



The compilation and transmission of the *Hakusei*:  
An examination of young interpreters appearing in Mandarin textbooks

KIZU Yūko

## 0. Introduction

Ryūkyū 琉球, which had a tribute-investiture relationship with China, held an important position in the history of East Asian maritime trade during the Ming-Qing period. It is well known that a group of professionals known as *Kumemura shijin* 久米村士人, descended from thirty-six families who had migrated from Fujian 福建, played important practical roles in diplomacy and trade. They were collectively known as “interpreter families” (*tsūjike* 通事家), and because Kumemura, where they lived, possessed the character of a Chinatown (Tōei 唐營), they used Tōei 唐榮 as their attributive name in Chinese contexts. This clearly shows that their proficiency in Mandarin (*guanhua* 官話, the *lingua franca* of officials and merchants in Ming-Qing China) guaranteed their position in Ryūkyū and that studying and embodying Chinese etiquette underpinned their identity.

There have survived some of the textbooks used by the interpreter families of Kumemura for studying Mandarin, which undergirded the foundations of their survival, and among extant textbooks the dialogic *Hakusei* 百姓,<sup>1</sup> *Gaku kanwa* 學官話, and *Kanwa mondō bingo* 官話問答便語 are well known as representative works of this type. They have all survived in the form of manuscripts, and it is known that, while they were being used around the same time, there are major differences between the *Hakusei* and the two other works with respect to the grammatical features reflected in each of these texts.<sup>2</sup> It is to be surmised that these differences derive from the fact that the study of Mandarin by the interpreters of Kumemura was transmitted in the form of hereditary or family scholarship, which resulted in the formation of several schools of such learning.

In this article I take up for consideration as a pivotal text the *Hakusei*, and through a detailed examination of relationships between the people mentioned in it, I show that it was composed within an extremely narrow circle of marital relations. Additionally, I hope to reevaluate the realities of family scholarship in the study of Mandarin in Ryūkyū at the time.

## 1. The Base-text of the *Hakusei*

In 1749 (Qianlong 乾隆 14) a merchant vessel registered in Jiangsu 江蘇 was cast up on Ōshima 大島 in Ryūkyū, and in the fourth month of the following year the survivors were sent under escort to Naha 那覇, where they were housed in facilities in Tomari 泊. In the twelfth month of the same year they boarded a tribute ship and were repatriated to Fujian. The *Hakusei* is a dialogic textbook for Mandarin based on conversations had by Kumemura professionals with the castaways during these eight months. The title derives from the fact that the *Hakusei* (“Haku [= Bai] Family Name”) begins with Bai Shiyun 白世蘊, a travelling merchant from Shandong 山東 who had been on board the ship, introducing himself, and not only Bai Shiyun but also other crew members figure in the dialogues. To the best of my knowledge, the extant

manuscripts of the *Hakusei* are as follows:

- A. *Hakusei kanwa* 百姓官話, held by Tenri Central Library (cover title: *Hakusei*).
- B. *Hakusei*, held by Faculty of Letters (Department of Chinese Philosophy and Literature), Kyoto University (constitutes one volume of the 5-vol. *Ninchūga* 人中畫; bears seal reading “Tonkōdō” 敦厚堂).
- C. *Hakusei*, held by Faculty of Letters (Department of Japanese History), Kyoto University (“Ikemiyagusuku Pēchin” 池宮城親雲上 inscribed on cover; the cover of a later binding has *Shinajin Ryūkyū raikōtan* 支那人琉球來航譚 [Tales of a Visit to Ryūkyū by Chinese]).
- D. *Hakusei mondō* 百姓問答, held by Ishigaki City Yaeyama Museum (badly damaged).
- E. *Hakusei*, held by Ishigaki City Yaeyama Museum (copied by Aramoto Niya 新本仁屋 in Tongzhi 同治 13 [1874]).
- F. *Hakusei*, held by Okinawa Prefectural Museum.
- G. *Hakuseiwa* 百姓話, held in Nagasawa Collection, Kansai University Library (“Shō Yuki” 向有基 inscribed on inside of cover; bears seals reading “Mōshi Sonan” 毛氏楚南 and “Okī Toshokan” 沖圖書館).

Although there are minor differences between these seven manuscripts, the overall scenario is the same. Manuscript B preserves the most complete form of the text, consisting of a preface at the start by Lin Qisheng 林啓陞, a Confucian scholar in Fujian, and dated Qianlong 18 (1753), followed by the main text, and lastly a report submitted by the castaways on their departure for China. Among the seven manuscripts, those apart from manuscripts A and C are more or less complete, but manuscript D is very badly damaged and Lin’s preface is almost completely illegible, while manuscript E is a rather crude manuscript copied in Tongzhi 13 (1874). Manuscript A lacks Lin’s preface and the latter part of the final report, but it is widely known on account of its having been reproduced together with a Japanese translation by Setoguchi Ritsuko.<sup>3</sup> Manuscript C corresponds to “Ryūkyū Materials” no. 65 held by the Faculty of Letters (Department of History) at Kyoto University, and instead of breaking off partway through the final report, like manuscript A (hereafter: Tenri manuscript), it ends with the dialogue immediately preceding the report, with the words “*Hakusei*, 48 leaves” (百姓枚數四十八) indicating that it is a complete manuscript. Judging from the fact that not only the final report but also the report on the deaths of three officials named Zhu 朱 (see below) partway through the text have been omitted, manuscript C may be regarded as a variant recension of the *Hakusei* that was intentionally produced as a text consisting of only dialogues. Manuscript G includes Lin’s preface and the final report, but the final date and the drafters’ names have been omitted. Furthermore, judging from the title *Hakuseiwa* given on the first page, it would seem to have been copied quite some time later by someone who was unfamiliar with the origins of the title *Hakusei*.

In view of the above, the following examination of the *Hakusei* will be based on manuscript B (hereafter: Kyoto University manuscript). As will be shown in the final section, this manuscript formerly belonged to the Maesato 真榮里 family of the Tei<sup>4</sup> 鄭 clan, a branch of the family line of Tei Tenho 鄭天保, who appears in the *Hakusei*, and in this respect, too, it

may be regarded as an important text.

## 2. The Structure of the *Hakusei*

As noted at the outset, the aim of this article is to examine the structure of the *Hakusei* and the background to its compilation by focusing on the people appearing in the text. Let us begin by reviewing the work as a whole, with a focus on the Ryukyuans who figure in the text.

A large number of people appear in the *Hakusei*, and those who converse are either Ryukyuans from Kumemura or Chinese castaways. Among the latter, those whose names are known are Bai Shiyun (one of the passengers who also gave his name to the text), the shipmaster Zhang 張,<sup>5</sup> and three officials named Zhu, who died of tuberculosis in their lodgings in Tomari on the 7th day of the seventh month. Apart from the three officials named Zhu, it is difficult to identify the speakers except in scenes where they give their names.

The Ryukyuans, on the other hand, can be broadly divided into (1) duty interpreters and (2) young men from interpreter families who frequented the castaways' lodgings to study Mandarin, and they can be differentiated because they were given different designations by the castaways. In the case of (1), they were invariably called "Interpreter" (通事) by the castaways, while in the case of (2) they were never called "Interpreter" and were called "Master" (先生) or "Older Brother" (某兄, 仁兄). Let me give some examples. (The locator "5a," etc., after quoted passages indicates the leaf number in the base-text ["a" for recto, "b" for verso]. The base-text [Kyoto University manuscript] and Tenri manuscript proceed with roughly the same pagination, but in the second half there is often a half-leaf discrepancy, and in such cases the leaf number of the Tenri manuscript is also given.)

