

795.4
403

地質專報乙種第三號

章鴻釗著

洛氏中國伊蘭卷金石譯證

中華民國十四年六月

農商部地質調查所印行

地質專報乙種第三號

章鴻釗著

洛氏中國伊蘭卷金石譯證

中華民國十四年六月

農商部地質調查所印行

**MEMOIRS
OF
THE GEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF CHINA**

Series B

Number 3

June 1925

**METALS AND STONES AS TREATED
IN LAUFER'S "SINO-IRANICA"
TRANSLATED WITH COMMENTARIES**

**BY
H. T. CHANG**

**PEKING
MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE & COMMERCE
THE GEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF CHINA
V. K. TING AND W. H. WONG DIRECTORS**

Printed by the Commercial Press, Peking Branch Works

1925

洛氏中國伊蘭卷金石譯證自敘

余曩撰石雅。凡載籍言金石之屬。見聞所及。靡不參稽互察。循名責實。以求得其本末之所在。若夫西人著述。間有涉於此者。又往往能舉東西文物與夫異域方言之源流。綜達條貫。探本而出之。有如洛氏前後數傑作。固嘗有所省覽。而援爲論證之資焉矣。顧搜求未遍。遺棄孔多。復以斷章節取。疎漏出入。時或難免。誠甚憾焉。今石雅初刊。已爲海內外學者持而去者。且殆盡。而余愛好金石之志。愈猶未已。方將進而有所修正。或更增廣之。庶幾稍償吾願。亦藉以鑒求者之望也。適去歲洛氏至北京。與之語。知尙有中國伊蘭卷。一日吾友翁詠霓兄檢得之。亟示余曰。此君必以先覩爲快者。余喜而讀之。其書博大浩瀚。凡於中國植物金石稱謂沿革。搜討備勤。其餘一名一物之微。詳加疏證。誌其出處始末者。亦復前後錯綜其間。要皆異乎曩之考據家。硜硜墨守一家言。與一國文字者之所爲。故頗多新穎可喜。不惟余所亟欲知之。凡我國人士與余有同好者。當亦無不欲知之。而或猶有未盡知之者。乃迺譯其言金石者。輒復舉所聞見。增益於每篇之後。顏曰金石譯證。示未及其全。且有所商榷云爾。曰釗案者。某補述也。曰原註者。洛氏自註也。曰註者。某附註也。洛氏稱引漢籍。必曰某卷某葉。今略言卷者。版異而葉不必盡同。且取符舊例也。原註間有一二未畢具者。非遺之也。略其所可略也。餘乃悉存其文。文出於古籍者。必仍其舊。若猶

洛氏中國伊蘭卷金石譯證 自敘

二

有所未盡。抑或疎漏出入不及自檢者。惟世之博碩君子教而正之。中華民國十四年四月上旬
鴻釗自識。

THE GEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF CHINA

V. K. TING AND W. H. WONG DIRECTORS

MEMOIRS.

SERIES B.

NUMBER 3.

METALS AND STONES AS TREATED IN LAUFER'S "SINO-IRANICA"

TRANSLATED WITH COMMENTARIES

BY

H. T. CHANG

WITH AN ENGLISH PREFACE BY DR. W. H. WONG.

Peking
1925

PREFACE

If it is interesting for the foreign scholars to study Chinese literature, it is still more so for the Chinese to know such foreign studies. New light comes out always by viewing the things from a new angle.

It is in this spirit that Mr. H. T. Chang has undertaken the translation of the Sino-Iranica of Dr. Berthold Laufer. As he is especially interested in the study of minerals and metals, only such parts in the Sino-Iranica dealing with these materials are here translated. There is probably no other Chinese scholar better fitted than Mr. Chang, author of *Lapidarium Sinicum*, to do such translation, he himself being an authority on and having a masterly command of the Chinese literature on such subjects. He is also thoroughly acquainted with all the important publications dealing with similar subjects by Dr. Laufer, of whose scholarship he is a deep admirer. As stated in the translator's own preface, he takes great pleasure in presenting to a wider Chinese reading public this incomparably learned and suggestive work of the eminent American sinologue.

