STUDIA ORIENTALIA EDIDIT SOCIETAS ORIENTALIS FENNICA XIX:4

SOME GLOSSES ON RECENT MONGOL STUDIES

WALTHER HEISSIG

Some Glosses on Recent Mongol Studies

BY

WALTHER HEISSIG

Goettingen

I

The Reverend P. Antoine Mostaert, CICM, in an erudite introduction to the new facsimile-edition of the Mongol chronicle Erten-ü qad-un ündüsülegsen törü yosun-u tobčilan quriyaysan altan tobči kemekü orusiba (Altan tobči Nova) by Blo bzan bstan 'jin, published by the HARVARD YENCHING INSTITUTE 1, has established the time of compilation of this work of history between 1649 and 1736. He bases his reasoning on the following facts:

- 1. In vol. II, 189 of the new edition, the $Jir\gamma u\gamma an\ ordus$, »Six Ordos banner» are mentioned. These 6 banner were established in 1649, therefore the AT Nova can not have been written earlier than 1649.
- 2. The 7th banner of the Ordos was established in Ch'ien-lung 1, 1736: this banner being not mentioned in the AT Nova gives the clue that this chronicle must have been written earlier than 1736.

The Reverend A. Mostaert adds to this that by additional study, the date of the compilation of this work might be defined more precisely.

Altan tobči, a Brief History of the Mongols, by Blo bzan bstan 'jin, SCRIPTA MONGOLICA I, Cambridge 1952 (Fotofacsimile of the Ulanbator Edition 1937, 2 vols.), X.

The above established time between 1649 and 1736 strengthens the assumption 1, that the author of the Altan tobči Nova (II, 292), ayaya tegimlig šašana dhara blo bzang bstan gjin kemegdekü güüsi is one and the same person with Sumati śasanadhara gusri blo bzan bstan 'jin, the lamaist cleric who wrote the Wu t'ai-shan guidebook Uda-yin tabun ayulan-u orusil süsügten -ü čikin čimeg orusiba (»Earornament of the Pious, Guidebook to the Five Sacred Peaks»).²

In the manuscript of the AT Nova which was described by Žamcarano ³ its author is named still more in conformity with the Wu t'ai-shan Guidebook, Su ma dhi ša sa na dha ra ku śri blo bzan bstan 'jin.

The »Guidebook to the Five Sacred Peaks» states about its author in the colophon (71 r.):

»I, called Sumati śasana dhara who sprinkles unto his head the dust from the soles of him styled Jaya pandita Khutukhtu by the predetermination of the omniscient Pancen and Dalai Lama... did compile this ... work, respecting the demand ... uttered by the migrant monk nag dban blo bzan from Köke Khota.» ⁴

¹ Žamcarano, Mongol'skie Letopisi XVII veka (Mongolian Chronicles of the 17th Century), Moscow-Leningrad 1937, 80; W. Heissig, Bolur erike — literaturhist. untersucht, MON.SER. Monograph Series X, Peking 1946, 35; A. Mostaert, op.cit.

² Cf. my forthcoming book, Die Pekinger lamaistischen Blockdrucke in mongolischer Sprache.

³ Letopisi, 79; Mostaert, Introduction, XI.

⁴ Ene jokiyal-i anu köke qota daki orud-i bitügeči toyin kemen (71 v.) aldarsiγsan . . . ngagdvang blo bzang-ber . . . duradduγsan-dür sitüjü . qamuγ-i ayiladuγči-yi bancen dalai blama-yin esi bošuγ-iyar Jaya bandida qutuγtu kemen (72 r.) aldarsiγsan tegün-ü ölmei-yin toyusun-i oroi-bar abuγči su madhi sasana dhara kemegdekü bi . . . üiledbei . . . The Wu t'ai shan monography U-dai serigün tungγalaγ aγula-yin jokiyangγui (printed first 1702; reprinted 1924, cf. my forthcoming Die Pekinger lam. Blockrucke, Nr. 10), fasc. 2, 2or. reports that a certain nag dban blo bzan became in Shun-chih 17, 1660 by imperial order the authority above all monks at the Wu t'ai shan-peaks. He wrote 1661 a preface to a Wu t'ai shan description. K'ang hsi 39, 1700 he is mentioned with the title of the čing siu ča si (l.c., fasc.

