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Abstract

The following lines are inspired by John Kupchik’s seminal article ‘Austronesian Lights the Way’ that appears in this volume of JEAL. It demonstrated beyond any reasonable doubt for the first time that there are reliable Austronesian loanwords in Japonic that reveal quite ancient and profound contacts, because without these profound contacts the borrowing of the names of the most basic celestial bodies, such as the sun and the moon, would not be possible. In my opinion, his article opened a new and an exciting direction in the Japonic historical linguistics.

There are, however, two important differences between Kupchik’s article and the present one. First, while Kupchik mostly concentrated on the Amis language from Taiwan, and to a less extent on the languages of Philippines and other Western Malayo-Polynesian, my major focus is on the Philippines languages as potential donors, and much less on other Austronesian languages of the region. Second, while Kupchik looked mostly on mysterious words in the *Omoro Sōshi*, a collection of Old Okinawan and Amami sacred and folk poems (1531–1623 AD), this article focuses more on Old Japanese in particular and Japonic in general.
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1 Introduction

Some general remarks are in order. Overall, I agree with Lyle Campbell, who always said that “languages should speak for themselves”. This means that other humanities data, such as archeology, history, religious studies, etc., as well as genetics from the natural sciences, which is in great vogue nowadays, cannot tell us anything either in support or criticism of the purely linguistic data. Yet, sometimes these data may be interesting and worth looking at, as they can potentially point into a right direction.

Therefore, before diving into historical linguistics and philology, let me offer some preliminary extralinguistic observations.

First, the distance between Yonaguni, the last island in the Ryukyuan archipelago, and the coast of Taiwan is mere 108 km. The closest landfall in Taiwan also appears to be in the region where the Amis people live. Among the Taiwan aboriginal tribes, only Amis and Yami are true seafarers, with Amis being famous for their long boats well suited for distant ocean voyages. From this point of view, it is incomprehensible why Austronesians would sail only south, and not north, especially that in clear weather one can see Yonaguni from Taiwan and vice versa. We, of course, know nowadays that there was Shimotabaru culture in South Ryukyus between 2900–2000 BC, but the archeological evidence supporting its connection to a culture found in North-Eastern Taiwan at the same time is inconclusive, and in addition there is a hiatus in population found between 2000 BC and 900 BC (Pearson 2013: 71–81). In any case even 900 BC is too early for Japonic speakers to be present in Sakishima, as they would not be able to reach there before 1200 AD.

2 Austronesian Vocabulary in Old Japanese Makura-Kotoba

One of the natural sources for searching Austronesian vocabulary in insular Japonic are those permanent epithets in the Old Japanese poetry that are opaque. These permanent epithets are known in Japanese as ‘pillow words’ (makura-kotoba 枕詞). It must be mentioned that the majority of them are quite transparent, and can be clearly explained on the basis of Japonic itself. Then there are two other groups, a larger one based on Old Korean, and a smaller one that has Ainu origin. Finally, there is one more group that cannot be analyzed on the basis of any these three languages. I will try to show below that at least some of those, or parts thereof can have Austronesian etymologies.

One of the most spectacular cases is the permanent epithet taratine n-ǝ that is used with the OJ word papa ‘mother’, but never with its doublet omǝ ~ amo
‘id.’ that is likely to be a loan from Old Korean (cf. MK ὀμά ~ ὀμό ‘id.’). OJ ʾn-ǝ in taratine n-ǝ can be easily explained as an attributive form n-ǝ of the copula n-, so our task boils down to determining the etymology of taratine. The first two syllables tara are strikingly reminiscent of PAN *daRaql ‘blood’ (Blust and Trussel 2020).2 The reflexes of PAN *daRaql ‘blood’ are all over the Austronesian family, being found in Formosan languages, WMP, CMP, SHWNG, and OC, but the phonetically closest forms to OJ ʾtara seem to be: Formosan: Seediq dala, WMP: Ilokano dára, Bontok dála, Ifugaw dála, Pangasinan dalá, Tiruray daraʔ, Basadaraʔ, Bulungan daraʔ, Lun Dayeh daraʔ, Tabun daraʔ, Kelabit daraʔ, Iban darah, Maloh daraʔ, Cham darah, Moken dalak, Malay darah, Acehnese darah, Simalur dala, Madurese dhara, Buginese dara, CMP: Manggarai dara ‘blood’, Rembong daraʔ, Riung dara, Dhara/ Ndao dara, Helong dala, OC: Arop dara, Kis dara, Wogeo dara, Manam dara, Takia dala-, Tawala tala-, Cheke Holo da-dara, Kokota da-dara-na.

Blust further notes that Itbayat ka-ray a means ‘cosanguine’, ‘blood kin’, and Rejang daleaʔ dagiŋ (daleaʔ ‘blood’) means ‘kinsmen’, ‘blood relatives’ (2020). These meanings are important for the discussion that will shortly follow below.

With such a distribution of Austronesian words for blood resembling OJ ʾtara, it is practically impossible to say what group of the Austronesian languages could be a possible source. But we can considerably narrow it down by determining the place of origin of OJ ʾtine in ʾtara tine. It is well known that there is no contrast between OJ /e/ ⟨ PJ *ia and /ɛ/ ⟨ PJ *ay after coronals. But OJ /e/ is extremely rare, therefore our best bet is that we are dealing here with OJ *nɛ ⟨ PJ *nay. Thus, I reconstruct PJ *tinay.

1 Blust’s reconstruction (2020). Wolff proposes *dayāq (2010.2: 833–834). I normally follow Blust if available, since his reconstructions appear to be more reliable.

2 One should keep in mind what in OJ there are no contrasts /t/ : /d/, /r/ : /l/ and no syllable-final or word final consonants.

3 Blust traces Formosan forms back to PAN *ta-ina (2020).
Eastern branches, is limited to Formosan and languages of Borneo in WMP, but these languages do not have daraʔ ’blood’. This distribution, I believe, probably points to the Northern Philippines as a place of origin, which lacks honorific t-, but has all other features attested.

To the best of my knowledge, among all OJ texts, tara tine is found only in the Man’yōshū, the earliest and the largest Japanese poetic anthology. It is quite clear that in OJ we deal with a very old prehistoric loan, because the meaning of the permanent epithet tara tine was already lost in the eighth century AD. Some poems engage in a folk etymological analysis, spelling tara ti as た乳 ‘hanging breasts’ (MYS 9.1774, MYS 11.2368, MYS 11.2557, MYS 12.2991, MYS 13.3314), but such an interpretation is obviously ungrammatical, because with the vowel verb tare- ‘to hang down’ we would expect tar-uru ti ‘hang. down-ATTR breast’ or tare ti ‘hang.down(NML) breast’, but under no circumstances *tara ti would be possible.

I believe that OJ tara tine means ‘one’s own birth mother’. It looks like it was an important distinction to make, because in all likelihood, other wives and possibly even concubines of one’s father were also referred to and/or addressed as ‘mother’. As far as I am aware, there is no textual evidence to support this claim, but there is strong linguistic evidence supporting it. Blood lines in Ancient Japan were extremely important, and the matrilineal descent was as important as the patrilineal, with the former replaced by the latter only after the Heian period (794–1192 AD). Originally, the maternal line seems to be more important than the paternal one. In the Nihonshoki and other WOJ and MJ texts we find the following compounds, consisting of いそ + kinship term, which designate kinship relationship by blood:

WOJ いそ-pa ‘one’s birth mother’, attested in the Nihonshoki exclusively in kana glosses that cannot be earlier than the Heian period: イロハ (NS 1.114), (NS 1.12), (NS 1.13), etc. There is also one more attestation いそ-pa (伊呂波) in the man’yōgana in WMS (2.14b), which is much more useful than the kana glosses, in spite of the fact that WMS is from the early Heian period, but in this case we apparently have a case of an orthographic conservatism. It is not clear what いそ in this and other kinship terms below means. Apparently it is a different word

4 When citing the Kojiki or the Nihonshoki, Japanese scholars normally provide very vague textual addresses that include only a reference to the number of a book. This is obviously unacceptable in modern-day philology. When citing the Nihonshoki, I organize these addresses adding also a page number according to the modern edition in the Newly Edited and Enlarged Series on the Japanese History (新訂増補國史大系) by Kuroita Katsumi (黒板勝美) et al. (1974). Textual addresses for the Kojiki are compiled on the basis of Hisamatsu Sen’ichi (久松潛市) et al. 1958.『古事記総索引』A General Index to the Kojiki, vol. 1–2 in the『古事記大成』The Kojiki Series, vol. 7–8. They include volume number, leaf number and verso or recto, indicated as a or b.
from a homophonous OJ *ira ‘color’, ‘appearance’. Its meaning is opaque, but it clearly refers only to one’s maternal relatives, as the combination *irǝ-ki *ira + father simply does not exist.

