

The Liu-Ch'iu Words in the Sui-Shu

BY

KURAKICHI SHIRATORI

The appearance of the phrase Liu-ch'iu-kuo 流求國 or Liu-ch'iu in history dates from the Sui dynasty. A very simple account given under the 3rd year of *Ta-yeh* 大業 607 A. D. in the Annals of the Emperor Yang-ti 煬帝 in the *Sui-shu* 隋書, Chap. 3; a description of Liu-ch'iu-kuo, *ibid.*, Chap. 81, *Tung-i-chuan* 東夷傳; and an article forming a half of *Ch'ên-lêng-chuan* 陳稜傳, *ibid.*, Chap. 64;—these constitute the entire literature on the country in those days.

There exists no question whatever as to the identity of the two terms 流求 and 琉球. However, if *Liu-ch'iu-chuan* 流求傳 in the *Sui-shu* be taken as a true record of events which took place in the present Loochoo 琉球 Islands, so many difficulties arise that it is impossible to comprehend the documents thoroughly. This raises a question: How is it that this particular country came to be called Liu-ch'iu 流求, namely Liu-ch'iu 琉球? And if this *Liu-ch'iu-chuan* be taken as an account of events which took place in the present Formosa and informations obtained there, the difficulties above referred to seem to drop off. But then another question arises: How is it that the name Liu-ch'iu has not been handed down in Formosa, but transferred to the present Loochoo Islands? This being the case, Liu-ch'iu-kuo in the *Sui-shu* has been a difficult problem in the academic world, and various views have been presented by a large number of scholars of the East and West. Their arguments are varied in tenor. Their conclusions, however, we may safely assert to represent three views: one that assigns Liu-ch'iu for the present Loochoo Islands, another that assigns it for Formosa, and still another that assigns it for both the Loochoo Islands and Formosa combined. Of these three, which can be the most probable? Indiscriminate scholars unqualified for discernment have

been left to grope in the dark.

In the meantime, Mr. Sei WADA published a paper in the *Tôyô-gakubô*, Dec., 1924, entitled "On the Names of Liu-ch'iu 琉球 and Tai-wan 臺灣" in which he put forth a trenchant criticism and a sound argument based on the most adequate historical materials he had collected concerning the Loochoo Islands and Formosa. He concluded that Liu-ch'iu-kuo 流求國 in the *Sui-shu* exclusively represented the present Formosa and also asserted that men of the Ming dynasty were responsible for transferring the name to the present Loochoo Islands. To my great satisfaction, this paper of Mr. WADA's was one that decisively solved the most difficult problem of long standing. However, his argument somehow did not carry the academic world as I expected it would, for Mr. Fuyû IFA published a paper in the *Tôyô-gakubô*, No. 2, Vol. XVI, July, 1926, entitled "A Doubt on Liu-ch'iu in the *Sui-shu*" in which he gave a somewhat compromising view that *Liu-ch'iu-chuan* in the *Sui-shu* includes facts relative to both the Loochoo Islands and Formosa. According to Mr. IF, the country which Chu K'uan 朱寬 conquered was Formosa while one Ch'ên Lêng 陳稜 conquered was the Loochoo Islands. Hence his conclusion. If he had gone so far as to suppose that the country Ch'ên Lêng conquered was also Formosa, his conclusion would have been similar to Mr. WADA's. I was then looking forward to a speedy appearance of papers in this vein to follow one after another, but I was quite disappointed. Mr. Kenzô AKIYAMA, in the *Rekishi-chiri*, Vol. LIV No. 2, Aug., 1928, contributing a paper entitled "Re-examination of Liu-ch'iu-kuo in the *Sui-shu*", discussed the entire document of *Liu-ch'iu-chuan* from the side of the Loochoo Islands and offered a theory aggressively detrimental to Mr. WADA's Formosan theory. This was a considerable surprise to me.

Soon after publishing this view of his, Mr. AKIYAMA paid me a visit, requesting me to give my interpretation of those Liu-ch'iu words. I consented and as I became confirmed in my view after an elaborate research on the matter, I gave my humble opinion on I-chou 夷洲 and Tan-chou 檀洲 at a session of the Tôyôshi-danwakwai (Oriental History Symposium) held in October, 1929, in which I stated that they

belonged to a branch of the Malayan language and had no relation whatever to the Japanese or Loochoo language. In spite of the fact that Mr. AKIYAMA was one of those who were present at the meeting and listened to my address, there was no indication that he changed his old views. The following year M. HAGUENAUER, French scholar on Japan, contributing a paper entitled "Le Lieou-k'ieou kouo du Souei chou était-il Formosa?" to the *Bulletin de la Maison Franco-Japonaise*, T. II, No. 3-4, supported Mr. AKIYAMA's Loochoo theory from the standpoint of a folklorist. So the Loochoo theory came to revive and some Japanese scholars blindly followed it. In the face of this situation, it seemed impossible even for Mr. WADA to keep silent. In the *Rekishi-chiri*, Vol. LVII, No. 3, he published another paper entitled "On Liu-ch'iu in the *Sui-shu* Again" and revised and elaborated his original views into better form in order to emphasize his points.

Four years have passed since Mr. WADA's publication of his theory. The present trend in the academic circle of the Liu-ch'iu-kuo question is not clear. In my point of view, however, this question has been definitely settled. So far as the question as to whether 流求 was the Loochoo Islands or Formosa is concerned, there is neither necessity of discussing it again nor any room for doubt. However, there is one important aspect neglected, though considerably bearing upon this problem on the one hand, and deserving an independent investigation on the other. It concerns of an interpretation of the Liu-ch'iu words handed down in *Liu-ch'iu-chuan* in the *Sui-shu*. The present writer lectured on it some six years ago; but since he has not presented it to the academic circle at large, he has decided to give it here again with some revision.

The Loochoo language was generally considered a foreign language to a Japanese, no more intelligible when spoken or legible when written than Korean or Chinese. As its diction and grammar were studied, it proved so similar to the Japanese language that none would now regard it a language foreign to Japanese. But to what extent is it similar? Is it only a dialect of the Japanese language with the relation of parent and child? Or is it to be regarded a sister language with Japanese? On

this point, opinions of the scholars may not agree. If there is a considerable difference between the two languages, it is perhaps due to the fact that the Loochoo people separated, in an archaic age, from the Japanese to occupy the southern islands.

Contact of the islanders of Yaku 屋久, Tane 種子 etc., with the southern parts of Kyûshû, such as Ôsumi and Satsuma, no doubt took place at a very remote ancient time, but the first visit of the southerners to the Japanese court recorded in Japanese history dates only from the Empress Suiko 推古天皇. In the *Nibon-shoki* 日本書紀 and the *Shoku-Nibon-gi* 續日本紀, we read, under the 24th year of the reign of the Empress Suiko 616 A. D., first of the naturalization of three Yaku 掖玖 people and then of the coming of some islanders of Tane 多禰, Amami 奄美, Toku 度感, etc., offering tributes as a token of their allegiance during the period between the reign of the above-mentioned Empress and that of the Empress Kôken 孝謙天皇 (616-758 A.D.). I have no objection to the usual supposition which assigns Yaku 掖玖 for the present 屋久; Tane 多禰 for 種子; Amami 奄美 for Amami Ôshima 奄美大島; and Toku 度感 for 徳. And the period above-mentioned corresponds to the Sui and T'ang dynasties in China. Then there is no doubt that the people who occupied the Loochoo Islands when the Emperor Yang-ti 煬帝, during the era of *Ta-yeb* 大業, attacked a place named Liu-ch'iu-kuo 流求國, were the forefathers of the present Loochoo people.

Therefore, the supposition that Liu-ch'iu 流求 which Chu K'uan and Ch'ên Lêng conquered during the *Ta-yeb* era refers to the present Loochoo Islands, as some people insist, raises a question whether there was a place called by that name in this archipelago. The Chinese pronunciation of the two characters 流求 is *liu-ch'iu*. Since neither the Loochoo nor the Japanese language has no "l" sound in it, it is inferred that there was no place called by a name pronounced exactly *liu-ch'iu*; and since there is no "r" sound in Chinese and the Chinese used to substitute an "l" for an "r" in transliterating a foreign word containing an "r" in it, the original name the Chinese transliterated *Lin-ch'iu* may well be supposed to have been *Rin-ch'iu*. However, the Loochoo language like Japanese has no word beginning

with an "r" sound. Any word in modern Japanese beginning with an "r" sound is either a Chinese word or one from some other foreign language. *Riu-ch'iu* as it is pronounced in these two languages is a forced corruption of the Chinese *Liu-ch'iu*. The Japanese in some districts, feeling difficulty in pronouncing an initial "r" sound of a Japanese word, sometimes change it to a "d" sound. For instance, the people at Kagoshima in South Kyūshū may corrupt *Ron-go* 論語 to *Don-go*. This is also the case in the Loochoo Islands. To give a more proper example, the island people can formally pronounce the Chinese name 琉球 *Riu-ch'iu*, but commonly pronounce it *Du-kiu* or *Du-ch'iu*.

