

中央研究院
民族學研究所集刊

第十八期

目 錄

| | |
|------------------------|-------|
| 論繼嗣羣結構原則與血親關係範疇..... | 衛 惠 林 |
| 封禪文化與宋代明堂祭天..... | 劉 子 健 |
| 神話象徵之離題表現..... | 林 衡 立 |
| 布農族的法律..... | 丘 其 謙 |
| 屏東縣瑪家鄉筏灣村排灣族的家庭制度..... | 石 磊 |
| 秦漢時代之時..... | 凌 純 聲 |
| 東亞華僑研究參考書目..... | 李 亦 園 |

中華民國五十三年秋季

臺 灣 • 南 港

中央研究院民族學研究所集刊

第 十 八 期

本刊年出兩期，全年國內新臺幣八十元，國外美金四元。零售每本新臺幣四十元。

Published semi-annually. Foreign subscription: US\$ 4.00 a year.

出 版 者 中 央 研 究 院 民 族 學 研 究 所

編 輯 者 民 族 學 研 究 所 集 刊 編 輯 委 員 會

發 行 者 中 央 研 究 院 民 族 學 研 究 所

印 刷 者 精 華 印 書 館 股 份 有 限 公 司
臺 北 市 長 沙 街 二 段 七 十 一 號

代 售 處 大 陸 雜 誌 社
A G E N T S 臺 北 市 羅 斯 福 路 二 段 五 號 之 二 、 三 樓

集 成 圖 書 公 司
香 港 九 龍 彌 敦 道 五 八 〇 E
(Chi Cheng Book Co. 580E, Nathan
Road, Kowloon, Hong Kong)

中 華 民 國 五 十 三 年 秋 季

中央研究院
民族學研究所集刊

編輯委員會

編輯委員

凌純聲(主編)

衛惠林 黃文山

何聯奎 張光直

李亦園(秘書) 文崇一(常務)

助理編輯

陳毓杰 吳燕和

EDITORIAL BOARD

Editors:

Prof. Dr. SHUN-SHENG LING (Chief editor)

Prof. HWEI-LIN WEI Prof. WEN-SHAN HUANG

Prof. LIEN-KWEI HO Dr. KWANG-CHIH CHANG

Associate Editors:

YIH-YUAN LI CHUNG-I WEN

Assistant Editors:

YU-CHIEH CHEN YEN-HO WU

中央研究院 民族學研究所集刊

第十八期

目 錄

| | | |
|------------------------|------------|-----|
| 論繼嗣羣結構原則與血親關係範疇····· | 衛 惠 林····· | 19 |
| 封禪文化與宋代明堂祭天····· | 劉 子 健····· | 45 |
| 神話象徵之離題表現····· | 林 衡 立····· | 58 |
| 布農族的法律····· | 丘 其 謙····· | 59 |
| 屏東縣瑪家鄉筏灣村排灣族的家庭制度····· | 石 磊····· | 89 |
| 秦漢時代之時····· | 凌 純 聲····· | 113 |
| 東亞華僑研究參考書目····· | 李 亦 園····· | 143 |

中華民國五十三年秋季

臺 灣 · 南 港

BULLETIN

OF

THE INSTITUTE OF ETHNOLOGY

ACADEMIA SINICA

Number 18

Autumn 1964

CONTENTS

| | | |
|---|---------------------|-----|
| Descent Principle and Kindred Category..... | HWEI-LIN WEI.... | 1 |
| Two Forms of Worshipping the Heaven in Sung China | JAMES T. C. LIU.... | 50 |
| The Deviation of Mythical Symbols..... | HEN-LI LIN.... | 53 |
| The Law of the Bunun | CHI-CHIEN CHIU.... | 87 |
| The Family System of the Paiwan at Su-Paiwan Village.. | LEI SHIH... | 110 |
| The Sacred Places of Chin and Han Periods .. | SHUN-SHENG LING... | 136 |
| Studies on Overseas Chinese in East Asia: A Catalogue of Books and Articles in Chinese and Japanese | YIH-YUAN LI... | 143 |

An English summary is given at the end of each article in Chinese.

