洛"。

《周易·系辞上》："河出图，洛出书，圣人则之"。

扬雄《核灵赋》:"大《易》之时,河序龙马,洛贡龟书。"

《汉书·五行传》:"刘歆以为虙戏氏继天而王,则而画之,八卦是也。禹治洪水,赐洛书,法而陈之,《洪范》是也。"

Indeed, there is proof that Sima Zhen also bought the forgery, as shown below.

司马贞《史记·(三皇本纪》:自人皇已后，有五龙氏、〔一〕燧人氏、〔二〕大庭氏、柏皇氏、中央氏、卷须氏、栗陆氏、骊连氏、赫胥氏、尊卢氏、浑沌氏、昊英氏、有巢氏、朱襄氏、葛天氏、阴康氏、无怀氏。斯盖三皇以来有天下者之号。〔三〕但载籍不纪，莫知姓王年代，所都之处。而《韩诗》以为自古封太山、禅梁甫者，万有余家，仲尼观之，不能尽识。《管子》亦曰，古封太山七十二家，夷吾所识十有二焉，首有无怀氏。然则无怀之前，

天皇已后，年纪悠邈，皇王何升而告？但古书亡矣，不可备论，岂得谓无帝王耶？故《春秋纬》称自开闢至于获麟，凡三百二十七万六千岁，分为十纪，凡世七万六百年。一曰九头纪，二曰五龙纪，三曰摄提纪，四曰合雒纪，五曰连通纪，六曰序命纪，七曰修飞纪，八曰回提纪，九曰禅通纪，十曰流迄纪。盖流迄当黄帝时，制九纪之间，是以录于此，补纪之也。(**You see Sima Zhen citing the forgery book 《春秋纬》.**)

Note that ***the 'Wei'-Suffixed forgery books had no ill intention***. Just that modern people need to know the timing of the books to know which one preceded which. Otherwise, there is a danger of going into a loop to find no answer.

6) Forgeries related to the "Complete Shang-shu Compilation" of Qing Dynasty (清 陈寿祺 辑《尚书大传》)

Confucius was said to have compiled *Shang-sh*u (《尚书》) to make it about 100 chapters out of the original records of 1000 chapters. The Confucian disciples had carried on the interpretation of *Shang-shu* to Han Dynasty. Abbreviated as *Shu* (《书》), *Shang-shu*, together with 《诗》、《礼》、《易》、《春秋》, were bundled as the Five Classics ("五经"), whereas 《大学》、《中庸》、《论语》、《孟子》were termed the Four Books ("四书").

Mo-zi ascertained the contents of *Shang-shu* as belonging to the royal courts that consisted of statesmen's or king's talks or commandments dating from Xia, Shang and Zhou dynasties and even earlier. (《墨子·明鬼下》："故尚书夏书，其次商周之书。") Sima Qian commented that Confucius edited the book and gave the preface. (《史记·孔子世家》"序《书传》，上纪唐虞之际，下至秦缪，编次其事"..."故《书传》、《礼记》自孔子"。) Wang Shu claimed that 'shang' meant for the ancient lords to be at the top. (王肃《尚书序》: "君上") Wang Chong defined the definition of "shang" as remotely ancient. (王充《论衡·正说篇》："《尚书》者，上古帝王之书。或以为上所为，下所书，故谓之《尚书》。") Haan Yv of Tang Dynasty claimed that the ancient Chinese characters in Shang-shu were difficult to read. (韩愈《进学解》:"周诰殷盘，佶屈聱牙")(《风俗通义校注》卷一〈皇霸〉～ 盖天地剖分，万物萌毓；非有典艺之文，坚基可据，推当今以览太古，自昭昭而本冥冥，乃欲审其事而建其论，董其是非而综其详略，言也实为难哉！故易纪三皇，书叙唐、虞，惟天为大，唯尧则之，巍巍其有成功，焕乎其有文章。自是以来，载籍昭晰。然而立谈者人异，缀文者家舛，斯乃杨朱哭于歧路，墨翟悲于练素者也。是以上述三皇，下记六国，备其终始曰皇霸。) (清(张照)《史记》："夫删《书》断自唐、虞，孔子岂未见黄帝之书？谓其荒远难稽，不欲传疑于后世也。迁《史》始黄帝，已失孔子之指。贞复等而上之及于伏羲，益又甚矣。")

Among several schools (伏生=>欧阳,大、小夏侯, i.e., 欧阳（和伯）、大小夏侯（夏侯胜、夏侯建）三博士), only the text of Fu-sheng's version of *Shang-shu* (《尚书》), survived, which was termed the "Contemporary [i.e., Han Dynasty] Shang-shu" (《今文尚书》). It had 28 chapters plus a preface, totaling 29.