(1) 通事、請坐。(5a) ("Interpreter, please sit down.")

你看、鄭通事來了。(36b) ("Look, Interpreter Zheng(Tei) has come.")

通事與先生，看看這張呈子，有不着處，替弟改一改。(54b) ("Interpreter and Master, take a look at this report by Zhang, and if there is anything inappropriate, please amend it.")

(2) 阮先生來了。(14b) ("Master Gen, welcome.")

蔡兄、青春多少。(15a) ("Cai(Sai), how old are you?")

今日蔡先生替鄭先生兩位是纔到這裡的，那有不送的理。(21a) ("Today Master Cai(Sai) and Master Zheng(Tei) have only just arrived here, but why would we not see you off?")

In accordance with the above designations, the people mentioned in the text can be classified in the following manner:

(1) Interpreter Tei (鄭通事), Interpreter Sai (蔡通事), Interpreter Rin (林通事), Interpreter Ryō (梁通事).

(2) Tei Sedō 鄭世道, Gen Sūki 阮崇基, Sai Eishi 蔡永思, Sai Shū 蔡楫, Tei Tenho 鄭天保.

As will be shown below, the people belonging to category (2) vary in age, ranging from

fifteen to close to thirty. In addition, Tei Sedō is an important figure who has a lengthy conversation with the castaways at the start of the *Hakusei* in which he extracts details about how they were cast ashore, and until now he has often been identified with Interpreter Tei of category (1).<sup>7</sup> But Tei Sedō, who was seventeen at the time, is not once called “Interpreter,” and he should be regarded as a student from Kumemura who frequented the castaways’ lodgings not in the position of an interpreter but in order to study Mandarin. This is because, as is shown in the next section, the person known as “Interpreter Tei” can be identified with considerable accuracy on account of the fact that he was related by marriage to another person appearing in the text (i.e., he was a brother-in-law of Sai Shū), and this person is clearly not Tei Sedō. At the same time, judging from the designation used, it would seem reasonable to equate the person referred to as “Master Tei” in the parting scene at the end of the work with Tei Sedō rather than Interpreter Tei.

The duty interpreters belonging to category (1) worked on a rotation system. As is stated by the interpreters themselves in the *Hakusei*, “Interpreters here change every month” (這裡的通事是一个月一換。[16a]) and “Having returned home and lived there for one month, we come again to interpret for you” (回家住一个月，又來替你們做通事了。[19b]), and they are also asked, “One month has again passed since you, Interpreter, came here. Will you be returning home today?” (通事到這裡，又是一個月了。今日可回府麼。[50a]).

With the exception of seasonal festival days such as those on the 5th day of the fifth month, the 15th day of the eighth month, and the 9th day of the ninth month and also the funerals of the three officials named Zhu, the dates on which conversations were held are almost never recorded in the *Hakusei*. But on the basis of the system of monthly rotations it is possible to trace the passage of time in accordance with the rotation of interpreters on duty at the time. In other words, the castaways’ sojourn can be divided into the following periods.

- 1st period: first month after their arrival in Naha (early in fourth month to middle of fifth month)<sup>8</sup> (1a–21b).

This period can be identified because the topic of the Dragon Boat Festival, held on the 5th day of the fifth month, comes up in conversation. Interpreter Tei was on duty, and Tei Sedō, Gen Sūki, Sai Eishi, Sai Shū, and Tei Tenho, students of Mandarin, also appear. In addition, although Interpreter Sai is mentioned in conversation, he does not actually take part in any of the dialogues.

- 2nd period: middle of fifth month to middle of sixth month (21b–36b).

Interpreter Rin was on duty, and he visited the castaways on three occasions. Among the students, Gen Sūki and Sai Shū make an appearance.

- 3rd period: middle of sixth month to middle of seventh month (36b–47a).

Interpreter Tei was once again on duty. The period until the death of the three officials named Zhu and their funerals on the 7th day of the seventh month is described. Although their names are not given, “several of those people studying Mandarin” (那學官話的人好几个) attended the funeral.

- 4th period: Mid-Autumn Festival; middle of seventh month to 15th day of eighth month (47a–50a).

Interpreter Rin was once again on duty. There was only a conversation on the day of the Mid-Autumn Festival (15th day of eighth month). On this day, Interpreter Rin immediately announces that he will be replaced since one month has elapsed in his current term, and this makes it possible to determine the final day of this period. The other main people to make an appearance are Gen Sūki and Sai Shū.

- 5th period: Double Ninth Festival; 16th day of eighth month to middle of ninth month (50a–53b).

Interpreter Tei should have been on duty, but because he was in poor health, Interpreter Ryō took his place. There are exchanges about a site for the customary climbing of a mountain on the day of the Double Ninth Festival (9th day of ninth month) and the collapse of the castaways' lodgings because of a typhoon.

- 6th period: return to China, late twelfth month (53b–57a).

The name of the interpreter on duty is not known. Someone called Master Tei and large numbers of other people come to see the castaways off. In content, this section consists of farewell speeches by both parties and a report composed by the castaways for the king of Ryūkyū.

The volume of text covering each period is fairly unbalanced, with the first three periods accounting for more than three-quarters of the text, while there are only one or two conversations in each of the remaining three periods. The people who figure most frequently are Interpreter Tei, Gen Sūki, and Sai Shū. Interpreter Tei, in particular, carried out various important tasks during the period immediately after the castaways' arrival, arranging their lodgings and instructing them in Ryukyuan conventions. He played an important role in the lives of the castaways, such as arranging the burial of the three officials in the third period when they died after having been bedridden for some time.

### 3. Details of People Mentioned in the *Hakusei* and Their Relationships

Among the Ryukyuans appearing in the *Hakusei*, the interpreters are all called only “Interpreter Tei,” “Interpreter Rin,” etc., and are not referred to by their given names, whereas the full names of all of the students are given. In the following, I therefore wish to attempt to identify the Ryukyuans, using the students' names as leads.

An important historical source for Ryūkyū is the extant genealogies of official families, many of which have been published and include the genealogies of families in Kumemura.<sup>9</sup> In addition to these published genealogies, copies of genealogies preserved in Okinawa are also kept at Naha City Museum of History. When preparing this article, I also conducted on-site investigations of these unpublished genealogies. As well, I consulted the *Rekidai hōan* 歴代寶案 and Chinese archival sources.<sup>10</sup> When quoting genealogical and archival materials, I give the page numbers of the relevant publication or, in the case of unpublished genealogies, the

number of the source given in the *Ujishū* 氏集 compiled by Naha City Museum of History (e.g., *Ujishū* 2156).

Let us begin with the students. As noted in the previous section, five students of Mandarin are mentioned, namely, Tei Sedō, Gen Sūki, Tei Tenho, Sai Shū, and Sai Eishi, and they are introduced as follows (*emphasis added*).

#### A. Tei Sedō

世道：弟姓鄭，名世道，賤字民儀。

Sedō: “My family name is Zheng(Tei), my given name is Shidao(Sedō), and my courtesy name is Minyi(Mingi).”

白世藝：今年貴庚了。

Bai Shiyun: “How old are you this year?”