Later on the date of the preparation of the manuscript by the author himself for the purpose of the blockcutting is defined as (73 r.):

»It has been requested by all the monks of the monastery Pu sa-ting led by the Čing siu ča si didu bstan pa Khubilghan and the Didu jasay Lama, these two, 'Cut this Description of the Lofty Place, the Mountain with Five Peaks into printing blocks and let it be a solid beginning of the tenthousand years of the exalted emperor, the Mañjuśri incarnate who develops this world' and, respecting this, Gusri blo bzan bstan jin wrote it, repeating and collecting from works compiled by earlier savants ...»¹

Upon this, the printing blocks were finished in K'ang-hsi 6, 1667/VII, 5.2

A short survey of the history of construction of monasteries of the kind of the Čaylasi ügei süme in Köke Khota ³, written in the late fifties of the Ch'ien-lung era (about 1785), reports for 1661, the year of the ascension to throne by emperor Sheng-tsu as well as for K'ang-hsi 6, 1667 the institution of two monasteries . . boyda ejen-ü tümen nasun-u öljei batudqu-yin tula or . . . badaraqu-yin tula — 'for the consolidation' or 'for the augmentation of luck for the tenthousand years of the exalted emperor'. The use of the same phrase of felicitation in the request for preparing the manuscript

^{3, 29}v). He was a Chinese who became a lamaist monk and was in the confidence of the Manchu emperors (cf. his biography, l.c., fasc. 7).

¹ Degedü orun tabun üjügür tü ayula-yin garčay-i anu manjusiri -yin qubilyan delekei-yi manduyuluyči degedü ejen-ü tümen nasun-u batu orusil bolyan keb-tür bütügeye kemen čing-siu ča si di du bstan ba qubilyan kiged, didu jasay -un blama'jin dge slong qoyar ekilen (73 v.) busa ding -un keyid-ün quvaray bügüde duradduysan-dur sitüjü erten-ü merged-ün jokiyaysan šastir-ača tobčilan quriyaju gusiri blo bzang bstan 'jin ber bičibei . . .

² 74 v.: Dayičing ulus-un engke amuyulang-un jiryuduyar on čayayčin eme temür üker jil-ün namur-un terigün doluyan sara-yin čayan jüg-ün bayasqulangtu sine . . . sayin edür-e busa ding -tur keb-tür bütügebei . . .

³ Čaylasi ügei süme-yin jerge-yin bügüde süme-yin uy bayiyuluysan yabudal-i bayičayaysan dangsa (Ms, Royal Library Copenhagen, Coll. Grønbech).

^{4 1661} the Öljei-yi erkin bolyayči süme in Kuei-hua, 1667 the Yeke bayas-qulangtu süme South of Kuei-hua.

of the Wu t'ai-shan Guidebook means that this work too was printed in celebration of the beginning of the reign of Sheng-tsu.

The reference made by Blo bzan bstan jin to the Jaya pandita Khutukhtu determines the possible time of its compilation still further.

For the Jaya pandita Khutukhtu, a monastery, the *Pandida-yin süme* was constructed K'ang-hsi 1, 1662 in the vicinity of Köke Khota. It was later, since K'anghsi 36, 1696, called *Sayin erkilegči süme*.¹

About its construction, the above mentioned survey reports: »... if one investigates about the Sayin -i erkilegči süme, it has been originally built by the Jaya paṇḍita Khutukhtu. When he, in the first year of K'ang-hsi (1662), coming from the banner of the Dzasakhtu Khan of the Khalkha with an retinue of onehundred-andsixty monks, had presented himself to the holy majesty, the exalted order was given: 'Khutukhtu, you may make your home together with the disciples in peace at any place you like within the borders of (the district of) Kuei-hua!' He followed these words with zeal and built a monastery on the Dzirghalanghtu Mountain at the source of River Kharightsin . . . 2

In consequence, the Guidebook to the Five Sacred Peaks must have been compiled by blo bzan bstan 'jin between 1662, the year of the arrival of the Jaya Pandita to whom he pays his respect, and 1667/VII, 5.

Close examination of the $Altan\ tob\check{c}i$ Nova and comparison with other Mongolian texts reveals further indications that the AT Nova was written at approximately the same time as the Wu t'ai-shan Guide.

¹ Loc.cit.; Pozdneev, Mongolija i Mongoly, II, 145.

