



# 人類學 在台灣的發展

回顧與展望篇

徐正光 黃應貴 主編

中央研究院民族學研究所

# 人類學 在台灣的發展

回顧與展望篇

徐正光 黃應貴 主編

中央研究院民族學研究所

國家圖書館出版品預行編目資料

人類學在台灣的發展：回顧與展望篇／徐正光、  
黃應貴主編．- 初版．- 台北市：中研院民族所，  
民 88

面： 公分

ISBN 957-671-666-7 (精裝)．ISBN 957-671-  
667-5 (平裝)

1. 文化人類學 — 論文，講詞等 2. 民族學 — 論文，  
講詞等

541.307

88012966

## 人類學在台灣的發展：回顧與展望篇

主 編：徐正光 黃應貴

出版者：中央研究院民族學研究所

發行者：中央研究院民族學研究所

台北市南港區研究院路 2 段 128 號

排版者：天翼電腦排版印刷股份有限公司

電話：(02)2705-4251

定 價：新台幣 350 元(平裝)

新台幣 400 元(精裝)

初 版：中華民國八十八年九月

GPN 50952988015

ISBN 957-671-666-7 (精裝)

ISBN 957-671-667-5 (平裝)

# 序

1995 年 9 月 19-20 本所爲了慶祝成立四十週年舉辦了系列的活動，同時爲了讓週年慶的活動更具有積極性的意義，我們將當時原擬於次年舉辦的「人類學在台灣的發展」學術研討會亦列爲四十週年慶的後續活動之一。此一研討會的主要構想是邀請曾在台灣從事人類學研究的國內外學者撰寫論文，借以檢討人類學這個學術領域在台灣走過的道路，以便作爲本所規劃未來發展方向的參考。

人類學在台灣的发展大致可以分爲下列幾個階段，第一個階段是日治時期，日本學者或與日本統治政策相關的研究者留下了豐富的研究成果與調查資料。第二階段是以戰後從大陸來台的人類學者對於台灣南島族群的研究貢獻。第三個時期是結合美歐（特別是美國）與國內學者以中國社會研究模型所作的台灣漢人社會研究。第四個時期則是 1980 年代末期以來，研究主題與對象更爲繁複多樣的時期。對於這四個時期的簡單回顧，可以發現人類學在台灣的發展，在研究課題與研究對象上，一方面受到國際人類學思潮的影響，同時也可以看出在不同的台灣歷史階段人類學發展的處境、條件與特徵。關於這些研究趨勢，除了反映在研討會發表的論文外，李亦園教授的大會專題演講以及黃應貴先生的導論都作了扼要的回顧與評論。

我們將研討會的論文依其性質分爲兩輯出版。第一輯爲「回顧與展望篇」，共包括 11 篇論文，內容主要針對日治時期及戰後時期人類學者對於台灣南島族群、漢人社會以及中國少數民族研究的回顧與檢討。本輯由黃應貴先生負責編輯並撰寫導言。第二輯爲「經驗研究篇」，由 12 篇論文組成，內容涵蓋傳統人類學研究的一些重要主題（例如家

族、宗族、宗教與儀式）以及一些新的領域，例如女性問題與夜市的研究。本輯由林美容女士負責編輯。

從上述兩輯的內容來看，雖然大致反映了人類學在台灣的发展狀況，但因在研討會籌備時並未就特定的主題邀請特定學者撰寫論文，所以這兩輯論文並未能完整呈現人類學在台灣的发展全貌。所幸，李亦園教授的專題演講及兩位編者的導言都作了補充，可以讓讀者進一步瞭解。在內容的編排上，我們將李亦園教授的大會專題演講“The Studies of Anthropology in Taiwan: A Personal View”放在論文集的前頭，除了作為台灣人類學發展的導讀文獻外，也表達我們對李教授在推展台灣人類學所作的卓越貢獻的崇仰之意。

