

# The Solar Eclipse of the Xia Dynasty: A Review

Emil Khalisi  
69126 Heidelberg, Germany  
e-mail: ekhalisi@khalisi.com

## Abstract

We present a review on the renowned solar eclipse in the Chinese book *Shujing* describing the oldest account of this kind. After balancing the arguments on the time, place, and the celestial stage, we offer a new scenario. The path of totality on 15 September 1903 BCE traversed Anyi, the assumed capital of the Xia dynasty. The date matches remarkably well the chronological order of two other incidents of mythological rank: the closest-ever agglomeration of the naked-eye planets and the Great Flood under Emperor Yu. Still, this eclipse does not remove all questions about the historical circumstances given in the account.

**Keywords:** Solar eclipse, Astronomical dating, Chronology, Xia dynasty, Ancient China

## 1 Introduction

The solar eclipse in the reign of the Xia Emperor Zhong Kang is one of the best known among the historical accounts on eclipses. The event is associated with the dreadful fate of two astronomers, named He and Ho, who were not prepared for it and therefore punished. This oldest account known, held in the classical work *Shujing* (also *Shu Ching* or *Shoo King*), surpasses any other by more than 800 years. A lot of information about this eclipse is rather legendary than steady, as will be shown.

To understand the connection between the mythological character, its fame, and the reality, one has to trace down the history of the sources as well as the political importance of astronomy in the days of ancient China. This article tries to review the passed down facts. First, we briefly examine the origins of the *Shujing* and the derivative descriptions and check for their conclusiveness. We quote the relevant paragraphs from these works. After summarising previous analyses, we compare the proposed dates, and finally suggest a new solution that would be consistent with two other incidents of that obscure era. In conclusion, we wish to add the new date to the evidence in favour of the historicity of delineated events, although the account itself is of doubtful nature.

An essential quantity for studying historical eclipses is the “clock error”,  $\Delta T$ . It denotes the deceleration parameter of the earth’s rotation: the difference between a theoretically uniform time scale (Ephemeris Time) and the present time (Universal Time). This issue will not be covered here, but we touch on the problem at the very end pointing out that our result perfectly fits the average value of the extrapolated  $\Delta T$ .

Dates will be given historically, i.e. omitting the year zero. For example, the year “1903 BCE” is “-1902” of the astronomers.

## 2 At the dawn of the Xia dynasty

The Xia dynasty is the first kingdom that controlled a major domain of tribes in China. According to traditional texts there existed “Five proto-Emperors” with some kind of god-like status before the Xia. Some knowledge about these legendary Emperors helps to understand the events preceding the solar eclipse.

### 2.1 On the ancient text sources

Almost all we know about the solar eclipse at the dawn of Chinese history goes back to the *Shujing*, the “Book of Historical Documents”. Its origin is particularly complex. Apparently written by various authors, it is attributed to the philosopher Confucius (551–479 BCE). The book contains speeches, royal decrees, proclamations, and appointments of high officials since the foundation of the kingdom. Embedded into an elegant language, many important events are conveyed there. Starting with those pre-dynastic emperors, the oldest documents are estimated at 2400 BCE, the latest at the 7th century BCE [7]. The collection contains no continuous historical narrative and no attempt at chronology.

The original of the *Shujing* was destroyed in the burning of books in 213 BCE, together with many other works. This event represents a pivotal moment in the history of China, as the monarch of the short-lived Qin dynasty performed various acts against Confucianism and other beliefs. He wanted to reform the state and re-write history from scratch. The destructive operation was to leave behind a great impact on the society and culture. In spite of the immense loss of precious historical treasures, a few changes led to some positive aftermath in the following Han dynasty. However, the burning of the books is the main cause for our lack of knowledge about the very early times.

Attempts were made to recover the book. Fragments



Table 1: *Proposals for the reign of the Xia dynasty.*

Time span [BCE]	Method of dating	Ref.
2205 – 1766	Traditional chronology	[18]
2200 – 1675	Timeline of rulers (Wikipedia)	[30]
2183 – 1751	Solar activity / method unclear (1980)	[27]
2100 – 1800	Radiocarbon method (1992)	[5]
2070 – 1600	Xia-Shang-Zhou-Project (1996–2000)	[14]
1989 – 1558	Annals of the Bamboo Books ( $\approx$ -300)	[13]
1953 – 1550	Planetary grouping + average regency	[18]
1900 – 1550	Geologic stratigraphy (2016)	[32]

of rivers. It would have modified the landscape and altered the agricultural conditions. The disaster has been dated at  $1922 \pm 28$  ( $1\sigma$ ) BCE utilising the radiocarbon method on skeletons of three cave dwelling human victims [32]. The 95% confidence interval ranges from 1976 to 1882 BCE.

This geologic study provoked controversy among scholars. We will not re-discuss the pros and cons here, see [33] and references therein. Another work argues that the same sediments, that have been used in that analysis, indicate rather two separate landslides having occurred at 8,300 and 6,300 BCE, respectively [34]. The two dammed lakes gradually shallowed and then disappeared, but both preceded the Great Flood of the Xia by 1400 years, at least. The geomorphic events would be unrelated to the historical events in the writings.

The legends say that the Great Flood lasted for two generations, putatively two decades, at least, till Yao’s second successor, the engineer Yu, attained a solution to the problem. After “taming the waters”, he was conventionalised as a hero, then ennobled as emperor and founder of the first dynasty, the Xia. He was given the epithet “the Great”. Furthermore, the calendar ought to have started with him (again?) upon a celestial sign which will be outlined below. Yu is said to have ascended 100 years after Yao. This contradicts the statement on the inundation of “two decades”, but any information might already be rooted in later legends.

The Flood marks a central element for the first dynasty of kings/emperors. Manifold efforts were made to place it at the start of the Chinese chronology. Some have given specific years, while others consider the problem intractable (Table 1).

### 2.3 Archaeological evidence

An archaeological historicity can only be verified for the second dynasty, the Shang, which started in the mid-second millennium BCE. There are indications that Xia and Shang were coexisting and interacting spheres of influence vying for supremacy [5, 18]. Even some coeval intervals in the king lineages of the two dynasties have aroused suspicion.