² Sayin-i erkilegči süme-yi bayičayabasu. Jaya bandida qutuytu-yin uy bayiyuluysan anu. Engke amuyulang-un terigün on-du qalqa-yin jasaytu qan-u qosiyun -ača nige jayun jiran yarun örüge šabinar tai irejü. boyda ejen-ü gegen-dü baralaqui-dur degere-eče jarliy bayulyaysan anu. qutuytu či šabinar-luya selte köke qota-yin orun-daki ali jokistai yajar -tu amur-iyar nutuylan sayutuyai. kemegsen-i kičiyenggüilen dayaju qariyčin-u youl-un ekin-dür jiryalangtu kemekü ayulan-du keyid süme bayiyulju darui . . .

One of these clues is offered by the AT Nova itself in its presentation of the next descendants of Ligdan Khan of the Tsakhar (1604 -1634). Blo bzan bstan 'jin mentions there (AT, 181) as the last of these the two grandsons of Ligdan Khan, Burni wang and Lubsang tayiji, the sons of his son Abunai wang with Jürčid-ün bars sečen qayan-u ökin gürün-ü güngči, the imperial princess and daughter of Abahai of the Manchu.

This daughter of Abahai, Princess Makata, was married to Abunai in 1645. Her first son Burni was born not earlier than 1651. Her second and younger son Lubsang tayiji therefore must have been born some time after 1651. Since both sons, Burni and Lubsang, elder and younger brother are mentioned by the AT Nova for the last descendants of Ligdan Khan, the AT Nova must have been written few years after 1651.

Abunai, Ligdan's son as well as the two grandsons Burni and Lubsang revolted 1674 against the Manchu. Burni was waylaid in the course of this uprising in 1675, May 15 and murdered ³; his brother Lubsang was punished.⁴

Blo bzań bstan 'jin, however, mentions nothing at all about these happenings. Later, Mongolian chronicles of the 18th century report in the detail about the revolt of *Burni* and *Lubsang* and their subsequent doom. This means that these happenings had not yet taken place when Blo bzan bstan 'jin wrote the *Altan tobči* Nova.

The AT Nova (II, 191-193) stresses at its end particularly

¹ HUMMEL, Eminent Chinese, I, 304.

² The chronicle Altan kürdün mingγan gegesütü bičig (Ms. in the Royal Library Copenhagen), written 1739 by the Siregetü güüsi Dharma (cf. Bolur erike- lit.hist. untersucht, 21—22) mentions: Burni čin wang . . . qorin tabun nasun-u temür taulai jildür törü-yi terselen urbaju čirigleged — »Burni Čin wang revolted in his 25th year, the year of the iron-hare against the governement and waged war . . .» 1675, the year of the Tsakhar uprising, is the woodhare year of the 11th sexagenary-cycle; it should therefore read modun taulai jildür. Burni was then 24 years of age (counted in Western style) and must have been born 1651.

³ Hummel, Eminent Chinese, I, 305.

⁴ Bolur erike (Kalgan edition 1941), 674.

the genealogy of the Kharatsin and their first alliance with the Manchu. Comparison of this part with Mongyol borjigid oboy-un $te\ddot{u}ke$ (*History of the Mongolian Clan Bordzigid*), a chronicle written by the bannergeneral Lomi, a descendant of the Kharatsin-chieftains, in 1735 in Manchu and Chinese and translated later, 1839 into Mongol, furnishes another indication as to the date of the AT Nova.

While the AT Nova (II, 199) enumerates five generations only of descendants of Köndelen qayan, ending with Büre, son of Jolbin, the BOT (III, 27—28) names a 6th and 7th generation more. These are the son of Büre, ded jerge kiya Dalai and finally his son Qosiyu-yi jakiraqu sayid Lomi², the author of the BOT.

Lomi refers to himself in the preface to the BOT (I, 8), dated Yung-cheng 13, 1735, as edüge bi jiran nasun önggerebe—'I have passed now the age of 60 years' (for us 59 years). He therefore must have been born about 1675, K'ang-hsi 14. Consequently, his father Dalai must have been born about 20 years earlier, i.e. about Shunchih, 1655.