WOJ *ira-ye5 (伊呂兄) ‘elder brother from the same mother’ is attested in the Kojiki in a partially phonographic script (KJK 2.1a). Omodaka et al. do not provide this example, apparently believing that all examples come only in the logographic script as 兄 ‘elder brother’ and only from the Nihonshoki (1967: 107).

WOJ *irǝ-se (伊呂勢) ‘brother from the same mother’ (Omodaka et al. 1967: 107), although, attested in the man’yōgana script (萬葉仮名) in the Kojiki (KJK 1.23a), and possibly in a gloss for the character 兄 in the Nihonshoki, although there is also an alternative gloss *ira-ye for the same character. OJ se refers exclusively to an ‘elder brother’, ‘male beloved’, or ‘husband’, and never to a ‘younger brother’. Therefore, the motivation for Omodaka et al. to define this combination as ‘brother from the same mother’ rather than ‘elder brother from the same mother’ remains unclear. The examples they cite support only ‘elder brother’. Cf. also WOJ *irǝ-ndǝ ~ *irǝ-tǝ ‘younger brother or sister from the same mother’ below.

WOJ *irǝ-nda ~ *irǝ-tǝ (伊呂杼) ‘younger brother or sister from the same mother’ is attested in a completely phonographic spelling in KJK 2.13a–13b, see the example above.

WOJ *ira-ne (伊呂泥) ‘elder brother or sister from the same mother’ (Omodaka et al. 1967: 108). This time Omodaka et al. seem to be right, since this combination is applicable to both sexes. The completely phonographic spelling is attested in KJK 2.13a–13b, see the example above.

WOJ *ira-mo (伊呂妹) ‘younger sister from the same mother’ is attested only in partially phonographic spelling in KJK 1.42b, 2.28b, 2.31a, and 3.17b. In all these cases we have kana gloss *mo to the right of the character 妹 ‘younger sister’.

The etymology of WOJ *ira is obscure. To the best of my knowledge, it is not attested in any other variety of Japonic except WOJ. Such a limited distribution

5 Capitals indicate the logographic spelling.
is highly suggestive of a borrowing. But what language did this loan come from? Ainu, Koreanic and Austronesian have no word that could fill in this niche. Quite possibly, this might be a borrowing from some Jōmon period language. But certainly this hypothesis is impossible to prove or to disprove, so most likely it will remain just a speculation. There is a tiny chance that WOJ irǝ- may also be from Austronesian, cf. WMP Paku irǝ? ‘blood’ (Blust and Trussel 2020). But besides an obvious problem with a vocalism in the second syllable, Paku irǝ? (a reflex of PAN *daRaQ ‘blood’) is isolated in WMP. And finally, seeing an Austronesian behind every bush is going to be more harmful than helpful. However, notwithstanding its source language, most likely irǝ means ‘blood’, so irǝ-pa is probably the construction identical to tara tine.

There are altogether twenty-four examples of tara tine in the Man’yōshū poems6 not including those that appear in the Chinese prefaces, like the one to mys 14.3550a. See exx. (2–5) below:

(2) MYS 15.3688 (WOJ)7
(9) aki sar-amba (10) kaper-i-[i]mas-am-u tǝ (11) tara tine n-ǝ (12) papani mawos-i-te
(9) autumn come-COND (10) return-CONV-HON-TENT-FIN QV (11) blood mother COP-ATTR (12) mother-DAT tell(HUM)-CONV-SUB
(12) [He] told [his] mother (11) who is [his] mother [by] blood: (9) “When the autumn comes, (10) [I] will come back”

(3) MYS 15.3691 (WOJ)
(13) tara tine n-ǝ (14) papa mǝ tuma-ra mǝ (15) asa tuyu-ni (16) mo-nǝ suso piṇdut-i
(13) blood mother COP-ATTR (14) mother FP spouse-PLUR FP (15) morning dew-LOC (16) skirt-GEN hem drench-CONV
(14) although both spouses and mother (13) who is [your] mother [by] blood, (16) drenching the hems of [their] skirts (15) in morning dew

6 All Man’yōshū poems, as well as their kana transcription, romanization, glossing, and translation are based on my edition and translation of this text (Vovin 2009a–).
7 In poems written in WOJ there is a very strong tendency for tara tine ‘blood mother’ to appear in chōka. The exceptions for tara tine attested in tanka are mostly found in books eleven and twelve that have no chōka at all.
There is also one example of *tara tine* attested in EOJ:

(6) **MYS 20.4348 (EOJ)**
(1) 多良知祢乃 (2) 波々乎和加例弖 (3) 麻許等和例 (4) 多非乃加里保尔 (5) 夜须久祢牟加母
(1) *tara tine* n-ǝ (2) papa-ŋGa mƐ kare-te (1) *blood mother* COP-ATTR (2) mother-POSS eye separate. from(CONV)-SUB (2) being separated from my mother (1) who is [my] mother [by] blood.

To the best of my knowledge, *tara tine* ‘mother by blood; one’s own birth mother’ is not attested in OOK.

At the first glance, there might be, however, a fly in the ointment: in addition to twenty-four examples of *tara tine* ‘mother by blood’ there are also three examples of the permanent epithet *tara tisi* for the word *papa* ‘mother’ in the *Man’yōshū*: 多羅知斯 (MYS 5.886), 多良知子 (MYS 5.887),8 and 垂乳為 (MYS 16.3791). But ultimately these three examples might also have a solution. *Tara* ‘blood’ has been already discussed above. But *t-isí* might be another

---

8 多良知子 (MYS 5.887) might have an alternative explanation, but is weaker than the Austronesian one given below. Although the character 子 is used in the extant Old Japanese texts only as the ongana sign *si*, in the Heian period kana it is also used with its kungana value *ne*. Since the Heian period kana is an obvious development of the man’yōgana, we can easily imagine that such a usage might have occurred in Old Japanese texts that are no longer extant. But this explanation certainly would not work for the examples from MYS 5.886 and MYS 16.3791.
Austronesian word: honorific t-, also discussed above + isi ‘flesh’, ‘meat’ (Blust and Trussel 2020: *isi5):9 Formosan: Tamalakak Puyuma isi ‘meat’, ‘flesh’, WMP: Kalamian Tagbanwa isi ‘flesh’, ‘meat’, Palawan Batak ðisi ‘meat’, ‘flesh’, Ngaju Dayak isi ‘flesh’, Delang isi ‘meat’, Maloh isi2 ‘meat’, ‘flesh’, Simalur isi ‘flesh’, Uma thi ‘flesh’, Mori Atas thi ‘meat’, ‘flesh’, Koroni thi ‘meat’, ‘flesh’, Wawonii thi, Moronene thi ‘meat’, ‘flesh’, CMP: Komodo isi ‘meat’, Manggarai ici ‘flesh’, Ngadhla isi ‘flesh without bones and fat’, Leti isi ‘flesh’, Luang isi ‘flesh’, Yamdena isi-n ‘flesh’, Fordata ihi-n ‘flesh’, Kei ihi-n ‘flesh of people, animals, and fruits’, Telutin isi-colo ‘flesh’, Simalur isi ‘flesh’, Asilulu isi- ‘flesh’, Manapu si-n ‘flesh’, Batu Merah isi-va ‘flesh’, Morella isi ‘flesh’, Buruese isi-n ‘meat’, ‘flesh’, Soboyo isi-n ‘flesh’. Consequently, tara tisi n-ǝ papa means ‘a mother, who is [of the same] blood and flesh’. A textual example:

(7) MYS 5.887
(1) 多良知子能 (2) 波々何目美受提
(1) tara tisi n-ǝ (2) papa-ŋga ME mi-nz-nte
(1) blood flesh COP-ATTR (2) mother-POSS eye see-NEG-CONV-SUB
(2) Without seeing the eyes of [my] mother, (1) who is [of the same] blood [and] flesh.

Finally, there is one example of tara tune (足常) in MYS 11.2495. I suspect that it is simply a case of an irregular development in WOJ, probably caused by progressive assimilation from the front vowel i to the back vowel u under the influence of another preceding back vowel a.

