

UDC 373.1

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/2787-5137-2023-2-6>**Changlong Sun,**Postgraduate Student at the Department of Philosophy,
National Technical University "Kharkiv Polytechnic Institute"

E-mail: 1246175775@qq.com

ORCID: 0009-0008-2405-3242

THE ROLE AND INFLUENCE OF CHINA'S HISTORICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL TRADITIONS ON MODERN EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT AND SOCIETY

Chinese philosophy arose at about the same time as ancient Greek and ancient Indian philosophy, in the middle of the 1st millennium BC. Separate philosophical ideas and themes, as well as many terms that later formed a large part of the lexicon of traditional Chinese philosophy, were already contained in the most ancient written monuments of Chinese culture – "Shu jing" ("Canon of [documentary] writings"), "Shi jing" ("Canon of poems"), "Zhou i" ("Zhou changes"), which developed in the 1st half. 1st millennium BC, which sometimes serves as the basis for claims (especially by Chinese scholars) about the origin of philosophy in China at the beginning of the 1st millennium BC. This point of view is also motivated by the fact that these works include separate independent texts with a developed philosophical content, for example. "Hong fan" ("Majestic Pattern") from "Shu jing" or "Xi ci zhuan" ("Commentary of tied words") from "Zhou Yi". However, as a rule, the creation or final design of such texts dates back to the 2nd half of 1st millennium BC. The first historically reliable creator of philosophical theory in China was Confucius (551–479 BC), who realized himself as the spokesman for the spiritual tradition of Zhu – scientists, educated people, intellectuals, whose name later became a terminological designation for Confucianism. According to traditional dating, Lao Tzu, the founder of Taoism, the main ideological movement opposed to Confucianism, was an older contemporary of Confucius. However, it has now been established that the first Taoist works proper were written after the Confucian ones, and even, apparently, were a reaction to them. Lao Tzu, as a historical person, most likely lived later than Confucius. Apparently, the traditional idea of the pre-Qin (until the end of the 3rd century BC) period in the history of Chinese philosophy as an era of equal controversy of the "hundred schools" is also inaccurate, since all the philosophical schools that existed at that time were self-determined through their attitude to Confucianism.

Key words: Chinese philosophy, ideas, traditional content.

Чанлун Сунь,

аспірантка кафедри філософії,

Національний технічний університет «Харківський політехнічний інститут»

E-mail: 1246175775@qq.com

ORCID: 0009-0008-2405-3242

РОЛЬ ТА ВПЛИВ ІСТОРИЧНИХ ТА ФІЛОСОФСЬКИХ ТРАДИЦІЙ КИТАЮ НА СУЧАСНЕ ОСВІТНЄ СЕРЕДОВИЩЕ ТА СОЦІУМ

Китайська філософія виникла приблизно в той же час, що й давньогрецька та давньоіндійська філософія, у середині I тис. до н. е. У статті виявлено, що окремі філософські ідеї та теми, а також багато термінів, які згодом склали значну частину лексикону традиційної китайської філософії, містилися вже в найдавніших письмових пам'ятках китайської культури – «Шу цзин» («Канон [документальних] писань»), «Ши цзин» («Канон віршів»), «Чжоу і» («Чжоу зміни»), що склалися в I пол. I тис. до н. е., що іноді служить підставою для тверджень (особливо китайських учених) про зародження філософії в Китаї на початку I тис. до н. е. Ця точка зору обумовлена також тим, що ці твори включають окремі самостійні тексти з розгорнутим філософським змістом, наприклад «Хун фань» («Величний Візерунок») із «Шу цзин» або «Сі ци чжуань» («Коментар зв'язаних слів») із «Чжоу І». Проте, як правило, створення або остаточне оформлення таких текстів датується 2-ю половиною I тис. до н. е. Першим історично достовірним творцем філософської теорії в Китаї був Конфуцій (551–479 рр. до н. е.), який усвідомлював себе виразником духовної традиції Чжоу – учених, освічених людей, інтелектуалів, чиє ім'я згодом стало термінологічним позначенням для конфуціанства. Згідно з традиційним датуванням, Лао-цзи, засновник даосизму, основної ідеологічної течії, що виступає проти конфуціанства, був старшим сучасником Конфуція. Однак, тепер встановлено, що перші власне даоські твори були написані після конфуціанських і навіть, мабуть, були реакцією на них. Лао-цзи, як історична особа, швидше за все, жив пізніше за Конфуція. Швидше неправильним є і традиційне уявлення про доцинський (до кінця III ст. до н. е.) період в історії китайської філософії як про епоху рівноправної суперечки «ста шкіл», оскільки всі філософські школи, що існували на той час, самовизначилися через своє ставлення до конфуціанства.