世道：賤年十七歲。

Sedō: “I am *seventeen years old*.”<sup>11</sup> (6a)

#### B. Gen Sūki

難民：前日又一位姓阮的，在這裡講話半天，講得很好。這几天不來，好想殺我了。

Castaway: “The other day another person with the family name Gen came here and talked for quite a while. He spoke very well. He has not come for several days, and I am dying to see him.”

鄭通事：他叫甚麼名呢。

Interpreter Tei: “What was his name?”

難民：他叫崇基。

Castaway: “He was called Chongji (Sūki).”

鄭通事：那是舍親。

Interpreter Tei: “That is my relative.”

難民：呵，是令親麼。甚麼親呢。

Castaway: “Oh, he is your relative? What sort of relative?”

鄭通事：是我同門。

Interpreter Tei: “He is my clansman.” (13b)

#### C. Tei Tenho, Sai Shū, and Sai Eishi

These three are all young men who were taken to meet the castaways by Gen Sūki.

(1) 阮：這兩位姓蔡，這一位姓鄭。

Gen: “These two are called Cai(Sai), and this one is called Zheng(Tei).”

難民：想必替鄭通事蔡通事都是一家了。不知道是什麼名字。

Castaway: “I assume that they belong to the same families as Interpreter Zheng(Tei) and Interpreter Cai(Sai). I do not know their names.”

阮：這位字定庵，名天保，是鄭通事一家。這位名永思，字克比，是蔡通事一家。這個就是蔡通事的令郎，名楫，字克慎，替小弟是郎舅。

Gen: “This one’s courtesy name is Ding’an(Teian), his given name is Tianbao(Tenho), and he belongs to Interpreter Zheng(Tei)’s family. This one’s given name is Yongsi(Eishi),

*his courtesy name is Kebi(Kokuhi), and he belongs to Interpreter Cai(Sai)'s family. This one is the son of Interpreter Cai(Sai), his given name is Ji(Shū), his courtesy name is Keshen(Kokushin), and he is my brother-in-law."*

難民：呵，蔡通事是先生的令岳翁麼。

Castaway: "Oh, *Interpreter Sai is your father-in-law?*"

阮：是家岳父。

Gen: "Yes, *he is my father-in-law.*"

(.....)

難民：蔡兄青春多少。

Castaway: "Master Sai, how old are you?"

蔡楫：學生痴長十五歲。

Sai Shū: "*I am fifteen years old.*"

難：好青年，令尊貴庚。

Castaway: "You are young. How old is your father?"

蔡楫：家父五十一歲。

Sai Shū: "*My father is fifty-one.*" (14b)

- (2) 鄭通事：小舅蔡克慎，那中國的禮數言語都不知道。他來的時候，求兄不要吝教，尽心教導。

Interpreter Tei: "*My brother-in-law Cai Keshen (= Sai Shū) knows nothing about China's etiquette and language. Whenever he comes, I would ask you to not be sparing in your teaching and to instruct him as best you can.*" (21a)

The above information can be summarized in the following way.

Interpreter Tei's family: Interpreter Tei (son-in-law of Interpreter Sai = brother-in-law of Sai Shū, relative of Gen Sūki), Tei Tenho (and Tei Sedō).

Interpreter Sai's family: Sai Shū (son of Interpreter Sai, brother-in-law of Interpreter Tei and Gen Sūki), Sai Eishi, Gen Sūki (son-in-law of Interpreter Sai, clansman of Interpreter Tei).

When we look for these people in genealogies of Kumemura, we find that the names of four of the students (apart from Tei Sedō) can be ascertained in genealogical sources, and in the case of Sai Shū and Tei Tenho, their own genealogical charts are also extant. Since it is known from the *Hakusei* that two of Sai Shū's elder sisters were married to Interpreter Tei and Gen Sūki, let us first examine the genealogy of the Sai clan.

#### (1) Interpreter Sai, Sai Shū, and Gen Sūki

Sai Shū belonged to the thirteenth generation of the Gima 儀間 family of the Sai clan. According to the genealogy of this Gima family (*Kafu shiryō* 1), the twelfth generation included Sai Bai 蔡培 (p. 279), whose second son was Shū, while his eldest son I 懿 left the family in 1723 to be adopted by his uncle Sai Tan 蔡垣, *pēchin* of the Gima family, as a result of which Shū became Sai Bai's designated heir. In other words, Sai Shū's father, "Interpreter Sai," was Sai Bai, *uēkata* 親方 of the Gima family, who rose to the rank of *shikin taifu* 紫金大夫 (Grand Master with a Purple-Gold Ribbon), the highest rank for an interpreter. According to the

Sai clan's genealogy, Sai Bai was born in 1690, and although, according to the *Hakusei*, Sai Shū says, "My father is fifty-one," he would have been sixty-one, ten years older. All manuscripts have "fifty-one," and it is currently not known how this discrepancy arose.

According to the genealogy of the Sai clan, Sai Shū's courtesy name was indeed Kokushin, and since he was born in 1736, he would have been fifteen at the time, that is, a youth as stated in the *Hakusei*. It is further recorded in Sai Bai's biography that Sai Shū had six older sisters, the fourth of whom married Gen Sūki. This means that, as mentioned in the dialogue quoted above, he was Gen Sūki's brother-in-law. Of Sai Shū's six sisters, the oldest died in 1740, and the youngest died at the age of only eight, while the second sister married into the Sō 曾 clan, the fourth sister married Gen Sūki, and the remaining two sisters married into the Tei clan: the third sister married Tei Jōhō 鄭丈鳳, and the fifth sister married Tei Kokusū 鄭國樞.<sup>12</sup> In other words, one of these two men belonging to the Tei clan was undoubtedly "Interpreter Tei."

## (2) Interpreter Tei

What is indicated in the *Hakusei* is that he was Gen Sūki's brother-in-law and the second-oldest of four brothers.<sup>13</sup>

The biography of Tei Kokusū, who married Sai Shū's fifth sister, is found in the genealogies of Kumemura. According to the *Teishi kafu* 鄭氏家譜 (Ikemiyagushiku family), he belonged to the fifteenth generation and was *uēkata* of the Ikemiyagushiku family, later rising to the rank of *shikin taifu* (p. 580). Tei Kokusū was born in 1730 and was a young man of twenty-one when the castaways arrived in 1750. His mother was the second daughter of Sai Yō 蔡壙 (Uehara 上原 family),<sup>14</sup> and because Sai Yō had no sons, in 1741 Kokusū's younger brother Kokutaku 國鐸 became heir to this family line as the adopted eldest son of his maternal grandfather Sai Yō.<sup>15</sup> As is indicated by his name, Sai Yō belonged to the same generation as Sai Bai in a branch of the Sai clan. It is evident also from this that the Tei and Sai clans were closely related by marriage. As is indicated by his career, Tei Kokusū would seem to have been extremely talented, but according to the genealogy, at the time he would have been an outstanding student yet to be appointed to the position of an official interpreter. He was the oldest of three brothers, and so he does not meet the condition of being "the second of four brothers" alluded to in the *Hakusei*. However, as noted below, it is known that in the eleventh month of 1753, when Lin Qisheng's preface was written, Tei Kokusū was definitely in Fuzhou 福州. Even if he was not "Interpreter Tei," it is highly likely that, as someone related by marriage to people mentioned in the *Hakusei*, he would have been present when a local Confucian scholar in Fuzhou was asked to check the draft of the *Hakusei*.