Another interesting permanent epithet is nama yami-na (奈麻余美乃) with unknown meaning, which occurs only once in MYS 3.319 as a makura-kotoba for Kapī (甲斐) province. The yami-na part is comparatively uncontroversial, as it is likely to be -na, genitive case marker, and yami in all likelihood reflects yami in Tuku-yami10 ‘moon deity’. The important thing is that it cannot be Yǝmï ‘Hades’, which is very popular as a folk etymology, but the second syllable vowels in yǝmi and Yǝmï are very different.11 Sometimes Tuku-yǝmi ‘moon deity’,

---

9 I selected only those words from Blust and Trussel’s list have meanings ‘human flesh’ and/or ‘meat’.
10 There is apparently some confusion in WOJ texts between yomi and yami in this word. Most importantly, there is apparently an example of raising o > u: Tukuyomi > Tukuyumi that never happens with the vowel a (Omodaka et al. 1967: 466), so it is more likely that the vowel was o and not a. But we should not also exclude a possibility of contamination.
11 Surprisingly, even some scholars support this folk etymology. E.g. Nishimiya dedicates a long discussion where he tries to circumvent this problem, although he understands
tuku-yo ‘moon-lit night’ mean ‘moon light’. Therefore, it is not unconceivable that yomi could do the same. The first word nama, however, is unlikely to be Japonic: while there is woj nama ‘fresh’, ‘raw’, it does not fit here semantically. It is always notoriously difficult to deal with hapax legomenoi like this one, so our first step will be to examine the context of MYS 3:319. It is a chōka, but just a few lines will suffice (8–10):

(8) Preface to the poem 3.319
詩不盡山歌一首并短歌
A poem composed about Mt. Puⁿzi with tanka envoys.

Commentary
WOJ Mt. Puⁿzi is the same as MdJ Mt. Fuji, a dormant volcano and the highest mountain in Japan.

(9) MYS 3:319
(1) 奈麻余美乃 (2) 甲斐乃國 (3) 打縁流 (4) 駿河能國与 (5) 己知其智乃 (6) 国之三中従 (7) 出立有 (8) 不盡能高嶺者
(1) nama yami-ŋ (2) Kapï-ŋ KUNI (3) UT-I YƏS-Uru (4) Suruⁿga-nə KUNI-tə (5) kəti-ŋgati-nə (6) KUNI-nə mi-NAKA-YU (7) 1ⁿDE-TAT-ER-U (8) Puⁿzi-nə TAKA NE pa
(1) deep.river moon.light-GEN (2) Kapï-GEN province (3) hit-CONV approach-ATTR (4) Suruⁿga-GEN province-COM (5) here-there-GEN (6) province-GEN HON-middle-ABL (7) go.out(CONV) stand-PROG-ATTR (8) Puⁿzi-GEN high peak TOP
(5) Here and there, (2) in Kapï province, (1) where the moon light [is reflected] in deep rivers, (4) and in Suruⁿga province, (3) where [waves] approach and hit [the shore], (8) the high peak of [Mt.] Puⁿzi, (7) which is towering high (6) over the middle of [both] provinces ...

(10) Postscript to the poems 3:319–321
右一首高橋連蟲麻呂之歌中出焉以類載此
The poem [3.321]¹² above appears in the poetic collection of Takapasi-nə muraⁿzi Musimarə. Therefore, I placed it here on the basis of similarity with other poems [in this sequence].

the difference between kō-rui vowel /o/ and otsu-rui vowel /ə/ (1984: 169–171). Omodaka is much more straightforward, just noting that the meaning of nama yami is unknown (1977.3: 239).

¹² I did not include this or other poems in this mini-sequence here.
I glossed above *nama* as ‘deep river’, because I think that the word reflects yet another Austronesian loan in insular Japonic. Cf. the following data from Blust and Trussel 2020: PMP: *namaw* ‘sheltered water’, ‘deep place in a river’, ‘cove’, ‘harbor’, ‘lagoon’ > WMP: Casiguran Dumagat *namaw* ‘coral reef’, Karo Batak *namo* ‘deep place in a river, generally where it makes a bend and the water moves slowly’, Palauan *lomáu* ‘small, deep spot within shallow area inside reef’, CMP: Tetun *namo-n* ‘bay’, ‘harbor’, Yamdena *name* ‘deep sea channel in the reef’, Proto-Ambon *nama(w)* ‘bay’, ‘harbor’, Buruese *nama* ‘level stretch in a stream’s course; cove, bay, harbor’, POC *namo* ‘lagoon’ > OC: Wuvulu *namo* ‘lagoon’, Kwaio *namo* ‘lake, pool, deep place in river’, Lau *namo* ‘the lagoon inside a reef, near the reef (the deep) pools towards the shore’, Arosi *namo* ‘a landlocked, shallow lagoon near the shore’, Pohnpeian *nahmw* ‘deep place within the barrier reef; ‘lagoon’, Tongan *namo* ‘lagoon’, Niue *namo* ‘lake’, ‘pond’. One has to keep in mind that the above Austronesian words mostly reflect seashore topography. Meanwhile, Karipō is a land-locked province, so semantic shifts after the borrowing are to be expected. Karipō has its good share of lakes, ponds, and rivers, but, of course coral reefs or lagoons are not found there. To illustrate this point, I place below a photograph of Mt. Fuji with some large (unidentified) large body of water in front of it.

There are also other *makura-kotoba* in OJ, which as I suspect, might have Austronesian origin, or be partially Austronesian, but this is still the work in progress that will be presented in a future publication. One of them, is, however, dealt with in the next section of this article.

Now I turn to other insular Japonic words that might have Austronesian origin.
3 Other Austronesian Vocabulary in Insular Japonic

My attention was attracted by the Batanic (Bashiic) languages spoken on a chain of small islands, politically divided between two countries: Taiwan and Philippines. While the Northernmost island, Yami (older name: Botel Tobago, Chin. 蘭嶼 Lán’yu13) ‘Orchid Island’, belongs to Taiwan (it is located only 64 km from the southeastern coast of Taiwan, all other islands (Itbayat, Batan,14 and Ibatan), stretching between Northern Luzon and Yami are under Philippines’ jurisdiction. In terms of speakers, Ivatan on Batan islands with 35,000 comes the first, followed by Itbayat 3,500, then Yami ca. 3,000, and finally Ibatan (Babuyan) with just 1,240. The current consensus seems to be that the Batanic languages represent a separate WMP subgroup and are not in any case connected genetically to the Philippine languages of Northern Luzon (Ross 2005) and (Blench 2015), however just a few days ago David Zorc and Robert Bust have persuaded me that the Batanic languages are just normal Philippine languages.

The Batanic languages are studied comparatively well, with the first publications produced by Japanese scholars, starting with a ground-breaking study of the Yami language by Asai (1936), and also keeping tempo with more recent work by Tsuchida et al. (1987, 1989), Yamada (2002, 2014), and Yamada and Zayas (1997). From 1960s Western scholars also pitched in: Reid (1966, 1971), Maree (2007), and Maree and Tomas (2012), as well as above-mentioned Ross (2005) and Blench (2015), closely followed by Taiwanese researchers: Li (2000), Zhāng Xún-huí (2000), Yang (2002), and Rau et al. (2012). Finally, there is welcoming sign that Filippino scholars are also getting involved in the study of the Batanic languages: Hidalgo (1998) in addition to the cooperation by Ernesto Constantino in Tsuchida et al. (1989), and C. N. Zayas with Yamada (1997).

Let me start with two Batanic words. The Yami language is naturally saturated with loanwords from Japanese, as the period of Japanese colonial rule in Taiwan was long enough (1895–1945 AD). Therefore, Japanese loans have penetrated even the Yami basic vocabulary, cf. for example, inu ‘dog’ ⟨ Jpn. inu ‘id.’ and saru ‘monkey’ ⟨ Jpn. saru ‘id.’ But not all Yami-Japanese look-alikes can be classified in this way. For example, Yami takei ‘mountain’ (Zhāng 2000: 132) cannot be a loan from Jpn. take (⟨ woj take) ‘peak’, ‘mountain’, or Ryukyuan taki ‘id.’, which more frequently appears as u-taki ‘sacred grove on a mountain’, ‘shrine on a mountain’. There are several facts that strongly speak against the directionality of borrowing from Japanese to Yami in this case. First, Jpn. take ‘peak’, ‘mountain’ is not a colloquial word in the modern Japanese language.