Ключові слова: китайська філософія, ідеї, традиційний зміст.

Introduction. It is no coincidence that this era ended with the "anti-philosophical" repressions of Emperor Qin Shi Huang in 213–210. BC e., directed specifically against the Confucians. The term "zhu" from the very beginning of Chinese philosophy denoted not only and not so much one of its schools, but philosophy as a single ideological complex, combining the features of philosophy, science, art and religion. In different eras, the balance of these features was different. However, as a rule, the creation or final design of such texts dates back to the 2nd half of 1st millennium BC. The first historically reliable creator of philosophical theory in China was Confucius (551–479 BC), who realized himself as the spokesman for the spiritual tradition of Zhu – scientists, educated people, intellectuals, whose name later became a terminological designation for Confucianism. According to traditional dating, Lao Tzu, the founder of Taoism, the main ideological movement opposed to Confucianism, was an older contemporary of Confucius. However, it has now been established that the first Taoist works proper were written after the Confucian ones, and even, apparently, were a reaction to them. Lao Tzu, as a historical person, most likely lived later than Confucius. Apparently, the traditional idea of the pre-Qin (until the end of the 3rd century BC) period in the history of Chinese philosophy as an era of equal controversy of the "hundred schools" is also inaccurate, since all the philosophical schools that existed at that time were self-determined through their attitude to Confucianism (Chen, 2005, p. 20).

Analysis of recent research and publications. In the 2nd century BC e. Confucianism achieved the official status of an orthodox ideology, but even before that it informally had a similar status. Consequently, the entire history of Chinese philosophy is connected with the fundamental division of philosophical schools on the basis of correlation with orthodoxy. This theologically relevant classificatory principle had a universal meaning in traditional China, extending to all spheres of culture, incl. for scientific disciplines.

The purpose of the article is to research how Confucius and the first philosophers – zhu – saw their main task in the theoretical understanding of the life of society and the personal fate of a person and its further development. As carriers and disseminators of culture, they were closely associated with social institutions responsible for the storage and reproduction of written, incl. historical and literary documents (culture, writing and literature in the Chinese language were denoted by one term – "wen"), and their representatives – skribamish. Hence the three main features of Confucianism: 1) in institutional terms – connection or active desire for connection with the administrative apparatus, constant claims to the role of official ideology; 2) in terms of content – the dominance of socio-political, ethical, social science, humanitarian issues; 3) formally – the recognition of the textological canon, i.e., compliance with strict formal criteria of "literariness", as a methodologically significant norm.

Presentation of the main research material. From the very beginning, Confucius' policy was to "transmit, not create, believe in antiquity and love it" ("Lun Yu", VII, 1). At the same time, the act of transferring ancient wisdom to future generations had a culturally creative and creative character, if only because the archaic works (canons) on which the first Confucians relied were already incomprehensible to their contemporaries and required comprehending interpretations. As a result, commentary and exegesis of ancient classical works became the dominant forms of creativity in Chinese philosophy. Even the most daring innovators sought to appear as mere interpreters or restorers of the old ideological orthodoxy. Theoretical innovation, as a rule, not only was not emphasized and did not receive explicit expression, but, on the contrary, was deliberately dissolved in the mass of commentary (quasi-commentary) text (Gao, 1998, p. 1).

This feature of Chinese philosophy was determined by a number of factors – from social to linguistic. Ancient Chinese society did not know polis democracy and the type of philosopher generated by it, who was consciously detached from the empiricall life surrounding him in the name of understanding life as such. Introduction to writing and culture in China has always been determined by a fairly high social status and determined it. Already from the 2nd c. BC, with the transformation of Confucianism into an official ideology, an examination system began to take shape, which consolidated the connection of philosophical thought both with state institutions and with "classical literature" – a certain set of canonical texts. Since ancient times, such a connection was determined by the specific (including linguistic) complexity of obtaining an education and access to the material carriers of culture (primarily books).

Due to its high social status, philosophy was of outstanding importance in the life of Chinese society, where it has always been the "queen of the sciences" and never became the "servant of theology." However, it is related to theology by the immutable use of a regulated set of canonical texts, which form an inescapable source for all kinds of speculative speculations. On this path, which involves taking into account all previous points of view on the canonical problem, Chinese philosophers inevitably turned into historians of philosophy, and in their writings historical arguments prevailed over logical ones.