The husband of another of Sai Bai's daughters was Tei Jōhō. There does not exist any direct genealogical chart for him, and the only instantiation of his name in published genealogies of Kumemura is the passage in the Sai clan's genealogy quoted in note 11. But during an exhaustive investigation of materials held by Naha City Museum of History that I conducted in 2007, it came to light that the character *jō* 丈 in Tei Jōhō's name is an error for *bun* 文. There has not survived any direct genealogical chart for a person called Tei Bunhō 鄭文鳳 either, but his name appears frequently in other genealogies. He was one of six men selected in 1754 as



pupils of Sai On 蔡溫, tutor to the throne, in order to train men able to draw up documents that would need to be submitted to the Chinese authorities during a tribute-investiture ceremony to be held in three years' time,<sup>16</sup> and judging from the period during which he was active, it may be assumed that this was the Tei Bunhō whom one of Sai Shū's older sisters married. An extensive search of genealogical records for names with the character *bun*, indicating men who belonged to the same generation, reveals that in the fifteenth generation of the Noborikawa 登川 family of the Tei clan there was a person called Tei Bunki 鄭文龜, who was born in 1727 and was the fourth son of the *yabu pēchin* Tei Kokuchū 鄭國柱.<sup>17</sup> Official posts such as *yabu* 屋部, referring to a local overseer, were usually passed down from father to son and prefixed to their titles. According to the *Saishi kafu*, Tei Jō[/Bun]hō's title was *yabu satonushi pēchin* 屋部里之子親雲上, and so it is highly likely that he was a son of the *yabu pēchin* Tei Kokuchū and therefore a brother of Tei Bunki. Furthermore, it is to be surmised from his name that Bunhō was an elder brother of Bunki. Since Bunki was twenty-three in 1750, Bunhō would have been perhaps in his late twenties or thirties, that is, old enough to have held the post of interpreter. In addition, Chinese archival sources record the name of Tei Bunryū 鄭文龍 as someone who held the important post of resident interpreter for tribute envoys around the same period in 1751–52.<sup>18</sup> If we suppose that this Tei Bunryū was a brother of Tei Bunhō, then, judging from naming conventions, Bunryū would naturally be an older brother of Bunhō, and considering that Bunki was Tei Kokuchū's fourth son, it is quite possible that Bunhō was the second of his four sons. On the basis of the above, I would like to suggest that Interpreter Tei was Tei Bunhō, one of Sai Shū's brothers-in-law.

Tei Kokuchū, assumed to have been Tei Bunhō's father, had an older brother called Kokutō 國棟, and, as discussed below, his son Shikoku 師谷 was the father of Sai Eishi's wife. In other words, Sai Eishi and Interpreter Tei were related by marriage on their fathers' side.

### (3) Tei Tenho

Genealogical material relating to Tei Tenho is found in the genealogy of the Yoza 與座 family in the *Teishi kafu*. The oldest son of the seven-generation Yokei 餘慶 (p. 672ff.) was Tenho, and his biography is given among members of the eighth generation (p. 674). As stated in the *Hakusei*, Tei Tenho's courtesy name is given as Teian in the genealogy, and we also learn that he was born in 1722 and would have been twenty-nine in 1750. According to the genealogy, he died four years later in 1754, and there is no record of his having married.<sup>19</sup> Worth noting is the fact that his father Yokei served as chief interpreter for the tribute mission that repatriated the Chinese castaways.<sup>20</sup>

The *Hakusei* includes a passage in which mention is made of the death of Tenho's grandmother. The castaways had heard that his grandmother was sick in bed, and in response to a question about her subsequent condition, Gen Sūki said:

阮：已經死了一个月了。先生還不知道麼。

Gen: "One month has passed since she died. Did you not know?" (Kyoto manuscript, 49b; Tenri manuscript, 49a)

This was part of a conversation that took place when the students visited the castaways' lodgings with food and drinks on the day of the Mid-Autumn Festival (15th day of eighth month). Tei Tenho's grandmother was the wife of Tei Kokuketsu 鄭國傑, who belonged to the sixth generation of the Yoza family of the Tei clan, and was from the Sai clan, and in Tei Kokuketsu's genealogy it is indeed recorded that his wife died on "the 16th day of the seventh month of the year Qianlong 15" (乾隆十五年七月十六日 [p. 672]). This was exactly one month before the Mid-Autumn Festival and tallies perfectly with the account in the *Hakusei*. This is a good example of how even everyday personal events are faithfully recorded in the *Hakusei*.

In the *Hakusei* it is stated that Tei Tenho belonged to the same family as Interpreter Tei, but strictly speaking they cannot be said to have belonged to the same family. The progenitor of the Yoza family of the Tei clan to which Tei Tenho belonged was Zheng Zhaozuo (Tei Chōso) 鄭肇祚 from Changle 長樂 county in Fujian province, who was newly incorporated into the Tōei during the Wanli 萬曆 era in order to fill a vacancy in the Tōei based on thirty-six families from Fujian when it went into decline in the late Ming, and Tei Tenho thus differed in descent from Tei Bunhō, whom we have identified as Interpreter Tei and who, together with Tei Kokusū, was descended from Zheng Yicai (Tei Gisai) 鄭義才, progenitor of one of the original thirty-six families (and similarly hailing from Changle county, Fujian). But it was probably because they both belonged to the Tei clan originally from Changle county in Fujian that Tei Tenho was introduced to the castaways as belonging to the same family as Interpreter Tei.

#### (4) Gen Sūki, Sai Eishi, and Tei Sedō

Direct genealogical charts of the three remaining figures—Gen Sūki, Sai Eishi, and Tei Sedō—cannot be found in any extant genealogical materials, published or unpublished. But as was noted in connection with Sai Shū, Gen Sūki's name is recorded in the genealogy of Sai Bai (Sai Shū's father, Interpreter Sai) as the husband of Sai Shū's fourth-oldest sister, and it can therefore be confirmed that Gen Sūki's statement in the *Hakusei* that "Interpreter Sai is my father-in-law" was factually true. Since it is evident that he was quite proficient in Mandarin in 1750, it is to be surmised that he may have previously travelled to Fuzhou either to study or as an interpreter, but no such person is recorded in extant genealogies of the Gen clan.

