

KANSAI GAIDAI UNIVERSITY

ON THE CHINESE MIGRANTS AND OVERSEAS JAPANESE IN ANCIENT ERA : COMPARISON WITH KOREA AND VIETNAM, AND THEIR ROLE IN CULTURAL-TECHNICAL TRANSFER AND DIPLOMACY

メタデータ	言語: en 出版者: Kansai Gaidai University. Intercultural Research Institute 公開日: 2021-04-07 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): Hán-yì 韓奕, Yuè-rén-gē 越人歌, Hata-uji 秦氏, Aya-uji 漢氏, Yamato-no-uji 倭種, Shú Kūn-lún 熟崑崙, Khānfū Massacre 廣州大屠殺, Nii-hata-gami 新波陀神 作成者: Shine, Toshihiko メールアドレス: 所属: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tōkyō University of Foreign Studies
URL	https://doi.org/10.18956/00007984

ON THE CHINESE MIGRANTS AND OVERSEAS JAPANESE IN ANCIENT ERA: COMPARISON WITH KOREA AND VIETNAM, AND THEIR ROLE IN CULTURAL-TECHNICAL TRANSFER AND DIPLOMACY¹

SHINE TOSHIHIKO

Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa
Tōkyō University of Foreign Studies

During the Suí (隋) and Táng (唐) dynasties, descendants of Chinese migrant like Hata-uji (秦氏) clan, Aya-uji (漢氏) clan born in Japan, and Overseas Japanese called Yamato-no-uji (倭種) born in China were active in cultural-technical transfer and diplomacy. In this paper, the author tries to reexamine their origin and roles based on historical materials, previous studies, and to compared with cases in Korea and Vietnam (Champa/Campā).

Keywords: Hán-yì 韓奕, Yuè-rén-gē 越人歌, Hata-uji 秦氏, Aya-uji 漢氏, Yamato-no-uji 倭種, Shú Kūn-lún 熟崑崙, Khānfū Massacre 廣州大屠殺, Nii-hata-gami 新波陀神

Introduction

According to the chronicle *Nihon-kōki*² (日本後紀, 840 AD) and the lawbook *Ruijū-Sandaikyaku*³ (類聚三代格, c947 AD), Yamato (Japan)'s abolition of corps: "Shokoku-no heishi-wa mina teihai-ni shitagae" (諸國兵士皆從停廢) began in 792 AD (Year En'ryaku 11, rén-shēn 壬申)

¹ The first draft of some parts of this paper was read at the IRI (Intercultural Research Institute) Open Lectures at Kansai Gaikokugo University Nakamiya Campus (Hirakata City, Ōsaka Prefecture) in January 24, 2020 (Year Reiwa 02, gēng-zì 令和二年庚子). This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 19K21648/Kikin/Chōsenteki-kenkyū (Hōga): Study on Cham Muslim-Confucians and Islam-Confucianism fusion in Vietnam (Research period: 2019-2021, principal researcher: Shine Toshihiko).

² The article on Kondei militia, Book 18 of the *Ruijū Sandaikyaku* (類聚三代格, edited by Anonymous, completed after/circa 967 AD) says: 太政官符。應差健兒事。以前被右大臣宣。奉勅。今諸國兵士。除邊要地之外。皆從停廢。其兵庫、鈴藏、及國府等類。宜差健兒以充守衛。宜簡差郡司子弟。作番令守。延曆十一年〔壬申〕六月十四日。(無名氏撰『類聚三代格』卷十八, 健兒條, Yagi-shoten 2005-2006: third volume 238-239.)

- "Kondei" (健兒, militias guarding "kokufu" (or kokubu 國府, provincial offices) or "sekisho" (關所, checking station)) that managed the armed forces after the abolition of corps (gundan-heishi 軍團兵士) in 792 was basically cavalry with archers recruited from Bandō 坂東 region (Shimomukai Tatsuhiko 1997, Terauchi Hiroshi 2008).

³ The description on the Year En'ryaku 24 (805 AD, yī-yōu 乙酉) of Yamato-neko-sumerogi-iyateri-no-sumeramikoto (Kan'mu), Book 13 of the *Nihon-kōki* (edited by Fujiwara-no Otsugu et al., completed in 840 AD) says: 于時緒嗣議云。方今天下所苦。軍事與造作也。停此兩事。百姓安之。眞道確執異議。不肯聽焉。帝善緒嗣議。即從停廢。(藤原緒嗣等撰『日本後紀』卷十三, 日本根子皇統弥照天皇〔桓武〕延曆二十四年條)

and completed by 805 (Year En'ryaku 24, yǐ-yǒu 乙酉) under the emperor Yamato-neko-sumerogiyateri (Kan'mu 桓武)'s reign. He had ancestors of mixed races of Manchurians and Koreans from Kudara (Baekje/Bǎi-jì 百濟) in his mother's clan called the Yamato-uji (和氏). At that time, Yamato/Japan has transitioned from the corps system to the militia system called "kondei" (健兒). Complete military victories over Ezo/Xiā-yí (蝦夷), Mishihase/Sù-shèn (肅慎) in the East, and successful diplomatic negotiations with China (Morokoshi/Táng 唐) and Korea (Shiragi/Silla/Xīn-luó 新羅) in the West made this abolition possible. Japan's diplomacy with China resumed in 607 and by 778 succeeded in creating a favorable international environment for Japan. Although most of senior envoys like "Taishi" (大使), "Ōshi" (押使) were high-ranking aristocrats such as the former royal family and Fujiwara-uji/Fujiwara-shi (藤原氏) clan, there were also diplomats who were descendants of Chinese migrant like Hata-uji (秦氏), Yamato-no-Aya-uji (倭漢氏/東漢氏), Kōchi-no-Aya-uji (河內漢氏/西漢氏) clans, and Overseas Japanese (Yamato-no-uji 倭種) who are considered that children between Japanese envoys, scholars, monks (who returned to secular life) and Chinese females. There are previous studies by Sakamoto Tarō (1960), Kamo Masanori (1984) and Wáng Yǒng (王勇, 1998 and 2009) on people of mixed race between Chinese and Japanese in the Táng. However, we also try to reexamine their origin and role in this paper.

1. Migration of Chinese to ancient Manchuria, Korea, Southern China and Vietnam

According to the list of nine divisions (九州 jiū-zhōu) in the Yǔ-gòng (the Tribute of Yǔ) chapter of the Xià-shū in the *Shū-jīng* (『書經』夏書, 禹貢) and the list of twelve divisions (shí-yǒu-èr-zhōu 十有二州) in the *Shǐ-jì jí-jìě*⁴ (史記集解), there was a concept of the nine or twelve divisions as the land where the Chinese (Huá-xià-rén 華夏人) live as follows: Jì, Yǎn, Qīng, Xú, Yáng, Jīng, Yù, Liáng, Yōng, Bing, Yōu, Yíng (冀, 兗⁵, 青, 徐, 楊, 荊, 豫, 梁, 雍, 并, 幽, 營).

⁴ Notes for the description on Di-yáo, the Wū-dì-běn-jì, Book 1 of the *Shǐ-jì* in the *Shǐ-jì jí-jìě* (edited by Péi Yīn, completed in circa 451 AD) says: 肇十有二州。決川。〈馬融曰。禹平水上。置九州。舜。以冀州之北廣大。分置并州。燕、齊遼遠。分燕置幽州。分齊爲營州。於是爲十二州也。〉(裴駰撰『史記集解』史記卷一, 五帝本紀, 帝堯條)

⁵ The "兗" (Yǎn) in the Yǔ-gòng (禹貢) chapter is written in Chinese character "浣" (almost same with shuì) in Takahashi Yōichirō (1991)'s text.

Figure 1: Location of the twelve divisions





Figure 2: Territories of Zhōu and surround areas



About Northeastern border. Traditionally, tribes of Manchuria and Korea were outside of Yōu-zhōu (幽州, initially Hán-guó 韓國, later Yàn-guó 燕國) and controlled by the Hán-chéng wall (韓城, or so called Yàn-cháng-chéng wall 燕長城). The poem "Hán-yì" in Dà-yǎ chapter in the *Shī-Jīng* (『詩經』大雅韓奕, c479 BC) says:

(Original text in Chinese with Pīn-yīn transliteration)

溥彼韓城 燕師所完 /pǔ-bǐ hán-chéng yàn-shī suǒ-wán/
 以先祖受命 因時百蠻 /yǐ xiān-zǔ shòu mìng yīn shí bǎi-mán/
 王錫韓侯 其追其鮒 /wáng xī [cì⁶] hán-hóu qí Zhuī [Huì] qí Bà [Mò⁷]/

(English translation based on James Legge 1871)

*Large is the wall of Hán-chéng, the end part of the Yán's great wall,
 As his ancestor had received charge, to preside over all wild tribes,
 The king of the Zhōu gave the Zhuī/Huì, and the Bà/Mò tribes to marquis of the Hán.*

There were some Chinese migrants' colonies in Manchuria and Korea like legendary Jī-hóu (箕侯, later Cháo-xiǎn 朝鮮), established by a royal exile fled from the Yīn (殷) during the change of the Yīn (殷) and Zhōu (周) dynasties, and other exiles fled from former Yàn-guó (燕國) and Qí-guó (齊國) territories under the Qín (秦) and early Hàn (漢) dynasty era. The poem Hán-yì (韓奕) mentioned

⁶ Although the Chinese character "錫" (Old Chinese reading by GSR* is /siek/) in the poem Hán-yì (韓奕)'s PTH** reading is /xī/, its meaning here is /cì/ (same as "賜," its Old Chinese reading by GSR is /s'c'g/), that is, "king give").

*GSR = *Grammata serica recensa* (Gāo Běh-hàn's *Hàn-wén-diǎn* 高本漢漢文典, Bernhard Karlgren 1957).

**PTH = Pǔ Tōng-huà 普通話 (*Hàn-yǔ pīn-yīn fāng-àn qián-wén* 漢語拼音方案前文, 1958).

⁷ The Chinese character "鮒" (Old Chinese is /baek (?)/, PTH reading is /bà/) in the poem "Hán-yì" is written in Chinese character "貂" (Old Chinese by GSR is /māk/, PTH reading is /mò/) in James Legge (1871)'s text, and in Jiāng Yǒng (江永 c1762)'s text, too. However, Naka Michiyo (那珂通世 1915: 96-98) 's "Hakujinkō/Mò-rén-kāo" (貉人考) did not mention Legge's and Jiāng Yǒng's text.

above suggested there was a kind of multi-ethnic society between the aboriginal Zhuī/Huì (追/濊), Bà/Mò (鮑/貊) tribes and the Chinese migrants⁸.

According to the description on Wáng Mǎn⁹ in the Cháo-xiǎn-liè-zhuàn, Book 115 of the *Shǐ-Jì*¹⁰(司馬遷撰『史記』卷一百十五, 朝鮮列傳, 王滿條, c91 BC), when Wáng Mǎn and his Chinese troopers fled from the Hàn (漢) to Manchuria, they accepted local customs like tying mallet-shaped topknot (tuí-jié 魃結) and wearing local clothes (mán-yí-fú 蠻夷服). According to James Legge (1871), the Bà (鮑) tribe is the same people as the Mò (貊) belonged to later Koma (Goryeo/Goguryeo or Gāo-lì/Gāo-jù-lì 高麗/高句麗), a powerful territory of the Fū-yú (夫餘) tribe in Manchuria and North Korea. According to Shiratori Kurakichi (1936)'s analysis on the Old Fū-yú languages based on fragmented linguistic information in Chinese historical materials, some vocabularies of them suggested their Tungus/Manchurian origin. Not only Koma, but ruling class of the Kudara (百濟) were also the Fū-yú tribe, that is, the Manchurian. They were not the aboriginal Hán tribe (韓/汗, the Korean).

However, the description on the Biàn-Chén in the Dōng-yí-liè-zhuàn, Book 85 of the *Hòu-Hàn-shū* (『後漢書』卷八十五, 東夷列傳, 弁辰條, 445 AD) says:

In the beginning, during the change of the Qín (秦) and Hàn (漢) dynasties, when Wèi Mǎn/Wáng Mǎn (衛滿/王滿) and his troopers attacked Jī Zhǔn (箕准) and took the Cháo-xiǎn (朝鮮, that established by descendants of Jī-hóu 箕侯), people of the Jī family fled by sea route, arrived the Hàn territories, conquered the aboriginal tribe in Mǎ-hán (馬韓) and became chieftain, called himself the Hàn-wáng (韓王). After the Jī family people was extinct, a Mǎ-hán person succeeded chieftains, called himself the Chén-wáng (辰王). (初。朝鮮王准為衛滿所破。乃將其餘眾數千人走入海。攻馬韓。破之。自立為韓王。准後滅絕。馬韓人復自立為辰王。)

⁸ According to the description on Èr-shí-sì-nián Lìng-hú, Book 1 of the *Chūn-qiū dì-lǐ kǎo-shí* (edited by Jiāng Yǒng, completed in circa 1762, 江永撰『春秋地理考實』卷一, 二十四年令狐條), there were two Hán-chéng (韓城): early Hán-chéng and later Hán-chéng in the history. The early Hán-chéng located in present Gù-ān district of Hé-běi province (河北省固安縣), that is, the South suburbs of present Běi-jīng. Bó Yáng (1993) also affirmed that Yàn's great wall (Yàn cháng-chéng 燕長城) located in the south side of Gù-ān district. The description on the 8th month, 946 AD, bǐng-wǔ says: 戰國時代燕王國長城在河北省固安縣南。However, there is an opposite opinion. According to Taniguchi Yoshisuke (1998), The Hán-chéng (韓城) depicted in the poem "Hán-yì" (韓奕) was the later Hán-chéng. It was not the early Hán-chéng, not the end part of the Yàn's great wall.

⁹ According to Ebata Takeshi (1989), it is the *Wèi-lüè* (魏略, edited by Yú Huàn (魚豢), completed in circa 255 AD) to regard Jī-hóu (箕侯) or Jī-zǐ Cháo-xiǎn (箕子朝鮮) as a historical dynasty rather than a legend. In addition, Wáng Mǎn (王滿) in the *Shǐ-jì* (史記) refers to Cháo-xiǎn-wáng Mǎn (朝鮮王滿), and his full name was not written as Wèi Mǎn (衛滿) in the *Shǐ-jì*.

¹⁰ The description on Wáng Mǎn in the Cháo-xiǎn-liè-zhuàn, Book 115 of the *Shǐ-Jì* (edited by Sī-mǎ Qiān, completed in circa 91 BC) says: 滿亡命。聚黨千餘人。魃結蠻夷服。而東走出塞。渡淇水。居秦故空地上。下鄣。稍役屬真番朝鮮、蠻夷及故燕、齊亡命者。王之。(司馬遷撰『史記』卷一百十五, 朝鮮列傳, 王滿條)

Then, Chinese exiles who fled to avoid forced hard labor of the Qín arrived the Hán territories. The Mǎ-hán (later conquered by the Fū-yú 夫餘 tribe and formed the Kudara 百濟) cut their east-end territory and gave them. In their language, bāng (邦) means country, hú (弧) means bow, kòu (寇) means thief, xíng-shāng (行觴) means drink together, tú (徒) means call each other. It sounds similar with Qín Chinese (秦語). So, it is considered, because of this, this territory named Qín-hán (秦韓). (秦之亡人。避苦役。适韓國。馬韓割東界地與之。其名國為邦、弓為弧、賊為寇、行酒為行觴、相呼為徒、有似秦語。故或名之為秦韓。)

Although the ancient the Manchurian (the Fū-yú tribe 夫餘) and the Korean (the Hán tribe 韓) were not necessarily obedient to the Chinese empire like the Hàn (漢), but never rejected the Chinese civilization (華夏文明). There are the tradition that both the Kudara (百濟) chieftain family who are the Fū-yú tribe, and the Shiragi (Silla/Xīn-luó 新羅) chieftain family who are the Hán tribe, were born from Hàn Chinese females or females of mixed race between Chinese and Korean came from former Cháo-xiǎn (朝鮮) (the description on Bǎi-jì, Dōng-yí-liè-zhuàn, Book 81 of the *Suī-shū*, 636 AD (魏徵等撰『隋書』卷八十一, 東夷列傳, 百濟條云: 漢遼東太守公孫度。以女妻之。)) and the description on Shǐ-zǔ, Xīn-luó běn-jì, Book 01 of the *Sān-guó shǐ-jì/Samguk-sagi*, 1145 AD (金富軾撰『三國史記』卷一, 新羅本紀, 始祖條云: 先是。朝鮮遺民分居山谷之間。為六村。)). However, the Qín-speaking agricultural/sericultural migrants from Northern China did not assimilate with the Fū-yú (夫餘) and Hán (韓) tribes. Especially, the *Samguk-sagi* says:

In the past, many Chinese exiles fled to the East. They formed a multi-ethnic society between the Fū-yú, Hán and the Chinese in the East-end of Mǎ-hán. Mǎ-hán's chieftain hated the prosperity of the Chinese resettled there. He harassed them. (前此。中國之人苦秦亂東來者衆。多處馬韓東與辰韓雜居。至是寢盛。故馬韓忌之。有責焉。)

According to the description on Yuè-dì in the Dì-lǐ-zhì xià, Book 28 of the *Hàn-shū*, c117 AD (『漢書』卷二十八, 地理志下, 粵地條云: 武帝元封元年略以為儋耳、珠崖郡。民皆服布如單被。穿中央為貫頭。男子耕農。種禾稻紵麻。女子桑蠶織績。)) and the descriptions on Mǎ-hán and Wō-rén in the *Wèi-shū*, Wū-wán, Xiǎn-bēi, Dōng-yí liè-zhuàn, Book 30 of the *Sān-guó-zhì*, c280 AD (『三國志』卷三十, 魏書烏丸鮮卑東夷列傳, 馬韓條云: 馬韓在西。其民土著。種植、知蠶桑、作綿布。又倭人條云: 其風俗(中略)作衣如單被。穿其中央。貫頭衣之。種禾稻、紵麻、蠶桑、緝績, 出細紵、縑綿。)), at that time, agriculture, sericulture and weaving were spread in whole surround areas of China like Nán-yuè, Mǎ-hán and Wō. However, Chinese migrants still kept their advantages, high quality products of agriculture and sericulture. So, it is considered that, because of those advantages, Chinese migrants in the East of Mǎ-hán was not obedient vassals/subjects but competitors on trade for Mǎ-hán (later Kudara)'s chieftains. Thus, Mǎ-hán/Kudara may have been supportive of Qín Chinese's migration to Yamato during 404-406 AD in order to expel competitors.

