CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 rGyalrong: the people

Defining the term ‘rGyalrong’ is fraught with difficulty. First of all, ‘rGyalrong’ is not a self appellation but a loanword from Tibetan, the term by which outsiders refer to some aspect of ‘rGyalrong-ness’. Secondly, the term can carry very different meanings, depending on whether it is defined by historical, geographical or political arguments, among other possibilities. For the purposes of this study I use the term ‘rGyalrong’ to indicate both the rGyalrong Tibetan people as defined by the present administration of the PRC and the language that a large number, but by no means all, of these people speak. With the term ‘the rGyalrong area’ I mean the area of distribution of the rGyalrong language rather than the historical or geographical entity of the traditional Eighteen Principalities.

The rGyalrong people live in the north-west corner of Sichuan Province in the People’s Republic of China (PRC), at the far eastern edge of the Tibetan plateau. The rGyalrong area consists of steep mountains intersected with deep valleys and fast-flowing rivers. As with all communities on the Tibetan plateau, rGyalrong social organisation, language and economics are a factor of geography. At lower altitudes the people farm steep sloping terraced fields growing barley, wheat and potatoes. On the high altitude grasslands semi-nomadic herders graze yak and sheep. Most people adhere to Tibetan Buddhism, with a fair sprinkling of Bon believers. The farmers speak rGyalrong. The nomads speak a variety of nomad Amdo (Ānduō) Tibetan and are usually bilingual in rGyalrong.

The rGyalrong call themselves kəruʔ, a designation traditionally used in opposition with the terms pot, ‘Tibetan’ and kəpaʔ, ‘Han Chinese’. Historically there were up to eighteen hereditary lineages of kings or chieftains. Throughout history, the number, configuration and scope of administrative reach of the principalities has varied greatly. The rGyalrong people simply called themselves ‘the people of the Eighteen Principalities’. During the Míng and Qīng dynasties the rGyalrong

---

21 The full designation is rGyal-mo tsha-wa rong, རུགམ་ཅིག་གཟུང, meaning ‘the hot valleys of the queen’. The ‘queen’ refers to mount Mòěrdùō (墨尔多, དམགར dMu-rdo), the seat of the rGyalrong protector deity.
22 I have written more extensively about rGyalrong history, culture and identity issues in earlier papers, see Prins 2002, 2007 and 2009.
23 四川, Si-khron.
24 安多, Ānduō.
25 明.
26 清.
principalities were incorporated into the tǔsī system. While the temporal authority of the rGyalrong kings derived from the Chinese emperor, their religious allegiance and cultural identification was with the Buddhist authorities in Tibet. rGyalrong identity was delineated clearly as a separate entity centred on kingship and the individual’s locality. The position on the margins, sandwiched between two behemoths to the east and west and relying on both for different aspects of life, afforded the rGyalrong a sense of independence and distinct identity as the people of the Eighteen Principalities. This status was altered radically in the 1950s after the PRC was established, with the abolition of the last remaining tǔsī. The rGyalrong lost their visibility as a separate political unit. As a result of the government’s project to make an inventory of and award minority nationality status to minority peoples living within the boundaries of the PRC they were incorporated in the newly created Tibetan nationality. Nationality status confers benefits on the group so recognised, from political representation and language recognition to economic development and preferential policies in the areas of education and family planning. In the case of the rGyalrong people, the administration of the PRC was inclined, mainly on the grounds of linguistic arguments, to grant minority nationality status. This drew protests from Tibetan scholars, who perceived it as an attempt to break up the larger Tibetan cultural entity. In the end the people of the Eighteen Principalities became Tibetans, though hyphenated ones. Within the PRC they are usually referred to as Jiāróng Zàngzú or ‘rGyalrong Tibetans’. For rGyalrong speakers, the original self appellation kəruʔ came to mean ‘Tibetan’ rather than ‘person of the Eighteen Principalities’ and is now used widely for all people belonging to the Tibetan nationality. The inclusion of the rGyalrong in the Tibetan nationality means that the rGyalrong language is not officially recognised within the PRC, that no official language development takes place and that rGyalrong is not used in any state sponsored realm of society such as education or administration.

