

INTRODUCTION

Introduction to this duology on the Sinitic civilization and history, which was skipped in the previous editions, is added here after receiving critique from Daniel Patrick Morgan, a student of Professor Edward L. Shaughnessy. Daniel questioned how this duology is different from or better than Jacques Gernet (1921-2018)'s *A History of Chinese Civilization (Le Monde Chinois, 1972/1999)* or Needham's *Science and Civilization* series. Daniel pointed out that the body texts went into far more details about certain historical events, technical matters (astronomy), and scholarly arguments (archeoastronomy, and the authenticity of sources) than did a shorter, standard introduction such as Gernet's. From the calendrical perspective, Daniel kindly perused the related contents as to the ancient Chinese calendars, felt that the author was "operating within the limits" and advised the author to be "cautious about certain connections and interpretations". Daniel saw the impreciseness of this duology as to its placement between genres: somewhere between such an introduction like Gernet's and a greater over-arching argument about Chinese civilization, such as seen in the Needham's. Daniel has valid questions as to the "genre, aims, intended readership, relation with other works", etc.

Since the preface(s) did not answer some of the above questions, an introduction is provided here to answer the issues raised by Daniel and to cover the duology books' scope, thesis, purpose and limitations. This *Introduction* would go beyond the purpose of a book introduction to cover some additional topics such as divination, i.e., the Sinitic nation's structural and cultural backbone. First we want to make a point that the duology on the Sinitic civilization and history could not be anywhere close to Joseph Needham's *Science and Civilization* series. Needham's *Science and Civilization* series is a general history book on China covering the science and technology aspects. This duology's main technical coverage was the threading-together and synthesis of ancient China's calendrical history, i.e., topics that could be elusive to ordinary readers who did not have the luxury to peruse the ancient Chinese classics. The calendrical matter is scattered in different contexts of the two books, with discourses on Lord Yao's commandments and the 366-day calendar in Chapter 8 of *Book One*, and discourses on the *Zhuanxu-li*, *Taichu-li* and *Sifen-li* calendars in Chapters 26, 32 and 40 of *Book Two* [plus a section on Liu Xin's *Santong-li* calendar in Chapter 35]. The important points to make here in regard to the calendrical matter are that the five planets' records and the sexagenary reign years as seen in the forgery contemporary version of *The Bamboo Annals* could be merely flashback results; the ancient quarter remainder calendars' mechanism could be discovered after the rule of thumbs in regards to the 81 'ri fa' (diurnal) number and the leap month intercalation, i.e., to place seven intercalary months within 19 years [which had 235 calendar months], was discovered; and the sexagesimal system of sixty years possibly started in the 4th century B.C., about one or two sexagenary cycles or one Jupiter chronogram ahead of invention of the Qin state's *Zhuanxu-li* calendar (247 B.C.). Half a century ago, Professor Jacques Gernet already pointed that "the cycle of sixty was only applied to the years ... from the second century B.C. onwards." The five planets' data could be seen in *Wu-xing Zhan*, a book that logged the planets' movements from the late Qin dynasty onward, and it would be in the late Han dynasty that the data on the seven luminaries [including sun and moons] were seen in the Han dynasty 'chen-wei' category prophecy books.

Technology and science wise, the pre-2000 B.C copper-based metallurgy was discussed in *Book I* without making conclusive statements on its indigenoussness versus the possibility as an import. In regards to bronze, Jacques Gernet had a brilliant point about the continuity of the Lungshan black

pottery and the bronze vessels of the Shang period. Gernet, who took Hsia (Xia) “very probable the existence of this dynasty” for the traces of “the first city-palaces and the first manifestations of Chinese civilization to the end of the third millennium”, pointed out that the Shang dynasty and the earlier Lungshan (Longshan) Culture exhibited a direct succession, as represented in the “very typical shapes which appear in closely related versions both in the fine black pottery of Shantung (Lungshan) and in the bronze vessels of the Shang period”. Gernet, half a century ago, derived the brilliant conclusion that “the mastery of the potters of Lungshan, the high temperatures which they seem to have been capable of obtaining, and the restricted role of hammering and forging in the technical traditions of the Far East all incline one to favor the idea of an independent discovery of bronze metallurgy”. This viewpoint, from a different angle, invalidated the claim that the Indo-Europeans gave China the bronze technology or the Sumerians gave China the oracle bone scripts.