A long-standing debate is related to whether or not the Xia was identical with the so-called Erlitou culture, an urban society, that existed in the Yellow River valley at the same time. Guided by some geography texts, excavations were performed at a site Yangcheng in Honan. The

place would be consistent with Anyi, the probable residence of the Xia kings, though there are different locations surmised. Pottery was recovered, ceramic vessels, and pieces of bronze. One sample has a tree-ring-corrected age of  $1900 \pm 70$  BCE [18]. However, this gives no proof for the Xia, since the affiliation of the archaeological samples remains unclear. Because of this deficiency, the time for this dynasty is given very, very roughly depending on the method of analysis, see Table 1. Its starting point may fall at some time within the interval between 2200 and 1900 BCE. The endpoint of the Xia is not known for the same reasons.

Seventeen monarchs are known from the Xia, but the lengths of their regencies are rather estimated. The ancient historian Sima Qian (ca. 145–86 BCE) gave a relative order for their sequence, but even the names have been assigned posthumously, for they are not well identified. Most events from those times originate from texts compiled during the Eastern Zhou Dynasty (from 771 BCE onwards). How they were transmitted over many centuries remains unknown, too. Actually, the whole existence of the Xia rests on legendary stories.

### 2.4 Agglomeration of planets

The close approach of three or more planets is usually a magnificent, eye-catching sight in the sky. In the history of mankind there were social turmoils at such occasions. This issue is widely ramified and has been discussed extensively under astronomical as well as historical aspects elsewhere.

Almost every culture considered tight configurations of planets as the moment of creation. It was linked to the beginning of time and set equal to the onset of the particular calendar. In Babylonia, India, Greece, and in the Mayan Empire astronomers computed great cycles for the cosmos based on the re-occurrence of special planetary meetings. First an apocalypse was prophesied, often combined with a deluge, thereafter a re-creation with a “new era”. Ancient scholars believed that *any* cosmic cycle would have started from a certain point in the past: the day, the lunation, the year, and the course of the planets.

An overwhelming clustering of planets did happen in spring of 1953 BCE. All five classical planets gathered at dawn with the moon and the sun joining the parade. This would have triggered the Chinese calendar. The extraordin-




Figure 2: Closest-ever agglomeration of the naked-eye planets on 25 February 1953 BCE, 23:36 UT, at sunrise in Anyi.

ary grouping is accompanied by a remark in the work by the librarian Liu Xiang (77–6 BCE) [19]:

The original *Zhuanxu* calendar began ... on cyclic day 6, mon 51, year 51 (modulo 60) at the start of spring when the sun, moon and 5 planets met at *Yingshi*,  $5^\circ$ .

The date is correlated with 5 March 1953 BCE. The positions of the planets reached their smallest separation seven days prior to that, namely on 26 February, with a minimum distance of  $4.3^\circ$  (Figure 2). That value was never beat in the reproducible history such that it is regarded as the narrowest grouping ever. Robert Weitzel was the first to draw attention to the scene as an astronomical curiosity, but he was unaware of the historical record by the Chinese [28]. On 2 March, the planets were visited by the waning moon, and a few days later the new month began with the lunar crescent in the evening time.

The massing of planets took place in the constellation of “Yingshi”, indeed: It is allotted to Pegasus near the border of Pisces and Aquarius not far from the equinox. Pegasus was rising, but the planets could not be seen well due to the proximity of the sun (too small difference in height).

Sometimes the above quotation is assigned to the mythological proto-Emperor Zhuanxu who reigned two positions before Yao. Texts depict Zhuanxu as a god who separated Heaven from Earth and arranged the positions of the sun and stars. At the age of twenty he became sovereign, going on to rule for fabulous 78 years similar to his predecessors and successors. Various authors place Zhuanxu somewhere at  $\approx 2500$  to  $2400$  BCE [16]. The “conjunction” of five planets on the same day would have happened in 2513 BCE [1]. Unfortunately, there was no such clustering, even less it would have been as conspicuous as the one of 1953 BCE.

From the historical point of view, we just may wonder why no Sumerian reference exists to this, for their deeds are more numerous for the same period of time.

It seems incomprehensible whether and how the knowledge about that particular agglomeration would have survived all the centuries down to its documentation in the 1st century BCE. It is most likely that the event was computed backwards and then defined to be the starting point of the Chinese calendar. However, there seems no appearance of astronomers having had the skill to do so, especially, such far back in time. It was not before the royal astronomer and mathematician Guo Shoujing (1231–1316) realised, around 1280 AD, that the planetary cycles are incommensurable [19]. They could never have had a common start. This celestial incident offers by no means a reliable framework neither for the dynasty of Xia nor for the calendar epoch nor for the flood.

Another concentration of planets happened at the end of December 1576 BCE, when four of the five planets assembled in Sagittarius. Except Venus, the others convened within a circumference of  $5^\circ$ . Historically, the Xia dynasty was replaced by the second, the Shang. The new ruler claimed this clustering as his “legitimation” for the command. At that occasion the calendar was reformed deploying a 60-day-cycle. This cycle gives a special designation to each day. The mechanism is up and running strictly and continuously to our days without any disruptions.

Then, in late May 1059 BCE, the naked-eye planets appeared for a rendezvous ( $6.5^\circ$ ) once more, and the freshly established Zhou dynasty declared it to its “Heavenly Mandate” [20]. Again, the calendar was manipulated and then suspended by a later dynasty. The Han, that just conquered power in 206 BCE, made use of another gathering of planets in May 205 BCE, though it was less impressive ( $\approx 21^\circ$ ).

All kinds of calendar reforms have been, at any time, an appropriate remedy for practising political control. Many sovereigns tried to customise the history of the country to their own needs. All these “conjunctions” can hardly be used for dating purposes, for they have been reckoned in later times to suit the astrological influence “justifying” their policy [11].

## 2.5 Xia-Shang-Zhou Project

On the whole, the Chinese history consists of many divisions as well as rivalling monarchs. The times of their rulership were differently reckoned depending on the source of information. Their flourishing is of great importance for both historians and astronomers.

For the purpose of a binding chronology the so-called Xia-Shang-Zhou Project was born in 1996 [14]. It collated more than 200 scientists from various fields of work among them archaeologists, astronomers, historians, and palaeographers. The objective was to explore the period of action for the first three dynasties. The experts should reconcile fixing points for the old data with our modern chronology. The Project was carried out by 44 working groups, twelve of which used mainly astronomical evidence. As for the Xia, a decision was made with the commencement of this dynasty placed at approximately 2070 BCE (Table 1).

The Western world looks more critical at this national project. Sinologists consider many conclusions as inadequate, see e.g. [11]. New evidence has it that the new dating by the Chronology Project also turns out to be flawed. Recent archaeological discoveries like the sculptural bronze artifacts from the Meixian County undermine almost every one its dates [24]. So, the controversy surrounding the solar eclipse of our interest during the Xia dynasty is not settled yet.