Moreover, the logical became historicized, just as in the Christian religious and theological literature the Logos turned into Christ and, having lived a human life, opened a new era of history. But unlike "real" mysticism, which denies both the logical and the historical, claiming to go beyond both conceptual and space-time boundaries, Chinese philosophy was dominated by a tendency to completely immerse mythologemes in historical specifics.

What Confucius was going to "transmit" was recorded by ch.o. in historical and literary monuments – "Shu jing" and "Shi jing". Thus, the specificity of Chinese philosophy was determined by a close connection not only with historical, but also with literary thought. Philosophical works have traditionally been dominated by the literary form. On the one hand, philosophy itself did not strive for dry abstraction, and on the other hand, literature was also saturated with the "finest juices" of philosophy. According to the degree of fictionalization, Chinese philosophy can be compared with Russian philosophy. On the whole, Chinese philosophy retained these features until the beginning of the 20th century, when, under the influence of acquaintance with Western philosophy, non-traditional philosophical theories began to emerge in China (Huang, 2007, p. 34).

The specificity of Chinese classical philosophy in the substantive aspect is determined primarily by the dominance of naturalism and the absence of developed idealistic theories such as Platonism or Neoplatonism (and even more so the classical European idealism of the New Age), and in the methodological aspect, by the absence of such a universal general philosophical and general scientific organon as formal logic (which is a direct consequence of the underdevelopment of idealism). We are talking about naturalism, and not about materialism, because the latter is correlative to idealism, and outside this correlation, the term "materialism" loses its scientific meaning. Researchers of Chinese philosophy often see the concept of the ideal in the categories *y* – "absence-non-existence" (especially among the Taoists; see *Yu* – *y*) or *li* – "principle-reason" (especially among the Neo-Confucians). However, "*y*" at best can denote some analogue of Platonic-Aristotelian matter as a pure possibility (actual non-existence), and "*li*" expresses the idea of an ordering structure (regularity or "lawful place"), immanently inherent in each individual thing and devoid of a transcendental character.

In classical Chinese philosophy, which did not develop the concept of the ideal as such (the idea, the eidos, the form of forms, the transcendent deity), not only the "Plato line", but also the "Democritus line" was absent, since the rich tradition of materialistic thought was not formed in a theoretically meaningful opposition clearly expressed idealism and did not independently give rise to atomism at all. All this testifies to the undoubted dominance of naturalism in classical Chinese philosophy, typologically similar to democratic philosophizing in ancient Greece.

One of the consequences of the general methodological role of logic in Europe was the acquisition by philosophical categories, first of all, of a logical meaning, genetically ascending to the grammatical models of the ancient Greek language. The Chinese analogues of categories, genetically ascending to mythical ideas, images of divinatory practice and economic and ordering activities, acquired, first of all, a natural philosophical meaning and were used as classification matrices: for example, binary – *yin yang*, or *liang* and – "two of images"; ternary – *tian, jen, di* – "heaven, man, earth", or *san cai* – "three materials"; fivefold – *wu xing* – "five elements". The modern Chinese term "category" (*fan-chou*) has a numerological etymology, originating from the designation of a square nine-cell (9 – *chow*) construction (according to the 3×3 magic square model – *lo shu*; see He Tu and Lo shu), on which "Hong fan" is based.

The place of logic in China was occupied by the so-called. numerology (see *Xiang shu zhi xue*), i.e. a formalized theoretical system, the elements of which are mathematical or mathematical-figurative objects – numerical complexes and geometric structures, connected, however, with each other Ch. O. not according to the laws of mathematics, but otherwise – symbolically, associatively, factually, aesthetically, mnemonically, suggestively, etc. As shown in the early 20th century. one of the

first researchers of the ancient Chinese methodology, Hu Shih, its two main varieties were Confucian logic, set forth in Zhou Yi, and Mohist logic, set forth in chapters 40–45 of Mo Tzu, i.e. numerology and protology. The most ancient and canonical forms of self-comprehension of the general cognitive methodology of Chinese classical philosophy, implemented, on the one hand, in the numerology of Zhou Yi, Hong Fan, Tai Xuan Jing, and on the other hand, in the protology of Mo Tzu, Gongsun Long Tzu, "Xun Tzu", now arouse increased interest in the entire world of Sinology (Chang, 2016, p. 109).