Over the last half century or so rGyalrong society has undergone rapid change. The advent of modern society with electricity, roads, media and education has brought the outside world to what once was a relatively isolated area. After the establishment of the PRC the main source of income in the area, outside of farming and herding, was the timber industry. Decades of logging throughout the watershed of the Yangzi river caused erosion and, eventually, severe flooding downstream. In the rGyalrong area, the logging ban imposed by the national government late in the 1990s caused a collapse of the local economy. The authorities have since promoted reforestation, while trying to develop a tourist industry as an alternative source of income. Ironically, the development of the tourist industry has led to a resurgence if not a complete re-invention of rGyalrong identity. Local governments now promote the colourful rGyalrong culture, with its beautiful music and dancing, its fine skill in weaving and pottery, and its exquisite architecture. Another source of income is hydropower. Many dam-building and other infrastructure projects are underway in the rGyalrong

27 A tǔsī (司) is a hereditary local ruler whose temporal authority derived from the Chinese emperor. The tǔsī system was established under the Yuán (元) dynasty and functioned, in some areas, up to the establishment of new administrative units under the Communist Party government in the 1950s. All rGyalrong principalities were ruled by tǔsī lineages, perceived by their retainers and other subjects as kings, and addressed as such.

28 嘉戎藏族.
areas. The building of infrastructure as well as certain government policies require the removal of communities to lower altitudes or out of an area altogether. The search for jobs is a reason for rapid urbanisation as well as ongoing out-migration. Traditional community lifestyles change accordingly. People from different dialect areas, previously isolated, now frequently rub shoulders. There is also much increased language contact with Chinese, both the standard language of broadcast media and local varieties such as Sichuan dialect through in-migration of Han Chinese setting up shop in a variety of trades and in government jobs.

In traditional rGyalrong society, few people were literate. Reading and writing was commonly used only by the ruling circles and in the monasteries. rGyalrong people used an adapted form of Tibetan script to write rGyalrong. Tibetan was also the language of high prestige, which has resulted in a large number of loanwords from Tibetan. These loans predominantly occur in religious and technical terminology and as honorific forms in high register contexts. A large collection of texts has survived the upheavals of the past few decades. There are quite a few texts that are bilingual, written line by line in rGyalrong as well as in Tibetan.29 Education in state schools became compulsory after the establishment of the PRC. rGyalrong students study Chinese or, in some cases, Tibetan. Since neither language is their mother tongue, the level of education remains for the most part dismal. The students who do well in school choose to adapt to the Chinese language and culture to a large degree. Access to better jobs and economic development thus exacts a price in terms of culture and identity loss. However, recently there is once again a greater interest in the rGyalrong cultural heritage. Partly this interest is driven by the search for ‘authentic’ material to present to tourists. But there is also a desire of the people themselves to reconnect with traditional culture. One happy example is the publication of a collection of classical rGyalrong texts, with notes in Tibetan.30 There is no standardised orthography as yet.

Since the rGyalrong are part of the larger Tibetan nationality, there are no statistics available on the number of speakers of rGyalrong proper. My estimate is about 150,000. However, the number of people that consider themselves ‘rGyalrong Tibetan’, either because they live in areas historically under the administration of the rGyalrong tūsī or because recent development of tourism makes that identity appealing, is far larger.