## 3 The four versions of the eclipse

The next reference after Yao to an astronomical incident appears in the *Shujing* at the time of the fourth Xia-Emperor Zhong Kang. In his first year occurred that solar eclipse that became so popular among the legends. We quote four versions.

### 3.1 Shujing

In the order of progression, the preface to the Book III of the *Shujing* points to “The Punitive Expedition of Yin”. The prince of Yin was sent out to punish He and Ho because they allowed the days to get into confusion [13, p3]:

(1) When Zhong Kang commenced his reign over all within the four seas, the prince of Yin was commissioned to take charge of the imperial armies. At this time He and Ho had neglected the duties of their office, and were sunk in their private cities, and the prince of Yin received the imperial charge to go and punish them.

Then, Book IV describes the mission of the prince on behalf of the emperor in more detail. In the verses 2 and 3 the prince makes a military announcement. He addresses his forces on the objective of the expedition and says that the stability shall be restored in the land. So far, there is no mention of an eclipse. The reader does not come to know who the two persons were, nor their duties, nor how they committed their crime. The laws are put forward and then it is said [13, p162]:

(4) Now here are He and Ho. They have entirely subverted their virtue, and are sunk and lost in wine. They have violated the duties of their office, and left their posts. They have been the first to allow the regulations of heaven to get into disorder, putting far from them their proper business. On the first day of the last month of autumn, the sun and the moon did not meet harmoniously in *Fang*. The blind musicians beat their drums; the inferior officers and common people bustled and ran about. He and Ho, however, as if they were mere personators of the dead in their offices, heard nothing and knew nothing; — so stupidly they went astray from their duty in the matter of the heavenly appearances, and rendering themselves liable to the death appointed by the former kings. The statutes of government say, “When they anticipate the time, let them be put to death without mercy; when they are behind the time, let them be put to death without mercy.”

The concluding three verses of the Book IV contain invocations to the enemies to surrender, since the legitimization for the punishment was ordered by the heavens. — The reader is informed about a turmoil in the country.

### 3.2 Bamboo account

The second passage is found in the *Annals of the Bamboo Books*. The incident is recorded as follows [13, p119]:

(1) In his first year, which was *ke-ch'wo* (26th of the year cycle = 1951 BCE), when the emperor came to the throne, he dwelt in *Chin-sin*.  
(2) In his 5th year in the autumn, in the 9th month, on the day *kang-siu* (47th of the day cycle), which was the first day of the month, there was an eclipse of the Sun, when he ordered the prince of Yin to lead the imperial forces to punish He and Ho.

The calendric and territorial information will be analysed in the next section. About the capital, which is said to be *Chin-sin*, the translator, James Legge [13], remarks in a footnote: “The site of *Chin-sin* is not well ascertained. The dictionary places it in the district of Wei, department of Shan-tung. Others — more correctly, I think, — refer it to the district of Kung, department of Ho-nan.”

Deviant from the *Shujing* it is mentioned here that the eclipse occurred in the fifth year of the Emperor. When reading the text independently, the crime of He and Ho becomes not clear. It is not explained what the eclipse has to do with them. Their fault could lay some time before it. In other words: there are two people being punished on a day when, by chance, a solar eclipse happened? [6]

Moreover, the name of the punishing prince is not given, again. “Yin” is — as in the *Shujing* above — the region where he lived or descended from. The modern encyclopaedia give a mountains to the North of China.

### 3.3 Chunqiu

The confusion widens as one takes notice of the third text by Zuo Qiuming. He writes in his commentary to the “Spring and Autumn Annals”, *Chunqiu*, about an eclipse that was to take place in the 6th month, in summer. At the decisive point a discussion is going on between a priest and a historian. The historian can be set equal to the astronomer or astrologer who takes care of the chronology and calendar. The two converse about the rites to be performed in the case of the eclipse: to beat the drums, wearing of clothes, and presenting gifts. While quarrelling over what protocol should be followed, the historian/astronomer intercalates and recalls a former eclipse long ago [7, 27]:

The Sun already passed the equinox but has not arrived at the solstice. When any calamity happens to the three celestial bodies (i.e. Sun, Moon, and planets), the various officials put off their elegant robes, the king does not have his meal (table) fully spread, and withdraws from his principle chamber, till the time is past. (...) This is what is written in the *Xia Shu*: “The Sun and Moon could not live harmoniously in their place, the blind beat the drum, low rank officials mounted the horses, and people ran up in haste.” That is said of the first day of this month — it was in the 4th month of Xia, which is called the first month of summer.

The words within the quotation marks used by the royal astronomer are identical with those in the *Shujing*. There seems no doubt that they refer to the same solar eclipse of Xia. According to Schlegel & Kühnert, the word “equinox” alludes to the spring, and the instructions would only apply to eclipses in summer [23]. The circumstances would resemble those old days of Xia.

Though not dealing directly with the story of He and Ho, the text throws instructive light on the eclipse customs in ancient China. Finally, we get the impression that the aftermath of the solar eclipse encompassing He and Ho remained in mind for very long. Now we have three quotations at hand bearing reference to the same incident, but they are ambiguous.

### 3.4 A modern version

In modern times, a completely different variant emerged. The misdoing of the two astronomers would be contrary: they foretold a solar eclipse that did not occur. The concept is based on the idea that the monarch possessed the power of darkening the sun whenever he wanted. Actually, he relied on a man skilled in foretelling eclipses. The two astronomers got secret information about the next date by a subterfuge and wanted to benefit from it over the emperor. The emperor gathered the public upon the prognostication in order to distinguish himself by the miracle of commanding the sun. But the foreteller intentionally included a wrong date, and the occultation failed to appear. After the proclamation had gone wrong, the monarch was embarrassed so much that the doom of the sinners was the same.

This alternative entertains with a love story and intrigues. It has its roots in the novel “Sonne, Mond und Sterne” by A.G. Miller, which is a pseudonym of the German-Austrian writers Marie Louise Fischer (1922–2005) and Hans Gustl Kernmayr (1900–1977). Although the book is categorised as non-fictional, the storyline suits rather a thrilling TV movie than sound history [10]. This version can be rejected, for in those times there was definitely no-one to presage a solar eclipse.

Within the alleged  $\approx 180$  years between the first Emperor Yu and the fourth Zhong Kang about 15 solar eclipses could have been visible, mostly partial ones. This is much to little to discover an astronomical cycle, even if all of them would have been observed [23]. Another constraint concerns the fact that there was no eye protection for monitoring the sun permanently. It was not useful, anyway, and thus only those eclipses would be seen that are almost total, or close to the horizon at sunrise and sunset. Many partial obscurations would have passed unnoticed. Therefore, the two unfortunate astronomers could never have met the requirements of their office.