Published by

THE INSTITUTE OF ETHNOLOGY
ACADEMIA SINICA
NANKANG, TAIPEI, TAIWAN
REPUBLIC OF CHINA

DESCENT PRINCIPLE AND KINDRED CATEGORY

WEI HWEI-LIN

I. INTRODUCTION

During the last two decades, there has arisen a noticeable current in the mainstream of social anthropology in connection with the so-called "bilateral and/or nonunilinear kin structure". A number of prominent Anglo-American scholars have concentrated their effort in discovering and analysing this kind of kin structural models in the Pacific islands, Arctic area, Eurasia and Indonesia (see Pehrson, 1954; Goodenough, 1955; Davenport, 1959). This is without question a positive trend in the intellectual development of the study of social structure, a subject neglected too long. On the other hand, one will not fail to note at the same time, that it was accompanied by a serie of ideological confusions. Should these be not clarified, they will become serious obstacles to the theoretical advancement of our science and to the elucidation of the facts to be faced.

The most significant confusion exists with regard to the problem, "Malayo-Polynesian Social Organization", a theoretical challenge led by P.G. Murdock (1948, 1949: 228-230, 349-50). Murdock's recent important proposition entitled "Cognatic Form of Social Organization" was given as an introductory article to the book "Social Structure in Southeast Asia" (1960), edited by him. In the same book, a "Supplementary Note" on Formosan Aborigines of the present author is included, which in fact was rewritten by the editor himself. In his introduction Murdock forcibly fits the kin structural forms of four Formosan ethnic groups, the Atayal, the Yami, the Paiwan and the Puyuma to his procrustean bed of cognatic form. Regarding this misinformation, the present author has felt for a long time the responsibility to make a clarification. Meanwhile, accumulated endeavours to elucidate the reality from ideological confusions had created a substantial progress in the United States and in England. In fact, the most important revisions and criticisms against Murdock's theory were raised by his disciples and juniors, such as Goodenough (1955: 71-83; 1961: 1374-77), Davenport (1959: 557-72), Marshall Sahlins (1962: 93-115) and Mitchell (1962: 343-54). Some important remarks were at the same time made by such leading figures among the British social anthropologists, as Reymond Firth (1957: 2,4-8), Fortes (1959: 139-197, 206-212, 309-331) and Leach (1962: 601-04). By these constructive elaborations, the situation has been greatly improved. The author has also been encouraged to take his part in turn, to make his own "Supplementary Note" by using the Formosan materials for documentation. Before entering into main

discussion, some preliminary remarks will be made concerning the main sources of the current confusions, which includes the following:

1. Insufficiency and ambiguity of terminology—Just as most of the early sociologists in their discussions of unilinear kinship system, used to group some nonunilinear examples together; they consider a clan, a lineage and a sib as all belonging to the same category. Likewise some recent social theorists of bilateral or cognatic forms of social organization make no explicit differentiation between bilaterality, nonunilinearity and ambilaterality.

2. Lack of definit frontiers between the related phenomena in analysing kinship systems. There are four categories of kinship aspects that are closely interwoven; these are:

- (a) The Descent Group, which will be referred to as 'D'.
- (b) The Family Form, 'F'.
- (c) The Kinship Terminology, 'T'.
- (d) The Corporate Kindred group, 'K'.

These four categories of kinship aspects are of course, interconnected; but for theoretical analysis, each one has an independent foundation. Every one must have some adequate criteria to be set up. But many of the students of social system, from Morgan to Murdock, have tended to interweave more than two of them. In the early period of this century, they define the 'D' by means of 'F' and 'T'; while more recent theorists prefer to use 'T' and 'K' in explaining 'D'. Professor Murdock has taken the four together, to build up his theoretical reconstruction of "Malayo-Polynesian social organization": (1) bilocal extended family, (2) bilateral kindreds, (3) Lack of unilinear descent group, (4) Hawaiian generational terminology. However, both the unilinearists and bilateralists seem to consent in one point, that is that the descent principle and group form make the basic determinant of the kinship System. But nevertheless when they set about to work for a theoretical interpretation, they fall back to their convenient manner of intertwining the multilineal basis for one subject. Recently the 'D' and 'K' are more closely combined by most theorists, and we are convinced that this is the key problem to be resolved.