According to the account of Homuda-no sumera-mikoto (Ōjin), Book 10 of the *Nihon-shoki* (『日本書紀』卷十, 譽田天皇 [應神], 720 AD), during Year Ōjin 15-17 (404-406 AD), Yamato (倭) and Shiragi (新羅) fell into a state of conflict in an attempt to bring in Chinese human resources "takarako" (人夫, that is, farmers) into their own country by taking advantage of the discord between the chieftain of Mā-hán/Kudara (馬韓/百濟) and the Chinese migrants in Biàn-hán (弁韓 includes Kara/Gaya/Jiā-luó 加羅 territory). In other side, Kudara (百濟) has consistently tribute to the Wú (吳) and later Southern Dynasties. So, it is considered that, Kudara's chieftains used people from Southern China (Wú 吳) for their diplomacy and commerce, did not used Qín exiles-migrants from Northern China. The description on the 37th year of Homuda-no sumera-mikoto (Ōjin), Book 10 of the *Nihon-shoki* (『日本書紀』卷十, 譽田天皇 [應神] 三十七年條) says (English translation based on William George Aston (1896):

At that time, Achi-no-omi was about to go to the Kure/Wú via Koma/Gāo-lì. But, on arriving at the Koma, his party did not yet know how to get route to the Kure from there. So, he begged the chieftain of the Koma to help. Then, he was given two pathfinders named Kure Ha and Kure Shi. In this way, his party were enabled to reach the Kure. (爰阿知使主等。渡高麗國欲達于吳。則至高麗。更不知道路。乞知道者於高麗。高麗王乃副久禮波。久禮志二人爲導者。由是得通吳。)

It is considered that Kudara also had a similar diplomat clan like Kure clan in Koma. Regarding the contact between Kudara and the Southern China, the description on the Year Jiā-hé 01 of the emperor Wú Sūn Quán (吳孫權嘉禾元年, 232 AD, rén-zì 壬子), the Wú-shū, Wú-zhū-zhuàn, Book 47 of the *Sān-guó-zhì* (『三國志』卷四十七, 吳書, 吳主傳) says:

The Year Jiā-hé 01, the 10th month, Gōng-sūn Yuān, the governor of Liáo-dōng-jùn of the Wèi sent Sù Shū and Sūn Zòng to the Wú and said that since now Liáo-dōng-jùn is an alliance/belonging territory of the emperor Wú Sūn Quán, and tribute a marten and a horse. The emperor really glad, and gave him the title. (嘉禾元年。(中略) 冬十月。魏遼東太守公孫淵遣校尉宿舒、郎中令孫綜稱藩於權。並獻貂馬。權大悅, 加淵爵位。)

The description on Bǎi-jì in the Dōng-yí liè-zhuàn, Book 81 of the *Suí-shū* (『隋書』卷八十一東夷列傳百濟條) says: *The ancestor of the chieftains of Bǎi-jì (百濟) came from the Gāo-lì (高麗). They were the same tribe in origin. Kudara's chieftains are descendants of Dōng-míng-wáng (東明王). Qiú-tái (仇臺, or Qiú-shǒu 仇首, died in 234 AD), one of Dōng-míng-wáng's successors was a credible and sincere man. At first, he built his country where Dài-fāng-jùn (帶方郡) was. (百濟之先, 出自高麗國。(中略) 東明之後, 有仇臺 [仇首] 者。篤於仁信。始立其國于帶方故地。)*

As mentioned above, *Qiú-tái*, the chieftain of Kudara married to a daughter of Gōng-sūn Dù (公孫度, died in 204 AD), the governor of Liáo-dōng-jùn of the Hàn. (漢遼東太守公孫度以女妻之。)

Thus, before the Kudara moved to the area of the Mā-hán in South Korea (the beginning of the 3rd century), the Kudara located at China-North Korea border area (that is, later a part of the Koma). At

that time, Gōng-sūn Yuān (公孫淵), the grandson of Gōng-sūn Dù (公孫度) had a relationship between the nephew and the uncle-in-law with the Kudara's chieftain, Qiú-tái (or Qiú-shǒu). Thus, it is considered that the relationship between the Kudara and the Kure/Wú (the Southern Dynasties) began around 232 AD through the blood relationship between Kudara's chieftain and king of the Yàn (Gōng-sūn family). According to the description on the Sakyō-shohan in the File 3 of the *Shinsen Shōji-roku* (『新撰姓氏錄』第三帙, 左京諸蕃條, 815 AD), after the fall of the Gōng-sūn-family, some people who claim to be descendants of Gōng-sūn Yuān arrival Yamato via Kudara. Like other Chinese migrants like Hata-uji (秦氏, means cloth, silk) and Aya-uji (漢氏, mean textile patterns), they were people related to the weavings, red color dye craftsmen, called Akazome-uji (赤染氏).

About Southern border. The aboriginal Yuè (越) tribe or Jīng-mán (荊蠻) tribe were both inside and outside of Yáng-zhōu (楊州, Wú-guó 吳國 and Yuè-guó 越國) and Jīng-zhōu (荊州, Chǒ-guó 楚國). They cohabitated with Chinese migrants who came from the North. The description on Tàì-bǎi (太伯, or called as Wú Tàì-bǎi¹¹ 吳太伯) in the Zhōu-běn-jì (周本紀), Book 4, and the description on Xià-hòu Dì-Shǎo-kāng¹² (夏后帝少康) in the Yuè-wáng Jù-jiàn-shì-jiā (越王句踐世家), Book 41 of the *Shǐ-Jì* (史記) says those early generations Chinese migrants chose same way with above mentioned Northeast Chinese migrants. Legendary early generations of both Chinese Yuè-guó (Wú Yú 無餘, an illegitimate son of Xià-hòu Dì-Shǎo-kāng) and Wú-guó (Tàì-bǎi 太伯, the eldest son of the Lord Zhōu-gǔ-gōng-dàn-fù 周古公亶父) accepted local customs of the Yuè (越) or Jīng-mán (荊蠻) tribes like short-cutting hair¹³ and tattooing (wén-shēn duàn-fà 文身斷髮) voluntary. Like Northeast borders case, later generations of Chinese migrants in Southern borders were a kind of exiles, too. According to the Nán-Yuè-liè-zhuàn¹⁴, Book 113 of the *Shǐ-Jì* (『史記』卷一百十三, 南越列傳), the emperor Qín-shǐ-huáng-dì (秦始皇帝) captured exiles, let them joined encourage immigration program at the Southern borders (秦時已并天下。略定楊越。置桂林、南海、象郡。以謫徙民).

¹¹ The description on Tàì-bǎi in the Zhōu-běn-jì, Book 4 of the *Shǐ-Jì* says: 古公有長子曰太伯。次曰虞仲。太姜生少子季歷。季歷娶太任。皆賢婦人。生昌。有聖瑞。古公曰。我世當有興者。其在昌乎。長子太伯虞仲知古公欲立季歷以傳昌。乃二人亡如荊蠻。文身斷髮。(『史記』卷四, 周本紀, 太伯條)

¹² The description on Xià-hòu Dì-Shǎo-Kāng in the Yuè-wáng Jù-jiàn-shì-jiā, Book 41 of the *Shǐ-Jì* says: 越王句踐。其先禹之苗裔而。夏后帝少康之庶子也。封於會稽。以奉守禹之祀。文身斷髮。披草萊而邑焉。(『史記』卷四十一, 越王句踐世家, 夏后帝少康條)

¹³ According to Shiratori Kurakichi (1925), both people in Manchuria and the Bǎi-yuè at that time had hair-style of tying mallet-shaped topknot like present Miáo-zú (苗族). The description on Wèi Tuó (尉佗) in the Nán-yuè-liè-zhuàn, Book 113 of the *Shǐ-Jì* says: 高祖使賈賜佗印。爲南越王。賈至。尉佗魑結箕踞見賈。(『史記』卷一百十三, 南越列傳, 尉佗條)

- According to Yoshikai Masato (2001), Sī-mǎ Qiān (司馬遷, the author of the *Shǐ-Jì*) himself stayed months in the border area between Nán-yuè and the Hàn Empire before he started to write the *Shǐ-Jì*. So, it is considered that, the detailed description on the Nán-yuè is not only based on historical materials, but based on his own experiences, too.

¹⁴ The description on Wèi Tuó (尉佗) also says: 秦時。已并天下。略定楊越。置桂林。南海。象郡。以謫徙民。與越雜處十三歲。(『史記』卷一百十三, 南越列傳, 尉佗條)

There was already a multi-ethnic society of various aboriginal peoples called Bǎi-Yuè-zá-chù¹⁵ (百越雜處), but with the addition of Chinese people, it became a multi-society of both Chinese and aboriginal ethnic groups (Bǎi-Yuè) called Yǔ-Yuè-zá-chù¹⁶ (與越雜處). There is a detailed analysis by Katayama Tsuyoshi (2013) on the mixed settlement of Hàn Chinese and various Bǎi-Yuè people, and the Chinalization/Sinicization of the Yuè in Southern China, especially in the Guǎng-zhōu (廣州) area. Anyway, the reconciliation and mixed race of multi-ethnic groups in Southern China continued thereafter (Chén Jié-míng 陳傑明 et al. 2009). The period of the arrival of Islam, the early Muslim generations of Arabs, Persians repeated mixed races with aboriginal Southern China's ethnic groups, especially Hàn Chinese, and so called the "Tǔ-shēng-fān-kè" (土生蕃客) in the past, the "Běn-tǔ-Huímín" (本土回民) in the present were formed (Xiè Míng-kūn 謝明昆 et al. 2019).

What kind of people were the Yuè and/or Jīng-mán? The Yuè and Jīng-mán are considered as Northwest-end group of the Bǎi-yuè (百越/百粵). Territories of the Bǎi-yuè were the region from present-day Southern China to Central Vietnam, and its current inhabitants are Southern Chinese like the Yuè-rén (粵人), Thai-Kadaic like the Zhuàng-zú (壯族), Austro-asiatic like the Viêt and Mùòng, and Austronesian like the Formosan (Gāo-shān-zú/Yuán-zhù-mín) and the Cham. Although there are few linguistic materials of the ancient Yuè language, the text of Yuè-rén-gē (越人歌, *Song of the Yuè boatman*) sung by a Yuè young boatman longing for a handsome and heroic Chǔ prince, accidentary recorded in Chinese characters with its Chǔ Chinese (楚語) translation in circa 540 BC, quoted in the *Shuō-yuàn* (說苑, c06 BC) are valuable example of the ancient Yuè vocabularies. Regarding the trial restorations of the original language of Yuè-rén-gē, there are restorations in Cham, in Zhuàng-Tai and in Vietnamese languages¹⁷. Here, the author (Shine Toshihiko) also tries to restore in Cham again with a completely different interpretation from the previous restoration by Izui Hisanosuke (1953).

¹⁵ The annotation by Chén Zàn about the description on the Yuè-dì, the Dì-lǐ-zhì xià, Book 28 of the *Hàn-shū* (edited by Bān Gù et al., completed in circa 117 AD) says: 自交阯至會稽七八千里。百越雜處。各有種姓。不得盡云少康後也。(班固等撰『漢書』卷二十八, 地理志下, 粵地條, 臣瓚注條)

¹⁶ However, it is unclear when Qín-shǐ-huáng-dì (秦始皇帝) finally conquered the Bǎi-yuè (百越) territories. According to Losnard Arousseau (1923), Wada Sei (1941), Tsuruma Kazuyuki (1992) and Kawate Shō (2016), the "jun" (郡) of the Qín set up there were units for implementation of the conquest war, not units for administration.

¹⁷ The chapter of Shàn-shuō, Book 11 of the *Shuō-yuàn* (edited by Liú Xiàng, completed in circa 06 BC) says: 越人擁楫而歌。歌辭曰。濫兮杼草 濫予昌桓 澤予昌州 州饒州焉 乎秦胥胥 纒予乎昭 漣秦隳滲 悞隨河湖。鄂君子皙曰。吾不知越歌。子試為我楚說之。於是乃召越譯。乃楚說之曰。今夕何夕。攀中洲流。今日何日兮。得與王子同舟。蒙羞被好兮。不訾詬恥。心幾頑而不絕兮。知得王子。山有木兮木有枝。心說君兮君不知。(劉向撰『說苑』卷十一, 善說)

- About previous studies on restorations of the Old Yuè language, see: Izui Hisanosuke (1953, in Cham, Austronesian), Wéi Qīng-wēn (韋慶穩 1981, in Zhuàng 壯語, Tai-Kadaic), Zhèng-zhāng Shàng-fāng (鄭張尚芳 1991, in Old Tai, Tai-Kadaic), and Kinh Viêt Trâm Tĩnh Nguyễn (京越沈永順 2010, in Vietnamese, Austro-asiatic).

- According to Yán Shì-ān (顏世安, 2020: 110), although Chǔ-rén (楚人) is a part of Zhǔ-Xià (諸夏), their custom and identity are deeply influenced by aboriginal tribes. The Chǔ-shì-jia, Book 40 of the *Shǐ-jì* says: 熊渠曰。我蠻夷也。不與中國之號諡。(『史記』卷四十, 楚世家)

(Original text in Chinese with Pīn-yīn transliteration)

濫兮拊草 濫予昌柁 /làn xī biàn cǎo làn yǔ chāng hù/
 澤予昌州 州饑州焉 /zé yǔ chāng zhōu zhōu sǎn zhōu yān/
 乎秦胥胥 縵予乎昭 /hū qín xū xū màn yǔ hū zhāo/
 澶秦踰滲 悞隨河湖 /chán qín yú shèn tí suí hé hú/

(English translation based on Chō Chinese 楚語 translation quoted in *Shuō-yuàn* 說苑, c06 BC)

今夕何夕 拏中洲流
 (*What night is this? The night anchoring a sandbank in the flow,*)
 今日何日兮 得與王子同舟
 (*What day is this? The day you board my boat, my prince,*)
 蒙羞被好兮 不訾詬恥
 (*My heart is about solidify, but its beat does not stop,*)
 心幾頑而不絕兮 知得王子
 (*Trees live on mountains, branches live on trees,*)
 山有木兮木有枝 心說君兮君不知
 (*my heart glad for your heart. Do you know?*)

(Trial restoration of Old Yuè language in Cham by the author, Shine Toshihiko)

濫兮拊草 濫予昌柁 /glam yiei b^hian ts^hau, glam dio t^hian q^ho/
 Klem gaih, bhian thau, klem dhua caor ahaok,
 (*What night? Usually you know, the night anchoring a bank the boat,*)
澤予昌州 州饑州焉 /d^hāk dio t^hian teiəu, teiəu d̪iəm teiəu ?ian/
 Dhlak dhua caor acaow, acaow siam, acaow tian,
 (*I anchor a bank of prince, handsome prince, prince in my heart,*)
乎秦胥胥 縵予乎昭 /q^ho dz^hiēn sio sio, mwan dio q^ho t̪ioq/
 hu jiéng asit asit, muen dhua hu thrach o,
 (*Get nervous, nephew (I) anchor, cannot row,*)
澶秦踰滲 悞隨河湖 /d^han dz^hiēn d̪i ts̪iəm, d̪iēq dzwia q^ha q^ho/
 Dhan jiéng kayau ciim, nduec dua daok thaoh.
 (*Branch become bird's nest tree, leave ourselves to the flow.*)

This trial restoration may be not correct. However, there is no doubt there were Austronesian language speakers cohabitating with Austro-asiatic and Tai-Kadaic speakers in the Bǎi-yuè (百越).


2. Migration of Chinese to ancient Japan

There were five ancient routes from China to Japan (Yamato/Wō 倭). Of the five routes, three were the main routes and depicted in the official histories of China. The first route departed the port of Kuài-jī (會稽) of the Wú (吳), crossed the East China Sea (Dōng-hǎi 東海) to the East, and reached Yí-zhōu, Chán-zhōu (夷洲, 亶洲, the islands considered as parts of Wō 倭 by the emperor Wú Sūn Quán 吳孫權). This route was depicted in description on the Year Huáng-lóng 02 of the emperor Wú Sūn Quán (吳孫權黃龍二年, 230 AD, gēng-xū 庚戌) in the Wú-shū, Wú-zhǔ-liè-zhuàn (吳書, 吳主列傳), Book 47 of the *Sān-guó-zhì* (三國志). Sūn Quán also considered that the people of the Eastern Islands came to Kuài-jī to buy and sell cloth by this route, too. The second route departed the citadel of Dài-fāng-jùn (帶方郡, as mentioned above, later Kudara was first founded here) of the Wèi (魏), went down the Yellow Sea (Huáng-hǎi 黃海) along the West coast of Korean peninsula to the South, crossed the Hàn-hǎi Sea (瀚海, currently Genkainada Sea 玄界灘), and reached Mò-lú-guó, Yī-dōu-guó (末盧國、伊都國, later Tsukushi-no-kuni 筑紫國/竹斯國 province). This route was depicted in the description on the Wō-rén (倭人), the Wèi-shū, Dōng-yí-liè-zhuàn (魏書, 東夷列傳), Book 30 of the *Sān-guó-zhì*. It is considered that envoys of the Wèi went to Wō by this route in the Year Zhēng-shǐ 01 of the emperor Wèi Cáo Fāng (魏曹芳正始元年, 240 AD, gēng-shēn 庚申). Wō's envoys dispatched by Himiko (Bēi-mí-hū 卑弥呼) are also considered that they went and came backed by this route. The third route departed the port of Kuài-jī (會稽), crossed the East China Sea (Dōng-hǎi 東海) and Yellow Sea, reached Tsukushi-no-kuni province via the West coast of Korean peninsula (③a) or the Tam-na/Dān-luó (耽羅, currently Cheju/Jì-zhōu 濟州 Island (③b). This route was depicted in description on Tuǐ-guó/Wō-guó (倭國/倭國) in the Dōng-yí-liè-zhuàn (東夷列傳), Book 81 of the *Suí-shū* (隋書). It is considered that Péi Shì-qīng 裴世清, an envoy of the Suí dispatched to Yamaoto/Wō by this route in the Year Dà-yè 04 of the emperor Suí Yáng-dì (隋煬帝大業四年, 608 AD, wù-chén 戊辰). The envoys, scholars and monks of Yamato described in the *Nihon-shoki* are also considered that they went and came backed by this route¹⁸. In addition, there were route that crossed the Sea of Japan (Bó-hǎi-guó 渤海國 route, the fourth route) and route that went the South through the Strait of Tartary (Mò-hé-guó¹⁹ 靺鞨國 route, or Hú-guó²⁰ 胡國 route, the fifth route).

¹⁸ See: Note No. 26, the route from Yamato/Wō (倭) reach to the Wú (吳) via Koma (高麗/高句麗) in the description on the Year Ōjin 37 (426 AD, bǐng-yín 丙寅), Book 10 of the *Nihon-shoki*.

¹⁹ According to the *Inscription of Taga Castle* (Tagajōhi 多賀城碑), engraved in Year Ten'pyō-hōji 06 (762 AD, rén-yín 壬寅), the distance from Tagajō of Michinoku-no-kuni (陸奥國, currently Tōhoku region) province on the Pacific coast of Yamato to Mò-hé-guó (靺鞨國) in the East Manchuria (currently Primorskaya oblast) is 3,000 ri/lǐ (about 1500 km). In the case this distance is by sea, it across the Strait of Tsugaru, Sea of Japan and the Strait of Tartary. The West-side of Tagajō inscription says: 去京一千五百里。去蝦夷國界一百廿里。去常陸國界四百十二里。去下野國界二百七十四里。去靺鞨國界三千里。『多賀城碑』西, 天平寶字六年) *原文國作国, 京作京。

²⁰ "Michinoku-no-kuni-no Abe-no-Yoritoki Kokoku-ni yukite munashiku kaeru-koto" (陸奥國安倍賴時行胡國空返語). Episode 11, Book 31 of the *Kon'jaku Monogatari-shū* (今昔物語集, edited by anonymous, completed in circa 1156-1157) depicted a sea route connecting the lower Amur River region of the East Manchuria and the Tōhoku 東北 region of Japan around 1156 AD, bǐng-zǐ 丙子。

Figure 3: Five ancient routes from China to Yamato/Wō (Japan)

Chén Shòu (陳壽), a Chinese historian edited *Sān-guó-zhì* (三國志, c280 AD) noted that there was a gap between the location of Yamato/Wō (倭) and the route to Yamato. Although Yamato belonged to the Lè-làng-jùn (樂浪郡) of the Hàn (漢) and the Dài-fāng-jùn (帶方郡) of the Wèi (魏), it was located the East of Kuài-jī (會稽) of the Wú (吳). According to his description on the Yamato-bito/Wō-rén (倭人) in the Wèi-shū, *Dōng-yí-liè-zhuàn* (魏書東夷列傳), Book 30 of the *Sān-guó-zhì*, custom of the sea people (ama/shuǐ-rén 水人/蜃民) in Yamato like tattooing (horimono/wén-shēn 文身) was similar with the aboriginal Yuè (越) and Jīng-mán (荊蠻) nearby the Wú (吳). He also noted about existence of processing technology of mercury (zhū-dān 硃丹) in the Yamato and usage of mercury in their tattooing. He suggested a blood relationship between the Yamato-bito (Wō-rén) and Xià-hòu Shǎo-kāng-zhī-zǐ²¹ (夏后少康之子, the same person as Wú Yú 無餘), legendary ancestor of the Yuè. Not only Chén Shòu, later, the description on the Wō in the Zhū-yí-liè-zhuàn (諸夷列傳), Book 54 of the *Liáng-shū* (梁書) also wrote that the Wō called themselves as descendants of Tàì-bǎi²² (太伯, the same person as Wú-Tài-bǎi 吳太伯), ancestor of Wú-guó during the change of the Yīn (殷) and Zhōu (周) dynasties.