## 4 Analyses and interpretations

Countless attempts were made to identify the mysterious eclipse in spite of objections by historians. From the first text, the *Shujing*, only one line has an astronomical relevance: The Sun and the Moon did not meet harmoniously in *Fang* on the first day of the last month in autumn.

One might think that it will be simple to find a suitable event having the location and date at hand, but, unfortunately, it is not. The main difficulty concerns the interpretation of any information: the specification of the season is disputed as well as the celestial meaning of “Fang”.

### 4.1 Constellation “Fang”

Usually, *Fang* is assigned to an area of about  $5^\circ$  between  $\beta$ ,  $\delta$ ,  $\pi$  and  $\sigma$  Scorpii, a region in the “pincer” westward of Antares. A few stars from Libra and Ophiuchus would belong to it, too [31]. The Sun needs 5 days to cross this part of the sky. According to the Xia calendar, it is the ninth

month, the month after that which contains the autumnal equinox.

Other commentators consider *Fang* as undetermined but understand it more general as a “planetary mansion” or “domicile”, i.e. those 28 Chinese lodges along the ecliptic which can be visited by the Moon [23, 2]. Each of the constellations has a different extent: the smallest about  $1^\circ$ , the largest  $31^\circ$ . Thus, *Fang* would not be used as a fixing point for the position of the sun. Also, a calligraphic confusion could not be excluded among the thousands of symbols in the Chinese language.

The statement that the sun and the moon “did not meet harmoniously” also turns out quite ambivalent. Such an expression exists nowhere else in Chinese literature except for the *Shujing*. When denoting an eclipse, the common usage was something like “the sun was devoured” or “it lost its light” [23]. A variant of the original phrase might read “the sun and the moon could not live peacefully together in the sky” [27]. Another translation is “[they] were not in agreement” [31]. The crucial point applies to the Chinese symbol for the sun: Depending on the context it could be altered in “time” or “celestial body”, or it can denote a morning hour between 7 and 9 a.m. [17]. This gives a different meaning to the whole line. Since most experts base their interpretation on the authority of James Legge [13], the author of this paper will stick to that. It is generally agreed upon that we are treating a solar eclipse here. The chaos among people and the consequences for the victims suggest that no other phenomenon is the subject. In addition, the debate in the *Chunqiu* explicitly deals with this issue.

As far as the instant of the eclipse is concerned, the last month of autumn is specified (*Shujing*), or the first month of summer (*Chunqiu*), or the whole event could have been retrieved by computation very much later. In historiography such acts were carried out quite often, as many examples show like the so-called “Star of Bethlehem” or birth dates of celebrities with political power. Some historians prefer to fix the eclipse exactly to the day of the autumn equinox. In fact, it was lying in the constellation of *Fang* about 2150 BCE, and it would correspond to 11 October of our calendar [26].

Keeping in mind that the books were written in the 5th century BCE, one would have to consider the luni-solar precession when calculating backwards. The Chinese were not aware of the precession at the time of Confucius, though. It was discovered in the 4th century AD, more than 500 years after Hipparchus [22]. Hence, there is a suspicion of a deliberate modification by the restorers of the *Shujing* as such as they substituted “autumn” for the reading “winter” because *Fang* had moved to that season. Or, taking the other perspective, autumn would be the original and *Fang* was emended for agreeing with the lifetime of the writer. Most present-day analysts, however, give credence to the last month of autumn, though there is no reason. The question about the season must remain unsettled.

## 4.2 Cyclic day

The second quotation from the *Bamboo Books* provides an exact day in the shape of a cyclic name: *kang-siu* (#47). It is generated by combining one of ten “heavenly stems” with one of twelve “earthly branches”. The 60-day-cycle acts like an analogy to our 7-day-week: It runs without an interruption ever since. Admittedly, it was introduced in the second dynasty around 1500 BCE — for the Xia meaningless. If still trying to analyse it, discrepancies arise being at odds with the eclipse dates.

Richard Rothman (1800–1856) approved of the cyclic day name corresponding to the eclipse of 13 October 2128 BCE [21]. The eclipse would have had a magnitude of 0.875 at noon. The historian of astronomy John Fotheringham (1874–1936) referred to the *Bamboo Books* giving 28 October 1948 BCE as the correct day for the name —  $3 \times 60$  years later than Rothman’s result [6]. Unfortunately, there was no eclipse that day, not even a new moon. Fotheringham put forward that the eclipse did not match the lifetime of Zhong Kang and his reign would have to be shifted within a century or two one side or the other of 2000 BCE. Instead, he emphasized the clearness with which the *Shujing* makes the offence of the astronomers’ neglect of the calendar. It went out of order, and this became evident through the occurrence of the eclipse on an unexpected day, i.e. not on the first day of the month as it should be. This drew attention to their negligence and convicted them of the error of issuing a wrong calendar [7]. They were executed for the false reckoning and not for the eclipse. Finally, Fotheringham concluded that the record did not permit an identification of the date at all.

Before that, the historian John Williams (1797–1874) used the name of the cyclic year in the previous verse, and obtained 2158 BCE as the year of the accession of the emperor [31]. But the cycle of names was only applied to years during the Han dynasty from  $\approx 200$  BCE, after the completion of the *Bamboo Books*. When looking into various encyclopaedia, the durations of rulership for all emperors prove contradictory. The information about the cyclic names, whether related to the day or year, must be a later insertion based on a doubtful backreckoning [18].

## 4.3 The capital of Xia

In addition to the arguments above there are further disharmonies: The location of the residency of the Xia dynasty is not well known. It changed permanently with the emperor, and could be situated in Anyi or Taikang, which is 500 km farther to the East (Table 2).

Another problem is that the text gives no hints neither to the time of day nor to the magnitude of the eclipse: total or a very high degree of obscuration. For example, there are no accompanying phenomena mentioned like a sudden darkness or the visibility of stars or allusions to the corona. If the eclipse was not total, the search would expand to numerous partial eclipses.

Also, it is not said what space of time passed after the eclipse when the “Punitive Expedition” against the astro-

Table 2: Suggested capitals for the Xia dynasty.