The Shang bronze vessels, like the Shang oracle bones and tortoise shells, carried the sparsely-written characters that denoted the emblems, names and titles, developed to the bronzeware inscription with hundreds of characters by the Zhou dynasty, the moon phase information of which could be the sole extant data to periodize the reign years of ancient dynasties and kings. In Chapter 19 of *Book I*, there is a discourse on Zhang Wenyu’s consistent “fixed points” interpretation of bronzeware moon phases and his rebuttal of the 1-2 day floating deviation, the 3-day floating deviation [as proposed by 20th century historian Dong Zuobin] and the 7-day floating deviation [as proposed by Wang Guowei]. The scientific contents were also briefly touched on in *Book II* in the context of discussing Han Dynasty King Huai’nan (Liu An) and his book *Wan Bi Shu* (techniques with ten thousand pieces in one complete compendium) as well as in the context of discussing the divination topics related to Han Dynasty scholar Zhang Heng, i.e., author of *Ling Xian* (supernatural {celestial bodies’ orbit} chart). Gernet succinctly noted that the Chinese logic “followed the path taken by the specialists in divination, who were the founding fathers of mathematics in the Chinese world. The manipulation of numbers and the combination of signs suited to translate the correct values of space-time were to serve as the basis of philosophical theories and of the sciences.” Gernet meant that the Chinese dialectics was “a kind of sophistry which is quite original in character and distinguished by its essentially pragmatic aim from that of the Greek world, which was bound up with the practice of making speeches in law courts and political assemblies” and that the Chinese, after a short dialectic excursion, reverted back to the old ‘divinatory’ tradition, which was dichotomy. Gernet’s point about divination and science was very much corroborated by the two Han dynasty books of *Wan Bi Shu* (techniques with ten thousand pieces in one complete compendium) and *Ling Xian* (supernatural {celestial bodies’ orbit} chart).

Since divination was intrinsically-related to the divine spirits, ancestor worship and theology, as well as the Sinitic language spawning and nation building, it deserves a highlighted discourse in this *Introduction*. Ancient divination, which ran parallel with the tortoise shell divination and yarrow divination in the Zhou dynasty, developed to the occult “*Shu-shu Jia*” (Techniques and Calculations) school in the Han dynasty, that encompassed astronomy, calendrical ephemeris, five constant elements, tortoise shell divination and yarrow divination, miscellaneous prognostication, and forms and names (i.e., the Logicians) and engendered the “*chen-wei*” esoteric commentaries of the five classics. The *Zhou-yi* divination’s binary system was acknowledged to be the foundation for the arithmetic language of modern computers. Gottfried Wilhelm von Leibniz (1646-1716), who took the Chinese male-female system as corresponding to his zero and one binary system, might not have realized that it was the earlier Jesuits who brought back the Sinitic divinatory philosophy, and later in his late years, wrote

Discourse on the Natural Theology of the Chinese in acknowledgment of debts the West owed to ancient China.

Divination, i.e., the Sinitic nation's structural and cultural backbone, could be traced to the Jiahu civilization (7000-8000 B.C; dendrochronologically-adjusted 7500—8800 B.C.) which could be the source feed for the Lingjiatan civilization (6000 B.C.) in the lower Huai-shui River rivercourse and the Dawenkou and Longshan culture in the lower Yellow River rivercourse. The Jiahu site, taken to be of the Peiligang Culture type, produced the earliest tortoise shells containing dice-like stones, which could be the origin of Sinitic China's tortoise shell divination. The Lingjiatan civilization, which produced the octagram star (i.e., prototyped on top of the pottery spin wheels), the double eagle-head jade octagram (i.e., prototyped on top of the three-leg or three-head sun bird of the Neolithic time, as seen in the excavated potteries carrying the three-leg birds coupled with the sun image or the three-head birds pulling the sun in the middle of its joint body), and a jade turtle with eight-trigrams-like drawings on a jade plate inside of its belly, corroborated the Jiahu site's religious nature of the prehistoric tortoise shell divination. The tortoise shell divination, which was absent along the Yangtze and southern China but widely seen in the Peiligang and Dawenkou cultures, exhibited itself as a patented Sinitic tradition. Though, the tortoise shell divination was infrequently seen in the successor Longshan culture sites and the Xia dynasty sites, only to be revived again starting from the Lower Phase II of the Erligang site of the Shang dynasty.

Archeological data showed the wide usage of bone divination among the Yangshao Culture sites of the upper, middle and lower Yellow River rivercourse 6000 years ago, including the sheep's scapula with burnt marks in the third phase Yangshao culture site of Xiawanggang (lower king's hill) in Xichuan of Xiachuan, Henan; sheep, pig and cattle bones in the Majiayao site of Shiling (stony ridge) in Fujiamen of Wushan, Gansu; and deer and sheep bones in the Fuhegoumen (rich river ditch gate) site of Inner Mongolia. This could be a matter of sourcing of divination materials when the Sinitic people expanded to northwestern China and the northern frontier. The Longshan (Lungshan) culture along the middle Yellow River rivercourse, which could be related to the Jiahu Culture's eastern infusion towards the Dawenkou Culture and its subsequent back-tracing westward, and the successive Xia and Shang dynasties, inherited the Yangshao bone divination tradition, with the Shang people perfecting the divination custom of osteogenesis in addition to reviving the tortoise shell divination. In the opinion of Zhang Zhongpei (1934-2017, curator of the forbidden city museum), bone divination was a universalized religion of prehistoric Sinitic China. (Zhang Deshui and Li Lina of the Museum of Henan Province claimed that prehistoric China possessed a third jade divination as seen in the Hongshan culture in Northeast China, the Liangzhu culture [of the Austronesian people] in the Taihu Lake basin, and the Lingjiatan culture in Anhui. The jade divination of the middle and late Neolithic period should be properly termed "jade as burial" and "jade as sacrifice", a practice seen in the Shimao Culture of northwestern China and Sanxingdui Culture of the Sichuan basin to the west as well as inherited by the Xia and Shang China dynasties. *Tai-bu* of *Zhou-li*, a book compiled by Liu Xin (50 B.C.- 23 A.D.), claimed that imperial sorcerer Tai-bu of the ancient times had three prognostication methods of using cracked jade (*yu zhao*), cracked title (*wa zhao*) and cracked fields (*yuan zhao*). The cracked jade (*yu zhao*) was interpreted by Zheng Xuan (A.D. 127-200) of the Latter Han dynasty to be about examining the tortoise shell's cracked veins which were similar to a jade's veins.)