As in the case of Gen Sūki, the biography of Sai Eishi does not appear in any direct genealogies, but there are several leads. First, the *Teishi kafu* mentions Shikoku in the fourteenth generation of the Noborikawa family (p. 606), and it is recorded that his second daughter Shigyoku 思玉 (born in 1723) married "Eishi, a brilliant scholar from Kogusuku and a second son" (次男永思湖城秀才) of the Sai clan. In addition, in the biography of the thirteenth-generation Kōki 功熙 of the Gushi 具志 family in the *Saishi kafu* (p. 315) it is stated that his third son Tokuteki 德迪 married Sai Eishi's second daughter Shiki 思龜. This daughter Shiki was born in 1750, the year when the events of the *Hakusei* were unfolding. Judging from the fact that his wife was born in 1723 and his second daughter was born in 1750, it is to be supposed that Sai Eishi may have been about the same age as Tei Tenho, who was born in 1722 and was twenty-nine at the time. It may also be noted that Tei Tenho's younger

brother Tenken 天眷 (born in 1737) married an older sister (born in 1736) of Sai Tokuteki, whom Sai Eishi's second daughter had married, and it is evident that the Tei clan (Yoza family) and Sai clan (Noborikawa family) were closely related by marriage.<sup>21</sup>

The *Rekidai hōan* records the name of Sai Eishi as one of four men consisting of the shipmaster, navigator, and arsenal comptrollers on a tribute ship sent in 1755, on which Sai Kōki served as chief interpreter,<sup>22</sup> but almost nothing else is recorded about him. However, during my investigations of genealogical materials at Naha City Museum of History I discovered the following passage in the biography of Chin Tenpō 陳天鳳, a fifth-generation member of the Kōki 幸喜 family of the Chin clan (headed by the fourth-generation Itō 以棠, *Ujishū* 2183), in the *Chinsei kafu shōsō* 陳姓家譜小宗 (Kōki family):

乾隆二十一年丙子四月十八日、爲漏刻御番役 [原是蔡永思湖城里之子親雲上勤此役之間、乃有薩州下令問罪等、由故代爲之。] (passage in square brackets given in half-size, two-column text in original)

According to this passage, some time prior to 1756 (Qianlong 21) Sai Eishi had been charged with a crime by Satsuma 薩摩 province in Kyushu and had been dismissed from his post of official time-keeper. It may have been because of his criminal record that little has been recorded of his career.

Lastly, there is Tei Sedō (Master Tei), who makes an appearance at the start of the *Hakusei*. Unfortunately, biographical details about him have been even more difficult to uncover than about anyone else. Not only is there no direct genealogy containing his biography, but his name cannot be found in any other sources whatsoever. All we know about him is that, according to the *Hakusei*, his courtesy name was Mingi and he was seventeen years old.

At the start of the *Hakusei*, he listens sympathetically to Bai Shiyun as he describes the hardships endured by the castaways, comforts Bai who is losing all hope, and builds a deep relationship of trust with the castaways. It is clear that he was quite proficient in speaking Mandarin, but it seems to me that Gen Sūki was also present on this occasion. This is for the following reason.

When Tei Sedō is about to leave after he and the castaways have talked together for quite some time, there is the usual exchange about whether or not the castaways should see him off. Tei Sedō declares that there is no need for any such formalities since he will be visiting them frequently, but the castaways overrule him, saying, “We will do as you say when you come next time” (若再來時, 小弟就當從命 [8a]). Several days later, Gen Sūki visits the castaways together with three students of Mandarin, and when the castaways again try to see them off as they are about leave, he says, “We said the other day that there was no need to see us off when we came again” (前日講過, 再來不消送 [18b]). This tallies with Tei Sedō's earlier exchange with the castaways. The words of the castaways as they fondly recall an intimate talk with Gen Sūki are also easier to understand if one assumes that he, too, had been present at the initial intimate conversation between Tei Sedō and the castaways.

##### (5) Other Interpreters



#### 4. The Background to the Composition of the *Hakusei* as Seen in Relationships among Its *Dramatis Personae*

What facts become clear once we have identified the people mentioned in the *Hakusei* in the above manner? What I would first like to emphasize above all else is that, apart from Tei Sedō and Interpreters Rin and Ryō, who cannot be identified with the names of people found in extant genealogies, everyone else can be conclusively said to have been real young men from the families of interpreters in Kumemura. That is to say, unlike language textbooks since the modern period, the *Hakusei* describes people on the basis of historical facts and does not anonymize them. This does not only apply to people's names and their relationships, but also extends to private family matters, such as the date of the death of Tei Tenho's grandmother, said to have occurred one month prior to the Mid-Autumn Festival, which tallies exactly with the historical fact recorded in the Tei clan's genealogy, according to which she died on the 16th day of the seventh month.

Similar historical facts can be found throughout the *Hakusei*. Of course, the description of their shipwreck by Bai Shiyun and Qu Zhangshun and the transfer of castaways from another Fujianese ship during the time when they were being accommodated in Naha are historical facts that have been pointed out in the past.<sup>24</sup> Here, I would like to add an interesting fact pertaining to the deaths of the three officials named Zhu.

According to the *Hakusei*, the deaths of these three officials occurred during the third period as defined earlier. The report by the shipowner Qu Zhangshun, which is included in the main text of the *Hakusei*, states that they “died on the evening of the first 7th day of the seventh month” (於七月初七日酉時身亡 [Kyoto and Tenri manuscripts, 43b]), and it is related how they were buried in a cemetery on the 8th day, with the funeral service, also attended by officials from the government office in Tomari, being performed with great solemnity (44a–47a). The graves of the three officials are in fact preserved in Tomari Cemetery for Foreigners in Naha, a well-known tourist site. The epitaph is half-buried and abraded, but part of the text can be made out: 乾隆十五年庚午／清故江南蕪（蘇）州府常熟縣朱 [remaining text buried in ground] ／七月□□日酉時死. According to this epitaph, a person or persons with the family name Zhu who died in Qianlong 15 (1750) are buried here, and they can have only been the three officials named Zhu. The date of death is partially illegible, but the time and month tally with the *Hakusei*. This epitaph is mentioned in the *Tomari-shi* 泊誌 (1974), and more recently a transcription has been given in a detailed investigative report together with a rubbing of the inscription: 乾隆十五年庚午／清故江南蕪 (sic) 府常熟朱三官／七月初八日酉時死.<sup>25</sup> However, the place-name that has been read as 蕪府 should be emended to 蕪州 (蘇州) 府, i.e., Suzhou prefecture, as can be seen in the rubbing.<sup>26</sup>

The date of the officials' death, given as “the first 7th day of the seventh month” in the *Hakusei*, is given as “the first 8th day of the seventh month” in the epitaph, and the date given in the epitaph should of course be accepted as the correct date. A memorial drafted by Pan Siju 潘思渠, governor of Fujian, and dated the 20th day of the eighth month, Qianlong 16 (1751), mentions the castaways of the previous year who had been repatriated by Ryūkyū, and here too the date of the three officials' death is given as “the first 8th day of the seventh month” (於柒月

初榑日酉時身故、埋葬造墳立石爲誌).<sup>27</sup> However, when quoting Qu Zhangshun's testimony, the same memorial refers to "the first 2nd day of the seventh month" (內有朱三觀壹人、於今年柒月初貳日身故),<sup>28</sup> and it can be seen that there were some discrepancies in recollections of the date of the officials' deaths.

The preface to the *Hakusei* by Lin Qisheng (d.u.), a Confucian scholar from Fujian, which describes the circumstances leading to the composition of the *Hakusei*, also conveys aspects of intercourse between the Chinese castaways and the Ryukyuan interpreters.

.... At a time when I was feeling bored, a talented young man from the Ryūkyū kingdom with the family name Zheng (Tei) and the personal name Fengyi (Hōyoku) happened to become a pupil of mine.... He had with him a collection of writings called *Wenda guanhua* (*Mondō kanwa*) and asked me to correct it. On perusing it, I discovered that a merchant called Bai Ruilin from Laiyang county in Dengzhou, Shandong, had in the fifteenth year of the Qianlong reign encountered a storm and had been blown to the Ryūkyū kingdom, where he had compiled a collection of writings on Mandarin. On carefully reading the text, it turned out that it discussed in detail particulars and processes, and it did not require any further correction. However, when considering the writing, functional words and phrases could have been used to link the introduction, development, denouement, and conclusion, but because this was ordinary spoken language, it may not be necessary to use such literary devices. I then took up my writing brush and altered one or two expressions to make them clearer. I have presumed to write a preface, and I pray that smart people will not consider the words of an old man to be in error.