Place	Today's name	Latitude	Longitude	Reference
An Yi Hsien	Anyi	35° 5' N	110°58' E	[17, 23, 22]
Tay-kang-kien	Taikang	34° 7' N	114°57' E	[21, 22]
Tschin-sin	(in Honan)	34°54' N	114° 6' E	[23]
Tschin-sin	(in Shan-tung)	36°46' N	119°20' E	[17]
Yangchen	Dengfeng	34°27' N	113° 1' E	[18]
Yanshi	Luoyang	34°40' N	112°27' E	[5, 9]

nomers was set off. The punishment could rest upon political motives. In the context of history a war against an usurper followed lasting for two years [6]. The procedure of punishment is not told, either. A “decapitation”, as widely depicted, is not stated. The victims could be hanged or stoned to death or be “punished” in any other way. The reader of the text is even not informed whether the punishment was actually inflicted or not. It seems enough to have it declared that they merited death.

Some modern authors stretch out the interpretation as much as they do not regard the names He and Ho as individuals but rather the titles of officers because they are called this way under the pre-emperor Yao [7]. William Whiston (1667–1752), a theologian and mathematician who succeeded his mentor Isaac Newton (1643–1727) at the University of Cambridge, believed that both Emperors Yao (counting #7 in the succession series) and Zhong Kang (#12) were nearly contemporary to one another [29]. Again others suggest that it was only *one* astronomer named He-Ho [27]. He would be the usurper of the rebellious tribe and assembled a considerable military force to overthrow the emperor. This discomfited Zhong Kang, so he took advantage of the eclipse to attack He-Ho.

All these imponderables raise the thought that the subject in the *Shujing* is not the eclipse itself. The account does not focus on the astronomical event but seems to give a moral sermon for deterrence.

## 5 History of suggested eclipses

The search for a solar eclipse falls into an interval of about 300 years depending on the assumed commencement of the Xia dynasty. Table 3 lists a selection of suggested dates sorted by the year of publication.

The findings scatter tremendously. The first to introduce the Chinese works to the Western world was the Jesuit Antoine Gaubil (1689–1759). He rejected the year of 2128 BCE from medieval times, by the help of a Chinese assistant, because the eclipse would not have taken place in Beijing [8]. Instead, he introduced the date of 12 October 2155 BCE.

It was William Whiston who first referred to Edmond Halley’s discovery, in 1695, of the “acceleration of the Moon’s mean motion”. In 1734 Whiston pointed out the small quantity of obscuration ( $<1/12$ th) of Gaubil’s proposal, which would ill agree with the capital punishment of two astronomers for not taken notice of so small an ec-

lipse as this was [29]. He replaced it by one later Saros to appear more striking in many parts of China. These early computations from the 18th century should be taken with some caution, for the method of determination was not technically mature: neither the deceleration of the earth’s spin (clock error  $\Delta T$ ) nor the Besselian Elements were worked out. However, the date by Gaubil still prevailed for long.

An improved value for  $\Delta T$  was included by Charles-Louis Largeteau (1791–1857). In 1840 he re-calculated the ephemeris of the moon and found that Gaubil’s eclipse of 2155 BCE occurred when China resided on the night side [23]. Also, the year 2128 BCE will have to be definitely excluded, in spite of a revival by John Chalmers in 1861, who was unaware of the work by Largeteau [2].

In our time, the date of 22 October 2137 BCE is mentioned most often, as suggested by Whiston (Figure 3). The case was examined by the astronomer and mathematician Samuel Russell (1856–1917) in detail and seemingly discussed in the most convincing way [22]. Theodor Ritter von Oppolzer (1841–1886), the time-honoured authority on eclipses, reached the same conclusion a decade earlier [17]. Popular science repeats this date constantly without elucidating the origin of the information.

However, that eclipse of 2137 BCE was not total but annular, and the magnitude in Anyi was about 0.875. A complete darkness was never achieved at any moment. Moreover, the date does not correspond to the (speculative) cycling day #47 from the *Bamboo Annals*. The cyclic name would perfectly coincide with the former 13 October 2128, which must be excluded in any case.

In the year following 2137, there was another eclipse also visible in the northern hemisphere: 11 October 2136 BCE. Russell gives the time of onset at 4:30 p.m., and the magnitude in Anyi was about 0.58 [22].

Including the concept of the Great Flood, which was the cause for the accession of the first Emperor Yu and put by archaeologists at approximately 1925 BCE, then the late date by Kevin Pang gains a surprising attention [18]. It could reduce some conflicts from the historical point of view, though not eliminate them from the astronomical. The agglomeration of planets cannot be integrated, for example, into Yao’s or Yu’s lifetime and his successors. And, again: the eclipse of 1876 BCE was annular, and the central track passed over Siberia much to the North. In Anyi, only a small partial coverage (mag = 0.386) would be observed shortly after sunrise at 8:30 a.m. local time.

The archaeoastronomer Göran Henriksson argues in fa-

Table 3: *Dates of proposed solar eclipses related to He and Ho.*

Date [BCE]	Type	Commentator (publ. year)	Reference
2128, Oct 13	P	Yi Xing ( $\approx 700$ )	[15]
2128, Oct 13	P	Guo Shoujing ( $\approx 1280$ )	[1, 15]
2155, Oct 11/12	A	Antoine Gaubil (1732)	[8]
2137, Oct 22	A	William Whiston (1734)	[29]
2007, Oct 24	T	Nicolas Fréret (1796)	[17, 23]
2128, Oct 13	P	Richard Rothman (1837)	[21]
2156, Oct 22	T	Johannes von Gumpach (1853)	[17]
2128, Oct 12	P	John Chalmers (1861)	[2]
(2158 – accession)		John Williams (1863)	[31]
2137, Oct 22	A	Theodor von Oppolzer (1880)	[17]
2165, May 07	A	Schlegel & Kühnert (1889)	[23]
(1905, May 12)	T	Schlegel & Kühnert (1889)	[23]
2136, Oct 10	P	John N. Stockwell (1895)	[26]
2137, Oct 22	A	Samuel M. Russell (1895)	[22]
(1948, Oct 28)	—	John N. Fotheringham (1921)	[6, 1]
2159, Jun 29	T	F. Crawford Brown (1931)	[1]
2110, Oct 23	P	Liu Chao-Yang (1945)	[27]
1876, Oct 16	A	Kevin D. Pang (1987)	[18]
1912, Sep 24	A	Kuniji Saito (1992)	[15]
1961, Oct 26	T	Göran Henriksson (2008)	[9]
1903, Sep 15	H	<i>this work, Sec. 6</i> (2020)	[12]

our of the eclipse of 26 October 1961 BCE because it was total and crossed the territory of Yin where the punishing prince had his residence [9]. Henriksson locates the region to the Northeast of China at the estuary of the Yellow River about 200 km South of Beijing. In Anyi the eclipse would be seen partially with a magnitude of 0.863. The sun had a distance of  $10^\circ$  from  $\pi$  Scorpii, the central star in *Fang*.