---

13 Note that this reading is irregular: we should expect Lán xù.
14 Actually, several islands.
It appears mostly either in place names as take ~ -dake, or in poetry. Therefore, it is highly unlikely that soldiers from the Japanese occupational force on Orchid Island would use this word, and not the much more habitual yama ‘mountain’ in reference to local mountains. Second, Yami takfäi ‘mountain’\(^{15}\) looks suspiciously more like PJ *takai rather than its descendant forms. Third, there are apparent cognates at least in the Itbayat and Ivatan languages: Itbayat takey ‘field’, ‘farm’, ‘forest’, ‘wilderness’ ‘island space other than hili (town where people live)’ (Yamada 2002: 252); Ivatan takey ‘field’ (GIEID). Proto-Batanic *takai\(^{16}\) was apparently borrowed into insular PJ as *takai due to Arisaka’s constraint on the combination of /a/ and /ä/ within the same morpheme. Note also that in WOJ take (PJ *takai functions as a single morpheme and does not have a compounding form taka- resulting from a *-y loss in preconsonantal position. Cf. WOJ take (PJ *takai ‘bamboo’, for which both a free form take and a compounding form taka- are well attested. We can firmly establish the Batanic languages as a source of borrowing into insular Japonic, because as far as I can tell, takäy ‘mountain’, ‘wilderness’ is not attested anywhere else in the Austronesian language family.

WOJ asi ‘foot’, ‘leg’ is an interesting word, appearing only as a free form, the compounding form as well as the form found before the OJ plural suffix -na is just a-, for example a\(^{-}\)mbumı ‘stirrup’ (PJ a-nǝ pum-i ‘foot-GEN step-NML’, a-tu ‘footprint’, ‘track’ (PJ a-to ‘foot-track’ or ‘foot-place’, ayypi ‘leg cord’ (PJ a-yup-i ‘leg-tie-NML’, a-na suwe ‘feet end’, etc. Omodaka et al. (1967: 1). The weird behavior of WOJ asi ~ a- ‘foot’, ‘leg’ is also paralleled by WOJ una’zi ‘nape of the neck’ (a free form) and una- ‘id.’ (a compounding form). On the other hand, EOJ a ‘foot’ appears as a free form in two examples: MYS 14.3387 and MYS 14.3533, but the form asi is not attested in the extant EOJ texts. The EOJ examples are below:

(11) **MYS 14.3387**\(^{17}\)

(1) 安能於登世受 (2) 由可牟古馬母我
(1) a-na otǝ se- tả-u (2) yuk-am-u koma mǝŋga
(1) foot-GEN sound do-NEG-CONV (2) go-TENT-ATTR stallion
(2) [I] want a stallion, which would go (1) without making any noise with its hoofs.

---

\(^{15}\) Rau and Dong define Yami takei as ‘mountain’, ‘field’ in their online dictionary (2009).

\(^{16}\) In both Yami and Itbayat orthography /ǝ/ is rendered as e.

\(^{17}\) This poem is from Simotupusa province, corresponding to the northern part of modern Chiba prefecture.
The tricky part of this example is that EOJ *a ‘foot’ is found before the genitive case marker -na, which always requires a free form of a noun before, cf. EOJ ke-na ‘tree-GEN’ (MYS 20.4375), unlike WOJ where both free and compounding forms can be found before -na: ki-na ‘tree-GEN’ (ki is a free form) and ka-na ‘tree-GEN’ (ka- is a compounding form).

(12) MYS 14:3533
(4) 安奈由牟古麻能 (5) 乎之家口母奈思
(4) a nayum-u koma-na (5) wosi-keku mọ na-si
(4) foot suffer-ATTR stallion-GEN (5) be.regrettable-ATTR/NML FP exist.
not-FIN
(5) [I] have no sorry feelings (4) for [my] stallion that will hurt [its] legs.

Here we clearly have a free form of a ‘foot’, ‘leg’. Thus, we can reconstruct PJN *a, but not PJN *asi, which is clearly innovative, being confined to WOJ, MJ and all modern Japanese dialects that are descendants of MJ (except Hachijō, which is at its core is a descendant of EOJ).

In Ryukyuan the situation is very different as compared to the one in Japanese. While ?asi is attested in Shuri (Kokuritsu kokugo kenkyūjo 1998: 618)18 and asi in Tonosiro (Uchima and Arakaki 2000: 356),19 given the fact that it is a form with -si, which is innovative in Japanese, these two attestations must be viewed as Japanese loans in Ryukyuan. In addition, two other words for ‘foot’, ‘leg’ are attested in Ryukyuan. The first one appears on the periphery as hagi in Yuwan and Koniya dialects on Amami island in the North, and as pagi in Higashi Nakasone, and pag? in Yonaha on Miyako island, and finally as pag in Tonosiro and Hateruma dialects of Yaeyama island group in the South of the Ryukyuan archipelago (Uchima and Arakaki 2000: 356). This word is cognate to WOJ pa?gi ‘shin’, MJ fagi ‘id.,’ and other Japanese forms, such as MdJ -hagi in fukura-hagi ‘calf of the leg’, etc. Both WOJ pa?gi ‘shin’ and PR *panki reflect PJ *panki ‘foot’, ‘leg’, which underwent a semantic shift in Japanese. There are three independent pieces of evidence that point to PR *panki as an original Japonic word. First, it is preserved on periphery of Ryukyuan, and innovations typically happen in the center, not on the periphery. Second, the semantic shift

18 Shuri attestation is weird, because it appears only in the Japanese to Okinawan index, but not in the main part of the dictionary.

19 Aleksandra Jarosz also informed me that there are other attestations of this word in Miyako, and that it looks like an old loan due to the compound asīda ‘geta’ and the shift of i > i. John kupchik further found andu ‘heel’ in Ryukyuan, probably also related to Tōhoku aguto ‘id.’ The main problems, is however that all these words include opaque ‘suffixes’ which makes the establishment of a somewhat not 100% reliable.
‘leg’ ⟩ ‘shin’ is easy to imagine, while ‘shin’ ⟩ ‘leg’ is not. Third, this semantic shift in Japanese was undoubtedly triggered by the appearance of OJ a ‘foot’, ‘leg’. Finally, there is Shuri hwisja (Kokuritsu kokugo kenkyūjo 1998: 618), Oku pisə, Benoki pisə, Pīsa, Kumejima çisə, etc. ‘foot’, ‘leg’ (Uchima and Arakaki 2000: 356), found in the center of the Ryukyuan language area. This word is apparently cognate to WOJ piwza ‘knee’ ⟩ PJ *pinsa ‘id.’ This time we are dealing with a clear innovation in Ryukyuan: it occurred only in the center, and is a derivation from the word for ‘knee’.

The important fact is that PJ *panki ‘foot’, ‘leg’ has reflexes in both Japanese and Ryukyuan, while OJ a ‘id.’ is confined to Japanese. The limited geographical distribution of a ‘foot’, ‘leg’ makes it a perfect candidate for a loanword.

I think that Batanic is again the best candidate for the source of this loanword. I was able to find Yami ai and Itbayat ayi, the latter, according to Blust and Trussel 2020 being the case of a secondary resyllabification in order to confirm to PAN canonical disyllabic structure. Ultimately, Yami ai and Itbayat ayi go back to PAN *qaqay ~ *waqay ‘foot’, ‘leg’. The situation with ai ‘foot’, ‘leg’ is more complicated than with takay ‘mountain’ discussed above, as it is attested outside Batanic as well. I cite below all cases of ai in Austronesian according to Blust and Trussel 2020. WMP: Bolinaw Sambal ayi ‘foot’, ‘leg’, Maguindanao ai ‘foot’, ‘leg’, Bintulu ai ‘foot’, Banggi ai ‘foot’, ‘leg’, CMP: Tetun ai-n ‘leg’, ‘foot’, Ujir ai ‘leg’, ‘foot’, Kamarian ai ‘leg’, ‘foot’, Wahai ai ‘foot’, Hitu ai ‘leg’, ‘foot’, Batu Merah ai-va ‘foot’, Morella ai-ka ‘foot’, SHWNG: Pom ai ‘foot’. Still, Batanic remains the likeliest source due to its proximity to Ryukyus and Japan. Blust and Trussel posit the following process of resyllabification: *ay ⟩ ai ⟩ ayi. Our task is to determine at which of these stages the borrowing took place. Certainly not at the monosyllabic *ay stage, because *ay would contract to *e in pre-Old Japanese, resulting in OJ e.20 It is the same process that we have already seen above with PJ *takay ⟩ WOJ takɛ ‘mountain’, ‘peak’. If OJ a ‘foot’, ‘leg’ were from *ay, we would expect WOJ e, not a for its free form. And not at the ayi stage, because it would stay intact in OJ.21 This leaves us with ai ‘stage’, which is further supported by OJ phonotactics that prohibits vowel clusters VV. If certain phonological or morphonological processes lead to formation of such a cluster, one of the vowels has to go, and it is normally higher and narrower vowel that does. In the case of Batanic ai, /i/ is certainly higher and narrower than /a/, so in the process of borrowing ai ⟩ a, because ai could not be borrowed as such. As much as I generally dislike etymologies

20 The contrast between PJ *ɛ and *e is lost in OJ in the initial position, after coronals, w and y.
21 See Vovin (2020.1: 48–54) on the contrast /i/ː/yi/ in WOJ.
for monophonemic words, I cannot find anything faulty with OJ a ‘foot’, ‘leg’ derived from Batanic ai.