From the foregoing it may be safely asserted that as the Loochoo language has no "l" sound and no word beginning with an "r" sound, there was absolutely no place among the Loochoo Islands called *Riu-ch'iu* during the Sui dynasty. Some men who contend that *Liu-ch'iu* 流求 in the *Sui-shu* refers to the present Loochoo Islands may explain it away as a name given by the men of the Sui dynasty. But the fact that the name is given as 留求 in the *Sbōryōshū* 性靈集 a collection of writings by KŌBŌ-DAISHI 弘法大師, 流球 in the *Yenchinden* 圓珍傳 (The Life of Yenchin, a Japanese Monk) by Kiyotsura MIYOSHI 三好清行, and 琉球 in the *Wên-hsien-t'ung-k'ao* 文獻通考,—the fact that the name is not given by the uniformal characters would prove the word as nothing but a Chinese transliteration of some foreign word. The Loochoo language has no "l" sound and no word beginning with an "r" sound; whereas the native language of Formosa has both the sounds and also words beginning with an "r" sound. From this fact, it may be inferred that *Liu-ch'iu-kuo* in the *Sui-shu* refers to Formosa.

It would be impossible now to elucidate the name transliterated by the characters 流求 or the meaning it has. The nine *Liu-ch'iu* words given in *Liu-ch'iu-chuan* in the *Sui-shu* have not yet been completely explained. Before attempting an investigation of the words, we must first make out the circumstances under which these words are used. The passages needed for our reference follow:

"*Liu-ch'iu-kuo* 流求國 is situated among the sea-islands in the east of Chien-

an-prefecture 建安郡. It may be reached by making a five-day-voyage. The land has many mountainous districts. The chief's surname is *Huan-ssü* 歡斯 and his personal name *K'o-la-tou* 渴刺兜. As to his ancestry, his succession to the dominion, and the number of generations before him, nothing is known. The natives call him *K'o-lao-yang* 可老羊 and his wife *To-pa-t'u* 多拔荼. The place where they dwell is called *Po-lo-t'an-tung* 波羅檀洞. It is trebly girt with moats and walls and surrounded with running water. Trees and shrubs form walls. The chief's hall extends along sixteen columns, and is engraven with birds and animals. . . . The country has four or five *shuai* 帥 or chiefs, who rule the several *tung* 洞 or districts which are ruled by *hsiao-wang* 小王 or lesser chiefs. The *tung* often contains villages. The ruler of a village is *niao-liao-shuai* 鳥了帥; only a brave warrior is appointed. He is quite independent from others and manages all the affairs of the village."—(1)

"As the Emperor Yang-ti 煬帝 ascended the throne, (Lêng 稜) was appointed *Piao-ch'i-chiang-chün* 驃騎將軍, and in the 3rd year of *Ta-yeb* 大業 (607 A.D.), *Wu-pên-lang-chiang* 武賁郎將. Three years later, taking with him Chang Chên-chou 張鎮周 in the rank of *Chao-ch'ing-ta-fu* 朝請大夫, and over ten thousand soldiers of Tung-yang 東陽 (Chin-hua, Che-chiang 浙江金華), Lêng embarked from I-an 義安 (Chao-an, Kuang-tung 廣東潮安) for the purpose of attacking Liu-ch'iu-kuo. In more than a month, they arrived. The Liu-ch'iu people, seeing war-vessels for the first time, took them for traders and often came out to trade. He first sent Chên-chou forward as vanguard. Huan-ssu K'o-la-tou, 歡斯渴刺兜, the chief, sent an army to counter-attack them. Chên-chou often defeated the enemies. Lêng advanced and reached Ti-mu-t'an-tung 低沒檀洞. Huan-ssü Lao-mo 歡斯老模, the lesser chief, of the *tung* or district resisted them with his men. Lêng

(1) The *Sui-shu*, Chap. 81, *Tung-i-chuan*. 流求國居海島之中, 當建安郡東, 水行五日而至, 土多山洞, 其王姓歡斯氏, 名渴刺兜, 不知其由來有國代數也, 彼土人呼之爲可老羊, 妻曰多拔荼, 所居曰波羅檀洞, 壘柵三重, 環以流水, 樹棘爲藩, 王所居舍, 其大一十六間, 瑠刻禽獸. . . 國有四五帥統諸洞, 洞有小王, 往々有村, 村有鳥了帥, 並以善戰者爲之, 自相樹立, 理一村之事. (隋書卷八十一, 東夷傳)

defeated the enemies and slew Lao-mo. The day grew so drizzly and dark that officers and men became frightened. Lêng killed a white horse and offered it to the sea-god as a sacrifice. Presently the day began to clear up. Dividing the army into five divisions, he attacked the capital. K'ô-la-tou came forward with an army several thousand strong to counter-attack them. Lêng sent Chên-chou forward, and the vanguard, with an attack, put the enemies to flight. Lêng, following up the victory, chased the runners up to the fences. K'ô-la-tou fought with his back to the fences. Lêng attacked with his very staunchest fighters. The battle lasted from eight o'clock in the morning to two o'clock in the afternoon, and the fiercest was not over. K'ô-la-tou, as his army was exhausted, retired within the fences of his accord. Lêng, filling up the moats, destroyed the fences. He slew K'ô-la-tou and captured his son Tao-ch'ui 島榑. Taking several thousand men and women as prisoners, he came home. The Emperor was so delighted with him that he promoted Lêng to the rank of *Yu-kuang-lu-ta-fu* 右光祿大夫, without removing him from the post of *Wu-pên* 武賁.⁽¹⁾

The social organization of Liu-ch'iu-kuo in the Sui dynasty may roughly be seen from the foregoing passages. At that time the land was divided into four or five districts; there was no king to rule the whole country. The land consisted of several *tung* 洞 or districts, the heads of which were called chiefs. The chief who was attacked by the Sui army was Huan-ssü 歡斯 by surname and K'ô-la-tou by individual name and his dominion was called Po-lo-t'an-tung 波羅檀洞. Under this chief there was a lesser chief whose name was Huan-ssü Lao-mo 歡斯老模; and whose estate, Ti-mu-t'an-tung 低沒檀洞. The *tung* or district was again made

(1) The *Sui-shu*, Chap. 64, *Ch'ên-lêng-chuan*. 煬帝即位, 授驃騎將軍, 大業三年拜武賁黃將, 後三歲, 與朝請大夫張鎮周, 發東陽兵萬餘人, 自義安汎海, 擊流求國, 月餘而至, 流求人初見船艦, 以爲商旅, 往々詣軍中貿易, 稜率衆登岸, 遣鎮周, 爲先鋒, 其主歡斯渴刺兜遣兵拒戰, 鎮周頻擊破之, 稜進至低沒檀洞, 其小王歡斯老模率兵拒戰, 稜擊敗之, 斬老模, 其日霧雨晦冥, 將士皆懼, 稜刑白馬, 以祭海神, 既而開霽, 分爲五軍, 趣其都邑, 渴刺兜率衆數千逆拒, 稜遣鎮周, 又先鋒擊走之, 稜來勝逐北至其柵, 渴刺兜背柵而陣, 稜盡銳擊之, 從辰至未, 苦鬪不息, 渴刺兜自以軍疲, 引入柵, 稜遂填澗, 攻破其柵, 斬渴刺兜, 獲其子島榑, 虜男女數千而歸, 帝大悅, 進稜位右光祿大夫, 武賁如故 (隋書卷六十四, 陳稜傳)

up of some villages, the rulers of which were called Niao-liao-shuai 鳥了帥. The natives in respect called their chief K'o-lao-yang 可老羊, his wife To-pa-t'u 多拔荼, and their son Tao-ch'ui 島槌.