3. Extra-generalization in theory making—Most of the forerunning unilinearist theories, either patriarchy or matriarchy were too widely appropriated; inasmuch, it is improper to apply the current bilateralism or cognaticism to any large area. It is unbelievable that such an erudite scholar like Murdock did not notice the predominance of unilineality among the continental Indonesians from Assam to the South Vietnam mountain area. It is still harder to imagine that Murdock did not review the works of Wilkin (1926), de Moubray (1931), Loeb (1936) and ter Haar (1948), concerning the unilinear predominance of Sumatran peoples. Moreover, Murdock is to be blamed for his arbitrary judgment on the Formosan

Aboriginal societies, of which he is completely ignorant; nevertheless he has affirmatively classified the patrilinear Atayal (Wei, 1963), and the Yami (Wei, 1959, 1962), matrilinear Puyuma (Wei, 1962), and ambilineal Paiwan (Wei, 1960) as all belonging to the same cognatic form. If every of his other manifold examples were like this manipulation, we have to doubt how far his contributions need to be reexamined.

II. KINSHIP SYSTEM AND DESCENT PRINCIPLE

Kinship system and consanguinity have often been misconceived as being synonymous, while they actually refer to two fairly different aspects. Every individual inherits genes from his ascendants of both parental sides, when he marries and has children, he contributes for his own part to his descendants of both sexes; this is the so-called consanguinity, a biological determination for all human beings. In most societies, however is consciously build up a more or less restrictive system of affiliation by arbitrarily recognizing certain categories of relatives, while rejecting others. This is the so-called kinship system, a social and cultural exploration, which differs from one ethnic and regional group to another. The kinship system constitutes the most essential part of the human society. During early decades of this century, most scholars concentrated their interests in analysing the unilinear kinship system; thereafter appeared a trend of emphasising their researches for the bilateral or nonunilinear structural models. Both of them consent on one point, that is descent principles constitute the basic effect of the kinship system of any society.

The descent group is a persistent, concrete social group, usually localized in a certain settlement. Members of a descent group recognize a common ancestor or ancestress by tracing back through genealogical reckonning. They acknowledge their common originality by using a group name or emblem. A descent group is always bigger than the family unit, and smaller than a local group; though it is usually fitted to be a corporate group for practicing social functions, it is rarely constituted as an integrated society. There are manifold structural forms and principles of descent, which may be divided into two main categories: the principle of affiliation, or internal principle of descent structure, and the principle of segmentation, or external principle of descent structure. For the former we may include the three principles proposed by Reymond Firth (1957: 2-4-8) as basic categories of descent analysis:

A) Unilaterality, by tracing filiation consistently through one parental side only, to exclude the other.

B) Bilaterality, by tracing filiation through both parental sides, including all descendants of both sexes equally.

C) Ambilaterality, by tracing filiation through either of two parental sides, with some selectivity being emphasized to build a specific form of descent system.

Besides, there is another descent form, called double descent, which in strict sense is a double unilinear descent system, it will be recognized as a complex form of the category A.

The above mentioned three categories of descent principles may exhaust all the variations of descent system of human society. Even some peculiar models of variety may be ambiguous between the system A and B, or between B and C, with different degrees of exclusiveness, but no variety could exist beyond the three main forms. Here below, we will examine each principle more closely.

A) Unilateral descent system includes only two sub-types: patrilinear and matrilinear, which may be supplemented by a certain number of variations of double unilinear descent type, being affected by matrimonial classes or residential arrangements.

