



歷史與社會經濟

第四屆國際客家學研討會論文集

徐正光 主編

中央研究院民族學研究所

第四屆國際客家學研討會論文集

歷史與社會經濟

徐正光 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

第四屆國際客家學研討會論文集：歷史與社會經濟
／徐正光主編.-- 初版.-- 台北市：中研院民族
所，民 89
面： 公分

ISBN 957-671-749-3 (精裝).--ISBN 957-671-
750-7 (平裝)

1. 客家學研究 — 論文，講詞等

536.2107

90000113

第四屆國際客家學研討會論文集： 歷史與社會經濟

主 編：徐 正 光

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：中華民國八十九年十二月

GPN 509529890022

ISBN 957-671-749-3 (精裝)

ISBN 957-671-750-7 (平裝)



第四屆國際客家學研討會論文集：歷

350.0 平裝

Proceedings of International Conference on Hakkaology

History and Socio-economy



Edited by Cheng-Kuang Hsu

Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica

序

本書為「第四屆國際客家學研討會」發表的論文，經審查後合編而成。研討會於1998年11月4～7日在台北中央研究院民族學研究所舉行。在研討會中，我們收到的68篇論文，分別放在十個場次的會議中發表。在集結成書時，我們將審查通過的45篇論文整合為三輯出版，這三輯的主題為：(一)歷史與社會經濟；(二)聚落、宗族與族群關係；(三)宗教、語言與音樂。

研討會結束後，主辦單位要求作者進行論文的修訂工作，修訂後的論文則經過三個階段的審查。第一個階段是將論文送請相關的學者專家（大多是在研討會中擔任評論者）審查。審查意見送回彙整後，召開研討會的籌備委員會議，就第一階段的審查結果進行討論。籌備會的討論集中在兩個方面：第一，根據審查意見，初步決定那些論文可以收入專書中刊登，那些不宜刊登；第二，就可被接受刊登的論文討論是否需要再進行修改。在結束第一階段的審查工作後，主辦單位再將所有的審查意見以及籌備委員會所作的建議，依過去三屆國際客家學研討會慣例，送請在香港的國際客家學會進行複審工作。國際客家學會也將所有的論文分送學者專家複審，然後將審查結果送回主辦單位。這是第二個階段的審查工作。

做為研討會的籌備召集人以及論文集專書的主編，我想將我個人在編輯此書時所扮演的角色做一些說明。除了在助理的幫忙下，協助論文審查作業的進行外，我對於選錄於此書中的論文做了最後把關的工作，並依論文的性質將其放入不同的章節與主題中。

在選錄論文方面，基本上我大致尊重不同階段學者專家的審查結

果，但也加入了我個人對於專書出版的考慮。我主要的關懷在於：本屆研討會已是第四次舉辦，我希望此次出版的專書能夠超越前幾次研討會論文的品質，而不只是將所有在會議中發表的論文予以出版。在此基本關懷下，我以下列原則進行專書論文的選錄：

- 一、論文主題已由作者以類似的篇名在其他地方發表，或相關主題已有其他作者以論文的方式做了更好的處理與論述者，為免同一主題一再重複論述，只好割愛；
- 二、發表於研討會的論文，在研討會結束後，已在其他地方發表者，亦不再重複收入本書；
- 三、在論文中提供了客家研究的新資料，或者以新的觀點檢討舊的論述而有新的創見者，則優先列為收錄的對象；
- 四、有些論文的論點可能不符合傳統客家學研究的主流觀點，或對主流觀點持著批判的立場，但卻有助於刺激新的思考，並能促進客家研究往前發展者，亦不加避諱地收錄於此書中。

上述的考慮也許難免有我個人的主觀意見，亦或難免見仁見智，我應該負起編輯者的所有責任，但我總是期望客家研究能夠擺脫傳統主流典範的束縛，不僅在研究方法上能兼採人文與社會科學研究方法的優點，並且在論述與理論架構上更具多元思考與深刻化，如此客家研究才能在不斷的批判與辯論中，有新的突破與發展。