1.2 rGyalrong: the language

rGyalrong is one of the Qiangic languages.31 F.W. Thomas was the first to propose that some languages of the Chinese south-west belong to a Sino-Tibetan subgroup which he called the ‘Hsifan
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29 A selection of classical rGyalrong texts is available online in Zänlā Āwang Cuochéng (赞拉.阿旺措成, bTshan-Iha Ngag-dbang Tshul-Khrims) and Prins 2006, at www.gyalrong.latse.org.
30 bTshan-Iha Ngag-dbang 2009.
31 Katia Chirkova’s excellent recent overview of the history and the challenges that pertain to Qiangic as a genetic unit informs the following paragraphs to a large extent (Chirkova 2011: 1-7).
group’. Others already used the term ‘Chiang’ to refer to ethnic groups spread out over a large area from north-west Sichuan down to northern Yunnan. Peter Goullart, who lived in the area in the 1940s, writes that:

“There were a number of these little-known tribes called the Tampa, Badi, Bawang, Yuetungs and Lifans stretching all the way up to Sungpan in the north. I later learned that they all belonged to a sub-race of the Burma-Tibetan stock called Chiang whose other tribes extended as far north as North Yunnan, reaching into Tibet at that end....The Chiang group of tribes had a perceptible unity in their dialects, dress, appearance and, above all, their religious rites.”

The current linguistic label ‘Qiangic’ was introduced by Sun Hongkai in the 1960s to cover the Qiāng, Pūmǐ and rGyalrong languages. Over the years more groups were added so that now the Qiangic group of what has become known as the ‘Ethnic Corridor’ of west Sichuan has thirteen members divided in a northern and a southern branch. The northern branch is phonologically and morphologically more complex and includes Qiāng, Pūmǐ, Mūyǎ, Ėrgōng, rGyalrong, Lavrung and Tangut. The southern branch, which is less complex phonologically and morphologically, and less well-researched than the northern branch, consists of Zhābā, Quēyù, Guīqióng, Ėrsū, Nàmùyì and Shīxīng. The idea of the Qiangic grouping as a genetically related subgroup within Tibeto-Burman rests on shared lexical items and typological similarities. Chirkova lists twenty characteristics, which I repeat here: (1) shared vocabulary, (2) a large number of consonant clusters, (3) large vowel and consonant inventories, (4) uvular phonemes, (5) contrast between prenasalised and plain initials, (6) three medials, i, y and u, (7) vowel harmony (mostly in the northern branch), (8) few or no consonantal codas, (9) tones, (10) reduplication as an important means of word formation, (11) singular, dual and plural distinction in nouns, (12) diminutive formation with a suffix derived from the morpheme for ‘child’ or ‘son’, (13) numeral classifiers, (14) case forms of personal pronouns, (15) dual and inclusive/exclusive forms of personal pronouns, (16) person and number agreement in verbs (in the northern branch), (17) directional prefixes (marking for geographical and topographical location), (18) reciprocal forms, (19) differentiation of existential (locative) verbs, and (20) rich inventory of case markers.

Still, the Qiangic subgroup is controversial for several reasons. First, the typologically common features mentioned in the list are also common in the non-Qiangic languages of the area. Second, there is only a small percentage of shared vocabulary between any two languages of the group. Third, there is an absence of common innovations. And finally, the geographical area occupied by

32 Thomas 1948.
33 云南.
34 Peter Goullart (1959: 21).
35 羌.
36 普米.
37 尔龚.
38 扎巴, 却域, 贵琼, 尔苏, 纳木义, and 史兴.
the Qiangic languages is historically, ethnically and linguistically very complex. For these reasons, the similarities between the Qiangic languages may be caused by diffusion rather than be genetic in nature. Katia Chirkova, who is documenting the Qiangic languages of Mùlǐ in west Sichuan, found that rather than genetic relatedness the first results of her work show such sharp contrasts between the languages under consideration that a genetic connection between them is doubtful. It is more likely that the shared features of these languages are the result of contact induced structural convergence, and that the Qiangic group should be considered an areal language group rather than a group of genetically related languages.41