I propose to differ the clan and lineage as two distinctive systems of unilinear descent structure, the former is characterized by its exclusiveness of unilaterality and exogamic rule of marriage, by which the membership of a clan is clear cut into an in or out group, never combine two groups together, or are flexible between the two. While a lineage, even unilinear in form, more or less tends to ambilineality, personal relationship is specially recognized by collateral distances, by which there is a series of different extensions of relationship acknowledged by co-members; no strict exogamic unit could be observed; on the contrary, most of them being restricted by an incest group within the lineage. Frequently they are agamic or endogamic in order to maintain their relationship, therefore no strict frontier of group unit could be distinguished, a flexibility of membership always exists with them (Wei, 1958). By these characteristics, the exclusiveness of unilaterality is greatly weakened. In some examples, the two types of descent system are combined into one, within a same society, which can be called 'clan-lineage system' (Wei, 1961, 1962). Here we classify the sub-types of unilinear descent system as follows:

Table I. Sub-types of unilinear descent system

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| A) Patrilinear descent..... | (a) patri-clan type |
| | (b) patri-lineage type |
| | (c) patri-clan-lineage type |
| B) Matrilinear descent..... | (d) matri-clan type |
| | (e) matri-lineage type |
| | (f) matri-clan-lineage type |
| C) Double unilinear descent..... | (g) matrimonial moieties type |
| | (h) bisexual double descent type |
| | (i) double descent by alternate order of birth right |

B) Bilateral descent: the bilateral descent termed by Firth and Fortes, cognatic form by Murdock, unrestricted nonunilinear descent, by Goodenough and Davenport, all refer to the structural principle without emphasis on either parental side, and there is no exclusion of the male nor female sex. They distinguish collateral distances, but disregard lineal divergence; all descendants issued from one common ancestor or ancestress or a couple of initiators are all included into the bilateral descent group. Which differs from the so-called 'kindred' by the fact that the former a common ancestor is regarded as it's starting point; while the latter is an ego based relationship. Some other characteristics may be further indicated by the following conditions: (a) a bilateral descent group is constituted by natural development of a consanguineal family; (b) endogamy is observed as marriage custom; (c) the descent group extension is generally limited to a restricted local community. It is therefore diversified by residential differentiation into the following types:

- (a) patrilocal bilateral descent type;
- (b) matrilocal bilateral descent type;
- (c) ambilocal bilateral descent type;
- (d) neolocal bilateral descent type.

C) Ambilateral descent: This term is used by Firth (1957); the same system was called 'nonunilinear descent' by Goodenough (1955), or 'utrolateral' by Freeman (1959). The author prefers Firth's term in view of it's wide use. According to Firth's explanation, an ambilateral system provides invariant group membership and presumably a very flexible group form. In short, ambilateral descent is neither unilinear nor bilateral, but fluctuating between the two, with a great variability and wide flexibility, and is open to different kinds of emphasis. With regard to the residence and marriage rules, it has no unilocal inclination toward either parental or spouse side. But it may have variations signified by the custom of privilege to the succession and inheritance according to different societies. Besides, there are different kinds of lineal inclination and fluctuation of membership recognition; all these could raise diversified types of the system:

- (a) Symmetrical ambilateral descent type;
- (b) Patri-inclined ambilineal descent type;
- (c) Matri-inclined ambilineal descent type;
- (d) Optative recognition ambilineal descent type.

Applying the above classification of descent systems to the Formosan aboriginal societies, the existence of the following types becomes evident:

Table II. Classification of descent system of the Formosan aboriginal societies

| | | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|---|
| I. Unilateral descent | (A) Clan system | (a) patri-clan sub-type | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Saisiat 2 Bunun 3 Tsou (includes Kanakanabu, Sa'arua) |
| | | (b) matri-clan sub-type | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 Southern Ami 5 Puyuma proper |
| | (B) Lineage system | (c) matri-lineage sub-type | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6 Northern Ami 7 Katipol Puyuma |
| | | (d) patri-lineage sub-type | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8 Atayal 9 Yami |
| II. Ambilateral descent | C Ambi-lineage | (e) patri-inclined ambi-lineage | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10 Rukai 11 Raval Paiwan |
| | | (f) symmetrical ambi-lineage | 12 Butsul Paiwan |

It happens that there are no bilateral or cognatic descent types among the Formosan aboriginal societies. If one claims that there does exist such structural principle on this island, we would not disagree with him, but must point out that it is not at all a principle of descent, but of frame work of kindred.

