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CHAPTER 1

THE NON-CHINESE TRIBES OF ANCIENT YUNNAN PROVINCE

1.1 Introduction

There has been a great deal of debate within the spheres of historical linguistics, anthropology, and archeology concerning the ethnicity of the peoples occupying the territory of present-day Yunnan province during the 6th to 13th centuries. The origins and histories of the diverse peoples of this period and region are myriad. Much of the debate has centered on the history of the state of Nanzhao 南诏, a non-Han kingdom whose rule was consolidated in 794 AD and that took as its center the Dali plain and Erhai 洱海 region of northwest Yunnan province. A smaller portion of research in this area has focused on the questions regarding the ethnicity of the ruling class of the Nanzhao state as well as on the ethnicity of those under that elite class within and without its borders. These two groups are identified in Tang sources2, respectively, as the Wu-man 烏蠻 and Bai-man 白蠻3. An even smaller portion of such research has engaged questions of the ethnicity of the peoples living on the borders of the Nanzhao kingdom. This is likely due to the scarcity and indeed, paucity of information available about these groups.

There are many reasons for the state of information in Chinese historical texts regarding the cultures and political entities of the bordering chiefdoms of China’s

---

1 By Nanzhao I mean the kingdom resulting from the unification of the Six Zhao in 794 AD and whose ruling elite, the Wu-man 烏蠻 of the Meng 蒙 clan, ceased to rule in 902 AD with the coup that resulted in the turnover of power to more prominently sinified Bai-man 白蠻. These Bai-man were probably mixed with the Chinese war captive population. See Backus, Nan-Chao, pp.159-161.
2 These two groups were differentiated by language primarily. For example, “言語音白蠻最正, 蒙舍蠻次之, 諸部落不如也.” Manshu Jiaozhu 蠻書校注 (hereafter noted as MSJZ), v.8, p. 216. Also see Xin Tang Shu 新唐書 (hereafter noted as XTS), “蠻...其語四釋乃與中國通.” XTS, v.222, p.11a.
3 For the dual classification of Wu 烏 and Bai 白 groups, see also MSJZ, chapters 3 and 4.
extreme southwest. Firstly, in must be remembered that it wasn’t until the Qing dynasty that the area south by southwest of the Red River in Yunnan was firmly within the sphere of control of a northeastern capital. The Tusi system of the Yuan and Ming dynasties established frontier offices headed predominately by local tribal leaders and kings and gave these precursors to the “autonomous/self-governed” areas of modern China a great deal of autonomy for their often merely token fealty to the central state. Indeed, for much of the early history of the Yunnan area the Red River marks a neat diagonal natural boundary limit delineating the area of direct control from a more central Yangtze River valley territory.

The information on kingdoms and/or tribes during the Nanzhao period is especially difficult to assess during times when the southwest kingdom took an aggressive military stance against the power of the Tang state. It was at these times that diplomatic and trade missions were no longer carried out. Despite this fact, it was Fan Chuo, an assistant to the commander at Annan, who was to produce the most valued text describing the local tribes within the Nanzhao polity.

Among the attempts to reconstruct the culture and history of these groups there have been those that have postulated that there were settlements of people living in what is now the extreme southwest of Yunnan province whose language and customs, as they were recorded in Chinese historical annals resembled those of Tai populations living in the same area at a later period.

Today, it is more than evident that this area, in its abundance of differing ethnic groups, presents a challenge to the researcher. If this is true today then the situation could hardly have been less difficult for earlier scholars. It is known that a great many
diverse tribal groups have occupied the Yunnan area from a very early time onwards. As a result, perhaps, there has been a great deal of contradictory scholarship within and without China regarding this issue.

It is one of the assertions of this thesis that many of the place names studied here contain Chinese transliterations of Proto-Tai morphemes which are consistently used in a Tai language from ancient time to the present. However, it may also be found that many of the place names thought to be Tai by previous scholars represent cases in which little or no convincing evidence can be found to make such an assertion. That is to say that while the work of this thesis seeks to provide evidence for earlier assertions by other authors that these areas were indeed populated by the ancestors of some modern day Tai peoples, it also sets out to clarify certain cases of place name ethno-cultural attribution by investigating the possibility that the original assertions can still be made in light of the present study and recent research. For example, it may be shown that if one solely examines place-name evidence then there is revealed a great deal of cultural cross-identification that contradicts or at least undermines the assertion that two tribal groups were entirely unrelated linguistically.

That there was much change in the ethnic make-up of the Yunnan border areas cannot be contested, particularly for the time period I am discussing here. It is well known that the most politically stable period of Nanzhao history (c. 794-902 CE)⁴ was one in which there were massive population shifts, most notably of Pyu peoples from

---

⁴ This period delineates the time of rule of the Greater Nanzhao kingdom beginning in the year in which it conquered neighboring Zhao or kingdoms of a presumably similar cultural foundation. These were the Liu Zhao 六诏 whose area of control encompassed the Erhai 洱海 Lake region of modern day Dali 大理 in Yunnan Province. There is some toponymic evidence which suggests that cultural influence of the cultures that would found the Six Zhao was established in the area for at least two hundred years before consolidation of all of them by Mengshe Zhao 蒙舍诏 (Nanzhao 南詔) in 794. See the discussion of place names 蒙東, 小勃弄, and 大勃弄 found in the Sui Shu 隋書(comp. 636,656) in the following pages.
ancient northeast Burma to within the central area of Nanzhao control. But the Pyu were only one group of people subjected to forced migration by Nanzhao. The Nanzhao rulers very dominated a very diverse body of peoples made up not only of Pyu and Mon captives from the kingdoms on its southern borders but also of Chinese captives from Shu 蜀 (ancient Sichuan) to the north⁵.

The place names investigated here are those that belonged to peoples that most likely operated in concert with the rulers of Nanzhao while being ethnically distinct from them. It is my assertion that these toponyms were devised by a Proto-Tai speaking population, some of which were the ancestors of current Tai populations in Dehong 德宏 and Xishuangbanna 西雙版那. Unlike the Pyu captives or Chinese slave-settlers of the Nanzhao territory, these Proto-Tai populations may have lived within the area prior to the establishment of the Nanzhao kingdom in close proximity to populations of other variously identified tribal groups. While some of their territories were attacked and subsumed by the Nanzhao entity, many of their settlements remained throughout the Nanzhao and Dali period (794-1253). Moreover, since many of the names recorded for these settlements appear to have had some longevity in Chinese government and private historical accounts after the Nanzhao/Dali period, it is likely that such settlements were relatively stable socially and culturally. There are hints in both Chinese and Xishuangbanna 西雙版那 historical texts that there was a greater Proto-Tai political and cultural homogeneity in the Nanzhao southern border areas than has previously been suggested. It is the purpose of this thesis to investigate the hypothesis that there was in fact a series of settlements with Proto-Tai place names, some of which were very strong

⁵ Zhongguo yimin Shi, v. 3, chapter 7, particularly pp.226-230 for a discussion on the circumstances of Han
politically and economically, that co-existed with the Nanzhao/Dali rule and survived it. This investigation will focus on the occurrences of these place names in Chinese histories of the extreme southwest and southeast of the Nanzhao periphery.

Many of the place names to be discussed here have been assumed to represent the settlements of Tai peoples by both ancient as well as modern scholars. The conclusion that these settlements belonged to a specific ethnic group are often unexplained. It is indeed frustrating to come to terms with seemingly unqualified ethnic designations for peoples that undoubtedly were not only of diverse origins but also subject to many cultural and political upheavals over time. In light of the region’s diversity, and considering the general paucity of reliable ethnological data for the given time period, it cannot be stated unequivocally that a specific group was Tai or the ancestors to the Tai, for example. In the following, I will seek only to establish trends in the employment of certain place names in Chinese transliteration which may be termed Proto-Tai since I am connecting them with morphemes that exist in the place names reflecting modern Tai languages.

The diversity of past and present populations in the Southwest is one of the main reasons why toponymic research, which seeks to provide evidence for the existence of the ancestors of present-day populations is so difficult. Moreover, research into Tai prehistory heavily relies on the reading of Chinese historical texts of both private and government origin. As outside observers of the non-Chinese groups, the ethnological or linguistic accuracy of the Chinese historian was often weakened by such factors as physical distance and/or cultural bias. Entire tribal groups that may have played important roles in the development of a certain region might be glossed by no more than

migration to the Nanzhao controlled territory during the Tang.
a few terse lines of the classical language. Sometimes a people and place are referred to by an identical ethnonym and toponym, while at other times this same dual classification is incorrectly used by a later scribe.

The archeologist has artifacts that may tell their own story about the history of a particular area. Toponyms, under the right conditions, are the textual historian’s artifact. If one can find place names that are faithful transliterations of the settlement name then one has an insight into the linguistic background of that settlement.

There are such place names to be found in Chinese records about the tribal groups living in the Nanzhao border areas from as early as the seventh century and perhaps even earlier. If it can be shown that there are certain toponyms (for example, with a /man-/ “pre-fixed” elements) that display a certain “loyalty” to what we know about population movements in ancient China then one can perhaps provide more evidence for the conclusion that these place names, despite their varying ethnic attributions in the histories, display a linguistic cohesion that may be otherwise clouded. That is to say that we can first classify a group of so called “outland” place names as sharing phonetics features. The place names studied here are purposely chosen from such areas of non-Chinese control since it is thought that such place names may more accurately represent true transliterations rather than observer-specific translations. Obviously, one must be cautious in defining each category since some ancient foreign place names may belong to both categories. For example many names of foreign

---

6 The ethnonym and the toponym may sometimes be represented by the same graph. For example the quasi-ethnic designation Mang man 茅蠻 found in the both the Xin Tang Shu 新唐書 (comp. 1045-1060) and the 蠻書 (comp. in the early part of the Xian Tong 咸通 reign period from 860 to 873 of the Tang Dynasty, probably c. 860-864) both employ the first graph. All place names listed for this group begin with /man/ 茅. This is by no means atypical for the Chinese records under investigation in this thesis.

7 Names of territories beyond the pale of Chinese culture i.e. 徽外諸國.
kingdoms in Chinese historical documents contain no linguistic information about the foreign entity and are mere epithets that may relate to a traditional story about that kingdom.\(^8\)

Here, it may be useful to the reader to delineate further the ethnic and linguistic groups that will be addressed in this paper. As mentioned above, scholars attempting to understand the ethno-cultural distinctions among the tribes of the ancient Yunnan border areas have often sought to connect these tribal groups mentioned in the historical sources to peoples living in the same area in modern times and thus to modern ethno-cultural and linguistic categories. These modern ethnic distinctions are often based on linguistic criteria. As such, the languages of these modern peoples belong to three main language families: Tibeto-Burman, Mon-Khmer, and Tai.

The Wu Man 烏蠻 and Bai Man 白蠻 groups of the Manshu 態書 have traditionally been attributed to the speakers of Tibeto-Burman languages, a language family of which representatives can be found in the Yi 彝, Lahu 拉祜, Lisu 傈僳, Hani 哈尼, Naxi 納西, and Bai 白\(^9\) of Yunnan. The People’s Republic of China officially includes Bai as belonging to the Tibeto-Burman group under the Yi 彝 language branch. Yet, the inclusion of Bai within the Tibeto-Burman family is another matter of debate. The language possesses features that seem to share affinities with Tai and Mon-Khmer languages alike while lacking an important central feature of Tibeto-Burman languages, i.e., the object-verb word order.\(^10\)

---

\(^8\) One example of this is to be found in the name of the city of Haripunjaya, transliterated in Chinese as 女王國, or “Queen’s Kingdom”, since it was thought to have had a female sovereign at its founding.

\(^9\) Also known as the Minjia, 民家.

