PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

After publication of the first edition of *The Sinitic Civilization* duology in October and November 2018, the author sent a copy of the two books to Professor Edward L. Shaughnessy at University of Chicago and received a prompt response with comments to the effect that the writing was "monumental". Taking into consideration Professor Shaughnessy's comments on the deficiency in the English language and the encouragement to get the two books published in the Chinese language, the author exerted efforts to correcting the deficiency, such as obvious spelling, punctuation and typographical errors, and heteronym mistakes, etc. The purpose of this second edition is to present a rightly balanced output in the hope that some interested Sinologists would make a critique in the future and render some form of assistance in publishing this duology on the Sinitic civilization in the other languages, including the Chinese language. Any critique, criticism, suggestion, advice, and feedback would be appreciated.

In the second edition, most of the bracketed and parenthetical contents remained inline but were made into smaller fonts for readability's sake. The chapter and section numbering of this second edition matches that of the first edition, with the correction of numbering mistakes of chapters in the first edition of *Book II*. The attempt to keep changes to the first-edition's materials to a minimum for sake of avoidance of a new indexing, by producing an erratum or corrigendum, became unrealistic after broadening the scope of modification for the second edition. The revision in the second edition impacted over 10% of the contents. Most importantly, special efforts were made to remove conflicts in the first edition as a result of compacting the manuscripts that were drafted over a time span of twenty years, such as the author's ascertaining 247 B.C. as the first year on the Qin empire's *Zhuanxu-li* calendar in preference over an earlier concurrence with historian Qian Mu's discourse on 250 B.C. versus 249 B.C. as the Qin empire's first year, traces of which were not reconciled and removed in the first edition.

Dozens of pages of extra writings were added to the second edition, with considerable new contents concentrated on the prehistoric East-West contacts in *Book I*. There was a rewrite of the prehistory in regards to the paleo groups of ancient people and their genetics, with the inclusion of the Lingjiatan Ruins in the Jade Age section. It appears to this author that the 6000-year-old Lingjiatan double-eagle-head jade octagram could imply an ancient transfusion of the 10,000-year-old emblem to Central Asia from China. Before Lingjiatan, there was the spread of North China's microlithic stone tools towards the west over 10,000 years ago. It would not be farfetched to state that the Sumerian cuneiform's speedy transformation to logophonetic, consonantal alphabetic and syllabic signs among different groups of the Central Asia and Middle Eastern people could imply the Sumerian script's likely origin as an out-of-area and imported product from let's say North China. Additionally, there was extra discourse on the western spread of red-colored potteries 5000 years ago. Here, with the existence of the obscure pre-2000 B.C copper-based metallurgy in northern China, such as the controversial brass pieces of the fourth and third millennium B.C., there was no rebutting the spread of ancient metallurgy technology to China from the west.

A tentative conclusion could be made in that the ancient world(s) did have some unknown form of discrete, disparate and non-continuous links between the East and West. However, this kind of East-West links were disrupted numerous times, with the consequence of loss of such links amounting to thousands of years in-between, as seen in the westward spread of the microlithic tools, the octagram, the double-head eagle emblem, the pictographic characters, and the red potteries. In regards to genetics, *Book I* was revamped with the new genetic discoveries for analyzing the prehistoric East-West

exchanges. Though, Herodotus' one-eye country's link to the one-eye legends in *Shan Hai Jing* (Legends of Mountains & Seas) was rebutted. As to *Shan Hai Jing*, the important thing to note is that ancient China did not have the European equivalent bestiary of strange creatures as claimed by Richard E. Strassberg of the University of California, Los Angeles. The one-eye country in the seas' component was expanded on the one-eye animal in the mountain component of *Shan Hai Jing*, while the one-eye animal was similar to what Sima Qian described about Guan-zi's allegories in *Feng Shan Shu*, i.e., 'bi-mu yu' [one-eye fish with the pairing eyes of two fish] of the East Sea and the 'bi-yi niao' [one-wing bird with the pairing wings of two birds] of the West Sea. Namely, philosophical and imaginary products.