Revised by Lin Qisheng, on an auspicious day in the eleventh month of the cyclic year *guiyou*, the eighteenth year of the Qianlong reign.

.....正在無聊之間，適有琉球國青年俊士姓鄭諱鳳翼者從吾門下。.....懷有一集問答官話，請予□正。予閱之，始知是山東登州萊陽縣白瑞臨商人，于乾隆十五年間遭風飄到琉球國，彙纂官話一集。細閱其詞，果係細論條目工夫，又奚須更正爲哉。但思行文，用此虛字虛句，可以爲起承轉合之過接，今止平常說話，可以不必用此文辭也。遂援筆略改一二，便見直截。妄爲一序，還祈高明勿以老叟之言爲謬也幸矣。

乾隆十八年癸酉十一月穀旦 林啓陞守超氏較正

We learn from this preface that it was a young man named Tei Hōyoku 鄭鳳翼 who brought the *Mondō kanwa* 問答官話, a draft version of the *Hakusei*, to Lin Qisheng. Unfortunately, no one named Tei Hōyoku can be found in extant genealogies of the Tei clan, but his name is mentioned in a memorial submitted by Zhong Yin 鐘音, governor of Fujian, on the 20th day of the seventh month of Qianlong 21 (1756) (included in the *Qingdai Zhong-Liu guanxi dang'an xubian*). When the ships bearing the 1755 tribute mission departed for Ryūkyū in the sixth month of 1756, 121 people, including the tribute envoy, resident interpreters, and so on, travelled on three ships, namely, the leading ship, a second ship, and a ship from Taipingshan 太平山 (Yaeyama 八重山) that had been cast up on the Chinese coast and was being escorted back home, and one of those on board this last vessel was Tei Hōyoku (京回跟

伴 向維祐 鄭鳳翼 [p. 310]). A report of similar contents also appears in the *Rekidai hōan*,<sup>29</sup> and Tei Hōyoku's name is also mentioned in a certificate issued in the fifth month of 1756 as one of five attendants (派撥跟伴) along with Ryō Teiho 梁廷輔, in overall charge of the mission, and others.<sup>30</sup>

This means that Tei Hōyoku was in Fujian in the eleventh month of 1753 (Lin's preface) and the sixth month of 1756 (archival sources and *Rekidai hōan*), but the only person of the Tei clan in extant genealogies to meet these two conditions is Sai Shū's brother-in-law, Tei Kokusū. One also wonders about Tei Bunhō, another of Sai Shū's brothers-in-law whose name includes the same character *hō* 鳳, and it is regrettable that it is difficult to investigate the matter any further since genealogical sources for both have been lost.

In the above, I have examined the people who make an appearance in the *Hakusei*, with a focus on their biographical details and relationships, and it has become clear that they were all young interpreters or students. Interpreter Sai (Sai Bai), who is mentioned only by name, was at this time already sixty-one years old, held the rank of *seigi taifu* 正儀大夫 (Grand Master for Proper Consultation), and held the important position of headman (*sō-kumigashira* 惣與頭) of Kumemura. When the castaways arrived, it was probably Sai Bai who managed the initial response as the person in overall charge of their reception. Once they had settled into their lodgings, the young duty interpreters would have been responsible for looking after them, and it is only natural that the elder Sai Bai does not once appear as a speaker in the *Hakusei* and is only mentioned with great respect by the castaways.

However, Sai Bai sent his designated heir Sai Shū, who had only just come of age, to visit the castaways on his behalf in order to learn Mandarin. It is hardly surprising that, after having sent his eldest son to become his older brother's heir, Sai Bai should have paid special attention to the education of his second son, who had eventually been born more than twenty years later. It may have been due to Sai Bai's instructions that his son-in-law Gen Sūki took Shū to visit the castaways and frequented their lodgings ahead of Shū. Nor should it be forgotten that Interpreter Tei, who was the most frequent visitor to the castaways in his position as duty interpreter, was also one of Sai Bai's sons-in-law.

Tei Tenho and Sai Eishi were related by marriage, and Tei Tenho's grandmother had also come from the Sai clan. In addition, Sai Shū's grandfather and the maternal grandfather of Tei Kokusū, Shū's brother-in-law, were brothers.<sup>31</sup> Considering that the people who figure in the *Hakusei* were thus closely related to each other by marriage, it would probably be safe to assume that Tei Sedō (Master Tei) and Tei Hōyoku, who brought the *Mondō kanwa*, a draft version of the *Hakusei*, to Lin Qisheng in 1753, were also relatives of other people appearing in the *Hakusei* or related to them by marriage.

It would seem, therefore, that the *Hakusei* was, at least initially, a text similar in character to a family-transmitted work that recorded some events pertaining to a quite narrow circle of relatives without concealing even private matters. This conjecture is supported to some extent by some of the bibliographical information provided by extant manuscripts of the *Hakusei*, to be discussed in the next section.

## 5. Conclusion: Information Gleaned from Extant Manuscripts of the *Hakusei*

Manuscript B of the *Hakusei*, held by Kyoto University and used as the base-text for the present study, has an ownership seal at the end that reads “Tonkōdō” 敦厚堂. Tonkōdō was the studio name of Ryōhitsu 良弼 (born in 1789), who belonged to the ninth generation of the Maesato family of the Tei clan, which was a branch of the Yoza family, to which Tei Tenho belonged. In addition, Manuscript C, also held by Kyoto University, has “Ikemiyagushiku Pēchin” written on the cover and the seal “Ikemiyagushiku ki” 池宮城記 affixed at the start of the text. As noted, the Ikemiyagushiku family was directly descended from Tei Kokusū. This means that the two manuscripts held by Kyoto University formerly belonged to branches of the Tei clan, who had close connections with people who figure in the *Hakusei*.

Next, I would like to touch on the two manuscripts of the *Hakusei* held by Ishigaki City Yaeyama Museum. Manuscript D (*Hakusei mondō*) is badly damaged but includes both the preface and the final report, and it is a fine manuscript accompanied by phonetic glosses for characters difficult to read and headnotes written in Classical Sinitic mixed with vernacular Chinese. The handwriting is also clearly quite old. How did such a fine manuscript of the *Hakusei* end up in Yaeyama?

An interesting passage that may provide a lead for considering this question is found in the genealogy of Seijo 正恕 of the eighth generation of the Jōkan 上官 family, an official family of Yaeyama. Seijo was one of Yaeyama’s first interpreters.<sup>32</sup>

Submitted in the cyclic year *jiawu*, the thirty-ninth year of the same [Qianlong reign]. Receiving orders to study spoken Mandarin, I boarded a ship left in summer. Under *Iryō of the Tei clan, general interpreter and pēchin, whose personal name is Sakurin*, of Tōei, Kumemura, I studied spoken Mandarin and various documents day and night until the third month of the following year. Having made a careful study of the four tones, tonal prosody, and so on and *having been given by my teacher four secretly transmitted works*, I asked the Court to be able to return to my domicile [in Yaeyama]....

同（＝乾隆）三十九年甲午奉 憲令爲學習官音事、駕夏立地船、.....奉請久米府唐榮鄭氏伊良皆通事親雲上諱作霖公、日夜攻學官音併雜案、至翌年三月間。已講究四聲平仄等、既蒙授賜先生秘傳書四部、乃稟 朝廷請回藉〔籍〕.....

