

mentions (5, 21 b; cf. also *Wên-hsien t'ung-k'ao*, 197, 2 b) the *I-i mou Hsia lu* in seven chapters (not in one or in three chapters, as said above) as the work of 汪藻 Wang Tsao, and the same authorship is given in the bibliographical section of the *Sung chih* (203, 11 a), where, however, the *I-i mou Hsia lu* is said to be only in three chapters. Now, it is most improbable that there should have been two different works of the Sung period with the same rare title of *I-i mou Hsia-lu*; one of the attributions (or perhaps both of them) must be erroneous. Wang Tsao (1079-1154) was a well-known statesman and writer (cf. GILES, *Biogr. Dict.* No 2236, to be combined with the pseudo-Wang Kung-tso of No. 2192), but a cursory examination of his literary collection, entitled 浮溪集 *Fou-ch'i chi* (ed. *Ssü-pu ts'ung-k'an*), has failed to reveal to me anything to suggest his possible authorship of the *I-i mou Hsia lu*. Whether the *I-i mou Hsia lu* be due to Wang Tsao or to Liu Chung-shu, and whether or not it be a work of the first half of the twelfth century, the fact remains that it already existed c. 1235 when the *Chih-chai shu-lu chieh-t'i* was completed, and so antedates both the *Ta-Chin kuo chih* and the *Wên-hsien t'ung-k'ao*. Although I cannot cite the *I-i mou Hsia lu* at first hand, the following passage is quoted in LI Wên-t'ien's *Commentary on the Secret History* (ed. *T'ung-yin-t'ang*, 1896, 7, 2 a): «The *I-i mou Hsia lu* of Liu Chung-shu of the Sung says: 'The original name of the kingdom of Chin was 朱里真 *Chu-li-chên*. To avoid [the use of] the personal name *Tsung-chên* of Hsing-tsung of the Ch'i-tan, [the *Nü-chên*] have also been called *Nü-chih*. In [the period] *chêng-kuan* (627-649) of the T'ang the Mo-ho came [to render homage to the Court]; the Middle Kingdom [then] heard for the first of the name of the *Nü-chên*. For generations, [the *Nü-chên*] lived east of the Hun-t'ung-chiang; [to the east] (there is clearly a lacuna here, due to haplography between the two *tung*, «east», of the other texts, and so the intervening limits of the *Nü-chên* have been omitted) they reached the sea. They are what the *San-kuo chih* calls *I-lou*. They lived on the Ch'ang-pai-shan, [where] the Ya-lu-shui takes its rise'.»

When comparing these four texts, one cannot but be struck by their close connection and even, in many cases, by their identical wording. The most sober and accurate version is that of the *San-ch'ao pei-mêng hui-pien*. There the author draws a clear line between hearsay tradition and accurate information, and says neither that the name of the *Nü-chên* was known in the seventh century, nor that there was another form *Lü-chên* of *Nü-chên*. The statement that the name of the *Nü-chên* was known in early T'ang times occurs for the first time in the *I-i mou Hsia lu*. It was certainly from the latter work that it passed into the *Ta-Chin kuo chih* and the *Wên-hsien t'ung-k'ao*, but neither of the authors of these later works noticed that it was in contradiction with another statement, which they copied from the *Sung-mo chi-wên* or the *San-ch'ao pei-mêng hui-pien*, to wit that the name *Nü-chên* made its appearance only in the tenth century. That the author of the *Ta-Chin kuo chih* knew either the *Sung-mo chi-wên* or the *San-ch'ao pei-mêng hui-pien* (or perhaps both) is quite certain. If an additional proof should be required, it would be provided by the passage of the *Ta-Chin kuo chih* (32, 2 b) in which it is said that the *Nü-chên* terms for «wife» and «husband» were 薩那 *sa-na* (the 薩薩 *sa-sa* in the *Chin chih* [*Shuo fu*, 86, 12 b] is corrupt) and 愛根 *ai-kên* respectively. This is clearly drawn from the *Sung-mo chi-wên*, 14 a, or the *San-ch'ao pei-mêng hui-pien*, 3, 4 b, where we read, more correctly, that the *Nü-chên* terms for «wife» and «husband» were 薩那罕