

Some Reflections on the First Muslim Visitor to Japan

James Harry Morris

Japanese relations with Islam and Muslims have a much longer history¹ than is commonly assumed. Most scholarship on Japanese-Middle East and Japanese-Muslim relations has focused on the modern period. Nevertheless, there is evidence that Persian visitors came to Japan as early as 736CE (*Tenpyō hachi nen* 天平8年).² It has been postulated that some of these Persians were Syriac Christians,³ Zoroastrians, or Manichaeans,⁴ however, the historical sources do not provide details of their religious affiliation and therefore no definitive conclusions in regards to their religions can be made.⁵ This research note explores the visit and biography of a man who came to Japan some five and a half centuries later than these first Persian visitors, a man whom Hosaka Shuji notes was the first recorded Muslim visitor to Japan.⁶ This figure, known as Sādōulǔdīng 撒都魯丁 in Chinese and Sadorotei in Japanese, came to Japan as part of an envoy sent by Khubilai⁷ Khan (1215-1294CE), the first ruler of the Yuán 元 dynasty (1271-1368CE), in 1275CE. Herein Sādōulǔdīng's biography and the significance of his visit to Japan will be explored.

James Harry Morris is a doctoral candidate at the University of St Andrews, Scotland, and a Specially Appointed Research Associate at the National Institute of Technology, Fukushima College (J. Fukushima Kōgyō Kōtō Senmon Gakkō 福島工業高等専門学校). His research focuses on conversion to Christianity in East Asia, Christian-Muslim relations in East Asia, and Syriac Christianity in East Asia. He would like to extend thanks to Tomiyama Aki 富山亜紀 for discussing the contents of this paper and its translations, and to the editors of AJISS.

Who was Sādōulǔdīng? The Primary Sources

Chinese sources tell us little about Sādōulǔdīng. The *Yuán Shǐ* 元史 notes that following the defeat of the Mongol forces in the attempted invasion of Japan in the winter of 1274, an envoy carrying a letter⁸ was sent in the second month of the following year consisting of Dù Shìzhōng 杜世忠, official from the Ministry of Rites; Hé Wénzhù 何文著, official from the Ministry of War; and Sādōulǔdīng, chief planning consultant.⁹ However, after its dispatch the Yuán authorities failed to receive a report, and five years later, in 1280CE the members of the envoy were killed.¹⁰ The *Xīn Yuán Shǐ* 新元史, composed in the twentieth century by Kē Shàomín 柯劭忞 (1850-1933) as an attempt to correct numerous errors present in the *Yuán Shǐ*, provides a slightly different account. It notes that in the second month of 1275, an envoy consisting of an official from the Ministry of Rites, Dù Shìzhōng; an official from the Ministry of War, Hé Wénzhù, the chief planning consultant, Sādōulǔdīng; a Korean bureaucrat, Xú Zàn 徐贊; and some 30 staff members went to Japan in possession of a letter requesting friendly relations with the country.¹¹ The envoy landed in the fourth month at Murotsu 室津 in Nagato 長門 Province (present day Yamaguchi Prefecture), and were transported to Daizaifu 太宰府 in Chikuzen 築前 Province (present-day Fukuoka Prefecture).¹² In the eighth month, the governor of Daizaifu escorted the group to Kamakura.¹³ Then in the ninth month, envoy members Dù Shìzhōng, Hé Wénzhù, Sādōulǔdīng, Xú Zàn, and record keeper (scribe) Dǒng Wèi 董畏 were beheaded by Hōjō Tokumune 北條時宗 (1251-1284CE) at Tatsu no Kuchi 龍口.¹⁴ The *Yuán Shǐ* and *Xīn Yuán Shǐ* agree on several key points, which allow us to garner some details about Sādōulǔdīng, namely his name, position, and execution. Both texts also note that the envoys were in possession of a letter. Sādōulǔdīng's position is described in both texts as *jìyì guān* 計議官 (J. *Keigikan*), an official in charge of arrangements or planning. The texts differ on the dating of the executions of Sādōulǔdīng and the other envoy members; the *Yuán Shǐ* records the year 1280CE, meaning that Sādōulǔdīng would have been in Japan for five years, whilst the *Xīn Yuán Shǐ* records the ninth month of 1275, meaning that he would have only spent five months in the country. The *Xīn Yuán Shǐ* is more accurate in this regard, as shall be illustrated below through comparison to Japanese primary sources and modern scholarship. The *Xīn Yuán Shǐ* also records the movements of the envoy in Japan from landing in Nagato to their execution at Tatsu no Kuchi, which if accurate

illustrates that Sādōulǔdīng sojourned for approximately four months in Daizaifu.

Japanese sources provide further details on Sādōulǔdīng. Verifying the account given in the *Xīn Yuán Shǐ*, the *Kamakura Nendaiki Uragaki* 鎌倉年代記裏書, completed in 1332, notes that the envoy landed at Murotsu Bay, Nagato Province, on the fifteenth day of the fourth month of 1275CE.¹⁵ In the eighth month, five envoy members were summoned to go to the Kantō 関東 region, and on the seventh of the ninth month they were beheaded at Tatsu no Kuchi.¹⁶ The five were:

1. The 34-year-old, Mongolian, official of the Ministry of Rites, Dù Shìzhōng.
2. The 38-year-old, Chinese, official of the Ministry of War, Hé Wénzhē 何文着.
3. The 32-year-old, *chéng shì láng* 承仕郎 (J. *shōjirō/jōjirō*), Uyghur, Muslim servant, Dūlǔdīng 都魯丁.
4. The 32-year-old, scribe from the country of Xūnwèi 薰畏, Guo 杲/果.¹⁷
5. The 33-year-old, Korean, translator Jiāng Xū 將徐.¹⁸