In the second edition, an analysis of the ancient calendars' mathematical mechanism was undertaken, with inclusion of Wang Yixun's mathematical models in calculating the epochal calendar's inception year and the quarter remainder calendar's diurnals, namely, the "close decimal point" and "numerator and denominator simplification [to 4 digits]" approaches. This is a chicken and egg matter as to how ancient China designed the calendars using the music instrument's measurements, namely, whether there first existed the ancient quarter remainder calendars' diurnals (i.e., 499/940 or 43/81) or the yellow bell musical instrument's 81 [cubic] Chinese inches. Wang Yixun, believing that Han dynasty astronomer Luoxia Hong adopted "close decimal point*"* and "numerator and denominator simplification [to 4 digits]" in deriving the 81'ri fa' (methods of adjusting the day, i.e., diurnal) number, pointed out that Luoxia Hong used the one '*yue4*' volume of a musical instrument, which was equivalent to 81 [cubic] Chinese inches [in physical measurement], as the day's measurement, a number that had the base denominator of 3, plus or minus of which formed the 12 gamut notes. It could be purely coincidental that both the musical instruments and the diurnals possessed the same base denominator. In the Latter Han dynasty, minister Bian Shao claimed to Emperor Shundi (r. 126-144 A.D.) that '*chen*' (argot; apocrypha) book *Qianzao-du* (heavenly-chiseled way [up] of the *Yi Wei* [latitude] divination series) carried the 43/81 diurnal, which was an inverse superposition of cause and effect. Note that Luoxia Hong and Tang Du's *Taichu-li* calendar had its own time lag. In A.D. 85, the Latter Han dynasty revoked the 104 B.C. *Taichu-li* calendar and adopted the *[Yuanhe-]Sifen-li* calendar with the ancient quarter remainder calendar's 499/940 diurnal, which effectively pulled ahead the "solar terms" nodal and medial inception and "*he2 shuo*" syzygy moments by the three fourths of a day's time.

There was a rewrite of the Han dynasty's chronicling events in *Book II*. The Han dynasty emperors' reign years were realigned in strict observance of the Qin empire's *Zhuanxu-li* calendar which started from lunar October of a prior year to September of the succeeding year. The first Han emperor Liu Bang's war with the Huns on the Baideng mountain, for example, was hence revamped to the correct timestamp. Another jeopardy involving the Han dynasty reign years, i.e., the sexagenary years' differential by one year in the virtual *Yin-li* calendar versus the *Zhuanxu-li* calendar, was also extensively reexamined for conformity's sake. In regards to the 260 B.C. Changping Battle, alternative timelines were given with the assumption of different calendar's dates regarding the start of a year and the start of the twelve ordinal months. Namely, what Zhang Wenyu claimed that the 'political' calendars of *Shang-li* (i.e., *Yin-li*), *Zhou-li*, and *Zhuanxu-li*, etc., were academic "pests" in the sense that the Shang and Zhou people merely had a difference in the Dipper establishment months which varied from lunar October to December. Indeed, out of twenty-six solar eclipses in *Chun-qiu*, the Zhou calendar failed 25 times and the Lu calendar failed 13 times. Zhang Wenyu implied that *Zuo Zhuan*, in treating lunar November as the king's "*chun* [spring] *zheng-yue* [first month]", artificially adjusted the Lu state's *Chun-qiu* chronicle to a fixed ordinal month of lunar November of a purported *Zhou-li* calendar. If so, the *Zhuanxu-li* calendar, in treating lunar October as the Qin state's start of a year

and the first ordinal month, committed the same mistake as *Zuo Zhuan*'s author. Wang Mang's Xin dynasty followed the same 'academic pest' route in setting lunar December as the first month of a year.