In Western Han Dynasty, there was an entry claiming that Fu-sheng, who was an old man surviving the Qin-Han dynastic substitution, had written a 'commentary' book on Shang-shu, totaling 41 chapters. In Jinn Dynasty, there was a comment that Fu-sheng was the person who wrote the commentary book. Since the book was long lost, scholars in Qing Dynasty believed whatever fragments available were forgeries, and further believed that it was actually the students of Fu-sheng who made the later-lost book, not Fu-sheng himself.

《尚书大传》汉·伏胜 （《史记集解》称“伏生名胜，伏氏碑云”；《汉书·艺文志》“**《尚书》《传》四十一篇**”；《晋书·五行志》“文帝时，伏生创纪《大传》”。

《四库全书总目提要》：“《玉海》載《中興館閣書目》，引鄭康成〈尚書大傳序〉曰：‘蓋自伏生也。伏生爲秦博士，至孝文時年且百歲。**張生、歐陽生**從其學而受之。音聲猶有譌誤，先後猶有舛差，重以篆隸之殊，不能無失。生終後，數字各論所聞，以己意彌縫其闕，別作章句。**又特撰大義，因經屬指，名之曰傳**。劉向校書，得而上之。凡四十一篇，銓次爲八十一篇云云。’”)

It was classified as a Wei [纬] forgery in Qing Dynasty encyclopedia 《四库全书》.

7) 《伪古文尚书》and《尚书伪孔传》

Fu-sheng's book was termed the "Contemporary [i.e., Han Dynasty] Shang-shu" (《今文尚书》) since it was re-written by 'doctors' sent by the Han Dynasty emperor to 'stenograph' and record what Fu-sheng orally recited with a notorious accent. The Fu-sheng's version was said to have **29 chapters**.

Kong An'guo, a descendant of Confucius, surrendered a hidden version of *Shang-shu* that was discovered during Han Emperor Wudi's timeframe, which came to be called the **tadpole**-shaped "Old Text [i.e., Zhou Dynasty] Shang-shu" (《古文尚书》), **--16 chapters** more than Fu-sheng's version. (Alternatively, this book was discovered when Liu Yu, son of Han Emperor Jingdi 鲁共王 刘馀 dismantled Confucius' residency to build a palace.)

It appeared that during the Han Dynasty time period, scholars did have chance to draft the first version of Shang-shu (《尚书》) using the remnants of the said book produced by Fu-sheng. However, the tadpole text version or ancient text version book was not utilized due to the court palace upheavals.

Feng Yan, a Tang Dynasty scholar, claimed that the Latter Han Dynasty scholars obtained the imperial decree to have opened up the tomb of former Qin prime minister Lv Buwei for sake of procuring the ancient texts for comparison, which was to say that the Han court

(under Emperor Han Mingdi, reign A.D. 58-75) had apparently secured a trove of precious ancient texts, similar to the future THE BAMBOO ANNALS find of Jinn Dynasty. The unfortunate thing, however, was that when shipping the Lv Buwei tomb texts, the ship, **en route to Ye from Luoyang**, sank, with over half of the texts lost. Feng Yan did not specify when the accident had occurred, and further claimed that the demise of Sui Dynasty caused a loss of 90% of the Lv Buwei texts. In conclusion, the ancient scholars had more than one chance to compare the texts of Shang-shu (《尚书》) against the ancient tadpole texts. (From the movement between Ye and Luoyang, this webmaster deduce that Feng Yan actually meant that the text from Lv Buwei's tomb was lost in shipping during the Tuoba Wei Dynasty time period, namely, approximately A.D. 537 when Eastern Tuoba Wei emperor Xiaojingdi relocated to Ye, with movement of the "Three Style Monuments" of Han Dynasty and Cao Wei Dynasty. See "537年（东魏孝静帝四年）八月，移洛阳汉魏石经于邺。579年（北周大象元年）二月，又自邺还涉洛阳。" This could give further deduction that Feng Yan could have erorr when referring to Eastern Han emperor Mingdi (后汉明帝) as it could be in fact an imperial decree from Eastern Tuoba Wei emperor Xiaojingdi [东魏孝静帝] to dig up Lv Buwei's tomb.)