The text then records preparations for a future invasion by Yuán forces.¹⁹ On several occasions the *Kamakura Nendaiki Uragaki* provides different names and details to the Chinese sources. Sādōulǔdīng's name is incorrectly rendered as Dūlǔdīng. According to the text, Sādōulǔdīng was 32 at the time of his execution; he held the rank *chéng shì láng*, was a *fuihui* 回々/回回 (C. *huíhuí*), and a *fuihui yōnin* 回々用人 (C. *huíhuí yòng rén*).²⁰ The term *chéng shì* 承仕 (J. *shōji/jōji*) refers to a person who oversees equipment such as carpeting and folding doors during ceremonies and rituals, and dresses in the style of a monk or priest.²¹ The addition of the term *láng* 郎 (J. *rō*) used in various terms to indicate different kinds of bureaucratic rank²² likely indicates that Sādōulǔdīng was the official in charge the aforementioned ceremonial equipment overseeing. This does not necessarily conflict with the position of *jìyì guān* listed in Chinese sources, although it does provide greater specificity as to the sort of planning that Sādōulǔdīng may have been involved in. The fact that the writers describe Sādōulǔdīng as a *chéng shì láng*, a role which was undertaken by people in priestly or monkish attire (J. *Sōgyō no mono* 僧形の者), likely points to the exoticism with which this visitor was viewed and the ways in which he was demarked by his differing behaviour and appearance in comparison to other envoy members. The

term may also suggest that Sādōulǔdīng wore religious clothing or attire which evoked the image of religiosity for the Japanese authors. The further role of yōnin 用人 (C. *yòngrén*) likely indicates that he was a servant or assistant of some description.²³

The text uses the descriptor *fuifui* on two occasions to refer to Sādōulǔdīng, firstly as a prenominal description of the figure, and secondly in the term *fuifui yōnin*.²⁴ The term *fuifui* can refer to members of the *Huízú* 回族 (J. *Kaizoku*) ethnic group; those who reside in the Níngxià 寧夏 region of China; Islam; or certain countries in Central Asia.²⁵ Scholars have argued that Sādōulǔdīng was a Uyghur²⁶ or an Arab,²⁷ but I would caution against indiscriminately labelling him as such. There are links between the term *fuifui* (C. *huíhuí*) and the genesis of the terms *Huíjiào* 回教 (J. *Kaikyō*, E. Islam) and *Huígǔ* 回鶻 (J. *Kaikotsu*), which refers to the Uyghur ethnic group.²⁸ However, according to Lo Jung-pang, though the term referred predominantly to Muslims it also acted as a general term for the peoples of Central Asia.²⁹ Moreover, as Xu Xin notes, the term once referred to all western Asian, Middle Eastern, and European peoples, and with the use of various prefixes and suffixes the three Abrahamic traditions.³⁰ To further complicate this issue, the *Yuán Shǐ* uses the term in various senses. The term is regularly used in a way that clearly does not refer to Uyghurs, for instance when it is used in lists of different nationalities in which descriptors for Uyghurs such as *Huígǔ*,³¹ *Wèiwù* 畏兀 (E. Qocho) and *Wèiwùèr* 畏吾兒 (E. Qocho)³² also appear as separate entities.³³ On other occasions, the term adopts a general meaning used alongside the races of Mongols (C. *Ménggǔ* 蒙古) and Han Chinese (C. *Hàn rén* 漢人)³⁴ to describe a third racial category present in Yuán society. At other times, geographic specificity is offered through the application of locational prefixes allowing the term to denote specific *huíhuí* groups.³⁵ Such usage illustrates that the term is not necessarily synonymous with the term Uyghur, but moreover that it may be used as a general descriptor for non-Mongol and non-Han sections of Yuán society. Moreover, if we accept the argument that the country of Xūnwèi used in reference to Guǒ in the *Kamakura Nendaiki Uragaki* is a reference to Uyghur territories, as Tsuji Zennosuke, P. Y. Saeki and Kuwata Tadachika assert,³⁶ then we must also assume that the term *fuifui* refers to a different identity, as is the case when terms related to Uyghurs and the term *huíhuí* are used in close proximity in the *Yuán Shǐ*. Michael Dillon notes that contemporaneous accounts almost always refer to Central Asians as Muslims by using the term *huíhuí* and related vocabulary.³⁷ Similarly, the

Ben Cao Gang Mu Dictionary notes that the term usually refers to Muslims, but may also bear a geographical connotation referring to areas of north-western China and Central Asia.³⁸ Given all of this, it appears that references to *huíhuí* in the *Yuán Shǐ* identify said people primarily as Muslims with possible connotations of being Central Asian, Western Asian or Uyghur. As such, I would argue that whilst the term *fuihui* denotes that Sādōulūdīng was likely a Muslim, it cannot be used to identify his race beyond a general suggestion that he was likely from Central Asia, Western Asia, or Uyghur territory. Moreover, if we accept the postulation that Xūnwèi is a reference to Uyghur territory, it is unlikely that Sādōulūdīng was a Uyghur as we would then expect the same terminology to be used. Since the text does not contextually refer to the religious affiliations of other envoy members, it might be possible that the term *fuihui* is to be understood primarily as an ethnic or racial category, however, as the descriptor is used twice (once to describe his personage and once to describe his role) it would seem likely that at least one iteration refers to his religious identity since repetition of his ethnicity or race in such close proximity would be unnecessary. Nevertheless, it is also apparent that contemporaneously religious identities were often treated as ethnic or racial categories, since the distinctions between ethnicity, race, and religious identity familiar to us in the modern world had not yet been developed.³⁹ In other words, the term Muslim (J. *fuihui*) was not only a religious categorization but an ethnic and racial one.