After providing new limits for the Xia dynasty by the Xia-Shang-Zhou Project, none of the dates suited for the eclipse except Henriksson’s. A plenty of new candidates emerged: 2043, 2019, and 1970 BCE that are not listed here [14].

## 6 The hybrid eclipse of 1903 BCE

Most commentators commit themselves to the constellation of *Fang*. They examine “automatically” a date in October. If one is willing to look at the putative course of events with some reservation, he comes across an eclipse less considered: 15 September 1903 BCE (Figure 3).

The hybrid solar eclipse flashed by in a distance of 20 km from Anyi. The width of totality was as narrow as 15 km. An observer would experience a full obscuration of the solar disk for about 12 to 15 seconds, if he stood on the central line. The rotation rate of the Earth has been varying to such an extent in the past that it must be taken into account whether a solar eclipse could have been visible from a certain location or not.

The Earth’s rotation is an exhaustive issue out of the scope of this paper — see the many works by Richard Stephenson (e.g. [25]) or [12] for the most recent overview. The clock error, termed  $\Delta T$ , is defined as the difference between

the uniform timescale, based on the celestial motion of the sun and moon (Ephemeris Time, ET), and our standardised civil timescale which is used for the rotation of the earth (Universal Time, UT). For the remote past, that difference is modelled by a parabola:

$$\Delta T = ET - UT = -20 + ct^2$$

with  $c \approx 32 \text{ sec/cy}^2$  and  $t$  in centuries (cy) before 1820. This formula corresponds to a regular and systematic slow-down. It comprises the tidal friction as well as other seasonal effects having influence on the behaviour of the earth’s rotation. We also know that there are irregular fluctuations superimposed on it and destroy a strict validity of the formula. If something unexpected happens, e.g. an earthquake slightly altering the moment of inertia, a systematic error enters and accumulates over time. It puts the backreckoning into serious trouble: the path of the eclipse can be shifted to either side of the mean longitude. An extrapolation beyond 500 BCE turns out somewhat dangerous.

Although a precise localisation of the eclipse track of 1903 BCE cannot be given as long as the account in the *Shujing* lacks of a detailed description concerning totality, the social aftermath suggests a high magnitude of obscuration. Even without exactly determining the belt geographically, the extrapolated  $\Delta T$  lies within the expected error bars. Fred Espenak’s map provide a  $\Delta T = 44,058 \pm 3,328 \text{ s}$  (12h 14m  $\pm$  55m) [4]. An error of 55 minutes produces a tolerance of  $13,75^\circ$  in longitude.

However, the observer does not need to find himself inside the zone of totality to become deeply touched by the sudden loss of light thinking the end of the world is near. The ideal position will be even unlikely. An eclipse mag-




Figure 3: Central zones of two annular eclipses (yellow) and three total eclipses (grey), one of which is of 1903 BCE.

nitude of 0.996, as the *average* value provides, would do the job, too. An incisive darkness, as in nighttime, in order to make stars visible, is not required. It rather supports the correctness of the empirical formula for extrapolation by Stephenson & Morrison [25].

The advantage of this date is the reproduction of the historical corner stones. It would involve a liberate interpretation of the manuscripts. Historians will have to disengage themselves from the long counts of regents, and the durations of their governances must be mapped in a more compact way. Our new framework is outlined as follows:

- 1953: Agglomeration of planets with a starting point of the calendar — if this issue should matter at all;
- 1925: then, a Great Flood with an unsuccessful emperor after Yao (in accord with [32]);
- 19\*\*: then, an effective remedy of unknown duration under the first Xia-Emperor Yu (see Table 1);
- 1903: and, finally, the eclipse during the rulership of the fourth (?) Emperor Zhong Kang.

Two pre-emperors and four Xia-emperors, at least, would have to be squeezed in a time interval of about 50 years. Previously they were attributed much longer periods of regency. So far, the time spans for the four Xia emperors are allocated at 45 years (Yu), 10 years (his son), 29 (grandson), and 13 years (Zhong Kang himself), as given in

the *Bamboo Annals*. The German Wikipedia gives 58, 29, 29, and 13 years, respectively, referring to ancient Chinese historians whose information will be outdated by now [30]. The French version provides 8, 9, 29, and 13 years, respectively, crediting the historian Henri Cordier (1849–1925). More recently it was suggested that Emperor Yu’s regency might have lasted between 1914 and 1907 BCE [16]. This absolute timeframe would still conflict the flood and should be shifted further back in time.

That leads to the suspicion that the whole genealogy of the Xia should also be examined anew. Of the 17 known names (*Bamboo Books*), the shortest regency is 10 or 11 years (king #2 or #15 and #16, respectively), and the longest 59 years (king #11). One may ask whether there was no-one within the four centuries, in which the dynasty lasted, holding the office for less than a decade? Probably some of them were too insignificant for a mention, and, thus, they were omitted by the historians who copied, transmitted, or restored the information. Speculations on interregnums were also launched [16]. Already the compression of the whole length of the dynasty would put back the lifetimes into a more realistic view. The “average reckoning”, as performed by Kevin Pang [18], becomes void and seems not very scientific, anyway. In a time span of  $\approx 20$  to 25 years between the flood and Zhong Kang, four emperors could easily find their place.

While the chronology of rulers is given back to the historians, astronomers have to accept some other weaknesses:

The constellation *Fang* does not fully agree with the account, and the literal minuteness must be abandoned in favour of an approximate sighting. In September, *Fang* is setting heliacally, i.e. one sees its final visibility at dusk before disappearing for the conjunction with the sun.

This raises the general question about the scene of the eclipse: Would anyone really take care for celestial constellations while a dramatic phenomenon with a blackened sun falls upon the unprepared and a civil commotion is going on? Would the observer check for some stars at which the “non-harmonic meeting” of the sun and moon occurred? Or is it more likely that he guessed the time and place of the event when the state of affairs have settled down? And why would anyone keep such a detail for so many generations after him? — We believe that the dispensable note on the constellation would rather be sought after the routine gradually returned to everyday’s life [12]. It could have taken some weeks of regeneration when the description would be put to record unless it did not slip at all. Then it was copied without questioning by one writer after another till it became an immovable part of the lore. At the restoration of the *Shujing*, either the season or the constellation could have been readjusted with the calendrical precession of the wrong era.