Tei Sakurin (Iramina), under whom Seijo of the Jōkan clan studied Mandarin in Kumemura, had earlier, in 1773, been looked after by Seijo and others when the ship on which he was travelling had taken shelter in Yaeyama in order to wait for favourable winds, and he had taught them Mandarin. He belonged to the seventh generation of the Maesato family of the Tei clan and was the lineal grandfather of Tei Ryōhitsu, a former owner of Manuscript B (*Kafu shiryō*, p. 691). It is not clear what the four “secretly transmitted works” given to Seijo by Tei Sakurin were,<sup>33</sup> but it is quite possible that they included the *Hakusei*. That a manuscript of the *Hakusei*, which had been compiled within a narrow, closed group, was preserved on Yaeyama, which lay a long way from Kumemura, could be explained if one supposes that Tei Sakurin especially conferred it on Seijo as a “secretly transmitted work” not only because of his studiousness but



also to repay him for the kindnesses he had received while staying in Yaeyama.

Among the teaching materials for Mandarin used by Kumemura interpreters around the same time as the *Hakusei* was compiled, there have also survived the *Gaku kanwa* and *Kanwa mondō bingo*. In particular, a person named Kin Han 金範, mentioned at the start of the *Kanwa mondō bingo* (Tenri manuscript), belonged to the twelfth generation of the Aharen 阿波連 family of the Kin 金 clan, and in 1750, at the age of thirty, he travelled to Fuzhou to study and returned three and a half years later in 1754, which means that the *Kanwa mondō bingo* is a textbook that was used around the same time as the *Hakusei*. But, as noted at the beginning, the two textbooks differ in some of their grammatical characteristics, and they were clearly compiled on the basis of different forms of Mandarin.<sup>34</sup> This, too, would suggest that the *Hakusei* was initially studied as a “family-transmitted work” within a closed group related by marriage.

The *Hakusei* had its beginnings with young students keeping careful records of their conversations with the castaways with the aim of improving their proficiency in Mandarin. It was not the work of an elder who had already attained a certain level of scholarship, but was a textbook for Mandarin that evolved among a group of young students. Initially, it may have been no more than individual notes by participants in the dialogues or by those who acted as scribes. There was then born amidst close personal relationships centred on the Tei and Sai clans the idea of pooling their notes, arranging them in chronological order, and turning them into a textbook of uniform content that covered the period from the arrival of the castaways to their departure, and this would have fuelled their desire to bring it to completion. When Tei Hōyoku, thought to have been one of their clansmen, asked a Confucian scholar in Fuzhou to give it a final check, he would have been carrying the expectations of all the interpreters and students in Kumemura who had been involved in its compilation. The original notes would, of course, have also been checked from time to time by the castaways themselves.<sup>35</sup>

Ryūkyū's tribute ships set sail from Naha every year in the eleventh or twelfth month. The tribute ship in 1753 left Naha in the eleventh month and arrived in Fuzhou towards the end of the same month. Tei Kokusū, one of Sai Shū's brothers-in-law, had boarded this ship to travel to Fuzhou for the first time to study there. But since Lin's preface to the *Hakusei* is dated the eleventh month of the same year, it would have been impossible for Tei Kokusū to ask Lin to review the text and write a preface and to bring all this to completion within the stated time span. It is likely that Tei Hōyoku, mentioned in Lin's preface, had travelled to Fuzhou on board the tribute ship for 1752 and had become one of Lin Qisheng's pupils. Lin's review and preface would then have been completed in time for Tei Kokusū's arrival.

These various matters that have come to light in connection with the compilation of the *Hakusei* are linked to the fact that, prior to the use of Mandarin teaching materials for group learning at the school Meirinkan 明倫館 in Kumemura, there had existed a sort of scholarly lineage centred on “families” for Kumemura interpreters to study Mandarin. It is to be supposed that, in order for these descendants of Chinese to preserve their position as representatives of “Chinese civilization” in Ryūkyū, these families, responsible for their education, would have played an important role and did in fact operate quite closely and effectively with one another.

The manner in which the duties and skills of interpreters were passed down is described in books. Such is the character of the Mandarin textbooks of Ryūkyū.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Until now, this textbook has often been called *Hakusei kanwa* on the basis of the title given in the manuscript held by Tenri Central Library. But none of the other manuscripts uses this title, and most of them call it *Hakusei*. Taking the view that the word “Hakusei” is sufficient for identifying the work in question, in the following I have used the title *Hakusei*.

<sup>2</sup> See Kizu Yūko 木津祐子, “Ryūkyū hensan no kanwa kahon ni miru ‘weiceng’ ‘buceng’ ‘meiyou’: sono kahon-kan sai ga imi suru koto” 琉球編纂の官話課本に見る「未曾」「不曾」「没有」——その課本間差異が意味すること [Comparative Analysis on the Usage of Negatives, WEICENG, BUCENG, and MEIYOU: the Significance of Their Differences according to Guanhua Textbooks Compiled in Ryukyu], *Chūgoku Gogaku* 中國語學 251 (2004).

<sup>3</sup> Setoguchi Ritsuko 瀬戸口律子, *Hakusei kanwa zen'yaku* 百姓官話全譯 [Complete translation of the *Hakusei kanwa*] (Tokyo: Meiji Shoin 明治書院, 1994).

<sup>4</sup> In this paper, the Chinese names of Ryukyuan are written in the Japanese reading of the Chinese characters, except when quoting conversations in Chinese.

<sup>5</sup> His real name was Qu Zhangshun 瞿張順, but the interpreters always called him Mr. Zhang (張氏).

<sup>6</sup> The word *ti* 替 is a conjunction indicating a paratactic relationship, a usage that is distinctive of the Mandarin of the *Hakusei*.

<sup>7</sup> See Setoguchi, op. cit.

<sup>8</sup> The castaways arrived at Unten 運天 Port on the 4th day of the fourth month, but since it is not known whether the duty interpreter took up his duties from that day, I have placed the commencement of the first period “early in the fourth month.” Considering that the date of the change from Interpreter Rin to Interpreter Ryō can be pinned down to the 15th day of the eighth month, it is to be surmised that the interpreters rotated on the 15th day of each month. But since it has not been possible to confirm this, the date of the change of interpreter has been given as the “middle of the month” except for the eighth month.

<sup>9</sup> Nahashi Kikakubu Shishi Henshūshitsu 那覇市企劃部市史編集室, *Naha shishi: shiryō hen* 那覇市史 資料編 [History of Naha city: Materials], vols. 1–6 (1980–), *Kafu shiryō* 家譜資料 [Genealogical materials], vols. 2a & 2b, *Kumemura kafu* 久米村家譜 [Kumemura genealogies].

<sup>10</sup> Zhongguo Diyi Lishi Dang'anguan 中國第一歷史檔案館 (First Historical Archives of China), ed., *Qingdai Zhong-Liu guanxi dang'an xuanbian* 清代中琉關係檔案選編 [Selection of archival sources on China-Ryūkyū relations during the Qing period] (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju 中華書局, 1993); id., ed., *Qingdai Zhong-Liu guanxi dang'an xubian* 清代中琉關係檔案續編 [Continuation of archival sources on China-Ryūkyū relations during the Qing period] (Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 1994).