The *Kamakura Nendaiki Uragaki* contains material absent in other documents. It records different names and roles for the envoy members. However, it also agrees with the *Xīn Yuán Shǐ* in terms of the order and timing of events. Whilst the *Kamakura Nendaiki Uragaki* appears to be the most detailed historical source, it is the *Dai Nihonshi* 大日本史 (written from the seventeenth to the early twentieth Century) that appears to be the most accurate, since it was composed with reference to numerous local, national, Chinese, and Japanese records. There are two passages concerning Sādōulūdīng in the *Dai Nihonshi*. The first appears in volume 201, and notes that an envoy from Yuán China consisting of Dù Shìzhōng, Hé Wénzhù, Sādōulūdīng, and others landed in Murotsu, Nagato in 1275.⁴⁰ The envoy was sent to Kamakura at the command of Hōjō Tokimune 北条時宗 (1251-1284CE), where all its members were beheaded.⁴¹ The second reference appears in the 243rd volume, in which further details pertaining to the envoy are conveyed. It notes that in the fourth month of 1275, an official from the Ministry of Rites, Dù Shìzhōng; an official from the Ministry of War, Hé Wénzhù, and their chief planning consultant, Chèdōulūdīng

撒都魯丁 (a misprint or alternative rendering of Sādōulūdīng), brought a letter from Yuán China seeking to establish good relations.⁴² It continues to record that in the eighth month, Dù Shizhōng, Hé Wénzhù, Chèdōulūdīng, and two others were sent to Kamakura, and finally in the ninth month they were executed by Hōjō Tokimune.⁴³ The *Dai Nihonshi* therefore allows us to corroborate details given in other sources, namely that Sādōulūdīng was a *jìyì guān*, that the group landed in Murotsu carrying a letter, that the group was sent to Kamakura in the eighth month, and were executed in the ninth month.

There are other potentially useful primary sources which may be used to explore the figure of Sādōulūdīng. The *Hōjō Kudaiki* 北条九代記 (1676CE) radically differs from other sources arguing that the envoy was not executed, but sent back to China.⁴⁴ Yet it does not refer to Sādōulūdīng by name.⁴⁵ The *Zenrin Kokuhōki* 善隣国宝記 (1470CE) provides a similar account, but in agreement with the *Yuán Shǐ* notes that the envoy was executed in 1280CE.⁴⁶ Hayashi Razan 林羅山 (1583-1657CE) and Hayashi Gahō's 林鷺峰 (1618-1688) *Honchō Tsugan* 本朝通鑑 (1670CE) records many of the same details as other documents including the landing in Murotsu, sojourning in Daizaifu, movement to Kantō, and execution of five envoy members at Tatsu no Kuchi by Hōjō Tokimune.⁴⁷

Comparing the details given in all the foregoing sources, there are several key points that we are able to ascertain about Sādōulūdīng. The *Yuán Shǐ*, *Xīn Yuán Shǐ* and *Dai Nihonshi* all refer to him as holding the position of *jìyì guān*, an official in charge of planning, arrangements, or consultation, and due to the agreement between these sources we can assume that this description is historically accurate. The *Kamakura Nendaiki Uragaki* describes him as a *chéng shì láng* (J. *shōjirō/jōjirō*) and *fuifui yonin*, which as noted does not necessarily conflict with accounts which describe him as a *jìyì guān*, but may suggest that he was of lower rank than described in the *Yuán Shǐ*, *Xīn Yuán Shǐ* and *Dai Nihonshi*. The account of the *Kamakura Nendaiki Uragaki* may also point to the religious nature with which Sādōulūdīng was viewed, since the role of *chéng shì láng* was undertaken by those who wore monkish attire. The account moreover suggests that he was a Muslim through its use of the descriptor *fuifui*. A second point that finds agreement across multiple sources (the *Xīn Yuán Shǐ*, *Kamakura Nendaiki Uragaki*, *Dai Nihonshi*, and *Honchō Tsugan*) is that the envoy landed at Murotsu in Nagato Province. It also seems likely that the envoy spent some time in Daizaifu since this is mentioned in the *Xīn Yuán Shǐ*, *Hōjō Kudaiki*,

Honchō Tsugan, and *Zenrin Kokuhōki*. The envoy was sent to Kamakura in the eighth month and executed in the ninth month at Tatsu no Kuchi (as attested to by the *Xīn Yuán Shǐ*, *Kamakura Nendaiki Uragaki*, *Dai Nihonshi* and *Honchō Tsugan*). Most sources also agree that the envoy was carrying a letter.

To summarize, Sādōulūdīng, an official in charge of planning or arrangements, arrived in Japan as part of a letter bearing envoy at Murotsu in Nagato Province in early 1275CE. After briefly sojourning in Daizaifu he was sent with other envoy members (between three and five persons) to Kamakura in the eighth month of 1275CE, and was subsequently executed in the ninth month at Tatsu no Kuchi. Since he is described as a *fuifui* in the *Kamakura Nendaiki Uragaki* it is possible to suggest that he was a Muslim.