The proper nouns in these quotations are all that is handed down of the language recorded in the *Sui-shu*. Though only nine in number, they would constitute the most important material, should they be the oldest Liu-ch'iu 流求 language. In the light of what language should one explain these Liu-ch'iu words? This is the question which should have confronted every scholar interested in this problem. Since I am one of those who take Liu-ch'iu in the *Sui-shu* to be Formosa, I have always thought it the most proper attitude or method in approaching this problem, to investigate it, in the light of the native Formosan language. However, owing to the fact that unfortunately I am entirely an outsider as to the Formosan language and there was no adequate dictionary available, it seemed impossible to explain these Liu-ch'iu words in that way. But a clue of investigation presented itself, to my great joy, as I carefully and repeatedly studied the last part of *Liu-ch'iu-chuan* where we read: 初稜將南方諸國人從軍,有崑崙人,頗解其語,遣人慰諭之,流求不從,拒逆官軍,稜擊走之. "At first Lêng 稜 took with his army some foreigners from southern countries. The Kun-lun 崑崙 men among them understood the Liu-ch'iu language quite well. One of them as a messenger was sent to negotiate with the Liu-ch'iu people. But as they refused and attacked the Chinese army, Lêng fought and put them to flight." Kun-lun was the name which the Chinese of the Sui and T'ang dynasties gave to the dark-skinned races scattered in the South Seas and what the Chinese of the T'ang dynasty called the Kun-lun language referred to Malayan, the common language of the South Sea Islands. The fact that Chên Lêng employed a Kun-lun man in negotiating with the Liu-ch'iu chief suggests that the language had so much resemblance with Kun-lun or Malayan. This put me studying and comparing these Liu-ch'iu words with the Polynesian languages such as Malayan, Javanese, etc., which brought forth the following results.

(1) 鳥了帥. That 鳥了帥 was a name for the village head is readily seen in the quotation from the *Sui-shu*. Only this term is usually spelt 鳥了帥 in the versions now available; but according to Mr. Fuyû IFA's investigation, *Liu-ch'iu-chuan* 流求傳 in the *Wên-hsien-t'ung-k'ao* 文獻通考 quoted by Mr. Gisuke SASAMORI in his *Nankai-tanken* 南海探檢 (South Sea Expeditions) gives the name as 鳥了帥:⁽¹⁾ and according to Mr. Sei WADA's enquiry, the *Ts'ê-fu-yüan-kuei* 冊府元龜, Chap. 599, also gives 鳥了帥:⁽²⁾ Thus it is evident that this word is transliterated 鳥了帥 as well as 鳥了帥; and it is not easy to decide which is the right form. Mr. IFA favours U-liao-shuai 鳥了帥, saying that the word has something to do with the ancient Loochoo word *ura-ōsoi* or creek-invaders.⁽³⁾ In the face of the fact, however, that Liu-ch'iu-kuo in the *Sui-shu* is not the present Loochoo Islands, this interpretation could not be accepted. Opposing this interpretation, Mr. Yoshinori INÔ presumes niao-liao-shuai 鳥了帥, to be the right form and says, "The south Fu-chien pronunciation of the two words 鳥了 being *liau-liau*, it may be inferred that the term has something to do with *larkelakehal*, a word for a band of youths formed according to the custom of social organization among the Pazet tribe⁽⁴⁾; otherwise it may be that the word shuai 帥 denoting a warrior was added to a transliteration of this term or some corruption of this term?"⁽⁵⁾ I am all for his dividing this transliterated term into two parts 鳥了 and 帥, but I cannot agree upon Mr. INÔ's interpretation.

A study of the quotation from the *Sui-shu* shows that 鳥了帥 seems to be an honorific for the village head who won the post by virtue of his bravery in fighting. In the Malay language the head is *ulu* or *bulu* which is an Indonesian word meaning the head; it has become obsolete since it was commonly replaced by the Sanscrit *kepala*. But the word is still employed for the head of a sovereign and in some

(1) "A Doubt on Liu-ch'iu 流求 in the *Sui-shu*", the *Tōyō-gakuhō*, Vol. XVI, pp. 256-257.

(2) "On Liu-ch'iu-kuo 流求國 in the *Sui-shu* Again", The *Rekishi-chiri*, Vol. LVII, No. 3.

(3) The *Tōyō-gakuhō* Vol. XVI, p. 256. *op. cit.*

(4) One of the ancient aboriginal tribes of Formosa.

(5) *Taiwan-bunkashi*, p. 18.

special dialects.⁽¹⁾ The head is *ulu* in the dialects of Java, Sunda, and Bisay; *bulu* in the Lumpung language, and *olo* in Togai. The chief or leader in the Kawi language is *ulu*.⁽²⁾ It is quite a common custom throughout the world that the word for the head is employed as an honorific. *Ulu* in the Kawi language for the chief must be an honorific derived from the original meaning the head. Likewise, a chief in Japanese is called *kashira* 頭 (head), in Chinese *Tou-mu* 頭目 (head-eye), and the autocrat in English a head. It follows that 烏了 *u-lian* in 烏了帥 must be a transliteration of a Malay word *ulu*, an honorific for the chief derived from the original meaning the head. It is also inferred that, 帥 in 烏了帥 being similar to 帥 in the phrase 渠帥 meaning a chief in Chinese, it was combined with the Chinese transliteration of *ulu*. Should this interpretation be acceptable, the 烏了帥 in *Liu-ch'iu-chuan* must be a mistake in copying, and must read 烏了帥.

(2) 可老羊. The term *K'o-lao-yan* with which the Liu-ch'iu natives called the chief might be a form of honorific. In the Malay language, an adjective meaning magnificent, sublime, majestic is *raya*.⁽³⁾ In this language it is customary, in changing an adjective to a noun, to add a prefix *ka* and a suffix *an* to the stem. For instance, the adjective *kuāt* meaning strong, when *ka* and *an* are added to both ends, becomes a noun *ka-kuāt-an* meaning strength. In a similar way, when *ka* and *an* are added to the above-given stem *raya*, the noun *ka-raya-an* meaning magnificence, sublimity, or majesty, is obtained. 可老羊 *k'o-lao-yan* the Liu-ch'iu word should be regarded a transliteration of the Malay word *ka-raya-an*, a form of honorific derived from the meaning of magnificence, sublimity, or majesty. This is quite similar to the way in which is formed the English honorific *majesty* or *highness*, or the Hungarian honorific *nagyiság*; which corresponds to his majesty or his highness.

(1) J. WILKINSON, *Malay-English Dictionary*, Part I, p. 60.

(2) FAVRE, *Grammaire Javanaise*, p. 74.

(3) WILKINSON, *A Malay-English Dictionary*, p. 320.

(3) 渴刺兜. In *Cb'ên-lêng-chuan* in the *Sui-shu*, the name of the Liu-ch'iu chief is given as 歡斯渴刺兜, but in *Liu-ch'iu-chuan*, 歡斯 is given as his surname and 渴刺兜 his personal name. It is thus evident that 歡斯 and 渴刺兜 each stands for a word. According to Mr. INÔ's interpretation, the names the Pazet tribes-men can assume are all traditional and limited in number. As one of the traditional names is *harato*, Mr. INÔ supposes K'o-la-tu 渴刺兜 to be a transliteration of the word.⁽¹⁾ His view is, however, based on the assumption that K'o-la-tu is a proper noun, the surname of the chief,—a plausible view if the paragraph in the *Sui-shu* should be taken literally. The Oriental countries, however, have a custom to avoid the names of high dignitaries such as kings out of respect and to call them by honorific titles instead. So when a Chinese goes to a foreign country and asks of the natives the name of their ruler, they usually give in response his title, not his name. The Chinese fails, however, to understand the similar circumstances and takes the title for a true name, and as the title happens to be a long one, he often divides it to two parts, calling one a surname and the other a personal name. One or two appropriate examples may be given here. *Wo-jên-chuan* 倭人傳 in the *Wei-chih* 魏志 records Pei-mi-hu 卑彌呼 as the name of a queen ruling the northern part of our Kyûshû and Pei-mi-kung-hu 卑彌弓呼 (a reversion of 卑弓彌呼) as that of a king reigning over the southern part. As the compiler of the *Wei-chih* gives the names of the two rulers, believing them to be their real surnames, the reader has never doubted his statement. However, it is not likely that the subjects of Wo-kuo 倭國 called their rulers by their surnames. So some time ago I put forth my explanation of both terms as titles; 卑彌呼 being an abbreviation of the Japanese *fime-mikoto* or honourable princess, and 卑弓彌呼 being another of the Japanese *fiko-mikoto* or honourable prince. Again under *Tung-i-chuan* 東夷傳 in the *Sui-shu*, Chap. 81, where the name of the King of Wo-kuo 倭國 is given, it reads 倭王姓阿每, 字多利思比孤, 號阿輩鷄彌. "The surname of the Japanese

(1) *The Taiwan-bunkashi*, p. 16.