Prehistoric Sinitic China possibly developed trigrams and hexagrams on top of the tortoise shell divination and bone divination. In Neolithic Jiahu, the burial of stone-embedded tortoise shells started with two, four, six, and eight and progressed toward the direction of one and two, namely, some

divination experiments towards a manageable numerological target. The Lingjiatan jade turtle, with an octagonal plate sandwiched between the jade tortoise shell and the carapace of the jade tortoise, appeared to be a set of divination tools that had the rudimentary shape of eight trigrams, i.e., what Han dynasty history book *Shi-ji* defined the function of divination as setting the four [sky] nets (i.e., dimensions) at four corners and aligning the eight trigrams within each other's sight. As pointed out by Zhang Zhenglang (1912-2005), Neolithic China already possessed trigrams and hexagrams, as seen in the Qingdun site of the Songze Culture (5400-4400 B.C.) in Hai'an of Jiangsu, which produced eight carved bone inscriptions showing the existence of six 'yao' trigrams, such as 353364 ('dun' hexagram [with 'gen' and 'qian' trigrams] in *Zhou Yi*) and 623531 ('gui-mei' hexagram [with 'dui' and 'zhen' trigrams; disputed to be 'da-zhuang' hexagram by Wu Yong of Huazhong Normal University] in *Zhou Yi*). Wu Yong, in analyzing the excavated Neolithic trigrams and hexagrams, expressed doubt about applying the reading of Shang oracle bone and bronzeware pictographs to identifying the prehistoric carved characters. Wu Yong pointed out that the digits on the Neolithic trigrams and hexagrams, i.e., 3, 4, 5 and 6 in "353364" or 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6 in "623531", were actually either male-female (i.e., odd-even) images (that formed the resulting 'yao' six-liners) of the divinatory texts or four symbols, that were for the binary divination system but were misread as decimal numbers 1 to 9. Without expounding the difference of five versus four Neolithic 'signs' as seen on the Qingdun bones, Wu Yong believed that the four-sign milfoil system (i.e., "senior male"; "senior female"; "junior female"; and "junior male"), when raised to the power of six, yielded the more manageable set of 4096 'yao' six-liner dictums --which were the 4096 poems (64x64 six-liners) in Jiao Yanshou's *Jiao-shi Yi-lin* (forest of *The Book of Changes*).

Not to make this *Introduction* into a discourse on divination, the above elaboration's point was that Sinitic China had a divinatory history of more than 8000 years, with the Sinitic written language very much a resultant or byproduct invention. After prehistoric Sinitic China developed trigrams and hexagrams from the tortoise shell divination and bone divination, trigrams and hexagrams possibly evolved to milfoil divination using yarrow independently of the tortoise shell divination and bone divination. Interpretation books related to *Zhou-yi* (i.e., *The Book of Changes*) claimed that it was the [fabled] ancient sovereign Fu-xi who designed the eight trigrams by examining the heaven and earth; and Sima Qian's *Shi-ji* claimed that Zhou founder-king Wenwang, when imprisoned in a place called Youli, renovated the ancient eight trigrams into sixty-four hexagrams. Gernet succinctly pointed out that in Zhou China, "divination itself developed autonomously in the time of the first kings of Chou" in the direction of the yarrow stems instead of "divination by fire" of Shang China. Though, milfoil divination, i.e., numerical stalk divination, could have already existed before the Zhou dynasty. Oracle bone expert Tang Lan ascertained some Shang dynasty "shil-shu" numerical stalk divination signs on the Sipanmo divination bone, which were written as "787676 called kui [with the Fief signific], and 757566 called kui [with the Dipper signific]". The combination 'kui-kui', in the Latter Han dynasty, became the name of the Fiery Thearch. Not going into details here about Fu-xi being a fable figure of the Han dynasty and being prototyped on the Shang dynasty's wind god, ancient China could have developed the trigrams through astronomical observation. In the Qingtai (green terrace) site of Xingyang, about the same spot where Johan Gunnar Andersson discovered the Yangshao civilization, there was excavated in year 2015 a yellow mud underground terrace with nine pottery jars surrounding it, with the 5500-year-old jars speculated to be related to ancient Chinese's divinatory reverence for the Northern Dipper (i.e., Ursa Major) and its handle.