²¹ The description on the Yamato-bito (Wō-rén) in the *Wèi-shū*, *Dōng-yí-liè-zhuàn*, Book 30 of the *Sān-guó-zhì* (edited by Chén Shòu, completed in circa 280 AD) says: 男子無大小皆黥面文身。自古以來。其使詣中國。皆自稱大夫。夏后少康之子封於會稽。斷髮文身。以避蛟龍之害。今倭水人好沈沒捕魚蛤。文身亦以厭大魚水禽。後稍以為飾。諸國文身各異。或左或右。或大或小。尊卑有差。計其道里。當在會稽東治 [東治] 之東。其風俗不淫。男子皆露紒。以木綿招頭。其衣橫幅。但結束相。略無縫。婦人被髮屈紒。作衣如單被。穿其中央。貫頭衣之。(中略)以硃丹塗其身體。(中略)其山有丹。(中略)正始元年 [240 AD, gēng-shēn 庚申]。太守弓遵遣建中校尉梯俊等。奉詔書印綬詣倭國。拜假倭王。並齎詔賜金、帛、錦罽、刀、鏡、采物。倭王。因使上表。答謝恩詔。其四年。倭王復遣使大夫伊弉耆、掖邪狗等八人。上獻生口、倭錦、絳青縑、綿衣、帛布、丹木、狝、短弓矢。(陳壽撰『三國志』卷三十, 魏書東夷列傳, 倭人條)

²² This is considered a quotation from the *Wèi-lüè* (魏略). The description on the Wō in the Zhū-yí-liè-zhuàn, Book 54 of the *Liáng-shū* (edited by Yáo Sì-lián et al., completed in 636 AD) says: 倭者。自云太伯之後。(姚思廉等撰『梁書』卷五十四, 諸夷列傳, 倭條)

The Hán (韓) and Yamato/Wō (倭) were tribes belonged to the Dài-fāng-jùn (帶方郡) of the Wèi (魏) and controlled by it. However, the Wú (吳) also tried to have contact with the Yamato/Wō. Under the emperor Qín-shǐ-huáng-dì (秦始皇帝, 221-210 BC), Xú Fú (徐福), an alchemist with magical powers (fāng-shí 方士), voyaged to the East to seek the Pén-lái-shèn-shān (蓬萊神山) Islands with 3,000 children to get mysterious herbal medicines (xiān-yào 仙藥) for the emperor. Although they did not return, 400 years later, there was a group of people sometimes voyaged from the Eastern islands called Yí-zhōu, Chán-zhōu (夷洲, 亶洲) to Kuài-jī of the Wú to buy and sell cloth. As mentioned above, the emperor Wú Sūn Quán (吳孫權) thought that they were descendants of Xú Fú's children, and dispatched his fleet to seek the Pén-lái-shèn-shān or the Yí-zhōu, Chán-zhōu Islands in 230 AD²³. The fleet arrived in Yí-zhōu and took thousands of people, but returned without being able to reach Chán-zhōu. According to the *Suí-shū* (隋書), Péi Qīng/Péi Shì-qīng (裴清/裴世清), a Suí envoy dispatched to Yamato/Wō (倭) in 608 also suggested the Yí-zhōu Island and the Wō was same²⁴. His suggestion was based on his confirmation on the existence of the Qín-wáng-guó (秦王國), a territory of Chinese migrants in Yamato/Wō. He recognized people in there was same as Chinese (其人同華夏).

There have been several waves of migration of ancient Manchurian and Korean exiles (Koma 高麗/高句麗, Kudara 百濟 and Shiragi 新羅) to Yamato (倭). The same was true for individual Chinese migrants to Yamato, too. However, according to the *Nihon-shoki*, the large-scale migration or "the mass exodus" (Choi Jae-sōk 2011: 29-37) included migration of the ancestors of Hata-uji (秦氏) and Aya-uji (漢氏) clans to Yamato was only one wave²⁵, the wave of migration from 404 AD, jiǎ-

²³ The description on the Sūn Quán Huáng-lóng-èr-nián in the Wú-shū, Wú-zhǔ-liè-zhuàn, Book 30 of the *Sān-guó-zhì* says: 黃龍二年 [230 AD, gēng-xū 庚戌] 春正月。(中略) 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。(陳壽撰『三國志』卷四十七, 吳書吳主列傳, 孫權黃龍二年庚戌條)

²⁴ The description on the Tuī-guó (Wō-guó) in the Dōng-yí-liè-zhuàn, Book 30 of the *Suí-shū* (edited by Wèi Zhēng, completed in 636 AD) says: 明年 [隋煬帝大業四年, 608 AD, wù-chén 戊辰]。遣文林郎裴清。使於倭國。度百濟行。至竹島。南望舩羅國。經都斯麻國。迺在大海中。又東至一支國。又至竹斯國。又東至秦王國。其人同於華夏。以為夷洲。疑不能明也。(魏徵撰『隋書』卷八十一, 東夷列傳, 倭國條 [倭國條])

²⁵ The description on the 14th year of Homuda-no-sumera-mikoto (Year Ōjin 14, 403 AD, guǐ-mǎo 癸卯), Book 10 of the *Nihon-shoki* (edited by Toneri-no-miko, completed in 720 AD) says: 是歲。弓月君。自百濟來歸。因以秦之曰。臣領己國之人夫百二十縣。而歸化。然因新羅人之拒。皆留加羅國。爰遣葛城襲津彥。而召弓月之人夫於加羅。然經三年。而襲津彥不來焉。(舍人親王等撰『日本書紀』卷十, 譽田天皇 [應神] 十四年條)

- The description on 16th year of Homuda-no-sumera-mikoto (Year Ōjin 16, 405 AD, yǐ-sì 乙巳), Book 10 of the *Nihon-shoki* says: 春二月。王仁來之。(中略) 是歲。百濟阿花王薨。天皇召直支王謂之曰。汝返於國以嗣位。(中略) 八月。遣平群木菟宿禰。的戶田宿禰於加羅。仍授精兵詔之曰。襲津彥。久之不還。必由新羅之拒而滯之。汝等急往之擊新羅。披其道路。於是。木菟宿禰等。進精兵位於新羅之境。新羅王愕之服其罪。乃率弓月之人夫。與襲津彥共來焉。(『日本書紀』卷十, 譽田天皇 [應神] 十六年條)

- The description on 20th year of Homuda-no-sumera-mikoto (Year Ōjin 20, 409 AD, jǐ-yǒu 己酉), Book 10 of the *Nihon-shoki* says: 秋九月。倭漢直祖阿知使主。其子都加使主。並率己之黨類十七縣。而來歸焉。(『日本書紀』卷十, 譽田天皇 [應神] 二十年條)

chén (甲辰) to 409, jǐ-yǒu (己酉) (that is, from the 15th to 20th of Homuda-no sumera-mikoto, or Year Ōjin 應神 15 to 20)²⁶. As mentioned above, according to the descriptions on Biàn-Chén (弁辰) in the *Hòu-Hàn-shū* (後漢書) and the *Sān-guó-zhì* (三國志), both Chén-hán (辰韓) and Biàn-Chén territories at that time were multi-ethnic societies without central chieftainship (kingship), and formed independently by both the Chinese settlers (exiles who migrated to the eastern-end of Mǎ-hán 馬韓 territory) and the aboriginal Hán (韓) tribe. The description on the 14th year of Homuda-no sumera-mikoto (Year Ōjin 14, 403 AD, guǐ-mǎo 癸卯), Book 10 of the *Nihon-shoki* also says that Yuzuki-no-kimi (弓月君) and his clan (later Hata-uji 秦氏 clan) was disturbed by troopers of Shiragi (新羅 who conquered the Chén-hán later) when they were going to migrate from Chén-hán, Biàn-hán to Yamato. 120 kōri (or 120 agata, 百二十縣) of his clan members resettled from the Chén-hán and Biàn-Chén regions to Yamato with escort of the Yamato troopers of General Heguri-no Tsuku-no-sukune (平群木菟宿禰) through mediation of the Kudara (百濟).

- The description on the 37th year of Homuda-no-sumera-mikoto (Year Ōjin 37, 426 AD, bǐng-yín 丙寅), Book 10 of the *Nihon-shoki* says: 春二月戊午朔。遣阿知使主、都加使主於吳。令求縫工女。爰阿知使主等渡高麗國。欲達于吳。則至高麗。更不知道路。乞知道者於高麗。高麗王乃副久禮波、久禮志二人爲導者。由是得通吳。吳王。於是與工女兄媛、弟媛、吳織、穴織四婦女。〔《日本書紀》卷十，譽田天皇〔應神〕三十七年條〕

- The description on 41st year of Homuda-no-sumera-mikoto (Year Ōjin 41, 430 AD, gēng-wù 庚午), Book 10 of the *Nihon-shoki* says: 春二月。(中略)阿知使主等自吳至筑紫。時胸形大神。乞工女等。故以兄媛奉於胸形大神。是則今在筑紫國御使君之祖也。既而率其三婦女。以至津國。及于武庫。而天皇崩之不及。即獻于大鷦鷯尊是女人等之後。今吳衣縫、蚊屋衣縫。是也。〔《日本書紀》卷十，譽田天皇〔應神〕四十一年條〕

²⁶ According to the *Declaration Number 34 issued by Grand Council of State* in 1872 (明治五年太政官布告第三十四号), the 1st year of the Japanese imperial year (Year Kōki 01 皇紀元年) based on the chronology of the *Nihon-shoki* was 660 BC, xīn-yǒu 辛酉. So, the Year Ōjin 01 (gēng-yín 庚寅) was Year Kōki 930, that is, 270 AD.

- However, the description on the 16th year of Homuda-no-sumera-mikoto (Year Ōjin 16, yǐ-sì 乙巳), Book 10 of the *Nihon-shoki* says: In this year, Aka-ō of the Kudara (Baekje A-hwa-wang/Bái-jì Ā-huà-wáng 百濟阿花王, same as A-sin-wang/Ā-xīn-wáng 阿莘王, reign 392-405 in the *Samguk-sagi*/Sān-guó-shǐ-jì 三國史記 edited by Kim Bu-sik/Jin Fù-shì 金富弼, completed in 1145) demise. The emperor sent for prince Toki (Toki-ō/Jīk-jī-wáng/Zhí-zhī-wáng 直支王, same as Jeon-ji-wang/Tiǎn-zhī-wáng 腆支王, reign 405-420 in the *Samguk-sagi*) and addressed him, saying: Do you return to your country and succeed to the dignity? 是歲。百濟阿花王薨。天皇召直支王謂之曰。汝返於國以嗣位。〔《日本書紀》卷十，譽田天皇〔應神〕十六年乙巳條〕

- According to *The Portraits of Periodical Offering of Liáng* (蕭繹畫『梁職貢圖』, c526 AD), the name of the chieftain of Kudara during Yì-xī was Yú Tiǎn, that is Toki-ō 直支王/Jeon-ji-wang 腆支王 (Yì-xī-zhōng qí wáng Yú Tiǎn 義熙中其王餘腆). It is consistent with later Korean materials. So, the 16th year of Homuda-no-sumera-mikoto (Year Ōjin 16) is 405 AD, yǐ-sì 乙巳, and the 1st year should be 390 AD, gēng-yín 庚寅. Naka Michiyo (那珂通世 1893:32) also says that the chronology of the *Nihon-shoki* matches the chronology of Korean materials when two cycles of sexagesimal-cycle years (gān-zhī-èr-yùn 干支二運) are added to the kōki. According to him, the 1st year of Aka-ō/Ā-huà-wáng 阿花王, that is A-sin-wang/Ā-xīn-wáng 阿莘王 (Year Ōjin 02) is 391 AD (Year Tàì-yuán 16 of the emperor Jìn Xiào-wú-dì, xīn-mǎo 晉孝武帝太元十六年辛卯).

- However, according to the *Kojiki*, the chieftain of Kudara at the same time of Akari-no-miya (明宮, same as Homudawake-no-mikoto/Homda-no-sumera-mikoto/Ōjin-tennō 應神天皇) is not Aka-ō, but Shōko-ō (Jo-go-wang/Zhào-gǔ-wáng 照古王, same as Geun-cho-go-wang/Jīn-xiào-gǔ-wáng 近肖古王, reign 345-375 in the *Samguk-sagi*). There is a 36-years gap between the *Kojiki* and *Nihon-shoki* in the year of demise of Akari-no-miya/Homda-no-sumera-mikoto. The year of demise of Akari-no-miya (that is, Ōjin-tennō) in the *Kojiki* is 394 AD, jiǎ-wù (甲午), but the year of demise of Homda-no-sumera-mikoto (Ōjin-tennō) in the *Nihon-shoki* is 430 AD, gēng-wù (庚午) according to the above mentioned Naka Mchiyo's theory. See: Kobayashi Kiyohiko (1946) for the *Nihon Shoki's* chronology problems.

On the other hand, the description on the 20th year of Homuda-no sumera-mikoto (Year Ōjin 20, 409 AD, jǐ-yǒu 己酉), Book 10 of the *Nihon-shoki* (『日本書紀』卷十, 譽田天皇 [應神] 二十年條) did not mention the areas of departure²⁷ of Achi-no-omi (阿知使主) and 17 kōri (or 17 agata, 十七縣) of his clan members (later Aya-uji 漢氏 clan) migrated to Yamato²⁸. The description on the 15th year of Homuda-no sumera-mikoto (Year Ōjin-tennō 15, 404 AD) mentioned the arrival of Achiki (阿直岐), an envoy and an administrator of horses dispatched by the chieftain of Kudara (百濟) to Yamato (Wō 倭) and did not return to Kudara. Later, his descendants' clans were given the Kabane of "Kishi" (吉士/吉師, same name with the title of the 14/17 court rank in Shiragi 新羅) by emperor (sumera-mikoto/tennō 天皇). The Kabane was titles given by emperor to his subject clans. And the Kabane of "Kishi" here meant foreign bureaucrats²⁹ and navigators/pathfinders (Miura Keiichi 1957). It is not sure that they are Chinese-origin clan or Chinese-Manchurian mixed-race origin clan. Their clan is not included in both Hata-uji (秦氏) and Aya-uji (漢氏) clans. As described above, the Péi Shì-qīng (裴世清)'s report (608 AD) quoted in the *Sui-shū* (隋書) confirmed existence of the Qín-wáng-guó (秦王國) as a kind of autonomous territory inside the Wō (倭). The Qín-wáng (秦王) in here refers the Hata-no-miyatsuko (秦造), the Uji and Kabane of chief class of Hata-uji clan. He (they) was also given another Kabane, Uzumasa³⁰ (禹豆麻佐 or 太秦). Later, the Kabane "Uzumasa (太秦)"

²⁷ See: Note No. 25, the description on the Year Ōjin 20, 409 AD, jǐ-yǒu 己酉.

²⁸ There were so called the Seven sub-clans of Chinese-Japanese (Shichishōmin 七姓民 or Shichishō-Kanjin 七姓漢人) in the Aya-uji (漢氏) clan. According to the *Sakanoue-keizu*. in the *Zoku gunsho-ruijū*, Book 185 (無名氏撰「坂上系圖」『續群書類從』卷百八十五), the Seven sub-clans include Shu/Zhū 朱, Ri/Li 李, Ta/Duō 多, Sōkaku/Zào-guō 皂郭, Sō/Zào 皂, and Dan/Duàn 段 and Gāo 高. Three of seven (Duō 多, Zào-guō 皂郭 and Zào 皂) are not in the table of the *Bāi-jia-xìng* (百家姓, c1127), so it is considered those three surnames are the Fū-yú (夫餘, Manchurian)-Chinese mixed race's surnames.

- The report regarding the ancestors of Sakanoue-no Karitamaro quoted in the description on the 6th month, the Year En'ryaku 04 (785AD, yǐ-chōu 乙丑), Book 38 of the *Shoku Nihongi* (edited by Sugano-no Mamichi et al., completed in 840) says, their ancestors once settled the areas between Koma and Kudara: 右衛士督從三位兼下總守坂上大忌寸畑田麻呂等上表言。臣等本是後漢靈帝之曾孫阿智王之後也。漢祚遷魏。阿智王因牛教。出行帶方。忽得寶帶瑞。其像似宮城。爰建國邑。育其人庶。後召父兄告曰。吾聞。東國有聖主。何不歸從乎。若久居此處。恐取覆滅。即携母弟迂興德。及七姓民。歸化來朝。是則譽田天皇治天下之御世也。於是阿智王奏請曰。臣舊居在於帶方。人民男女皆有才藝。近者寓於百濟高麗之間。心懷猶豫未知去就。伏願天恩遣使追召之。乃勅遣臣八腹氏。分頭發遣。其人民男女。舉落隨使盡來。永為公民。積年累代。以至於今。今在諸國漢人亦是其後也。(菅野真道等撰『續日本紀』卷三十八, 今上天皇 [桓武]) 延曆四年條)

²⁹ The description on Achikishi (阿知吉師) in Page 23 of Book 33 (Book 2 of the Akari-no-miya/Sovereign of Ōjin-tennō), the *Kojiki-den*, edited by Motoori Norinaga, completed in 1798) says: これもと新羅國の官、十七等中の第十四等を吉士といふこと漢籍(北史)に見え候へば、皇國にてもそれをとりてからびとの品に用うるを。(本居宣長撰『古事記傳』卷三十三, 明宮 [應神] 中卷, 第二十三葉)

³⁰ The description on the 15th year of Ōhatsuse Wakatakeru-no-sumera-mikoto (Year Yūryaku 15, 471 AD, xīn-hài 辛亥), Book 14 of the *Nihon-shoki* says: [欠月] 秦民。分散臣連等。各隨欲驅使。勿委秦造。由是秦造酒。甚以為憂。而仕於天皇。天皇愛寵之。詔聚秦民。賜於秦酒。公仍領率百八十種勝。奉獻庸調。御調也。緡續充積朝廷。因賜姓曰禹豆麻佐。(『日本書紀』卷十四, 大泊瀨幼武天皇 [雄略] 十五年條)

- However, there is a 10-years gap between the *Kojiki* and *Nihon-shoki* in the year of demise of Hatsuse-no-Asakura-no-miya-Ōhatsuse Wakatakeru-no sumera-mikoto/Yūryaku-tennō 雄略天皇. According to the *Kojiki*, the year of demise of Ōhatsuse Wakatakeru-no sumera-mikoto (Year Yūryaku 23) is 489AD, jǐ-sì 己巳 (not 479 AD, jǐ-wèi 己未 like the *Nihon-shoki*). So, according to the *Kojiki*, the 15th year of Ōhatsuse Wakatakeru-no sumera-mikoto (Year Yūryaku 15) become 481 AD, xīn-yǒu 辛酉 (not 471 AD, xīn-hài 辛亥 like the *Nihon-shoki*).

became the land name of Hata-uji clans' territories in Ōshikōchi-no-kuni (凡河内國) and Yamashiro-no-kuni (山背國) provinces, currently the Uzumasa area in the Neyagawa City of Ōsaka prefecture, and another Uzumasa area in the Ukyō ward of Kyōto City, Kyōto Prefecture.