Christopher Cullen of Needham Research Institute, citing Zu Chongzhi (A.D. 429-500) and Kong Yingda (A.D. 574-648), believed that the six ancient calendars of the three dynasties, as a "single integrated calendrical system", did not exist, and on basis of Li Zhonglin (Lanzhou University)'s research of the 305 *syzygy* (conjunction) dates from 246 B.C. to 105 B.C., expressed concurrence with Li Zhonglin's no-epact re-initialization calendars --in that there existed the varying form of quarter remainder calendars. Namely, ancient astronomers, for sake of compensating for the winter solstice's falling at a time other than midnight, could have i) adopted different epochal start years and ii) shifted the start year for calculating epact of the 19-year cycle (i.e., recurring conjunction of '*he2 shuo*' syzygy and the winter solstices) sometime during the three time periods of Oct 246-Dec 202 B.C., Dec 202-leap Sept 164 B.C., and Jan 163-May 104 B.C. Namely, there existed the non-continuous or interrupted time reckoning at midnights of the winter solstices linking up the three segments of time at issue here. Li Zhonglin's research covered the three time periods of Oct 361 B.C. onward [assuming that it was backtracked to Qin Lord Xiaogong's 1st year as the start epochal year and was adopted by Qin Emperor Shihuangdi {reign 246-210 B.C.}]; Oct 240 B.C. onward [assuming that it was backtracked to Qin Emperor Shihuangdi's start epochal year and adopted by Han Emperor Gaozu {reign 206-195 B.C.} during the 5th year reign]; and Nov 206 B.C. onward [assuming that it was backtracked to Han Emperor Gaozu's start epochal year and was adopted by Han Emperor Wendi {reign 180-157 B.C.} during the Hou-yuan Era 1st year until Han Emperor Wudi's adoption of the 104 B.C. *Taichu-li* calendar].

In addition to a new table of the Han emperors' reign years and eras, the reign years of the lords, kings and emperors of the Zhou-Qin dynasties and the Zhou dynasty vassals were collected under a separate chronology table. Most importantly, a table of the Lu Principality lords' reign years was appended to the second edition to give the readers additional perspectives for making a determination whether ancient China ever possessed the credible written records about the kings and lords prior to the *interregnum* (841-828 B.C. per *Shi-ji*/840-827 per Zhang Wenyu), with or without the book burning of 213 B.C. Note that Sima Qian, 50 years after the book burning, and Liu Xin, 200 years after the book burning, produced two separate sets of the Lu lords' lineage history. Qian Mu believed what Liu Xin cited as *Shi-jia* (Lu Principality lords' lineage) in *Shi4 Jing* for the Lu lords' years was not the same as the *Lu Shi-jia* section in Sima Qian's *Shi-ji*. Zhang Wenyu, who only accepted Liu Xin's adjustment of Lu Lord Shanggong's reign to 60 years, used the Lu lords' summary reign years to derive the year 1106 B.C. for the Zhou conquest of the Shang dynasty. The matter in regards to the Lu lords' lineage history is a cornerstone for cementing the reign years of the ancient Xia, Shang and Zhou dynasties of China.

Lu lords	***Lu Shi-jia* of *Shi-ji***		**Table of 12 Vassals of Shi-ji**	**Lin Xin's *Shi4-jing***		***Di-wang Shi4-ji***	***Tong-jian Wai Ji***	***The Bamboo Annals***
Bo-qin	r. 1042-997 per *Shi4 Jing & Shi-ji*			46 yrs	r. 1114-1069 B.C.	46 yrs	46 yrs	1037-989 B.C. (49 yrs)

The second edition has a new round of discourse on the authenticity of the forgery contemporary version of *The Bamboo Annals* and the Qinghua University bamboo slips *Xi Nian* as far as Zhou King Xiewang's reign of "twenty-one" years (twenty-two if counting 771 B.C.; eleven or twelve {counting