III. EXTERNAL PRINCIPLE OF DESCENT STRUCTURE

In most societies, an external principle or principle of segmentation runs parallel to the internal principle or principle of affiliation. The study on the matrimonial classes of Australian tribes by Durkheim (1905) forms the initial contribution. A great progress has been achieved by many eminent scholars, such as W. H. R. Rivers and Radcliffe-Brown on the subject of "Dual Organization" and "Dichotomous Classes System" (1939). Kroeber attributed greater importance to the residence rule as basic element of social structure (1938). Lévi-Strauss made an original approach to the system of "exchange of women" between kin group units (1949). All the these above mentioned contributions have so far been made on the base of unilinear descent system. No parallel exploration has been made for the phenomena of nonunilinear descent. This may be due to the fact that the latter is far from being systematic and regular, and is too flexible and variable to be satisfactorily analysed. Some related problems have to be reexamined further.

(1) **Homogeneity and heterogeneity:** The most simple homogenous society, the horde is an undivided nomadic social type, in which one local community includes only one kin group. In tribal societies, the characteristics are polysegmentary organizations; their population is of two kinds homogenous or heterogenous of com-

position. the former is represented most typically by the dual organization of Australian tribes (Durkheim, Radcliffe-Brown, Elkin).

Of whatever degree is the complication of internal organization, equality and systematic characters come always into sight. Exogamy of clan and endogamy of tribe are always simultaneously observed. We find this kind of social organization also represented as an original feature of the tribal organization of the Bunun, specifically the Northern Bunun tribes (Wei, 1956, 1957), where the subgroups the 'Take Todo' and Take Bakha are all constituted into dual exogamic moieties. The tribal organization of the Tsou of Arisan, Kanakanabu and Sa'arua and the Isi Bukun of Bunun similarly consist of a threefold phratrial organization; with which only two phratries are balanced by seize, with a complementary part of minority. Therefore, we may conclude that the dual system had been their original structural feature (Wei, 1953, 56). The more typical a clan system is, the larger its exogamic unit is constituted. After the exogamic rule is reduced to the lower clan units, many other related customs began on their way to decadence. The most noticeable change is the loss of strictness of unilineality and relaxation of membership exclusiveness.

With regard to the lineage system, neither unilinear nor nonunilinear by affiliation, it bears the characteristics of systematic segmentation and formal integrity. Conversely, a general trend of genetic or hierarchic ramification and heterogeneity of composition appears significant. Eventhough the patrilineage system of the Atayal and the Yami represent a genetic form of lineage segmentation; with them, no privileged households being specially regarded, no stratification is accompanied by collateral divisions of lineage groups. Patriachal and patrilocal families serve as their base of social structure. A semi-hordish standard of social development is proved by the local ritual group or *gaga* of the Atayal and the localized lineage group or *asa sateju* of the Yami. For these two peoples, tribal organization is still not sufficiently integrated, For them, kinship tie is always more strong than local rule.

Among the matrilinear Ami and Puyuma tribes of the Eastern Coast, they have no systemic organizations of clan units, and no moiety or phratrial units could be acknowledged. With them, every maximal descent unit within a tribal community represents one isolated genealogical descent group, unrelated to each other, which issued from one original settlement. Among the Northern Ami tribes, some quasi-hordish local groups still remain here and there as living models of ancient homogenous communities. Within this kind of community, even though there are several lineage groups, they are traceable matrilineally to only one founding ancestress or ancestral spouse. But most of the other Ami tribes are constituted by heterogenous sources; every maximal lineage group is called *kakaosan*, which segments into lineages or *nanasawan*; these are further divided into lineage branches, *raruma²an*, each including two to five households, *rumah*. These minimal lineage units

subsequently migrated from their homeland to the remoted southern settlements, where they became the initial center of a clan unit of the Southern Ami, called *raruma²an*. In this respect, we may admit that the matriclan units of the Southern Ami possess a character far too peculiar to be accepted as that of clan in the strict sense. Nevertheless the matriclan of Southern Ami, in most instances bears permanent group names and observes exogamy. For this reason we call their system a matriclan-lineage. The descent group structure of the Southern Ami differs from that of the North, both by its principle and their group names, and more significantly by the presence or absence of the exogamic rule. With the Northern Ami, three grades of lineage units, are observed, while those of the Southern Ami only two descent group units, *raruma²an* and *tatapa²an* are recognized.