Hu Shi sought to demonstrate the presence of the "logical method" in ancient Chinese philosophy, including both protology and numerology on an equal footing. Hu Shih's remarkable achievement was the "discovery" in ancient China of a developed general cognitive methodology, but he failed to prove its logical nature, which was rightly noted in 1925 by Academician V.M. Alekseev. In the 1920s the most prominent European Sinologists A. Forke and A. Maspero showed that even the teaching of the late Mohists, which is closest to logic in ancient Chinese methodology, is strictly speaking eristic and, therefore, has the status of protology.

In the mid 1930s. understanding of "Zhou and" as a logical treatise was convincingly refuted by Yu.K. Shchutsky. And at the same time, Shen Zhongtao (Ch. T. Song) showed in an expanded form that the numerology of Zhou Yi can be used as a general scientific methodology, since it is a harmonious system of symbolic forms that reflect the universal quantitative and structural patterns of the universe. Unfortunately, Shen Zhongtao left aside the question of the extent to which this potential was realized by the Chinese scientific and philosophical tradition.

The methodological role of numerology in the broadest context of the spiritual culture of traditional China was then brilliantly demonstrated by the outstanding French sinologist M. Granet, who considered numerology as a kind of methodology of Chinese "correlative (associative) thinking". Granet's works contributed to the emergence of modern structuralism and semiotics, but for a long time, despite their high authority, they did not find proper continuation in Western Sinology.

The theory of "correlative thinking" found its greatest development in the works of the greatest Western historian of Chinese science, J. Needham, who, however, fundamentally separated "correlative thinking" and numerology. From his point of view, the first, by virtue of its dialectical nature, served as a breeding ground for genuine scientific creativity, while the second, although a derivative of the first, hindered rather than stimulated the development of science. The internal inconsistency of Needham's position is outwardly smoothed out by the narrowing of the concept of Chinese numerology to just the mysticism of numbers (of course, which does not have a general methodological status). This position was criticized by another outstanding historian of Chinese science, N. Sivin, who, using the material of several scientific disciplines, concretely showed the inherent organic nature of their inherent numerological constructions.

The most radical views in the methodological interpretation of Chinese numerology are held by domestic sinologists V. S. Spirin and A. M. Karapetyants, who defend the thesis of its full scientific character. Spirin sees in it, first of all, logic, Karapetyants – mathematics. Similarly, Chinese researcher Liu Weihua interprets the Zhou Yi theory of numerology as the oldest mathematical philosophy and mathematical logic in the world. Spirin and Karapetyants propose to abandon the term "numerology" or use it only when applied to obviously unscientific constructions. Such a distinction, of course, is possible, but it will reflect the worldview of a modern scientist, and not a Chinese thinker who used a single methodology in both scientific and non-scientific (from our point of view) studies (Fu, 2014, p. 177).

The foundation of Chinese numerology consists of three types of objects, each of which is represented by two varieties: 1) "symbols" – a) trigrams, b) hexagrams (see Gua); 2) "numbers" – a) he tu, b) lo shu (see He tu and Lo shu); 3) the main ontological hypostases of "symbols" and "numbers" – a) yin yang (dark and light), b) wu xing (five elements). This system itself is numerological, since it is built on two initial numerological numbers – 3 and 2. It reflects all three main types of graphic symbolization used in traditional Chinese culture: "symbols" – geometric shapes; "numbers" – numbers; yin yang, wu xing – hieroglyphs. This fact is explained by the archaic origin of Chinese numerology, which has performed a cultural modeling function since time immemorial. The most ancient examples of Chinese writing are extremely numerological inscriptions on oracle bones. Therefore, in the future, canonical texts were created according to numerological standards. So in a purely traditionalist society, the most significant ideas were inextricably fused with iconic clichés, in which the composition, number and spatial arrangement of hieroglyphs or any other graphic symbols were strictly established.

Over its long history, numerological structures in China have reached a high degree of formalization. It was this circumstance that played a decisive role in the victory of Chinese numerology over protology, since the latter did not become either formal or formalized, and therefore did not possess the qualities of a convenient and compact methodological tool (organon).

Chinese protology was both opposed to numerology and strongly dependent on it. So, being under the influence of the numerological concept of the mental apparatus, in which the concept of "contradiction" ("contradiction") was dissolved in the concept of "opposite" ("contrarality"), protological thought failed to terminologically distinguish between "contradiction" and "opposite". This, in turn, most significantly affected the nature of Chinese protology and dialectics, since both the logical and the dialectical are defined through the relation to the contradiction. The central epistemological procedure – generalization – in numerology and numerologized protology was based on the quantitative ordering of objects and the value-normative selection of the main one from them – the representative – without logical abstraction of the totality of ideal features inherent in the entire given class of objects. Generalization is essentially interconnected with the axiological and normative nature of the entire conceptual apparatus of classical Chinese philosophy, which led to such fundamental features of the latter as fictionalization and textual canonicity.