However, Mr. Chang's work is not only a mere translation. To the already very rich data and literary references gathered by Dr. Laufer, he has been able to add many new ones which serve most often to further strengthen the author's conclusions but not infrequently also to suggest new interpretations. To keep scrupulously faithful to the words in the translation, Mr. Chang sets aside in separate paragraphs the additional references as “註” and his own views under the heading of “鈞案”.

With no intention of misappreciating in any degree the value of Dr. Laufer's work, it may be to the interest of foreign readers to mention here some of the new points which Mr. Chang seems to have brought out.

1. Dr. Laufer emphasizes the double meaning of the Chinese term Po-se (波斯) in T'ang and pre-T'ang records, which must not be blindly translated “Persia” but may often indicate certain Malayan regions. According to Mr. Chang there seems to be no definite proof that the Chinese records of pre-T'ang and T'ang periods did not truly refer to the Iranian Po-Se. The Malayan Po-Se is only referred to since Sung Dynasties, and then it especially refers to Borneo.

2. Dr. Laufer is of the opinion that the term T'ou-Si (銅石) is derived from the Persian word *Tutiya*: and from this fact he draws the conclusion that

the art of zinc-smelting originated in Persia. It is now found by Mr. Chang that this term occurs in Buddhist classics earlier than in any other Chinese literature and is probably translated from Sanscrit. There is therefore no more reason to plead for the Persian origin of zinc smelting.

It may be added that the history of the beginning of the use of zinc in China has been the subject of many years study by Mr. Chang and a summary of his previous works is given as additional notes in the present translation.

3. The real significance of the term Tze-Mo-King (紫磨金) has not been hitherto well understood. Dr. Laufer contented himself by saying that it is of purely Chinese origin. Mr. Chang finds now that the term Tse-Mo-King first occurred in Buddhist literature of the Hou Han period and is the Chinese translation of the Sanscrit word *Jambunadasuvarna*. The latter is also variously translated by the terms Yen-Fou-Tan-King (閻浮檀金), Yen-Fou-Na-Tou-King (閻浮那陀金) etc. and means gold of the river below the Jambu tree. Four varieties of this placer gold have been distinguished according to the color; Tse-Mo-King is probably one of them characterized by its purplish coloring.

4. The exact origin of Se-Se (瑟瑟) has been already much discussed both by Laufer and Chang in their previous writings. Mr. Chang still maintains his former opinion that it may correspond to the blue corundum or artificial Lapis Lazuli (Lui-Li) and derived its origin either from Tze-Se-Si (枝斯石) mentioned in Mu-Tien-Tse-Chuan (穆天子傳 biography of the Emperor Mu) or from the Nan-Man (the aboriginal tribes of Southern China).

5. The origin of the term for amber, Hu-P'o (琥珀) remains still obscure and Dr. Laufer thinks that it has no relation to the word *Harpax* of Greek origin. It is now shown by Mr. Chang that Hu-P'o was known since high antiquity from Yung Chang, in Yi Chou (益州) district which covered the Northern part of the present Burma. It is further known that communication by water-way existed between Ta Tsin (大秦) and this part of Asia since at least the Han Dynasties. He further points out that the fact has been presumed by Meyer that Burmese amber was brought to the west by Phoenicians. It is therefore very probable that some relation existed between Hu-P'o and *Harpax* which were both applied to the Burmese amber.

6. Dr. Laufer confesses his ignorance of the origin of the Chinese term for coral San-Hu (珊瑚). Mr. Chang proves that it is derived from Su-Hu (蘇胡), the first character Su probably representing the abbreviation of the Persian capital Su-Ling (蘇蘭).

7. Referring to the term Pi-Si (碧璽), Laufer contented himself by saying that it took its starting points from Yunnan, but still remains to be determined mineralogically. It is now identified with positive evidence by Mr. Chang as tourmaline. He goes on also to detail its origin and places of production.

These are a few instances which will serve to give an idea of the new light thrown by Mr. Chang upon the subjects discussed in Sino-Iranica. His work therefore not only renders a service to the Chinese readers but also constitutes a contribution to Sinological research.