\(^10\) Ramsey, The Languages of China, p.290.
The ancient Ailao 被牢, said to have settled the area of Lake Dian 滇池 near modern-day Kunming in the first centuries of the Common Era, have been variously identified as the ancestors of the modern Tai and Mon-Khmer speakers. This is a still a subject of some debate, as will be seen, and does not concern us here. A later group, the Pu 濮, are traditionally ascribed as being the predecessors of the Wa 佤 group whose language belongs to the Mon-Khmer family. There are only three representative languages to be found in Yunnan and the number of speakers of Mon-Khmer speakers is the smallest among the language families mentioned here. In all of China and only three groups have been identified as belonging to the Mon-Khmer language family; Blang 布朗, Benglong 嶧龍 (also 德昂), and Wa 佤.

Finally, the Tai language family in China is traditionally called the Zhuang-Dong 壮侗 family. Many scholars have accepted the divisions of the Tai language family into three divisions, following the work of Li Fangkui 李方桂 (1965). These divisions render the family into three groups; Northern, Central, and Southwestern. This thesis, since it deals with areas of Tai settlement in and around Dehong 德宏 and Xishuangbanna 西双版纳 will focus on speakers of a language classified as belonging to the Southwestern Tai branch of the Tai language family. The Tai languages spoken in Yunnan include; Zhuang 壮, Buyi 布依, and Dai 傣. It is the last branch that is primarily addressed in this thesis. While the Dai 傣 branch is officially recognized as including Lue (also Lû) 撲 dialect of Xishuangbanna 西雙版那 as well as Dehong 德宏 dialect, and with some merit, it should be noted that there are significant differences between these two languages and
some have reported their mutual unintelligibility. The term Shan-Tai is sometimes used to refer to the Dai branch. The ancient tribal groups that have been associated with the Tai by various scholars, mostly through textual analysis of Chinese sources, include the Mangman, Ailao, and most controversially, the Wuman and Baiman of the Nanzhao ruling elite.

After selecting a group of non-Chinese place names that share phonetic features we can then trace the occurrence of those place names as they move from one place to another, disappear altogether and reappear elsewhere. It may be possible to compare the history of a group of phonetically related toponyms independently of what is known or assumed about the cultures of the people occupying the territories in question. Finally, it may be fruitful to compare the history of the place name groups with the recorded history of certain ancient tribal groups, their settlements and kingdoms to see what patterns emerge.

1.2 The Background of the Tai-Nanzhao Debate

The locales and events of Tai history, or rather Tai pre-history, lying hidden in the era before Tai written records, and can only be pieced together from the records of neighboring countries principally those of China. One of the few sets of relevant data to be gleaned from such sources is the collection of transliterated place names belonging to the man tribes of the Nanzhao periphery. While it is largely assumed that the people of these areas were the ancestors to the Tai populations of southern Yunnan and neighboring areas, little research has been done in the search for conclusive evidence that

11 Sipsongpanna is the English transliteration of the Tai. The Chinese transliteration and its pinyin romanization will be used in this thesis to refer to the area.
12 Luo, Dehong, p.xi.
tribal groups recorded in ancient histories are in fact the ancestors of later modern groups living in the same area today. Many of the ethnological identifications employed by past research include the usual assertion that their customs "seemed" Tai or that a certain group's region of settlement in the past was one of modern Tai settlement in later times, thus the two populations are part of the same group\textsuperscript{13}.

Many scholars for well over a hundred years have struggled with the question of the cultural background and origins of the peoples inhabiting the Yunnan area during the time of the Tang 唐 dynasty (618-907).

Western scholars of the late 19th century, in particular, many bold claims regarding the descendants of the people ruling and those ruled by the Nanzhao state. Much of this kind of scholarship has a recurring theme that postulates that the ancestors of the Tai\textsuperscript{14} people were in fact the rulers of Nanzhao, and that the Nanzhao and its subsequent successor states were Tai kingdoms.

In contrast, there have been vehement attacks upon such theories, particularly by Chinese scholars who have claimed that the ruling elite of the Nanzhao Kingdom were not in any way related to the predecessors of the Tai groups of later ages. The debates over Yunnan history grew heated in many areas of the field took as Chinese historians and others sought to defend against what was perceived of as aggrandizing historical impulses by colonial scholars, post-colonial Western scholars, and those accused of

\textsuperscript{13} For an example of such an assertion see Fang Guoyu's argument in Zhongguo Xinnan, p. 23, connecting the Ailao 哀牢 with the later Pu people 播人, and thus with the modern Mon-Khmer Wa (Va) 腊 groups of the contemporary Yunnan border areas.

\textsuperscript{14} Following convention, I will use Tai to refer to the people of various origins sharing the Tai language outside of present day Thailand without reference to the people of the state of Siam established in the 12th to 13th centuries.
playing into the imperialist game of revisionist scholarship. The Nanzhao-Tai hypothesis was seen as a way of disabling Chinese territorial and cultural claims over the Southwest at a time when China was beset by very real imperialist threats in post-war China.

Thus, it can be seen that this area of research has been charged from the beginning with political frictions that may not have been conducive to a truly empirical study that sought to unravel the ethnological knots that one must confront in researching the area. While it has been shown fairly conclusively that the rulers of the Nanzhao-Dali kingdoms were of Tibeto-Burman linguistic background, the research into the origins and migrations of the diverse peoples living under their suzerainty, particularly those identified as the ancestors of later Tai/Shan populations, still has yet to be carried out thoroughly and empirically. Such research necessarily relies heavily on Chinese accounts and, as such, it has adopted almost exclusively the ethnic identities and cultural affiliations assigned by ancient scholars. However, if one were to accept the basic conclusions drawn by dynastic scholars about the ethnology of the main groups, then some of the this kind of textual analysis does agree with the conclusions arrived at by the more objective linguistic investigations by scholars such as Luo Changpei 羅常培 (1945) and Ma Changshou 馬長壽 (1961). Still, there is a dearth of such research which focuses on the tribal groups that were not dominant in the Nanzhao/Dali states, where information is less scarce about these groups than it is about the more politically potent

---

15 For example, Xiang Da 向達, who would later compiled the Manshu Jiaozhu 曼書校注 (1962), is criticized for his ‘misinterpretation’ of early Yunnan history by Hu Houxuan 胡厚宣 and Yang Xiangkui 楊向奎 in “批判向達反馬克思主義的歷史觀點,” published in Lishi Yanjiu 歷史研究(1957).
16 Both scholars employ linguistic analysis in linking the ruling Wuman 烏蠻 of Nanzhao with later Tibeto-Burman speaking groups.
groups of the Nanzhao period. There is one area of study that is less affected by the political prejudices of later ages, i.e. place names.

Terrien De Lacouperie’s essay “The Cradle of the Shan Race” asserted not only that the Meng clan (蒙氏) of the Nanzhao was of Shan ethnicity (Tai) but also he asserted that the rulers of the Nanzhao may have been related by degree to the founders of the Shang dynasty. “I am not indisposed to say that the Shang (i.e., traders) who overthrew the Hia [Xia] dynasty and gave their name to the following one, were connected with the Shan race, and that their very name (or a form of it) is perhaps the antecedent of that of Shan or Siam.” This assertion was partially based on the author’s assumption that the ancient Dian Yue 滇越 and the later Ailao 崖牢 were ancestors to modern Tai speaking groups. Of course, modern scholars coming across such great leaps of faith and reasoning would scoff today at such daring, to put it politely. Contemporary scholars still cite De Lacouperie’s essay in refuting other arguments that also posit that the Kingdom of Nanzhao was ruled by a people who later migrated to the south and were the ancestors of the modern Tai people. As will be shown later, a good deal of modern scholarship has hardly improved upon our knowledge of the past. Indeed, much new research in the area is simply a rearrangement of the constants provided by the same sources, or reiterations of past arguments.

The claims that Nanzhao was founded by a Tai/Shan or Proto-Tai people were adopted by many European writers (some of them stationed in Southeast Asia as colonial officers at the time) of the late 19th and early 20th century. They were chronologically:

---

Le Marquis d’Hervey de Saint-Denys, Emile Rocher, E.H. Parker, H.R. Davies, and
lastly W.W. Cochrane. The claim that Nanzhao was Tai was to remain a tenant of
Western scholarship regarding the origins of the people of upland Southeast Asia well
into the middle of the 20th century. For example, Weins in his 1954 Han Chinese
Expansion in South China quotes many of the above mentioned authors before asserting
that the Bai-man of the Nanzhao elite were of Tai stock among other more bold
assertions.

Among some of the first scholars, if not the very first, to refute De Lacouperie’s
arguments through textual analysis was Fang Guoyu 方國瑜. Fang was extremely
critical of both “imperialist” scholars and the Chinese academic community at the time
which he saw as widely echoing the assertions of previous Western interpretations of Tai
pre-history. His monograph, Yuandai Yunnan Xingsheng Daizu Shiliao Biannian 元代雲
南行省傣族史料編年 (1958) directly engages the arguments proposed by the Nanzhao-
Tai theory proponents, notably Lacouperie. Moreover, the results of his careful textual
research with its far ranging use of historical records suggested that the Nanzhao rulers
had dealings with tribal groups to the south that Fang identified as Tai. His often subtle
analysis of this relationship implicitly argued against any direct equation of Nanzhao
rulers with ethnically Tai tribes. The development of this kind of relationship between a
Nanzhao ruling elite and a weaker subordinate tribal entity of Tai stock precipitated later

---

19 In fact, there is one current scholar who still identifies the founders of the Mengshe Zhao 蒙舍詔, the
hegemonic principality that would unify the other Zhao 詔 or princedoms of the 7th century Erhai 洱海
region, with the Ailao 奕牢 of Southern Yunnan and thus with the Tai/Shan people. See Dore, “Did the
Tai people contribute to the foundation of the Nanzhao kingdom: some chronological events.”
20 Weins, Han Chinese, p.146.
21 “...關於傣族歷史過程,自從英國拉古柏(Teirinde Lacouperie) e.g., Terrien Lacouperie] 的說法發表以
後, 所有帝國主義分子奉為圭臬, 國內學者也一至附合。但我認爲拉古柏的說法毫無價值, 與歷史事
實乖舛,而且是極其荒謬的解釋史料...”, Yuandai biannian, p.3.
Tusi 土司 and Tuguan 土官 political structures beginning in the 13th century during the Yuan 元 dynasty.

Fang, while perhaps to be noted as one of the most prolific writers on the area, was a part of a greater body of Chinese scholars that, beginning in the 1930’s and 40’s, contributed to a sort of renaissance in the scholarly work on Yunnan and its history, especially in the postwar period. Much of the impetus for Fang’s later historiography came from startling finds just before the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese war. Probably the first major modern archeological examination of the Nanzhao culture occurred in 1938 by a team led by Wu Jinding 吳金鼎. The team’s pioneering work was first published in Wu’s Yunnan Cang’er jing kao baogao 雲南蒼洱鏡考報告 in 1942. The report contained investigations of several prehistoric as well as later sites. Most of the objects found in the later sites were pottery shards and tiles. The tiles were found to be imprinted with Chinese characters and some bore graphs of a language that may have belonged to a Tibetan script. Wu Jinding assumed that many of the artifacts belonged to the Nanzhao period and were proof of a thriving captive Chinese artisan class at the capital of Nanzhao in the 8th century.

Also significant in Wu Jinding’s report is the material related to the preliminary excavations done on several terraces located at the foot of the Diancang Mountains 蒼山 near Dali 大理. Wu concluded that the terraces were likely the vestiges of a agricultural people but that that they were likely not padi terraces given their location and construction. The importance of such an assertion will become clearer in later passages.