As for the matrilinear Puyuma, they may be also divided into two subgroups, the Puyuma proper and the Katipol. The former, recognize two group units, the maximal unit is called *samawan*, the minimal unit *sajamunan*, both bearing group names. While among the Katipol Puyuma only one descent group *sajamunan* unit is recognized. Both of them regard a direct line household as center of all detached households. By its institutional significances, we may identify the matri-clanlineage system of the Puyuma proper with that of the Southern Ami; and the pure matrilineage system of the Katipol Puyuma with that of Northern Ami (Wei, 1962a).

We have other two ethnic groups, the Paiwan and the Rukai, settled in the Southern part of the Formosa island, to be taken as examples for the ambilateral lineage system. Both peoples exhibit a specific descent principle, take residence as reference of descent line, and has no priority of either sex for privileged rank. As to the structural principle, they tend to emphasize collateral degrees to make distinctions of personal rights and obligations, in order to stratify social status within every descent group, as well as to diversify lineage standings within one local community.

(2) **Equality and Hierarchy**—Besides a consideration of homogeneity and heterogeneity of social composition, equality and hierarchy, another pair of opposite principles have to be discussed as interrelated aspects. This we conceive as the key point to distinguish the 'clan' versus the 'lineage' system. Durkheim was the first who noticed that within a clan, personal distinction is usually neglected. The members of a clan are related with one another by a mystic belief in a common ancestor and by recognizing a common group name or emblem. They merely make distinctions by ingroup or outgroup of clan unit, within a clan, consciousness of kind is specially significant. (Durkheim, 1889). The Hopi Indians, recognizes even a lair co-clan member. The Tsou of Central Formosa formerly practiced adoption of a as captive enemy, and later admitted his descendands to make up a sub clan in their master's clan. Rarely some priorities may be reserved to certain clan units, such as suc-

cession of priesthood or local chieftainship. Personal distinctions are observed only according to the principle of seniority or generational precedence.

The recognition of membership versus clan is exclusive. If one belongs to clan A, he could never be transferred to clan B, unless a special ceremony had been performed. For example, in a matrimonial ceremony of the Bunun of Central Formosa, the tabooed millet of a clan is transferred from the clan of the bride to that of the bridegroom. On the other hand, among the matrilinear Clannish Southern Ami and Puyuma, eventhough a married man goes to live with his wife, he never changes his membership of his maternal clan into his wife's. The male heir is responsible for executing ceremonial performances in the name of his maternal clan. When a married man dies, his body is carried back to the the burial place of his maternal clan. For the Ami and Puyuma, there is a series of special functions of priesthood, *silisinai* of the Ami, *rahan* of the Puyuma, being distributed to definite privileged clanship, which are hereditarily succeeded by the male heirs of the direct line households of major clans. For most tribes of the two peoples, local chieftainship is combined with some important priesthoods; for example, the *kakita'an* of the Tavalun tribe is the priest of enemy's head ritual, while the *sapurayao* of the Vata'an tribe is the priest of the agrarian rite; they concurrently serve as big chiefs of the two tribes as a whole.

The principle of lineage segmentation is characterized by the process of continual ramification, resulting in a hierarchic centralized organization; for one lineage group, there is a number of sublineage units, at least two, maximal and minimal. Within every lineage group, there is a direct line household being regarded as the center of authority over all members of its detached lineage branches. By this order, a stratification of social status of households is established within every lineage group, as well as among the lineage units within a local community. Only very rarely there is no formal leading household being regarded as the center of lineage group, as that of the Yami of Botel Tobago (Wei, 1962). This we called genetic lineage system, an archaic form of equalitary character. The patri-lineage system of the Atayal of Northern Formosa (Wei, 1959) also belongs to the same type.