In general, in classical Chinese philosophy, numerology prevailed with the theoretical underdevelopment of the "logic-dialectic" opposition, the undifferentiated materialistic and idealistic tendencies and the general dominance of combinatorial-classification naturalism, the absence of logical idealism, as well as the preservation of the symbolic ambiguity of philosophical terminology and the value-normative hierarchy of concepts (Fingarette, 1972, p. 2).

BASIC SCHOOLS. In the initial period of its existence (6th–3rd centuries BC), Chinese philosophy, in the conditions of the categorical non-differentiation of philosophical, scientific and religious knowledge, was a picture of the utmost diversity of views and directions, presented as "the rivalry of a hundred schools" (bai jia zheng min). The first attempts to classify this diversity were made by representatives of the main philosophical currents (Confucianism and Taoism) in an effort to criticize all their opponents. The 6th chapter ("Fei Shih-er Tzu" – "Against the Twelve Thinkers") of the Confucian treatise "Xun Tzu" is specially devoted to this. In it, in addition to the propagandized teachings of Confucius and his disciple Zi Gong (5th century BC), the author singled out "six teachings" (liu sho), presented in pairs by twelve thinkers, and subjected them to sharp criticism. In the 21st chapter of his treatise Xun Tzu, giving the teachings of Confucius the role of "the only school that has achieved the universal Tao and mastered its application (yun, see Tu – yong)", he also singled out six "disorderly schools" (luan jia) opposing him.

Approximately synchronous (although, according to some assumptions, later, up to the turn of the new era) and typologically similar classification is contained in the final 33rd chapter ("Tian-xia" – "Celestial") "Zhuangzi" (4–3 centuries BC), where the core teaching of Confucians, inheriting ancient wisdom, is also highlighted, which is opposed by "one hundred schools" (bai jia), divided into six directions.

These structurally similar sixfold constructions, proceeding from the idea of the unity of truth (tao) and the diversity of its manifestations, became the basis for the first classification of the main philosophical teachings as such (and not just their representatives), which was carried out by Sima Tan (2nd century BC.), who wrote a special treatise on the "six schools" (liu jia), which was included in the final 130th chapter compiled by his son Sima Qian (2–1 centuries BC) of the first dynastic history "Shi ji" ("Historical notes"). This work lists and characterizes: 1) "the school of dark and light [world-forming principles]" (yinyang jia), also called "natural-philosophical" in Western literature; 2) "school of scientists" (zhu jia), i.e. Confucianism; 3) "Mo[Di] school" (mo jia, Moism); 4) the "school of names" (ming jia), also called "nominalist" and "dialectical-sophistical" in Western literature; 5) "school of laws" (fa jia), i.e. legalism and 6) "the school of the Way and Grace" (dao de jia), i.e. Taoism. The highest rating was awarded to the last school, which, like Confucianism, in the classifications from Xun Tzu and Zhuang Tzu, is presented here as synthesizing the main advantages of all other schools.

This scheme was developed in the classification and bibliographic work of the outstanding scientist Liu Xin (46 BC – 23 AD), which formed the basis of the oldest in China, and possibly in the world, the corresponding catalog "I wen zhi" ("Treatise on Art and Literature"), which became the

30th chapter of the second dynastic history "Han shu" ("The Book [of the] Han Dynasty") compiled by Ban Gu (32–92). Firstly, the classification grew to ten members – four new ones were added to the six existing ones: the diplomatic "school of vertical and horizontal [political unions]" (zongheng jia); eclectic-encyclopedic "free school" (tsza jia); "agrarian school" (nong jia) and folklore "school of small explanations" (xiao sho jia). Secondly, Liu Xun proposed a theory of the origin of each of the "ten schools" (shih chia) encompassing "all philosophers" (zhu zi). This theory assumed that in the initial period of the formation of traditional Chinese culture, i.e. in the first centuries of the first millennium BC, officials were the bearers of socially significant knowledge, in other words, "scientists" were "officials", and "officials" were "scientists". Due to the decline of the "way of the true sovereign" (wang dao), i.e. the weakening of the power of the ruling house of Zhou, the centralized administrative structure was destroyed and its representatives, having lost their official status, were forced to lead a private lifestyle and ensure their own existence by implementing their knowledge and skills already as teachers, mentors, preachers. In the era of state fragmentation, representatives of various spheres of the once unified administration, who fought for influence on the specific rulers, formed different philosophical schools, the very general designation of which "jia" (this hieroglyph has a literal meaning "family") testifies to their private nature.