W. H. WONG.

洛氏中國伊蘭卷金石譯證目次

一 馬來波斯與其產物篇(The Malayan Po-se and its Products)

馬來波斯(Malayan Po-se) 明礬(Alum).....一——一九

二 波斯織物篇(Persian Textiles)

火浣布(Asbestine cloth, "fire-proof cloth")一〇——二八

三 伊蘭之礦物金屬及寶石篇(Iranian Minerals, Metals and Precious Stones)

呼洛(Hu-lo).....一九——三二

硃砂(Nao-sa, sal-ammoniac).....三二——三九

密陀僧(Mi-t'o-sen, litharge).....三九——四一

紫磨金(Tse-mo kin).....四一——四三

鹽綠(Yen-lü, "the green of salt").....四三——四四

五色鹽(Wu se yen, "manicolored salt").....四四——四六

鍮石(T'ou-shi).....四六——六〇

鑛鐵(Pin t'ie, pin iron).....六〇——六三

瑟瑟(Se-se, sit-sit).....六三——七一

綠松石(Turquoise)	七一—七五
金精(Kin-tsin, "essence of gold")	七五—七八
琥珀(Amber)	七八—八六
珊瑚(Coral)	八七—九二
婆娑石(P'o-so si)	九二—九八

四 伊蘭中國篇(Iranic Sinica)

纏絲瑪瑙(Onyx)	九九—一〇〇
白銅(Pai-t'un, "white copper")	一〇〇—一〇四
消石(Saltpetre)	一〇四
高嶺土(Kaolin)	一〇五—一〇六
碧珉(Pi-si, tourmaline)	一〇六—一一〇

補證(Supplements)

紫磨金補證(Supplement on Tse-mo kin)	一一—一二五
鍮石補證(Supplement on T'ou-shi)	一二五—一二八
金精補證(Supplement on Kin-tsin)	一二八—一二九

洛氏中國伊蘭卷金石譯證

吳興章鴻釗

一 馬來波斯與其產物篇 (The Malayan Po-se and Products)

篇首畧云。中國人所稱波斯。除伊蘭波斯 (Iranian Po-se) 外。尙有一同名之國。其地當在南洋。且屬馬來族系中。此二波斯國。中國人淆亂已久。稽諸載籍。亦罕有明說。歐洲人之精通中國文者。亦鮮不誤以爲即西域波斯也。

此馬來波斯 (Malayan Po-se) 樊綽蠻書 (約西歷紀元後八六年) 曾紀之云。驃國 (Burma) 在永昌城南七十五日程。與波斯及婆羅門 (Brāhmana) 鄰接。西舍利城二十日程。此明唐人所知之波斯。正界緬甸。在亞洲本陸上。

蠻書又云。大銀孔南有婆羅門波斯。閼婆勃泥崑崙數種。外通交易之處。多諸珍寶。此馬來波斯。明與伊蘭波斯有別。太平御覽 (卷九八一) 引南夷志文。亦與蠻書同。明此五族之貿易市場。正在南詔國 (今雲南) 也。

日本高楠氏 (J. Takakusu) 錄唐僧鑑真原註一遊記云。廣東珠江有婆羅門波斯及崑崙人之估舶無數。原註二此文亦與蠻書略同。由是知第八世紀之初。馬來波斯之操航海業者。嘗往來於廣東與中國人貿易焉。

馬來波斯唐以前或已知之。宋洪芻香譜引廣志（西歷紀元五二一七以前）云。乳香卽南海波斯國松樹脂。此明非伊蘭波斯也。且伊蘭波斯亦非出乳香者。原註三

第八世紀李珣海藥本草引廣志云。乳頭香生南海。是波斯松樹脂也。紫赤如櫻桃。透明者爲上。原註四 文與洪氏香譜所引小異。寇宗奭本草衍義云。薰陸南印度界呵吒釐國出之。南番者更佳。卽乳香也。此以馬來波斯當南番。陳承本草別說云。乳香西出天竺。南出波斯等國。西者色黃白。南者色紫赤。此明南波斯出一種乳香。如廣志所云然也。