771 B.C.} using the Jinn marquis' running history per Wang Guowei's *Ji-jiao* of *The Bamboo Annals*) as an independent king was concerned. The puzzle rested with Zhou King Xiewang's twenty-one year reign that did not get discussed in history –other than a lonely entry in Kong Yingda's *Chun-qiu Yi-shu (Zheng-yi)* (The Spring & Autumn Annals with essence rectification, commentary and subcommentary) –that could be a Ming dynasty annotation and after Luo Mi's forgery of the *Jin Ben* bamboo annals in the Southern Soong dynasty. Wang Guowei, an erudite, appeared to have doubts about Zhou King Xiewang's reign years as seen in *Chun-qiu Yi-shu (Zheng-yi)*'s comment on Lu Lord Zhaogong's 26th year of *Zuo Zhuan*, as he thought that Zhou King Xiewang (r. 770 B.C. per Wu Baozhou's *Shi4-shi Ji Gu*; 770-760 B.C. per the forgery bamboo annals & Wang Guowei; 770-750 B.C. per the forgery bamboo annals/ *Xi Nian*) was killed during the Jinn marquis' 21st year on the assumption that the original book *The Bamboo Annals* had adopted the Jinn lords' reign years, not the Zhou kings' eras. Wang Guowei might have seemingly believed that *Chun-qiu Yi-shu (Zheng-yi)* was of the '*shi-san jing*' (thirteen classics) series of the Ming dynasty, rather than the '*wu jing*' (five classics) series of the Tang dynasty; and that the data on King Xiewang's twenty-one years of reign, no matter in the forgery contemporary version of *The Bamboo Annals* [which was taken to be forged during the Ming dynasty] or in *Chun-qiu Yi-shu (Zheng-yi)*, was not a significant issue to be reckoned with. Haan Gaonian of Northwestern Normal University, citing *Zuo Zhuan*, concurred with Wang Guowei that Zhou King Xiewang was killed by the Jinn marquis during the marquis' 21st year or 760 B.C., after which the Jinn marquis escorted Zhou King Pingwang to Luoyi. This would have seemingly reconciled with an alternative interpretation of the records in the *Xi Nian* bamboo slips and gave Zhou King Xiewang a one-person reign of eleven years, 770-760 B.C., till Zhou King Pingwang was escorted to Chengzhou in 759 B.C., three years after being supported by the Jinn marquis as a 'king' at Jingshi in 762 B.C., or about nine years after the death of a Zhou king –which would render Zhou King Pingwang's reign as 762-720 B.C. A more radical claim construed the *Xi Nian* records about death of a Zhou king as that of King Xiewang, which would render Zhou King Pingwang's reign as 741-720 B.C. on the assumption that King Pingwang was supported as a king nine years after King Xiewang's death in 750 B.C. and with a simplistic premise that King Pingwang's purported relocation to Luoyi three years later or 738 B.C. would have fulfilled Zhou minister Xin-you's prophecy that it would not take 100 years for the dangling hair Rong barbarians to move in to the Yi-shui and Luo-shui river plains area, a statement recorded in Lu Lord Xigong's 22nd year of *Zuo Zhuan* or 638 B.C. This would further cast doubts on the authenticity of the *Xi Nian* bamboo slips as the Rong barbarians battled against Lord Guo-gong at Sangtian as early as 658 B.C. and attacked the Zhou king in 648, 647 and 644 B.C., respectively.

Another matter related to the timing of *Chun-qiu Yi-shu (Zheng-yi)* would be the second edition's discourse on the existence and weight of the nine ancient bronze cauldrons. It could be actually inferred that there never existed Lord Yu's nine cauldrons, but one cauldron that was made of nine pieces of bronze surrendered to Lord Yu. In *Hou Han Shu*, there was a statement like this: '*chuan*' (legends [or '*zhuan*' {the past classics}]) stated that the cauldron(s), as the [holy] instrument ('dǐng zhī wèi qì'), was what the god[s] treasured ('shén zhī suǒ bǎo') and could not be robbed or moved ('bùkě duó yí') no matter how small and heavy it was ('suī xiǎo ér zhòng').

Other highlights in the second edition would be: the addition of a complete write-up on *Yu Gong* (Lord Yu's Tributes), with emphasis on the astrological developments of nine to twelve allocated fields or territories ('*fen ye*'); a rewrite of the ancient China's myth on the sovereigns on basis of the *Feng-shan Shu* (heaven and earth oblation) chapter of *Shi-ji*; a comparison of the *Xia Xiao-zheng* monthly ordinances with *Lv-shi Chun-qiu*; and a rewrite of the Great Wall's history plus the correction of errors