The last etymology that I am going to discuss here concerns not the Batanic languages, but the Amis language on Taiwan. As demonstrated by Kupchik (2021), the names of several celestial bodies in Ryukyuan and to a lesser degree in Japanese, come from Austronesian and in particular from Amis. This time, however, we are going to descend from heaven to the depths of the ocean.

There are two words in WOJ for ‘whale’: kuⁿdira and isa. Both words have obscure etymologies, or to put it frankly, no etymologies at all. But there are differences. WOJ kuⁿdira is likely to be a non-poetic word: except in the poems KK 9 and its variant NK 7, kuⁿdira does not appear even once in whole text of the Man’yōshū, while there are plenty of attestations of isa in the Man’yōshū, while kuⁿdira seems to be confined to documents, historical and mythological texts, and dictionaries. Furthermore, kuⁿdira undoubtedly enjoys PJ status, as it is everywhere in Japonic: WOJ, MJ, Ryukyuan, MdJ, and modern Japanese dialects. Meanwhile, isa is attested only in WOJ, although there is also a piece of evidence that it was attested as well in the dialect of Iki islands: 俗云鯨爲伊佐: ‘In the local dialect ‘whale’ is called isa’ (IFIB 5 2822). My position has always been that among the two doublets, the one with more limited distribution is a perfect candidate for a loanword.

Indeed, there is Amis Ɂiso and Sakizaya Ɂisu ‘whale’. The Amis orthography with o, normally stands for [o] or [ʊ], therefore Wolff believes that it is the same word as PAN *qísu ‘shark’ (2010.2: 965). I beg to differ, since sharks are fish, and whales are mammals. Admittedly, people of old might not have such a solid foundation in zoology, as we have today: there are cases when whales are called fish, e.g. WOJ isa-na ‘whale-fish’, or Russian folklore рыба-кит ‘fish-whale’. Apparently, whatever swims in water is ‘fish’. But still such a maritime people as Amis would know the difference between sharks and whales: it would be highly unlikely if both were perceived simply as ‘big fish’. Interestingly enough, Blust and Trussel (2020) do not include Amis Ɂiso ‘whale’ under their PAN *qiSu ‘shark’, the only representative of Formosan languages cited is Paiwan qisu ‘shark’. There is no dearth of numerous WMP and CMP forms provided in Blust and Trussel 2020, but they are not relevant to our purposes here, as none of them could be a source for WOJ isa.

Thus, at the initial glance, Wolff’s Austronesian etymology for Amis Ɂiso ‘whale’ has a semantic problem, while WOJ etymology isa ‘whale’ has a phonetic problem of vowel correspondences Amis /u/ : WOJ /a/ in the second syllable. I will attempt to demonstrate now that this problem with different vocalism

---

22 Pages are cited according to Akimoto Kichirō’s edition of Fudoki.
in Amis and WOJ is actually a pseudo-problem. First, the phonetic sequence [isu] within the same morpheme in WOJ is extremely rare. To the best of my knowledge, it is found only in five cases: 1) Isu-nä kami ‘Top of the rock’, a name of a famous shrine, where isu is certainly a result of *o ⟩ u raising, and Iso-nä kami, an original form that is attested wider and better than Isu-nä kami; 2) in three WOJ words: isusuki, isusuku, and isurakap- with unclear meaning; 3) in isu kupasi, a makura-kotoba for kuödira ‘whale’, which is also considered to have an unknown meaning (Omodaka et al. 1967: 75–76), Actually, this makura-kotoba is extremely important for our purposes here. I think that it represents an Austronesian-Japonic hybrid, where isu is Austronesian, being a loan from Amis ?iso ‘whale’. The remaining part is Japonic. Certainly, it is unlikely that we are dealing here with WOJ kupasi ‘to be beautiful’, ‘to be perfect’, ‘to be superb’; ‘whale (kuödira) that is beautiful [like] whale (isu)’ would make little, if any sense at all. The primary function of whales in Japan from times immemorial to the present day, has always been a food source. Therefore, I think that WOJ kupasi in this case consists of kup- ‘to eat’ and adjectivizer -asi, invariably found after verbal stems. If I am right, then isu kup-asi may not seem as syntactically modifying kuödira, because the attributive form of -asi is -asi-ki. However, since we are dealing with poetry, -ki could have been also omitted to confirm to 5–7 poetic meter. Also, attributive in -ki in WOJ is a relatively recent innovation, and as Kupchik indicated to me, it is unlikely to predate this makura-kotoba. Then isu kup-asi kuödira can be understood as ‘a whale, which is an edible whale’. It is also interesting that all attestations of isa in the Man’yöshü are in the compound isa-na ‘whale-fish’,23 and all of them are found invariably in the context referring to whale hunting like in the example from MYS 17.3893 below. Therefore, it seems that we have both isu and isa ‘whale’ in WOJ. I suspect that the second syllable vowel a in isa is due to the regressive assimilation that took place in the compound isa-na ⟩ *isu-na, as well as to overall structural pressure to eliminate the sequence [isu]. Relevant WOJ textual examples (13–15):

(13) **KK 9**  
伊須久波斯久治良佐夜流  
isu kup-asi kuödira sayar-u  
whale eat-ADJ whale be.caught-FIN  
A whale, an edible whale, got caught.

23 There is another possibility for analyzing isa-na as ‘whale-PLUR’. See the commentary to MYS 17.3893 (Vovin 2016: 16–17). The possibility of the connection with Amis ?iso ‘whale’ was also suggested for the first time in the same commentary.
4 Austronesian Affixes in Insular Japonic

These are a priori difficult to find, because Austronesian uses mostly prefixes and infixes, while in Japonic suffixes rule supreme, except in OJ, which has some prefixes as well.

Thus, for example, there is an OJ locative prefix sa-, which marks not the separate nouns, but NP. This prefix is not recognized in the traditional Japanese grammar, but see its full description in Vovin (2020.1: 101–105, 108–109). Some textual examples (16–20):

(16) NK 4
佐祢耐據茂阿黨播怒介茂
sa-ne-n-dakɔ mo atap-an-u kamo
PREF-sleep(NML)-GEN-bed FP give-NEG-ATTR EP
[my wife] will not give me a place to sleep!

(17) MYS 5.800
多爾具久能佐和多流伐波美
tani-h-guku-nɔ sa-watar-u kipam-i
valley-GEN-frog-GEN PREF-cross-ATTR go to the end-NML
[until] the end [of the Earth], where a toad goes
(18) MYS 5.804
遠等咩良何佐那周伊多斗乎意斯比良伎
wotame-ra-ŋga sa-n-as-u ita to-wo os-i-pirak-i
maiden-PLUR-POSS PREF-sleep-HON-ATTR board door-ACC push-
CONV open-CONV
pushing open the wooden doors [of the chambers] where maidens
sleep

(19) MYS 15.3735
左奴流欲能伊米爾毛伊母我美延射良奈久尔
sa-n-uru yo-nə imɛ-ni mo imə-ŋga mi-ye-ŋz-ar-an-aku n-i
PREF-sleep-ATTR night-GEN dream-LOC FP beloved-POSS see-PASS-
NEG(CONV)-exist-NEG-NML DV-CONV
in the dreams of the nights when [I] sleep, [my] beloved always
appears

The examples above are all from WOJ, but prefix sa- is also attested in EOJ:

(20) MYS 14.3489
左祢度波良布母
sa-ne-ŋ-do parap-umə
PREF-sleep-GEN-place clean-EXCL
[I] am cleaning the place where [we] sleep [in]!