Zuo Zhuan (Zuo-qiu-ming's commentary on *Chun Qiu*) and *Guo Yu* (discourse of the states) carried twenty-two divination cases that showed the juxtaposition of two divinatory methods of the tortoise shell

divination and milfoil divination via the “*shil-shu*” numbers, with the former given more weight over the latter in the augury process for its possibly high “matched divination” and “realized divination” rate. Though, Neolithic [or Shang China’s] milfoil divination could be just simple, or original, or root hexagrams, as pointed out by Wu Yong, and might not be of the nature of root versus resultant (alternative, transformant) hexagrams of *Zhou-yi* of the Zhou dynasty. The simple, or original, or root hexagrams were seen in the fabled alternative divination of *Lian-shan Yi* and *Gui-cang Yi* as seen in the A.D. 279 Ji-zhong tomb, or the excavated 1993 Wangjiatai divination bamboo slips, or the *Shi-fa* (stalk) divination slips. The *Zhou-yi* divination system with the complex change mechanisms might not have a fixed rule or method according to the caveat statement in Lu Lord Zhaogong’s 12th year of *Zuo Zhuan*, namely, the divination should not be canonized or essentialized as long as it fit the change [of circumstances]. The “change”, namely, “conversion” or not of a hexagram in *Zhou Yi*, was something that could be interpreted to be the result of human, natural or supernatural influence.

Divination with trigrams and hexagrams is an occult science that the barbarians, whom were described by Sima Qian [or Chu Shaosun] in *Gui-ce Lie-zhuan* of *Shi-ji* to have their separate tortoise shell divination and bone divination, never mastered. Divination played the role of a repository recording the prehistoric Sinitic history. Li Pingxing, an early communist who was a preparatory Soviet government commissariat member at one time during the 1927 Nanchang mutiny, pointed out that the *Zhou Yi* divination was an “argot language” history. The twenty-two divination cases as recorded in *Zuo Zhuan* and *Guo Yu* are scattered across the duology books. In Chapter 23 of *Book I*, there is a section on “The Yarrow & Turtle Divination Mechanism of the Shang, Zhou & Chu People”, in which Soong dynasty scholar Zhu Xi’s seven rules of prognostication and modern scholar Gao Heng’s predicate logic interpretation method are discussed. In Chapter 25 of *Book II*, there is discussion of ‘[Yi-]dao’ (i.e., the divination way) in the *Yi ‘zhuan’*, namely, ten interpretation books for the *Yi* divination, and Confucius’ ‘*tian dao*’ (heavenly way), i.e., the philosophical divination. As to the fabled alternative divination of *Lian-shan Yi* and *Gui-cang Yi* as seen in the A.D. 279 Ji-zhong tomb, or the excavated 1993 Wangjiatai divination bamboo slips, or the *Shi-fa* (stalk) divination slips, there are dedicated Chapters 36 and 37 of *Book II* dealing with those divinatory topics in the context of interpreting *Shan Hai Jing* (‘The Classics of Mountains and Seas’), a book that was dramatized by Gao Xingjian, the Year 2000 Nobel Prize winner and a ‘pretender’ who misinterpreted the Sinitic genesis and Mankind creation theories.

Back to the theme of this *Introduction*. This duology is not a general history like Gernet’s book but could serve the purpose of filling in “gaps, imperfections, and errors” that were said by Gernet to be inevitable in his general history due to the fact that China’s written literature contained “rich and varied a range of events extending over three and a half millennia”. Gernet’s *A History of Chinese Civilization* (*Le Monde Chinois*, 1972/1999) is a general history book on China, that covers the political, economic, and social aspects and traverses the Chinese history from antiquity down to the 20th century. This author’s duology on the Sinitic civilization and history, however, covered the time span of history of the Sinitic civilization from antiquity, to the 3rd millennium B.C. to A.D. 85, with the scope being the enumeration and synthesis of historical facts. Hence the duology carries the subtitle of a factual history. The duology’s timeframe falls into what Charles Hucker (1919-1994) termed by the formative age (from antiquity to the 3rd century B.C.) and the early imperial age (from the 3rd century B.C. to the 10th century A.D.). In regards to Daniel’s questions as to the “genre, aims, intended readership, relation with other works”, etc., the duology could be considered a quasi-general history book for readers who wish to gain a better understanding of ancient China beyond the generalized

and universally accepted conclusions. This could be achieved through digestion of primitive data presented in this duology, rather second-hand enumeration of facts, and via comparison with more than Gernet's book to include Charles Hucker's *China's Imperial Past: An Introduction to Chinese History and Culture* (Stanford University Press, 1975).

Gernet piled praise on the Chinese civilization for the "tremendous historical dimension", "writing, its technology, its conceptions of man and of the world, its religions and its political institutions", and "the originality of all Chinese intellectual traditions". Specifically, Gernet raised a good point in regards to importance of intellectuals who had "the prerogative of the written word in the Chinese world" and who were "attached in China to a knowledge of writing and to book knowledge" and acknowledged the Chinese language character set as "most effective instruments of political unification". Note that Hucker's *China's Imperial Past* did not shake off the old-fashioned stereotyped description of China and its land, topology, people, language and other "themes that pervade Chinese life and history", such as China proper and its purported insulation from "other major centers of civilization until the advent of modern communication and transport techniques" or China taken to be the "only major nation of Asia that is racially homogeneous". The limitations or demerits of this duology are lack of synthesis of subjects on a chapter scale. In contrast, Hucker's book, in addition to a general history, aligned the chapters into political institutions, socioeconomic organization, religion and thought, and literature and the arts. Though, this duology could serve the purpose of a complimentary reading to Gernet's Chinese history book in that it filled the "gaps, imperfections, and errors" of both Gernet's and Hucker's works.