on the related Warring States map. The section *Yu Gong* (Lord Yu's Tributes), like the epic *Tian Wen* (Asking Heaven), *Mu-tian-zi Zhuan* (Zhou King Muwang's Travels), and *Shan Hai Jing* (The Legends on Mountains and Seas), was not translated *verbatim* but paraphrased and expounded with inclusion of different angles as seen in both the ancient and modern literature. In the second edition, Sima Qian's *Feng-shan Shu* was a significant *Shi-ji* chapter reckoned with as it contained the cornerstone event in regards to Zhou King Wuwang's campaign against the Shang dynasty, with the king said to have passed away '*ke-Yin er-nian* [two years after the Shang conquest]' in *Feng-shan Shu*. This was a key event that automatically debunked the forgery contemporary version of *The Bamboo Annals* as a post-Han-dynasty fake as far as the Zhou founder-king's reign years were concerned. *Lv-shi Chun-qiu*, in dividing the sky into nine quarters and the land mapped to the nine allocated fields or territories ('*fen ye*') in astrology, served the function of an intermediary form of '*fen ye*' astrological divination before the Han dynasty astrologists possibly expanded the Sinitic land to twelve '*fen ye*' divisions. This was on top of the first edition duology's expounding the developments of four polars (poles; struts; extremity; culmen per David Pankenier) in *Lv-shi Chun-qiu* to eight polars in *Huai Nai Zi*. The earliest reference to the four extremities would be '*si-fang* [four domains] *zhi* [whereof] *ji* [center]' as seen in poem *Yin Wu* (Shang martialness) of *Shang1 Song*, an eulogy of the Shang capital city as the most magnificent of all four domains, before the 'polar' concept was to deviate from the center notion and evolve to the azimuths in *Lv-shi Chun-qiu* and *Huai Nan Zi*.

In the second edition, the units of measurement were highlighted and notated with the modern equivalent scales and weights. Though no separate appendix was created for the units of measurements, the ancient scales and weights could be seen in the relevant contexts. For examples, in *Mu-tian-zi Zhuan*, there were the weight units about the king's jar containing 10,000 '*jin*' (copper, the ancient term for gold being equivalent to one Chinese gram, with 1 *jin* equivalent to 250 metric grams), and the king's award of forty *yi4* of gold (equivalent to 800 *liang* [Chinese ounces]). Confucius, when arriving in the Wey state in 497 B.C., was given a pay of 60,000 '*su4*' (bucket) of grains from Wey Lord Linggong. According to *Huayang Guo Zhi*, during Qin King Wuwang's 3rd year, Sima Cuo, commanding a Shu-Ba joint army and ten thousand ships (carrying six million '*hu*' [bushels] of grains), sailed down the Jiang1-shui River (i.e., a rivercourse that could be parallel to the Han-shui River) to attack the Chu state. At about 48 B.C., i.e., the year Han Emperor Yuandi [r. 48-33 B.C.] was enthroned, the Hunnic *chanyu* Huhanye received 20,000 '*hu*' (bushel) of grains. During the Xin dynasty, there was a currency reform, with the issuance of knife-shaped coins that carried the denomination of 50 (i.e., *da-quan*, weighing 15 metric grams and equivalent to 12 *zhu*), 500 (i.e., *qi-dao* knife) and 5000 (i.e., *jin-cuo-dao* knife) coins. The 5000 coins equivalent '*zhi*' (value) knife, with a nominal value of half *jin* (1 *jin* equivalent to 250 metric grams) gold, became the later famed "*jin* [gold] *cuo* [gilt] *dao* [knife]" antique, i.e., gifts to the poet officials from the distinguished '*geisha*' women, as seen in poems of the Eastern Han, Tang and Soong dynasties. Wang Mang, after realizing that the royal Liu surname had a knife radical, changed the knife coins' names to '*quan*' which was seen as a Qin empire's measurement unit called '*zhong-quan*' wherein the '*quan*' (spring) character was a soundex for 'quan' (power -originally a steelyard's weight), with '*quan*' unit being equivalent to two '*jin*' or 32 '*liang*' (ounces) equivalent coin money of the Han dynasty. The ancient distance unit of '*li*' (leagues) could be seen in the distance between the Huns and the Dong-hu barbarians, about 1000-*li* distance apart on the two opposite edge of a vacant land somewhere north of today's Kalgan, or specifically the so-called Pine Desert area, with one '*li*' or league being equivalent to 300 steps or 420 meters.