最後，我要代表民族學研究所向來自國內外的論文作者及所有參與會議的人士表達感謝之意。對於協助研討會舉辦與本書出版的同仁亦在此併致謝忱。



序於中央研究院民族學研究所

# 目 錄

序 .....	i
---------	---

## 專題演講

The Studies of Anthropology in Taiwan: A Personal View.....	Yih-yuan Li 1
--	---------------

## 會議論文：回顧與展望

導論：幾個有關人類學在台灣之發展的議題 .....	黃應貴 25
---------------------------	--------

## 會議論文

戰後台灣人類學對於台灣南島民族研究的 回顧與展望 .....	黃應貴 59
平埔族的人類學研究 .....	葉春榮 91
日本對台灣原住民族宗教的研究取向： 殖民地時期官學並行傳統的形成與糾葛 .....	黃智慧 143
傳統主義、反傳統主義與台灣人類學的發展 ....	黃樹民 197

Lessons from the Golden Age of “China” Ethnography .....	Steven Harrell	211
The Pressure of Contemporaneity:		
A Personal View of Insiders and Outsiders in the Politics of “Cultural” Anthropology in Taiwan .....	Stephan Feuchtwang	241
台灣地區近五十年來的中國西南民族史研究 ....	王明珂	281
類含與全述／典型與異型：		
芮氏中國民族誌的半世紀 .....	謝世忠	319
從中國少數民族研究的幾個個案談		
「己」與「異己」的關係 .....	何翠萍	357
近五十年來台灣藏族史研究 .....	林冠群	405
編著者簡介 .....		452

# The Studies of Anthropology in Taiwan: A Personal View

Yih-yuan Li

*Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica*

## I. Introduction

A number of review articles on the anthropological research and teaching in Taiwan have been published during the last five years. These are:

Hsu, Mutsu

- 1993 A Brief Overview of Anthropological Studies in Taiwan, *Bulletin of the Institute of Nationality Studies, National Cheng-Chi University*, No.20.

Li, Yih-yuan

- 1993 From Ethnography to Social Anthropology: Notes on the Development of the Anthropological Research in Taiwan, *Tsing-hua Journal of Chinese Studies*, Vol. XXIII, No.4.

Huang, Ying-kuei

- 1995 Anthropology and the Society of Taiwan. *Symposium on Methods for Analyzing a Society*, Pintung: National Pintung Teacher's College.



Tsui, Elaine Yi-lan

- 1996 The Development of Anthropology in Taiwan: Inspecting and Perspecting, Report to the National Science Council. (Manuscript)

Chiao, Chien

- 1996 Anthropological Researches in Taiwan: Evaluation and Recommendation, Report to the National Science Council. (Manuscript)

Li, Yih-yuan

- 1997 Department of Anthropology, NTU and the Development of Anthropological Studies and Teachings in Taiwan, Memories Lecture to Dr. Li Chi's 100th Birthday. *BDAA*, No.51.

If we add to this list previously published articles on the history and development of anthropological studies in Taiwan, there will be many more (e.g., Li 1971; Tang 1976; Chen Chi-lu 1978, 1989; Huang 1984; and Chen Chi-nan 1985).

There are a few reasons why I am writing this seemingly one too many article on this topic: first of all, as a keynote in a conference on "The Development of Anthropology in Taiwan", it seems only appropriate to do a retrospective and prospective summary of the subject. Secondly, aside from the 1989 article by Professor Chen Chi-lu, the afore-mentioned articles are all written in Chinese. In an international conference like this one, it seems appropriate to provide an English keynote for our foreign colleagues. Another reason is: personally, I have been with the Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica and the Department of Anthropology, NTU for over forty years, starting right from the establishment of both institutes. After forty years of participation and observation, I do

have some personal views and insights that may differ from those of other scholars. Thus, I believe it is worthwhile to share these views with you all.