Sādōulūdīng's Name

The descriptor *fuifui* likely indicates that Sādōulūdīng was a Muslim, but this is not conclusive evidence due to the term's multiple potential meanings and its appearance in only one of the primary sources. Sādōulūdīng's name allows us to garner details about his personage and religious identity. Sādōulūdīng is the Chinese rendering of the name Ṣadr al-Dīn.⁴⁸ The name, which translates as "person at the forefront or head of their faith," points to Muslim parentage.⁴⁹ Several figures in the *Yuán Shǐ* have names which include the element *al-Dīn* (C. Lūdīng 魯丁), including two figures named Fakhr al-Din (C. Fāhélūdīng 法合魯丁⁵⁰ and Fāhūlūdīng 法忽魯丁),⁵¹ the astronomer Jamal al-Din (C. Zhāmālūdīng 扎馬魯丁),⁵² and another Sādōulūdīng 撒都魯丁 who was executed in China alongside others in 1290 or 1291.⁵³ Other possible renderings of the element *al-Dīn* also existed in contemporaneous China including *Érdīng* 兒丁, *Ládīng* 刺丁 and others. *Dīng* 丁 has since become a common Islamic surname.⁵⁴ Those who adopted the name settled in Shandong 山東 and Guangxi 廣西, whilst some of those who adopted the name were originally from the north-western part of China.⁵⁵ In the Yuán period, many people with the name *al-Dīn* were Persian or of Persian ancestry (although it must be noted that some were Turks).⁵⁶ Indeed, the aforementioned Jamal al-Din and his son Fakhr al-Din were Persians.⁵⁷ This makes sense since *al-Dīn* is a name of Persian origin, and Ṣadr al-Dīn was a popular name in contemporaneous Persia.⁵⁸ As such I would suggest that there is a strong possibility that the Sādōulūdīng (Ṣadr al-Dīn) who visited Japan was a Persian or of Persian ancestry, although Arabian ancestry or an ancestry linked to north-western

China are also possibilities. Moreover, the figure's name clearly distinguishes him as a Muslim.

The Importance of Sādōulǔdīng's Visit

Sādōulǔdīng's visit to Japan is little more than an interesting historical episode, but the events in which he was involved and his death did not lack influence. In his classical study, Nakaba Yamada argues that with the executions "the government of Japan assumed a state of complete hostility to Kublai's empire,"⁵⁹ making the second Mongol invasion of Japan in 1281CE an inevitability. The primary sources also attest to this result with the *Yuán Shǐ*, for instance, noting that the commanders of the first invasion Xīndū 忻都 and Hong Dagu 洪茶丘 (C. Hóng Cháqiū) held meetings regarding Japan in the wake of the executions.⁶⁰ Shortly thereafter the Chinese commander from the first invasion, Fàn Wénhǔ 范文虎, was invited to discuss the invasion of Japan, and then began recruiting soldiers for that purpose.⁶¹ In other words, the execution of the envoys was a major contributing factor in the second Mongol invasion of Japan in 1281CE. The executions also had influence on the work of contemporaneous thinkers. One of the earliest sources to refer to the executions, a letter written in 1275CE by the Buddhist monk and founder of Nichiren Buddhism (J. *Nichirenshū* 日蓮宗), Nichiren 日蓮 (1222-1282CE), uses the execution of the envoys as a theological tool. Nichiren notes that it is pitiful that whilst the innocent envoys were executed, those who are the real enemies of the country (Buddhists of other schools of thought) are allowed to live.⁶² The executions of the envoys therefore appear to have had direct political results and were repurposed for Nichiren's theological purposes. It is only the fact that Mongol ambassadors were executed that influenced Japanese and Mongol-Chinese responses, not the specific people who were killed.

As far as can be ascertained Sādōulǔdīng is the first Muslim to have ever set foot on Japanese soil. This fact is little known, and most histories of Islam in Japan begin with the establishment of Ottoman-Japanese relations in the late nineteenth century.⁶³ The fact that a Muslim visited Japan centuries earlier than is commonly assumed and well before members of the other Abrahamic faiths illustrates the need to reassess commonly accepted historiographical chronologies. This research note seeks to provide one starting point for such a reassessment. Sādōulǔdīng's visit is also potentially important for Japanese and non-Japanese Muslims in Japan who through a knowledge of Sādōulǔdīng are able to claim a history in the country which predates the presence of Christianity and matches the length of

Nichiren Buddhism. Perhaps most importantly, Sādōulūdīng's visit must be used alongside other historical sources to demonstrate that foreigners, both Muslim and non-Muslim, have contributed to Japanese history. This is becoming increasingly important as many in Japan double down on political policies and academic and popular discourses which view the country as contemporarily and historically closed.⁶⁴ In summation, while Sādōulūdīng's role in Japanese history was limited, the envoy of which he was a member had real political effects. Furthermore, knowledge of his visit is potentially important for challenging contemporary political discourses, for the identity formation of Japanese and non-Japanese Muslims, and as a starting point for questioning commonly accepted Japanese and global historiographical chronologies.

