

biography says that Uriyangqadai «reached the city of Yači which is the capital (or a capital) of the Black Barbarians», «Black Barbarians» (Wu-Man) is only the Chinese equivalent of a Mongol original Qara-Ĵang (the Mongol original is shown by the use of Yači), and the sentence simply alludes to the fact that Yün-nan-fu was the second capital of the Qara-Ĵang, *i. e.* the Ta-li kingdom. Nor can the mention of the thirty-seven tribes of the Black Barbarians carry any great weight. The many Chinese texts, ranging from the Six Dynasties to the Yüan period and even later, which concern the Black and White Barbarians have not been studied critically, but amidst their sometimes conflicting statements we clearly find Black Barbarians in western Yün-nan, nay in the very country of the Čayān-Ĵang, or «White Jang», of Li-chiang, from which, in the T'ang period, according to *YS*, 61, 4*a*, the Black Barbarians had ousted the Mo and So tribes; *i. e.* the Mosso. Without being positive as to its absolute value, I think that my theory of 1904 still holds good at the present day, and at any rate it is in apparent agreement with the use of Qara-Ĵang in Polo's text where «Caragian», taken in its restricted sense, is Ta-li. To prevent all misunderstanding, I wish to add that my explanation refers only to the use of Qara-Ĵang, and is not concerned with the location of the Ts'uan tribes.

My hypothetical derivation of «Ĵang» from «Ts'uan» is open to more objection. I had not noticed in 1904, and neither CHAVANNES nor LAUFER remarked on it later, that the phonetic correspondence is not very satisfactory. Ts'uan is an ancient Ts'uan, that is to say the word was never pronounced with the sonant initial of Tib. 'Jañ or Mong. Ĵang. I think, however, that there are fairly strong historical arguments to connect «Ts'uan» with «Ĵang».

The Nan-chao kingdom was actually founded in the first half of the 8th cent. by a petty chieftain whose inherited territory was at Mêng-hua, south-east of Ta-li and south-west of Yün-nan-fu (on the «six *chao*» of Nan-chao, cf. SUZUKI in *Tōyō gakuhō*, XIX [1931], 267-282). Before this, the main power in Yün-nan had been for some centuries in the hands of the Ts'uan, and there is now no doubt that the Ts'uan were Lolo tribes. We know from literary sources that the Ts'uan had a writing of their own as early at least as the Mongol period; two inscriptions in Ts'uan characters were discovered in 1909 at Lu-ch'üan, to the north-east of Yün-nan-fu; they date from the Ming period and are in Lolo writing and Lolo language (cf. *BEFEO*, IV, 155; V, 195-197; also 丁文江 TING Wên-chiang, 爨文叢刻 *Ts'uan wên ts'ung-k'o*, I, 1936, 5, and pls. 1-4).

Of the Ts'uan we possess much earlier epigraphical monuments in Chinese. Two funerary inscriptions of Ts'uan chieftains of the region of Yün-nan-fu, dated A. D. 405 and 458 respectively, have been translated by CHAVANNES (*JA*, 1909, II, 15-41), with a very valuable commentary. In his introduction CHAVANNES says that «Ts'uan is a general term designating the people of the ethnic group which we now call Lolo; the so-called Ts'uan family existed merely as the result of the mistake of the Chinese who made of the name of the nation that of the reigning family. . . The inscriptions of 405 and 458. . . give the first mentions of the name of the Ts'uan who make their appearance in official records only *c. a. d.* 550.» There is of course a great deal of truth in CHAVANNES's statement; I think, however, that it is not absolutely correct. The *Chan-kuo ts'ê*, written before our era, refers, in the section concerning the 魏 Wei State, to a man called 爨襄 Ts'uan Hsiang (cf. CHANG Chu's *Hsing-shih hsün-yüan*, 34, 4*a-b*). All later mentions of members the Ts'uan family refer to people of the region of Yün-nan-fu. But one of them appears in the