Comparisons could be illustrated to make a point about the utility of this duology as far as aims, intended readership, and relation with other works are concerned. Armed with the historical facts presented in this duology, readers, who had previously read Gernet's book or Hucker's book, could come to a different understanding of China's history. For example, Hucker categorically claimed that the Chinese society consisted of "at least 80 per cent of the total population" that consisted of "farming villagers" and "20 per cent or so of the traditional population" of the "homogeneous literate culture". This categorization is similar to Alfred Tennyson and William A. P. Parsons Martin's claims as to "A Cycle of Cathay" for Sinitic China's superficial staleness, namely, what Gernet pointed out to be the repeat of stages of "stagnation, periodical return to a previous condition, and permanence of the same social structures and the same political ideology". As pointed out by Jacques Gernet, China was a technical civilization, not a vegetable (i.e., agrarian) civilization as commonly perceived, and took China as "the land of the most skilled metallurgists". It needs to be acknowledged that Professor Jacques Gernet was the most brilliant Sinologist of all, who made almost impeccable generalizations about history of China and must have influenced Daniel Patrick Morgan as to the choice of his subject of studies. Perhaps, a student of Chinese history could read both Professor Jacques Gernet's book and this duology to achieve an enhanced understanding of the Chinese history. Namely, this duology plays the role of compensating for the "gaps, imperfections, and errors" as far as historical facts are concerned.

Though, Gernet, who was the most prescient among all Sinologists, made some similar general observations, such as the argument that "no clergy, no military caste, no merchant class ever succeeded in gaining political power" in China while applying the term of Sino-barbarian autocracy to the southern and northern dynasties (A.D. 590-755) of China, a time period of disintegration for China, that saw northern China being ruled by the Shatuo Turks who belonged to a mercenary military caste. Gernet's prescience in evaluating China's imperial system could be seen in his caution to avoid

making distinction between “monarchy and democracy too absolute”, and expressed admiration for the “complex forms of political organization” of China and “fundamental traditions” in the political, religious, aesthetic, juridical arena. Gernet erred in claiming that the “peasant militias”, i.e., Soviet-sponsored proxies, founded in 1949 the communist nation after sweeping away “a military dictatorship”, i.e., Republic of China. Gernet did not know that it was the Soviet-supplied artillery divisions and regiments that blasted the cities of Jinzhou, Xinbao’an, Taiyuan and Tientsin to pieces. Gernet thought he had worked out “a general framework” that “will help to crystallize... ideas about the successive changes in the political forms of the Chinese world”. Note that the communist revolution of China was not another indigenous or autochthonous cycle of 50 years in Cathay. In the following, the scope, thesis, purpose and limitations of the duology will be elaborated and contrasted with Gernet’s book in a parallel framework.

This duology is sequentially aligned in the format of a comprehensive and factual recital of dynasty-by-dynasty chronicles that are mainly based on the ancient annals of *Shi-ji* (*Historian’s Records*), *The Spring & Autumn Annals*, and *The Bamboo Annals*, with contents covering the topics of archaeology, bronzeware, astronomy, divination, and calendar interspersed throughout. The duology on the Sinitic civilization and history started with Chapter 1 entitled “*Asking Heaven*” (“Heavenly Questions”) which was an ancient Chinese epic with a hybrid of questions about the riddles and enigma concerning the Universe, Genesis, Nature, and the rise and fall of dynasties. This epic contains the untainted theological and cosmological framework of ancient China, such as the rainhat-shaped round heaven and square earth, the skies being propped up by eight pillars (*ba zhu*), and the celestial hub (*wo* [rotating] *wei* [heavenly net]) with the heavenly polar(s) subjoined to the celestial body by an axial rope. The pillar concept could have origin in Zhou King Wuwang’s poem called *Zhi* (pillars of the sky), which stated that the sky’s pillars could not be damaged, and if damaged, could not be repaired by the human force. In Zou Yan (Tsou Yen) or his disciples’ works, the pillars were described to be located in the connection area of heaven and earth in the far way areas (*tian-di ji*) of the remaining eight ‘greater’ prefectures [beyond the Centric “Greater” Prefecture]. Hucker, who possibly took the Chinese as atheists since antiquity, claimed that “the Chinese felt no need to explain the creation of the universe and the origin of mankind”. Actually, ancient China merely lacked a personified omnipotent, omniscient and omnipresent god who created the universe and engendered the mankind, and stratified the divine spirits into the grandiose sky (*huang tian*) and the lord on high (*shang di*) before combining the two into one and creating a separate grand one god (*tai yi*) by the late Zhou dynasty.