For the ambilateral lineage system of the Paiwan and the Rukai of Southern Formosa, a hierarchical system has specially developed. Every local community is dominated by one or more privileged noble lineage groups, which are led by the heading households, having for each of them a primogenital chief regarded as their representative and ruler. Each of the noble households holds a named residence as the center of landlordship and related privileges. Under this there is a threefold subordinate class: the collateral noble households (*mamatsajilan* of Paiwan and *talialalai* of Rukai), the vassals or semi-noble class (*pualu*), and the serfs (*tala'alalak*, *kokaokaolu*) (Wei, 1960, 1963). Every class is still constituted by a series of ramified

lineage units. Within one integrated local community, two forms of tribal organization may be recognized, homogenous and heterogenous. The former is figured as a downwarded tree with a main trunk and lesser stems of branches; while the latter is made of two or more stratified subordinated lineage groups. The priority of land preoccupation and predominance of majority of population are also affected as the basis of social stratification.

(3) **Intratribal integration and supratribal systematization**—The composition of an autonomous local society organized on the base of descent groups is common among primitive societies. But in the course of social development, two different inclinations have been observed: (a) The society is formed of a clan system, and it has, in general, a systematic organization of dualism or phratrial constitution as characteristics. After a long range of social development, eventhough their people increased in number and diffused into several tribal units, they, as a rule, maintain their original structural system in their newly established communities. Specifically a dual or phratrial organization could survive in every individual tribal unit. We may take the Northern Bunun tribes as examples of dual system (Wei, 1959); and the tribal organization of the Arisan Tsou as similar models of the threefold phratrial system (Wei, 1953). These signify that the segmentation of clan system has a character of stability and regularity; which can be maintained as a supratribal structural system through a wide distribution.

On the other hand, the segmentation of the lineage is not of the same principle as that of the clan. With the composite organization of lineage based society, there is no highly static system to be persistent through time, nor to be distributed into different local communities. The consistency of lineage groups within an autonomous tribe is by no means permanent; every lineage group may be multiplied by self development through generations. For an homogenous society, one unique lineage group could be divided into several branching units. Inversely, in an heterogenous tribe two or more unrelated lineage groups could be coordinated into an unitary subordination. But when a detached lineage segment or one household moves out from one tribe to another, it usually cuts off its relation with the original lineage group, and resumes to establish a new stem of lineage group in the migrated tribe. Therefore, no lineage system could be enlarged into a wide distributed supratribal organization, eventhough there is real linkage between them.

Most of the Formosan lineage based tribal societies used to take a few number of earliest residence as centers of lineage groups, having a proper name for each as the symbol of authority. As a rule, no residential name could be used for a lineage group as a whole. Despite that some famous residence names are concurrently used by different households of different settlements, this only indicates that the same names are frequently attributed to different household units, and there is

no real relationship between them.

It follows that no static lineage system of supratribal standard could be maintained in the course of social development. The more hierarchic and heterogeneous a lineage based society is, the less durable its structural form proves to be.

IV. NONUNILINEAR DESCENT GROUP AND COGNATIC KINDRED

We have already distinguished the descent group from consanguinity, and it would be easy to disentangle the nonunilinear descent from the cognatic kindred on the same base. Every society, either unilinear or nonunilinear by affiliation, could acknowledge the cognatic kindred as a complementary corporate group, in order to perform some temporary social functions. In case of an exclusive unilinear society, most of the corporate functions are executed by the clan units of both lineal and cross parental sides. Conversely, in case of nonunilinear societies, cognatic kindred plays a more important role for functional performances. The kindred itself by no means always follows the cognatic principle in the same degree of strength. The less strict the unilinear descent is, the more significantly the cognatic kindred is to be regarded emphatically. For instance, among the Atayal, a kindred relationship is made up by a five generations depth of paternal kin, with a complementary part of four generations depth of maternal relatives and of paternal uncle's descendants. While for the matrilinear Ami, it is combined by a proportion of 5: 3 by matrilinear reckoning; Those of the matrilinear Puyuma and ambilateral Paiwan and Rukai reckon five generations depth of both parental sides symmetrically, through cognatic principle. Even though they all have the same interweaving and overlapping of the two kinds of kin groups, the frame work of each is made distinctive by its own principle and consistency.