---

22 Yuandai biannian, pp. 18-22.
23 Wheatley would later confirm this conclusion. See Nagara and Commandery, p.64.
Fang Guoyu's *Zhongguo Xinan Lishi Dili Kaoyi* (1987) was, and continues to be, a monumental contribution to the study of the China's southwest frontier in the fields of ethnology, historical geography, and textual history. As suggested earlier, Fang Guoyu placed a great deal of trust in the Chinese historical record when it came to identifying the ancestors of various ethnic groups. Yet, this work, in its mammoth scope and range of detail, still provides an invaluable resource for studying the area, particularly in matters of historical geography and textual history.

Perhaps the strongest historical linguistic evidence to date arguing against the Nanzhao-Tai connection is that presented by Luo Changpei 羅常培 in his essays on patronymic kinship traditions among Tibeto-Burman peoples. Luo was another of the prominent scholars that contributed to the breakthroughs in the historical study of the ancient Yunnan area. Luo pointed out that the Meng ruling family of the Nanzhao Kingdom employed a patronymic kinship system in which the son took the last syllable of his father's name as the first syllable of his own. Luo effectively showed not only that such a system was used by the ruling family of the Nanzhao but also in the other ruling families of the area before the unification of the Nanzhao. Furthermore, this system was identified in several other Tibeto-Burman families. That this is a tradition very closely tied to Tibeto-Burman traditions in the same geographical area strongly suggests that the ruling families of the Nanzhao were not Tai people or even the ancestors to later Tai people.

---

24 His essay on the patronymic linking system of Wuman 鳥蠻 and Baiman 白蠻 clans appeared in the *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* in March of 1945.
25 Luo, Changpei, *Yuyan Yu Wenhua* 語言與文化, chapter six "Cong Xingshi He Biehao Kan Minzu Laiyuan He Zongjiao Xinyang" 從姓氏和別號看民族來源和宗教信仰 and appendix one "Lun Zangmiande Fuzi Lianmingzhi" 論藏蕃父子名制.
Luo's work was to prove extremely influential with regard to the debate over the ethnicity of the groups living in Yunnan in the seventh and eighth centuries. F.W. Mote was perhaps one of the earliest western scholars to benefit from Chinese breakthroughs in this area. Mote's remarks at the 1964 Symposium for the Study of Southeast Asian History reflect a studied, cautious approach to this difficult subject. Largely through an analysis of the Manshu and Tang dynastic sources, Mote concluded that the Nanzhao ruling elite were most likely to have been speakers of a Tibeto-Burman language.

Paul Wheatley's analysis of the origin of urban forms in East Asia and Southeast Asia represents a body of work that cannot be ignored by the contemporary scholar looking into the origins and development of tribal groups in the Chinese Southwest. Both The Pivot of the Four Quarters (1971), and Nagara and Commandery (1983) serve as representatives of exemplary scholarship in the area of urban historical geography. The present author has relied heavily on the insights of both these texts as their respective fields of enquiry when put together border the present area of discussion on at least three sides.

David K. Wyatt's overview of Tai pre-history at the beginning of his book Thailand: A Short History (1984) cites Luo's work as the conclusive evidence determining the ethnicity of the Nanzhao ruling clan as well as the majority of its inhabitants. Wyatt postulates that there was likely some loose confederation of villages in the border interstice formed between the more powerful kingdoms of ninth and tenth century Southeast Asia. These chiefdoms were likely located in between the areas of control maintained by bordering kingdoms. Such a Proto-Tai entity (or entities), on its

---

26 Thailand, pp.15-19.
immediate borders, would have had to deal with Nanzhao to the north, Haripunjaya\(^{27}\) to the south, and Pyu\(^{28}\) to the west. Far to the southeast situated on the central Vietnamese coast was the kingdom of Champa.\(^{29}\)

Throughout the 6\(^{th}\) century the kingdom of Funan 夷南 (2\(^{nd}\)-6\(^{th}\) centuries) exerted considerable influence from a center located on the lower Mekong. One of Funan’s subordinate chiefdoms would consolidate extensive control in this area after the former kingdom’s decline. This kingdom would become the most powerful of the southern neighbors for any Tai chiefdom, or series of chiefdoms, at that time. This was the kingdom of Zhen La 真臘 and it served, in turn, as the predecessor kingdom to that of Angkor (877-1001) which would have vast influence over the Southeast Asian peninsula and come to directly control much of southern Laos and what is known as the northeastern region of Thai Isan\(^{30}\) today.

With regard to the reconstruction of the Proto-Tai past, Wyatt states that there is no evidence to be found in Chinese sources to indicate that there were Tai kingdoms in 9\(^{th}\) and 10\(^{th}\) century Yunnan. He states only that there might well have been a loosely connected string of principalities that moved in development from east to west along the north of upland Southeast Asia before the ninth century.\(^{31}\)

---

27 A 6\(^{th}\) century Mon “city-state” that was centered near the site of the modern Thai city of Lamphun in northern Thailand. In Chinese records this kingdom is noted as Nu wang guo 南王國. It has been identified as the northernmost city of a group of early urban sites called Davaravati, situated in the Menam basin of modern day Thailand.

28 The Pyu were probably originally Tibeto-Burman culturally but were later heavily influenced by Indianized Mon culture which they absorbed as the population shifted down out of the Tibetan plateau into the Irrawaddy Basin. This entity is identified as 爨國 in the \(\text{xTS, v.222, 5a.}\)

29 Wheatley tentatively identified the \(\text{xTS}\) reference to Chanpo 詔婆 with Champa. \(\text{Nagara and Commandery, p.181.}\) The name occurs in a list of Pyu dependencies in \(\text{xTS, v.222(下), p.5b}\)

30 The Khorat plateau.

31 Wyatt, \(\text{Thailand, pp. 30-32.}\) There are several Northern Tai and Shan chronicles which hint at such a migration. However, many of the tales of the pre-history of the Tai/Shan coming out of these chronicles
An ancient culture that may have had a cultural influence on the people of southwestern China beginning around the 6th century is that represented by the Dvaravati of the ancient Menam basin, with important cities located near the Thai sites of modern day Nakhom Pathom, Lopburi and Lamphun. George Coedes was the first scholar to identify some of the archeological finds belonging to the Dvaravati group in the central Menam basin with an ethnically Mon culture. At a time when it was largely assumed that the early cultural heart of the Dvaravati was located primarily in the lower Menam basin and in lower Burma according to archeological and textual finds respectively to those areas, Coedes showed that a Mon cultural predominance prevailed further north as well. It was the cities of this northern Menam basin Mon culture, notably Haripunjaya, that would form the southern border of the Nanzhao state in the 8th and 9th centuries.

Some researchers have tackled the problem of the origins and history of the Tai or Dai ethnic minority in southern Yunnan by interviewing local inhabitants. Many settlements along the southern borders of China trace their origin back to the beginning of Mongol suzerainty of the border areas in the 13th century. A look at many of the toponyms of this area found in historical place name dictionaries leads one no further back than the thirteenth century. This is likely due to the lack of information about the Yunnan border areas after the collapse of the Tang dynasty in Chinese sources.

---

32 This country is perhaps transcribed as 磚落娑提 in the XTS. See Coedes’ notes on the various transliterations of Dvaravati in Chinese historical texts in Indianized States, p.62 and p. 292 (footnote # 91). Also useful is Wheatley’s list of Chinese references to the kingdom in Nagaraja Commandery, p. 224, note 28.
33 Wheatley points this out in Nagaraja and Commandery, p.224, note 28.
34 Coedes, “Documents sur l’histoire politique et religieuse du Laos occidental,” BEFEO.
35 T’ien Ju-K’ang, Religious Cults, for one such example.
Subsequent governments would review the turbulent history between the Tang court and the Nanzhao kings and conclude that the southwest was better left under loose administration or none at all. This trend is not reversed with the coming of the Mongols who in large part either replaced or aided the kings of Dali in maintaining quasi-independent Tai states on the border areas as buffer territories against the kingdoms further south such as Pagan in upper Burma. Facts such as these confirm the convictions of many scholars that there was no mass migration of Tai peoples that resulted from the invasion of Mongol forces. Du Yuting and Chen Lufan’s (1989) make the argument that the nature of the Mongol conquest of Yunnan makes the claim for a mass migration unnecessary.

Since the invading forces offered title conferment and reconciliation as long as the local rulers pledged fealty to the new Mongol elite there was little more than a brief skirmish at the onset of the siege of the capital. As for Tai groups and other tribal entities along the borders, the delegation of titles and local government authority were most likely bestowed upon the leaders of settlements that had been in existence in the area for several centuries already.

Charles Backus’ monograph, *The Nan-chao Kingdom* (1981), begins with a review of the debates over the ethnicity of the rulers and subjects of the kingdom. Backus falls squarely in the camp that identifies the ancestors of the Yi peoples as the Wu-man. Furthermore it is this group that he identifies as having been the ruling elite of the early stage of Nanzhao history. Backus also refutes earlier scholarship that sought to identify the Bai-man, or Min-jia, peoples with the Tai or Shan.
Michael Blackmore's analysis of the problems in reconstructing the ethnic make-up of the time is generally concurrent with that of Backus, who is quoted in his argument.

Xie Shizhong 謝世忠 (1996) has demonstrated recently that the debate over the ethnicity of the rulers of Nanzhao has consistently served as a proving ground for Thai and Chinese competing nationalisms. Xie makes the point that the anxiety of the Chinese anti-Nanzhao/Tai hypothesis is perhaps one that is a "condition of nervousness...was [a] matter of putting pressure on one's shoulders by oneself." Whether or not this is true may well be evidenced in the article by Xie for in it he exclusively focuses attack on those scholars that supported the Tai hypothesis without mentioning any of the more contemporary work (besides Backus) that begins on the assumption that Nanzhao was not Tai. In fact, the only Western scholars actually named in the article are W.A.R. Wood and William C. Dodd who were writing articles in the 1920's.

From the above paragraph it should be readily apparent to the reader that the debate over ethnicity within and without the borders of the Nanzhao kingdom has sometimes suffered from a focus on issues that distract from objective scholarship. In the following chapter I hope to be able to focus upon evidence that may represent the most unbiased source of textual information available, i.e. toponyms, so that we may avoid the pitfalls of past research in this area.

As has been mentioned above, Luo Changpei's research on the patronymic naming system of the Nanzhao has long stood, and rightly so, as the foundation of the

---

37 Xie Shizong, "Nanchao, Tai people, and Homeland Yunnan: a Competing Process of Modern Nationalisms Between China and Thailand".
argument against all those that would argue the ruling elite of Nanzhao to have been of Tai origin. It can be said with great confidence, due almost exclusively to Luo’s work, that the Nanzhao ruling elite employed a language that bore great similarities with the languages we now identify as Tibeto-Burman. However, it was Luo’s conclusion from such findings that a linguistic connection necessitated the further inference that the Nanzhao rulers also shared in the culture and history of those Tibeto-Burman groups. This conclusion was perhaps precipitated by the strongly political climate surrounding the Nanzhao ethnography described above. That the Wuman 烏蠻 shared in the same cultural heritage as that of the Baiman 白蠻 may not necessarily have been the case. The significant difference culturally and linguistically between Wuman and Baiman was apparent to observers throughout the 7th and 10th centuries. This fact in of itself should raise a flag when describing the already hazy ethnographic distinctions of past scholars. Moreover, the debate over the origins of the Bai 白 language should also be taken into consideration when discussing the linguistic and cultural affiliations of populations that are traditionally assumed to have been the ancestors of the modern Bai 白 minority of Dali 大理. The language’s unusual collection of features, as mentioned in the introduction, suggests a history of development within a rich linguistic environment in which one or more languages of diverse origin had great influence.