第四屆國際客家學研討會得以順利舉辦，首先要感謝蔣經國國際學術交流基金會、香港崇正總會、台灣省政府文化處、世界客屬總會在經費上的支持；做為研討會籌備委員會的召集人，我也要向其他籌備委員在研討會的籌辦以及論文集的審查工作上所盡的心力，表達誠摯的謝意，他們是：勞格文(John Lagerwey)、莊英章、彭欽清、張維安、賴澤涵、陳子欽、陳運棟、鄭赤琰、蕭新煌、劉義章、謝劍、謝嘉梁、鍾榮富、羅肇錦。

研討會開幕典禮，渥蒙李遠哲院長、李亦園院士、劉兆漢校長、黃石華理事長、鄭赤琰會長等貴賓蒞臨致詞，為大會添增光采，謹表謝忱。

中央研究院民族學研究所的同仁以極具效率的團隊精神圓滿達成研討會各項行政事務，特別值得感謝，他們是：江惠英、何國隆、陳麗鳳、蔡美鳳、陳玉雲、陳美鳳、鍾菊慧、楊雯娟、楊文靜、蔡金蓉、李秋慧、蘇淑華等同仁；彭欽清、黃子堯、陳板三位先生協助客家文化之夜與文化之旅的工作，亦在此一併致謝。

在論文的編輯與出版作業方面，特別要感謝江惠英主任、鍾菊慧、郭佩宜、陳美華、張桂華、陶慶甄。

最後，要感謝民族學研究所暨蔣經國國際學術交流基金會同意並補助本書的出版，謝謝李亦園院士、黃應貴所長。



謹誌

2000.12.10

目 錄

序	i
---------	---

第一篇 回顧與展望

The Structure and Dynamics of Chinese Rural Society	John Lagerwey 1
台灣客家研究的考察	陳運棟 45
論譜牒文化與客家文化的傳承	張衛東 81
推展客家民系與其他民系的比較研究	陳支平 95
羅香林教授在港對客家學之拓展及與 客家社團之關係：紀念羅香林教授 逝世二十週年	李志剛 119

第二篇 社會經濟

台灣地方社會與客家政治力： 客家族群派系的類型、發展及限制	蕭新煌、黃世明 143
台灣客家族群的社會與經濟分析	張維安、黃毅志 179
客家、美濃、菸草文化之象徵化過程	洪馨蘭 209

Social and Economic Differences among Minong Families during Qing: An Essay on the Historical Anthropology of a Hakka Community in Southern TaiwanMyron L. Cohen	259
The Political Economy of Shatian Pomelo (沙田柚): Erosion of Patron-client Bond in a Hakka Village of Meixian in the Reform Era of Socialist ChinaHok Bun Ku	293
客家地區的經濟發展和基層組織的變遷: 以閩西爲考察物件	張 侃 337
二十世紀二〇~三〇年代閩西土地改革與 客家文化.....	孔永松 359
東南亞華人社團與跨國社會和商業網絡: 兼論客屬與非客屬之異同	劉 宏 379
客籍領事梁碧如與檳城華人社會的幫權政治	黃賢強 401

附 錄

主辦單位 協辦單位 贊助單位
會議時間 會議地點 籌備委員會

The Structure and Dynamics of Chinese Rural Society*

John Lagerwey

Ecole Pratique Des Hautes Etudes (Paris)

In my original Project Description I stated that “the basic aim of this project would be to describe traditional Chinese social life and organization at the township (鄉) level.” My theoretical starting point in the definition of the task was David Faure’s *The Structure of Chinese Rural Society*.¹ Faure, I wrote, “shows in particular that Freedman’s notion that ‘the village is no more than a lineage or an inter-lineage alliance’ does not fit the facts: ‘the foci of such alliances would not have been ancestral halls but, as Brim pointed out, temples devoted to the deities, at which all participant groups within the alliance might conduct common worship.’” Next to Freedman’s “lineage China”, in short, as a permanent substratum, there is a “territorial China”, a China of the gods whose paradigmatic ritual manifestation is the Taoist Jiao (醮). My initial idea, therefore, was