The confusion between the nonunilinear descent group and cognatic kindred relationship is mainly due to the fact that both kin groups adopt the same cognatic principle as a dominant rule. But the former is an ancestor centred group, organized by tracing back to ascendants through lineal reckoning, while the latter is an ego centred relationship, made by collateral recognition.

More precisely, a descent group always starts from one point of the founding ancestor, proceeding downward to descendants; while the kindred network is starting from ego through six close parents: father, mother, brothers, sisters, sons and daughters, developing hexagonally. The kindred category may be diversified by different volumes and emphasis on the ideology of descent principle, inherent in respective societies.

As to the descent system having two or more group units, the network of kindred relationship may also have various degrees of extensions to be applied to different functional performances. At least one close and one remote volume is

recognized; the former could be identified with the incest group, and the latter functions for mutual aid or reciprocal obligations.

Let us examine the coexistence of descent group and kindred among the nine ethnic groups of Formosan aboriginal societies. In the three patri-clannish peoples, the Bunun, the Tsou and the Saisiat, with almost every functional performance being practiced by clan units, seemingly there is no kindred group that can be observed as a corporate group. Conversely in the two matrilinear peoples, the Ami and the Puyuma, the situation is fairly different; descent group and kindred parallelly coexist for different occasions of functional performances. The kindred group of the Ami is called *marauinauina²ai* or *mararuma²ruma²ai*, it shows an inclination toward the maternal side, of proportion 5: 3; while that of the Puyuma called *inajamunan* and *inutoalan* extends 3 and 5 generations depth to both parental sides symmetrically.

As to the patri-lineage system, the Atayal have a close kindred group, *qotoq jaja* consisting of 3 generations in depth on both parental sides, and a remote kindred group, *qotoq laxoan* including 5 generations of paternal kins, supplemented by 4 generations of maternal's. The kindred group of the Yami is bilateral in character, with two volumes of extensions, the lesser kindred volume, the *ripus* consists of 3 generations in depth of both parental sides; and the major group *inainapu* extending over 5 generations of 6 close kins.

Finally, we come to the two ambilateral descent peoples, which both have a twofold kindred group. Among the Paiwan the lesser kindred group, *sikatsekəl* consists of 3 generations of both parents; while the major group *malusiapatsetsev* includes 5 generations symmetrically. The two volumes of the kindred group of the Rukai consist of the same degree of volumes as those of the Paiwan, and named *lalakan* for the lesser, and *toamakaosai* for the major. We are going to show the above mentioned parallelism of descent groups and kindred categories in each society in the table below:

Table III. Paralleism of Descent group and Kindreds in
Six Formosan Aboriginal societies

| Structural type | Ethnic group | Descent Groups | | Kindred Categories | |
|-----------------------|--------------|---|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| | | Maximal unit | Minimal unit | Major extent | Lesser extent |
| Patri-lineage pattern | Yami | sategnu, itetegnuan | kasina no inawan | inainapu | ripus |
| | Atayal | (A) ural mēlaxao (B) otox gamil (C) kigal viludan | qotoq mēlaxao otox nevekese kigal sanax | qotoq (otox) jaja | qotoq (otox) laxao'an |
| Matri-lineage pattern | Ami | ḡaḡasawan (N. G.) raruma ² an (S. G.) | raruma ² an tatapaa ² an | marauinauin ² ai | sarauinauina |
| | Puyuma | samawan, sajamunan | sajamunan saruma ² anan | inutoaran | ianjamunan |
| Ambi-lineage pattern | Rukai | lituran, patiutan | malududusə | toamakaosai | lalakan |
| | Paiwan | tsunulan | tatarataran | malusiapatsetsev | sikatsekəl |