38 ibid, p. 77.
CHAPTER TWO

TOPOYMS OF THE NANZHAO PERIPHERY

2.1 Explanation of Method

In order to investigate the possibility that some of the place names found in the Chinese corpus of historical accounts, one must first focus rather narrowly upon a few phonetic elements that commonly occur in the place names of modern Tai languages. In doing so one assumes a certain amount of continuity in toponymic practice from the 7th century to the present day. This may seem from the outset to be a great leap of faith. However, it has been often pointed out by linguists of diverse backgrounds that local place names change very little over time and often retain their original forms even through periods of dominance by an alien language/culture. Examples of such resistance to change in local place names can be readily found in many traditions.\(^\text{39}\)

It is first necessary to focus on a group of toponymic elements that occur in modern Tai languages, and from there work backwards. That the Proto-Tai forms of these elements may have had important structural differences in the 7th and 9th centuries is also a possibility. However, it is also not unreasonable to expect that the manner in which important settlements, cities, and towns were named has not changed significantly over time. From the samples of Gedney’s data collected in the appendices to this thesis, it can be seen that certain morphemes that carry geographic or toponymic detail are shared among almost all of the Tai dialects. An historical investigation into the place names of Tai peoples of upland Southeast Asia will benefit from an analysis of those
place names that occur most frequently among all the different dialects of the language family, and will produce a greater probability of finding phonetically similar toponymic practice in the past. It can be readily seen that a few morphemes occur in all of the dialects.

/məŋ/ “kingdom/realm, city, town”
/wen/ “city”
/baan3/ “village”
/naa3/ “wet rice field, paddy”
/baan3 naa4/ “village fields, village”
/cəŋ4/ “city”
/vəŋ4/ “city” (variant of above)

In the above examples, all elements with the possible exception of /naa3/ (“wet rice field, paddy”), function in modern Tai languages as head-nouns which are always followed by modifying nouns (as in the example /baan3 naa4/ above) or adjectives when occurring in place names. It should be noted here that in Tai languages nouns usually occur before their modifiers, i.e. noun + modifier. This is why one consistently sees such place names that employ /məŋ-/ as their first element.

The word /məŋ/ in Tai languages is one which carries a great deal of import culturally and historically when one considers the history, and perhaps pre-history, of the Tai peoples. As settlements of Tai peoples moved southwards into the Menam basin of north-central Thailand, for example, they often did so by following the course of rivers (e.g., the Mekong) and establishing agricultural settlements along the way centered on fertile river valley areas in which wet rice cultivation was carried out. The word in Tai

39 See Zheng-zhang Shangfen 鄭張尚芳, “Gu Wu Yue” for a discussion of this phenomenon of toponyms and ethnonyms transliterated into Chinese. For a general discussion on the resistance of toponyms to change see Collinge, “Names and Resistance”
languages for such areas is the previously mentioned /məŋ-/ in the list of place name elements above and in the appendices.

Since such a morpheme would have been so central to many aspects of the social, cultural, and political enterprises of a settlement, it seems reasonable to posit that one would find the morpheme /məŋ/ in the place names of the past as one does in the toponyms of present day Xishuangbanna 西雙版那, for example. However, this supposition is based on the assumption that wet rice cultivation and the labor organization required for it would have been in place in the early centuries of the Common Era. If not, then one can only be on less stable ground for the assertion that such vocabulary dependent as it is on such agriculture would have existed in the place names of certain unidentified groups in southern Yunnan. We do indeed find evidence that the Nanzhao governing elite relied in part on wet field rice production as a principal source of crops. It is stated in the Manshu 蠻書:

Local custom has as its only agricultural industry the wet field...Beginning in eighth month the rice is harvested, at the advent of the eleventh and twelfth months, barley is then planted in the rice fields and is mature in the third [or] fourth month.

...土俗唯業水田...從八月穫稻,至十一十二月之交,便於稻田種大麥,三月四月即熟。^{40}

It is evident that the author of the Manshu is particularly impressed by the Nanzhao practice of hillock agriculture of barley. The method of using spring water to irrigate crops on descending terraces of a foothill is noted as a practice that had developed a substantial administrative hierarchy of management and control.^{41} That Nanzhao hillock farming receives in-depth description in the Manshu suggests that this type of agriculture was considered by Fan Chuo to be unusually efficacious, especially since it avoided the

^{40} Manshu Jiaozhu 蠻書校注, v.7, p.171.
dangers of drought by relying on the water supply of mountain springs. The advanced state of Nanzhao hillock farming practice may also indicate that such methods had figured more prominently in the culture of predecessor societies from which it was inherited. Given what is known about the spread of rice cultivation from the Yangtse valley, it may well be that this type of terraced hill agriculture predated the wet field culture. It should be recalled here that Wu Jinding’s preliminary excavations at the foot of the Diancang mountain chain revealed similar terraced fields that may have been irrigated by a spring-fed source running off the mountain slope above.\textsuperscript{42}

\textbf{2.2 Historical Phonology of the toponymic elements}

Most significant to the toponyms here is the following is Li’s construction of the Proto-Tai initial cluster \textit{*ml-} and its correspondence to later \textit{m-}\textsuperscript{43} and \textit{l-} initials. Building his work on the massive contributions of Li Fang-kuei to the study of Tai and Proto-Tai phonology, Luo Yongxian’s outline of consonant change serves us particularly well here. One series that Luo glosses in his work is also pertinent to our later discussion of place names; Proto-Tai \textit{*j-}, \textit{*c}, \textit{*k-}, \textit{*g-}, \textit{*kl-} $\Rightarrow$ /ts/, as in tsee\textsuperscript{2} and tseim\textsuperscript{2} meaning ‘city’.

Another change in consonant structure is reflected in the phonological changes of certain graphs in Chinese. Graphs with the MC /m-/ initial split in modern standard Chinese into /m-/ and /w-/ initial syllables. This was likely due to the influence of the medial glide /-u-/ upon the initial. For example here are two similar graphs reconstructed by Pulleyblank to have different vowel structures.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
茫 E. man\textsuperscript{1} > L. man\textsuperscript{1} > Y. man\textsuperscript{1}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{41} “蠻治山田，殊為精好”，Manshu Jiaozhu 蠻書校注, v.7, 172.
\textsuperscript{42} 雲南蒼洱境考古報告, p. 74.
\textsuperscript{43} See Luo, Dehong, xxxi.
It should be noted that both graphs 茫、望 were used at the same time in the Manshu, for example, to describe both the ethnonym as well as the head noun marker in toponyms of peoples living on the southern border of the Nanzhao kingdom of the 8th century. It is possible that the two graphs were actually transliterating the same syllable. I infer that this is evidence towards the fact that peoples described as belonging to differing ethnic groups were likely to have either been the same or closely related groups thus unintentionally disguising a degree of linguistic homogeneity that may have existed among Proto-Tai and/or proto-Mon people of the area.

Another series of graphs which may have a similar relationship to one another in the place names of Nanzhao are the following. Their Middle Chinese reconstructions are provided as well.

Each one of the above graphs has been used to transliterate non-Han place names along the Nanzhao border areas. As a group they diverge from one another quite dramatically. However, there are arguments to be made for some of them transliterating a morpheme that seems to have cognates in at least Middle Mon (15th century) and Proto-Tai.

---

44 Pulleyblank, Lexicon, pp. 207, 319. Y. = early Mandarin  L. = Late Middle Chinese  E. = Early Middle Chinese.
45 Based on Pulleyblank (1991)
2.3 The Northwest border of Zhenla 真臘 7th-8th centuries:

Shanguo 揚國 and Can Ban 參半

It is stated in the Bei Shi 北史 that the kingdom of Canban 參半 was a subordinate state to the kingdom of Zhen La 真臘 (6th-8th).

This country [Zhenla] has close relations with the two [countries] of Canban and Zhu Jiang.

其國與參半朱江二國和親.  

The phrase *heqin* 和親 is a confusing here since it can have implications of relations within a single family but also connotes the practice of employing marriage as a strategic political device, often between members of a Han 漢 household with that of a non-Han ethnic group. Obviously, the distinction is important here since we want to determine the nature of the connection between the countries. Since the name of the country Zhujiang 朱江 is identified in as another name for the country of Pyu 頌, it stands to reason that the grouping of both territories under the rubric of a *heqin* 和親 association signifies a relationship of a more political order. It is likely that the relations between Water Zhenla and these subordinate territories was not one solely based on the kinship ties of a single royal line.

Zhenla 真臘 was divided into two entities, Land Zhenla 陸真臘 and Water Zhenla 水真臘, sometime in the second half of the 8th century. This division is recorded in the Xin Tang Shu 新唐書 where it is also stated that the latter entity was also referred

---

46 *Beishi*, v. 95, p. 8b
to as Wendan 文單國. The kings of Water Zhenla would be claimed in inscriptions to be ancestors to the kings of Angkor.

To the northwest of Wendan is the dependency of Canban. 文單西北屬國曰參牟. Fang Guoyu tentatively located Canban 參牟 as being somewhere in the on the upper reaches of the Mekong, north of the modern-day Thai border, in the proximity of an area inhabited by people he identified as the Shan 揚. Such an identification would place Canban 參牟 anywhere from the area later inhabited by the Tai Lue 傣聶 of Xisuangbanna 西雙版納 northwest to Dehong 德宏. Of course, it is interesting to note that the area of Canban 參牟 would be a place located very near, or perhaps the very place, where a people identified in the Hou Han Shu 後漢書, called Shan 揚, had established a kingdom of some power in the first and second centuries. The tribes of this kingdom have long been identified as the ancestors of peoples speaking Tai languages. The Shan Kingdom 揚國 is mentioned in the Hou Han Shu in a chapter which deals with the tribes beyond the borders of Han control, southwest of Dian Lake.

In the ninth year [of the Yongyuan 永元 reign period, 97 C.E.], the outland barbarians [together] with the King of Shan Guo, Yong You Diao sent embassy with translators to present tribute [to the court] [consisting of] jewels and [other] valuables.

九年微外夷及揚國王雍由調遣重譯奉國珍寶.

---

47 Reconstruction of the graph 文 in Middle Chinese yields /mun/, which immediately suggest the ethnonym Mon.
48 XTS, v. 222 (下), p. 3a.
49 Yuandai Biannian, p. 11.
50 Hou Han Shu, v. 160, p.16a.
Although there have been several scholars that have raised serious doubts about the location of Shanguo 潭國 in Upper Burma,\(^1\) much of this debate has centered on the same citation that states that Shanguo 潭國 bordered upon the kingdom of Daqin 大秦.

To the [its] West, Shanguo has contact with Daqin.

Since Daqin 大秦 has been identified as being part of the Late Roman Empire, scholars have thus postulated that Shanguo 潭國 must then have had to be far beyond the borders of present day Burma. However in the above citation, tong 通, cannot be interpreted strictly as “bordered upon,” and thus we need not read it as such. It is more likely that what was implied by the statement was that their was some sort of exchange between the two entities identified as Daqin 大秦 and Shanguo 潭國. As this may have been a sea route via the lower Irrawaddy River Basin as well as an overland corridor we need not narrowly read the above passage as indicating a contiguous border shared by the two territories.

The *Hou Han Shu* indicates that the reading of the graph 潭 should be homophonic with that of the graph, shan 擽. Yet, the evidence for this reading according to Li Xian (651-684) is the use of the shan 擾 graph in the Dongguan Hanji 東關漢記.\(^2\)

---

1. Luce (1924) suggested it may have been located outside the frontiers of modern-day Burma. Luce (1924), “The Tan and Ngai Lao”, *Journal of the Burma Research Society*. See also, He, “Shangguo is not a Shan Kingdom: To correct a Mistake Related to the Early History of Tai-Speaking peoples in China and Mainland Southeast Asia”, *Journal of the Siam Society*. However, Wheatley (1983) saw no reason locate the kingdom outside of the traditionally identified area of Upper Burma bordering on the present day Dehong 德宏 area. See, *Nagara and Commandery*, p. 187, note 6.