As noted in Vovin (2020.1: 109): “There is a dative-locative case marker -sa in all
Tōhoku dialects. The proper locative function seems to be confined to Tōhoku
(those dialects that have it do not have Central Japanese -ni). In directive
and dative functions case marker -sa is found also in Northern and Southern
Kyūshū and in Northern Kantō”. In peripheral modern Japanese dialects
(Tōhoku and Kyūshū), where it probably became a suffix under the pressure
of the SOV word order.

More than fifteen years ago, in the first edition of my WOJ grammar I have
suggested that this sa- might have an Austronesian origin (Vovin 2005: 90–91),
repeated in Vovin (2020.1: 109). At this time, I mentioned the existence of the
locative sa- in Tagalog, Atayal, and Rukai, noting also that in Atayal sa- marks
NP like in OJ:
(21) Atayal (Asai and Ogawa 1935: 34)
   sa-ko makiɁ BaBao na rahejal
   PREF-I exist top GEN earth
   on the earth, where I am

(22) Tagalog (Schachter and Otanes 1972: 384)
   a. b-um-alik siya sa Maynila
      re-AF-turn he LOC Manila
      He returned to Manila.
   (Schachter and Otanes 1972: 384)
   b. um-akyat siya sa puno
      AF-climb he LOC tree
      He climbed the/a tree.
   (Schachter and Otanes 1972: 77)
   c. um-upo sa silya ang ale
      AF-sit LOC chair TOP lady
      The lady sat on the chair.
   d. (Schachter and Otanes 1972: 76)
      mag-bigay ng pera sa pulubi ang tatay
      AF-present ADJC money DAT beggar TOP father
      Father gave the beggar some money.

However, the locative sa is not limited to Tagalog. I was able to find it in other Philippine languages as well, Hiligaynon (23) and Cebuano (24):

(23) Hiligaynon (Motus 1971: 70)
   di’in sa Texas
   where LOC Texas
   Where in Texas?

(24) Cebuano (Borello 2018: Leksyon 5, p. 3)24
   duol sa post office
   close LOC post office
   Close to post office.

24 This book has no pagination.
The same holds true in Bikol (sa locative class marker occurring before general nouns, see Mintz 1971: 368) and Maranao (san ‘there’, ‘in’, ‘at’, see McKaughan and Macaraya 1967: 389). No textual examples for any of them.

This list is probably far from conclusive, but accessible resources on the Philippine languages that I am able to reach are quite limited during the COVID-19 pandemic years. But even on the basis of the short list of attestations above, one can see that the locative sa is found in the Northern, Central and Southern Philippines. This is important, since both Atayal and Rukai are the languages spoken in the interior of Taiwan. Consequently, their speakers are not seafarers, and the Austronesian source of OJ sa- is unlikely to be in Taiwan. It is a different story with Philippines, which seem to be the likeliest source of OJ sa-.

In addition, OJ directive-locative focus verbal prefix i- might also have had an Austronesian origin. The locative prefix i- attested in the Amis language is, on the contrary, a nominal prefix. This fact makes this etymology less credible, but not impossible. Furthermore, given the situation that the Amis language as demonstrated by Kupchik (2021), is the most prodigious source of Austronesian loans in the insular Japonic, I think that it is even more or less likely. See Old Japanese examples (25–28) below:

(25) KK 13
伊勢能字美能意斐志爾波母登富呂布志多陀美能伊波比母登富理字知弓夜麻牟
Ise-nə umi-nə opi-[i]si-ni pap-i-matapər-əp-u sita°dami-nə
i-pap-i-matapər-i ut-i-te si yam-am-u
Ise-GEN sea-GEN grow(CONV)-stone-LOC crawl-CONV-go.around-ITER-ATTR seashell-COMP DLF-crawl-CONV-go.around-CONV hit-CONV-SUB EP stop-TENT-FIN
like the shellfish that are constantly crawling around on the growing rocks of the Ise sea, [we] will crawl around [them] there, smite and stop [them].

(26) KK 86
意富岐美袁斯麻爾波夫良婆布那阿麻理伊賀弊理許牟叙
opo kimi-wo sima-ni pa°bur-a°ba puna-amar-i i°gaper-i-kə-m-u ⁿzə
great lord-ACC island-LOC exile-COND boat-exceed-CONV DLF-return-CONV-come-TENT-ATTR FP

25 All OJ examples are cited from Vovin (2020.2: 505–512).
if [they] exile [my] great lord to an island, there are many boats, and
[he] would return here.

(27)  
MYS 5.804  
遠等咩良何佐那周伊多斗乎意斯比良伐伊多度利与利提  
wotame-ra-ga sa-n-as-u ita-to-wo os-i-pirak-i i-ta^ndor-i-yar-i-te  
maiden-PLUR-POSS PREF-sleep-HON-ATTR board-door-ACC push-CONV  
open-CONV DLF-pursue-CONV-approach-CONV-SUB  
[gentlemen] push open wooden doors where maidens sleep, and [they]  
pursue [maidens] there ...

(28)  
MYS 14.3518 (an EOJ example)  
伊波能倍尓伊可賀流久毛  
ipa-nǝ [u]pe-ni i-kakar-u kumo  
rock-GEN top-LOC DLF-hang-ATTR cloud  
clouds, hanging over the rocks

The directive-locative focus prefix i- is also attested in Old Ryukyuan:

(29)  
OS 12.658  
としが三年いきよてとしが四年いきよて  
tosi-ga SAN-NEN i-kiyo-te tosi-ga YO-NEN i-kiyo-te  
year-POSS three-year DLF-invite-SUB year-POSS four-year  
DLF-invite-SUB  
inviting [the goddess] here for three years, inviting [the goddess] here  
for four years

Now let us turn to the examples in the Amis language:26

(30)  
Amis (Cài and Zêng 1997: 327)  
a.  
adihay ko kapaysinan no 'Amis i-tiya ho  
be.many SM taboo GEN 'Amis LOC-long.time ago  
There were many taboos for Amis in the times now past.

26  The following examples are all from (Cài and Zêng 1997). However, since Cài and Zêng's
glosses are sometimes incomplete and also include omissions, I used the Amis dictionary  
by Virginia Fey (1986) to fill in the necessary gaps.
b. *i-tiraay ingata no lalan no tosiya ko niyaro’*

   **LOC-** there **be.close GEN road GEN car SM village**

   The village there is close to the motor-way.

(cái and zēng 1997: 306)

c. *hinam-han nira i-taliyok no talo’an ira ko mapeliay a narakatan no tamdaw*

   **look.around-DEB he LOC-perimeter GEN small.hut exist SM be.left CP trace GEN person**

   When he was prompted to look **around** the small hut, there were traces left by a person.

5 Conclusion: When and Where?

I will try to give very approximate and tentative answers to two questions here: “When these Austronesian loanwords entered insular Japonic?” and “Where did it happen?”

The first question is easier than the second. I do not see any traces of these loanwords in peninsular Japonic, therefore the upper temporal boundary must not be earlier than 300 BC, the rough date when the Yayoi culture that could be defined as Proto-Japonic first appeared in Japan. Although it has become trendy recently to push back the beginnings of the Yayoi culture to 700 BC or so, I am not convinced, because the evidence presented is not very reliable. As for lower temporary boundary, 400 AD seems to be quite likely, because while our knowledge of Ancient Japan increases exponentially after this date, leaving no likely room for significant population movement or language contacts on a large scale (and judging by the nature of these loans, the language contact was indeed on a very large scale, since we are dealing not just with just a peripheral, but with a basic vocabulary). However, before 400 AD we know precious little about the ethnolinguistic history of Japan.