3. Formation of Chinese migrants society in Japan/Yamato: Hata-uji (秦氏), Aya-uji (漢氏), and the emergence of Overseas Japanese born in China: Yamato-no-uji (倭種)

The population of Hata-uji clan arrival Yamato in 406 AD was 120 kōri, Aya-uji clan arrival Yamato in 409 was 17 kōri. The population of Hata-uji in 471 was 180 kusa-no-suguri (or 180 kusa-no-katsu, 百八十種勝), and 7,053 households in 540. The population of each unit related to Hata-uji clan, such as "kōri" (縣) in 405 and "kusa-no-suguri" (種勝) in 470 is unknown. Converting the number of Hata-uji clan's 7,053 households in 540 to fifty (sato 五十戸), it is around 140 "sato" (百四十五戸). The number of sato (140 sato) in 540 is almost same with number of kōri in 405 (120 kōri). Considering that the descendant population of Hata-uji Chinese migrants doubled in 135 years, and half of them were married to aboriginal Yamato tribe (Japanese) and removed from Hata-uji, the units "kōri," "kusa-no-suguri" and later "sato" may have the same population scale. The population of Hata-uji in 540 was about 35,000 when calculated with 5 people per household. Hata-uji clan's population at the time Péi Shì-qīng (裴世清) visited Japan (608) was equal to, or greater than that³¹. So, Péi Shì-qīng confirmed Hata-uji clan's community as an autonomous territory inside Yamato/Wō. According to the *Nihon Shoki*, many of Hata-uji clan were "takarako" (人夫), that is, farmers. Later, Suguri-be (勝部, Katsu-be), or Katsu-me (勝目) were Hata's agricultural technical groups. So, "kōri"s, or "kusa-no-suguri"s are the units of farmer's communities or agricultural technical groups (Yagi Mitsuru 1957, Ochiai Shigenobu 1972). Unlike Hata-uji clan, Aya-uji clan was not specified as takarako (farmers) in the *Nihon-shoki*.

Like "Hata 秦"(the Uji) and "Miyatsuko 造" (the Kabane) of chief class of the Hata-uji clan, leading clans of Yamato had both the Uji (氏) and the Kabane (姓), or so called shōji (姓氏, 姓尸). The Uji were different from both the ancient Chinese Shì (氏) and the current Japanese Myōji (苗字) or Shi (氏) means surname. The Uji were the titles (or names) of patrilineal clan group (the ancestors can be either male or female) approved by sumera-mikoto (tennō 天皇). The Uji also known as the hon'sei (běn-xìng 本姓). The Myōji (surname) in the family register system after the Meiji (明治) era has changed from the Uji. On the other hand, the Kabane were titles given by sumera-mikoto and was abolished after the Shōji-fushōrei (姓尸不稱令, Year Meiji 05, 1872 AD, rén-shēn 壬申). Regarding

³¹ According to Tanaka Fumio (1996: 24), unlike other clans, Hata-no-tami and Aya-be members were difficult to remove or leave their clans because they were managed by the "sekichō" (or "jakuchō" 籍帳, family register).

the clan names of descendants of Chinese who migrated to Yamato, above mentioned *Shinsen Shōji-roku* recorded as follows: Yuzuki-no-kimi (弓月君)'s descendants (that is, Hata-uji 秦氏): 30 sub-clans, Wa Ni (王仁)'s descendants (that is, Fumi-uji 文氏): 07 sub-clans, Achi-no-omi (阿知使主)'s descendants (that is, Yamato-no-Aya-uji 倭漢氏/東漢氏): 26 sub-clans, other Hàn emperor's descendants (漢帝裔): 16 sub-clans, other Hàn Chinese descendants (漢人裔): 07 sub-clans, Zhōu king's descendants (周王裔): 11 sub-clans, Wèi emperor's descendants (魏帝裔): 08 sub-clans, Wú Chinese descendants (吳人裔): 08 sub-clans, other descendants: 34 sub-clans, total: 145 sub-clans (『新撰姓氏錄』第三秩, 左京諸蕃條: 43-44, Ōta Akira 1940: 87-93). According to the *Nihon-shoki*, under the Be-no-tami system (部民制), the Hata-uji's sub-clans were organized into Hata-no-tami (秦民 or Sugiri-be/Katsu-be 勝部) almost alone (few groups of Kōchi-no Fumi-uji/Kōchi-no Aya-uji were added only) in the Year Yūryaku 15, 471 AD, xīn-hài (辛亥). Different from this, the Aya-uji's subclans and other various sub-clans were organized together into Aya-be (漢部, while absorbing Newcomer Chinese) in the Year Yūryaku 15, 472 AD, rén-zì (壬子). As described above, the Hata-uji and the Aya-uji clan originally had Chinese surnames like Shu (Zhū 朱), Ri (Lǐ 李), Ta (Duō 多), Sōkaku (Zào-guō 皂郭), Sō (Zào 皂), Dan (Duàn 段) of the Shichishō-Kanjin (Qī-xìng-Hàn-rén 七姓漢人), a part of Aya-uji arrival Yamato in 409, Sō³² (Cáo 曹) of Sō Tatsu (Cáo Dá 曹達) dispatched to China in 425, or Kan (Hán 韓) of Kan Tai (Hán Dài 韓岱) served for Ōhatsuse Wakatakeru-no sumera-mikoto (Yūryaku 雄略, reign 457-479 in the *Nihon-shoki*, c467-489 in the *Kojiki*). After the migration to Yamato in 406 (Hata-uji clan) and in 409 (Aya-uji clan), both the Hata-uji and the Aya-uji clan reduced to use these Chinese surnames officially, and started to use the Uji like the Hata-uji and Aya-uji approved by emperor, and the Kabane "Miyatsuko" (造, for Hata-uji) and "Atai" (直, for Aya-uji) given by emperor. "Hata" in Japanese means "cloth, weaving", and "Aya" means "textile patterns." Like those Uji clan names show, the Hata-uji in origin was clan of agriculture and sericulture technical groups, and the Aya-uji in origin was textile traders and diplomats, at the

³² According to the description on Wō-guō in the *Yi-mán-liè-zhuàn*, Book 97 of the *Sòng-shū*, edited by Shěn Yūē, completed in 488 AD (沈約撰『宋書』卷九十七, 夷蠻列傳, 倭國條), the chieftain Wa San (Wō Zàn 倭讚) sent a diplomat name Sō Tatsu (Cáo Dá 曹達) to the Sòng (宋) for tribute in 425. Since his job title is Shiba/Sī-mǎ (司馬) means administrator of the horses, it is considered that Cáo Dá is Chinese style surname and given-name of Achiki (阿直岐), the administrator of the horses called shōshi (掌飼) or yōba (養馬) in court of the emperor Homuda (Homudano-sumeramikoto/Ōjin-tennō 應神天皇) who arrival Yamato from Kudara in 403 (the 14th year of Homudano-sumeramikoto, Year Ōjin 14, guī-mǎo 癸卯). However, the dispatch of Shiba Sō Tatsu (司馬曹達) or Achiki to the Wú (吳, actually the Sòng 宋) in 425 (Year Ōjin 36) is not recorded in the *Nihon-shoki*. It recorded about the dispatch of the diplomat Achi-no-omi (阿知使主) to the Wú from 427 to 430 (See: Notes No. 25, the description on the Year Ōjin 37, 426 AD, bīng-yīn and the Year Ōjin 41, 430 AD, gēng-wù). Although Achiki and Achi-no-omi have similar names, they are different people. Achiki's descendants are not belonging to Aya-uji (漢氏), the clan established by Achi-no-omi. On other hand, Achiki's descendants may have some relations with Shiba Tatsuto (司馬達等/司馬達止) arrival circa 522 AD because Tatsuto's descendants became manufacturer of saddles, harnesses called "Kura-tsukuri-be" (案部/鞍部/鞍作部), the people in charge of horse-related works.

- The *Sòng-shū* says: 高祖永初二年 (421 AD, xīn-yǒu 辛酉)。詔曰。倭讚萬里修貢。遠誠宜甄。可賜除授。太祖元嘉二年 (425, yī-chǒu 乙丑)。讚又遣司馬曹達。奉表獻方物。(『宋書』卷九十七, 夷蠻列傳, 倭國條)

order of the emperor, they went to Kure/Wú (吳) twice to escort two teams of female sewing technicians from Kure to Yamato (426-430 AD and 471 or 481 AD. See: Table 1). *There are two Wú (吳) dynasties in China's history, the Jī-shì Wú-guó 姬氏吳國: c1100-473 BC and the Sūn Wú 孫吳: 222-280 AD. However, Yamato used the name Kure/Wú as land name of whole Southern China and the Southern Dynasties, the Nán-cháo 南朝. In other hand, there were people who contributed to the court of Yamato without having the Uji and/or the Kabane. According to the report *Iki-no-muraji Hirotoke-no fumi* (伊吉連博德書) or *Iki-no Hirotoke-no koto* (伊吉博得言) quoted in the *Nihon-shoki* several times, there were two diplomats of Yamato did not have both the Uji and Kabane acted in the Táng (唐) during 659-660. They were subsequently arrested as criminals against the Táng dynasty during 660-661³³, deported to Yamato in 671³⁴. Their names are Kan Chikō (Hán Zhì-xīng 韓智興) and Chō Gan'hō (Zhào Yuán-bǎo 趙元寶), and the reporter/author Iki-no Hakatoko called them Yamato-no-ujji (倭種). According to the *Shoki-shūge* (書紀集解), "Yamato-no-ujji" (or Koto-Yamato-no-ujji) means Japanese born in China³⁵. So, those two were the first generation of Overseas Japanese in history. It is important that they had used their Chinese style surnames and given names when they acted as diplomats of Yamato in the Táng. Their names suggested that they were not the subjects (omi or shin 臣) of the emperor (sumera-mikoto/tennō 天皇) until their arrival Yamato in 671³⁶.

³³ Although not spies or criminals, there is an example in which Táng use surrendered Kudara (Baekje/Bǎi-jì) officials and let them served to the Táng side during Táng- Baekje war like brothers Ye Gun/Ni Jūn (禰軍) and Ye Sik-chin/Ni Shí-jin (禰寔進). See: Oda Fujio (2015) and Kobayashi Toshio (2016).

³⁴ The report *Iki-no Hirotoke-no koto* quoted in the description on the Year Hakuchi 05 (654 AD, jiǎ-yín 甲寅) of Ame-yorozu-toyohi-no-sumera-mikoto (Kōtoku), Book 25 of the *Nihon-shoki* says: 〈伊吉博得言。學問僧惠妙於唐死。知聰於海死。智國於海死。智宗以庚寅年付新羅船歸。覺勝於唐死。義通於海死。定惠以乙丑年付劉德高等船歸。妙位、法膳、學生氷連老人、高黃金、并十二人、別倭種韓智興、趙元寶。今年共使人歸。〔《日本書紀》卷二十五，天萬豐日天皇〔孝德〕白雉五年條，伊吉博得言〉

- The description on the 10th year of Ame-mikoto-hirakashiwake-no-sumeramikoto (Year Tenji Shōsei 10, 671 AD, xīn-wèi 辛未), Book 27 of the *Nihon-shoki* says: 十一月甲午朔癸卯。對馬國司遣使於筑紫大宰府言。月生二日。沙門道文、筑紫君薩野馬、韓鳴勝娑婆、布師首磐四人從唐來曰。唐國使人郭務棕等六百人、送使宅宅孫登等一千四百人。合二千人。乘船冊七隻俱泊於比智嶋。相謂之曰。今吾輩人船數衆。忽然到彼恐彼人驚駭射戰。乃遣道文等豫稍披陳來朝之意。〔《日本書紀》卷二十七，天命開別天皇〔天智稱制〕十年條〕

- The description on the 4th year of Takamanohara-hironohime-no-sumeramikoto (Year Jitō 04, 690 AD, gēng-yín 庚寅), Book 30 of the *Nihon-shoki* says: 冬十月。(中略)詔軍丁筑紫國上陽郡人大伴部博麻曰。於天豐財重日足姬天皇七年救百濟之役。汝爲唐軍見虜。泊天命開別天皇三年 (Year Tenji Sokui 03, that is, Year Tenji Shōsei 09)。土師連富杼。氷連老。筑紫君薩夜麻。弓削連元寶兒四人。思欲奏聞唐人所計。緣無衣糧。憂不能達。於是。博麻謂土師富杼等曰。我欲共汝還向本朝。緣無衣糧。俱不能去。願賣我身以充衣食。富杼等任博麻計得通天朝。汝獨淹滯他界於今三十年矣。〔《日本書紀》卷三十，高天原廣野姬天皇〔持統〕四年條〕

- Although some details are not match, it is considered the "this year" in the *Iki-no Hirotoke-no koto* quoted in the description on the Year Hakuchi 05 (654 AD, jiǎ-yín 甲寅) of Ame-yorozu-toyohi-no-sumera-mikoto (Kōtoku), Book 25 of the *Nihon-shoki* is 671 AD (Year Tenji Sokui 04, that is, Year Tenji Shōsei 10) based on a rough match of all three descriptions on Year Hakuchi 05 (654), Year Tenji Shōsei 10 (671) and Year Jitō 04 (690).

³⁵ Note for "Koto Yamato-no ujji" (別倭種) in the description on the Year Hakuchi 05 (654 AD, jiǎ-yín 甲寅) of Ame-yorozu-toyohi-no-sumera-mikoto (Kōtoku), Book 25 of the *Shoki-shūge* (edited by Kawamura Hidene and Kawamura Shigene, completed in circa 1806) says: 按此方人於彼所生之種。(河村股根、河村益根撰『書紀集解』卷二十五，天萬豐日天皇〔孝德〕白雉五年條，別倭種〔コトヤマトノウヂ〕分注)

³⁶ According to the list of people arrival Yamato in 671 inserted in the description on the Year Hakuchi 白雉 05 (654

Here we have two questions. First, who were their fathers? There are few records about the migration of ancient Japanese women to China, Manchuria and Korea. If their fathers were ordinary Chinese or mixed race of Chinese and Manchurians-Koreans (like Nǐ/Ye 禰 clan, envoys of Kudara dispatched to the Táng) living in China and had children with Japanese women living there, it is difficult to guess the candidate fathers. If their fathers were ordinary Chinese once lived in Yamato (Wō 倭) and returned to China, the two Suí (隋)'s POWs (prisoners of war): Teikō and Futō (Zhēngōng 貞公 and Pú-tōng 普通, their surnames are unknown) who were transferred from Kudara to Yamato in 618 become candidate fathers, but there is no record about their return to China (the Táng). If their fathers were Japanese dispatched to China with long span, the eight international students (include a monk) and an unreturned interpreter who went to China/Suí with Péi Shì-qīng (裴世清) in 608 become candidates.

Table 1: Types and population of Chinese migrant arrival Yamato between 404 and 660

Year (AD)	Year (Gān-zhī, sexagenary cycle)	Types and population
404	jiǎ-chén 甲辰	Achiki (阿直岐, intellectual, administrator of the horses) from Kudara (百濟), Achiki-no-fuhito's ancestor.
405	yǐ-sì 乙巳	Wa Ni/Wáng Rén (王仁, intellectual) from Kudara, Fumi-no-obito's ancestor.
*405	yǐ-sì 乙巳	*Shin'son-ō (辰孫王, Manchurian = the Fū-yú prince, not Chinese) from Kudara, Sugano-uji's ancestor.
406	bǐng-wǔ 丙午	Yuzuki-no-kimi 弓月君 with 120 kōri of Hata-no-miyastuko's ancestors (intellectuals, agriculture-sericulture's technical groups) from Kara (加羅)
409	jǐ-yǒu 己酉	Achi-no-omi 阿知使主 with 17 kōri of Aya-no-atai's ancestors (intellectuals) from Kudara-Koma (百濟高麗間)
430	gēng-wǔ 庚午	04 female sewing technicians from Kure/Wú 吳 (Sòng 宋)
471 or 481	gēng-xū 庚戌 or gēng-shēn 庚申	04 female sewing technicians from Kure/Wú (Sòng or Qí 齊)
**522	rén-yín 壬寅	**Shiba Tatsuto/Sī-mǎ Dá-dēng/Sī-mǎ Dá-zhǐ (司馬達等/司馬達止) from Kure/ Liáng? (梁?), Kura-tsukuri-be's ancestor.
540	gēng-shēn 庚申	Ko Chi/Xǔ Zhì/Jī Zhì (許智/己智) from Kudara (interpreters), Naraosa-uji (Sub-clan of Hata)'s ancestors
618	wù-yín 戊寅	02 Suí (隋) prisoners of war from Koma
660	gēng-shēn 庚申	100 Táng (唐) prisoners of war from Kudara

Source: *Ogata Korekiyo (1953), ***Fusō-ryakuki* (Kin'mei-ki 欽明紀) and *the Nihon-shoki*.

AD, jiǎ-yín 甲寅) of Ame-yorozu-toyohi-no-sumera-mikoto (Kōtoku 孝德), Book 25 of the *Nihon-shoki*, Kan Chikō (韓智興) and Cho Gan'hō (趙元寶) returned (or were deported) to Yamato with total twelve people included themselves their colleagues (POWs) and Táng's envoy(s). However, other two lists of four people (inserted in the descriptions on 671 AD and 690 AD) show different names from the list inserted in the description on 654 AD. See: Note No.34 and Table 4 for details of total three lists inserted in three different descriptions: 654, 671 and 690.

Table 2: Evolution of Hata-uji clan's population in Yamato between 405 and 540

405	yī-sì 乙巳	120 kōri (or agata, 縣)
470 or 480	gēng-xū 庚戌 or gēng-shēn 庚申	180 kusa-no-suguri (or kusa-no-katsu 種勝)
540	gēng-shēn 庚申	7053 be (7053 戶) ≈ 141 sato (141 五十戶)

Source: *The Nihon-shoki*.

Table 3: List of candidate fathers of Overseas Japanese (Yamato-no-uji)

	Full name	Chinese character	Uji	Note
1	Kura-tsukuri-no-suguri Fukuri	鞍作村主福利	Kura-tsukuri/ Sī-má 司馬	Interpreter dispatched to Suí in 608
2	Yamato-no-Aya-no-atai Fukuin	倭漢直福因	Aya/Hàn 漢	Student dispatched to Suí in 608
3	Naraosa-no E'myō	奈羅譯語惠明	Hata/Qín 秦	Student dispatched to Suí in 608
4	Takamuku-no Ayahito Kuromaro	高向漢人玄理	Aya/Hàn 漢	Student dispatched to Suí in 608
5	Imaki-no Ayahito Ōkuni	新漢人大國	Aya/Hàn 漢	Student dispatched to Suí in 608
6	Imaki-no Ayahito Min	新漢人旻	Aya/Hàn 漢	Monk dispatched to Suí in 608
7	Minamifuchi-no Ayahito Shō'an	南淵漢人請安	Aya/Hàn 漢	Student dispatched to Suí in 608
8	Shiga-no Ayahito Eon	志賀漢人惠隱	Aya/Hàn 漢	Student dispatched to Suí in 608
9	Imaki-no Ayahito Kōsei	新漢人廣齊	Aya/Hàn 漢	Student dispatched to Suí in 608
10	Teikō (POW of Suí)	貞公	Unknown	Transferred from Koma (Gāo-jù-li) in 618
11	Futō (POW of Suí)	普通	Unknown	Transferred from Koma (Gāo-jù-li) in 618

Source: *The Nihon-shoki*.

As the Table 3 shows, all male Yamato (倭)'s envoys/diplomats, scholars/students (and a monk) who may become fathers of Yamato-no-uji (倭種) or Overseas Japanese in middle of 7th century participated in the Kenzuishi (遣隋使, the Envoy to the Suí) in 608, stayed in China with long span (or died in China) were Aya-be (漢部, both the Aya-uji 漢氏 and the various Aya-hito 漢人). Although most of them arrival Yamato via Kudara, a Fū-yú (夫餘)-Hán (韓) mixed race country (or Manchurian-Korean mixed-race country), The list did not include both the aboriginal Yamato tribe member and the people of mixed race between Manchurians-Koreans and Japanese member. As mentioned above, some clans given the Kabane of Kishi (吉士/吉師) that migrated from Kudara (百濟, and Kara 加羅 and Shiragi 新羅) to Yamato were in charge of navigators/pathfinders (shuǐ-fū 水夫). It is considered that those were people of mixed race between Manchurians-Koreans and Japanese. Those navigator clan members who remained in China due to marine accidents, injuries or illnesses are also candidates of the Yamato-no-uji's fathers. However, most of navigators' names were not mentioned in historical records.