3. “揲音揲東觀作揲字” *Hou Han Shu*, v. 160. p. 16a. This is the annotation by Li Xian 李賢 (651-684) referring to the use of 擾 for 潭 in the *Dongguan Hanji* 東關漢記, compiled by Ban Gu 班固 (32-92) and others. However, the graph 潭 is in this citation is found in the Sibu Beiyao 四部備要 edition of the
This seems to be the evidence upon which the pronunciation /šaŋ/ is based but such a citation employing the *shan* 搏 graph cannot be found. However the *Zhongwen Da Cidian* 中文大辭典 cites the Donguan Hanji as the source for the original graph 搏 to have been employed in the name of the country. Wang Xianjian 王先謙 (1842-1918) also cites the Dongguan Hanji as the original source indicating that the *dan* 搏 graph is to be read as *shan* 搏 but does not quote the earlier history as employing the 搏 graph in the original text. It seems there are extant variant texts, some of which have been corrected while others have not. It seems clear at this juncture that their has been some confusion, historically, over the pronunciation of the 搏 graph.

One of He’s (2000) arguments against associating the Shangguo 搏國 of the annals with the ancestors of the modern Tai peoples is the fact that there are no ethnonym by which modern Tai populations in the Dehong area identify themselves that resemble the morpheme /šaŋ/. However, nowhere in the earliest references to Shangguo is it noted that the people of this country referred to themselves with an ethnonym identical to the name of the kingdom. Thus, to make such an inference upon the ancient ethnicity of the people of Shangguo with such an argument is not valid. While it is often the case the ethnonym and toponym are identical, this is obviously not necessarily the case.

An alternative interpretation suggests itself when one looks for toponymic elements in Tai dialects. For example, in Dehong Tai the following morphemes occur as a head element in compounds meaning ‘area, place, position’.

---

*Dongguan Hanji*, cf. *Dongguan Hanji*, v. 3, p. 3a. The annotation may be referring to an uncorrected text at the time edited by Li Xian that is not extant now.

54 *Hou Han Shu Jieji*, v.1, p. 245.
55 He, “Shangguo is not a Shan Kingdom”, p.180.
Following Li (1977), the Proto-Tai initial for this morpheme was likely *t-. Li suggests that the quality of the unvoiced status of the dental initial is suspect in ancient times since in early Tai scripts a modification of the letter for d- was used to represent the t-consonant. It is possible that this morpheme was at work in the language of previous settlements, including ancient settlements, and that it may have simply stood for a simple head marker in the name of a kingdom. In the Chinese transliteration the remaining country name may have been lost. However, since this morpheme does not seem to be productive in the place names of Dehong, according to the data provided by Luo, such an argument must be said to lack necessary evidence.

If we look at the toponyms of the Jiu Tang Shu, Xin Tang Shu, and Mangshu that are identified in those texts as being the place names of Wuman and Baiman groups of the Erhai region, to the northeast of Yongchang, we see a similar morpheme at work as a place name element. Two similar graphs often occur as the second or third element of these place names.

兖 /giam/, /tan/
兖 /tan2/

These graphs have variant pronunciations in the 7th century and a phonological analysis reveals that they were likely transliterating the same morpheme.

---

56 Luo, Dehong, pp. 163, 167.
57 A Handbook of Comparative Tai, p. 97.
In the *Manshu* Fanchuo notes Dajiantan 大覦瞐 and Xiaojiantan 小覦瞐. The Chinese designations of size, appearing as they do in a pair, seem likely to an addition onto the original Wuman place name. Thus it can be seen that the graph /-tan/-瞐 would have been an element in second position. In the *Xin Tang Shu* we find that the morpheme /siam/ is very productive in the place names of the Yongchang area. One of the original Six Zhao 詔 contains the element, Dengtan Zhao 鎮瞐詔. We also find the following all within the area Erhai-Yongchang area.

越瞐
大施瞐
斂尋瞐
劍瞐( place name of the Shiman 施蠻 and Shunman 順蠻— To the Northwest of Tieqiao 鐵橋)
大瞐 (listed as one the 茫蠻 towns)

There seems to be some discrepancy in the use of the toponymic element since the Manshu employs瞐 while the Xi Tang Shu has瞐.

It is especially interesting that one the Mangman towns would contain this element for it suggests at least three possibilities. (1) The Mangman controlled the territory of previously Wuman occupied land. (2) The element -/tan2/-瞐 was shared in the languages of both groups. (3) The Mangman were living in a territory under the control of Wuman rulers and their settlement was called after the linguistic conventions of the Wuman. The first supposition is especially weak since these were place names recorded in the 9th century, where a less than a century before the area had witnessed a great expansion of Wuman power in the area. Indeed, the Mangman section of the Manshu begins with an account of Wuman aggression towards the Mangman settlements.

Furthermore, these Wuman and Baiman settlements (excepting Datan 大瞐) occur in an
area near the locus of Nanzhao power. Only Datan 大赕, in its grouping with the other
Mangman towns southwest of Yongchang, is outside of this ring of central control.
While we cannot positively describe the position of the settlement, we can thus
tentatively locate Datan 大赕 as one of the more northerly of Mangman towns, perhaps a
border town, which may have served as a kind of frontier outpost/trading-post for the
Nanzhao rulers.

Phonetic reconstruction of both of the initial graphs of Zhenla 真臘 and Canban 参罕 renders the following syllables.

參: /t̪sim/
真: /t̪sin/

Coedes reconstructed the graphs' 7th century pronunciation as /t'sien lap/ and stated
further that their exact meaning was as yet unknown. He also stated that no known
equivalent was to be found in Khmer vocabulary. However, a similar toponymic
construction occurs frequently in the place names of Mon inscriptions at a later period
(15th century) for roughly the same area (see appendix C). It is possible that these two
graphs were representing the same territorial designation in early Mon-Khmer languages.
A phonetically similar element appears in Mon inscriptions from the 6th to 16th centuries
sim /sim / a middle Mon term meaning, “[an] ordination place, piece of land ritually
demarcated on which ordination ceremonies may be performed; the boundary of such a
place…” Such similarity in the pronunciation of the initial graphs of each political
entity coupled with the fact that similar corresponding elements occur in the place names

58 See Coede’s, Indianized States, p.65.
59 See Shorto, Dictionary of Mon Inscriptions, pp.301-302. Also see Appendix C for a list of 15th century
place names with similar phonetic elements.
of the inscriptions suggest that the graphs were transliterations of the first element of an early Mon place name prefix.

That the language of Zhenla should share similar toponymic structures and vocabulary with the previously established Mon culture of the more eastern territories of the Southeast Asian peninsula is hinted at in statements in the Chinese record that connect the ancient culture of Funan (3rd-5th centuries?) with that of Kun Lun (3rd-5th centuries?). The former was the antecedent state to Zhenla while the later has been associated with the earliest Mon civilization on the peninsula, i.e. the founding culture over which that of the Dvararavati Kingdom (6th-9th centuries) developed. This cultural affiliation is stated in the *Jiu Tang Shu* 舊唐書.

Zhenla is northwest of of Champa. It originally was a subordinate state Funan. The people are of the same kind as those of Kunlun.

Of course, we cannot put much faith on such early attempts at ethnology. I do not want to argue the origins and exact meaning of the term Kunlun since it has been well argued elsewhere. Coedes’ suggested that it be thought of as a general term the Chinese applied to a somewhat homogenous culture of the southern peninsula and islands further south that had undergone an *Indianization* and transformed into a literate culture.

Similarly, Wheatley has identified it as the language of the Malay peninsula in the early centuries of the Common Era and perhaps earlier. The connection of the culture of Zhenla with that of the Kunlun was certainly made without any degree of exactitude.

---

60 *JTS*, v.197, p.2a
62 Nagara and Commandery, p. 267, 270.
However, it can perhaps be inferred that there were to some cultural affinities across the southern Southeast Asian peninsula at the time.

As toponymic elements they are likely to have existed in the languages of these northern Tai groups from a very early period. It can be argued that Canban 參半, appended to the Khmer kingdoms of the lower Mekong in the sixth century had a mixed population of Proto-Tai peoples serving under a well established Khmer ruling elite. It is thus tempting to read the name of the kingdom as representing a mix of both Mon-Khmer and Proto-Tai place name elements.

It is curious that the second element of this ancient kingdom name contains ban /ban/. According to the Shorto data such a syllable does not have a direct equivalent in his gloss of the Mon language as represented in the inscriptions. There are two occurrences of the morpheme /ban/ meaning “village” in the inscription data. Such a low frequency for the breadth of the Shorto’s data suggests that for the areas described by the content of the Mon inscriptions there existed very few settlements worthy of note in an official inscription.

However, it is also possible that the /baan/, “village”, of Tai languages was a borrowing from early Mon. Many of the place names of the Mon inscriptions (see Appendix C) contain the syllable /mba/. In Shorto’s transcription the /mb-/ initial represents the only pre-nasalized plosive to survive from Old Mon into Middle Mon. Li Fang-kui’s reconstruction of the initial in /baan/ is a pre-glottalized implosive labial *ʔb-
Thus it can be seen that in both the Mon and Tai reconstructions the initials and vowels are very similar and that the Chinese graph 半 or 板 could have transliterated both morphemes whether or not they came from one language or from two cognates of two distinct languages.

Gedney’s thorough gloss of the Tai-Lue dialect of Xishuangbanna contains the syllables /ceŋ⁴/ meaning “city” as well as /baan/ meaning “village”. The former can be found all over the area extending from northern Thailand into southern China in placed names beginning with the romanized Tai chiang as in Chiang Rai and Chiang Mai to name but two examples. This first element in the Tai place names of southern China is often represented by the 景 /tɕin/ graph as in 景東, the site of the 12th century capital of the Tai kingdom of Jinglongjiindian 景龍金殿國 located near the site of present day Jinghong 景洪 (also 車里). In fact, many of the modern Tai place names employing the /ceŋ⁴/ head noun are still transliterated in Chinese with the 景 graph. It is a very productive element.

In the Lue dialect of Xishuangbanna there are the following:

/ceŋ⁴ cŋ1/ One of the six northern cities of Sipsongpanna (Xishuangbanna)
/ceŋ⁴ hun⁵/ Chieng Hung (景洪)
/ceŋ⁴ lap⁵/ Town in Burma on the Mekhong
/ceŋ⁴ tɯuŋ⁴/ name of a city at Chieng Hong
/ceŋ⁴ tun⁴/ Keng Tung, Burmese Border Town and ancient capital

---

63 See Li, Handbook, 4.4.
64 Adapted from Gedney, Lue Dialect, p.116.
In Dehong Tai, Luo’s research yielded the following interesting equivalents. It should be noted that there is no equivalent initial to Xishuangbanna’s c-.

/tseŋ2/ (also /weŋ2/) city
/tseŋ2 hun6/ Chieng Hung (景洪)
/tseŋ2 tuŋ/ Chengtung, a place name
/tseŋ2təŋ1/ Chengtong, a place name

2.4 The mang-/茫- head element toponyms of the Nanzhao border areas

The Jiu Tangshu, Xin Tangshu and Fan Chuo’s Manshu contain mention of a people living to the south of the town of Yongchang 永昌 variously referred to as the Mangman 茫蠻, Heichi 黒齒, Jinehi 金齒, or Quchi 蜉齒. Of particular note is the following line of the Xin Tangshu:

*The Mang barbarians originally were of the south pass, mang is the name for their king, [who] may also be called Mangzhao.*

It is evident here that the term mang 茫- was not only used as a term denoting a lord but also as a semantic element that could combine as a prefix to form a toponym. Worth noting here is that Zhao 詔, seems to be used indiscriminately here since it is defined at the beginning of the volume as being a word used by the Wuman of the Nanzhao to mean king or kingdom (as in Nanzhao). But this may also indicate that these politically subordinate peoples of the Nanzhao borrowed the word for ‘foreign ruler’ into their language to denote the highest position of authority within the local context. Or, it is

---

65 Adapted from Luo, Dehong, p. 201.
66 For reference see the present day city of Baoshan 保山 southwest of Dali 大理.
67 XTS, 222c, 6276.
possible that both languages contained the same morpheme. Indeed, past scholars, from the very beginning, have made much of the fact that a phonetically similar element can be found in many modern Tai dialects with the same semantic value of ‘king’, or ‘lord’.