又本草綱目（卷三十五）柯樹下引廣志云。生廣南山谷。波斯家用木爲船舫者也。此亦指馬來波斯。廣志殆晉時作。時中國尙未知伊蘭波斯。波斯之名於西歷紀元後四六一年始見中國載籍。蓋波斯曾遣使至魏廷焉。原註五 波斯與中國交通。常取道中亞細亞。若馬來波斯則不然。或由陸從雲南入中國。亦或由海至廣東。

宋周去非嶺外代答（西歷一二七八年）云。西南海上波斯國其人肌理甚黑。鬚髮皆拳。兩手鈐以金串。縵身以青花布。無城郭。其王早朝。以虎皮蒙机。疊足坐。羣下禮拜。出則乘軟兜。或騎象。從者百餘人。執劍呵護。食餅肉飯。盛以磁器。掬而啖之。宋人雖不明言波斯所在。然固當爲馬來種族。抑或爲聶格利脫種族（Negrito）也。

有明一代史地記錄似均未及馬來斯波。然口碑傳說猶畧聞之。如本草綱目(卷三十一)阿勃勒下。李時珍曰。此即波斯皂莢。波斯西南夷國名也。

又酉陽雜俎(卷十六)云。波斯謂牙爲白暗。犀爲黑暗。此亦非波斯語。但當爲馬來語。因馬來與其近處方言。語白每與白暗音近。語黑又與黑暗音近也。取證語學。雖虞疏畧。但較與馬來語近似。又似與麻六甲人語有若何淵源者。

葛利尼氏(G. E. Gerini)原註六。疑此所謂波斯。或即拉姆培西(Lambesi 拉姆 即村落之意)即培西(Besi)或拔西(Basi)。此乃蘇門答刺西海岸一小國。與亞格(Acheh)鄰接者。竊謂不然。蓋從語言證之。中國波字不當爲重唇音。乃輕唇音也。

坪井熊三氏(Tsuboi Kunazo)原註七。謂波斯似即吧西(Pasi)吧賽(Pasei)吧塞伊(Pasay)吧茲(Pazze)或吧塞姆(Paceem)之音轉。此乃北蘇門答刺一商港。昔馬哥孛羅氏(Marco Polo)稱爲拔斯瑪(Basma)者。原註八。

婆拉格屯氏(C. O. Blagden)原註九。嘗言或以波斯當東北蘇門答刺之包斯(Pose 或 Pasai)然不能證明西歷一一七八年已有此地名云。即曰有之。似仍不足以當波斯。蓋考之記載。中國人之知有波斯。在第七世紀至第九世紀。即唐時已然。或前乎唐而已有知之者。蠻書所紀

波斯地望似最可據。後之求之者當亦不能外此。宋時馬來波斯。或已由本陸徙居近海他島。然遽以歸諸是時蘇門答刺之殖民地。則似不能無說以明之也。

明礬 明礬一物。司密底氏 (F. P. Smith) 原註十 謂除出本土外。亦嘗自波斯崑崙及大秦輸入中國云。蘇培倫氏 (J. L. Sanbeiran) 原註十一云。明礬昔得自波斯者。今乃從西方輸入。米雷氏 (F. DE Mely) 原註十一 又視波斯紫礬 ("fan violet de Perse") 若出波斯者。按皆非也。赫爾芝氏 (Hirtz) 原註十二 因明礬不產波斯。而每產小亞細亞。頗覺難解。普利尼氏 (Pliny) 原註十四 謂西班牙 (Spain) 埃及 (Egypt) 亞爾美尼亞 (Armenia) 瑪塞陶尼亞 (Macedonia) 邦得司 (Pontus) 及阿弗利加 (Africa) 均爲產明礬之國。赫爾芝氏據佩文韻府引海藥本草文。謂波斯礬實來自大秦者。云波斯礬 (赫氏譯稱波斯明礬 "Persian Alum") 乃命名之誤。波斯僅指貿易之地。蓋由此以入中國云。按此不僅見於第八世紀之海藥本草。晉時 (紀元二六五至四一九年) 之廣州志先已述之。此時中國固罕有識波斯之名者。證類本草 (卷二) 引廣州志云。金線礬生波斯國。波斯白礬出大秦國。原註十五 所謂金線礬即明礬之挾帶雜質者。如印度上緬甸等處今猶得見之。原註十六 由此知馬來波斯 (本題僅適用此名) 產一種不潔明礬。其地適爲交通市場。故潔白明礬得由西亞細亞經印度而入中國焉。波斯產自然明礬固昔所知者。故西亞細亞一變