Most importantly, the ancient 'volume' measurement of '*yue4*' [in 'lv {yellow bell} rong {volume} yi {one} yue4 {equivalent to 1200 '*shu3*' (i.e., *su4*) of grains}], which was cited by Han dynasty astronomer Luoxia

Hong in the selection of 'ri fa' (methods of adjusting or dividing the day, i.e., diurnal) number for the 104 B.C. *Taichu-li* calendar, was expounded and treated as a result of "close decimal point" and "numerator and denominator simplification [to 4 digits]" adjustment to the ancient quarter remainder calendars' diurnals (i.e., 499/940), rather than a derivative of the musical instrument's 81 [cubic] Chinese inches [in physical measurement], a number that was said by Meng Kang (author of *Han-shu Yin-yi*) of the Three Kingdoms to be the yellow bell's length of 9 [Chinese] inches times the girth of 7 "fractions of an inch", nor a 'heavenly number' as taken for granted by Christopher Cullen. According to Wang Guangqi, ancient China initially possessed five sounds, i.e., 'gong1' (*dao* in solmization), 'shang1' (*re*), 'jue2' (*mi*), 'zhi3' (*sol*) and 'yu3' (*la*), before there was the addition of six sets of male '*lv4*' and female '*lv3*' musical scale [or gamut] notes [of possibly the reedpipe, bronze or chord nature] in the late Zhou dynasty, with the pitchpipes' length scaled by the order of one-third plus or minus, namely, a mechanism using the base denominator of 3, which happened to be the same as the multipliers of 3 --that were utilized in the astronomical system. The '*yue4*' measure, other than being used in the volume calculation, was a weight scale that was equivalent to holding 1200 '*shu3*' (i.e., *su4*) of grains, or 12 '*zhu*' equivalent of coins, or half '*liang*' (i.e., ounce), with 16 '*liang*' being equal to 1 '*jin*' (gram), 30 '*jin*' equal to 1 '*jun*' (originally a pottery spin wheel), and 4 '*jun*' equal to 1 '*shi2*' (stone, originally pronounced as 'shi2' before changing to '*dan*' in the recent times and speculated to be a soundex related to the *talanton* unit and *talent* in the Bible). In contrast with the five '*quan*' weights, the Han dynasty capacity measurements were: '*yue*' (1200 '*shu3*' buckets of grains), '*ge*' (2 '*yue*'), [Chinese liter] '*sheng*' (10 '*ge*'), decaliter '*dou*' (10 '*sheng*' liters) and [Chinese bushel] '*hu*' (10 '*dou*'), with the '*dou*' decaliter unit deriving from the shape of the six stars of the [southern] Dipper mansion {which was alternatively disputed to be about the Northern Dipper for the position of being located to the direct north of the Winnowing Basket}, a measure juxtaposed in poem *Da-dong* (great east) of *Shi-jing* with the Winnowing Basket (dustpan) mansion in the same Sagittarius area of the Zodiac.

The two books on the Sinitic civilization contain ten thousand answers to ten thousand questions, something like an encyclopedic reference. The index, with dozens of pages of the history-related terminologies, could serve as an expanded table of contents. By searching for the keywords, topics, and events, people who are interested in China's civilization and history or the world civilization at large could glean information about the Sinitic cosmological, astronomical, astrological, historical, divinatory, and geographical developments, knowing that the foundation blocks of any civilization shared similarity as far as theology, myths, creation, and divination are concerned. *The Sinitic Civilization* duology is not just another history book series about China and its civilization, but a comprehensive rewrite with enumeration of historical facts on records and coverage of the inter-relationship of events spanning the millennia, with the obvious theme being that the more facts are presented and synthesized, the closer to truth the history becomes. The readers, after consuming the facts enumerated in the books, could make their own extrapolation, speculation and conclusion. In the process of presenting the facts, the ancient forgeries, intentional or unintentional, as well as the myths and legends, were pierced by the facts. Specifically, for two thousand years, the authenticity of the "ancient version" of the book *Shang-shu* (Remotely Ancient History) was debated, and for the last hundreds of years, the "contemporary version" of *The Bamboo Annals* was also being debated. Armed with the historical facts presented in the books, the readers would find that their previous beliefs about the Chinese civilization and its history might need to be modified or completely changed.