The term *mangman* 茂巂 may have been a reference to an actual Tai settlement in southern Yunnan. There is a tribe (reference also to place) up the Mekong from Chiang Mai that is referred to in the postscript to the Rama Khamaeng\(^6\) inscription (1292) as Muangman. This postscript seems to have been carved sometime after the principal stele inscription but has yet to be dated conclusively.\(^7\) Mentioned are the tribes/settlements of Muang Phlae, Muang Phlua, and Muang Chawa [Luang Prabang].\(^8\) Essentially, the northern borders Rama Khamaeng territory, as delineated by the inscriptions, describe an arc from modern-day Vientiane to the northeast and west from there to the south of present-day Chiang Rai. Further north there were other Tai princes, Mangrai of Chiang Rai and Ngam Muang of Phayao, *whose* combined territory abutted the Yunnanese Tai chiefdom at Jinghong 景洪.

Another possibility is that the *Manshu* and *Xin Tang Shu* references are in fact a transliteration of an eighth century local ethnonym for the Proto Burman.\(^9\) Indeed, Luo’s data for Dehong Tai contains the ethnonym /məŋ2maaŋ6/, meaning ‘Burmese’, as will be seen below.

---

\(^6\) *XTS*, 222c, 6267. The text denotes that in zhao is a term meaning king in Yiyu 楊語, or language of the foreign tribes. Taken in context here at the beginning of the Nanman Chapter it is meant to refer to the language of the rulers of the original Six Zhao, which are identified as Wuman.

\(^7\) Rama Khamaeng was the near legendary founder of the Sukhothai Kingdom (13\(^{th}\) to 15\(^{th}\) centuries).

\(^8\) The authenticity of the Rama Khamaeng stele inscription, as a whole, is a great subject of debate. See *The Rama Khamaeng Controversy* for a series of articles that cover the breadth of the debate.

\(^9\) Coedes, *ISSA*, p. 205.

\(^9\) Luce identified the Mangman 茂巂, Wang Ju 望苴, and Pu 潘 tribes as Proto Burman. See the forward to *Old Burma and Early Pagan*. 38
Convincing evidence that there existed a common toponymic morpheme in the language of the Mangman 茫蠻 is in the list of village names belonging to their sphere of influence;

*South of Yongchang there is Mangtianlian, Mangtuhaio, Mangcheng, Mangxian, Mangshi. All are their [Mangman 茫蠻] tribes.*

永昌之南有茫天連,茫吐藿,大賑,茫成,茫鮮,茫施,大底皆其種

This citation is from the *Xin Tang Shu* which always employs the graph 茫 as the head element of the toponyms in question. Fang Guoyu's 方國瑜 textual research of both the Xin Tang Shu and the Manshu suggests that the Nanzhao chapters of the *Xin Tangshu* were a carefully edited collation that drew from both Fan Chuo’s *Manshu* and the now lost *Nanzhao Lu* 南詔錄 of the Tang dynastic emissary to Yongzhou 永州, Xu Yunqian 徐云慶. This may explain why the place names within the detailed account of the subordinate tribes of the Nanzhao borders are not discussed in the *Jiu Tang Shu*. The texts do not differ in their assertion that the head element /maŋ-/ is also the name the Mangman apply to their prince. Here, it should be recalled that Luo’s data on the on the Dehong dialect also possesses such a morpheme with dual meaning of ‘area, country’, as well as ‘king, ruler’.

While in the Xin Tang Shu the place name element ordering is always consistent, when we look at the original pairing of some of these elements in the *Manshu* of Fan Chuo, we find that such an ordering is not always consistent. Since in modern Tai place names we almost always find the morpheme /maŋ-/ occurring as a head noun, it is curious that in Fan Chuo’s original list of Mangman place names, one occasionally finds

---

73 XTS, 222c, 6276
74 See Yu Shi’s “Nanzhao Wenhua De Tedian Jiqi Zai Yunnan Lishishang De Diwei”, in Nanzhao Wenhua Lun, 1991, p.4, for a discussion of Fang Guoyu enormous contributions in this area.
toponyms that reverse the order of their elements. Xiang Da 向達 (1962) was careful not to confuse the order of elements and notes a penchant of earlier compilers to preserve this confused ordering of elements in examples like Xian Mang 鮮茫 and Shi Mang 市茫. Luce’s translation (1961) preserves many of these original orderings and includes the place name, Ta Tan Mang 大譯茫 which Xiang Da corrects and indicates, simply, that an error was made on the part of earlier scribes in the parsing of the sentence. The second graph 談 seems to be an alternate of 贅.

It is worth noting that the manner in which Zhao 諟 is used in the section dealing with the Mangman also reverses what appears to be the head noun + modifier syntax of later Tai languages. While it is very likely that Fan Chuo was aware of the Zhao 諟 morpheme’s meaning, employ it in the manner of the Chinese 州 or 國, it seems that he was not always consistent with the use of the /man-/ morpheme. It may also be possible, however, that Fan Chuo knew of the morpheme’s meaning and was trying to use it correctly, if not rather inconsistently.

The Mang barbarian tribes are those various kinds found at Kainan. Mang is the name for their ruler. The barbarians call [him] mangzhao. From the south of the city of Yongchang [one] first passes [the town of] Tangfeng and arrives at [the town of ] Fenglanju. After this [there is] Mangtianlian [and] Mangtuhao. There is also Damangchang, Mangchengkong, Mangxian, Mangshi [which] are all [of the Mangman tribal] category.

The Mang barbarian tribes are those various kinds found at Kainan. Mang is the name for their ruler. The barbarians call [him] mangzhao. From the south of the city of Yongchang [one] first passes [the town of] Tangfeng and arrives at [the town of ] Fenglanju. After this [there is] Mangtianlian [and] Mangtuhao. There is also Damangchang, Mangchengkong, Mangxian, Mangshi [which] are all [of the Mangman tribal] category.

75 Dates unknown.
76 MS/JZ, v. 4, p. 204.
77 Man Shu Jiao Zhu 蠻書校注, v. 4, p.104.
Fan Chuo’s text uses the same character (茫, mang) to denote the toponymic prefixes of both Mang Tianlian 茫天連 and Mang tuhao 茫吐髙 as well as the to denote the second element of the toponyms Da Chang Mang 大茫然. We can be reasonably certain that the first graph is a Chinese attributive not present at the front of the original pair of morphemes.

As suggested above, in the review of common toponymic morphemes in all Tai dialects, it was found that the morpheme /məŋ/ and its variations is extremely productive in these dialects and Dehong Tai is no exception.

/məŋ2/, country, (flat) area, also noun head indicating ‘country’ of various placenames.
/məŋ2kaaŋ6/, the world
/məŋ2kon2/, the human world
/məŋ2kot5/, A placename in Burma
/məŋ2lao4/, A placename in Xishuangbanna, Mengla
/məŋ2laau2/, Laos
/məŋ2maaŋ6/, Burma (also /məŋ2taŋ4/)
/məŋ2maau2/, Muang Mau (also called Ruili, on the Burmese-Yunnan border)

Note also the morphemes semantic extension to signify a degree of nobility or rank.

/məŋ2/, An honourable title given to dignitaries in a feudal society.

This is an expansion of the term where it originally referred to an area of land demarcation. As ruler over the settlement depending largely on rice production taking place in the flat lands of the river valley, the title of /məŋ2/ directly associated the wealth of that crop with its king. Also of interest here is the phenomenon of voiceless/voiced alternation in some syllables particularly in the example of alternation between unvoiced

---

78 The same character for the Mangman toponyms of the XTS.
79 Luo, Dehong, p.102. See below for further discussion of the significance of the morpheme /məŋ/ meaning ‘king,’ or ‘prince.’
/təŋ2/ and voiced /məŋ2/ meaning ‘area, place’, or ‘country’. As such, it is tempting to connect the /cəŋ/ place names with those of /məŋ/. This alternation, however, since it represents a current phonological change, it not likely to have been present in the language system of the Mangman in the 8th century. Thus, it seems unwise to connect the two groups.

It can be seen from the place name data of Appendix C that a different graph is employed, i.e. 孟, in what appears to be a similar usage as in the earlier graph 蒙. Also, the distribution and frequency of the graph in the place names of the area, particularly in Yongchang area, suggest that this graph (and graphs with identical or near identical pronunciation) was simply a different character used to transliterate the same toponymic feature of earlier place names at a later time. One particular instance of this kind of graph-swapping is noted specifically by Fang Guoyu in the Manshu place name Mang Tianlian 孟天連 for which is hypothesizes a later incarnation of Menglian 孟連. Fang also asserts that Mangnai 孟乃, of 8th century Yongchang 永昌, was later named Mengle 猛泐 which would become an important chiefdom of Xishuangbanna in the 11th and 12th centuries. However, the transliteration is a bit problematic when we consider that the graph 孟- was a 1st division rhyme unlikely to have had anything but a high back unrounded vowel. The Middle Chinese pronunciation has thus, altered little. Furthermore, Li’s explication of the phonological change of the Proto-Tai *a- yields a long vowel, aa-, quite different from -o. Thus, it seems that the original vowel was a

---

80 Luo, Dehong, p.xv.
81 西南...考釋, p. 332.
82 Handbook, p.274.
diphthong with a lower front vowel that could have been approximated with the Middle Chinese *a- and also, later, with a higher back vowel, also unrounded, such a -ə.

Also present in the Manshu is mention of the Wang 望 peoples located by Fan Chuo in roughly the same area as the Mangman. In chapter six of the Manshu the armies of the Nanzhao are said to have occupied Yongchang and in doing so displacing over a thousand households of a person referred to as Wang-qu-zu 望 and Wang-wai-yu 望外瑜.

Among the place names in the Man Shu 阪書 recorded by Fan Chuo 樊绰 are some beginning with the graph 望- /wan4-/. It is the assertion of Fang Guoyu 方國瑜 that those tribes referred to in the Man Shu as wang ju 望苴 and wang wai yu 望外喻 were a branch of the Pu 濮 peoples which he later identifies as the old ethnonym for the ancestors of the Wa 佤 minority group of extreme southern Yunnan province. This connection makes some sense for it would establish a precedent for a Mon group being well established before the rise of the Tibeto-Burman Nanzhao elite.

There is evidence for a displacement in the Man Shu itself when Fan Chuo discusses the establishment of one of the 六詔 cities (Lang Qiong Zhao 浪穹詔), namely Dengchuan cheng 遼川城. The peoples that are displaced by the founding of Lang Qiong Zhao are later the peoples of the Wang 望 tribes that serve as the much valued shock troops of the Nanzhao fighting force. The name of their original settlement is also prefixed with the 望 graph.

---

83 Luce, Manshu, p. 57.
84 Published at the beginning of the Xian Tong 咸通 reign period (860-873) of the Tang 唐 dynasty.
85 Also 蒲.
The Wang tribes are noted for their involvement in the military of the Nanzhao. They are one of the tribes mentioned by Fan Chuo as participating in the siege and capture of Annam in 863 at the mouth of the Red River on the site of present-day Hanoi. Fang Guoyu locates many of their settlements in an area that can be described as lying between the territory of the Mangman (present-day Mangshi) and that of the Erhai lake area. Their territory also extended northwest toward present day Lijiang.