King is *A-mei* 阿每; his personal name To-li-ssü-pi-ku 多利思比孤 also called A-pei-chi-mi 阿輩鷄彌.” 阿每 is a transliteration of the Japanese *ame* 天; 多利思比孤 that of *Tarasifiko* 足彥; and 阿輩鷄彌 that of *ofo-gimi* 大君. 天; 足彥 *Ame-no-Tarasibiko* was the honorific title of the Emperor Yômei 用明天皇, not his real name. The Chinese of the Sui dynasty, however, did not understand the significance, but, according to their own custom, took 阿每(天) for the surname and 多利思比孤(足彥) for the alias. This book also gives *kimi* 鷄彌(君) as the honorific title of the empress, but it is only a common form of address.

If the Chinese of the Sui dynasty, in giving the names of the Japanese rulers, erroneously gave their addresses taking them for their real names, one may suspect that they made a similar mistake in giving the name of the chief of Liu-ch'iu-kuo. The *Sui-shu* gives K'o-la-tou 渴刺兜 as the real surname of the chief. But can it be right? The Malay word for king is *ratu*. In Java, persons of either sex in the direct line of the king are all called *ratu*. At present the Malaysians in conversation use this term for their own sovereign, but they do not use it in writing.⁽¹⁾ Occasionally they use this term for a foreign sovereign, especially a foreign queen. *Lat-tu* 刺兜 in K'o-la-tou 渴刺兜 in the *Sui-shu* is no doubt the transliteration of this *ratu*. Then what does this character 渴 at the beginning mean? Since there is no “r” sound in Chinese and the Chinese feel difficulty in pronouncing it, they often introduce it with a guttural prefix such as *ka*, *ga*, or *ha* when they transliterate a foreign word beginning with an “r” sound. For instance, the Sanskrit *raja*, *radja* (king) is transliterated Ko-lo-shê 曷羅闍 and Russia Ko-lo-ssü 葛羅斯. If this interpretation should prove acceptable, the Liu-ch'iu word K'o-la-tou 渴刺兜 is not a proper noun, but a common noun for a king.

(4) 波羅檀. The truth of the foregoing speculation may be proved from another point. In Malay and Javanese, the king's dominion or country is *paratuan* or *karatuan*. In these languages, an addition of the prefix *pá* and suffix *an* to *ratu*

(1) WILKINSON, p. 311.

(king or chief) composes a word meaning a land over which a king's reign extends, and consequently a country or kingdom.⁽¹⁾ Po-lo-t'an 波羅檀 in *Liu-ch'iu-chuan* is surely a transliteration of this *paratuan*, meaning the land under the chief's direct control.

(5) 老模. *Ch'ên-lêng-chuan* in the *Sui-shu* records Huan-ssü-Lao-mo 歡斯老模 as the name of a lesser chief of Liu-ch'iu Country. This is perhaps another term which may be separated into two parts: Huan-ssü 歡斯 and Lao-mo 老模, as in the case of Huan-ssü K'o-la-tou 歡斯渴刺兜. In the context in *Ch'ên-lêng-chuan*, *Lao-mo* reads as the real name of the lesser chief. But can it not be an honorific title as in the case of *K'o-la-tou*? In Malay and Javanese, *rama* is used for father though only in very specific writings. And in the Kotingin dialect a prince is called *rama*.⁽²⁾ Evidently this is an instance in which an honorific title for a prince is derived from the meaning of father. Another instance of a similar nature in Malay may be given. In this language, the head or chief of a locality is called a *demang*, and in the Balak language father is called *damang*. I have already referred to the fact that in Japanese and Loochoo languages "r" sounds are corrupted to "d" sounds. This is true of the languages of the South Sea Islands: for instance, *rima* (five) in the Kisa language is *dimi* in Malgashé; *duwi* (two) in Javanese, and *dua* in Madra, is *rua* in Malgashé. If "r" sounds and "d" sounds are thus interchangeable in the Malayan languages, *demang* or *damang* meaning a chief is no doubt a corruption of *rama* meaning father. This is not a view for which I alone am responsible, for Mr. Wilkinson does also so observe. I am of opinion, therefore, that *lao-mo* the Liu-ch'iu word is a transliteration of *rama* a Malay word, originally meaning father, but adopted in the Liu-ch'iu language as a title for a lesser chief.

In the foregoing, I have explained how the Chinese of the Sui dynasty, feeling difficulty in pronouncing the Liu-ch'iu word *ratu*, transliterated it *K'o-la-tou* 渴刺兜,

(1) FAVRE, *Grammaire Javanaise*, p. 75.

(2) WILKINSON, p. 317.

adding a guttural sound as a prefix. If the Liu-ch'iu word *Lao-mo* be taken as a transliteration of *rama*, should not this word be likewise rendered *K'o-lao-mo* 渴老模 with a guttural prefix? A question may be raised as to why this is rendered *lao-mo* 老模 instead. For this two answers may be given. The first is that though the Chinese, in transliterating a foreign word beginning with an "r" sound, and a guttural or a vowel prefix for the purpose of facilitating the pronunciation, sometimes they do not take that trouble. For instance, in the Chinese translation of the *Sutras*, Râhula, the first son of Yasodhara, is rendered *Ko-lo-tieh-lo* 曷羅帖羅 or *Ho-lo-tieh-lo* 何羅帖羅, but sometimes *Lo-hou-lo* 羅喉羅. The second is that, when the Chinese of the Sui dynasty heard the Liu-ch'iu word *rama*, they actually pronounced the word *barama* or *arama*, but wrote it *lao-mo* 老模.

In Mr. Inô's view, Huan-ssü is a transliteration of the Pazet word *kaisbi* for house. Moreover, *damori* one of the conventional accepted words used among the tribe as male personal names; since as a characteristic of this tribal language, "d" sounds and "r" sounds are frequently interchangeable, *damori* is pronounced *ramori*. Therefore, *lao-mo* in the *Sui-shu* may be a transliteration of *ramori*, a corruption of this *damori*.⁽¹⁾ I cannot agree on this argument, but the fact that "d" and "r" are interchanged in the native language of the Formosans is worthy of serious consideration.

(6) 低沒檀. Should the foregoing argument be accepted as correct, a chief, sovereign, or king in the Liu-ch'iu language was *K'o-la-tou* 渴刺兜 and lesser chiefs under him *Lao-mo* 老模. In accordance with the grammar of the language, the area under his direct control was called *pa-ratu-an* 波羅檀 meaning the sphere of influence of a *ratu* or king. The territory of a lesser chief likewise should be called *pa-rama-an* meaning the sphere of influence of a *rama*. Why is it then *Ti-mu-t'an* 低沒檀 in the context of the *Sui-shu*? Now this is a very difficult question. The two words 低沒 are inferred to have been pronounced *tei-mut*, *tai-mut*, in the Sui period;

(1) *The Taiwan-bunkashi*, p. 18.

they may be taken as a transliteration of *dema*, *dama*, a corruption of *rema* or *rama*. When a lesser chief is rendered in the Liu-ch'iu language *rama*, *rema*, namely 老模, it may appear hardly reasonable that, in the case of *pa-rema-an* meaning the territory of a lesser chief, *rema*, *rama* should be corrupted to *dema* (*dama*) and then transliterated *tei-mut* (*tai-mut*) 低沒 in the *Sui-shu*. Such a phenomenon, however, is by no means impossible. For instance, a king in Javanese is *ratu*, consequently a king's palace strictly should be *ka-ratu-an*, but it is, in practice, pronounced *ka-datu-an*.⁽¹⁾ From these instances, we may say that if the lesser chief was in the Liu-ch'iu language *lao-mo*, namely *rama* (*rema*), his territory would be, strictly speaking, *pa-rema-an*. However, it is possible that this word was occasionally corrupted to *pa-dama-an*. Such being the case, 低沒檀 given in the *Sui-shu* as the lesser chief's territory may be explained by inferring that *pa* 波 the initial letter was omitted and the middle part *dema* (*dama*), a corruption of *rema* (*rama*) was transliterated by the characters 低沒. Then, what the last word 檀 may stand for as a transliteration requires further investigation.