For rGyalrong, the first extensive study in modern times is Lín Xiàngróng’s description of the Central rGyalrong dialect of Zhuōkèjī,42 which gives a fairly complete overview of the language.43 Lín considered rGyalrong to be a language that could be divided into three very divergent branches, which he called Western, Northern and Eastern rGyalrong. Lín’s Western rGyalrong encompasses Sún Hóngkāi’s Ěrgōng. Noting that Ěrgōng is closer related to Northern and Eastern rGyalrong than the other Qiangic languages, Jackson Sun took one step further and proposed a distinct rGyalrongic linguistic subgroup within the Qiangic branch. He notes as characteristic shared features in inflectional verb morphology glottality inversion in past stem formation, ablaut, and transitivity marking via vocalic alternation in the orientational prefixes.44 The uniqueness of the phenomena should rule out common borrowing from a non-rGyalrongic source like Tibetan. Sun’s rGyalrongic tree has three branches. One is called Horpa-Shàngzhài and contains two varieties, Horpa and Shàngzhài.45 The second branch is Lavrun, and the third is rGyalrong proper. At present, the Horpa-Shàngzhài group is under debate by Suzuki as well as Jesse Gates who maintain that the Horpa-Shàngzhài complex actually consists of several languages.46 Gates thinks there may be as many as four and proposes the name ‘Western rGyalrongic’ for this cluster. Lavrun, the second branch of rGyalrongic, is widely accepted in academia and has recently been described by Huáng Bùfán.47 The third branch of the tree, rGyalrong proper, in Sun’s proposal is subdivided in three varieties, West (Sìdàbà),48 North (Chábǎo)49 and East (Sìtǔ).50 Jackson Sun has written extensively on the Western group51 and Guillaume Jacques continues to research the Northern varieties.52 The

40 木里, ཁོང་མི་Mi-li.
41 Chirkova 2011: 7-9, 14, 22.
42 桌克基, ཡུག་ཏོག་Cog-tse.
43 Lín Xiàngróng 1993.
44 Sun 2000a.
45 上寨, སྦོད་སྦེ་sTod-sde.
46 Suzuki 2010; Gates 2011.
47 Huáng Bùfán (黄布凡) 2007.
48 四大坝, སྦོད་པ་sTod-pa.
49 茶堡, རྡོ་ནག་Ja-phug.
50 四土.
51 Sun2004, 2005 and 2007, to mention just a few.
52 See for example Xiàng Bólín (向柏霖, Jacques) 2008.
most recent descriptions on the Eastern dialects include work by Nagano, Lín Xiàngrónɡ and Lín You-Jing on Zhuōkèjī. The dialect group which I describe in this study centres on the township of Jiāomùzú and also belongs to Sun’s Eastern rGyalrong.

The designation of rGyalrongic languages and different varieties within them is a cause for much debate. Mostly scholars use geographical names in transcriptions either from Chinese or Tibetan. Occasionally a term that is more historically based finds its way into the nomenclature. The terminology so far is confusing at best. In this study I use a simple three-fold naming scheme to cover rGyalrong proper. Based on my own survey of rGyalrong and rGyalrongic varieties in the 1990s as well as on more recent data from an extensive rGyalrong survey undertaken by Professor Nagano that is still ongoing, I divide rGyalrong into Northern, Central and Southern.

---

54 Prins 1997, unpublished.
55 The Nagano survey covers all of the rGyalrong speaking areas as well as quite a few varieties of other rGyalrongic languages. At present I am the field manager for part of the survey.
56 The Northern group as defined in this study consists of a North-Western branch which is centred on Rìbù (日部,  ngang-rDzong-'bur) Township of Māěrkāng (马尔康, ‘Bar-khams) County and a North-Eastern branch centred on Lóngěrjiǎ (龙尔甲, gDong-rgyad) Township in Māěrkāng County. The North-Western dialects are spoken in Rìbù, Cǎodēng (草登, Tsho-bdun) and Kāngshān (康山, mKar-gsar) Townships of Māěrkāng County, and parts of Shílǐ (石里, Si-li) Township of Rǎngtáng (壤塘, ‘Dzam-thang). These townships are all in Ābà Prefecture. North-Western rGyalrong is also spoken in Gēlètuó (歌乐沱, Go-la-thang) Township of Sèdá (色达, gSer-thar) County of Gānzī (甘孜, dKar-mDzes) Prefecture. North-Eastern is spoken in Lóngěrjiǎ, Shāěr (沙尔, gSar-rdzong) and Dàzàng (大藏, Da-tshang) Townships of Māěrkāng County.