The second question is much more difficult to answer. However, at the present point we already have several pieces of the puzzle at our disposal. First, we know that the initial landfall of the Yayoi culture in Japan was in Northern Kyūshū, from where it steadily and rapidly spread to the rest of Kyūshū, Shikoku, as well as to the most of Honshū, excluding its Northern part, which was dominated by Ainu at least until the late ninth or early tenth century AD. Ainu-Japanese bilingualism was still present in the Kantō region of Japan well into the early tenth century AD (Vovin 2009b, 2022). Second, we know
that Proto-Ryukyuan speakers did not start to migrate to Ryukyuan islands earlier than the late ninth century or early tenth century AD. There are different opinions as to where Proto-Ryukyuan was spoken: in the North-Eastern Kyūshū, North-Eastern Kyūshū, or Southern Kyūshū (Serafim 2003), but we can say for sure that the Austronesian loanwords detected by Kupchik (2021) in Old Okinawan come back to the time when Proto-Ryukyuan was still spoken on Kyūshū. Third, although we know very little about the Hayato (WOJ Payata, 隼人) and almost nothing about Kumaso (WOJ Kumasa, 熊襲) tribal languages in Kyūshū, their customs, headgear, clothes, shields, etc. look strikingly Austronesian (Ōbayashi 1975: 24–33). A treatment of the tits and bits of the Hayato and the Kumaso languages would require a separate article, so here I will limit myself to just one note. Almost half a century ago it was suggested by Murayama that WOJ -sǝ in Kumasa and -tǝ in Payata reflect PAN *Cau ‘person’, ‘human being’ (1975: 258–260). Apparently, there is a phonetic difficulty: we would rather expect WOJ -to and -so rather than WOJ -tǝ and -sǝ as a reflex of PAN *Cau. But there is a spelling Kumaso (球磨贈於) in Fudoki (CFIB 503), (HFIB 520, 521), (BF 358, 368), (HF 380), or almost identical 球磨嘸唸 (HF 404). This spelling apparently violates the OJ phonotactics prohibiting vowel clusters, and, consequently could only be an attempt to represent a foreign word. It still does not explain the vowel [ǝ], but, nevertheless brings us one step closer to PAN *Cau. The Extra-Formosan MP languages all uniformly have initial consonant t-, while the Formosan languages show here a variety of reflexes: Papora sǝ, ‘person’, ‘human being’, Pazeh saw ‘person’, ‘human being’, Thao caw ‘person’, ‘human being’, Hoanya sau ‘person’, Tsou cou ‘person’, ‘human being’, Puyuma Tau ‘to be human’ (Blust and Trussel 2020). For WOJ -sǝ Formosan origin will work better, but for -tǝ either Formosan or MP will do, because OJ has never had any affricates [c] or [č]. A possible solution to [ǝ] vowel may be offered by Tagalog that has ṭáɁo ‘person’, ‘human being’ with penultimate stress, but ṭaɁo ‘mortal’ with a stress on the last syllable. It is quite possible that WOJ sǝo (贈 於, 贈於) represents an attempt to transcribe saɁo. Furthermore, unfortunately our knowledge about OJ accentual system is speculative at best, but if saɁo had an accent pattern LH, it is not inconceivable that the vowel [ǝ] is reduction of an original *a. Therefore, we can posit a hypothetical *saɁo, which will be quite in agreement with Austronesian forms.

All three independent pieces of evidence discussed above point in the same direction: the quite intensive language contact between Austronesian and insular Japonic took place on Kyūshū sometimes between 300 BC and 400 AD. There will be many years ahead of the hard work before we get more or less coherent general picture, but it looks like that starting with Kupchik (2021) a new subfield of Japonic historical linguistics is born.
To put an icing on the cake, it is quite possible that Austronesians might have travelled to much more distant lands in the North than Japan. Long ago I have noticed PE *iqaluγ ‘fish’ (no Aleut cognates). In this word *-luγ looks like a postbase, but it cannot be -luy ‘to be bad’, and needs to be explained. The remaining part *iqa- suspiciously looks like PEMP *ikan ‘fish’ < PMP *hikan < PAN *Sikan. Aleut tana-ƛ ‘land’, ‘earth’ (traditionally compared with Eskimo nuna ‘id.’, but this etymology has too many problems) no less suspiciously looks like Maranao, Manobo, Visayan, etc. tana?, Malay, Old Javanese, Javanese, Balinese, etc. tanah ⟨ PMP *taneq ‘land’, ‘earth’, ‘soil’ (Blust and Trussel 2020). Certainly, these might be just chance look-alikes, but, in my opinion, this possibility is worth investigating a little bit further, in spite of the fact that poor Austronesians would be chilled to their bones in these frigid Arctic waters.
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Abbreviations

**Languages and Sources**

| Abbreviation | Language                  |
|--------------|----------------------------|
| Chn.         | Chinese                    |
| CMP          | Central Malayo-Polynesian  |
| EOJ          | Eastern Old Japanese       |
| GIEID        | Glosbe Ivatan-English and English-Ivatan Dictionaries. n.p., n.d. |
| Jpn.         | Japanese                   |
| MdJ          | Modern Japanese            |
| Code | Language                  |
|------|---------------------------|
| MJ   | Middle Japanese           |
| MP   | Malayo-Polynesian         |
| OC   | Oceanic                   |
| OJ   | Old Japanese (both Western and Eastern) |
| OOK  | Old Okinawan             |
| PAN  | Proto-Austronesian        |
| PEMP | Proto-Eastern-Malayo-Polynesian |
| PJ   | Proto-Japonic             |
| PJN  | Proto-Japanese            |
| PMP  | Proto-Malayo-Polynesian   |
| POC  | Proto-Oceanic             |
| PR   | Proto-Ryukyuan            |
| SHWNG| South Halmahera and Western New Guinea |
| WMP  | Western Malayo-Polynesian |
| WOJ  | Western Old Japanese      |

**Linguistic Terms**

| Code | Term          |
|------|---------------|
| ABL  | Ablative      |
| ADJ  | Adjectivizer  |
| AF   | Actor focus   |
| ATTR | Attributive   |
| COM  | Comitative    |
| COND | Conditional converb |
| CONV | Converb       |
| COP  | Copula        |
| CP   | Connecting particle |
| DAT  | Dative        |
| DEB  | Debitive      |
| DP   | Desiderative particle |
| FIN  | Final         |
| FP   | Focus particle |
| GEN  | Genitive      |
| H    | High pitch    |
| HON  | Honorific     |
| IP   | Interrogative particle |
| L    | Low pitch     |
| LOC  | Locative      |
| NEG  | Negative      |
| NML  | Nominalizer   |
References

**Primary Sources**

- **BF** Bungo Fudoki (豊後風土記), Bungo Fudoki, 713 AD
- **CFIB** Chikuzen Fudoki Itsubun (筑前風土記逸文), Fragments of the Chikuzen Fudoki, between 713 and 737 AD
- **HF** Hizen Fudoki (肥前風土記), Hizen Fudoki, 713 AD
- **HFIB** Higo Fudoki Itsubun (肥後風土記逸文), Fragments of the Higo Fudoki, between 713 and 737 AD
- **IFIB** Iki Fudoki Itsubun (壱岐風土記逸文), Fragments of the Iki Fudoki, between 713 and 737 AD
- **KJK** Kojiki (古事記), Records of Ancient Matters, 712 AD
- **KK** Kojiki kayō (歌), Songs of the Kojiki, 712 AD
- **MYS** Man'yōshū (萬葉集), A Collection of Ten Thousand Leaves [of Words], between 759 and 785 AD
- **NK** Nihonshoki kayō (日本書紀歌謡), Songs of the Nihonshoki, 720 AD
- **NS** Nihonshoki (日本書紀), Annals of Japan, 720 AD
- **OS** Omoro sōshi (おもろさうし), Omoro Anthology, 1531–1623 AD
- **WMS** Wamyō Rujiūshō (倭名類聚抄), Classified Japanese Words, 931–938 AD

**Secondary Sources**

Akimoto, Kichirō 秋本吉郎, ed. 1958. 『風土記』。「日本古典文學大系」2. [Gazetteers. Series of the Japanese Classical Literature, vol. 2.] Tokyo: Iwanami.

Asai, Erin. 1936. *A study of the Yami language: An Indonesian language spoken on Botel Tobago Island*. Leiden: Ginsberg.

Asai, Erin 淺井惠倫 and Ogawa Naoyoshi 小川尚義. 1935. 『原語による台湾高砂族伝説集』. [A Collection of Legends of Taiwan Hill Tribes Based on the Native Languages.] Taihoku: Taihoku Imperial University.
Blench, Roger. 2015. A New Look at Bashiic. Draft version. https://www.academia.edu/14178249/A_new_look_at_Bashiic_a_divergent_subgroup_of_Malayo-polynesian.