It is evident from the context of the *Sui-shu* that the territory of the chief was called 波羅檀洞 and that of the lesser chief 低沒檀洞. It is most interesting to observe that the character 檀 occurs in either phrase indicating territory. The territory of the chief being *pa-ratu-an*, *po-lo* 波羅 may be considered to stand for *pa-ra* and t'an 檀 for *uan*, the ending of the word; whereas, in the case of *pa-dema-an* meaning the territory of the lesser chief, there is no ending to be represented by 檀. Therefore, the supposition of this 檀 as the ending of the word would fail to explain these words satisfactorily. After elaborate research I have found out that, in Malay and its kindred languages, land is *tánah*, which exactly corresponds with the Chinese character *tung* 洞 at the ends of the phrases. Is not t'an 檀 a transliteration of this word *tánah*? According to this supposition, the chief's territory in full should be *paratu-an tánah*; but on account of the repetition of the similar sounds, it was abbreviat-

(1) W. HUMBOLDT, *Über die Kawi Sprache*, II, s. 66.

ed to *pa-ra-tan* 波羅檀; and the lesser chief's territory in full should be *pa-dema-an t̄anab*; but because of its great length, the initial sound *pa* being omitted and the *n* in *an* assimilated with the *t* in *t̄anab*, the transliteration 低浚檀 *demattan* was obtained. In Javanese there are two words for country, *pa-ratu-an* and *ka-ratu-an*; the strict difference between the two being that the former means the king's dominion and the latter the king's country. In order to express the dominion of the king, therefore, it was necessary to add another word *t̄anab* at the end. Should this inference be acceptable, land in the Liu-ch'iu language was *t̄anab*, and t'an 檀 its transliteration.

(7) 歡斯. The *Sui-shu* gives Huan-ssü 歡斯 in Huan-ssü K'o-la-tou 歡斯渴刺兜 as the chief's surname and K'o-la-tou 渴刺兜 his personal name. Then Huan-ssü 歡斯 in Huan-ssü Lao-mo 歡斯老模 the lesser chief should be his surname and Lao-mo 老模 his personal name. However, if K'o-la-tou should mean the chief and Lao-mo the lesser chief, as already stated, Huan-ssü surely was only a sort of title, not a surname. In addressing a governor or magistrate, in Javanese, the honorific title *kandjeng* is prefixed. For instance, Mr. (Honourable) Pangeran is addressed *Kandjeng Pangeran*, and an honorific for a king is *sang*. For instance, *Sang Radja* is His Highness the *Radja*—*radja* being the Sanskrit for king.⁽¹⁾ The Liu-ch'iu word should have been an honorific title which corresponded to *kandjeng*. If so, 歡斯渴刺兜 should read *Kangdje Karatu* meaning His Highness the chief, and 歡斯老模 should read *Kangdje Rama* meaning His Highness the lesser chief.

(8) 多拔茶. The Liu-ch'iu word given for the king's wife is To-pa-t'u 多拔茶. This again might be another honorific title. The Malay language has *tuwan* a title used generally for men only of European nationalities, but for both men and women of some rank among the Malaysans.⁽²⁾ *Tuwa* in origin meant mature age. The Madecass word for the *tuwan* in Malay and Javanese is *toumpon*, *tompon*, *tompo*, *topo*,

(1) FAVRE, *Grammaire Javanaise*, p. 61.

(2) WILKINSON, p. 206.

tope.⁽¹⁾ In a Malay dialect, *tuwan* seems to have been pronounced *tuban* since it is given as *tbauw* in Mr. Klaproth's table.⁽²⁾ This is surely a mistranscription of *tuban*. I am of opinion that this word originally read *tupan*, but in the course of time it came to be *tuban*, *tuwan*, *tuau*. Thus To-pa 多拔 in 多拔茶 the Liu-ch'iu word was no doubt a word which corresponded to the *tuban*, *tuwan* above-discussed. According to Mr. INÔ, *taatab* is a title for an old dame among the Pazet tribes, which corresponds to the Chinese title Ta-lao-ma 大老媽. He takes To-pa-t'u 多拔茶 as its transliteration.⁽³⁾ I am of opinion that his view cannot be wide of the mark. There are many instances in various Polynesian languages where a "b" sound is replaced by a "w" sound and then this "w" sound is lost and the vowel which follows it making up a syllable by itself. For instance, the moon in Malay is *bulan*, *wulan* in Javanese, *wulana* in Malagashe, and *wlong* in Bugis. If so, it may be inferred that *taatab* in the Pazet language, originally read *tabatab*, then *tawatab*, came to be finally *taatab*. Were such changes effected in this language, To-pa-t'u 多拔茶 in the Liu-ch'iu language should be regarded strikingly similar to *tabatab* the older pronunciation of *taatab*.

(9) 島槌. The paragraph previously quoted from *Ch'ên-lêng-chuan* in the *Sui-shu* contains a passage which reads 斬渴刺兜, 獲其子島槌. "He slew K'o-la-tou and captured his son Tao-ch'ui." At a glance, one would suppose that both K'o-la-tou and Tao-ch'ui were proper nouns. But if *K'o-la-tou* in the Liu-ch'iu language was a common noun meaning king, is it not possible that Tao-ch'ui also was a common noun commonly used among the Pazet tribes meaning king's son? According to Mr. INÔ, *taut* is a word commonly used among the Pazet tribes as a man's name. He supposes 島槌 the transliteration of that word.⁽⁴⁾ I am not inclined to accept his views readily, but I have then no definite view of my own to offer regarding the

(1) HUMBOLDT, *Über die Kawi Sprache*, Bd. II. S. 256.

(2) KLAPROTH, *Asia Polyglotta*, p. 380.

(3) *The Tawan-bunkashi*, p. 16.

(4) *The Taiwan-bunkashi*, p. 18.

same. If I should be invited to present a theory, may I not venture to state : Since there is, as previously shown, an instance in the *Sui-shu* where wu 烏 is confused with tao 島, this tao 島 may be considered likewise a mistranscription for wu 烏. Malay has three words for child,—*putra*, *anak*, and *budak*, of which *putra* is a borrowed word from Sanskrit ; *anak* and *budak* are native. And from *budak* may be derived *wudak* and *udak*, Wu-ch'ui 烏糙 may be a transliteration of the word. Now, in Malay a king's son is *ának raja* or *petra*.⁽¹⁾ *Anak raja* is a phrase meaning a king's son, while *petra* in Sanskrit is simply a child. It would not be wrong to suppose that a king's son was simply called Wu-ch'ui in the Liu-ch'iu language. On the other hand, the existence of the custom to call a king's daughter *than petri* with an honorific *than* before *petri* (girl) may suggest that a title was used before Wu-ch'ui in the case of a prince in the Liu-ch'iu language.

Should there be no serious error in my argument given at considerable length, you will see from a linguistic study that Liu-ch'iu-kuo in the *Sui-shu* was Formosa, not the Loochoo Islands. The reason why Formosa is not definitely mentioned in Chinese classics is perhaps because of the rough sea between this island and the continent proving detrimental to voyaging and because of the fact that Fu-chien province 福建省 situated on the other side of the strait communicated with the other Chinese provinces so seldom that the province was regarded quite another world, or because the civilization of the Formosan natives was so low that they had no eager desire to seek Chinese civilization in the face of the rough sea, and because their island was so spacious, so fertile, and so full of natural resources that they were assured of self-supporting existence, with no need of demanding for resources from abroad. However, it is impossible to believe that such a large island as Formosa had been left unnoticed by the Chinese up to the Sui period.

Dr. ICHIMURA published a paper entitled "On Fu-chien and Formosa Prior to T'ang Time" in the *Tôyô-gakuhô*, Vol. VIII, No. 1, Jan. 1918, in which he asserted

(1) A. SWETTEMHAM, *Vocabulary of the English and Malay Languages*, p. 95.

that Liu-ch'iu-kuo in the *Sui-shu* refers to Formosa which was known as I-chou 夷洲 at the Three-Kingdom period. The ground of his argument is the exact coincidence of the account of I-chou in the *Lin-hai-shui-t'u-chih* 臨海水土志 by CH'EN YING 沈瑩 with *Lin-ch'iu-chuan*, namely an account of Formosa in the *Sui-shu*. No one can protest against his assertion. The earliest account of I-chou in history appears under the 2nd year of *Huang-ung* 黃龍 (230 A. D.), the *San-kuo-chih*, 三國志. As the document has much bearing upon my argument which I am to present in the following pages, it will be quoted here.