Endnotes

1. Hosaka Shuji notes that the dating of Japan's first encounter with the Middle East is uncertain: Hosaka Shuji, "Japan and the Gulf: A Historical Perspective of Pre-Oil Relations," *Kyoto Bulletin of Islamic Area Studies* 4, no. 1 and 2 (March, 2011): 3.
2. The Japanese imperial history, the *Shoku Nihongi* (completed in 797CE,) records the presence of Persians (Hashibito/Perushajin 波斯人) in Japan in 736CE. First, it notes in the eighth month of 736CE that after returning from China, vice-envoy Nakatomi no Nashiro 中臣名代 (?-745CE) led a group of three Chinese and one Persian to have an audience with Emperor Shōmu (Shōmu Tennō 聖武天皇, 701-756CE). Naoki Kōjirō 直木孝次郎 et al. (J. Hoka 他), trans. *Shoku Nihongi* 続日本紀, Vol. 2 (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1988), 39. In the original text:
八月庚午。入唐副使從五位上中臣朝臣名代等率唐人三人波斯人一人拜朝。
Kuroita Katsumi 黑板勝美 and Kokushi Daiki Henshūkai 國史大系編修会, ed., *Shoku Nihongi: Zenpen* 続日本紀: 前編 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1979), 141. The text then records that in the 11th month, Nakatomi no Nashiro and others were given promotions in rank in an audience with the Emperor. During the same meeting, the Chinese Kōho Tōchō 皇甫東朝 and Persian Rimitsuei 李密翳 were presented with ranks according to their social status. Naoki et al., trans. *Shoku Nihongi*, Vol. 2, 40. In the original text:
十一月戊寅。天皇臨朝。詔授入唐副使從五位上中臣朝臣名代從四位下。故判官正六位上田口朝臣養年富。紀朝臣馬主並贈從五位下。准判官從七位下大伴宿祢首名。唐人皇甫東朝。波斯人李密翳等授位有差。

- Kuroita and Kokushi Daikei Henshūkai, ed., *Shoku Nihongi: Zenpen*, 141. Some scholars have theorized even earlier interactions between Persians and the Japanese. See Itō Gikyō, “Zoroastrians’ Arrival in Japan (Pahlavica I),” *Orient* 15 (1979), 55-63; Itō Gikyō 伊藤義教, *Perushia Bunka torai kō: Shirukurōdo kara Asuka e* ベルシア文化渡来考: シルクロードから飛鳥へ (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1980); Imoto, Eiichi 井本英一, *Kodai no Nihon to Iran* 古代の日本とイラン (Tokyo: Gakuseisha, 1980); Matsuki Akimoto 松木明知, “Kinmeichō ni Rainichi shita Kudara no ishi Ōyuryōda ni tsuite” 欽明朝に來日した百濟の醫師王有陵陀について, *Nihon Ishi Gaku Zasshi* 日本醫史學雜誌 29, no. 4, (1983), 447-454; Nishimoto Masahiro 西本昌弘, “Asuka ni kita seiiki no Toharajin,” 飛鳥に來た西域の吐火羅人, *Kansai Daigaku Tōzai Gakujutsu Kenkyūsho Kiyō* 関西大学東西學術研究所紀要 43 (2010), 1-23.
3. This argument was first theorized and popularized by P. Y. Saeki: Saeki Yoshirō 佐伯好郎, *Keikyō hibun kenkyū* 景教碑文研究 (Tokyo: Tairō Shoin, 1911), 14-16; P. Y. Saeki, *The Nestorian Monument in China* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1916), 62.
 4. Itō, *Perushia Bunka torai kō*.
 5. James Harry Morris, “The Figures of Kōho and Li-mi-i, and the Origins of the Case for a Christian Missionary Presence, in Tenpyō Era Japan,” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 27, no. 2 (April 2017): 5.
 6. Hosaka, “Japan and the Gulf: A Historical Perspective of Pre-Oil Relations,” 7.
 7. Hübiliè 忽必烈.
 8. The letter was first presented by an envoy in 1267CE demanding the vassalage of Japan with the threat of using force. The letter known as the *Mōkokoku Chōjō* 蒙古國牒狀 is published in original form in: Nihon hōsō kyōkai shu-zaihan 日本放送協会取材班, ed., *Dai Mongoru 3: ōinaru miyako, kyodai kokka no isan* 大モンゴル3: 大いなる都、巨大国家の遺産 (Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten, 1992), 56-57. An English translation is included in: K. W. Chase, “Mongol Intentions towards Japan in 1266,” *Sino-Japanese Studies* 16 (2009): 15-16. Nakaba Yamada suggests that the letter presented by the 1275CE envoy was a different letter, one apologizing for the previous invasion. See Nakaba Yamada, *Ghenkō: The Mongol Invasion of Japan* (London: Smith, Elder and Co. 1916), 149.
 9. *Yuán Shǐ* 元史, *Lièzhuàn dì jiūshíwǔ wài yí yī* 列傳第九十五 外夷一, Paragraph 37. The text reads:
十一年三月, 命鳳州經略使忻都、高麗軍民總管洪茶丘, 以千料舟、拔都魯輕疾舟、汲水小舟各三百, 共九百艘, 載士卒一萬五千, 期以七月征日本。冬十月, 入其國, 敗之。而官軍不整, 又矢盡, 惟虜掠四境而歸。十二年二月, 遣禮部侍郎杜世忠、兵部侍郎何文著、計議官撒都魯丁往使, 復致書, 亦不報。十四年, 日本遣商人持金來易銅

錢，許之。十七年二月，日本殺國使杜世忠等。征東元帥忻都、洪茶丘請自率兵往討，廷議姑少緩之。五月，召範文虎，議征日本。八月，詔募征日本士卒。

The *Yuán Shǐ* is available from the Chinese Text Project (C. *Zhōngguó zhé-xué shū diànzǐ huà jìhuà* 中國哲學書電子化計劃), <https://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=en&res=603186>, accessed May 2, 2018.