Blo bzań bstan 'jin, however, when writing the AT Nova, mentioned amongst these Kharatsin known to him as lastborn, i.e. his contemporaries only Jolbi, the grandfather of Lomi. He then did not know of the existence of a son of said Jolbi, nor of the grandson Lomi. This means that he wrote the AT Nova earlier than 1655.

The evidence furnished by the BOT is so much more of weight, if we consider that the AT Nova has served later as one of the sources of the BOT as is shown by the following concurrences of

- a) the first five generations in the genealogy of the Kharatsin (AT Nova, II, 190 = BOT, III, 27-28);
- b) the division of the Kharatsin into yellow, brownish and black Kharatsin (AT Nova, II, 190-191=BOT, III, 26); ³

¹ Survey of its contents MON.SER. X: 1945, 214-219.

² Mong. text and translation cf. MON.SER. X: 1945, 215²⁴.

³ Text and translation cf. Heissig, Bolur erike lit.hist. untersucht, 1005.

c) the narration about the alliance between Kharatsin and Manchu 1628 (AT Nova, II, $191-192^{1}=BOT$, III, 30-33).²

The above presented facts narrow the possible time of the compilation of the *Altan tobči* Nova down from 1649—1736 to between 1651 and approximately 1655.

Was it already highly improbably that there existed two author of the same name and the same title ³, then establishes the above demonstrated time of compilation of the AT Nova which is in close agreement with the time of compilation of the Wu t'ai-shan Guide, the identity of Blo bzan bstan'jin, the author of the Altan tobči Nova with Blo bzan bstan 'jin, the author of the Wu t'ai-shan Guide, beyond any reasonable doubt.

Accordingly, the author of the $Altan\ tob\check{c}i$ Nova presents himself as a member of the monk-congregation of the main temple Pu-sa-ting on the Eastern peak of the Wu t'ai-shan. He wrote the AT Nova, which formes vol. ha, 29^4 of his Collected Works (gsun 'bum) — between 1651 and 1655, the Wu t'ai-shan guidebook between 1662 and 1667. He payed particular hommage to the Jaya Pandita Khutukhtu, then staying at Köke khota, had some bonds to a celebrated monk called nag dban blo bzan from Köke Khota (Kueihua), which indicates that he formerly stayed too for some time at Köke Khota as it was customary with many lamaist priests during the first part of the 17th century. Judged by the contents of the AT Nova and its particular treatment of the Kharatsin he was a Kharatsin himself. His sojourn at the Wu t'ai-shan convent Pu-sa-ting can be explained by the fact that emperor Shun-chih in 1655 and 1657 brought to settlement at this monastery alltogether

¹ Cf. Žamcarano, Letopisi, 118-119.

² Cf. Bolur erike lit. hist. untersucht, 9548.

³ Mostaert, Introduction, X².

⁴ Žamcarano, Letopisi, 80 erronously gives for tib. ha the wrong number-equivalent 27.

⁵ Neyiči toyin, BNT-Domoy (Cf. Anthropos 48: 1953), the 44th abbot of dGa ldan, nag dban blo gros rgya mcho 1635 (LSSS,) and others.

90 Mongolian monks from all Mongol tribes. For a southmongolian origin of Blo bzan bstan jin speaks last not least the fact that the original of the AT Nova was found in a noble family of the $Y\ddot{u}ngsiyeb\ddot{u}$ who had emigrated from Tsakhar to Khalkha during the 17th century.

 Π

The Introduction (uduridqal) to the modern Mongolian rendering of the Secret History, Mongyol -un niyuča tobčiyan ³ by Čengdü -yin Damdinsürüng ⁴ presents some new material concerning the number of Mongolian historical sources.⁵

Because of the rarity of this new edition of the Niyuča tobčiyan

— there exists only one copy in Finland ⁶ — and the fact that

¹ Shan-hsi tung-chih, 171; Pokotilov, U-tai, ego prošloe i nastojaščee, Zapiski Irgo XXII: 1893 (German transl. by W. A. Unkrig, SINICA-Sonderausgabe 1935, 54).

² ŽAMCARANO, Letopisi, 80; MOSTAERT, Introduction, XI.