CHAPTER 3

CONCLUSION

The fact that a great diversity of tribal groups was marshaled to success against the citadel at Annam in 863 suggests a degree of cultural assimilation of these tribes into Nanzhao society. Conversely, it may also suggest that the Nanzhao elite were assimilating themselves or already assimilated into a cultural base that was present before their consolidation of power in the Erhai region.

There are indications in the historical record that there was indeed a more homogenous pre-Nanzhao culture and this has been asserted in recent research. For example, if the "Wang 舆" tribes are indeed the ancestors to the modern Mon populations of southern Yunnan then their subordination politically by warlords of Tibeto-Burman linguistic stock is a historical event with resonance in other parts of Southeast Asia at around the same time. It would hardly have been the first time that a Tibeto-Burman culture absorbed an earlier established Mon culture in the area.

The Pyu, or Piao Kingdom 順國 of ancient Burma was also one in which a warrior class of Tibeto-Burman stock dominated an area earlier settled by Mon culture, while incorporating many of the Mon cultural features into its own. This is in keeping with the conclusions of George Coedes in *The Indianized States of Southeast Asia*. Coedes believed that the area of upper Burma around the close of the Nanzhao era witnessed a convergence of Tibeto-Burman and Mon culture in the founding of the Pagan in 849.88 He speculated that the area of this meeting of cultures was near the area of the merging of the Irrawaddy and and Salween in Upper Burma, a place from which the

---

87 MSJZ, pp. 98-102.
rulers of Pagan had access to the fertile plains of the Kyaukse valley. From such a position, the rulers of Pagan could benefit from the close proximity to the trade route west into to the Gangetic plains and northeast into Nanzhao territory and China beyond.

Evidence such as common burial practices throughout the region also points to a greater cultural affiliation with Southeast Asian early cultures than with that of Yangtze valley centered Chinese culture.\(^8^9\) Recent archeological evidence discovered in the Erhai region shows that Nanzhao burial practices shared the same basic features with those of Zhenla and Pyu.\(^9^0\) In fact, the Wuman 烏蠻 burial customs are described as being quite different from that of their eastern Cuan 西爨\(^9^1\) neighbors, as well as their purported cousins the Baiman 白蠻. The citation is from the Manshu:

After death, the Western Cuan and Biman, inter a sarcophagus, as in the Han method of making mausolea.

西爨及白蠻死後, 皆入內埋攣, 依漢法為墓.

[As for] Mingshe\(^9^2\) and the various Wuman, [they] do not inter the dead. All [of them] have their corpses immolated. Their remaining ashes are kept in the soil. Only the two ears are collected.

蒙舍及諸烏蠻不墓葬, 凡死後三日焚殞, 其餘灰燼掩以土壤, 唯收兩耳.\(^9^3\)

Moreover, the burial urns of Pyu, notably at the Beikthano site, also bear a striking resemblance to those found at the sites further south in lower Burma,\(^9^4\) the so-called cultural heart of Mon country. Interred funeral urns containing the ashes of the body after ritual cremation have been found in the sites of all three kingdoms.\(^9^5\)

---

\(^8^8\) ISSA, p. 63. 
\(^8^9\) See Wheatley’s discussion of burial practices in *The Pivot of the Four Quarters*. 
\(^9^0\) See Kaogu 2.2 (2001) for the site report on the Delefeng tomb findings. 
\(^9^1\) There were two Cuan 西爨 tribes, 西爨 and 西爨, which were both located to the east of the Erhai lake region. 
\(^9^2\) Here, by ellipsis, this refers to the royal line of Nanzhao. 
\(^9^3\) MSJZ, v.8, p.216. 
\(^9^4\) *Nagara and Commandery*, p.172. 
\(^9^5\) For a summary of Zhenla and Pyu burial customs see ISSA, p. 76-77.
Would it not be logical to assume that settlers from a much earlier period had already established settlements coming north out of Burma by way of the China–India route that had been in use as early as the 2nd century B.C.E.? Despite Nanzhao’s repeated cultural contact with both Tang China and Tibet, the Buddhism of Nanzhao may have been influenced by the that of the established traditions of Theravada Buddhism much more akin to the Indianized cultures to the southwest and southeast. Was this perhaps the result of a melding of Tibeto-Burman with Proto Burman⁹⁶ or Mon cultures from an earlier period? At present, these questions cannot be answered with much confidence. However, Yunnan’s long history of trade with the territories beyond the upper reaches of the Salween and Irrawaddy does argue for the presence of some influence from Indianized cultures.

Fang Guoyu has suggested that the Ailao 资一副 tribes mentioned in the Han Shu 漢書 Hou Han Shu 後漢書 were in fact ancestors to the Pu 濂 tribes and thus the predecessors of the later Mon populations of Southern Yunnan. As mentioned before, the interpretation of historical materials in connecting earlier ethnic groups with hypothesized descendant groups in modern times has always been an exercise traditionally clouded in ambiguity and fraught with brash assumptions. Here, perhaps, Fang’s connection of the Ailao 资一副 group with the Pu 濂 tribes is based seemingly on the mere fact that the two groups occupied the same territory at different periods in history. Fang bases his connection on two citations, one from the Hua Yang Guo Zhi 華陽國志 compiled by Chang Ju 常璩 (fl. 265-316) and another from the Hou Han Shu 後

⁹⁶ Luce identified the Mangman 芒蠻, Wang Ju 望苴, and Pu 濂 tribes as Proto Burman.
The former text records the ethnonym Ailao as being the name of the tribe that formerly occupied the area of Yongchang Commandery but it also includes the graph in the names of various nearby tribes. The latter also contains reference to a former territory of the Ailao but places the Pu in the Yongchang area. It was from such circumstances that Fang Guoyu concluded that the Ailao and the Pu were related groups.

It is worth mentioning here also that the Meng clan of Nanzhao claimed descent from the Ailao but this claim was in fact qualified by the recorders of the Jiu Tangshu where it is said, “[They] speak [of themselves] as being the descendants of the Ailao.” What would have been the motivations for such a claim if false? Was there perhaps a culture to be claimed that was of Indian-influenced origin and spread by settlers from Upper Burma in the first or second centuries?

Let us not forget the fact that Nanzhao conquered Pyu and forcibly removed many of its inhabitants to live within the central lands of their kingdom’s control. Nanzhao had also previously aided the Pyu in defeating Mon forces to the south. This suggests that there were also perhaps cultural affinities between two Tibeto-Burman peoples as they moved against culturally distinct peoples further south. In this perspective, the conquest of previously Mon territories by Tibeto-Burman peoples can be seen as a general cultural trend in this area as it was to become a trend of Tai peoples in their supplanting of previously Mon territories in north and central Menam basin areas centuries later. It was the kingdom of Pagan in the 10th century that would become the inheritor of the Pyu

97 See Fang, Zhongguo Xinan...Kao shi, pp.22-23.
98 c.g. Min Pu, Pu Liao, and others.
literary tradition and become the exemplar tradition for the Mon literary tradition in
Burma and Southeast Asia in general. Was the same sort of cultural assimilation
happening on a smaller scale in the Erhai region? As there have been no examples of an
indigenous writing system at Nanzhao sites we cannot assume that there was an exchange
of a lettered tradition through a Buddhist transmission of religious texts or otherwise.
Indeed, all indications are that the Chinese literary influence on the region of Nanzhao
was the dominant one and that in the absence of an indigenous writing system the cultural
tradition of the north was adopted. But, that does not preclude the possibility that
elements of a cultural tradition other than a literary legacy were adopted or were extant at
an earlier time.

It is tempting to consider the possibility that there existed some sort of borrowing
between the languages of the Nanzhao elite and the tribes under their dominion. It should
be recalled that the Mengshe Zhao 蒙舍詔 was the only chieftdom of the original six to
possess a surname and that surname (蒙, /məwŋ/) was a syllable similar to the toponymic
elements 蒙-/məŋ-/, 猛 /məŋ-, 望 /muaŋ- /and 弄 /ləwŋ-h- of the above discussion.

Obviously, the last element in this series employs an initial that is quite different from
that of the first three morphemes and as such may seem highly suspect in any attempt to
link them on linguistic grounds. However, given the evidence that suggests some sort of
cultural affinity may have developed between suspected Tai, Mon, and Tibeto-Burman
groups under Nanzhao rule, it is perhaps not a hypothesis to be rejected out of hand.
Consider for example that the 弄 graph employs the lateral fricative l- in Middle Chinese
(來母) which produces both l- and n- in modern Chinese. Also, if we look at Li’s Proto-
Tai reconstruction for the initial in m- in modern Tai dialects, we find evidence that the
connection between the m- and l- graphs is quite plausible. For example, Li suggests
Proto-Tai *ml- as the initial for the word in modern Tai dialects for ‘insect’: Siamese
meeŋ, Lungzhou meeŋ, Po-ai (Buyi 布依) neeŋ, Lao meeŋ, Lü meŋ, Wu-ming meŋ, Dioi
neng. The words ‘insect’ and ‘country, area’ in Tai dialects show parallel
pronunciations in all dialects mentioned above. This seems to be evidence that points
toward a quite similar morpheme, in all cases, acting as a toponymic first element in
place names of ancient tribes whose descendants have been identified as belonging to
three different language families; Tai, Mon, and Tibeto-Burman.

The original identification in the Manshu and other sources of the Wu 鳥 and Bai
白 groups is one that cannot be taken at face value. Is it possible that the rulers of the
Nanzhao, the kings of the Meng clan, were not of Tibeto-Burman stock and simply
adopted the patronymic naming system of a Tibeto-Burman culture in order to legitimate
their rule? As was discussed earlier, the Meng clan may have sought to legitimate their
royal mandate by claiming descent from the Ailao, a group which Fang Guoyu and others
have identified through textual analysis with the predecessors of later Mon-Wa groups of
the Yunnan border areas. Whether or not the claim is true, it represents an attempt to link
the clan lineage with an older cultural tradition that must have been recognized as
representing a kind of higher social milieu or ruling class. After attempts were made by
the Nanzhao to gain access to political favor with the Tang court through marriage and
were subsequently denied, one of the last kings of the Nanzhao elite turned south to seek
a marriage alliance with a member of the royal line of the Kunlun 崑崙. As has been
mentioned before, this territory was likely at the heart of the Mon cultural heartland in
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lower Burma. Such alliances with the kingdoms of the south do not take place after the usurpation of power by the families of the more sinicized Bai 白 elite.

Given the evidence collected here we cannot conclude that the now traditional identification of the Meng clan as belonging to a Tibeto-Burman speaking group as invalid. However, given the geographic location of the Zhao originally controlled by the Meng clan chiefs in the territory that would later be identified as Wang 望 tribal border areas it seems reasonable to at least suggest that although the Nanzhao elite display Tibeto-Burman linguistic features in their naming systems, they may come from a very different cultural background.

Given the textual evidence that some of the toponymic elements used for the Mang tribes are also used in the place names of the Wang tribes we cannot consider the cut and dry ethnographic identifications to be beyond suspicion. Thus, the ethnic identifications of the historical sources, particularly the clear distinctions drawn between the Mang 茫 and Wang 望 tribes of the Yongchang area must also be considered in a new light. That the Mangman 茫蠻 employed the same morpheme to identify a person of kingly rank and as the head noun of their settlement names does not preclude the possibility that such a morpheme was not a borrowed form from another language of the area.