Of course, there is a limit to how far I can go in this review. Scientific anthropological research in Taiwan can be traced to the end of last century. For instance, the famous Japanese scholar Ryuzo Torii in 1896 began field investigation on the Taiwan Aborigines, an incident widely considered to be the beginning of scientific anthropological study in Taiwan. After that, Japanese scholars did quite a bit of archaeological and ethnological works and thus laid a good foundation for anthropological studies on the island. However, since I do not have first hand knowledge of this period, and Prof. Chen Chi-lu's article has succinctly covered the works of Japanese colleagues (Chen 1989:5-6), I shall skip this early stage in the present article.

Many of us might have the impression that anthropology in Taiwan, especially its training program and curriculum, has a distinctive American imprint, i.e., a four field approach that includes physical anthropology, archaeology, cultural anthropology and linguistic anthropology. But if we take a closer look, we will discover that the reality is a little bit different from the impression. Not all of the four fields were equally emphasized and their developments and accomplishment also varied. Also, because my own field is cultural/ social anthropology and this research institute is established as the Institute of Ethnology and therefore emphasizing ethnological research, I shall focus primarily on cultural/social anthropology in this article, and will touch upon other fields only when it is relevant.

For the sake of clarity, let me divide the development of anthropological studies in Taiwan into three phases. These are:

Phase 1, a traditional ethnographic approach, 1949-1965; phase 2, an integrated social sciences approach, 1965-1987; and phase 3, an emerging interpretative approach, after 1987.

## **II. Phase 1: 1949-1965**

### **A Period of Traditional Ethnographic Approach**

Taiwan was restored to China in 1945. However, anthropological research and teaching were not formally resumed until 1949 when the Department of Archaeology and Anthropology was established in the College of Liberal Arts at NTU. The establishment of the Department indeed marked the “Chinese phase of anthropology” in Taiwan, since most of its faculty came directly from Mainland and particularly from the staff of Academia Sinica in Nanking. Among them, Li Chi (1896-1979), Ling Shun-sheng (1901-1978), Ruey Yih-fu (1899-1991) and Wei Hwei-lin (1903-1995) were the most prominent. Li Chi himself was a Harvard-trained scholar, famous for his research on Shang civilization. As a pioneer, Prof. Li brought the American four field approach to the Department and established a tradition that is still being observed today. However, most faculty in the Department were trained as ethnologist or social/cultural anthropologist. In addition to Ling, Ruey and Wei, there were also Chen Shao-hsing (1906-1966) and Chen Chi-lu. Moreover, the tribal cultures of Taiwan offered an excellent field for ethnographic investigation. Thus, eventually ethnological or social/cultural anthropological studies in the Department became the most popular sub-field followed by archaeology, physical anthropology and linguistic anthropology.

Among those earlier ethnologists, Ling, Ruey and Wei had been doing extensive ethnological field work among various minority

groups in the Mainland during the thirties and forties. When they joined the department they brought with them the traditional ethnographic methods and started a phase of rather productive research on the Aborigines on the island. This trend of collecting ethnographic data on the Aborigines became even more emphasized when Academia Sinica established its Institute of Ethnology in 1955. From the publications during the period, we witness the popularity of Aboriginal studies. In the first thirty issues of the *Bulletin of the Department of Archaeology and Anthropology* (1953-1968), there were 159 articles, among them 81, or 51%, dealt with topics related to the Aborigines. In the first twenty issues of the *Bulletin of the Institute of Ethnology* from issues No.1 to No.20 (1955-1965), among 121 essays, there were 56, or 46.28%, of them that focused on Aboriginal cultures and societies. Besides those articles published in these journals, there were also one or two monographs for each of the Aboriginal groups published during that period (Li 1993:344-347).