封氏闻见记：天宝初，敕改尚书古文悉为今本。十 年，有司上言：“经典不正，取舍难准”。诏儒官校定经本，送尚书省并国子司 业张参共相验考。参遂榻定五声字样书于太学讲堂之壁，学者或就取正焉。又颁 字样于天下，俾为永制。由是省司停约习本。**后汉明帝时，公卿言五经驳异，请 开吕不韦冢，是未焚诗书前本。**论者以为（有缺文）神武作相，自洛阳运之于邺， 至河阳，岸崩，没水，其得至邺者不盈其半。隋开皇六年，又自邺再入长安，置 于秘书内省，议欲补葺。隋乱，造立之司，用为柱础。贞观初，魏征为秘书监， 始收聚之，十不存一。

The confusion was that part of the Feng Yan's text was lost. **Still some confusion here that I could not reconcile. My question is: If Lv Buwei's tomb was excavated in the Eastern Han times, why nobody else touched on it?**** My thought that the loss of Shang-shu was the result of the Yongjia Cataclysm, and that the motive to open up the tomb was to rectify the texts due to the loss of ancient classics ensuing from the Yongjia Ctaclysm. (The movement of the Tuoba Wei capital to Ye was an act by Gao Huan whose son later deposed the Tuoba Wei emperor to found Northern Qi Dynasty. The background for the move to Ye from Luoyang was to do with the split of the Tuoba Wei Dynaty, with Emperor Xiaowudi fleeing to Chang'an to be with Yuwen Tai, while Gao Huan (i.e., later Northern Qi Emperor Shenwudi) supported Tuoba Shan (Yuan Shan) as the Eastern Tuoba Wei Emperor Xiaojingdi and acted as a prime minister (i.e., '作相').)

However, both 《尚书》versions were lost to the war at the end of the Jinn Dynasty when five barbarian Hu groups ravaged North China. During Eastern Jin Dynasty, 梅赜 (“梅颐”、“枚颐”) produced 《尚书传》and《古文尚书》, about **58 chapters**，with additional **25 chapters** on top of 《今文尚书》, plus extra **4 chapters** split from 《今文尚书》, claiming in the name of Kong An'guo, called 《尚书传》. (趙銘豐 has a good discourse on

the numbers of chapters or volumes. The point made was that the authentic book as of Han Dynasty had 46 chapters, including 29 from Fu-sheng, 16 from Kong An'guo and a preface. Namely, 《尚书》**46** 篇 =《今文尚书》**29** 篇 +《古文尚书》**16** 篇 + 孔安国 序 **1** 篇)

Now, before the Cataclysm of Yongjia, ancient Chinese from Eastern Han Dynasty, Cao Wei Dynasty, and Sima Family's Jinn Dynasty had erected the "Three Style Monuments", with ancient tadpole scripts of Shang-shu《尚书》inscribed. Namely, the ancient Chinese prior to the cataclysm, not counting the Qin Emperor Shihuangdi's book burning, still had a chance to access the ancient texts.

《魏书·列传术艺》：“又建《三字石经》于汉碑之西，其文蔚炳，三体复宣。校之《说文》，篆隶大同，而古字少异。”

《列传·游明根·刘芳》：“昔汉世造三字石经于太学，学者文字不正，多往质焉。”

北魏江式《论书表》: [《三体石经》]“较之《说文》，篆、隶大同，而古字少异”。

北齐魏收《魏书》: [江式514年（延昌三年）]“陈留邯郸淳亦与（张）揖同时，博古开艺，特善《仓》、《雅》，许氏字指，八体六书精究闲理，有名于揖，以书教诸皇子。又建《三字石经》于汉碑之西，其文蔚炳，三体复宣。校之《说文》，篆、隶大同，而古字少异。”

唐房玄龄《晋书》引《四体书势》：“魏初传古文音，出于邯郸淳。恒祖敬侯（卫觊）写淳《尚书》，后以示淳，而淳不别。至正始中，立《三字石经》转失淳法，因科斗之名，遂效其形。”

Now, after the Cataclysm of Yongjia, we had the Eastern Jinn forgeries. Further editing and substantiation during the Tang Dynasty yielded to today's known fake *Shang-shu*, namely, "Kong Anguo's Old Text [i.e., Han Dynasty] Shang-shu" (《孔传古文尚书》in regards to Qing scholar 程廷祚〈《尚書古文疏證》辨〉)."

While Tang Dynasty scholars failed to ascertain the authenticity, the Qing Dynasty scholars figured out that Mei Yi's 《尚书传》 plus the extra chapters of Mei Yi's《古文尚书》were fake. This claim, however, could be fallacious as well.