In *Book I*, in addition to the epic *Heavenly Questions* (Chapter 1), two chapters are dedicated to interpreting the ancient classic, include a complete exposition on geography book *Yu Gong* (Lord Yu’s Tributes; Tribute of Yu) in Chapter 20, and a write-up on fiction *Mu-tian-zi Zhuan* (Zhou King Muwang’s Travelogue) in Chapter 21. *Lord Yu’s Tributes*, which talked about Lord Yu’s flood control and zoning of the nine prefectures of Sinitic China, was the cornerstone on which the Sinitic nation, with the three successive dynasties of Xia, Shang and Zhou from the same big family, was founded, and the blueprint according to which the imperial administrative layout was mapped throughout the past millennia. *Zhou King Muwang’s Travels* contained six travelogues that covered three discrete stories of no successive bearing to one another. The first four travelogues, i.e., visit with Count of the Yellow River at today’s northeastern Yellow River Bend, travel to mount Kunlun [where the Yellow Thearch’s palaces and thunder god Feng-long’s tomb were], rendezvous with Queen Mother of the West, and three months’ hunting at the northern feather wilderness, were about longevity, immortality and divination; the 5th travelogue was about hunting and divination around the Eastern Zhou capital

district area on the false assumption that the Western Zhou kings had already relocated eastward, a symptom of retrograde amnesia; and the last travelogue was about the mourning customs of the Zhou dynasty, which was a subject of the later Han dynasty book called *The Book of Rites*. Note that Liu Xie (? 465-520 A.D.), in *Bian Sao* (collating *Li Sao* poem) of *Wen-xing Diao-long* (Literary Mind and Carved Dragons), a book of literary aesthetics, numerology and divination, claimed that Kunlun and Xuanpu (hanging gardens) were not carried by ‘*Jing* [five Confucian classics] {&} *Yi* [*Zhou Yi*/I Ching, i.e., or *Book of Changes*]’.)

The chapters of this duology are arranged in sequence of the ages sorted by the dynasties and kings or emperors, and put under the topical sections of prehistory, Xia, Shang, Zhou, Qin and Han dynasties. Instead of outlining a summary of each chapter in this *Introduction*, a quick overview will be given here. The second section of *Book I*, from Chapters 2 to 6, covers China’s prehistory that is examined through the angles of archaeology, genetic research, ancient literature and fables. The three dimensional validation approach, i.e., underground/archaeological excavated artifacts and astronomical/calendrical data, is adopted for ascertaining the historical truth recorded in the history annals, real or forged, which should have filled in the “gaps, imperfections, and errors” that Gernet felt were left open in his history book. The next three sections detailed the history of the three Chinese dynasties of Xia, Shang and Zhou, with *Book I* ending in the late 7th century B.C., about the midpoint of the 242 years covered in Confucius’ abridged book *The Spring & Autumn Annals* (722-481 B.C.). Throughout the duology and up to the interregnum (841-828 B.C. per *Shi-ji*/840-827 per Zhang Wenyu), the forgery contemporary version of *The Bamboo Annals*, with its forgery contents covering the prehistoric legendary thearchs before the three dynasties of Xia (Chapters 10-12), Shang (Chapters 13-15) and Zhou (Chapters 16-23), was debunked line by line.

For China’s prehistory, note the overwhelming evidence that the ruins or origin of majority of the ancient thearchs from the pre-Xia dynasty eras, such as the Zhu-rong Ruins (in the Zheng state), the Tai-hao Ruins (in the Chen-guo state), Taichen {Shang Dynasty} Ruins (in the Soong state), the Zhuangxu Ruins (in the Wey state), You-shen (in the Wey state), the Kunwu Ruins (in the Wey state), Chu-qiu Ruins (in the Wey state), and Shao-hao Ruins (in the Lu state), were located along the middle Yellow River line and corroborated the O3a1c-002611 haplogroup Sinitic people’s same origin in the central plains of North China. Whether Sinitic China ever had an earlier united kingdom (or dynasty) than Xia was unknown. However, archaeological excavations showed that over six thousand years ago, the Chinese continent entered a jade age from the Mesolithic age, with unison jade ritual artifacts (such as the square-shaped ‘*yu-cong*’ jade disks with a round cylindrical solid body and an inner perforated round hole, and the jade hatchets) adopted in different regions, albeit the co-existence of regionally-differentiated potteries at the non-rulers’ or plebeian levels. The Sinitic civilization’s contribution to the world should not be underestimated. Since remote antiquity, at least over 10,000 years ago, there was the spread of North China’s microlithic stone tools towards the west. This was followed by the spread of the 6000-year-old Lingjiatan double-eagle-head jade octagram to Central Asia, an ancient emblem built on top of the octagram star that had origin in the Sinitic pottery spin wheels with a history of 12,000-15,000 years. Additionally, there was the spread to Central Asia of the patented Sinitic gourd-shaped colored and red potteries with a beam neck.

Gernet made a succinct point that the West or the world “borrowed from China” without “realizing it” nor “recognizing its sizable debt to her, but for which we ourselves would not be what we are”. This is similar to Aly Mazaheri’s claim in *La Route De La Soie* (1983) that China just needed the Ferghana stallions while the West needed everything from China, including products such as paper,