Majorities in this list (Table 3) are New comer Chinese (Imaki-no-Aya-hito, 今來漢人/新漢人). We can see only one person is member of the Naraosa-uji (奈良譯語氏), a sub-clan of the Hata-uji clan in the list. It is considered that language was the standard that distinguished Chinese migrants who arrival Yamato after 406 or 409 into the Hata-uji clan or the Aya-uji clan. Although both Hata-uji

and Aya-uji clan members were Chinese origin intellectuals and civilized people, their role at settlement countries - Kudara and Yamato were different. According to the *Nihon-shoki*, there are few cases that New comers Chinese (or people of mixed race between Chinese and Manchurian, Chinese and Korean) were accepted as sub-clan of Hata-uji after 406. The acceptance of the Naraosa-uji sub-clan that is almost exceptional. The Hata-uji arrival Yamato in 406 was the group of Qín Chinese (秦語) speaking farmers and agricultural technical groups (takarako, 人夫). When they migrated from the Qín (秦, China) to the Hán (韓, Korea), they almost cut relationship with people stayed mainland China (the Hàn 漢, the Wèi 魏, the Jin 晉 and the Northern Dynasties). When they migrated from the Hán to Yamato, they almost cut relationship with people stayed Korean peninsula (Koma, Kudara and Shiragi) again except Xū Zhì (許智)'s group. In other hand, it is considered that Aya-uji was the group of Wú Chinese (吳語) speaking diplomats/merchants. They still kept their network between Chinese origin intellectuals settled in Yamato/Japan, settled in Korean peninsula and stayed their homeland - Kure (the Wú 吳, or Southern China). And they accepted New comers who were suitable for their network with consent or approval of emperor. Therefore, many envoys, scholars dispatched to China were chosen from Aya-be (漢部, the Aya-uji 漢氏 and various Aya-hito 漢人 clans).

Second, who are their descendants? There are few records about both Kan Chikō (Hán Zhì-xīng 韓智興) and Chō Gan'hō (Zhào Yuán-bǎo 趙元寶). About Kan Chikō, although the Chinese surname Kan (Hán 韓) is not included in the Great Eight clans/families (Dà-xìng-bā-zú 大姓八族) of Kudara like Shā (沙), Zhēn (眞), Yàn (燕), Lí (劬), Jiě (解), Zhēn (貞), Guó (國), Mù (木), Bó (苜) listed in the *Suí-shū* (隋書), there are several migrants came from Kudara use this Chinese surname "Kan" in Yamato like Kan Onchi (韓遠智, *Shoku Nihongi*, Book 23), Kan Shinjō (韓眞成, *Shoku Nihongi*, Book 36), Kan Ontechi (韓袁哲, *Kokushi-bunin*, Book 01). Different from other Chinese surnames, the Kan (Hán 韓) may be approved as Japanese surname with its reading as Kara, or Karakuni, Karashima by emperor. In this case, it is considered that people of Kara or Karakuni, Karashima clans were people of Chinese-Manchurian mixed and/or Chinese-Korean mixed race³⁷.

³⁷ There was a clan had the Uji Karakuni whose origin are aboriginal Yamato tribe. However, they wanted to change their Uji with the consent of the emperor because they did not want to be misunderstood as Korean origin clans by ordinary people. The description on the Year En'ryaku 09 (790 AD, gēng-wū 庚午) of Yamato-neko-sumerogi-iyateri-no-sumera-mikoto (Kan'mu), Book 40 of the *Shoku Nihongi* says: 十一月。(中略)外從五位下韓國連源等言。源等是物部大連等之苗裔也。(中略)以父祖奉使國名。故改物部連。爲韓國連。然則大連苗裔。是日本舊民。今號韓國。還似三韓之新來。至於唱導。每驚人聽。因地賜姓。古今通典。伏望。改韓國二字。蒙賜高原。依請許之。(『續日本紀』卷四十, 今上天皇(日本根子皇統彌照天皇[桓武])延曆九年條)

Table 4: Comparison of twelve people (并十二人, 別倭種韓智興、趙元寶今年共使人歸):**Yamato returnees, Táng and Kudara's envoys arrival in 671, by three descriptions**

Year (AD) the list inserted in historical description	654 (6 years before arrest)	671 (11 years after arrest, the year twelve people arrival Yamato)	690 (30 years after arrest, the year Ōtomobe-no Hakama returned)
Year (Gān-zhī) *Sexagesimal-cycle	jiǎ-yín 甲寅	xīn-wèi 辛未	gēng-yín 庚寅
Total number of people in the list	12 (included 2 monks, 4 POWs and nameless people, envoys)	2,000 (included 1 monk, 3 POWs and 2 envoys)	4 POWs
1 Yamato's Monk	Myō'i 妙位		
2 Yamato's Monk	Hōshō 法膳 (法勝)		
3 Yamato's Monk	Nameless	Shamon Dōkyū 沙門道久	
4 Yamato's POW	Hi-no-muraji Okina 氷連老人		Hi-no-muraji Okina 氷連老
5 Yamato's POW	Kō Ō-gon 高黃金		
6 Yamato's POW	Kan Chikō 韓智興	Karashima-no-suguri Shaba 韓嶋勝娑婆	
7 Yamato's POW	Chō Gan'hō 趙元寶		Yuge-no-muraji Gan'hōdei 弓削連元寶兒
8 Yamato's POW	Nameless	Tuskushi-no-kimi Satsuyama 筑紫君薩野馬	Tuskushi-no-kimi Satsuyama 筑紫君薩夜麻
9 Yamato's POW	Nameless	Nunoshi-no-obito Iwa 布師首磐	
10 Yamato's POW	Nameless		Haji-no-muraji Hodo 土師連富村
11 Táng (唐)'s envoy	Nameless	Guō Wù-cóng with 600 郭務棕	
12 Kudara (百濟)'s envoy (escort)	Nameless	Sa-daek-son-deung, or Shā-zhái-sūn-dēng with 1,400 沙宅孫登	

Source: *The Nihon-shoki*.

According to the list of people returned to "this year" in *Iki-no Hirotoke-no koto* quoted in the description on the Year Hakuchi 05 (孝德天皇白雉五年, 654 AD, jiǎ-yín 甲寅) of Ame-yorozu-toyohi-no sumera-mikoto (Kōtoku), Book 25 of the *Nihon-shoki*, twelve people included four Yamato's POWs detained in the Táng were escorted by the Táng fleet and returned to Yamato. Although (1) the list of six Yamato returnees inserted in the description on the Year Hakuchi 05 of Kōtoku-tennō, 白雉五年, 654 AD, jiǎ-yín 甲寅), (2) the list of four Yamato returnees inserted in the description on the Year Tenji-tennō Shōsei 10 (天智稱制十年, 671 AD, xīn-wèi 辛未) and (3) the list of four Yamato returnees inserted in the description on the Year Jitō-tennō 04 (持統四年, 690 AD, gēng-yín 庚寅) are different (see Table 4), there are names which is considered their names after they are given the Uji and Kabane, the Uji "Karashima 韓嶋" and the given name "Gan'hōdei/Gempōji 元寶兒"³⁸.

³⁸ According to the Page 19, Book 30 of the *Shoki-shūge* (『書紀集解』卷三十, 第十九葉, edited by Kawamura Hidene

In the case that Karashima-no-suguri Shaba [Saba] (韓嶋勝娑婆) and Kan Chikō (韓智興) are same person, because "Suguri-be" or "Katsu-be" (勝部) are agricultural technical groups of Hata-uji as mentioned above, it is considered that his father was belonging to the Hata-uji clan. And, in the case that Yuge-no-muraji Gan'hōdei (弓削連元寶兒) and Chō Gan'hō (趙元寶) is same person, because Yíng-xìng Zhào-shì (嬴姓趙氏) was "xìng" and "shì" of the Qín³⁹(秦), that is, Chō (Zhào 趙) is Hata-uji (秦氏) clan's original surname (shì). So, it is considered his father was belonging to the Hata-uji clan, too.

4. The hardships that Yamato's diplomats and POWs who detained in the Táng faced: 660-671

The purpose of Yamato's diplomacy after the Taika Reform (大化改新 or 乙巳之變 in 645) was simple. It was the construction of an international peaceful environment for Yamato. During this period, Yamato had a kind of omnidirectional diplomacy, and avoided being deeply involved in some particular countries (Mori Kimiyuki 1998: 288). For peace, it was necessary to maintain good relations with the great power, the Táng (唐). It was the same in Shiragi (新羅). Yamato began usage of the regnal year (yuán-hào 元号) after the Taika Reform in 645. It showed externally that Yamato was an independent country, but at the same time it showed that Yamato was not submissive to the Táng. Shiragi's prince Kon Shunjū (Kim Chun-chu/Jin Chūn-qiū 金春秋, later Mu-yeol-wang/Wū-liè-wáng 武烈王 or Tae-jong-wang/Tài-zōng-wáng 太宗王) came to Yamato in 647 and watched the Taika Reform, and came to China in 648 to form alliance with the Táng. In 650, he succeeded in forming the Táng-Shiragi Alliance, let the emperor Táng Gāo-zōng (唐高宗) ordered Yamato to stop Kudara (百濟)'s repeated attacks against Shiragi⁴⁰. That year, Shiragi abolished usage of the regnal year. Yamato also followed Shiragi and abolished the regnal year in 654 once. This is the same as admitting that Yamato is a submissive country of the Táng. So, it was uneasy factor for peacekeeping that Kudara, a Yamato's quasi-allied nation, repeatedly attacked to Shiragi during this period. For Yamato since 650,

河村殷根 and Kawamura Shigene 河村益根 1785-1806), heirloom versions of the *Nihon-shoki* (日本書紀) wrote Yuge-no muraji Gan'hōdei as 弓削連元寶兒. Kawamura Hidene and Shigene "corrected" "jitsu 實" as "hō 寶" based on the *Ruijū-kokushi* (類聚國史, edited by Sugawara-no Michizane 菅原道真, completed in 892 AD). The name Yuge-no muraji Gan'hōdei 弓削連元寶兒's traditional reading is Yuge-no muraji Gan'hō-no-ko/Gwan-hou-no-ko (Sakamoto Tarō et al. 1965 vol.2: 506).

³⁹ The description on Tàì-shǐ-gōng lùn-zàn in the Qín-běn-jì, Book 5 of the *Shǐ-Jì* says: 太史公曰：秦之先為嬴姓。其後分封。以國為姓。有徐氏、郟氏、莒氏、終黎氏、運奄氏、菟裘氏、將梁氏、黃氏、江氏、修魚氏、白冥氏、蜚廉氏、秦氏。然秦以其先造父封趙城。為趙氏。(司馬遷撰『史記』卷五，秦本紀，太史公論贊條)

⁴⁰ The description on the Wō and Rì-běn in the Dōng-yí-liè-zhuàn, Book 220 of the *Xīn Táng shū*, edited by Ōu-yáng Xiū et al., completed in 1060) say: 永徽初 [650 AD, gēng-xū 庚戌]。其王孝德即位。改元曰白雉。獻虎魄大如斗。碼碯若五升器。時新羅為高麗、百濟所暴。高宗賜璽書。令出兵援新羅。(歐陽修等撰『新唐書』卷二百二十，東夷列傳，倭日本條)

it was a diplomatic goal to prevent the Táng from interfering into the Kudara-Shiragi War (Baekje-Silla War) as a reinforcement of Shiragi.

The following is a chronological summary of the records of the two Yamato-no-uji diplomats who joined the 4th Kentōshi (遣唐使, the Envoys to the Táng, 659-661), worked for the above purpose until their return (or arrival) to Yamato, based annotations in the *Shoki-shūge* (書紀集解) by Kawamura Hidene and Kawamura Shigene (1785-1806), and English translation and annotations of the *Nihon-shoki* (日本書紀) by William George Aston (1896).

According to the *Nihon-shoki* (日本書紀), in the year of jǐ-wèi (己未, the 5th year of Ame-toyotakara-ikashihi-tarashihime-no sumera-mikoto, Year Saimei-tennō 齊明天皇 05, 659 AD), the 3rd day of the 7th month, the fleet of the 4th Kentōshi (遣唐使) departed from Naniwa Mitsu-no-ura (難波三津之浦) bay. The 11th day of the 8th month, the fleet left Tsukushi Ōtsu-no-ura (筑紫大津之浦) bay. On the 23rd day of the 10th month, the fleet reached the port of Yú-yáo (餘姚). The 1st day of the 10th intercalary month, delegation arrived city of Yuè-zhōu (越州, nearby Kuài-jī 會稽). On the 15th day, delegation entered the capital (Jīng 京). On the 30th day, they had an audience of the emperor (Táng Gāo-zōng 唐高宗). On the 1st day of the 11th month (festival day of winter solstice, dōng-zhì 冬至), they again saw the emperor. According to the report Iki-no Hakatoko-no koto, everything went well. However, things changed suddenly on the 3rd day of the 12th month. On this day, Kōchino-Aya-no Ōmaro (西漢大麻呂, an attendant (tomobito 僮人) of Kan Chikō (Hán Zhì-xīng 韓智興) went to meet officials of the Táng. Although he was a member of delegation, he deliberately made a false report about delegation of Yamato. He said, the delegation of Yamato was involved in the crime against the Táng. Some of members like Kan Chikō, Chō Gan'hō (Zhào Yuán-bǎo 趙元寶) were found guilty by the emperor, and banished to a distance of 3000 ri/li (about 1500 km) far from capital. It is not sure what kind of crime that Kan Chikō and Chō Gan'hō were involved. The Iki-no Hakatoko-no koto wrote it was "magete yokosu/ō-zan" (wǎng-chán 枉讒, slander, a false accusation). Among the delegation members one, Iki-no-muraji Hakatoko (that is, the reporter/ author of the report Iki-no Hakatoko-no koto, belonging to the Iki sub-clan of Aya-be), who made representations to the emperor in consequence of which their punishment was remitted. When everything was concluded, the emperor decreed as follows: Our empire has determined next year to take military operation in the East of the sea (hǎi-dōng-zhī-zhèng 海東之政 or hǎi-dōng-zhī-gōng 海東之攻). And you, the delegation from Yamato/Wō (倭) cannot return to the East until the end of the operation. Although their punishment was remitted, they were detained in Xī-jīng (西京, currently Xī-ān 西安). They were placed in separate seclusion, their door was closed and prohibited, and they had no liberty of movement. In such misery they passed the year.

In the year of gēng-shēn (庚申, the 6th year of Ame-toyo-takara-ikashihi-tarashihime-no sumera-mikoto, Year Saimei 06, 660 AD), the 8th month, Kudara (百濟) was destroyed. After this, on the 12th day of the 9th month, the delegation (except members who were captured like Kan Chikō, Chō Gan'hō) were allowed to return home-country, Yamato. The year of xīn-yǒu (辛酉, 661 AD), on the 25th day of the 1st month, they returned to city of Yuè-zhōu (越州). On the 23rd day of the 5th month, they came back to Tsukushi-no-kuni (筑紫國) province of Yamato and reported their return to the imperial court at Tsukushi Asakura-no-miya (筑紫朝倉宮). However, a member of delegation deliberately made a false report about delegation again. Like before, they were slandered by a person belonging to the Aya-uji clan, Yamato-no-Aya-no-atai Tarushima (東漢直足嶋), another attendant of Kan Chikō. So, delegation members received no gracious command by the empress. Delegation members were wroth. And their anger penetrated to the god of sky high. The god killed Tarushima by thunderbolt immediately. People at that time said of this: Ō-Yamato-no ame-no mukui-no chikaki-kana! (Dà Wō tiān bào zhī jìn! 大倭天報之近! The Devine vengeance of Great Yamato is so fast!)

By the year of xīn-yǒu (辛酉, the 7th year of Ame-toyo-takara-ikashihi-tarashihime-no sumera-mikoto, Year Saimei 07, 661 AD), five Yamato officials included Kan Chikō, Chō Gan'hō were transferred and treated as POWs detained by the Táng due to the Kudara relief war (Kudara-o sukuu ikusa 救百濟之役, 660-663). In the Táng, they got some information about Táng's plan (聞唐人所計). The 3rd year of Ame-mikoto-hirakasuwake-no sumera-mikoto (Year Tenji Sokui 天智天皇即位 03, that is, Year Tenji Shōsei 天智稱制 09, 670 AD, gēng wū 庚午), Ōtomobe-no Hakama (大伴部博麻), one of the five sold himself and raised funds for the other four's escape. The 10th year of Ame-mikoto-hirakasuwake-no sumera-mikoto (Year Tenji Shōsei 10, 671 AD, xīn-wèi 辛未), on the 2nd day of the 11th month, the other four: Monk Shamon Dōkyū (沙門道久), Tsukushi-no-kimi Satsuyama (筑紫君薩野馬), Karashima-no-suguri Shaba (韓嶋勝娑婆) and Nunoshi-no-obito Iwa (布師首磐) arrived from the Táng (this list of the four POWs is different from other two lists inserted on the description in 654 and 690, see: Note No. 34 and Table 4). Tsushima-no-kuni (對馬國) provincial authorities (國司) reported to Dazaifu (Dà-zǎi-fū 大宰府, the Governor-General's residence in Tsukushi) that, the Táng's envoy (使人) Guō Wù-cóng (郭務棕) with his companions (Yamato's POWs return from the Táng?) numbering 600 persons, and the Kudara's escort (送使) Sa-daek-son-deung/Shā-zhái-sūn-dēng (沙宅孫登) with his companions (Kudara's refugees?) numbered 1400 persons, the total number being 2000, had embarked in forty-seven ships which came to an anchor together at the island of Hichi-no-shima (比智嶋 or Bi-jin-do 比珍嶋, about 50 km far from Tsushima). They sent messengers to Tsushima to apply for permission to enter (return) to Yamato, and were permitted. However, Ōtomobe-no-Hakama himself stayed the Táng 30 years from 660 to 690. 20 years after his four colleagues' return, he returned to Yamato in the 4th year of Takamanohara

Hironohime-no sumera-mikoto (Year Jitō 持統 04, 690 AD, gēng-yín 庚寅) via Shiragi (新羅)⁴¹. The empress Takamanohara Hironoshime-no sumera-mikoto (Jitō) praised his hardships and achievements.

We do not discuss here whether Kan Chikō and Chō Gan'hō were criminals (Yamato's spies) against the Táng or not. In the case both of them (Kan Chikō 韓智興 and Chō Gan'hō 趙元寶) were belonging to sub-clan of Hata-no-tami or Hata-uji clans (one of candidate fathers is Naraosa-no E'myō 奈良譯語惠明, student, the only one member of Hata-uji clan joined the Kenzuishi 遣隋使 and dispatched to Suí in 608), harassment or hate crime by attendant(s) belonging to the Aya-be clans against two Yamato-no-uji diplomats may have been accelerated by the hostility of whole Aya-be people or Aya-uji clan towards the Hata-no-tami people or Hata-uji clan. It is possible that Hata-no-tami people, who had lost their relationship with the Chinese of Kudara, was cold-hearted about Kudara relief, and Aya-be people, who maintained their network between Yamato, Koma, and Kudara, was enthusiastic and sympathetic for Kudara relief. Those may have been the cause of harassment or hate crime, too.

Anyway, their mission was failed. Yamato's delegation included Kan Chikō and Chō Gan'hō could not prevent Táng's interference with the Kudara-Shiragi War (Baekje-Silla War). Táng and Shiragi pinched and destroyed Kudara in 660 AD, gēng-shēn (庚申). The war called "Kudara-o sukuu ikusa" means Kudara relief war (救百濟之役) of Yamato implemented from 660 to 663. The Battle of Hakusukinoe (白村江) or Baek-gang-gu/Bái-jiāng-kǒu (白江口) was the turning point of this war, and the Yamato-Kudara Allied Forces were completely defeated. This defeat has had two positive consequences for Yamato. First, the fast defeat of the Yamato and Kudara troops weakened the alliance between Táng and Shiragi over postwar Kudara territorial management and next operation against Koma (Goguryeo/Gāo-jù-lì). As the result, the Táng and Shiragi each rushed to make peace with Yamato. Second, although the Kudara relief war was failed, the ruling class of Kudara maintained a certain degree of favor with Yamato, and was willing to asylum in Yamato, provided both knowledge and human resources. It made a huge contribution for the completion of Yamato's ritsuryō (lǜ-lìng 律令) system.