^{3 280} pages, Ulān bātor 1947, cf. P. Aalto, Zur Geschichte der Yüan-ch'ao-pi-shi-Forschung, JSFOu 1951; For an Innermongolian reprint of this edition cf. A. Mostaert, HJAS 15: 1952, 407. This modern Mong. rendering of the N.T. is based on 2 vols. of an older Mongolian reconstruction of the Yüan-ch'ao pi-shi by Baryu-yin čengdü güng, the Ye-teh hui Edition, Kozin's Sokrovennoe skazanie, I, 1941, Altan tobči by bLo bzan bstan 'jin, Kafarov's attempt of an reconstr., the reconstruction by Haenisch (1935—39), Rashid Ed Din's History of the Mongols in the transl. by Berezin (1858—1888), Činggis qayan-u čadig, Altan tobči and many other Mongolian chronicles and dictionaries (... olan jüil-ün mongyol-un teüke. toli bičig.), the part-translation by Pozdneev, the Mongolian reconstruction of the text of the NT by Altanwačir (cf. MS VIII: 1943, 267) and finally Vladimircov, Obščestv.stroj Mongolov.

⁴ Born in 1908, *Damdinsürüng* received some linguistical training at the Acad. of Sciences of the USSR and published some papers about the Mongolian language and a collection of narrations besides of translations of political pamphlets.

⁵ To this problem cf. m. Zum Umfang der mong. Geschichtsschreibung, MS X:1945, 211-214.

⁶ I have to express my gratitude to Mr. P. Aalto for a microfilm.

therein is voiced a Mongolian opinion about the character of certain Mongolian chronicles, I endeavour to repeat the contents of the relevant passages.

Damdinsürüng (op.cit., 12) reports, that *1945 a work of the following title had been acquired from Inner-Mongolia: ¹ Yeke yüwen ulus-un činggis tayızu qayan-u ulus ayımay-i abuysan čerig-ün tobčiya-yin on jil sara edür-ün bitegün quriyangyui-yin üiledbüri temdeglel-ün debter- *Register, detailed collection of the days, months and years of the history of the campains by which emperor Tai-tsu Chingis of the Great Yüan Dynasty has subjugated the nations and the tribes*. Unfortunately, Damdinsürüng does not add whether this work is a manuscript or a modern edition by the Mongol printing press at Kalgan.

»13 original sources of Mongolian history have been listed» 2 in this work, these are:

- Töbed-eče orčivulju abuysan čidayči-yin erketü čadig »Biography of the Omnipotent, translated from the Tibetan»;
- 2) Čidayči-yin čadig »Biography of the Allmighty»;
- 3) Jalayus-un qurim »Banquet of the Youth»;
- 4) Köke sudur »Blue Chronicle»;
- 5) Činggis-un šastir »Book about Chingis»;
- 6) Yuwan-u töb yeke sudur »Great principal Chronicle of the Yüan [Dynasty]»;
- 7) *Ijayur-un tegüke* »Genealogical History»; ³
- 8) Altan üres ten-ü tobči »Short History of the Imperial Progeny»;
- 9) Da yuwan-u čing si bičig;
- 10) Sanang (!) sečen-u sedkil-ün čenggel »Joy of the Mind, by Sanang setsen»;

^{1 12: . . .} kemekü neretü nom. 1945 on-du dotuyadu Mongyol -ača oldaba . . .

² 12: . . . tegün-dür dotura Mongyol -un teüke-yin 13 tulyur bičig-i temdeglegsen inu.

³ This title is of very general meaning. Very often it is referred to in mong. chronicles as a source; yet it is not possible to identify these references beyond doubt as concerning the same work.

- Altan uruγ tan-u dödte teüdke »Abbreviated History of the Imperial Family»;
- Boγda činggis-un sula tuγuji »Single narration about the Holy Chingis»;
- 12) γang mu sudur »Tung-kien kang-mu».

With the exception of the first title all other 12 titles are known to us as mentioned among the sources of the Mongolian historiographers Rasipungsuγ (1774/75) and Injanasi (1840—91), being today mostly not available.

But Damdinsürüng offers some important information as to the character of 6 of these titles, viz. Nr. 4, 5, 7, 8, 11 and 12 by stating »it is known that this kind of works are related to the Secret history».² He further adds that, »fragments taken from the Secret History»³ are to be found in the Sira teüke ⁴, the Altan tobči (by blo bzaň bstan 'jin) and in Erdeni-yin erike.