musk, iron cast ovens, iron wok, steel nails, pliers, needles, scissors, iron file, iron hammers, bronze mirrors, fire-making sickle [that Europe had utilized for eighteen centuries], etc. What Gernet and Mazaheri did not realize was Sinitic China's prehistoric contribution, including the written language and the cognates. It would not be farfetched to make a claim that the Sinitic pictographic characters, which could have origin in the Jiahu pristine engraved pictograms with a long history of 6000-8000 years, was the common origin for both the Shang oracle bone characters and the Sumerian wedge script --that shared similar significs or radicals, such as using the 'bow' signific for armies, adopting the reeds' signific to mean writing, and treating the 'square earth' character as animal, hunting and husbandry. In addition, it could be deduced that the Sinitic language, which shares 74% cognates with the Proto-Tibeto-Burman, could be the source for both the cognates of the Proto-North-Caucasian and the Proto-Indo-European for the "Old Chinese" sharing 43% cognates with the Proto-North-Caucasian, rather 23% with the Proto-Indo-European --as a result of the N haplogroup people's relocating to North Asia and then to Scandinavia and bringing along the Sinitic language to the Proto-North-Caucasian who in turn gave it to the Proto-Indo-European. From the bronze technology angle, Jacques Gernet believed that the Chinese "mastery of the potters of Lungshan, the high temperatures which they seem to have been capable of obtaining, and the restricted role of hammering and forging in the technical traditions of the Far East all incline one to favor the idea of an independent discovery of bronze metallurgy". Gernet illustrated his point with citation of the ancient Chinese invention of bellows which were enhanced with double-action piston by the Han dynasty, a kitchen appliance that this author used to operate during early childhood in the Chinese countryside.

Sima Qian's *Shi-ji* claimed that the three dynasties of Xia, Shang and Zhou came from the same family, i.e., descendants of the Yellow Thearch. Existence of the first Chinese dynasty of Xia was doubted by the academics as a result of lack of evidence of written language character set that could serve as an intermediary for transitioning to the Shang dynasty oracle bones. Whether Xia possessed a written language or not, *Jinn Yu* of *Guo Yu* (discourse of the states) claimed that the Yang-ren people, namely, the Yangfan people near the Xia people's You-Xia-zhi-ju habitat, carried the Xia and Shang dynasties' legacy classics. The successor Shang people, in history, held the role as the custodian of the thearchs, for which they were said to be in possession of books: 'you [having] *ce* [threaded documents] you [having] *dian* [canons]'. There is speculation that the Xia kings were the same as the Shang kings but were manufactured by the Zhou dynasty people to justify succeeding the mandate of heaven from the ancestral Xia people while not having discernment that the Xia dynasty suffered a period of loss of the kingdom as a result of usurpation of the Xia thrones by Hou-yi and Han-zhuo, a theme widely covered in the epic *Heavenly Questions*. The Xia kings versus the Shang kings, like the Shang kings versus the Zhou kings, could be an in-law relationship or an endogamy-turned coup according to historian Kwang-chih Chang. Zhang Junshi pointed out that Xia Kings Taikang, Zhongkang and Shaokang possessed the Shang-style 'geng' stem; Xia King Di-zhu, who was known as Di-ning, carried the 'ding' stem; and last Xia King Jie was known to have the 'gui' stem. Kwang-chih Chang took the Shang kings' 'jia', 'yi' versus 'ding' bifurcated groups as some kind of in-law relationship serving the endogamy purpose.

Zhou China, taken to be the dynasty that had expanded Sinitic China's historical boundary to what it was like at the time the Qin empire reunited China, could have actually inherited Shang China's territories, with the difference being the level of exercise of control over the territories. The Zhou people called their country by 'qu-xia' (regional/minor Xia), a term juxtaposed against 'kuang-xia' (grandiose Xi) or 'shi-xia' (prevalent Xia). The Zhou people, on basis of the ancient poems *Shi-jing*, had

constant battles and fights against the Rong & Di people, namely, the Haplogroup O3a2c1*-M134 and O3a2c1a-M117 people known as the historical Qiang and Hu barbarians or what Zhou King Jing[3]wang termed by the Tao-wu northwestern barbarian exiles. *Zuo Zhuan*, in Lu Lord Zhaogong's 9th year, carried Zhou King Jing[3]wang (r. 544-520 B.C.)'s rebuke to the Jinn state in regards to inviting the barbarians to the Zhou capital city district area to harm the Zhou people and implied that the Zhou people, together with a batch of the same Ji-surnamed states, had received the conferral of fiefs in the western territories from the Xia king(s) for agricultural minister Hou-ji's contribution, with the list of the states including the Wei-guo state and the Rui-guo state along the Yellow River Bend. Unlike the laconic inscription of the Shang bronzeware, Zhou China, for its abundant production of bronzeware artifacts carrying munificent description of events related to religion, war, administration, life and judicium, etc., and for the extant history annals *Zuo Zhuan*, presented us all-encompassing picture of a brilliant autochthonous culture of East Asia with vivid political, religious, aesthetic, artistic, literary, philosophical and juridical traditions. This was made possible by what Jacques Gernet termed by the "prerogative of the written word in the Chinese world" --which was a "cultural and administrative language" and the "most effective instruments of political unification", playing the role of "recording and transmitting facts and ideas, which gives man a hold over space and time" and facilitated by intellectuals with "knowledge of writing and to book knowledge".