“(Sun Ch'üan 孫權) dispatched Generals Wei Wên 衛溫 and Chu-ko Chih 諸葛直. Commanding 10,000 armed soldiers, they embarked on the sea, seeking I-chou 夷洲 and Tan-chou 亶洲. Tan-chou lies across the sea. The tradition handed down to the elders says that Shih-huang-ti of Ch'in 秦始皇帝 sent out the magician Hsü Fu 徐福. Taking several thousand boys and girls, he embarked on the sea, seeking the sacred mountain on P'êng-lai 蓬萊 or the island of eternal youth, and Hsien-yao 仙藥 or the elixir of youth. They remained on the island; they have not come back. In succeeding generations they have been multiplied to be several tens of thousands of households. The natives often come to Hui-chi 會稽 for selling cloths. The Tung-hsien 東縣 people of Hui-chi once voyaged. Some of them were drifted by a storm to Tan-chou. The island being too far and remote, they could not reach it, but came home, taking several thousand I-chou people with them.”⁽¹⁾

If the present Formosa was known by the name of I-chou to the Chinese at the Three-Kingdom period, it may have been heard of also during the Han dynasty; however, we find in the classics no name which corresponds to it. Under Wu-ti 吳地 in *Ti-li-chih* 地理志 in the *Han-shu*, we read 會稽海外有東鯤人, 分爲二

(1) 遣將軍衛溫諸葛直, 將甲士萬人浮海, 求夷洲及亶洲, 亶洲在海中, 長老傳言, 秦始皇帝遣方士徐福, 將童男童女數千人入海, 求蓬萊神山及仙藥, 止此洲不還, 世相承有數萬家, 其上人民時有至會稽貨布, 會稽東縣人海行, 亦有遭風流移至亶洲者, 所在絕遠卒不可得至, 但得夷洲數千人還. (三國志吳志卷二孫權傳.)

十餘國，以歲時來獻見云 “Beyond the sea of Hui-chi there live the Tung-ti people. The country is divided into more than twenty provinces. It is said that on special occasions, they come to pay tribute.” As to Tung-ti here mentioned, some scholars presume it to refer to the present Loochoo Islands or Formosa. In the *Fang-yen* 方言 by YANG HSIUNG 揚雄 a phrase reads “The Wu men of Tung-ti offered curious articles as tribute. 東鯤罽人獻珍.” And *Wei-tu-fu* 魏都賦⁽¹⁾ by Tso T'AI-CH'UNG 左太冲 reads “Hereupon Tung-ti submitted to order; Hsi-ch'ing abided by the law; Ching-nan were moved by mercy; So-pei adored goodness.” 於是東鯤即序，西傾順軌，荆南懷懷，朔北思韙。 Here Tung-ti is interpreted as the savages of the east. However, these were surely composed on the basis of *Ti-li-chih* in the *Hanshu*; this was by no means new knowledge obtained at the Later Han and the Three-Kingdom periods. It is most interesting to notice that a phrase under the heading Yen-ti 燕地 in *Ti-li-chih* in the *Han-shu* that reads “In the sea of Lo-lang there live the Wo people; the country is divided into more than a hundred provinces. It is said that on special occasions, they come to pay tribute,” 夫樂浪海中有倭人，分爲百餘國，以歲時來獻見云， and it is exactly similar in phraseology to the passage describing the Tung-ti people. The Wo people are described under the heading Yen-ti because they communicated with the Han dynasty by way of Lo-lang 樂浪; and the Tung-ti people are given under the heading Wu-ti because they paid tribute to the Han dynasty through the province of Hui-chi 會稽. In view of the fact that Hui-chi-prefecture 會稽郡 at Han time comprising the southern part of the present Chiang-su 江蘇 province, Chê-chiang 浙江, and Fu-chien 福建, Tung-ti 東鯤 in the great sea stretching in the east of this province and important enough to be compared with Wo-kuo 倭國 could not have been any island other than the present Formosa or Loochoo Islands.

If Tung-ti at the Former-Han period must refer to either Formosa or the

(1) *Wênhsüan* 文選, Part 1.

Loochoo Islands, is it not possible to suppose the name to refer to the present Formosa, namely I-chou of the Three-Kingdom period? As the Chinese had since ancient times called the savages of the east the Tung-i 東夷, some may infer that this I-chou was only a general indefinite name of a similar nature. However, according to *Wu-chih* previously quoted, I-chou and Tan-chou are given as countries lying across the sea beyond Hui-chi, which definitely proves that I-chou was a name given to a particular island. True, the character 夷 in 夷洲 is now pronounced *i*, but was it similarly pronounced at the Three-Kingdom period? In the general introduction to *Tung-i-chuan*, the *Hou-Han-shu*⁽¹⁾ the meaning of Tung-i 東夷 is explained thus: "The *Wang-chih* 王制 says that the easterners are called I 夷. 夷 is similar to 柢. It means that they are benevolent and merciful to all the living. Every thing is born only when rooted in the earth. Being meek and obedient in nature, the people are easily ruled with justice. There is even a land of virtue and no death." 王制曰, 東方曰夷, 夷者柢也, 言仁而好生, 萬物柢地而生, 故天性柔順, 易以道御, 至有君子不死之國焉. Thus the compiler of *Tung-i-chuan* interpreted the character 夷 as 柢 or root. Whether this interpretation is correct or not, it is hard to tell. According to the *Sshuo-wên* 說文 and other ideograph dictionaries compiled after it, the character 夷 has the following meanings: 平 smooth, 易 easy, 大 great, 傷 to injure, 芟 to mow; but no meaning of root is found anywhere. In my opinion, this interpretation of 夷 to be 柢 root was a personal view of Fan Yao 范曄, not the accepted view of the academic circle. What was the compilers' ground for putting forth such a view? The character 夷 had besides *i*, an old pronunciation *tei* which is similar to *ti* 柢 in pronunciation. May this not have been the reason? According to MR. KARLGRÉN'S dictionary, the present pronunciation of 柢 is *ti*, the Canton pronunciation is *tai*, and the pronunciation at the T'ang period was *tei*, while the pronunciation of 夷 always has been and is *i*. But the present pronunciation of the characters 稊 and 蕘 based on

(1) *Hou-Han-shu*, Chap. 115. 後漢書卷百十五東夷傳.

the same scheme of pronunciation as 夷 is both *t'i*, the Kiang-tung pronunciation is *t'ai* and the pronunciation at the T'ang period was *d'iei*, so similar to the pronunciation of 柢 that it may be considered that the character 夷 before the T'ang period had the same pronunciation as 柢. To interpret words with a similar pronunciation for words with a similar meaning in an etymological study is a habitual resort a Chinese scholar relies upon in his etymological work; Fan Yao 范曄 also followed suit. The reason why he definitely explained the character 夷 by “夷 is similar to 柢” 夷者柢也 is perhaps because 夷 was at his time pronounced *tei* like 柢.

If 夷 was actually pronounced *tei* like 柢, a similar relation must exist between the character 鯤 in 東鯤 and the character 夷 in 夷洲. According to Mr. KARLGREN, the present pronunciation of 鯤 is *t'i*, the Canton pronunciation *t'ai*, and the T'ang pronunciation was *d'iei*. This word and 柢 have exactly the same pronunciation. 東 in 東鯤 being a Chinese word—an adjective added because of its locality in the east of China, 鯤 must be the true name. Tung-tei-kuo 東鯤國 of the Former Han period was I-chou of the Three-Kingdom period; and both refer to the present Formosa.