The ethnographic works of this period have been criticized for being: 1) purely descriptive in nature; 2) too restrictive in the techniques employed, relying on one or two key-informants; and 3) too historical oriented and did not pay adequate attention to the contemporary conditions of the Aborigines (Li 1993). Despite such criticisms there were some excellent works which are considered as classics nowadays. For example, Wei Hwei-lin's works on the social organization of the Aborigines including some Pingpu Tribes, Chen Chi-Lu's works on material cultures, Ling Shun-sheng's essays on comparative studies between Taiwan Aborigines and other Austronesians in the Pacific, and Ruey Yih-fu's works on kinship systems, etc.

While emphasizing the reconstruction or "preserving the disappearing Aboriginal cultures" (Ling 1960:144), during the period,

there were almost no interests among the anthropologists in the studies of Han Chinese culture and society, except for the works done by Chen Shao-shing who spent his life time in studying demographic and social changes in Taiwan, including Han and Aboriginal peoples, with impressive results (Huang 1995:H4-5). During this period no one seemed to be aware of or remember the works done on peasant culture by the scholars of so-called Yenching school or Northern school (*Pei-pai* 北派) of social anthropology, such as Wu Wen-tsao and Fei Shiao-tung. The scholars who brought the ethnographic tradition to Taiwan belonged to the Southern school (*Nan-pai* 南派), and maintained their interests in studying minorities or cultures other than their own. In other words, during this period, the interest of the North and South “schools” remained unchanged (Li 1971; Tang 1976).

Maintaining the descriptive ethnographic tradition, however, had its advantages when compared with the situations of anthropological studies on the Mainland. As Chiao Chien points out, there were several difficulties that the anthropologists in Mainland had to face (Chiao 1994). It is obvious that here in Taiwan, we did not have to be concerned with the political implications in the use of terminology such as ethnology, anthropology, cultural anthropology or social anthropology, etc. Also, there was no need to be involved with the tedious and laborious task of “nationality identification”. And, above all, by focusing on the Aborigines, anthropologists in this period were able to avoid the issues that might have been too political to be discussed at that time. Despite their restrictive scope and methodological shortcomings our pioneers of this first phase had established a solid foundation for further developments in the years to come.

### III. Phase 2: 1965–1987

#### A Period of Integrated Social Science Approach

In the year of 1965, Wang Sung-hsing set foot the island of *Kuei-shan*, and began his first field work in a Han Chinese fishing community. In that same year, somewhat earlier in the spring, I myself also went to a village in Changhua with Chen Chung-min to start a project on a Chinese rice farming community. The year of 1965, then, should be considered as the commencement of the studies by Chinese anthropologists on the Han society in Taiwan (Huang 1995:H6). From a wider perspective, it was not only the beginning of the study among the Han Chinese society, it also marked a new period of anthropological studies on the island (Li 1993). Because it was during this period that anthropologists in Taiwan began to methodologically and epistemologically reconsider or rethink their discipline. Dissatisfied with the field techniques employed by their predecessors, they were anxious to search for some new concepts and methods in order to meet the challenges they would face when they shifted from the study of Aborigines to their own society; a shift from relatively simple tribal cultures to a complex civilization. A new research trend was initiated during this time. This new research trend was characterized by the efforts made to experiment with the methods and techniques of other social science disciplines, especially sociology and social psychology, and to promote a kind of interdisciplinary or integrated approach (Li 1993:347–350).

Starting from this period, and continuing to the present time, the study of the Han Chinese culture and society has become the focus of anthropologists in Taiwan. The research scope was extended from villages in rural Taiwan to Overseas Chinese communities in

Southeast Asia and other parts of the world. The research topics have also been expanded from family and lineage studies to religion, folk medicine, social changes and economic developments. Furthermore, in 1971 we witnessed a large scale research project — “Anthropological and Environmental Investigation of the Tatu and Choshui River Valleys”, co-sponsored by the Institute of Ethnology and Yale University, under the directorship of Chang Kwang-chih and myself. During the process of that project, many young anthropological workers were encouraged to do field studies on Han Chinese communities in central part of Taiwan. An evidence of shifting from the Aborigines to the Han Chinese during this period was the rapid growth of publication on the study of Chinese culture and society. For example, in 32 issues of the *Bulletin of the Institute of Ethnology* (No.21-52, 1966-1981), there are 228 articles, among them, 75 papers, or 32.89%, are on the subjects related to the Han Chinese, while only 47 papers, or 20.61%, deal with the Aborigines.