Book II continues with the Zhou dynasty's history (Chapters 24-26) and ends with chronicling of history of the Qin dynasty (Chapters 24-26), and Han dynasty plus the wars against the Huns (Chapters 29-41), up to Han Emperor Zhangdi (Liu Da, reign A.D. 76-88), with the A.D. 85 adoption of the *Sifen-li* posterior quarter remainder calendar serving as a convenient "semibreve rest". In regards to the Huns, Gernet had a brilliant reading of the Han dynasty chronicles to understand what China's colonial policy was really about, pointing out that "of ... ten millions (i.e., 1 billion coins' equivalent revenues of the Han dynasty), three or four were absorbed every year by the annual gifts to foreign peoples", including 100,900,000 *ch'ien* (coins) to the southern Hsiung-nu in A.D. 91 and 74.8 million to the western territories. This is exactly the same bribery work as today's idiotic "Belt & Road" policy of Communist China. Note that Gernet hedged himself in pinning the Hunnic-Han War, namely, Emperor Liu Bang's defeat at the Baideng mountain, to the period "201-200 B.C.", which should be November 201 B.C. when strictly observing the *Zhuanxu-li* calendar's ordinal months. This author, having expanded the coverage of the Han dynasty bribery to the Hsien-pi, intends to expand the writings on the Huns to include a series of books on the other groups of barbarians in the future, like the Hsien-pi, the Turks, the Khitans, the Jurchens, the Mongols, and the Manchus.

In *Book II*, Chapters 37 and 38 are dedicated to interpreting *Shan Hai Jing* (The Legends of Mountains and Seas), with conclusion that the mountains' part was actually the ancient *Shi-fa* stalk divination, and the seas or overseas' components shared similar contents as seen in the divinatory books *Lian-shan Yi* (divination on concatenated [undulating] mountain ranges) and *Gui-cang Yi* (returning-to-earth storage divination), including the Wangjiatai excavated divination texts of the 3rd century B.C. and the materials from the Ji-zhong tomb excavation of A.D. 279. The one-hand and one-eye 'shen-mu-guo' (the deep eye socket) state, which was speculated to be the legendary one-eyed state Arimaspi that was described by Herodotus in *Histories* as located north of Scythia and east of Issedones, was debunked as having origin in the one-eye bird in the northern mountain range of *Shan Hai Jing*, and the one-eye and three-tail 'huan' foxlike animal on Mt. Yiwang-zhi-shan in the western mountain range of *Shan Hai Jing*. Not to mention having nothing to do with the pineal gland, or the eye of providence, or the eye of Horus. *Book II* has discourses on the Hundred Schools of Thoughts (Chapter

38) and the authenticity of *Shang-shu* (Chapter 41). Zhou China, i.e., what Hucker termed by China's formative age, left behind a legacy of the Hundreds of Schools of Thoughts, i.e., prolific academic and philosophical traditions that could be traced to Confucius and his disciples per Qian Mu, including Confucianism, Taoism, Mohism, Legalism, Nominalism, Syncretism, Dialecticism, Naturalism, Mercantilism, and Egoism, etc. Gernet believed that Zou Yan (Tsou Yen)'s cosmological conceptions could be influenced by ancient India or Bactria, the Warring States' sophistry could be influenced by the Graeco-Roman oratory, and the Chinese school of sophists or dialecticians had the trace of the West, i.e., ten paradoxes equivalent from Greek philosopher Parmenides. Listing a purported East-West-shared Greek metaphor of the still shape of flying birds, Su Xuelin (1897-1999) claimed that Zou Yan (Tsou Yen), who propagated the Nine Greater Prefecture cosmology, must be a Central Asian or Western person; and that the Ji-xia academy of the Qi state, i.e., Plato's Peripatetic School Lykeion equivalent school, was staffed by the Westerners, not reconciling the fundamental difference between the Sinitic versus Greek theories on forms of matter. The Sinitic theory possessed five forms of matter, i.e., wood, mud, water, metal and fire, which were different from the Greek philosophical elements of earth, water, air, and fire.

So far, this *Introduction* devoted the majority of its passages to the highlights that underlie the factual theme of this duology. In here, the main purpose, reasons or motivation of this author's writing would not be expanded other than to repeat what was already mentioned in *Preface To the Second Edition*. As to the "intended readers" of this duology, the author already pointed out in the second preface that "the two books were not intended for the serious-minded readers alone". This author, who likened the exertion of lifelong efforts to writing the two books to similar painstaking works by Zheng Sixiao (1241-1318), Wang Fuzhi (1619-1692) and Gu Yanwu (1613-1682), i.e., adherent loyalists from the alien conquest of China, hopes that readers of the duology on *The Sinitic Civilization* could generate and share the same innermost nostalgic sentiments about the ancient world. In the chapter on the authenticity of ancient version *Shang-shu* (remotely ancient history; book of documents), this author expressed wish that the debates about its authenticity would not be perpetual. For the post-Confucius Confucian Classic *Shang-shu*, it is important to bear in mind that the buzz words like 'de' for virtues, 'ming' for mandate, 'zhong' for golden mean, and 'dao' for way carried different connotation in different historical contexts. As to the forgery contemporary version of *The Bamboo Annals*, this author hopes that Professor Shaughnessy and the others in the academic world would express concurrence one day that the contemporary version of *The Bamboo Annals* was indeed a complete forgery inside and out. A separate publication on *The Bamboo Annals* with line-item rebuttals could be released. It is this author's hope that this duology could have rectified the Chinese history to its original truth that had been damaged by Qin Emperor Shihuangdi's book burning of 213 B.C. and that this duology could have expounded the Chinese tradition, humanity, culture and legacy to the world community.

Hong Yuan
March, 2020