The *Nihon-shoki* does not blame the failure of Kan Chikō and Chō Gan'hō. Although its author Hakatoko was belonging to the Aya-be people, rather the *Iki-no-muraji Hakatoko-no-fumi*, quoted by

⁴¹ There are some doubts about this description. It is unclear if they were Yamato's troopers or spies. Ōtomobe-no Hakama and Hi-no-muraji Okina may have been Yamato's students stayed in the Táng. In that case, it suggests that there was a kind of judicial transaction between Hakama and the Táng authorities. In this context, the meaning of "sold himself" does not mean he became unskilled labor slave, but a kind of the Táng's officials until retirement is allowed at old age. So, his return to Yamato in 690 AD means he retired and returned with the permission of the Táng.

the *Nihon-shoki*, denounced Aya-uji clan diplomats (both Yamato-no-Aya-uji and Kōchi-no-Aya-uji) for making malicious and false reports to both the emperor Táng Gāo-zōng (唐高宗) and the empress Toyo-takara-ikashihi-tarashihime (Saimei 齊明). Not only Iki-no Hakatoko, but also the emperor Ama-no-nunahara-oki-no-mahito (Ten'mu 天武) criticized Aya-uji extremely heavily in the 6th year of his reign (678 AD, wù-yín 戊寅) as follows⁴²:

(English translation based on William George Aston 1896)

In this month, the emperor commanded the Yamato-no-Aya-no-atai, saying: "Your clan has from the beginning been guilty of the seven misdemeanours. From the era of Oharida-no-miya (Woharida-no-miya 小治田宮, empress Toyo-mike-kashikiyahime, Suiko 推古, reign 593-628) to the era of Ōmi-no-mikado (Ahmi-no-mikado 近江朝, emperor Ame-mikoto-hirakasuwake, Ten'ji 天智, shōsei/control 662-672, sokui/reign 668-672), it has been the emperor's constant business to take measures against you. Now, in this our reign, you deserve to be called to an account for your misconduct, and to receive condign punishment. We are very reluctant, however, to extirpate the Clan of Aya-no-atai (漢直之氏), and we therefore extend to you great clemency, and pardon you. But, henceforth, if any of you offend his crime shall surely be ranked among unpardonable offences."

Many of the members: envoys, scholars, monks, navigators of the Kenzuishi (遣隋使 the Envoys to the Sui) and the early Kentōshi (遣唐使 the Envoys to the Táng) of Yamato were Chinese-origin intellectuals like Chinese migrants and their descendants. Their ancestors arrival Yamato via Kudara (百濟) and Kara (加羅), Koma (高麗/高句麗). So, it can be said that they are the people of mixed race between Chinese, Manchurian, Korean and Japanese parentage. Most of the diplomacy of ancient Japan (Yamato) was handled by such kind of people. Cases in which foreign-origin intellectuals took full control of diplomacy were seen not only in Yamato but also in Champa located in the Central Vietnam (越南). Yamato-no-uji (倭種), the Overseas Japanese born in China were people among these Chinese migrants and their descendants who were particularly expected to contribute. Despite losing the war (救百濟之役) in 663, the international environment surrounding Yamato (Japan) after 663 has improved rather than before. That means they have done their duty.

⁴² The description on the 6th year of Ama-no-nunahara-oki-no-mahito-no-sumera-mikoto (Year Ten'mu 天武 06, 678 AD, wù-yín 戊寅), Book 29 of the *Nihon-shoki* says: 六月壬辰朔乙巳。大震動。是月。詔東漢直等曰。汝等黨族之自本犯七不可也。是以。從小墾田御世至于近江朝。常以謀汝等爲事。今當朕世。將責汝等不可之狀。以隨犯應罪。然頓不欲絕漢直之氏。故降大恩以原之。從今以後。若有犯者必入不赦之例。(『日本書紀』卷二十九, 天淳中原瀛真人天皇 [天武] 六年條)

5. The hardships that Yamato's diplomats who detained in Champa faced: 734-735, and role of Shú Kūn-lún (熟崑崙) - Chinese merchant/diplomat considered Muslim in Champa

Seventy years after the political accident that the 4th Kentōshi (第四次遣唐使, 659-661, included the Yamato-no-uji (倭種) diplomats: Kan Chikō 韓智興 and Chō Gan'hō 趙元寶) involved, a serious marine accident happened and killed almost people who took on the 3rd ship of the 10th Kentōshi (第十次遣唐使, 733-734) on the way return to Yamato from the Táng. According to the report of the survivor, Heguri-no Hironari (平群廣成, a descendant of General Heguri-no Tsuku-no-sukune 平群木菟宿禰 who escorted 120 kōri of Hata-uji clan Chinese migrants arrival Yamato from Kara 加羅 in 406 AD, bīng-wū 丙午) quoted in the description on Year Ten'pyō 11 of Ame-shirushikuni-oshiharaki-toyo-sakurahiko-no sumera-mikoto (Shōmu 聖武), 739 AD, jī-mǎo (己卯), Book 13 of the *Shoku Nihongi* (續日本紀), as the result of marine accident, they were washed ashore in Kuron-koku⁴³ (Kūn-lún-guó/Lín-yì-guó 崑崙國/林邑國). Most of his Hironari's colleagues were killed by Kuron's troopers, and others were prisoned by the Kuron's chieftain/king. Fortunately, the survivors were rescued by a Chinese-origin Kuron merchant/diplomat from port city of Qīn-zhōu (欽州), and they returned to the Táng. In Hironari's report, this Champa merchant/diplomat was called "Juku Kuron/Shú Kūn-lún⁴⁴(熟崑崙) means "Civilized Kuron (Civilized Cham people)."

The Southern China coastal areas' chieftains at that time were not so friendly for foreigners except special talented foreigners who was able to be intermediary between the local chieftains and the Táng authorities. The description on the Year Tiān-bǎo 07 of the emperor Táng Xuán-zōng (唐玄宗天寶七載, 748 AD, wù-zǐ 戊子) in the *Tō Daiwajō Tōseiden* (唐大和上東征傳, Ganjin-wajō's voyage to the East) also depicted that people who met piracy were being abused and exploited by local chieftains⁴⁵. The *Chì Rì-běn guó-wáng-shū* (勅日本國王書) praised Hironari's hardships and achievements, and confirmed that Lín-yì-guó (林邑國, that is, Kuron/Champa) was a country that does not understand

⁴³ Not all Kūn-lún-guó (崑崙國) that appeared in Chinese (and Japanese) historical records meant Champa. See: Gérald Ferrand (1891-1902), Féng Chéng-jūn 馮承鈞 (1930), Matsuda Hisao (1941), Ogawa Hiroshi (1967), Tomio Takehiro (2008), Nurni Wahyu Wuryandari (2014) and Shine Toshihiko (2014).

⁴⁴ The description on the Year Ten'pyō 11 of Ame-shirushikuni-oshiharaki-toyosakurahiko-no-sumeramikoto (Shōmu) (739 AD, jī-mǎo 癸卯), Book 13 of the *Shoku Nihongi* says: 十一月辛卯。平郡朝臣廣成拜朝。初廣成。天平五年隨大使多治比真人廣成入唐。六年十月事畢却歸。四船同發從蘇州入海。惡風忽起彼此相失。廣成之船一百一十五人漂着崑崙國。有賊兵來圍逐被拘執。船人或被殺或逃散。自餘九十餘人着瘴死亡。廣成等四人。僅免死得見崑崙王。仍給升糧安置惡處。至七年。有唐國欽州熟崑崙到彼。便被偷載。出來既歸唐國。逢本朝學生阿倍仲滿。便奏得入朝。請取渤海路歸朝。天子許之。《續日本紀》卷十三，天靈國押開豐櫻彥天皇〔聖武〕天平十一年條)

⁴⁵ The description on the Year Tiān-bǎo 07 of the emperor Táng Xuán-zōng (748 AD, wù-zǐ 戊子) in the *Tō Daiwajō Tōseiden* (Mahito Genkai 779), No. 164, Book 69 of the *Gunsho-ruijū* (c1819) says: 至萬安州。州大首領馮若芳。請住其家。三日供養。若芳每年常劫取波斯船三二艘。取物爲己貨。掠人爲奴婢。其奴婢居處南北三日行。東西五日行。村村相次。愍是若芳奴婢之住處也。(真人元開撰「唐大和上東征傳」唐玄宗天寶七載條)

Chinese language⁴⁶. So, it is considered that so called "Juku-Kuron/Shú Kūn-lún (熟崑崙) were a special talented foreigners. And Qīn-zhōu (欽州) is also considered a special city.

There is a witness's account written by Abū Zayd al-Hasan al-Sīrāfi⁴⁷ about so called "Khānfū (Guǎng-zhōu) Massacre" (廣州大屠殺) in 266 Anno Hegirae, 879 AD, jī-hài 己亥 (Year Gān-fú 06 of the emperor Táng Xī-zōng 唐僖宗乾符六年) during the uprising of Huáng Cháo (Huáng Cháo zhī luàn 黃巢之亂). Previous studies have admitted that the year of Huáng Cháo's capture of Guǎng-zhōu and the year of the Khānfū massacre do not match, but argued that Khānfū refers to Guǎng-zhōu considered Khānfū is Guǎng-fǔ (廣府), another name of Guǎng-zhōu (Kuwabara Jitsuzō, 1923: 17-21). However, as they themselves affirmed, there is no account/description in Chinese official history about this massacre⁴⁸. The original text was spelled out the name of the city where the massacre took place as "خانفو Khānfū" in Arabic. According to Arabic account like Dimashqi (1325-1327), the Champa is spelled "الصنف Al-Sanf" in Arabic⁴⁹. The Qīn-zhōu (欽州)'s Middle Chinese reading in GSR by Karlgren 1957 is /kʰiəm tɕiəu/ (Sino-Vietnamese: /khâm châu/) and its another name, Qīn-fǔ (欽府) is /kʰiəm p̄i/ (Sino-Vietnamese: /khâm phủ/). In Arabic at that time, the last consonant in foreign language "m" was spelled "ن nūn" and the initial vowel "p" was spelled "ف fā'," like "Champa" became "Sanf." So, "Khānfū" in this case is considered the transliteration of /kʰiəm p̄i/ (khâm-phủ, 欽府), not Guǎng-fǔ/Guǎng-zhōu (廣府/廣州). Thus, the massacre considered happened in Qīn-fǔ/Khâm-phủ (Qīn-zhōu).

So, it is considered that so called "Juku Kuron/Shú Kūn-lún (熟崑崙) or Chinese merchant/diplomat from Qīn-zhōu was early Muslim Chinese (or generation of mixed race between Chinese and Arabs/Persians). There is almost no record about Champa (崑崙國/林邑國/占城國)'s envoys' name dispatched to the Táng (唐) dynasty. However, under the next dynasty - the Sòng dynasty (there are

⁴⁶ The letter of "Chì Rì-běn guó-wáng-shū" drafted by Zhāng Jiǔ-líng in the Year Kāi-yuán 23 of the emperor Táng Xuán-zōng (735 AD, yī-hài 乙亥) says: 勅日本國王。王明樂美御德。彼禮義之國。神靈所扶。滄溟往來。未嘗爲患。不知去歲。何負幽明。丹墀真人廣成等入朝東歸。初出江口。雲霧斗暗。所向迷方。俄遭惡風。諸船漂蕩。其後一船在越州界。即真人廣成尋已發歸。計當至國。一船漂入南海。即朝臣名代。艱虞備至。性命僅存。名代未發之間。又得廣州表奏。朝臣廣成等漂至林邑國。既在異域。言語不通。並被劫掠。或殺或賣。言念災患。所不忍聞。然林邑諸國。比常朝貢。朕已勅安南都護。令宣勅告示。見在者令其送來。待至之日。當存撫發遣。又一船不知所在。永用疚懷。或已達本蕃。有來人可具奏。此等災變。良不可測。卿等忠信則爾。何負神明。而使彼行人。罹此凶害。想卿聞此。當用驚嗟。然天壤悠悠。各有命也。冬中甚冷。卿及首領百姓並平安好。今朝臣名代選。一一令口具。遣書指不多及。(張九齡起草「勅日本國王書」唐玄宗開元二十三年)

⁴⁷ See: Eusebius Renaudot (1733), Gérald Ferrand (1891-1902, 1912) and Kuwabara Jitsuzō (1923).

⁴⁸ There is no account/description on "Khānfū/Guǎng-zhōu massacre" around 789 AD in the *Huáng Cháo liè-zhuàn*, Book 200 (second volume) of the *Jiǔ Tàng shū* (edited by Liú Xū et al., completed in 945, 劉昫等撰『舊唐書』卷二百下, 黃巢列傳), and Book 225 (second volume) of the *Xīn Tàng shū* (edited by Ōu-yáng Xiū et al., completed in 1060, 歐陽修等撰『新唐書』卷二百二十五下, 黃巢列傳).

⁴⁹ See: Page 168-169, Book 7 of *Nukhbat al-dahr fī ajā'ib al barr wa al-bahr, bāb assāba'a* (French title: *Cosmographie*) by Dimashqi (1325-1327), and its French translation by Gérald Ferrand (1913-1914).

two Sòng dynasties in China's history, the Liú Sòng 劉宋: 420-479 AD and the Zhào Sòng 趙宋: 960-1279 AD), most of Champa's envoys' name dispatched to the Sòng were recorded⁵⁰. As the Table 5 shows, most of envoys had Muslim-likely name like Pú (蒲=Abu), Lǐ (李=Ali) (Tasaka Kōdō 1952, Dohi Yūko 2017). They had a wide range network of Muslim (included Muslim Chinese) surround whole Southern China and whole Southeast Asian countries (Kuwabara Jitsuzō 1923: 141-142). Although the royal family of Champa at that time was Hinduist Gaṅgārāja family (Sugimoto Naojirō 1941), Muslim took full control of its diplomacy. Muslim Chinese-origin people's role in Champa is similar as Chinese migrant's descendants in ancient Japan (Yamato).

Table 5: Foreign-origin envoys of Champa (Vietnam) dispatched to the Sòng (宋, 960-1279)

		Number of appearances	Concrete names (in Chinese character)
Total number of mission dispatch		32	
Envoys with names (Includes multiple envoys in one dispatch)		20	
Considered Muslim	Surname Pú 蒲, Pú 莆	2	蒲思馬、蒲訶散
	Surname Lǐ 李	8	李畔、李被瑤、李牌、李磨勿、李朝仙、李臻、李良莆、李波珠
	Surname Zhū 朱	2	朱淳禮、朱陳堯
	Surname Lí 黎	1	黎姑倫
	Non-Chinese (Hē 訶), Name without Chinese style surname	1	訶散
Considered Non-Muslim	Considered Non-Chinese, More than 4 characters	6	因陀玢李帝婆羅、蒲薩陀婆、蒲息陀琶、李蒲薩麻瑕陀琶、李木吒哆、布祿爹地加

Source: *The Sòng shǐ*.

Conclusion

There is no doubt that the Chinese who migrated to Manchuria and Korea in ancient era contributed to the formation of Koma (Goryeo/Gao-lì 高麗 or Goguryeo/Gao-jù-lì 高句麗), Kudara (Baekje/Bai-jì 百濟), and Shiragi (Silla/Xin-luó 新羅). Chinese migrants to Bǎi-yuè (百越) territories like the Zhào (Triệu 趙)'s administration in Nán-yuè (Nam Việt 南越) under the Hàn (漢) dynasty, the Shì (士) administration in Jiāo-zhǐ (Giao-chí 交趾) under the Wú (吳) dynasty also contributed to the regional economy and nation formation of present Guǎng-dōng (廣東), Guǎng-xī (廣西) and Vietnam (越南). However, while Chinese migrants and aboriginal Bǎi-yuè tribes have consistently been wide range of fusion since ancient times until Islam arrival era, the fusion of Chinese migrants in Manchuria-Korea and those aboriginal tribes has been limited. Chinese migrants there wanted to keep Chinese language and custom. When the non-Chinese-speaking ruling class emerged, Chinese

⁵⁰ See: the descriptions on the Champa (Zhān-chéng) in the Wài-guó liè-zhuàn, Book 489 of the *Sòng shǐ*. (『宋史』卷四百八十九, 外國列傳, 占城條)

migrants were separated. Some groups stayed there and served Manchurian and Korean ruling classes as bureaucrats and/or technocrats. And other groups like ancestors of Hata-uji clan left Manchuria and Korea, resettled in Yamato (Wō 倭, Japan) as agriculture and sericulture's technical groups. After arrival Yamato, both Hata-uji (秦氏) and Aya-uji (漢氏) clans married to the Yamato tribe and assimilated into Yamato, developed famous sub-clans/families such as Sakanoue-shi (坂上氏, descendants' clan of Aya-uji⁵¹), Shimazu-shi (嶋津氏, descendants' clan of Hata-uji⁵²).

Although the Chinese-origin Japanese were the majority in members of both the Kenzuishi (遣隋使) and early Kentōshi (遣唐使), the members of Yamato aristocrats such as the former royal family (皇別氏族) and Fujiwara-uji (Fujiwara-shi 藤原氏) also participated as envoys, scholars, and monks from the beginning. Since the defeat of the battle of Hakusukinoe (白村江) or Baek-gang-gu/Bái-jīāng-kǒu (白江口), Yamato's diplomatic efforts to build peace continued. Yamato did not engage in foreign war for more than 100 years after the Hakusukinoe. That means Yamato's diplomatic negotiations had been functioning for over a hundred years. Especially, Fujiwara-no Kiyokawa (藤原清河, his Chinese style name is Ka Sei or Hé Qīng 河清), who came to the Táng in 759 and died in the Táng before 778 made huge contribution. He himself married to a Chinese female and had a daughter of mixed race between Chinese and Japanese, and named Kijō (Xī Niáng 喜娘) as a new generation of Overseas Japanese. During Kiyokawa's stay in the Táng, Yamato prepared many attack plans on Shiragi. However, those attack plans were finally not carried out because of his successful negotiations with both the Táng and Shiragi. Since 780, both the Táng and Shiragi had been weakened by the civil war. The functioning of Yamato's diplomacy has revealed Yamato's advantages in the competition between nations. Yamato's gradual abolition of corps (諸國兵士皆從停廢) after 792 is believed to have been one of the outcomes of that advantages.

☆ ☆ ☆

Supplement: A Kuron boatman became a god: Nii-hata-gami

Sixty four years after the envoy/kentō-hōgan (遣唐判官) Heguri-no Hironari (平群廣成) was washed ashore in Kuron-koku (崑崙國, the kingdom of Champa located in Central Vietnam, 735 AD, yǐ-hài 乙亥), conversely, a young Kuron-bito/Kūn-lún-rén (崑崙人) on the boat was washed ashore in Mikawa-no-kuni province (參河國, Year En'ryaku 18, 799 AD, jǐ-mǎo 己卯), Central Japan's Pacific coast. Like the "Yuè boatman" in the *Shuō-yuàn* (說苑, c06 BC), this "Kuron boatman" also

⁵¹ See: *Tamuramaro-denki* (Minamoto-no Moroyoshi c1155), Book 64 of the *Gunsho-ruijū* (c1819) and Note 28.