10. *Yuán Shǐ* 元史, *Lièzhuàn dì jiùshíwǔ wài yí yī* 列傳第九十五 外夷一, Paragraph 37.
11. *Xīn Yuán Shǐ* 新元史, *Juǎn èrbǎi wúshí lièzhuàn dì yībǎi sishíqī* 卷二百五十列傳第一百四十七, Paragraph 20. The text reads:
十二年二月，帝復使禮部侍郎杜世忠、兵部郎中何文著、計議官撒都魯丁齋靈書通好於日本，高麗人郎將徐贊及搆工上佐等三十人導行。四月，杜世忠等至長門室津，既而移築前太宰府。八月，太宰府護送世忠等至金兼倉。九月，北條時宗斬杜世忠、何文著、撒都魯丁及書狀官董畏、高麗人徐贊於龍口，梟其首。

Refer also to the short account given earlier in the text in which *Sādōulūdīng* is referred to by the name *Chèlūdōubù* 撤魯都不: *Xīn Yuán Shǐ* 新元史, *Juǎn jiǔ běnjì dì jiǔ* 卷九本紀第九, Paragraph 29 and 36. It states:

庚戌，禮部侍郎杜世忠、兵部郎中何文著、計議官撤魯都不等使日本國...九月甲戌，杜世忠等為日本人所殺。

The *Xīn Yuán Shǐ* is available from the Chinese Text Project, <https://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=en&chapter=110272#p21>, accessed May 2, 2018.

12. *Xīn Yuán Shǐ* 新元史, *Juǎn èrbǎi wúshí lièzhuàn dì yībǎi sishíqī* 卷二百五十列傳第一百四十七, Paragraph 20. Yamada suggests that the envoy's movement to Daizaifu was the result of being compelled to go there following the authorities' refusal to grant permission to land at Murotsu: Yamada, *Ghenkō: The Mongol Invasion of Japan*, 149.
13. *Xīn Yuán Shǐ* 新元史, *Juǎn èrbǎi wúshí lièzhuàn dì yībǎi sishíqī* 卷二百五十列傳第一百四十七, Paragraph 20.
14. *Ibid.*
15. Takeuchi Rizō 竹内理三, ed., *Kamakura Nendaiki, Buke Nendaiki, Kamakura Dainikki* 鎌倉年代記; 武家年代記; 鎌倉大日記 (Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 1979), 32. The full passage relating to *Sādōulūdīng* in the *Kamakura Nendaiki Uragaki* reads:
今年建治元四月十四日、大元使着長門国室津浦、八月、件牒使五人被召下関東、九月七日、於滝口刎首、一、中須大夫礼部侍郎杜世忠、年卅四、大元人、作詩云、出門妻子贈寒衣、問我西行幾日歸、來時儻佩黄金印、莫見蘇秦不下機、二、奉訓大夫兵部郎中何文着、年卅八、唐人、作頌云、四大元無主、五蘊悉皆空、兩國生靈若(苦歟)、今日斬秋風、三、承仕郎回々都魯丁、年卅二、回々用人、四、書狀官薰畏国人杲(果)、年卅二、五、高麗詛語郎將徐、年卅三、作詩云、朝廷宰相五更寒、々甲將軍夜過関、十六高僧由末(マ

ゝ) 起、算来名利不如閑、今度刎首事永絶、窺覷不可攻之策也、其後警固事有沙汰、鎮西撰補守護人器用之人発遣海辺国々、止京都大番役、被差置在京人、公家武家減省公事、行儉約、休民庶、皆是為軍旅用意也...

16. Takeuchi ed., *Kamakura Nendaiki, Buke Nendaiki, Kamakura Dainikki*, 32.
17. This figure, the issues of his existence, and his country of origin are discussed in: James Harry Morris, "The Case for Christian Missionary Activity in Japan prior to the 16th Century, Part II: Evidence of the Earliest Encounter with Abrahamic Religions in Japan – Religious Encounters in Yuán-Kamakura Relations," *Oriens Christianus* 100 (forthcoming), 143-177.
18. Takeuchi, ed., *Kamakura Nendaiki, Buke Nendaiki, Kamakura Dainikki*, 32.
19. Ibid.
20. Ibid.
21. Shinmura Izumi 新村出, ed., *Kōjien 広辞苑*, 6th ed. (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2008), 1378.
22. Tōdō Akiyasu 藤堂明保, Matsumoto Akira 松本昭, Takeda Akira 竹田晃, and Kanō Yoshimitsu 加納喜光, eds., *Kanjigen 漢字源* (Tokyo: Gakken Kyōiku Shuppan, 2011), 1611.
23. If the text had been written later this term would likely denote that he held the rank below a retainer.
24. Takeuchi, ed., *Kamakura Nendaiki, Buke Nendaiki, Kamakura Dainikki*, 32.
25. Tōdō, Matsumoto, Takeda, and Kanō, eds., *Kanjigen* 304. Islam was once termed *Fuifuikyō* 回回教, see Kindaichi Kyōsuke 金田一京助, Kenbō Hidetoshi 見坊豪紀, Yamada Tadao 山田忠雄, Kindaichi Haruhiko 金田一春彦, eds., *Sanseidō Kokugo Jiten* 三省堂国語辞典, 75th Edition (Tokyo: Sanseidō, 1969), 109; Shinmura, ed., *Kōjien*, 6th edition, 2419.
26. Hosaka, "Japan and the Gulf: A Historical Perspective of Pre-Oil Relations," 7.
27. Tsuji Zennosuke 辻善之助, *Kaigai kōtsū shiwa* 海外交通史話 (Tokyo: Naitō Shōseki, 1930), 35. Kuwata Tadachika 桑田忠親, *Nanbokuchō no sōran* 南北朝の争乱 (Tokyo: Jinbutsu Ōraisha, 1965), 134.
28. Kaikyōken Kenkyūjo 回教圏研究所, ed., *Kaikyōken Shiyō* 回教圏史要 (Tokyo: Machigoto Paburishshingu, 2017), 37. Tōdō, Matsumoto, Takeda, and Kanō, eds., *Kanjigen*, 304.
29. Lo Jung-pang with Bruce A. Elleman, *China as a Sea Power, 1127-1368: A Preliminary Survey of the Maritime Expansion and Naval Exploits of the Chinese People During the Southern Song and Yuan Periods* (Singapore: National University of Singapore Press, 2012), 263.
30. Xu Xin, *The Jews of Kaifeng, China: History, Culture, and Religion* (Jersey City, NJ: KTAV Publishing House, 2003), 143-144.
31. *Yuán Shǐ* 元史, *Běnjì dì yī tài zǔ* 本紀第一 太祖, Paragraph 9. It states: 汪罕走河西、回鶻、回回三國，奔契丹。