Moreover, since the /-t’an/ 質 element occurring predominately in the place names of the Wu 烏 and Bai 白 groups also occurs in conjunction with both the 望-/wanʃ-/ and 茫-/manʃ-/we must reconsider the nature of the toponymic transliterations of the Manshu and Xin Tang Shu. For example, the Manshu contains all of the above elements in the place names of the Yongchang and Dali areas. If one considers the transliterations
to have employed graphs consistently throughout, maintaining the ethnic distinctions between regions, then one must seriously question the assertion that those distinctions were as rigid as they have been interpreted by later scholars. Of course, we don't have enough information about how the toponyms were chosen. Furthermore, it is easy enough to conclude simply that Fan Chuo did not have such concerns in mind when transcribing or creating the reported toponyms for the vast array of tribes he sought to record. However since there are trends in the employment of the graphs with regard for their position within a given place name, we can consider the possibility that there was some concern for consistency and accuracy. Three of the toponymic elements occurring in the data consistently occur as a head element (芒/-maŋ/-, 猛 /maŋ/-, 筠 /muŋ). The element, /-t’an/-, occurs consistently in 2nd or 3rd position in a given place name.

Given the frequency with which four of the toponymic elements (芒/-maŋ/-, 猛 /maŋ/-, 筠 /muŋ-, and /-t’an/-) occur in the same position within a name, it stands to reason that consideration for the consistent use of the same graph semantically would be paralleled by consideration for the consistent use of the same graph with regard to phonetic accuracy and cultural attribution. Why then, would Fan Chuo mix the elements contradicting his own ethno-tribal attributions? One possible solution to this problem is that these place name elements had long been part of linguistic background of the area and represented distinct evolutions of the same morpheme.

In light of these considerations, it would seem that the toponymic evidence does indeed suggest that while there was a great ethnic diversity if the Nanzhao area, particularly along its extreme southwestern and southeastern borders, but also that there were similar linguistic practices between these groups. Here, I hope I have provided
evidence that some groups previously identified as linguistically distinct actually shared some linguistic similarities with regard to their toponymic practices. However, since the evidence is still incomplete, and furthermore, due to the very nature of the evidence at hand, we can only conclude that the toponymic evidence suggests an argument against the hypothesis that the tribal composition of 8th and 9th century Yunnan was one in which the Wuman 鳥蠻, Baiman 白蠻, Wangman 望蠻 and Mangman 茫蠻 were categories of mutually exclusive cultural and linguistic practices.
APPENDIX A

COMPARISON TABLE OF TOPOYMNIC ELEMENTS (90 B.C.E-629 C.E.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place name element occurring in many of the associated areas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPENDIX A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPARISON TABLE OF TOPOYMNIC ELEMENTS (90 B.C.E-629 C.E.)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>地名</th>
<th>望</th>
<th>了,勒,索,勒</th>
<th>那,那,拿</th>
<th>景,車,車,拿</th>
<th>弄東</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>史書 (comp. date)</td>
<td>鄧印 (黔中)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>史記 (90 B.C.E.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>漢書</td>
<td>甲夢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>前漢書 (58-76)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>華陽國志 (常璩 fl. 265-316)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>三國志 (285-297)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>後漢書 (440)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>宋書 (492-493)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>南齊書 (c.530)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>魏書 (551-554/572)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>陳書 (622-629)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>南史 (c.629)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>北史 (c.629)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX B

COMPARISON TABLE OF TOPOYMIC ELEMENTS (627 C.E-945 C.E)

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>北齊書 (627-636)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>梁書 (636)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>周書 (636)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>曹書 (648)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>陝書 (636/656)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>顗書 (862)</td>
<td>芒懸—芒天連,芒吐織,芒昌,芒盛恐,芒鮮,芒施</td>
<td>望外瑜,望苴</td>
<td>樊緯-雲南緯有大覽贄,小覽贄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>舊唐書 (941-945)</td>
<td>郎茫州 (永泰二年—安南府西界)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX C

**COMPARISON TABLE OF TOPONYMIC ELEMENTS (973 C.E-1345 C.E)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1044-1060</th>
<th>1045-1060</th>
<th>1341-1345</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>舊五代史 (973-974)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>新五代史 (1044-1060)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>新唐書 (1045-1060)</strong></td>
<td>參半</td>
<td>茫詔, 茫天連, 茫吐巖, 茫昌, 茫鮮, 茫施茫悉越 (王之名—驪國)</td>
<td>望魁(驪國部落之一) 劍望(望州) 劍望蠻</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>宋史 (1341-1345)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX D

### COMPARISON TABLE OF TOPONYMIC ELEMENTS (1369 C.E-1885 C.E)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>元史 (1369-1370)</th>
<th>芒施路, 茫施蠻, 茫施, 孟隆路, 孟隆甸土官</th>
<th>望仙坡 (南寧府)</th>
<th>路赕 (南詔, 蒙氏, 閔羅鳳立) 成伽赕 牛赕 羅共赕 大枯赕, 小枯赕 (芒市路—茫施蠻地名)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 灵南通志 (1573) | 芒市蠻夷官司: 猛密宣撫司: 猛乃, 孟廣, 猛哈, 孟木寨 孟璉長官司 (後為孟定府) 芒屋山 (車里) | 那 (田—方言, 擺夷) 難 (水—方言, 擺夷) | 大荒 (1573)
| 明史 (1679-1736) | 芒—(芒市) 孟—(孟塞) 孟—(孟印宜撫司) 邦巖.... | 望仙坡 (南寧府) | 那莫江, 南寧府; 南寧寨, 南龍寨, 隆安府; 那久地直, 那樓寨 |
| 永昌府志 (1885) | 芒—(芒市) 孟—(孟塞) 孟—(孟印宜撫司) 邦巖.... | 望仙坡 (南寧府) | 那莫江, 南寧府; 南寧寨, 南龍寨, 隆安府; 那久地直, 那樓寨 |

---

103 “城烏蠻謂之弄”，雲南通志，v. 190, p.29a.
APPENDIX E

PLACE NAMES FROM MON INSCRIPTIONS (6TH TO 16TH CENTURIES)¹⁰⁴

Toponymic elements /sim/, /mba-/ onomastic prefixes

-- Inscriptions from Pegu, 1480 or later

Mba duin mba jay
Kyak mba
Sim jra(y) mba (p)u
Sim trit mba sam
Sim mba mba na
Sim mba nan
Sim mba duin
Sim mba dyon
Sim mba (b)at
Sim mba buddhawa
Sim mba mbuliy
Sim mba y(a) b(u)
Sim mba lau
Sim mba lau ban
Sim mba luit
Sim mba sa
Sim mba samin
Sim mba sem
S(im) mba (sra) mba

Toponymic element /ban/—“village”

- Incription from the Bayinnaung Bell at Nyuang-u (Burma) 1557

Ban n(ay)
Ban d(u)n

Also /twan/—“village”
APPENDIX F

GLOSSARY OF TAI TOponymy IN MODERN DIALECTS

The following is a list of modern toponymic elements for the Tai and Shan areas of the southern Yunnan border area and neighboring areas. All data gathered from Gedney’s glossaries unless indicated otherwise.

Chiang Mai (Northern Thailand)

/baan3/, ‘village’
/ceŋ3 tay3/, ‘southeast’
/don4/, ‘forest’
/naa4/, ‘field’
/taan4/, ‘road, way’

Vientiane (Laos)

/baan3/baan6/, ‘village’
/naa4/, ‘field’
/don4/, ‘forest’
/muœŋ4/, ‘city, town’

Dehong (Southwestern Yunnan, Burmese Border area, town of Mangshi မြစ်)\textsuperscript{105}

/keŋ2/, ‘city’
/laa2 ton4/, ‘rice field’
/maan4/, ‘village’
/maŋ2 saa2/, ‘prince, king’
/men2/, ‘country, flat area’
/men2 kaan6/, ‘world’
/tse6/, ‘big town’
/tseŋ2/, ‘city’
/wenŋ2/, ‘city’

Central Tai
(Guangxi 西)

/baan3/, ‘village’

\textsuperscript{104} Data from Shorto, Mon Inscriptions, p. 301-302.
\textsuperscript{105} See Luo, A Dictionary of Dehong.
Western Nung (NE Vietnam-Muong Khuong)

/baan3/, ‘village’
/baan3 naa4 laan1/, ‘village, cluster of twenty houses’
/baan3 laan5/, ‘home village’
/ciŋ4/, ‘earthen wall’
/don2/, ‘forest’
/don2 naa4/, /thon5 naa4/, ‘area of fields’
/haan4/, ‘market place’
/hun4/, ‘king, lord’
/khaw1/, ‘mountain’
/khuu3/, ‘mountain stream’
/kum5/, ‘valley’
/loo5/, ‘road’
/lun2/, ‘village’
/lun5 khaan4/, ‘village’
/mun4/, ‘city, town’
/naa4/, ‘wet rice field’
/nam6/, ‘water’
/naaŋ5/, ‘summit’
/paa2/, ‘forest’
/poo1/, ‘mountain’
/pun1 ciŋ4/, ‘earthen wall’
/thin5 naa4/, ‘field hut’
/khaan1 mwn1/, Muong Khuong, place name
/sian4 khaan5/, Chiang Khwang, place name in Laos
/mun4/ khaan1/, Muong Khuong
/mun4/thin5 naa4/, town in NE Vietnam near Muong Khuong
/baan3 nam6 tak4/, town in Vietnam
/viat4 can4/, Vientiane, Laos
**APPENDIX G**

**BUYI 布依 TOPONYMS AND MODERN CHINESE TRANLITERATIONS**

Data from:


---

Place name components in study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buyi pronunciation in IPA with tone value</th>
<th>Chinese Graph(s) said to be representing the Buyi word</th>
<th>Pinyin romanization of the Chinese morpheme(s) with tone value</th>
<th>Meaning of Buyi word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?ban42</td>
<td>板</td>
<td>ban213</td>
<td>“village”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na31</td>
<td>納</td>
<td>na51</td>
<td>“paddy field”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lu24/lok23</td>
<td>樂，落，六</td>
<td>le51, luo35, liu51</td>
<td>“valley”, area of a large village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lon35, lun33</td>
<td>農，蒙，猛</td>
<td>Nong51, meng213, meng35</td>
<td>“remote valley” “small road”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ton24</td>
<td>董</td>
<td>Dong213</td>
<td>“paddy field dam”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pa33, pja33</td>
<td>八，巴，敗，北</td>
<td>ba, bai51, bei213</td>
<td>“crag” “rocky mountain”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>po33</td>
<td>坡</td>
<td>pu213</td>
<td>“mountain” “hill”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i35, zie42</td>
<td>者，遮，冊</td>
<td>zhe51, zhe213, ce51</td>
<td>“place of difficult access”, “market”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ta24</td>
<td>打，達</td>
<td>da213, da35</td>
<td>“river”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>si35</td>
<td>喜，許</td>
<td>xi55, xu213</td>
<td>“place”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tan31</td>
<td>譚，淡</td>
<td>tan35, dan51</td>
<td>“village”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

ANALYSIS OF TAI TOPONYMY IN FOUR SOUTHEASTERN STATES

Data from:


Gainey divided his data, the various morphemes within village names, into the following categories:

I. Geographical components
   (a) noun morphemes referring to a body of water
   (b) defined in terms of a body of water
   (c) land of relatively high elevation
   (d) refers to terms of vegetation, plant type, etc.
   (e) refers to a passageway through or over land
   (f) refers to soil make-up, soil quality

II. Non-geographical
   (a) refers to a man-made object in the context of large gatherings of people
   (b) refers to an individual
   (c) refers to plants or animals (and their parts)

III. Locative or Directional Features
    (a) noun or preposition referring to a village’s position relative to other villages
    (b) prepositions defining a village’s position in relation to geographical features

IV. Descriptive features
    (a) adjectives, adjectival verbs and verbs which modify nouns in the other categories
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