⁵² See: *Seiwa-genji Tameyoshi-ryū Shimazu*, Book 108 of the *Kansei Chōshū Shokafu* (1789-1801).

sung a beautiful (and sad) songs while playing a single stringed instrument⁵³. Different from Heguri-no Hironari in Kuron-koku, at that time (Year En'ryaku 18) the Ō-Yamato-no-kuni/Nippon-koku (日本國, Japan) was a peaceful country without corps, so he was not attacked, not killed by troopers. And he had a talent, brought seeds of cotton and he knew how to grow it. As the Uji clan names like Hata (cloth, weaving) and Aya (textile patterns) show, in Yamato under the barter economy, textiles made from "asa 麻/大麻" (hemp/*Cannabis sativa*), "kaji/kazi 梶樹/穀樹" (*Broussonetia kazinoki*), "kōzo 楮樹" (*Broussonetia kazinoki* × *B. papyrifera*), "kiwata 木綿樹" (cotton tree/*Bombax ceiba*) and "ki'ito 絲綢" (raw silk made by Silkworm/*Bombyx mori*) were the same as cash crops, and were the most important in its national economy. The Kuron-bito brought cotton (*Gossypium arboreum*) to Yamato, which was not previously in Yamato. At that time, it was called the "nii-hata" (new hata, that is, new weaving/textile material), and now, it is called "hawata/menka 葉綿/綿花" (that is, "cotton" in Modern Japanese). Naturally, the imperial court favored this Kuron-bito and, at his request, set up his residence nearby Kawara-dera (川原寺) temple in the Yamato-no-kuni (大和國) province, and rested him⁵⁴. After that, he taught people how to grow cotton in various areas. *Hope his soul had met a prince who deserves to serve in Yamato!*

⁵³ One of the representatives of the intangible culture of the Cham (descendants of both Lín-yì 林邑, North Champa and Zhān-bō/Zhān-chéng 瞻波/瞻婆/占婆/占城, South Champa) is the music played by single-stringed instrument called ka-niy (Đàng Nãng Hòa 唐能和 2012 & 2019) and the representative of its material culture is the cotton fabric (Tôn Nữ Quỳnh Trân 尊女瓊珍 2003, Iwanaga Etsuko 2005, Thành Phần 成分 2013), it is called "mānyim liwei mǎhlei" in Cham ("mǎhlei" means cotton in Cham). This Kuron-bito/Kūn-lún-rén (崑崙人) brought both two things to Yamato/Japan. So, it is considered that he was a Cham. Like famous monk and musician Buttetsu/Fó-zhé (佛哲/佛徹/佛誓), another Cham intellectual who arrival Yamato/Japan with Bodaisenna/Bodhisena (菩提僊那) in 736, a person arrival Yamato before him called Tenjiku-bito (天竺人), whole Southeast Asia at that time was considered as a part of the Greater India. This nameless Kuron-bito is considered Non-Muslim, so, he called himself a Tenjiku-bito, an Indian, and/or a Hindu, too. Eighteens year after arrival of Buttetsu/Fó-zhé, in 754, when Ganjin/Jiàn-zhēn (鑑真/鑿真) arrival Yamato (Japan), Gunpōriki/Jūn-fǎ-lì (軍法力) of Kurun/Kūn-lún (崑崙 = Lín-yì 林邑, North Champa) and Zenchō (善聽) of Senba/Zhān-bō (瞻波, South Champa) arrival Yamato together. So, there were total four people who are considered arrival Yamato from/via Champa (Vietnam) in 8th century.

- The *Dai'anji Bodai denraiki* quoted in the Chapter 3, Book 2 of the *Tōdaiji-yōroku* (c1106) says: 去天平五年<歲次癸酉>四月三日。遣唐大使多治比真人廣成、副使大中臣朝臣名代等、並留學僧玄昉。經歷唐國三箇歲也。即同八年<歲次丙子>七月廿日。還歸聖崖。忽乘件船南天竺婆羅門僧菩提、大唐僧道璿、瞻婆國僧。此云林邑北天竺國佛哲等也。(無名氏撰「大安寺菩提傳來記」『東大寺要錄』卷二, 供養章第三)

- The *Nan'Tenjiku Baramon-sōjō-hi* (770), No. 169, Book 69 of the *Gunsho-ruijū* (c1819) says: 僧正諱菩提僊那。姓波羅遲。波羅門種也。(中略)以大唐開元十八年十二月十三日。與同伴林邑僧佛徹、唐國僧道璿。隨船泛海。(中略)以天平八年五月十八日。得到筑紫大宰府。(修榮撰「南天竺婆羅門僧正碑」)

- The description on the Year Ten'pyō 18 (745 AD, yī-yōu 乙酉) of Ame-shirushi-kuni-oshiharaki-toyo-sakurahiko-no sumera-mikoto (Shōmu) of the *Fusō-ryakuki* (c1094) says: 或記云。北天竺林邑國佛誓和尚。(皇圓撰『扶桑略記』聖武天皇天平十八年條)

⁵⁴ The description on the Year En'ryaku 18-19 (799 -800 AD, jǐ-mǎo 己卯,) of Yamato-neko-sumerogi-iyateri-no sumera-mikoto (Kan'mu), Book 8 of the *Nihon-kōki* says: 延曆十八年。(中略)七月。(中略)是月。有一人乘小船。漂着參河國。以布覆背。有犢鼻。左肩著紺布。形似袈裟。年可廿。身長五尺五分。耳長三寸餘。言語不通。不知何國人。大唐人等見之。僉曰。崑崙人。後頗習中國語。自謂天竺人。常彈一弦琴。歌聲哀楚。閱其資物。有如草實者。謂之綿種。依其願令住川原寺。即賣隨身物。立屋西郭外路邊。令窮人休息焉。後遷住近江國分寺。(中略)延曆十九年。(中略)四月。(中略)庚辰。以流來崑崙人實綿種。賜紀伊、淡路、阿波、讚岐、伊豫、土佐及大宰府等諸國。殖之。其法先簡陽地沃壤。掘之作穴。深一寸。衆穴相去四

A thousand year later, 18th to 19th centuries, Owari-no-kuni and Mikawa-no-kuni provinces (the combination of the two is now Aichi prefecture) became Japan's largest cotton cultivation area⁵⁵. The Kuron-bitō was deified as Nii-hata-gami (the cotton ancestor god), and is enshrined at the Tenjiku-jinja (天竹神社) shrine nearby Mikawa-no-kuni's seashore where he landed, currently Nishio city, Aichi prefecture (Tajima Isao 2015). The Toyota Motor Corporation, headquartered in Aichi, started out as a loom manufacturer because of the presence of vast cotton fields in Aichi at that time.

References

- ABE Akio: review, KOJIMA Noriyuki: annotations (1969, Reprint 1988). *Shoki-shūge*. Four volumes. 阿部秋生解題、小島憲之本文補注『書紀集解』全四冊, 京都: 臨川書店.
- ABE Masaaki (1980). A study on Yuè-rén-gē (in Japanese). 阿部正明「越人歌小攷」國學院大學大學院紀要文學研究科 (26): 251-276. 東京: 國學院大學.
- ASTON, William George: English translation and annotations (1896). *Nihongi* 日本紀: *chronicles of Japan from the earliest times to A.D. 697*, London, England: The Japan society.
- AUROUSSEAU, Losnard (1923). La première conquête chinoise des pays annamites IIIe siècle avant notre ère, *BEFEO (Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient)*, Tome 23: 136-246. Paris, France: EFEO (L'École française d'Extrême-Orient).
- Anonymous (After 811, Revised edition 1928, Reprint 1957). *Sakanoue-keizu*. in the *Zoku gunsho-ruijū*, Book 185, 381-394. 無名氏撰「坂上系圖」『續群書類從』卷百八十五, 東京: 續群書類從完成會. Open resource on the website of DL-NDL (Digital Library of the National Diet Library of Japan) (Inside library use only): <https://dl.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/2933573>
- Anonymous (Before 1106, Revised edition 2019). *Dai'anji Bodai denraiki*. in the Chapter 3, Book 2 of the *Tōdaiji-yōroku*. 無名氏撰「大安寺菩提傳來記」『東大寺要録』卷二, 供養章第三, 奈良: 東大寺史研究所. Open resource on the website of Senshū University Off1024: <http://www.senshu-u.ac.jp/~off1024/nenpyoushiryou/toudaijiyouroku/todaijiyouroku2-736-0720.htm>
- BÓ Yáng: Modern Chinese translation (1993), *Héng tiāo qiáng lín: Zī-zhī-tōng-jiàn Book 70*. 柏楊譯『橫挑強鄰: 資治通鑑第七十集』臺北: 遠流出版公司.
- CHAMBERLAIN, Basil Hall: English translation, ASTON, William George: annotations (1932). *The Kojiki* 古事記, or *Records of ancient matters*, Tōkyō, Japan: The Asiatic Society of Japan.
- CHÉN Jié-míng et al. (2019). Genetic Structure of the Han Chinese Population Revealed by Genome-wide SNP Variation. 陳傑明等「全基因組 SNP 變異揭示漢族人口的遺傳結構」. *American Journal of Human Genetics*, 85(6), 775-785. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cell Press. Open resource on the website of Cell Press: [https://www.cell.com/ajhg/fulltext/S0002-9297\(09\)00471-6](https://www.cell.com/ajhg/fulltext/S0002-9297(09)00471-6)
- CHOI Jae-sōk (2011). *Ancient Korea-Japan relations and the Nihon-shoki*, Oxford, England: The Bardwell Press.
- ĐÀNG Năng Hòa (2012). Âm nhạc dân gian Chăm. 唐能和「占民間音樂」. *Journal of science: Tap chí Khoa học*, 7(1), 89-96. Hochiminh City, Vietnam: Hochiminh City Open University. Open resource on the website of Hochiminh City Open University: <http://journalofscience.ou.edu.vn/index.php/soci-vi/article/view/1196/975>
- ĐÀNG Năng Hòa (2019). Âm nhạc dân gian Chăm. 唐能和「占民間音樂」. Hanoi, Vietnam: Nxb. Tri Thức.
- DIMASHQĪ (Shaykh Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Abī Ṭālib al-Dimashqī, 1325-1327, Reprint 1866). *Nukhbat al-dahr fī aḡā'ib al barr wa al-baḡ; bāb assāba'a* (French title: *Cosmographie*). Saint-Petersbourg, Russia: L'Académie Impériale des Sciences. Open resource on the website of Archive.org: <https://archive.org/details/cosmographie00muam/page/n15/mode/2up>

尺。乃洗種漬之。令經一宿。明旦殖之。一穴四枚。以土掩之。以手按之。每旦水灌。常令潤澤。待生芸〔耘〕之。〔『日本後紀』卷八, 日本根子皇統彌照天皇〔桓武〕延曆十八年條、卷九, 延曆十九年條〕

⁵⁵ See: Ukita Tsuneyoshi 1955. According to the Japanese poem (waka) written on the Theme of cotton, Book 5 (Jō 5), the *Shinsen Rokujō-dai Waka*, edited by Kinugasa Ieyoshi et al., completed in 1243 (『新撰六帖題和歌』第五帖, 題綿), cotton varieties brought by Kuronbito were extinct by circa 1243. Kinugasa Ieyoshi (衣笠家良)'s poem says: *Shikishima-no Yamato-niwa aranu Karabito-no ueteshi wata-no tane-wa ta'eniki*. (敷島のやまとの國にはあらぬ, から人の植えてし綿の種は絶へにき. *What pity it is! Karabito (Kuronbito) brought and planted cotton that was not originally in Shikishima-no Yamato (Japan), but the seeds eventually became extinct!*). The cotton varieties of the Mikawa-no-kuni province in the 18th and 19th centuries were imported from Korea or China in the 16th-17th centuries.

- DOHI Yūko (2017). *Sōdai Nankai bōekishi-no kenkyū*. 土肥祐子『宋代南海貿易史の研究』東京：汲古書院。
- EBATA Takashi (1989). Kishi Chōsen kaikoku-denshō-no tenkai: Kanjo, Giryaku, Gishi-o chūshin-ni. 江畑武「箕子朝鮮開國傳承の展開：「漢書」「魏略」「魏志」を中心に」阪南論集人文・自然科学編 25(1-3), 31-41.
- FÉNG Chéng-jūn: Chinese translation (1930, Revised edition 2002). *Kūn-lún jí Nán-hāi gū-dài háng-xíng-kǎo*. 馮承鈞譯『費瑯著崑崙及南海古代航行考』(*Les Musulmans à Madagascar et aux îles Comores* par Ferrand) 北京：中華書局。
- FERRAND, Gérald (1891-1902). *Les Musulmans à Madagascar et aux îles Comores*. Paris, France: Ernest Leroux. Open resource on the website of Gallica.bnf: <https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k75530x.image>
- FERRAND, Gérald (1913-1914). *Relations de voyages et textes géographiques arabes, persans et turks relatifs à l'Extreme-Orient du 8e au 18e siècles; traduits, revus et annotés*. Paris, France: Ernest Leroux. Open resource on the website of Archive.org: <https://archive.org/details/revisionsdevoynag1a2ferrouft/page/392/mode/2up>
- FERRAND, Gérald (1922, Reprint 1944). *Voyage du marchand arabe Sulaymān en Inde et en Chine rédigé en 851 suivi de remarques*. Tōkyō: Tōyōdō. 東京：東洋堂。Open resource on the website of DL-NDL (Digital Library of the National Diet Library of Japan) (Inside library use only): <https://dl.ndl.jp/info:ndljp/pid/1700231>
- HIGASHIMURA Junko (2004). Textile production systems at the beginning of the ritsuryō era based on archaeological analysis (in Japanese). 東村純子「古代日本の紡織体制：棊(かせ)・緹(かせ)かけ・糸棊の分析から」史林, 87(5), 603-641.
- HAGA Yaichi: annotations (1913). *Kōshō Kon'jaku Monogatari-shū, Three volumes*. 芳賀矢一編『攷證今昔物語集』上、中、下, 東京：富山房。Open resource on the website of DL-NDL (Digital Library of the National Diet Library of Japan): <https://dl.ndl.jp/info:ndljp/pid/945415>
- HOTTA Masa'atsu: editor-in-chief (1789-1801, Reprint 1964). *Seiwa-genji Tameyoshi-ryū Shimazu*. in Book 108 of the *Kansei Chōshū Shokafu*. 堀田正敦撰「清和源氏爲義流嶋津」『寛政重修諸家譜』卷百八, 東京：續群書類従完成會。
- INOUE Hideo and JEONG Jo-myo: Japanese translation and annotations (1980-1988), *Sangoku-shiki/Samguku-sagi*, Four volumes. 井上英雄、鄭早苗譯注『三國史記』全四冊, 東京：平凡社東洋文庫。
- IWANAGA Etsuko (2005). Tōnan-Asia orimono-bunka-ni okeru Cambodia: Cham-Malay-jin-no gijutsu-o chūshin-ni. 岩永悦子「東南アジア織物文化におけるカンボジア：チャム・マレー人の技術を中心に」季刊民族學 29(2), 94-97. 大阪：國立民族學博物館。
- IZUI Hisanosuke (1953). A propos d'une chanson indéchiffrée dans le Shuō-yuàn de Liú Xiàng (in Japanese). 泉井久之助「劉向「說苑」卷十一の越歌について」言語研究 (22+23): 41-45, 195. 日本言語學會。Open resource on the website of J-STAGE: https://www.jstage.jst.go.jp/article/gengo1939/1953/22-23/1953_22-23_41/_pdf/_char/ja
- JIĀNG Yǒng (c1762, Reprint 1860), *Chūn-qiū dì-lǐ kǎo-shí*, Four volume. 江永撰『春秋地理考實』四卷, 清文宗咸豐十年, 皇清經解卷二五二~二五五。
- KAMO Masanori (1984). On the writing motive of "Iki-no-muraji Hakatko-no-sho" (in Japanese). 加茂正典「『伊吉連博徳書』の再検討：その執筆動機に就いて」文化史學 (40): 101-117. 京都：同志社大學。
- KARLGRÉN, Bernhard (1957, Arranged version c1997). *Dictionary of old and middle Chinese: Grammata serica recenssa*. 高本漢『漢文典』。Alphabetically arranged by Tor Ulving (Orientalia Gothoburgensia 11), Database on the website of Hān-zì Gǔ-jīn-yīn Zì-liào-kù (漢字古今音資料庫): <https://xiaoxue.iis.sinica.edu.tw/ccr/>
- KATAYAMA Tsuyoshi (2013). Kanzoku-to Hi-Kanzoku-o meguru shijitsu-to gensetsu. 片山剛「漢族と非漢族をめぐる史實と言説」『現代中國に関する十三の問い：中國地域研究講義第一卷』, 3-25. 大阪：大阪大學中國文化フォーラム。Open resource on the website of OUFC (Ōsaka University Forum on China): <http://www.law.osaka-u.ac.jp/~c-forum/box5/katayama.pdf>
- KATŌ Kenkichi (2001). *Kishi-to Kōchi-no-Aya-shi*. 加藤謙吉『吉士と西漢氏』東京：白水社。
- KAWATE Shō (2016). The governance system of Nán-yuè and abandoning Zhū-yá county in Hān era (in Japanese). 川手翔生「南越の統治體制と漢代の珠崖郡放棄」史観 (174): 45-61. 東京：早稲田大學。
- KAWAMURA Hidene and KAWAMURA Shigene (1785-1806). *Shoki-shūge* (書紀集解), Twenty volumes (Thirty books). 河村殷根、河村益根撰『書紀集解』全二十冊 (全三十卷)。Open resource on the website of Aichi Prefecture Library Digital Collection (last modified 06/02/2015 10:22:54): <https://websv.aichi-pref-library.jp/wahon/detail/57.html>
- KIMURA Noriko (1999). Kodai iryō-goi-to sono uta-kotoba: asa-to kiwata-o megutte. 木村紀子「古代衣料語彙とその歌言葉：麻と木綿をめぐる」奈良大學紀要 (27), 37-51. 奈良：奈良大學。
- KINUGASA Ieyoshi et al. (1243, Revised edition 1906-1909, Reprint 2003). *Shinsen Rokujō-dai Waka* in the *Zoku-zoku gunsho-ruijū*, Book 14, 101-178. 衣笠家良等撰「新撰六帖題和歌」『續群書類従』卷十四, 東京：續群書類従完成會。
- KINH VIỆT/TRẦM Tinh Nguyên (2010). Phát hiện lại về Việt Nhân Ca, 沈永願「發現史衛越人歌」on the blog *Giao Duyên* (last modified 10/23/2020 13:50:07): <http://tramtinhhuyen.blogspot.com/2010/12/phat-hien-lai-ve-vie-t-nhan-ca-viet.html>
- KOBAYASHI Kiyohiko (1946). *Nhon-shoki-no rekijitsu-ni tsuite*. 小林清彦『日本書紀の暦日について』未公開。Open resource on the website of Science Library (Kagaku-toshokan, last modified 05/05/2015 13:10:26):