He draws, from these facts as from the existence of 233 paragraphs of the Secret History in the *Altan tobči* by blo bzań bstan 'jin, the conclusion that "an original manuscript of the Secret History written in Uiguro-Mongolian letters has been in the hands of the old Mongolian Writers and chroniclers".

From the above can be concluded that the Erdeni-yin erike mentioned there is a work different from the Khalkha-Chronicle Erdeni-yin erike by the Khalkha-nobleman Tayiji Galdan (about 1859), which latter evidently shows no traces of alliterative poetry of the kind as prevalent in the Secret History. It is, furthermore,

¹ Cf. Einige Bemerkungen ueber die *Köke sudur*, MS VIII: 1943, 256—257; Zum Umfang der mongolischen Geschichtsliteratur, MS X: 1945, 213; Bolur erike literaturhist. untersucht, Peking 1946, 21 sg.

² op.cit., 13: . . . jerge nom niyuča tobčiyantai olboydaltai bayiju medemüi . . .

³ Op.cit., 12: . . . niyuča tobčiyan-ača abuysan bolultai keseg keseg jüil üd . . .

 $^{^4}$ Cf. for this work C. Žamcarano, Mongol'skie letopisi XVII veka, Leningrad 1936, 60-69.

⁵ L.c.: . . . mongyol-un qayučin teükeči. jokiyalči nar-un yar-tu niyuča tobčiyan-u uyiyur mongyol üsüg-iyer bičigsen eke bayiysan bolultai . . .

⁶ Galdan tusalayči-yin Erdeni-yin tobči oder Erdeni-yin erike, edit. A. Pozn-NEEV, Mongol'skaja letopis »Erdeniin erike», St. Petersburg 1883.

not identical with the Mongyol-un orun-dur qayan-u uysaya kiged sajin delgeregsen. sajin-i bariyčin üsüg uralaysan. keyid ayimay terigüten yampar (sic) metü yaruysan-u yösu-yi nomlaysan Erdeni-yin erike- »Rosary of Jewels, which teaches how the imperial family and the Faith have developed in the Country of the Mongols and the way by which preachers, literati and monasteries came to exist there» abbreviatedly known as Erdeni-yin erike too. This work, written in 1835 by the Toyin qangčin pandita Ye šes dpal ldan, is an ecclesiastical history. Damdinsürüng must, therefore refer to another, third historical work of the same title, Erdeni-yin erike.

The title of Nr. 10, Sedkil-ün čenggel for the Erdeni-yin tobči by Sečen sayang (1662) has to be added to the already long list of titles under which this chronicle is known among the Mongols.²

Five more unknown works which referedly are among the Mongolian manuscripts in the State-Libary Ulān bātor ³ have been mentioned among the sources of another modern Mongolian historical treatise, Mongyol ulus-un tobči teüke: ⁴

- 1) Tayizu činggis qayan-u üre-yin tuyuji »History of the progeny of Tai-tzu Chingis Khan»;
- 2) Yuwen ulus-un teüke-yi yerüčilen delgeregülügsen bičig »Book, totally dealing with the History of the Yüan empire»;
- Mongyol-un eki urusqal-un bičig »Book about the Origin and the Course of the Mongols»; 5
- 4) Mongyol ulus-un erten-eče ulamjilaysan bičig »Book handed down from the ancient times of the Mongol Nation»;

¹ 2 copies in the Royal Library Copenhagen, which have been acquired by the 2nd Danish Centralasian Exped. in Tsakhar.

² Bolur erike literaturhist. untersucht, 47⁴⁴.

³ Čöm küriyeleng-ün nom-un sang-dur bui.

⁴ Ulān bātor 1935.

⁵ As the chronicle by Sayang sečen is particularly listed there as Sanang sečen qungtayiji-yin Erdeniyin tobči, the above title designates not this work which would otherwise be suggested by its resemblance of the Chinese title of Erdeni-yin tobči, Meng-ku yüan-liu.

5) Erten-eče edüge kürtelger qad noyad-un čidaγ — »Biographies of the kings and lords, from ancient times until today continued».

So far no reference has been found to these 5 works in any other Mongolian chronicle available in the West. They are to be added to the ever growing list of unknown Mongolian historical works.

with the first and the first the second section of the second section of the second second second second section is

ray or which and the last of t

en de la composition La composition de la La composition de la

to provide the control of the second section of the section of the second section of the section of the second section of the section of th

attended to the second of the

The second of th