Now that I-chou 夷洲 of the Three-Kingdom period is presumed to have been the present Formosa, where should we locate Tan-chou 檀洲 which appears with it? In his paper previously referred to, Dr. ICHIMURA sets it down as Ch'iung-chou-tao 瓊州島, namely Hainan. His reason is that while *Sun-ch'üan-chuan* 孫權傳 in *Wu-chih* 吳志 says that the generals were dispatched to conquer I-chou 夷洲 and Tan-chou 檀洲, *Liu-hsün-chuan* 陸遜傳 and *Ch'üan-tsung-chuan* 全琮傳 mention Chu-ai 珠崖 and I-chou 夷洲 instead as the lands to be conquered; so both must refer to one and the same affair. Tan-chou then must be Chu-ai; and moreover, Tan-chou 儋州 was located in Chu-ai 珠崖 in the T'ang dynasty; and from the fact that *tan* 儋 and *tan* 檀 are of the same pronunciation, it follows that Tan-chou was Chu-ai 珠崖, namely the present Ch'iung-chou-tao 瓊州島. However, this assumption is confronted with several difficulties. In the first place, Tan-chou at the Three-Kingdom period was a vast island on the great sea in the east of Hui-chi. This

accounts for the association of this island with the tradition of the emigration of Hsü Fu 徐福. On the other hand, Chu-ai because of its southern locality had been called since the Han days Nan-tao 南島. Secondly, it was said that Tan-chou was so far on the sea from Hui-chi that no Han people had ever been there. However, Chung-chou-tao was well-known to the Han dynasty, and two provinces Tanêrh 聃耳 and Chu-ai 珠崖 having been established therein already in the Former Han period. Thirdly, the fact that 儋 in 儋州 is pronounced *tam*, while 亶 in 亶洲 is *tan*, proves the difference between the two places in the point of their pronunciation. For these reasons Tan-chou 亶洲 cannot be regarded as Tan-chou 儋州. In Dr. FUJITA's view, Tan-chou is considered Tan-fu-lo 耽夫羅 or the ancient name of Chi-chou-tao 濟州島 off the southern coast of the Korean peninsula. This view has perhaps been hinted on account of the resemblance of the name Tan-chou 亶洲 with tan 耽 in Tan-fu-lo 耽夫羅. Chi-chou-tao was known by the name Chou-hu 州胡 to the Chinese at the Three-Kingdom period. Under the heading Han-kuo 韓國 in *Tung-i-chuan* the *San-kuo-chih* 三國志, Chap. 30, *Wei-chih* 魏志, a passage reads "There is a people called Chou-hu 州胡 (island savages) who inhabit a large island in the west of Mahan 馬韓. They are small in stature. Their language is different from Korean. Their hair is dressed like that of the Hsien-pei 鮮卑; only they wear leathers."⁽¹⁾ So it seems that they were a race with a language and customs entirely different from the Korean. Tan-fu-lo is given Jan-mou-lo 軻牟羅 under the heading Pai-chi-kuo 百濟國 in *Tung-i-chuan* in the *Sui-shu*, and Tan-lo 儋羅 in *Tung-i-chuan* of the *T'ang-shu* 唐書. The fu-lo 夫羅 in Tan-fu-lo and mou-lo 牟羅 in Jan-mou-lo is the transliteration of the Korean *puru* for the prefecture or castle, like *puru* 伐 and *puru* 火 attached to the ending of the geographical terms in *Hsin-lo-chi* 新羅記 in the *San-kuo-shih-chi* 三國史記 and *Fu-li* 夫里 in *Pai-chi-chi* 百濟記. Therefore, Tan-fu-lo 耽夫羅 is a name adopted since the annexation of this island by Pai-chi-kuo. At the Three-Kingdom period it had been known by the name Chou-hu 州胡. Moreover, the

(1) 又有州胡，在馬韓之西海中大島上，其人差短小，言語不與韓同，皆髡頭如鮮卑，但衣草。
(三國志卷三十魏志東夷傳)

pronunciation of 耽 is *tam*, and that of 亶 *tan*, 亶洲 can not be taken as 耽夫羅 from the standpoint of a student of pronunciation.

If Tan-chou 亶洲 was neither another name of Wo-kuo 倭國, Tan-fu-lo 耽夫羅 for Chi-chou-tao 濟州島 nor Tan-chou 儋州 for Ch'iung-chou-tao 瓊州島, and was quite different from I-chou 夷洲 Formosa, where could this distant island in the eastern sea have been except among the Loochoo archipelago? The name Tan-chou again appears in a paragraph in the *Chin-tan-p'ien* 金丹篇 by PAO-P'Ō-TZU 抱朴子 which reads 海中大嶋嶼若會稽之東翁洲亶洲綜嶼洲及徐州之羊莒洲泰光洲鬱洲皆其次也. Though this passage is extremely abstruse, I should like to read it like this. "The largest island in the sea are such as Tung-weng-chou 東翁洲, Tan-chou 亶洲, and Tsung-hsü-chou 綜嶼洲 of Hui-chi 會稽; Yang-chü-chou 羊莒洲 T'ai-kuang-chou 泰光洲, and Yü-chou 鬱洲, of Ch'u-chou 徐州 all rank lower." Here are given islands Tung-wêng-chou, Tan-chou, and Tsung-hsü-chou as the larger islands to be reached by a voyage from Hui-chi, and three islands Yang-chü-chou, T'ai-kuang-chou, Yü-chou as the smaller islands to be reached by a voyage from Ch'u-chou. As to this Tsung-hsü-chou 綜嶼洲, Dr. ICHIMURA quotes from *Wai-kuo-chi* 外國記 under the heading Tung-i 東夷 in the *T'ai-p'ing-yü-lan* 太平御覽, Chap. 782, Ssü-i 四夷. "Chou Hiang 周詳 embarked on the sea and reached Tsung-hsü which abounds in cotton. It has over 3,000 households. Tradition says that they are descendants of Hsü Fu and his youths. Their customs are similar to those of the Wu people." 周詳泛海落綜嶼, 上多紵, 有三千餘家, 云是徐福童男之後, 風俗似吳人. If this statement of the similarity of the customs of Tsung-hsü-tao and Wu be well-grounded, it should be taken no doubt to refer, not to the Formosan natives with savage customs, but to the Loochoo people with a somewhat higher civilization. If Tan-chou 亶洲 and Tsung-hsü-tao 綜嶼島 were two of the Loochoo Islands, Tung-wêng-chou 東翁洲 no doubt referred to Formosa for the reason that in discussing the larger islands beyond the sea from Hui-chi 會稽, such a large one as Formosa could not possibly have been ignored. KO HUNG 葛洪, the author of the *Pao-p'ŏ-*

tu 抱朴子, was a man of the earlier part of the Ch'in 晉 dynasty and it follows that Formosa was also known by the name Tung-wêng-chou among the Chinese. The *Tung* 東 in *Tung-weng-chou* being an addition by the Chinese as in the case of *Tung-ti* 東鯤, it is likely that Wêng-chou 翁洲 was the true name of this island.

From what I have dwelt upon, you will definitely see that Tan-chou 潭洲 was one of the Loochoo Islands. As to the question which island of the archipelago it was, however, it is extremely difficult to give a definite answer. I have not yet arrived at an indisputable conclusion, but it is possible to offer here but a probable theory based upon fragmentary historical data. The purpose of Sun Ch'ian 孫權 of Wu 吳 dispatching a large army to conquer I-chou 夷洲 and Tan-chou 潭洲 by no means consisted in an increase of geographical knowledge by exploring unknown regions; but in his competition for supremacy with such powerful enemies as Shu 蜀 and Wei 魏, he found necessity of expanding his territory beyond the seas and increasing armaments through improving natural resources and wealth. Communication between Wu-kuo 吳國 and the two islands I-chou and Tan-chou must have been slight as is recorded in *Wu-chih* and the ignorance of real situations of the two islands caused by this scarcity of communication, it is presumed, led to much exaggeration as to the wealth of their natural resources and products. Otherwise, it was as reckless as building castles in the air that a great monarch like Sun Ch'ian should have attempted to send abroad a strong army of no less than 10,000 men-at-arms.