The cyclic day name does not match any dates, but it becomes completely irrelevant because it was erroneously back-calculated in medieval times when the wrong position of the sun in the sky was assumed. Besides that, for the ancient people, any information about time had a much lower value than for us today. In the rural society, someone would not hold on a certain day after, say, half a month or so. He or she would just memorise the “dreadful event” and pass it down in dramatic stories rather than cling to the trifles of a constellation, or hours, or the celestial circumstances; especially, when the storyteller is illiterate as the majority of the “common people” was. Such a loose perspective on the texts leaves behind only the location of the observer as the single anchor for the determination of the eclipse. Unfortunately, even this is not explicitly specified, either.

The solar eclipse of 15 September 1903 BCE is placed reasonably compatible with the planetary grouping and the Great Flood. It produced the greatest magnitude in Anyi between 2000 and 1850 BCE. In view of the badly transmitted information, it fulfils several logic criteria.

Two more eclipses deserve a short notice (Figure 3). The track of totality on 3 July 1945 BCE (9:45 a.m. local time) did cross the region, and its magnitude of 0.95 must have left a noticeable effect in Anyi, provided that weather permitted. We disregard it because of the time-lag too short since the agglomeration of planets. The other suggestion by Kuniji Saito for 1912 BCE gives an annular eclipse with the central path more than 600 km farther to the South (mag = 0.864). This option shows a somewhat better chronology, however, the obscuration happened during sunset at  $\approx 6$  p.m. local time. It seems more difficult to integrate the severity of the social behaviour at the end of the day than if people were taken by surprise at noon.

## 7 Critical remarks

The most caveats were already touched in the preceding sections. In general, accounts on eclipses in the Chinese chronicles are both vague and sporadic before the 8th century BCE. In many cases the texts lack a correct understanding. In old times, people did not know how to describe such a strange phenomenon like the disappearance of the most important celestial body [15]. Such incidents did cause much panic but they were not described in the prevalent terms. This makes it difficult to identify an eclipse in the records. Many events were surely observed without a message left behind, provided that weather permitted.

Dates of any kind are scarce in the early history of China. Usually, the name of the regent was just recorded together with a keyword, as the example of He and Ho shows. Occasionally, a year appeared without the name of the regent. The earliest date that can be taken as a reliable point in the Chinese chronology is 841 BCE, the start of an interregnum called “Gonghe Regency” [11]. Beyond that date we know almost nothing about the history except a few names of emperors and their relationships.

The second unequivocal testimony about a solar eclipse goes back to 780 BCE. It shows up in the “Spring and Autumn Annals” (*Chunqiu*). The number of accounts on eclipses rises thereafter. So, there exists a gap of more than one thousand years to the *Shujing* eclipse. The lack of knowledge must be ascribed to the burning of books in 213 BCE. According to some opinions, astronomical/astrological works were not affected by this measure but rather those of philosophical and historical content [1]. Again others believe that the huge gap is due to a discouragement induced by the fate of He and Ho — scholars lost their motivation to show an active interest in astronomy, and this branch of scientific occupation was avoided for a long time. On the other side, astronomy was of such great importance to the emperor that it guided his political engagements. He could not do without.

Nonetheless, there is one subtlety in the eclipse account of the *Shujing* that should baffle: The phrase that the Sun and Moon did meet. The Chinese would consequently have realised that the moon was responsible for the eclipse phenomenon. Would this apply to those ancient times, too? Many other civilisations were far from such an awareness, for they thought that the moon would shine only at night. It is our modern comprehension correlating it to an eclipse. If one tries to gain an imagination of the cosmic matters, it will be necessary to observe several incidents of the same kind before the idea dawned that it was caused by the earth’s companion. When the perception once entered belief, it would be handed down to the successive events: the relationship between the eclipse and the moon would be mentioned more frequent. Hence, doubts are justified whether the text expresses the same what we would understand as an eclipse of the sun. If the so-called “meeting” was some other strange effect in the sky, verification fails. Therefore, the eclipse provides the only safe pillar for dating using astronomical means.

It becomes evident that there are manifold opinions on the ominous eclipse in the *Shujing*. They challenge the historical origin of the book itself. It seems more important to examine the delivery of the report throughout the ages as well as the survival of the book [6, 21]. In the 20th century more and more commentators pushed the eclipse of He and Ho into the realm of legends. A lot of stuff therein appears mystical. But, finally, a historical core accompanies every writing.

The experts on eclipse dating are remarkably silent today when it comes to a specification of a clear date. Though there is a permanent scientific improvement, e.g. in the physics of the earth's rotation, and precision of computation, and methods of analysis, it all does not bail us out in this case as long as history does not bring forward a distinct range for the existence of the Xia dynasty. Most of the dates in Table 3 would yield an eclipse more than 200 years before the appointed start of the Chinese calendar. The conflict affects any regent of that dynasty, too. If it should ever be possible to date this *Shujing* eclipse without doubt, then one could immediately enlighten the complete advent of China's history.

## 8 Summary

We examined the sources on the oldest eclipse account in history and undertook efforts to question their authenticity. By considering other natural occurrences of mythological rank, we tried to date the legendary solar eclipse within the context of the Great Flood, the origin of the calendar, and the first emperors of the first dynasty in China, the Xia.

We came across the hybrid solar eclipse of 15 September 1903 BCE. It must have swept through the area of Anyi, the supposed capital of the Xia. A correction of a few minutes to the average  $\Delta T = 44,058$  s would shift the path to either side of the capital. Allowing for the uncertainties, it appears consistent within the error margins for the deceleration of the Earth's rotation. The phrase "the Sun and Moon did not meet harmoniously in Fang" must be interpreted more tolerantly than previously, and deploy the heliacal setting of the stellar constellation "Fang".

Our arguments in favour of this eclipse are based on the matching of the chronological order of events: the two astronomical fix points are the gathering of planets in 1953 BCE and this eclipse 50 years later. They form the time-frame for evaluating the pieces of historical evidence. This interval could harbour an earthquake causing a dramatic inundation for several years as well as four regents, at least. The extraordinary long rulerships of all emperors in the Xia dynasty need to be shortened to more realistic durations. Probably there were more unknown names that would lower the average time of their reigns. Moreover, doubts are discussed whether the account describes an eclipse at all.

## Acknowledgements

The author thanks Jeremy Shears for important comments on improvement. Figure 1 is used under the licence CC-Lizenz BY-SA. The results are part of the Habilitation (ch. 10.2) submitted to the University of Heidelberg, Germany, in February 2020 [12]. This article is now published "as is" on arXiv. The entire work was accomplished under severe pressure.

