NOTES

1. A Note on the Reverend Father Savina

Elsewhere in this number Major Erik Seidenfaden contributes a review of Professor Okada's book on the Li tribes of Hainan Island. Major Seidenfaden has also written the following note regarding the Reverend Father Savina who once lived on Hainan Island and wrote among other things a Monographie de Hainan:

The late Reverend Father F.M. Savina lived in Hainan for more than four years (1924-1928) and, like Steubel, travelled widely, visiting several of the Li tribes. We have not been able to obtain or read Fr. Savina's Monographie de Hainan, and the following is mainly based on a review written by the distinguished French orientalist M. Paul Mus.(1) Hainan is mentioned by ancient Chinese writers as being peopled by the "Barbarian" Li (the "boiled" and the "raw" Li). For example Ma Tuan Li in the 13th century A.D. speaks about the tattooed Li and the petrified crabs of the island. In the 12th century certain Chinese writers remarked that the Chinese settlers, transplanted among the Li of Hainan, were of the worst possible sort. In our days their quality is not too good either. Their communistic potroilouses boast of having set fire to thousands of houses and burned alive an equal number of human beings, according to Fr. Savina writing in 1928. Are they better now?

In his monograph Fr. Savina supplies much interesting information about the customs and manners of the Li tribes. In 1928 the population of Hainan numbered more than two millions divided into three main groups, viz: the Chinese Hok-lo, one and one-half million; the Ong Beor Bue, a Thai people, 400,000 strong, and the so-called autochthonous Hiao-ao or Day (plus the Li, Lai and Loi) estimated at about 200,000. Add to these some 50,000 Maow or Miao people, descendants of soldiers brought from the mainland to the island by the Chinese. The Hok-lo occupy the northeastern part and all the coast line, the Ong Bue the north-

western and the Li tribes the central parts of the island, while the Mao live in the hills. (Hainan is very hilly; its highest mountain, called The Five Dragon Peaks, reaches an altitude of 1970 metres.) Fr. Savina also mentions some Malay settlements on the coast. (Are they not descendants of former Cham colonists?) The Indonesians of Hainan call themselves Hiao in the centre and Dai in the southern part (Li and Lai in the southwestern part) and these groups speak different dialects. (This nomenclature for these people is different from that of Steubel.)

Fr. Savina also relates the myth according to which the Hiao--Dai are the descendants of a dog and a princess. Hiao women still tattoo their faces in memory of their ancestress who did so in order to deceive her son into marrying her after he had unwittingly killed his own father, the dog. As pointed out in the writer’s Un ancêtre de tribu: le chien’ the Man or Yao possess exactly the same tale which, as Mus says, goes to prove a former near contact of the Yao with the Li somewhere in South China. A dead Hiao is interred in a tree trunk hollowed out like a canoe. It will be remembered that on the famous bronze drums from Dongson in Annam are seen pictures of the dead being sailed to the happy isles in canoes. The Hiao also build their houses on poles in the shape of an upturned boat.

Some persons who wrote about the autochthons of Hainan have given to them a number of various names such as Lai, Le, Lai, Lao, Dia, Li and many more. In this matter, Fr. Savina, a real polyglot who was able to converse with the natives in their own tongue, seems to be the best guide. Mus says, after a profound examination of the vocabularies prepared by Fr. Savina, that the Dai or Li language contains many Thai elements while the Chinese are all loans from South Chinese; and adds that more than one-third of the words are of an unknown origin. (Possibly some of the Thai elements are due to the influence of the Ong Bae who in an economic sense dominate a large portion of Die; the Chinese words may have all come from the Hok-lo.) The great mass of words which to Mus present a “mystery” (Strzoda Dai Li) must belong to the original language of this people which Paul Benedict
includes in his Kadai group. According to the researches of Benedict the Kadai languages seem to constitute a bridge between the Thai and Indonesian languages.

As regards the name Dai it is synonymous with Tai or Thai, says Professor Coedès, and it was probably adopted by the Tai prior to the separation of the three linguistically and ethnologically closely allied groups of the Thai, Kadai and Indonesians somewhere in Yunnan more than 3,000 years ago. Whether Doi or Dioi, as mentioned by Mus, is a form of Dai (which is most likely) we shall not discuss here. Doi means a hill in Northern Siamese language; Siam (pronounced Seeam) does mean the Western Hills, and was not Shen-si (Siem-sai) the original country of the Thai?