Conclusions. Confucianism was created by people from the department of education, who "helped the rulers follow the forces of yin yang and explained how to exercise educational influence", relying on the "written culture" (wen) of the canonical texts "Liu Yi", "Wu Jing", "Shi San Jing" and putting humanity (jen) and due justice (yi) at the forefront. Taoism (dao jia) was created by people from the department of chronography, who "composed chronicles about the path (tao) of success and defeat, existence and death, grief and happiness, antiquity and modernity", thanks to which they comprehended the "royal art" of self-preservation through "purity and emptiness", "humiliation and weakness". The "School of Dark and Light [World-Forming Principles]" was created by people from the department of astronomy, who followed celestial signs, the sun, moon, stars, cosmic landmarks and the alternation of times. Legalism was created by people from the judiciary, who supplemented the administration based on "decency" (li) with rewards and punishments determined by laws (fa). The "School of Names" was created by people from the ritual department, whose activity was determined by the fact that in ancient times in ranks and rituals, the nominal and the real did not coincide, and the problem arose of bringing them into mutual correspondence. Mohism was created by people from the temple watchmen who preached frugality, "comprehensive love" (jian ai), promotion of "worthy" (xian), reverence for "navyam" (tui), rejection of "predestination" (min) and "uniformity" (tun; see Da tun). The diplomatic "school of vertical and horizontal [political alliances]" was created by people from the embassy department, who were able to "do things as they should and be guided by prescriptions, not verbiage." The eclectic-encyclopedic "free school" was created by people from the councilors who combined the ideas of Confucianism and Moism, the "school of names" and legalism in the name of maintaining order in the state. The "agrarian school" was created by people from the department of agriculture, who were in charge of the production of food and goods, which in the "Hong Fang" are assigned respectively to the first and second of the eight most important state affairs (ba zheng). The "School of small explanations" was created by people from low-ranking officials who were supposed to collect information about the mood among the people on the basis of "street gossip and road rumors."

Evaluating the last school (which was more folklore than philosophical in nature, and produced "fiction" – xiao shuo) as not worthy of attention, the authors of this theory recognized the ten remaining schools as "mutually opposite, but forming each other" (xiang fan er xiang cheng), i.e. going to the same goal in different ways and based on a common ideological basis – the "Six canons" ("Liu jing", see "Shi san jing"). It followed from the conclusion that the diversity of philosophical schools is a forced consequence of the collapse of the general state system, which is naturally eliminated when such is restored and philosophical thought returns to the unifying and standardizing Confucian channel.

References:

1. Confucius (2016). *Analects*, Beijing: Peking University Press, 121, 139, 322, 341, 388 [in Chinese].
2. Chen, R. (2005). A Summary of the study of Zhouyi Copied on the bamboo slips of Chu Collected in Shanghai Museum, *Studies of Zhouyi*, 5(2), 16–27 [in Chinese].
3. Chen, L. (2021). On the Existence of the Xia Dynasty from the Mythological [in Chinese].

4. Standpoint. *Journal of Peking University* (Philosophy and Social Sciences), 58(4), 81–88 [in Chinese].
5. Chang, J. (2016). *The Book of Changes*, Zhengzhou: Zhongzhou Ancient Books Press, James Legge translation version, 109 [in Chinese].
6. Fu, J. (2014). Fuxi's historical contribution and the enlightenment of Fuxi's cultural research, *Gansu Social Sciences*, 1, 177–180 [in Chinese].
7. Fingarette, H. (1972). *Confucius: The Secular as Sacred*. Harper & Row Press, 2, 3 [in English].
8. Gao, J. (1998). *The Book of Changes and the Generation and Development of Confucian Ethics*. *Journal of Qiqihar University* (Philosophy & Social Science Edition), 1, 1–2 [in Chinese].
9. Ge, Z. (2001). *History of Chinese Thought I*, Shanghai: Fudan University Press, 74 [in Chinese].
10. Huang, S. & Zhang, S. (2007). *The Book of Changes*, Shanghai: Shanghai Ancient Books Press, 5, 34, 245 [in English].