The interest in studying their own culture and society in this period, in my own opinion, derived partly from the influence of British and American scholars who had either written or did field work on Han Chinese society. The inspiration by Fei Shiao-tung's work: *Peasant Life in China*, *Earthbound China* and other books and essays written in Chinese, however, should not be underestimated. Fei's themes on the principle of kinship distance and peasant life were frequently discussed and quoted in various publications. However during this time, Fei and other scholars on the Mainland were compelled to return to do traditional ethnographic studies on the minorities in order to uphold the policy of so-called “Nationality Identification”. Therefore, there was no more work done on the Han Chinese society. This contrast between anthropological works in Taiwan and those on the Mainland has been described as

essentially an interesting reversal of the traditions between Northern and Southern schools as mentioned in last the section (Li 1993:348-350).

Regarding the integration of the methods of other social sciences, anthropologists during this period were able to employ social survey techniques which greatly facilitated the study of a complex civilization such as Chinese society. The research works done by the researchers at the Institute of Ethnology demonstrated a balance between quantitative and qualitative studies. Moreover, there was also an active pursuit of interdisciplinary studies. Several seminars were organized and presented focusing on such topics as Chinese national characters, the modernization process, and the social changes in contemporary Taiwan. To illustrate the emphasis on an interdisciplinary approach, let me introduce the content of a book published in 1972 as an example:

Li, Yih-yuan and Kuo-shu Yang (ed.)

1972 *Symposium on the Character of the Chinese: An Interdisciplinary Approach*, Monograph series B. No.1, Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica.

This book contains 13 articles written by sociologists, social psychologists, historians, philosophers, psychiatrists and anthropologists, on Chinese culture and national character. It has been considered as a landmark of academic activities in Taiwan during that period. Actually the series of seminars and publications not only greatly influenced the theoretical orientation and the methodological improvement of anthropological studies in Taiwan, they have also shaped the course of social sciences research on the island since that time.

Another approach promoted by the Institute of Ethnology during



the second phase was the emphasis on the concept of "Sinicization". Before this period, when social scientists, including anthropologists, engaged in the study of Chinese culture and society, they had acknowledged the importance of adopting native point of view: but in practice they were still confined within a Western theoretical and conceptual framework. The emphasis on the so-called "Sinicization" in this period enabled them to reconsider and reinterpret the real meaning of natives' points of view. This, initiated a new research trend among social scientists in Taiwan and Hong Kong. A collection of essays, resulting from a series of seminars on this concept was published by the Institute of Ethnology which marked the inception of this effort. The title of this collection is:

Yang, Kuo-shu and Chung-i Wen (ed.)

1982 *The Sinicization of Social and Behavioral Sciences Research in China*, Monograph series B. No.10, Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica.

Following this publication, another series of conferences focusing on relevant themes were also organized by anthropologists from Hong Kong. The participants included social scientists from Taiwan and the Mainland. The following publications are the outcomes of those conferences; Chiao et al (ed.): *Proceeding of the Conference on Modernization and Chinese Culture* (1985); Chiao et al (ed.): *Chinese Family and Its Changes* (1991); Huang Shao-lun (ed.): *Religious Ethics and the Modernization of China* (1991); Chiao and Pan (ed.): *Chinese Concept and Behavior* (1995).

However, these trends of an "integrated social sciences approach" and "Sinicization" were also sharply criticized by some of our colleagues (Chen 1979; Huang 1984, 1995). The main criticism