Fr. Savina has published in the Bulletin de l’Ecole Française d’Extrême-Orient a “Lexique Day Français”, accompanied by a small French-Day dictionary as well as a comparative table of the two Day dialects, preceded by some remarks on the syntax, grammar and the numerals of the Day. A rapid survey of Fr. Savina’s dictionaries shows the presence of many Thai words. The dialect as spoken by the Li group studied by Prof. Okada seems to differ much from those spoken by the Day. The late Father Savina was no doubt one of the foremost linguists of Indochina and South China, and his works on the languages of these parts are generally admitted to be of a superior quality. The dictionary of the Thai Ong Bae language, also compiled by Fr. Savina, has not yet been published but, if memory serves right, some Thai Ong Bae (what is their true Thai name?) more than twenty years ago visited Bangkok where the late General Prince Kamrob, at that time Director-General of the Police, succeeded with some difficulty in understanding them and conversing with them.

Sorgenfri, Denmark,
January 1952.

(2) Vide P.B. “Thai, Kadai and Indonesian, a New Alignment in Southeast Asia” op cit.

II. Ethnic Groups of Northern Southeast Asia

The above work is a gazetteer of the various ethnic groups of the northern parts of Southeast Asia, embracing those peopling Northern Burma, Northern Siam, Northern Indochina and South China. This tribal gazetteer runs to 175 pages in the text, including a very useful name index, and is provided with a large well executed and instructive map where the habitats of the different ethnic groups are marked in colours. Altogether it is a very meritorious piece of work that will fill a gap long felt in the tribal cartography of these regions, a gap which has hitherto made difficult any general survey of the habitats of that variegated multitude of human beings peopling this Southeast Asian Caucasus. The contents of the book were prepared by Mr. William L. Thomas Jr., as Associate Project Director, with the late Prof. John F. Embree as the Project Director, both of the Faculty of the Southeast Asia Studies, Yale University.

In the preface it is said that good source materials on the peoples of mainland Southeast Asia are scarce and often out of date though in the latter case there are some books, such as Davie's "Yunnan", Graham's "Siam, a Handbook", and Dignet's "Les Montagnards du Tonkin" which are still useful. We would add Lajonquière's "Ethnographie du Tonkin Septentrional"; Sir George Scotts' and Hardiman's "Gazetteer of Upper Burma and the Shan States" as well as the former's "Burma and Beyond", all because of their detailed descriptions of the various tribal costumes.

The authors say in the preface that the classification of the ethnic groups is primarily based on linguistic affiliation and, in some cases, on other cultural criteria. A linguistic classification is not sufficient for the ultimate definition of any human group unless accompanied by an anthropological one. However, anthropometric measurements of the inhabitants of the areas surveyed have, so far, only been undertaken in a few localities, recently in Tonkin by Dr. Maneffe and Bezacier for instance. Thorough anthropometric measurements of all the ethnic groups included in this gazetteer might well give cause for a somewhat altered classification of them.
Quite a number of people have assisted in assembling the material for the ethnological map, as well as for the gazetteer itself. Among those assisting was Mrs. Allison Butler Mathews, who compiled the material on Thailand and the various other Thai peoples. These data were supplemented by information from several leading authorities with first-hand knowledge of the areas in question, thus in the case of Siam from Mr. Deignan, Dr. Kenneth Wells and the undersigned. Besides this, native informants (Burmese, Chin, Thai, Vietnamese and Chinese, some of them studying in the United States of America) have also lent a helping hand in making the information as complete and up-to-date as possible. Both the admirable “Bulletin de l’Ecole Franaise d’Extème-Orient” and issues of the Journal of the Siam Society and Journal of the Burma Research Society have of course yielded valuable material for the gazetteer too. The Ecole Franaise d’Extème-Orient’s ethno-linguistic map of French Indochina, as well as that of Assam by J.P. Mills, has been used as a base for the map of the gazetteer. As regards North Burma (the Shan States) and North Thailand no quite reliable maps exist as yet, still by help of local informants it has been possible to complete the map. In the case of South China so far the only good map is the old one of General Davies, and it covers only Yunnan and portions of the adjoining territories.

A praiseworthy step is the effort made to clarify the various tribal names. Much confusion exists here partly because of the various spellings (or mis-spellings) of European writers, partly because of the misnomers given so many tribes by their neighbours. The Chinese are the worst to dub all non-Chinese with the most impolite or even insulting nicknames. Thus the Thai of South China are called Pai-yi (barbarians); the Yao of Tonkin are called Man; the Mhong are dubbed Min and so on. The numerous primitive Indonesian or Mon-Khmer tribes living in the backlands of Laos and Vietnam are called Khâ and Moï respectively which names mean slaves. The data concerning the various tribes cover the following main topics: location, population, village sites, economy, language (including dialects), religion, contacts and names.
In the preface it is stated expressly that these data are not intended for culture summaries but rather as identifying features. For further data on any group the student is referred to the “Bibliography of the Mainland Southeast Asia”, published by the Yale Southeast Asia studies.