而改稱波斯耳。與波斯相若者又有崑崙罽。此乃狀如黑泥云。原註十七

以上洛著葉四六八至四七五

釗案洛氏以馬來波斯名篇。蓋考諸中國載籍。知於西域波斯外。尚有一波斯國屬於馬來統系者。惟其地位尙未詳。而中國果於何時始知馬來波斯乎。似洛氏所見猶有未盡者焉。洛氏引蠻書廣志鑑真遊記及酉陽雜俎等文。以爲皆指馬來波斯。殆未盡然。蓋晉人雖罕知波斯者。然是時正波斯薩山朝全盛之日。即貢獻偶闕。不應朝野絕無所聞。至唐則朝聘往來。史不絕書。大唐西域記（卷十一）謂之波刺斯國。並詳其道里物產風俗宗教。龍朔初遣使者到西域。分置州縣。以疾陵城爲波斯都督府。註一乾元中。波斯又從大食襲廣州。焚倉庫廬舍。註二則唐人宜無不知波斯者。何得更以此爲他國之名。即有之。亦不至漫無辨別。乃爾。若宋人嶺外代答本草別說所稱。則似舍馬來波斯莫屬。然其地亦自有記載可詳也。

洛氏據蠻書謂馬來波斯正鄰緬甸而在亞洲本陸者。似與原文未合。蠻書云。驃在永昌城南七十五日程。又云。驃國疑東天竺。考舊唐書稱驃國在永昌城南二千餘里。新唐書則云二千餘里。似蠻書所載日程已疑過遠。近人莫不知唐驃國在今緬甸。註三洛著猶如此。蠻書乃云驃國疑東天竺。則樊氏實未洞悉驃國所在地也。舊唐書稱驃國古未嘗通中國。貞元八年（

西歷七九二年）乃遣其弟悉利移因南詔重譯來朝。又獻其國樂凡十曲。樂曲皆演釋氏經論之詞意。則驃通中國僅先樊氏著書六十七年。作者未能道其詳也。固宜。樊氏既疑驃國爲東天竺。而婆羅門亦天竺之屬。註四天竺又鄰波斯。註五則謂驃國與波斯及婆羅門鄰接者。固不得謂非伊蘭波斯也。且波斯已於唐貞觀中爲大食所破。後卒爲所滅。註六而滅波斯者。史稱仍爲波斯人。大食亦嘗侵婆羅門。註七則自唐人視之。波斯與婆羅門固至密邇者。蠻書由驃國以及婆羅門。更由婆羅門以及波斯。亦連類而及之之意耳。鑑真遊記謂廣東珠江有婆羅門波斯及崑崙人之估舶無數。正與蠻書所載畧同。明爲波斯人之商販於南海中者。則亦不得謂鑑真遊記之波斯非伊蘭波斯也。唐書驃國傳云。北有市。諸國海舶所湊。亦寧獨無波斯估舶者。則蠻書之文似更得以交易往來之意解釋之。唐書又云。亦與波斯婆羅門接。則直截取蠻書語耳。惟不云驃國疑東天竺。乃云西接東天竺。蓋唐書成於宋人之手。是時固已知驃國所在地矣。

洪芻香譜引廣志云。乳香即南海波斯國松樹脂。洛氏又據以爲馬來波斯之證。然唐李珣海藥本草引廣志文稍異。洛氏已見及之。海藥在洪氏香譜以前。若海藥爲正。其意當云乃南海所出一種波斯松樹脂。未必謂南海別有一波斯國也。即曰不然。則當時實亦未有印度洋