32. *Yuán Shǐ* 元史, *Běnjì dì liù shìzǔ sān* 本紀第六 世祖三, Paragraph 32. It states:
罷諸路女直、契丹、漢人為達魯花赤者，回回、畏兀、乃蠻、唐兀人仍舊。
Yuán Shǐ 元史, *Běnjì dì shí sān shìzǔ shí* 本紀第十三 世祖十, Paragraph 9. It states:
定擬軍官格例，以河西、回回、畏吾兒等依各官品充萬戶府達魯花赤，同蒙古人，女直、契丹同漢人。
33. The separation of the terms “*huihui*” and “Uyghur” in Yuan period documents is also noted by Anthony Garnaut, “The Islamic Heritage in China,” *China Heritage Newsletter* 5 (March, 2006), accessed May 21, 2018: <http://www.chinaheritagequarterly.org/editorial.php?issue=005>.
34. *Yuán Shǐ* 元史, *Běnjì dì shí shìzǔ qī* 本紀第十 世祖七, Paragraph 15. It states:
壬子，囊加帶括兩淮造回回砲新附軍匠六百，及蒙古、回回、漢人、新附人能造砲者，俱至京師。
35. *Yuán Shǐ* 元史, *Běnjì dì shíyī shìzǔ bā* 本紀第十一 世祖八, Paragraph 17. It states:
五月癸卯，禁西北邊回回諸人越境為商。
36. Tsuji Zennosuke 辻善之助, *Kaigai kōtsū shiwa* 海外交通史話 (Tokyo: Naitai Shoseki, 1930), 35; Saeki Yoshirō 佐伯好郎, *Keikyō no Kenkyū* 景教の研究, (Tokyo: Tōhō Bunka Gakuin Tōkyō Kenkyūsho, 1935), 975-983; Kuwata Tadachika 桑田忠親, *Nanbokuchō no sōran* 南北朝の争乱 (Tokyo: Jinbutsu Ōraisha, 1965), 134.
37. Michael Dillon, *China's Muslim Hui Community: Migration, Settlement and Sects* (London: Routledge, 2013), 20.
38. Hua Linfu, Paul D. Buell, and Paul U. Unschuld, eds., *Ben Cao Gang Mu Dictionary*, Vol. 2, *Geographical and Administrative Designations* (Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2017), 146-147.
39. James Harry Morris, “Jesuits and Muslims in 17th-century China,” in *Christian-Muslim Relations: A Bibliographical History 1500-1900*, Volume 11, *South and East Asia, Africa and the Americas (1600-1700)*, edited by David Thomas and John Chesworth (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 434.
40. Tokugawa Mitsukuni 徳川光圀, Tokugawa Tsunaeda 徳川綱條, and Tokugawa Harumori 徳川治保, eds., *Dai Nihonshi* 大日本史, *Dai nijūichi satsu* 第21冊, *Kan 195-206* 卷195-206, *Restuden* 列伝 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Hanshichi, 1900), Chapter 201. It states:
建治元年，元又使杜世忠何文著撒都魯丁等，造長門室津。時宗命收杜世忠等，致之鎌倉，悉斬之。(關東評定傳。)
41. Tokugawa, Tokugawa, and Tokugawa, eds., *Dai Nihonshi*, *Dai nijūichi satsu*, *Kan 195-206*, *Restuden*, Chapter 201.