The authors state that in general the peoples of the area surveyed fall into a number of major groups, viz: 1. “Indonesoid”, 2. Mongoloid mountaineers, 3. Various major national groups speaking tonal languages, such as Burmese, Thai, Vietnamese and Yunnan Chinese. As regards group 1, “the Indonesoid”, this seems a somewhat vague term. For example, while some, like the Mường, the proto-Vietnamese of Thanh-hoa, as well as some of the eastern Môi (Rhaê, etc.) are Indonesians, other Môi or Khâ in this jungle-covered Annamite Cordillera land are Môn-Khmer (the western and southern groups). The Indonesians most probably preceded the Môn-Khmer; however, the latter were themselves preceded by several waves of Negritos, Melanesians and Australoids (Weddids too) if one is to judge from the skeletal remains found by Mansui and Mlle. Colani in the limestone caves in the North Annam.

The gazetteer states, “In some areas Khâ are simply hill people of Thai culture and ethnic affiliation.” Do the authors have in mind the Thai Loi or Kengtung? These Tai Loi have adopted Thai culture and Buddhism but ethnically they are Môn-Khmer. A similar change has made the Lawa of North Siam into Thai to the extent that they have forgotten their mother tongue.

If Paul Benedict's theory of a Thai, Kadai and Indonesian alignment(1) should be accepted, and much speaks in its favour, the Thai would, once and for all, be detached from any Sino-Tibetan-Burmese tonal and monosyllabic linguistic groups. (Was Tai not originally non-tonic and polysyllabic?) Examination of the blood groups both Thai and the Vietnamese (so far only in Tongkin) has shown that they are nearer to Indonesians than to the Mongoloids.

However, no human groups of “pure” blood exist. As the Swedish anthropologist Dr. Rolf Nordenström of Upsala said at the meeting of the 2nd International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences in Copenhagen (August, 1938): “Man is of many stemmed origin and cross-bred since the oldest times... There are no originally pure races nor have there ever been.” In his valuable work “Lamet, Hill Peasants in French Indochina” Dr. Izikowitz says that the Lamet resemble the Malay type, and that their resemblance to several Filipino tribes in Luzon is striking but also that there are Weddid types with fine features, large eyes and wavy hair among them. Still the Lamet speak a Mon-Khmer tongue (Wa-Paluang). One should, however, think that in their veins flows also blood of the Mon-Khmer since these (coming from India) swept over the Indonesian people of Further India less than 2,000 years before Christ. As regards the information concerning the ethnic groups of the four geographical sections into which the gazetteer is divided, this seems to be uniformly good and reliable with some exceptions which we shall treat below.

P. 12: the Akha or Kê at Phongsaly in the kingdom of Laos are called Phu Noi (small people) but dress and live like the other Akha.

P. 16: the Chin. The late Mr. F.H. Giles (whose Siamese title was Phya Indra Montri), from his long years of service in Burma knew the Chin well and used to say that Chin is a Burmese mis-pronunciation, their proper name being Chang.(2)

P. 27: the Hpon in the upper defile of the Irrawadi river. It is curious that the Thai elephant hunters of Chaiyaphum province in Northeast Siam are also called so. Could the explanation be that the Hpon of Burma received this name from the Shans (Thai-Yai) when these ruled Burma from 1287 to 1531?

P. 42: the domestic bison (*bos frontalis*), called *mithan*, is not a bison but a *gaur*. In the whole of Asia bison are only found in the Caucasus.

P. 50: economy of the Shans. The word *hai* (for wood clearing cultures) is synonymous with *rai* in Siamese, and does not mean "to cry" (*ronghai* in Siamese). The words for "to cry" and for cultivated wood clearing are spelt differently and pronounced with different tones. Thus a wood clearing is ใ๑ (Siam ใ๑), while for crying it is ใ๑.

P. 52: the meaning of the word *Tai* or Thai. I do not think that *Tai* is derived from the Chinese *Ta*—Great but from *Dai* (in *Kadai*) which name Coedès says is synonymous with *Tai* and Thai.\(^3\) It seems to mean "the Free".

P. 63: French Roman Catholic Mission. Among the Lao of Northeast Siam there are about 25,000 converts. Altogether there should be about a hundred thousand Christians in Siam (80,000 Catholics and 20,000 Protestants) of which, however, only half are Thai, the remainder being Chinese and Vietnamese.