Blust, Robert and Stephen Trussel. 2020 (last revision). The Austronesian Comparative Dictionary. https://www.trussel2.com/acd/.

Borello, Alfonso. 2018. My Little Book of Cebuano Visayan. Vol. 1. n. p., n. p.

Cài, Zhōng-hán 蔡中涵 and Zēng, Sī-qí 曾思奇. 1997. 《阿美族母語語法結構分析》[An Analysis of Syntactic Constructions in the Grammar of the Amis Tribal Mother Tongue.] Taipeh: Taiwan Aboriginal Foundation.

Fey, Virginia (Fāng Mǐn-yìng 方敏英). 《阿美語辭典》/Amis Dictionary. Taipeh: The Bible Society.

gIEID. Glosbe English-Ivatan Dictionary. n. p., n. d. https://en.glosbe.com/en/ivv.

Hidalgo, Cesar A. 1998. Ibatan-Filipino-English dictionary: the cultural dictionary of Batanes. Manila: Academies Foundation.

Hisamatsu, Sen’ichi 久松潜一 et al. 1958. 『古事記総索引』.[A General Index to the Kojiki], vols. 1–2. In: 『古事記大成』The Kojiki Series, vol. 7–8. Tokyo: Heibonsha.

Kuroita, Katsumi 黒板勝美 et al. 1974. 『日本書紀。前編—後編』.[The Nihonshoki], vols. 1–2.『新訂増補國史大系』.[The Newly Edited and Enlarged Series on the Japanese History.] Tokyo: Ōkurashō insatsu kyoku.

Kupchik, John. 2021. Austronesian Lights the Way: on the Origin of the Words for SUN in Old Ryukyuan. International Journal of Eurasian Linguistics 3 (2). 237–257.

Kuroita, Katsumi 黒板勝美 et al. 1974. 『日本書紀。前編—後編』.[The Nihonshoki], vols. 1–2.『新訂増補國史大系』.[The Newly Edited and Enlarged Series on the Japanese History.] Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

Li, Paul Jen-Kuei. 2000. Subgrouping of the Batanic Languages. n.p., n.p.27

Maree, Judith Y. M. and Orlando R. Tomas. 2012. Ibatan to English dictionary: with English, Filipino, Ilokano, Ivatan indices. Manila: SIL Philippines.

Maree, Rundell D. 2007. Ibatan: A Grammatical Sketch of the Language Babuyan Claro Island. Manila: SIL Philippines.

McKaughan, Howard P. and Batua A. Macaraya. 1967. Maranao Dictionary. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Mintz, Malcolm W. 1971. Bikol Dictionary. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Motus, Cecile L. 1971. Hiligaynon Lessons. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Murayama, Shichirō 村山七郎. 1975. 『隼人の言語』.[The Language of Hayato.] In: Ōbayashi, Taryō 大林太良 (ed.), 『隼人』. 日本古代文化の探究.[Hayato. The Search for the Ancient Culture of Japan Series.] Tokyo: Shikai Shisōsha. 249–263.

Nishimiya, Kazutami 西宮一民. 1984. 『萬葉集全注』. 巻第三.[The Man’yōshū Fully Annotated, vol. 3.] Tokyo: Yūhikaku.

27 I was able to obtain a very strange .pdf file which includes only the first two pages.
Austronesians in the Northern Waters?

Öbayashi, Taryō 大林太良. 1975. 「民俗学から見た隼人」。[Hayato from the Point of View of Ethnography.] In: Öbayashi, Taryō 大林太良 (ed.).『隼人』。日本古代文化の探究。[Hayato. The Search for the Ancient Culture of Japan Series.] Tokyo: Shakai Shisōsha. 2–62.

Omodaka, Hisataka 澤瀉久孝. 1977-3.『萬葉集注釋』。巻第三。[The Man’yōshū with a Commentary, vol. 3.] Tokyo: Chūō kōronsha.

Omodaka, Hisataka 澤瀉久孝 et al. 1967.『時代別国語大辞典』。[A Large Dictionary of Japanese by Periods – Old Japanese.] Tokyo: Sanseidō.

Pearson, Richard. 2013. Ancient Ryukyu. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.

Rau, Victoria, Dong, Maa-Neu. 2009. Yami (Tao) Dictionary Project. http://yamibow.cs.pu.edu.tw/index_en.htm.

Rau, Victoria, Dong, Maa-Neu and A. H. -H. Chang. 2012. Yami (Tao) dictionary. Taipei: National Taiwan University Press.

Reid, Lawrence A. 1966. An Ivatan syntax. Honolulu: Hawai‘i University Press (Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication #2).

Reid, Lawrence A. 1971. Philippine minor languages: Word lists and phonologies. Honolulu: Hawai‘i University Press (Oceanic Linguistics special publication #8).

Ross, Malcolm. 2005. The Batanic Languages in Relation to the Early History of the Malayo-Polynesian Subgroup of Austronesian. Journal of Austronesian Studies 1 (2). 1–23.

Serafín, Leon A. 2003. When and from Where did the Japonic Language Enter the Ryukyus? – A Critical Comparison of Language, Archaeology, and History. In: Vovin, Alexander and Osada Toshiki 長田俊樹 (eds.). 2003.『日本語系統論の現在』/Perspectives on the Origins of the Japanese Language. Kyoto: International Research Center for Japanese Studies. 463–475.

Tsuchida, Shigeru, Yamada, Yukihiro and Moriguchi, Tsunekazu. 1987. Lists of selected words of Batanic languages. Tokyo: Department of Linguistics, University of Tokyo.

Tsuchida, Shigeru, Constantino, Ernesto, Yamada, Yukihiro and Moriguchi, Tsunekazu. 1989. Batanic Languages: Lists of Sentences for Grammatical Features. Tokyo: Department of Linguistics, University of Tokyo.

Uchima, Chokujin 内間直仁 and Arakaki, Kumiko 新垣公弥子. 2000.『沖縄北部・南部方言の記述的研究』。[A descriptive Study of Northern and Southern Ryukyuan Dialects.] Tokyo: Kazama shobō.

Vovin, Alexander. 2005. A Descriptive and Comparative Grammar of Western Old Japanese. Part 1: Phonology, Script, Lexicon and Nominals. First edition. Folkestone: Global Oriental.

Vovin, Alexander. 2009a–. Man’yōshū. Folkestone: Global Oriental (books 5, 14, 15, 20), and Leiden and Boston: Brill (1, 2, 16, 17, 18, 19 so far).

Vovin, Alexander. 2009b.『万葉集と風土記に見られる不思議な言葉と上代日本列島におけるアイヌ語の分布』。[Strange Words in the Man’yōshū and the Fudoki]
and the Distribution of the Ainu Language in the Japanese Islands in Prehistory.]
Kyoto: The International Research Center for the Japanese Studies.

Vovin, Alexander. 2016. Man’yōshū, book 17: A New English Translation Containing the Original Text, Kana Transliteration, Romanization, Glossing and Commentary. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Vovin, Alexander. 2020. A Descriptive and Comparative Grammar of Western Old Japanese. Volumes 1 and 2. Handbuch der Orientalistik V: 16.1–2. Leiden and Boston: Brill. Second edition.

Vovin, Alexander. 2022 (forthcoming). Ainu Elements in Early Japonic. In: Bugaeva, Anna (ed.). Handbook of Ainu linguistics. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Wolff, John U. 2010. Proto-Austronesian Phonology with Glossary, 2 vols. Cornell: Cornell University Press.

Yamada, Yukihiro 山田幸宏. 2002. Itbayat-English Dictionary. Endangered Languages of the Pacific Rim Publications Series A3–006. Suita: Osaka Gakuin University.

Yamada, Yukihiro 山田幸宏. 2014. A Grammar of the Itbayat Language of the Philippines. Himeji: Himeji Dokkyo University.

Yamada, Yukihiro 山田幸宏 and C. N. Zayas. 1997. A Bibliography of the Bashic languages and cultures. CSSP Publications, UP Diliman, Office for Research and Development, Initiative for the Study of Ethnolinguistic Groups in the Philippines.

Yang, D. 2002. Subgrouping and Reconstruction of Batanic Languages. Unpublished MA thesis. Taichung: Providence University.

Zhāng Xún-huì 張旬慧. 2000. 《雅美語參考語法》。 [A Reference Grammar of the Yami Language.] Taipei and Hong Kong: Yuanliu chuban gongsi (Austronesian Languages of Taiwan 13).