The two books were not intended for the serious-minded readers alone as the interesting topics like *Mu-tian-zi Zhuan* (Zhou King Muwang's Travels) and *Shan Hai Jing* (The legends on Mountains and

Seas) were also included. For the Zhou king's travels, Charles Hucker mused about the Zhou king's rendezvous with Queen Sheba. Tang dynasty monk Dao-xuan (A.D. 596-667), in *Xu Gao Seng Zhuan* (continuum to {monk Hui-jiao's} *Gao Seng Zhuan* [biographies of distinguished monks]), made up a claim that during the Tuoba Wei dynasty, distinguished monk T'an-wu-tsui (Dharma Zui), citing [fake] *Zhou Shu Yi-ji* (non-orthodox records of *Zhou Shu*), [fake-]debated against Taoist Jiang Bin in front of Emperor Xiaomingdi and asserted that Buddha was born in Zhou King Zhaowang (reign 1052-1002 B.C. per *Huang Ji Shi Jing*; 1041-1007 B.C. per Zhang Wenyu/*Xiao Yuh2 Ding* cauldron)'s 24th year, i.e., where the Mahayana or the Tibetan calendar's start year 1027 B.C. derived from, and died in Zhou King Muwang's 52nd year; and Sui dynasty monk Fei Changfang (not Han dynasty alchemist Fei Changfang), in *Li-dai San-bao Ji* (records of three [Buddhist] treasures of past dynasties), cited [fake] *Mu-tian-zi Bie Zhuan* (alternative book of King Muwang's travels) in claiming that Zhou King Muwang travelled west in the attempt at visiting Buddha. Whether this is about the king's travel or the East-West exchange, readers could make a conclusion for themselves after perusing this author's comprehensive rewrite of the king's travelogue. And, Buddha was faked by Xie Cheng of the Sun-Wu dynasty to be born in 687 B.C., i.e., Zhou King Zhuangwang's 10th year, or Lu Lord Zhuanggong's 7th year of Chun-qiu which recorded an event of stars not being seen in the sky. Also note that there was also unfounded speculation that 'King Mu[wang]' might not be Zhou King Muwang, but Qin Lord Mugong. As to the book *Shan Hai Jing*, Henriette Mertz speculated about a Chinese expedition to the North American continent at the turn of the 3rd and 2nd millennia B.C. Though the terminologies like Lilliput and Brobdingnag were applied to *Shan Hai Jing*, readers would conclude for themselves that the writings on the mountains and seas were not about geography, nor bestiary, nor Eden or Paradise, but sacrifice and divination. Other than *Mu-tian-zi Zhuan* and *Shan Hai Jing*, Chapter One of *Book I* had the interpretation of *Tian Wen* (Asking Heaven), which was an epic that contained the ancient Chinese myths about the creation theories. As mentioned previously, the second edition of *Book I* had the addition of a complete write-up of *Yu Gong* (Lord Yu's Tributes). *Tian Wen*, *Mu-tian-zi Zhuan, Shan Hai Jing*, and *Yu Gong* would be made into four separate books for distribution.

Though not a 100% word-for-word translation of the two ancient Chinese history annals of *The Spring & Autumn Annals* (722-481 B.C.) and *The Bamboo Annals* (the late 3rd and early 2nd millennia B.C.-299 B.C.), the duology could be said to have at minimum 95-98% of the contents paraphrased, if not termed translated. It might very well be possible that the duology could be filtered into two separate books on *The Bamboo Annals* or *The Spring & Autumn Annals*. Additionally, the two books on the Sinitic Civilization contained the paraphrasing of ancient poems from *The Book of Poems*, and hence could serve as a literary source of reference. Absent the Chinese logographic characters, the books could serve as an entry-level Chinese language textbook as the Chinese words and their meanings were spelled out with the English paraphrased meanings in the brackets. The author hopes that readers of the duology books on *The Sinitic Civilization* could generate and share the same innermost nostalgic sentiments about the ancient world. The author, likening 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 surviving from the alien conquest of China, wishes to repose faith in the spirits of antiquity after wrapping up the two books.

Hong Yuan
October 2019