## References

- [1] **Brown, F. Crawford (1931)**: "The eclipse in China", *Popular Astronomy* 39, Dec 1931, p567–573
- [2] **Chalmers, John (1861)**: "Appendix on the Astronomy of the Ancient Chinese", in: *Chinese Classics vol. III: The Shoo King*, ed. by James Legge, Hongkong, 1861, p101–102; see [13]
- [3] **Chambers, George F. (1909)**: "The Story of Eclipses", McClure Publ. Co., New York, 1909, p65–69
- [4] **Espenak, Fred (2006)**: "Predictions for Solar and Lunar Eclipses", Eclipse maps courtesy of Fred Espenak, NASA/Goddard Space Flight Center, <http://www.eclipsewise.com/>
- [5] **Fairbank, J.K. & Goldman M. (2006)**: "China: A new History", 2nd ed., Harvard University Press, Cambridge/Massachusetts, 2006, p35; ISBN 978-0-67401828-0
- [6] **Fotheringham, John K. (1921)**: "Historical Eclipses", Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1921, p9–16
- [7] **Fotheringham, John K. (1933)**: "The Story of Hi and Ho", *Journal of the British Astronomical Association* 43, 1933, p248–257
- [8] **Gaubil, Antoine (1732)**: "Traité de l'Astronomie Chinoise", in: *Observations mathématiques*, Étienne Souciet, Paris, 1729–1732; cited by [29, 21]
- [9] **Henriksson, Göran (2008)**: "A new Attempt to date the Xia, Shang and Western Zhou Dynasties by solar eclipses", *Archeologia Baltica* 10, 2008, p105–109
- [10] **Herrmann, Dieter B. (1998)**: "Die Jahrhundertfinsternis", Paetec Verlag, Berlin, 1998, 1st ed., p22–23 (in German)
- [11] **Keenan, Douglas J. (2002)**: "Astro-Historiographic chronologies of early China are unfounded", *East Asian History* 23, 2002, p61–68
- [12] **Khalisi, Emil (2020)**: "Das Buch der legendären Finsternisse", Habilitation submitted to the University of Heidelberg, 2020, ch. 10.2 (in German)
- [13] **Legge, James (1865)**: "Chinese Classis", vol. III (The Shoo King), Trübner & Co., London, 1865
- [14] **Liu, Ci-yuan (2002)**: "Astronomy in the Xia-Shang-Zhou Chronology Project", *Journal of Astronomical History and Heritage* 5, No. 1/2002, p1–8
- [15] **Liu C., Liu X. & Ma L. (2003)**: "Examination of early Chinese records of solar eclipses", *Journal of Astronomical History and Heritage* 6, No. 1/2003, p53–63

- [16] **Nivison D.S. & Pang K.D. (1990)**: “Astronomical Evidence for the Bamboo Annals’ Chronicle of Early Xia”, *Early China* 15, 1990, p87–95
- [17] **Oppolzer, Theodor Ritter von (1880)**: “Über die Sonnenfinsternis des Schu-King”, *Monatsbericht der Königl. Preuß. Akademie d.W.*, 1880, p166–185 (in German)
- [18] **Pang, Kevin D. (1987)**: “Extraordinary floods in early Chinese history and their absolute dates”, *Journal of Hydrology* 96, 15 Dec 1987, p139–155; doi: 10.1016/0022-1694(87)90149-1
- [19] **Pang K.D. & Bangert J.A. (1993)**: “The Holy Grail of Chinese Astronomy: ...”, *Bulletin of the American Astronomical Society* 25, 1993, p922
- [20] **Pankenier, David W. (1981)**: “Astronomical Dates in Shang and Western Zhou”, *Early China* 7, 1981, p2–37
- [21] **Rothman, Richard W. (1840)**: “On an Ancient Solar Eclipse observed in China”, *Memoirs of the Royal Astronomical Society* 11, 1840, p47–50
- [22] **Russell, Samuel M. (1895)**: “Some Astronomical Records in ancient Chinese Books”, *The Observatory* 18, 1895 (No. 231 + 232 + 234), p323–325 + p355–358 + p430–432
- [23] **Schlegel G. & Kühnert F. (1889)**: “Die Schu-King-Finsternis”, Königl. Akademie der Wissenschaften, Verlag Johannes Müller, Amsterdam, 1889 (in German)
- [24] **Shaughnessy, Edward L. (2009)**: “Chronologies of Ancient China: A Critique of the Xia-Shang-Zhou Chronology Project”, in: *Windows on the Chinese World*, ed. by Clara Ho, Lexington Books, Lanham/Maryland, 2009, p15–28; ISBN 978-0-7391-2769-8
- [25] **Stephenson, F.R. & Morrison L.V. (2005)**: “Historical Eclipses”, *ASP Conference Series* 335, 2005, p159–180
- [26] **Stockwell, John N. (1895)**: “Eclipses and Chronology”, *The Observatory* 18, No. 226/1895, p161–163
- [27] **Wang P.K. & Siscoe G.L. (1980)**: “Ancient Chinese Observations of Physical Phenomena Attending Solar Eclipses”, *Solar Physics* 66, 1980, p187–193; doi: 10.1007/BF00150528
- [28] **Weitzel, Robert B. (1945)**: “Clusters of five planets”, *Popular Astronomy* 53, 1945, p159–161
- [29] **Whiston, William (1734)**: “Six dissertations”, ed. by John Whiston, London, 1734, p195–209
- [30] **Wikipedia (2020)**: <https://en.wikipedia.org/> (English + German sites), visited in February 2020
- [31] **Williams, John (1863)**: “On an Eclipse of the Sun recorded in the Chinese Annals ...”, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* 23, 06/1863, p238–242; doi: 10.1093/mnras/23.8.238
- [32] **Wu Q., Zhao Z., Liu L. + 13 co-authors (2016)**: “Outburst flood at 1920 BCE supports historicity of ...”, *Science* 353, 5 Aug 2016, p579–582; doi: 10.1126/science.aaf0842
- [33] **Wu Q., Zhao Z., Lui L. + 13 co-authors (2017)**: “Response to Comments on ›Outburst flood at 1920 BCE ...‹”, *Science* 355, 31 Mrc 2017, p1382e; doi: 10.1126/science.aal1325
- [34] **Zhang Y., Huang C.C., Schulmeister J. + 10 co-authors (2019)**: “Formation and evolution of the Holocene massive landslide-dammed lakes ...”, *Quaternary Science Reviews* 218, 2019, p267–280; doi: 10.1016/j.quascirev.2019.06.011