P. 70: the *Chaobon* or *Nia-kuol* are not living in the southeastern but in the western and southwestern section of the Khorat plateau.

P. 80 *La*nλί: their proper name, and that by which they call themselves, is *Laviia*. The *Chaobon* or *Nia-kuol* do not call themselves *La*nλί which name was given them officially, and wrongly, by the Government authorities.

P. 87, *Me*n: The late Reverend Father Savina, an excellent connoisseur of their language and their culture, says that the *Me*n tribes in Upper Laos, as known personally

\(^3\) Vide G. Coedès "Les langues de l'Indochine", 1948.
to him, possess certain Old Testament beliefs and that in fact they are Monotheists. This is denied by Bernatzik who, however, only knows the *Mee* of Northeastern Siam.

P. 92. Anonymous "Report of the Botanical Section of the Ministry of Commerce": the author is the late Dr. A. F.G. Kerr.

P. 101, *Hakka*: These people were originally Thai though they deny it. There are still some Thai-speaking *Hakka* in Northeastern Kwangtung.

P. 102, *Khà (Moi)*: to include the *Phu Noi* into the *Khia* group is wrong as the *Phu Noi* are Mongol *Akhu* or *Kò*.

P. 104: to the bibliography on this page should now be added Izikowitz's "*Lumel, Hill Peasants in French Indochina*.”

P. 107, second line from the bottom: Read Sip Song Panna for Sip Long Panna.

P. 111: to the bibliography should be added E. Seidenfaden "*Un ancêtre de tribu : le chien*", Bulletin de l'Institut Indochinois pour l'étude de l'homme, Vol. VI.

P. 116, Laotian Thai: This paragraph needs some clarification. The *Lū* are domiciled at the upper course of Nam U and in the former principality of Mang Sing. The Thai-(or Lao)-*Yuan* inhabit Northern Siam with some communities in Kengtung and in the former district of Honei Sai. The Thai, or Lao, around Luang Phrabang are not *Yuan* but so-called Lao *Sau Sau-Chava*, one of Luang Phrabang's old names.

In Siamese Laos, i.e. the provinces of Nakhon Phanom and Sakon Nakhon, there is a considerable population of *Nho* or *Yò Thai*. 
The name of the capital of the new Kingdom of Laos should be spelt Wiengchan (dr) and not as the French do (Vientiane).

P. 116: The Eastern Lao characters are called *doa thum* and are derived, like the Siamese, from the old Khmer-Indian alphabet while those of the *Yuan*, at first identical with the Sukhothai script of famous King Ramakhamheng, are derived from the Burmese (really *Môn*) cursive letters.

P. 177: *Khôm* (not *Kawn*) are the *Khmer* letters used in the liturgies (written on strips of palm leaves) sung by the Siamese monks.

P. 120: Lao *phung khao* do tattoo their thighs but have white bellies. *Lu*, *Lou*. The name of this Thai people should be pronounced *Lü* or *Leu*.

P. 121, Thai *Nūa*: the second word does not mean superior but northern Thai. *Yuan*, *Yuen*, *Yun*, *Eun*, *Phu Eun*: the latter two words have nothing to do with the Thai *Yuan* but are synonymous with *Phuan* or *Phuen*, the inhabitants of Chiang Kwang (wrongly called Tranh-ninh), a province of the Kingdom of Laos.

P. 123, Tribal *Tai*: the name of the white *Tai* chief was *Deo-van-tri*, not *Dia-van-tri*. The Thai of Tongkin were, prior to the communist rebellion, united in a Federated Thai State with their national flag and national hymn.

P. 128, The Vietnamese: They are probably *au fond* Indonesians (blood groups); their language has in part *Môn-Khmer* roots, and its syntax and tonal system is Thai-influenced. There are many Chinese loan words in it too.
P. 156, Tai Chung-chia: the latter word is Chinese. These Tai call themselves Dioy or Dioi, a variant of Dai. Tai Chawng seems to be identical with Chung-chia, while Tai Yong is a variant of Dioi.

That the above corrections and additions should be made does not of course detract from the general value of this extremely useful work which should be found on the book shelves of every student of any of the ethnic groups of Northern or Southern Southeast Asia. Its appearance means a real step forward in our approach to a deepened insight into the origins, habitats, languages and cultures of these fascinating peoples.

It might be a good idea now to re-arrange the information given here and master the ethnic groups not in geographical order but according to the ethnic relations, and to include the groups of Southern Southeast Asia too. May one hope to see such a work carried out by that band of enthusiastic and diligent collaborators who so successfully have produced the survey described here!

Erik Seidenfaden.

Sorgenfri, Danmark,
February 1952.