Tan-chou was probably, not a general name for the whole Loochoo Islands, but a particular name for only one of them. If traders of this island voyaged as far as Hui-chi-prefecture 會稽郡 of Wu 吳 in order to sell the cloths they made in their own island, this island no doubt occupied among the islands a position most convenient for carrying such foreign trade. A glance at the map of these islands shows that the largest in area is Okinawa Island, next Oshima, and then Tane. Yaku situated in the west of Tane is not as large as the three islands, but not the least in the archipelago. And because the two islands Tane and Yaku being situated in the northern part of the archipelago and nearest to the southern end of

Kyûshû, the Japanese civilization and goods when going to the South Seas went by way of these two islands, or were gathered together there first and then passed on and distributed among the islands lying in the further south. When commodities were imported to Japan from the South Seas, it was also most convenient to come through these two islands. For this geographical reason, of all the Loochoo Islands, Tane and Yaku had the most important position in communication. According to Japanese history, the first visit of the messengers of Yaku 掖玖 or the present Yaku 屋久 to the Japanese court dated from the 20th year under the reign of the Empress Suiko 推古天皇 (612 A. D.); and the first tribute paid by Tane 多禰 or the present Tane 種子 in the 6th year under the reign of the Emperor Temmu 天武天皇 (678 A. D.); thus they were the earliest to pledge allegiance to the Japanese court. In the *Shoku-Nihongi*, under the heading the 6th year in the reign of the Emperor Temmu 天武天皇 a passage reads "The Tane people sent messengers to offer a map of Tane Island. The province is more than five thousand *ri* away from our capital and is situated in the sea in the south of Tsukushi (Kyûshû)." 遣多禰島使人等, 獻多禰國圖, 其國去京五千餘里, 居筑紫南海中. Under the heading the 9th year in the reign of the Empress Jitô 持統天皇 (695 A. D.), a passage reads "Ayano-Imiki-Hakase 文忌寸博士 in the rank of *Mukôni* 務廣貳, Shimonooosa-Morota 下譯語諸田 in the rank of *Shinkwôsan* 進廣參, and others were sent to investigate Tane where the savages lived." 遣務廣貳文忌寸博勢, 進廣參下譯語諸田等多禰求所蠻居. In these references this seems not to refer to the present Tane alone. So the *Chirisanko* 地理纂考 suggests "It is improbable that Tane Island 多禰 mentioned in the Annals of the Emperor Temmu and the Empress Jitô refers to the present 種子. Again Hakuseki ARAI 新井白石 in his *Nantô-kô* 南島考 (A Study of the South Seas) argues "Tane here mentioned must be Loochoo. In those days the name of the foreigners in the South Seas were not definitely known. Therefore, they were known by the names of the routes they took and Tane was the name of a route." 所謂多禰國琉求也, 當此之時, 南海諸夷, 地名未詳, 故因其路所由, 而多禰島

即路之所由也。 Thus from the fact that the Annals of the Nara period regard Tane-no-kuni 多禰國 as the name for all the Loochoo Islands, the importance of this island may be imagined. Again in the Annals of the Empress Genshō 元正天皇, a passage under the 6th year of Yōrō 養老 (722 A. D.) reads "There were some vacancies in the offices for Tane, Iki 壹岐, and Tsushima 對馬 in the area governed by the Dazai Regional Office. They were filled with those picked-up among the officials in the Regional Office." 太宰管内多禰壹岐對馬等司有闕, 選府官人撰補之。 A passage under the 14th year of *Tempyō* 天平 (742 A. D.) reads "The stipends of the officials in Tane and other islands have been supplied by the governor of Chikuzen 筑前 province from the remainings left over in the Regional Office. Rations of rice have been also supplied according to the rules with the rice raised in convenient provinces. The officials ruling the three islands—Iki, Tsushima 對馬, Tane—rank with county governors" 郡司。多禰等官人祿者, 令筑前國司以廢府物給, 公廩又以便國稻依常給之, 其三島(壹岐對馬多禰)擬郡司。 All this shows that the present Tane was favoured with special consideration by the Imperial court of the Nara period.

The commercial activities of both Tane and Yaku both in the northern and southern seas during the Sui and T'ang periods may be traced in somewhat obscure and fragmentary documents. For example, there is a passage in Liu-ch'iu-chuan of the *Sui-shu* which reads "The next year (the 4th year of *Ta-yeh* 大業 608 A. D.) the Emperor again sent Chu K'uan to appease the people, but Liu-ch'iu did not obey. K'uan came back with cloth-armours. The messengers from Wo-kuo who came to China, seeing the articles, declared them to be of the kind used by I-hsieh-chiu 夷邪久⁽¹⁾ people." 明年(大業四年), 帝復令寬慰撫之, 流求不從, 寬取其布甲而還, 時倭國使來朝, 見之曰, 此夷邪久國人所用也。 A glance at this reference does not tell whether the cloth-armours obtained by Chu-k'uan 朱寬 were those manufactured by the Liu-ch'iu people or those imported into

(1) According to the ancient Japanese pronunciation, 夷邪久 was iyaku.

by the I-hsieh-chiu 夷邪久 people. Since this book where it describes the customs of the people says "They weave threads and make armours," 編紵爲甲 the cloth-armours in question surely were those made by the Liu-ch'iu people, and the cloth-armours used by I-hsieh-chiu 夷邪久 men were those bought from Liu-ch'iu-kuo.

Moreover, the writer can produce evidence that some Tane and Yaku people during the T'ang period probably crossed the sea for trading with the province of Yüeh 越 in the south-west. It is a very simple passage under the heading Jih-pên-kuo 日本國 in the *T'ang-shu*, Chap. 202, *Tung-i-chuan* 東夷傳, which reads "Among the islands in the east there are three lesser chiefs, Hsieh-ku 邪古,⁽¹⁾ Po-hsieh 破邪,⁽²⁾ and To-ni 多尼; on the north they adjoin Hsin-lo 新羅 on the north-west Pai-chi 百濟, and on the south-west the province of Yüeh 越 across the sea. These islands are reported to produce silks, cottons, and curious articles." 其東嶋嶼中, 又有邪古, 波邪, 多尼三小王, 北距新羅, 西北百濟, 西南濟越州, 有絲絮珍怪云. Hsieh-ku 邪古 here like I-hsieh-chiu 夷邪久 in the *Sui-shu* refers to Yaku 掖玖 or Yaku 益救 in Japanese history, namely the present Yaku 屋久; Tani 多尼 refers to Tane 多禰 or Tane 多嶺 in Japanese history, namely the present Tane 種子; but no definite island is assigned for Po-hsieh 波邪. I am of opinion that this Haya 破邪 is Haya 隼 in the phrase 隼人 (a Japanese tribe), referring to Satsuma and Ōsumi occupied by this people. The fact that the *T'ang-shu* in defining the boundaries of the three provinces gives Hsin-lo and Pai-chi on the north-west, and the province of Yüeh on the south-west evinces the existence of a sea-route extending north and south from a point including these islands. Though silks and cottons are given as among the products of these islands, these places were not known as producing such goods at the T'ang period or at the Nara or Hei-an period in Japan; hence the silks and cottons mentioned in the book must be those the traders of Hsieh-ku 邪古 and To-ni 多尼 had imported from the distant provinces of Wu 吳 and Yüeh 越. We cannot say what were included in the curious articles 珍怪.

(1) 邪古 Yaku.

(2) 多尼 Tane.

The mother-of-pearl works or art goods inlaid with the *Nisbikigai* 錦貝 of Yaku no shima 屋久島, commonly called Yaku-shells 屋久貝 (*pecten irregularis*) must have been among them. This phrase really meant, I believe, curious goods the traders of these islands imported from Formosa and the provinces of Wu 吳 and Yüeh 越. I have not succeeded in finding passages evincing the frequent visits of the Loochoo people to the southern part of the Korean peninsula in the Sui or T'ang period; but seeing that Hsin-lo and Pai-chi are given as the states on the northern boundaries of Hsieh-ku 邪古, To-ni 多尼 and others, the existence of a sea-route between the archipelago and the peninsula may be inferred. According to a paper by Mr. Masukichi HASHIMOTO, some coins named Ming-tao 明刀 of the Chan-kuo 戰國 period were discovered in a shell-mound in the suburb of Nafa, Okinawa prefecture. Since they certainly had come by way of Korea, it is presumed that communication between Korea and the Loochoo Islands dates from a very ancient period.

Some may laugh at my idea that the Loochoo people living on those tiny islands knew the art of sea-faring in ancient times and ventured to frequent Japan and Formosa, even southern China. However, the very fact that the ancestors of these people had left the continent and successfully emigrated to these islands proves the possibility, does it not? It was no wonder that their descendants, for want of resources on account of the scarcity of land, should have travelled on the sea as far as Wu or Yüeh in search of trade. This is one of my reasons why I located Tan-chou 潭洲 among the Loochoo Islands. If Tane and Yaku were two islands among the archipelago which enjoyed a geographical advantage in travelling north and south and collecting and distributing commodities, it is only natural that the traders of Tan-chou 潭洲 who in the Three-Kingdom period went out to trade with Hui-chi-prefecture 會稽郡 of Wu 吳 should have been from either of these islands. Moreover, on account of the extreme resemblance between the names Tan-chou 潭洲 and Tane 多禰 or the present Tane 種子, I further suggest that Tan-chou was very probably Tane-ga-shima 種子島.

(Translated into English by Kazue Sugimura)