42. Tokugawa Mitsukuni 徳川光圀, Tokugawa Tsunaeda 徳川綱條, and Tokugawa Harumori 徳川治保, eds., *Dai Nihonshi* 大日本史, *Dai nijūgo satsu* 第25冊, *Kan 236-243* 卷236-243, *Restuden* 列伝 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Hanshichi, 1900), Chapter 243. It states:
後宇多帝建治元年四月、先是、蒙古改國號元、至此使禮部侍郎杜世忠、兵部侍郎何文著、計議官撒都魯丁、持國書來求通好。(關東評定傳。杜世忠等官據元史。○考元史、改國號元、實龜山帝文永八年。然水路遼遠、未知其事。至是因使人者來、始聞之也。故前此概書蒙古、此後書元。) 八月、押送杜世忠、何文著、撒都魯丁等五人於鎌倉。九月、鎌倉執權相模守北條時宗收斬之。(關東評定傳、保曆間記。)
43. Tokugawa, Tokugawa, and Tokugawa, eds., *Dai Nihonshi*, *Dai nijūgo satsu*, *Kan 236-243*, *Restuden*, Chapter 243.
44. Waseda Daigaku Henshūbu 早稻田大學編輯部, ed., *Tsūzoku Nihon Zenshi* 通俗日本全史, Vol. 4, *Genpei Seisuiiki (Ge); Hōjō Kudaiki* 源平盛衰記 (下); 北條九代記 (Tokyo: Waseda Daigaku Shuppanbu, 1912), 171-172. It reads:
...かゝる所に蒙古の使杜世忠等又日本に來朝す、高麗人も同じく來れり、太宰府に船を駐め、船中にある物ども、悉く注録し、許多の人等をば太宰府に押留め、杜世忠等たゞ三人を鎌倉へぞ、遣しける、洛中へは入られず、すぐに關東に差下す、路次の間厳しく守護して、ひとへに囚人の如くなり、夜を日に継ぎて鎌倉に着くといへども、蒙古の牒狀に返簡すべきに及ばずとて、その儘追返し、大元に歸らしむ...
45. Waseda Daigaku Henshūbu, ed., *Tsūzoku Nihon Zenshi*, Vol. 4, *Genpei Seisuiiki (Ge); Hōjō Kudaiki*, 171-172.
46. See English translation in: Zuikei Shuho and Charlotte von Verschuer, "Japan's Foreign Relations 1200 o 1392 A.D.: A Translation from "Zenrin Kokuhōki"" *Monumenta Nipponica* 57, no. 4 (Winter, 2002): 430, 431.
47. Hayashi Razan 林羅山 and Hayashi Gahō 林鷲峰, eds., *Honchō Tsugan* 本朝通鑑, *Dai 10* 第十 (Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai, 1920), 2265-2266. It reads:
蒙古使杜世忠、何文著、撒都魯丁等來于長門國室津、而到太宰府。...八月...太宰少肖貳藤資能依時宗命、護送蒙古使杜世忠等五人到鎌倉。一説曰、是年正月十八日蒙古人二人、高麗人一人、明州人一人、已上四人、自鎮西送之、皆不入洛中、自山崎經岡屋醍醐、赴關東、七月二十一日蒙古人又送關東、路次如前度。九月戊辰朔甲戌、北条時宗爲絕蒙古使、捕杜世忠、何文著、撒都魯丁、及其二人、刎首於鎌倉龍口...
48. Hosaka, "Japan and the Gulf: A Historical Perspective of Pre-Oil Relations," 7.
49. Morris, "The Case for Christian Missionary Activity in Japan prior to the 16th Century, Part II," 172.

50. Referred to in: *Yuán Shǐ* 元史, *Běnjì dì sān xiànzōng* 本紀第三 憲宗, Paragraph 3.
51. Referred to in: *Yuán Shǐ* 元史, *Běnjì dì èrshí chéng zōngsān* 本紀第二十 成宗三, Paragraph 40; *Yuán Shǐ* 元史, *Běnjì dì èrshíyī chéng zōng sì* 本紀第二十一 成宗四, Paragraph 7 and 9; *Yuán Shǐ* 元史, *Běnjì dì èrshí'èr wǔzōng yī* 本紀第二十二 武宗一, Paragraph 9 and 10; *Yuán Shǐ* 元史, *Zhì dì sishísān shí huò èr* 志第四十三 食貨二, Paragraph 82; *Yuán Shǐ* 元史, *Lièzhuàn dì liùshísān* 列傳第六十三, Paragraph 3.
52. Referred to in: *Yuán Shǐ* 元史, *Zhì dì yī tiānwén yī* 志第一 天文一, Paragraph 26; *Yuán Shǐ* 元史, *Zhì dì sì lì yī* 志第四 歷一, Paragraph 3.
53. *Yuán Shǐ* 元史, *Běnjì dì shí'èr shìzǔ jiǔ* 本紀第十二 世祖九, Paragraph 9. The text reads:
辛酉，誅耿仁、撒都魯丁及阿合馬第四子忻都。
54. Sheau-yueh J. Chao, "Resource-sharing and genealogical research on Islamic Chinese names in Guilin," *Collection Building* 32, no. 3 (2013), 7, 14-15.
55. *Ibid.*, 15.
56. Liu Yingsheng and Peter Jackson, "Chinese-Iranian Relations iii. In the Mongol period," in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*. Accessed May 21, 2018: <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/chinese-iranian-iii> Chen Da-Sheng, "Chinese-Iranian Relations vii. Persian Settlements in Southeastern China during the T'ang, Sung, and Yuan Dynasties," in *Encyclopaedia Iranica Online*, accessed May 21, 2018.
57. Bira Shagdar, "The Mongol Empire in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries: East-West Relations," in *The Silk Roads: Highways of Culture and Commerce*, edited by Vadime Elisseeff (New York: Berghahn Books, 200), 136-137; John Chaffee, "Cultural Transmission by Sea: Maritime Relations in Yuan China," in *Eurasian Influences on Yuan China*, edited by Morris Rossabi (Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 2013), 46-47.
58. J.H. Kramers, "Les noms musulmans composés avec Dīn," *Acta Orientalia* 5 (1925), 53-67.
59. Yamada, *Ghenkō: The Mongol Invasion of Japan*, 173.
60. *Yuán Shǐ* 元史, *Lièzhuàn dì jiǔshíwǔ wài yī yī* 列傳第九十五 外夷一, Paragraph 37.
61. *Ibid.*
62. The Gosho Translation Committee, *The Writings of Nichiren Daishonin, Volume 1* (Tokyo: Soka Gakkai, 1999), 628.
63. See for example: Wakabayashi Han 若林半, *Kaikyō Sekai to Nihon* (Tokyo: Dainichisha, 1938); Salih Mahdi S. Al Samarrai, *Islam in Japan: History, Spread, and Institutions in the Country* (Tokyo: Islamic Center, 2009); <https://www.islamcenter.or.jp/history-of-islam-in-japan/>, accessed May 22, 2018.
64. I would term such discourses and policies as *Gendai no Sakoku Shugi* 現代の鎖国主義 (E. the modern closed country doctrine).