- <http://fomalhautpsa.sakura.ne.jp/Science/OgawaKiyohiko/shoki-rekijyutu.pdf>
- KOBAYASHI Toshio (2016). A study on the word "Japan" in the epitaph for Ye Gun (in Japanese). 小林敏男「禰軍墓誌銘の「日本」と白村江戦前後」大東文化大學紀要人文科學 (54): 272-255. 東京：大東文化大學。
- KŌEN (c1094, Revised version 1964, Reprint 2007). *Fusō-ryakuki*. 皇圓撰『扶桑略記』, 國史大系新訂増補第十二卷, 東京：吉川弘文館。
- KŌNO Ryōsen (1999). Buttetsu (Fō-zhé)-no motarashita Shittan, Shōmyō, Rin'yū-gaku (Xī-tán, Shēng-míng, Lín-yì-yuè)-to-wa nanika. 河野亮仙「佛哲のもたらした悉曇・声明・林邑樂とは何か」山家學會紀要 (2), 98-106. 東京：大正大學山家學會。
- KUWABARA Jitsuzō (1923). *Hojukō-no jiseki*. 桑原隲藏『蒲壽庚の事蹟』上海：東亞攻究會。Open resource on the website of DL-NDL (Digital Library of the National Diet Library of Japan): <https://dl.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/980485>
- LEGGE, James: English translation and annotations (1865, Revised edition 2014). *Book of Documents, Shàng-shū* 尚書 (*The Shū-king, Book of History*). Los Angeles, California: Lion-Share Media.
- LEGGE, James: English translation and annotations (1871, Revised edition 2014). *Shī-jīng* 詩經, *Book of Odes (The She-king: Classic of Poetry)*. Los Angeles, California: Lion-Share Media.
- MAHITO GENKAI/Ōmi-no Mifune (779, Revised edition c1819, Reprint 1960). *Tō Daiwajō Tōseiden in the Gunsho-ruijū*, Book 69. 真人元開/淡海三舟撰「唐大和上東征傳」『群書類從』卷六十九, 東京：續群書類從完成會。Open resource on the website of DL-NDL (Digital Library of the National Diet Library of Japan) (Inside library use only): <https://dl.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/2934515>
- MAHITO GENKAI/Ōmi-no Mifune (779, Revised/Copied time unknown). *Tō Daiwajō Tōseiden in the Gunsho-ruijū*, Book 69. 真人元開/淡海三舟 [三船] 撰「唐大和上東征傳」『群書類從』卷六十九, 東京：續群書類從完成會。Open resource on the website of DL-NDL (Digital Library of the National Diet Library of Japan) (Inside library use only): <https://dl.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/2934515>
- MAHITO GENKAI/Ōmi-no Mifune (779, Copied after 1192). *Tō Daiwajō Tōseiden* stored in the Nishio-shi Iwase-bunko. 真人玄開 [元開] /淡海三船撰「唐大和上東征傳」恒川了廬藏書本, 西尾市岩瀬文庫管理記號 140-53. Open resource on the website of NIJL (National Institute of Japanese Literature): http://base1.nijl.ac.jp/view/Frame.jsp?DB_ID=G0003917KTM&C_CODE=0214-27202
- MANDA-NO-MIKO et al. (815, Revised edition c1819, Reprint 1959) *Shinsen Shōjiroku* in the *Gunsho-ruijū*, Book 448 first and second volume. 萬多親王等撰「新撰姓氏錄」『群書類從』卷四百四十八上、下, 東京：續群書類從完成會。Open resource on the website of DL-NDL (Digital Library of the National Diet Library of Japan): <https://dl.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/2576267?tocOpened=1>
- MATSUDA Hisao (1941a). *Kuron-haku-no kairan*. 松田壽男「崑崙舶の解纜：南海史序說覺書」鴨台史報 (7/8), 1-23. 東京：大正大學。
- MATSUDA Hisao (1941b). *Kuron-koku-kō*. 松田壽男「崑崙國攷」國學院雜誌 74(1), 13-32. 東京：國學院大學。
- MINAMOTO-no Moroyoshi (c1155, Revised edition c1819, Reprint 1960). *Tamuramaro-denki* in the *Gunsho-ruijū*, Book 64, 44-45. 源師能撰「田邑麻呂傳記」『群書類從』卷六十四, 東京：續群書類從完成會。Open resource on the website of DL-NDL (Digital Library of the National Diet Library of Japan): <https://dl.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/2559094?tocOpened=1>
- MIURA Keiichi (1957). *Kishi-ni tsuite*. 三浦圭一「吉士について」日本史研究 (34): 27-45. 日本歴史研究會。
- MIYAZAKI Yasumitsu: annotations (1989). *Kokushi-bunin*. Six volumes. 宮崎康充『國司補任』東京：續群書類從完成會。
- MORI Kimiyuki (1998). *Kodai Nippon-no taigai-ninshiki-to tsūkō*. 森公章『古代日本の対外認識と通交』東京：吉川弘文館。
- MOTOORI Norinaga (1790-1822, Reprint 1944). *Kojikiden*. Eleven volumes. 本居宣長『古事記傳』全十一冊, 東京：中文館書店。
- NAKA Michiyo (1893). *Kōkuri kohikō*. 那珂通世「高句麗古碑考」史學雜誌 49. 東京：東京帝國大學。
- NAKA Michiyo (1915, Reprint 1958). *Hakujinkō*. 那珂通世「貂人考」『外交釋史』東京：岩波書店。
- NURNI WAHYU WURYANDARI (2014). Study on the documents of Java in Si-kū Quán-shū (四庫全書); Historical knowledge and historians' point of view. *Wacana, Journal of the Humanities of Indonesia*, 15(1), 190-200. Open resource on the website of Jurnal Kebijakan Ekonomi, Universitas Indonesia: <http://www.jke.feb.ui.ac.id/index.php/wacana/article/view/4114>
- OCHIAI Shigenobu (1972). A study of technical groups of jōri cultivation in ancient Japan: Is Katsube equivalent to it? (in Japanese). 落合重信「古代条里制開拓技術集団についての考察：勝部がそれに該当するか」人文地理 24(4), 468-473. 人文地理學會。
- ODA Fujio (2015). The postwar process and international relations of the Battle of Baek-gang (in Japanese). 小田富士雄「白村江戦の戦後処理と國際關係」古文化談叢 (73): 211-226. 九州古文化研究會。
- OGATA Korekiyo (1953). *Nara, Hei'an ryōchōni okeru kangaku-shi-no kenkyū*. 緒方惟精『奈良平安兩朝に於ける漢學史の研究』未公刊。Open resource on the website of DL-NDL (Digital Library of the National Diet Library of Japan): <https://dl.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/1660898>
- OGAWA Hiroshi (1967). *The Kūn-lún-nú* (in Japanese). 小川博「崑崙奴考」民族學研究 32(3), 211-212. 日本文

- 化人類學會。
- ÖNISHI Kazuhiko (2015). Nichietsu-kōryū-ni okeru Rin'yū-sō Buttetsu (Lín-yì-sēng Fó-zhé)-no jiseki. 大西和彦「日越交流における林邑僧佛哲の事跡」*Lịch sử và triển vọng mối quan hệ Việt Nam-Nhật Bản: Nhìn từ miền Trung Việt Nam*, 24-45. Hanoi, Vietnam: Nxb. Thông tin và Truyền thông. Open resource on the website of Cham Studies: <https://chamstudies.wordpress.com/2015/11/19/>
- ŌTA Akira (1940). *Shinsen Shōji-roku-to jōdai shizoku-shi*. 太田亮『新撰姓氏録と上代氏族史』東京：文部省教育局。Open resource on the website of DL-NDL (Digital Library of the National Diet Library of Japan): <https://dl.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/1109727>
- RENAUDOT, Eusebius: French translation and annotations (1733, Revised edition 2010). *Ancient Accounts of India and China, by Two Mohammedan Travellers (Sulaiman al-Tajir and Abū Zayd Hasan ibn Yazīd Strāfī)*. Farmington Hills, Michigan: Gale ECCO (Gale Eighteenth Century Collections Online), Print Editions.
- SAEKI Arikio (1962). *Shinsen Shōji-roku-no kenkyū*. Two volumes. 佐伯有清『新撰姓氏録の研究』本文篇、研究篇，東京：吉川弘文館。Open resource on the website of DL-NDL (Digital Library of the National Diet Library of Japan) (Inside library use only): <https://dl.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/2529718/1>
- SAEKI Ariyoshi: annotations (1928). *Rikukokushi*. Twelve volumes. 佐伯有義編『六國史』全十二冊，東京：朝日新聞社。Open resource on the website of DL-NDL (Digital Library of the National Diet Library of Japan): <https://dl.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/1172831>
- SAKAMOTO Tarō (1960). *Nihon-shoki-to Iki-no muraji Hakatoko*. 坂本太郎「日本書紀と伊吉連博徳」『日本古代史論叢：西田先生頌壽記念』，303-316。東京：吉川弘文館。
- SAKAMOTO Tarō et al.: annotations (1965). *Nihon-shoki*, Two volumes. (坂本太郎他校注『日本書紀』上、下，東京：岩波書店)
- SAKAYA/TRUÔNG Văn Món and SHINE Toshihiko (2015). *Cham-Vietnamese-English-Japanese vocabulary*. Tōkyō, Japan: ILCAA-TUFS (Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tōkyō University of Foreign Studies). Open resource on the website of ILCAA-TUFS: <http://www.aa.tufs.ac.jp/documents/training/ilc/textbooks/2014Cham2.pdf>
- SHIMOMUKAI Tatsuhiko (1997). En'ryaku jūichinen gundan-heishi haishi-no rekishiteki-igi: ritsuryō-kokkaron-e-no teigen. 下向井龍彦「延暦十一年軍團兵士制廢止の歴史的意義：律令國家論への提言」史人 (1), 2-13. 廣嶋：廣嶋大學。
- SHINE Toshihiko (2014). Shichi-Hasseiki-no Kuron-ni tsuite. 新江利彦「七～八世紀の崑崙について」未公開。Open resource on the website of the ResearchGate: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342098122_qibashijinokunluntolinyinitsuite_xinjiangliyan
- SHIRATORI Kurakichi (1925). *Asia Hokuzoku-no ben'patsu-ni tsuite*. 白鳥庫吉「亞細亞北族の辮髮に就いて」史學雜誌 37(1)(3)(4). 東京：東京帝國大學。
- SHIRATORI Kurakichi (1936). *Fuyo-koku-no shiso Tōmei-ō-no densetsu-ni tsuite*. 白鳥庫吉「夫余國の始祖東明王の傳説に就いて」『服部先生古稀祝賀記念論文集』東京：富山房。
- SHŪEI (770, Revised edition c1819, Reprint 1959). *Nan Tenjiku Baramon-sōjō-hi*. in the *Gunsho-ruijū*, Book 69. 修榮撰「南天竺婆羅門僧正碑」『群書類從』卷六十九，東京：續群書類從完成會。Open resource on the website of Senshū University Off1024: <http://www.senshu-u.ac.jp/~off1024/nenpyoushiryou/minamitennjikubaramonnsoujou/minamitennjikubaramonsoujouhi-736-0823.htm>
- SUGIMOTO Naojirō (1941). *Heguri-no Hironari-no ekken-shitaru Kuron-ō: Rin'yū Gāngārāja dō-ō-no kenkyū*. 杉本直治郎「平群廣成等の謁見したる崑崙王：林邑 Gāngārāja 王統の研究」『紀元二千六百年記念史學論文集』，577-608。京都：内外出版。
- SUZUKI Yasutami and KANEKO Shūichi et al. (2014a). *Yakuchū Nippon Kodai-no gaikō-bunsho*. 鈴木靖民-金子修一編『譯註日本古代の外交文書』東京：八木書店。
- SUZUKI Yasutami and KANEKO Shūichi et al. (2014b). *Liáng-zhī-gòng-tú to Tōbu Eurasia-sekai*. 鈴木靖民-金子修一編『梁職貢圖と東部ユーラシア世界』東京：勉誠出版。
- TAJIMA Isao (2015). En'ryaku jūhachinen-no Kuron-jin (Tenjiku-jin)-no Mikawa-no-kuni hyōchaku-to watadane-no denrai. 田島公「延暦十八年の崑崙人（天竺人）の參河國漂着と綿種の傳來」新編西尾市史研究 (1), 8-20. 愛知県西尾市：西尾市史編纂室。
- TAKAHASHI Yōichirō (1991). *Xià Běn-jì and nine areas (in Japanese)*. 高橋庸一郎「夏本紀と九州」阪南論集人文自然科學編 26(3), 1-13. 大阪府松原市：阪南大學。
- TAKANO Shōji. (1998). *Kodai-no orimono-gijutsu*. 高野昌司「古代の織物技術」織維機械学会誌, 51(2), 45-48.
- TANAKA Fumio (1996). *Toraijin-to Nippon Kodai-kokka*. 田中史生『渡來人と日本古代國家』博士論文，東京：國學院大學。
- TANIGAWA Yoshisuke (1998). *Taiga Kan'eki-no haikai*. 谷口義介「大雅韓奕の背景」學林 (28+29), 1-24. 京都：中國藝文研究會。
- TASAKA Kōdō (1952). *An introduction of Mohammedanism into Champa (in Japanese)*. 田坂興道「占城回教史序説：東南アジア回教史序説の一部として」東方學 (4), 52-60. 東京：東方學會。

- TERAUCHI Hiroshi (2008). The abolition of the Japanese ancient corps (in Japanese). 寺内浩「軍團兵士制の廢止理由について」愛媛大學法文學部論集人文學科編 (25), 71-88. 松山: 愛媛大學.
- THÀNH Phần (2013). Traditional weaving of the Cham people in Vietnam. 成分「越南占人傳統編織」*Malay Studies*, April 24, 2013. Open resource on the website of Scribd: <https://www.scribd.com/document/137654788/Traditional-Weaving-of-the-Cham-People-in-Vietnam>
- THIẾU CHUÛ/NGÔ Hữu Kha (1942, Reprint 1998). *Hán-Việt Tự-Điển*. 吳有柯「漢越字典」. Hochiminh City, Vietnam: Nxb. Thành Phố Hồ Chí Minh.
- TOMIO Takehiro (2004). Ganjin Zuikōsha Kuronoku-jin Gunpōriki. 富尾武弘「鑑真隨行者崑崙國人軍法力」インドネシア言語と文化 (10), 99-101. 日本インドネシア学会
- TOMIO Takehiro (2008). A study on Kūn-lún-céng-qī: the interchange between the Malay world and Madagascar (in Japanese). 富尾武弘「崑崙層期國考: マライ世界とマダガスカルの交流」東洋史苑 (70+71), 1-35. 京都: 龍谷大學.
- TOMITA Haruo (1984). Gagaku-no naka-no Buttetsu (Fó-zhē). 富田春生「雅樂の中の佛哲」南方文化 (11), 119-137. 奈良縣天理市: 天理南方文化研究會.
- TÔN NỮ Quỳnh Trân et al. (2003). *Nghề dệt Chăm truyền thống*. 尊女瓊珍「傳統占人編織」. Hochiminh City, Vietnam: Nxb. Trẻ.
- TSUDA Sōkichi (1916). Music known as Lín-yì Origin in Japan (in Japanese). 津田左右吉「林邑樂に就いて」東洋學報 6(2), 257-272. 東京: 東洋文庫.
- TSUKAMOTO Tetsuzō: editor-in-chief (1920). *Kan'bun-sōsho 23: Zei'en*. 塚本哲三編『漢文叢書第二十三: 說苑』東京: 有朋堂.
- TSURUMA Kazuyuki (1992). Kodai Chūka-teikoku-no tōitsuhō-to chiiki: Shin-teikoku-no hō-to sono kyokōsei. 鶴間和幸「古代中華帝國の統一法と地域: 秦帝國の法とその虚構性」史潮 30: 16-29. 歴史學會.
- UKITA Tsuneyoshi (1955). The Cotton Production in Japan during the Edo Era (in Japanese). 浮田典良「江戸時代綿作の分布と立地に関する歴史地理學的考察」人文地理 7(4), 266-283,330. 人文地理學會.
- WADA Sei (1941). On the establishment of "Nán-yuè-guó" (in Japanese). 和田清「南越建國の始末」史林 62(1), 1-10. 京都: 史學研究會.
- WÁNG Yǒng (1998). *Tō-kara mita Kentōshi: Konketsuji-tachi-no Daitō-teikoku*. 王勇『唐から見た遣唐使: 混血兒たちの大唐帝國』東京: 講談社選書メチエ.
- WÁNG Yǒng (2009). The imperial embassies to the Táng dynasty and the people of mixed Chinese and Japanese parentage (in Japanese). 王勇「遣唐使時代の中日混血兒」亞細亞文化交流研究 (4), 19-30. 大阪府吹田市: 關西大學.
- WÁNG Yǒng: editor-in-chief (2016). *Lì-dài zhèng-shǐ Rì-běn-zhuàn kǎo-zhù*. 王勇主編『歷代正史日本傳考注』上海: 上海交通大學出版社.
- WÉI Qìng-wēn (1981). *Yuè-rén-gē yǔ zhuàng-yǔ de guān xì shì-tàn*. 韋慶穩「越人歌與壯語的關係試探」『民族語文論集』北京: 社會科學出版社.
- YAGI Mitsuru (1957). Kabane Katsu-to sono shūdan. 八木充「カバネ勝とその集団」*Historia* (19), 25-36. 大阪: 大阪歴史學會.
- YAGI-SHOTEN (2005-2006). *Ruijū Sandaikyaku*. Three volumes. 『類聚三代格』全三冊, 東京: 八木書店.
- YÁN Shì-ān (2020). The integration of the Zhū-Xià and the regional community during the Spring and Autumn period and the War states period (in Chinese). 顏世安「春秋戰國時代的諸夏融合與地域族群」民族研究 2000 年第 2 期, 98-111. 北京: 中國社會科學院.
- YOSHIKAI Masato (2001). *Nan'estsushi-no kenkyū*. 吉開將人『南越史の研究』博士論文, 東京: 東京大學.
- XIǎO Yì (c526 AD). *The Portraits of Periodical Offering of Liáng*. 蕭繹畫『梁職貢圖』. Open resource on the website of CHNMUSEUM (National Museum of China): http://www.chnmuseum.cn/zp/zpml/201812/t20181218_26391.shtml
- XIÈ Míng-kūn et al. (2019). Genetic substructure and forensic characteristics of Chinese Huí populations using 157 Y-SNPs and 27 Y-STRs. 謝明昆等「中國回族的遺傳亞結構和法醫特徵」. *Forensic Science International: Genetics* (41), 11-18. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: Elsevier. Open resource on the website of Elsevier's Science Direct: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1872497318306422>
- ZHǎNG Jiǔ-líng: drafted (735, Revised edition 2020). Chì Rì-běn guó-wáng shū, in Book 12 of the *Táng chéng-xiàng Qū-jiāng Zhāng xiān-shēng wén-jí* stored in the Nishio-shi Iwase-bunko. 張九齡起草「勅日本國王書」『唐丞相曲江張先生文集』卷十二, 尾張明倫堂藏版本, 西尾市岩瀨文庫管理記號 126-73. Open resource on the website of Senshū University Off1024: <http://www.senshu-u.ac.jp/~off1024/nenpyoushiryou/chokusho/chokunihonkokuousho.htm>
- ZHÈNG-ZHǎNG Shàng-fāng (1991). Decipherment of Yuè-rén-gē (Song of the Yuè boatman), *Cahiers de Linguistique Asie Orientale*, 20-2, 159-168. Leiden, the Netherland: Brill Publishers. 鄭張尚芳「越人歌的解讀」東亞語言學報告 20-2, 159-168. Open resource on the website of Persée: https://www.persee.fr/doc/clao_0153-3320_1991_num_20_2_1345
- ZHŌNG-HUÁ-SHŪ-JÚ (1997). *Èr-shí-sì-shǐ*. Twenty volumes. 『二十四史』全二十冊, 北京: 中華書局.

Addendum

After submitting final draft of this paper, I obtained the book titled *Two Arabic travel books* (published by New York University Press in 2014), and perused both the newest English translation and Arabic text of "Abū Zayd al-Sīrāfī's Account of China and India," translated and annotated by Tim Macintosh Smith, the Shaykh of Nazarenes. Based on his account, I do not only keep my hypothesis that Qīn-fū/Qīn-zhōu (欽府/欽州, the base port of the Shú Kūn-lún 熟崑崙 who rescued Heguri-no Hironari 平群廣成 in 735) and Guǎng-fū/Guǎng-zhōu (廣府/廣州 traditionally regarded as Khānfū) were mistaken for the 878-879's Khānfū (خانفو) massacre site, but also got a side evidence why Abū Zayd depicted wrong location about Khānfū. According to Abū Zayd, Khānfū, the destination of 8th and 9th centuries' Arab's merchants lies a few days journey from the sea, on a great river where the water flows fresh. This location coincides with Hán-fū (邗府) in the Táng dynasty era (present Yáng-zhōu 揚州, happened China's first Muslim massacre in 760), where 350 km north from Yuè-zhōu (越州, nearby Kuài-jī 會稽, present Shào-xīng 紹興, where the Japan's 4th Kentōshi/Qiǎn-táng-shǐ 遣唐使 landed in 659), and those cities are linked by the Grand Canal (Jīng-Háng dà-yùn-hé 京杭大運河) which the water flows fresh just as his depiction. So, it is considered that Abū Zayd mistook two Khānfū-s, the Khānfū (Qīn-fū or Guǎng-fū) where Huáng Cháo (黃巢) caused Muslim massacre in 878-879 and Hán-phù/Hán-fū (邗府) where Tián Shén-gōng (田神功) caused Muslim massacre in 760. That's all.