- <sup>11</sup> Tenri manuscript: “eighteen years” (十八歲).
- <sup>12</sup> 十二世培……三女眞志部、適鄭丈鳳屋部里之子親雲上／四女眞吳染、適阮崇基宜保秀才／五女武美度金、適鄭國樞池宮城里之子。(Saishi kafu 蔡氏家譜 [Gima family], p. 280)
- <sup>13</sup> 難：通事昆仲几位。／鄭：兄弟四个。／難：你排行第几呢。／鄭：排行第二。(14a)
- <sup>14</sup> Saishi kafu (Uehara family), p. 342; Teishi kafu 鄭氏家譜 (Ikemiyagushiku family), p. 579.
- <sup>15</sup> Teishi kafu (Ikemiyagushiku family), p. 584.
- <sup>16</sup> 十四世中議大夫宣猷。……乾隆十九年甲戌、爲學文詞、濟公務事、諸大夫長史等、奉憲令、選舉(猷)等六人、館于首里、隨國師蔡公精學文法……[學文法者魏開祖金節鄭文鳳毛維基梁廷樞也]。(Teishi kafu [Kohagura 古波藏 family], p. 624; passage in square brackets given in half-size, two-column text in original)
- <sup>17</sup> 十五世文龜……雍正五年丁未二月十四日未時生、原係紫金大夫鄭國柱屋部親方四男。……乾隆六年辛酉十二月初二日、因師崇仲井眞里之子無子爲嗣子。(Teishi kafu [Noborikawa family], p. 615)
- <sup>18</sup> Memorial of Pan Siju 潘思渠, dated Qianlong 16/4/24 (Qingdai Zhong-Liu guanxi dang'an xuanbian, p. 36); memorial of Chen Shiguan 陳世倌, dated Qianlong 17/5 (Qingdai Zhong-Liu guanxi dang'an xubian, p. 215).
- <sup>19</sup> 童名眞三良，字定菴，康熙六十一年壬寅正月十四日丑時生。乾隆十九年甲戌八月十三日卒享年三十三。(Teishi kafu [Yoza family], p. 674)
- <sup>20</sup> It may be noted that it was Tei Bunryū, then resident interpreter at Ryūkyū House, who in 1751 wrote a report announcing the arrival of the castaways' repatriation ship in Fuzhou (see Pan Siju's memorial cited in n. 17).
- <sup>21</sup> The above is based on the following passage (p. 315): 十三世諱功熙。……乾隆十九年、二女眞那武樽、年十九歲、嫁都通事鄭餘慶與儀親雲上二男鄭天眷。三男德迪、年二十歲、娶蔡永思字良親雲上二女思龜。
- <sup>22</sup> Rekidai hōan II.36 (ed. Okinawa Kenritsu Toshokan Shiryō Henshūshitsu 沖縄縣立圖書館史料編集室, vol. 5, p. 208).
- <sup>23</sup> The original text reads as follows: …只是官話本來不大曉得，又兼好久沒有到中國去，官話曉得的都忘記去了。如今听你們的講話，弟還知道，弟自家說，就「說」不出來，還要求你們教導纔好。……弟當日在福建的時候，耳之所聞，目之所見，往來交接，都是中國的言語。所以略略曉得。如今回來好久了，貴國的官話禮數，好就沒有听见，故此都不記得了。(22ab)
- <sup>24</sup> 船戶福州府閩縣人蔣長興、客商蘇州府吳縣人潘順觀 (Shipmaster: Jiang Changxing from Bin county, Fuzhou prefecture; travelling merchant: Pan Shunguan, from Wu county, Suzhou prefecture). The *Hakusei* touches on the fact that, among the twenty-seven newly arrived castaways, there was one person from Suzhou, and his family name was indeed Pan.  
難民：船上共有多少人呢。／通事：連客共有二十七人。／難民：既是福建的船，想必客人也是福建的人了。／通事：有一位客是你們的鄉裡，也是江南蘇州府人。／難民：叫什麼名字呢。／通事：我見那文書寫着姓潘，名字忘記了。(12a)
- <sup>25</sup> Nahashi 那霸市 (Naha City), Nahashi sekai isan shūhen seibi jigyo: sekihi fukugen chōsa hōkokusho 那霸市世界遺産周邊整備事業 石碑復元調査報告書 [Renovation project for

---

areas surrounding World Heritage Sites in Naha: Survey report on the restoration of steles] (2004).

<sup>26</sup> To the best of my knowledge, the only prior reference to a connection with the *Hakusei* is found in Okinawaken Bunka Shinkōkai Kōbunsho Kanribu Shiryō Henshūshitsu 沖縄縣文化振興会公文書管理部史料編集室, ed., *Okinawa kenshi: kakuron hen* 沖縄縣史 各論編 [History of Okinawa prefecture: Individual topics], vol. 4, *Kinsei* 近世 [The early modern period] (2005), pt. 5, “Kinsei Ryūkyū no shosō” 近世琉球の諸相 [Aspects of early modern Ryūkyū], chap. 4, “Hyōryū, hyōchaku to kinsei Ryūkyū” 漂流・漂着と近世琉球 [Castaways and early modern Ryūkyū], in which Watanabe Miki 渡辺美季 refers to this grave as the grave of “three officials named Zhu from Changshu county, Suzhou prefecture,” who figure in the *Hakusei*. I am indebted to Nomura Naomi 野村直美 (of the Historiographical Office of Okinawa Prefectural Archives at the time) for alerting me to the existence of these materials.

<sup>27</sup> *Qingdai Zhong-Liu guanxi dang'an xubian*, p. 177. It should be noted that in Pan Siju's memorial the phrase “three officials [named] Zhu” (朱三官) is rendered as 朱三觀.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 179.

<sup>29</sup> *Rekidai hōan* II.8 (ed. Okinawa Kenritsu Toshokan Shiryō Henshūshitsu, vol. 5, p. 245).

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 260.

<sup>31</sup> Sai Bai's father Shaku 灼 and Tei Kokusū's maternal grandfather Sai Yō 蔡耀 were brothers (*Saishi kafu* [Gima family], pp. 238–243).

<sup>32</sup> *Jōkan-sei keizu (hittō) rokusei Seigi* 上官姓系圖 (筆頭) 六世正儀. See Kizu Yūko, “‘Kanwa’ no hyōchaku—Kenryū nenkan Yaeyama ni okeru ‘kanwa’ no denpa” 「官話」の漂着——乾隆年間八重山における「官話」の傳播 [The arrival of “Mandarin”: The dissemination of “Mandarin” in Yaeyama during the Qianlong reign], in *Higashi to nishi no bunka kōryū* 東と西の文化交流 [Cultural exchange between east and west] (Suita: Kansai Daigaku Tōzai Gakujutsu Kenkyūjo 關西大學東西學術研究所, 2004).

<sup>33</sup> In Kizu, “‘Kanwa’ no hyōchaku,” I pointed out that the “secretly transmitted works” may also have included the *Kanbunshū* 漢文集, another work that has been preserved in Yaeyama.

<sup>34</sup> See Kizu, “Ryūkyū hensan no kanwa kahon ni miru ‘weiceng’ ‘buceng’ ‘meiyou’.”

<sup>35</sup> That Lin's preface considers the *Hakusei* to have been compiled by the merchant Bai Ruilin is probably based on the fact that such checking by the castaways actually took place.