Hence, what we have today as to *Shang-shu*, either the original text or the purported Kong An'guo editing, were all fakes, that the later scholars knew to be forged books that were claimed to be written by Kong An'guo, termed 《古文尚书》and 《尚书传》, alternatively named 《伪古文尚书》and《尚书伪孔传》. What was claimed that Kong An'guo had combined the two versions of *Shang-shu* into a compilation with 58 chapters [58篇、46卷] then became a myth.

Since scholars spent thousands of years substantiating the texts, the value of *Shang-shu* is still there. It was discovered that the chapters on the relatively late time period were comparatively authentic while those pertaining to the ancient time periods, like Shang Dynasty, contained a large portion of forgeries.

What likely happened, as speculated by lots of people, was that during the Three Kingdom time period 三国·魏 王肃 scholar Wang Shu could have forged the 《尚书传》 book. (It was said that Wang Shu also forged *Confucius' Family Motto*《孔子家语》 in the name of Kong An'guo 孔安国，and *Confucius Descendants' Motto*《孔丛子》in the name of Kong Fu 孔鲋.) This was a categorical blame put on Wang Shu.

	总篇数	伪古文a1	真古文ao	真今文c
虞书				
夏书				
商书				
周书				
合计	29+25c+4ao	45	28+1=>33	

1) Editing during the Tang Dynasty -《尚書正義》 唐 孔穎達 注

Scholars, including 孔颖达、王德韶、李子云，reviewed by 朱长才、苏德融、隋德素、王士雄、赵弘智，and approved by 长孙无忌、李勣、于志宁、张行成, combined remnants from 《今文尚书》,《古文尚书》and 《伪孔安国 尚书传》to produce 《尚書正義》 as part of the officially sanctioned 《五经正义》.

http://club.xilu.com/wave99/replyview-950484-11786.html

2) Annotation and Comments

东汉 马融 《尚书传》 (lost)

郑玄，《尚书注》 (lost) [鄭康成〈尚書大傳序〉]

南宋 吴棫 《书裨传》(lost)

元代 吴澄 《尚书纂言》

明 梅竟 (梅鷟zhuó 1483-1553)《尚书考异》

清 阎若璩［?清 阎若理(1636—1704)］《古文尚书疏证》(con)

惠栋《古文尚书考》

丁晏 《尚书馀论》

毛奇龄《古文尚书冤词》(pro)

清 段玉裁、孙星衍、孙治

3) Printed during the Qing Dynasty -《十三经注疏》清 阮元

Ruan Yuan reviewed all available records to include: 《尚书注疏》（唐）孔颖达疏; 魏·王肃伪孔安国传; 毛诗正义; 汉·毛亨传、郑玄笺正义; etc.

(《十三经注疏》注，对经书字句的注解，又称传、笺、解、章句等；疏，对注的注解，又称义疏、正义、疏义等。) ("十三经":《易》、《诗》、《书》、《周礼》、《礼记》、《仪礼》、《公羊传》、《谷梁传》、《左传》、《孝经》、《论语》、《尔雅》、《孟子》)

《尚书》五十八篇 =《今文尚书》二十八篇(=> 二十三篇)+伪《古文尚书》二十五篇 + 孔安国 序

.....	总篇数	伪古文	真古文
虞书	5	1	4
夏书	4	2	2
商书	17	10	7
周书	32	12	20
合计	58	25	33

《四库全书总目》："白吴械始右异议，朱子亦稍稍疑之；吴澄诸人本朱子之说，相继抉摘，其伪益彰，然亦未能条分缕析，以炔其够漏，明海运始参考诸书，证其副别，而见闻较狭，苑采未周，至若原乃引经据古，一一陈其矛盾之故，古文之伪乃大明。所列一百二十八条，毛奇龄作《古文尚书冤词》，百计相轧，终不能以强词夺正理，则有据之言，先立十不可败也。"

唐代经学家孔颖达撰《五经正义》，连同王肃所伪造的《古文尚书》一起收入，合为五十八篇。其中除了伪《古文尚书》外，还有《书序》不出于孔子之手，清末康有为的《新学伪经考》中有《书序辩伪》一文，辨之甚明。因为孔颖达是特奉唐太宗之命作《五经正义》的，采用了王肃旧注本，便成了定本

4) Current editing by the 20th century China forgery specialist Li Xueqin (李学勤) on top of the bamboo excavations 《清华大学藏战国竹简（壹）》 --Since year 2000, I was calling the forgery Xia-Shang-Zhou project to be something "heavily influenced by politics and the government than a serious academic research". (See http://imperialchina.org/chronology.htm)