Central rGyalrong is spoken in the Māěrkāng County townships of Báiwān (白湾, brag-bar), Dāngbà (党坝, Dam-pa), Sōnggāng (松岗, rDzong-'gag), Bēnzhēn (本真, Pin-cin), Zhuōkèjī, Suōmō (梭磨, So-mang), and Jiāomùzú, the eastern part of Jīnchuān (金川, Chu-chen) County, part of Xiǎojīn (小金, bTsan-lha) County, in the western part of Lǐ (里, Lis) County, in Shāshíduō (沙石多, Sa-stod) and Lǚhuāzhèng (芦花镇, rDo-kha-kren) Townships of Hēishuǐ (黑水, Khro-chu) County and part of Baǒxìng (宝兴) County.

Southern rGyalrong is spoken in the eastern part of Jīnchuān County, parts of Lǐ County, and Bādǐ (巴底, Brag-steng) Township, Tāipíngqiáo (太平桥) Township and part of Bānhshānmén (半扇门) Township in Dānbā (丹巴, Rong-brag) County of Gānzī Prefecture. The exact boundaries between Central and Southern rGyalrong remain to be determined.
Phonological as well as morphological differences support this division. For one thing, the Northern group has uvular consonants, while these are lacking in Central rGyalrong. In my terminology Northern encompasses Sun’s Western and Northern groups. In light of the divergence between the Northern varieties I sub-divide them into North-Eastern and North-Western dialects. Central rGyalrong includes what Sun calls East or Sitū. So far researchers have not seen the need to distinguish a Southern group within rGyalrong proper. But preliminary results from the Nagano survey show a number of southern varieties to have tonal systems that significantly differ from anything presented by the Central or Northern groups. On a synchronic level at least I think there is enough reason to propose this third grouping. However, at the moment only raw data is available. The exact groupings within rGyalrong proper, as well as consensus on what to call them, will only emerge after much more careful analysis. For now, the most up to date overview of rGyalrongic languages, their geographic positions and the groupings within them can be found on www.sichuanzoulang.com, a website dedicated to the Tibeto-Burman languages of western Sichuān.57

1.3 Jiāomùzú and its dialects

This study is a descriptive grammar of the dialects spoken in Jiāomùzú Township.58 The name derives from rGyalrong comeco, meaning ‘flat place in the middle of the valley’.59 Jiāomùzú is indeed beautifully situated on wide banks along the Jiāomùzú river in central Māěrkāng County. The broad lands close to the river provide fertile ground for farming and harvests are plentiful. The Township consists of twelve villages and settlements. Each village in its turn consists of one or more hamlets. Eleven of the villages are in farmers’ areas. The twelfth settlement is on the high altitude grasslands. About 4000 people live in the township, divided into some 900 families. Of these, about 3500 people are Tibetan, the rest is Han Chinese. The Tibetan population is mostly engaged in agriculture and related occupations, while most of the Chinese hold government jobs or run small shops and restaurants. The administrative centre of the township is the village of Jiāomùzú. The local authorities have their offices here. There is also a bank, a post office, a small clinic and a boarding school which educates through to sixth grade of primary school. One or two shops stock necessities such as rubber boots, batteries, liquor and candles. A restaurant with an open air teahouse provides a place to exchange news and gossip. A minibus provides transportation once a day, if conditions are good, from the

57 The website is maintained by David Gatehouse and receives regular updates from scholars working on a variety of Qiangic languages.
59 Māěrkāng Dimínglù: 89.
The Jiəmùzú township centre to the administrative seat of Mǎěrkāng County, a few hours by bus to the south.

The outlying villages are dispersed on both sides of the river over an area of about 400 square kilometers. Some communities are high up in the hills, others are tucked away far into smaller valleys that branch off of the main river valley. In the past, the only way of travel between villages and communities was on foot along steep, winding paths that cling to the hill sides. Over the last decade or so roads have been built that are passable at least for tractors most of the year. Some of the roads along the river are accessible for cars throughout the year.

Electricity came to Jiəmùzú in the 1980s. But the steepness of the mountains blocked TV reception, so that watching TV only became possible around the turn of the century, with the introduction of satellite dishes.

Each village used to have a village school for primary level grades one through three or four. Recently the village schools have been closed in favour of educating all children in one centrally located primary school. The children board during the week and go home in the weekends. After primary school the children move to the county seat of Mǎěrkāng, a few hours down the road by bus, for further education. Education is compulsory, though compliance can be patchy. All children now learn Chinese in school. Access to media such as TV also exposes older monolingual generations to Chinese. Though many older rGyalrong speakers remain monolingual and rGyalrong remains the preferred language of communication in the home and the community, Chinese is the language of wider communication outside of the home valley.

The people of the valleys speak jirpeskaʔt, ‘the language of our place’, which is the language described in this study. They are farmers who plant highland barley, potatoes, corn and wheat. They usually also keep a couple of pigs and a cow or two for milk. The herders of the high altitude grasslands live in permanent housing in winter but are up in the high pastures with their yaks and sheep during the summer months. They speak mbrokpeskaʔt or ‘nomad speech’, a variety of nomad Amdo Tibetan. Most herders are bilingual in rGyalrong and Amdo. Their variety of rGyalrong however tends to show influence of Tibetan in phonology as well as in grammar. Many of the nomadic herders simplify or even muddle the complex rGyalrong pronominal and person and number system, and are therefore often laughed at by the farmers of the valleys.

I came to Jiəmùzú for the first time in the early 1990s and have visited regularly ever since. My work on the Jiəmùzú dialects was not part of a regular research program with set times for gathering field data. I just learned what I could from friends and colleagues, both while spending time in Jiəmùzú and in Chéngdū, the capital of Sìchuān where I live, and in any other location where I met rGyalrong people. The data in this study therefore are not limited to one or two native speakers but cover speech varieties from several locations in Jiəmùzú. The Jiəmùzú varieties are different enough from one another for local people to be able to identify a speaker’s village from his speech, though the differences do not hinder communication. The variations are mainly phonetic and lexical in nature. For example, the Kǒnglóng people say wupʰaj for ‘towards’, while Pàěrbā uses wumbaj. The verb kano means either ‘dare’ or ‘drive livestock’ in Kǒnglóng, but the Pàěrbā people only have one meaning for it, namely ‘drive livestock’. I have not found any significant variations in the morphology of the Jiəmùzú dialects, which makes me confident that the description as presented in this study is broadly accurate for the township. The majority of the data used in this
study comes from the farming communities of Kǒnglóng, Păerbā and Pūzhi, complemented by material from the Jiāomùzú Múchăng,\textsuperscript{60} the high altitude grasslands settlement. In traditional rGyalrong society the people had firm views about their own place in history, in their local environment and in the world at large. They based these views on the careful observation and analysis of temporal and geographical relationships between themselves, their communities and all other persons and entities in their world. The findings were passed on to following generations, often through contextualised teaching moments, which explicitly built a secure identity centered on the home place and community. Though the rGyalrong world has changed significantly over the last fifty or sixty years, the same careful observation of different entities and a fascination with the relationships between them remains. The all-important web of relations finds expression in the Jiāomùzú dialects in highly sophisticated systems of marking that encompass geographical direction, relative emotional distance between a speaker and an object, different categories of sentient beings, and precise semantic distinctions to clarify the actions, attitudes and relations of speakers and others in a given context. It is this intricate complexity of marking, and the web of relations that is foundational to it, that gives this book its name.

\textsuperscript{60} 脚木足牧场, Kyom-kyo rtswa-thang.