* This was the title of a three-year project funded by the Chiang Ching-kuo Foundation for International Scholarly Exchange, from 1994 to 1997. I directed this project on behalf of the Ecole Francaise d’Extemre-Orient (EFEO). While officially finished as of June 30, 1997, the project in fact continues, albeit with severely restricted financing. At the time of final changes to the present text (February 1999), seven volumes have been produced and four more are in various stages of advancement.

¹ David Faure, *The Structure of Chinese Rural Society: Lineage and Village in the Eastern New Territories, Hong Kong*. Cf. my book review in *Cahiers d’Extreme-Asie*, 5 (1990), p.445-448.

that “to make sense of the structure and the dynamics of Chinese rural society, it is necessary to distinguish between the ancestor cult and the various cults of the gods. What are their respective roles? Is there any relationship between them? What is the degree of variation from township to township as regards the organization of and interplay between the two types of cult? What kinds of ritual practice give social reality to them?”

Before summarizing the results below, it may be useful to explain why I added the word “dynamics” to Faure’s “structure of Chinese rural society”: it seemed to me that Faure’s definition of the problem, as given above, while it drew attention to a kind of permanent structural opposition (or complementarity) between two forms of worship and their related value systems, left unstated the obvious fact that this opposition necessarily had a history (even though Faure himself provided excellent histories of each of the lineages and lineage alliances he studied in the New Territories). That is, it left unformulated the one fundamental difference between the anthropological study of societies with and without written records, namely, that the existence of written records in peasant societies makes it possible to see the dynamically evolving nature of the structural oppositions and complementarities we can presently observe. What we can observe in the present is by definition a product of the past, but whereas the absence of written records makes it difficult if not impossible, in the case of tribal societies, to uncover that history, such is emphatically not the case in peasant societies like China.

As a specialist of Taoism, I had a second thought in mind: in the New Territories the Taoists who performed village Jiao were described by Faure as “the product of an intrusion from outside

the village.”² This struck me then, and strikes me even more now after four years of intensive fieldwork, as a rather unfortunate way of describing the religious and social dynamics that we observe in Chinese local society. What is at stake here, of course, is the problem of the relationship between what used to be called “big” and “little” or “high” and “low” traditions. Indeed, the above quotation from Faure’s book comes from Chapter 9, entitled “Greater and Smaller Traditions”. Judging by the fact that Faure also states that “it cannot be emphasized too strongly that the lineage as an institution was to a large extent introduced into the New Territories from outside” (*op. cit.* p.12), it would seem that he sees village culture as fundamentally different from, even alien to, the literate cultures of professional Taoists and Confucians. In other words, and to put it in more explicitly Sinological terms, this is the vexed problem of what to call “local religion”: can we or can we not use the word “popular”? Do we use it in opposition to the “higher religions” of Taoism, Buddhism, and Confucianism, or to refer in fact to “local religion”? But if the word “popular” then includes everything we see in local society, what is its use? I shall return to these questions below, but I should like in the first place to summarize what I see as the answers our project has provided to the initial questions stated above.

² The precise statement is more nuanced: “In the New Territories, it is possible to argue that the tradition in which the priests act as officials in sacrificing to the ghosts in the presence of the city god is the product of an intrusion from outside the village” (*op. cit.* p.145). Faure is in fact contrasting an “orthodox” Zhengyi Taoist performance of a Jiao with the more usual exorcistic Lüshan Taoism used in daily village life: the former is merged with the latter, he suggests (p.145), because of “the existence of a common theological ground, and the appeal of the professional and literate touch.” In his chapter on religion in the village, Faure adds that “communal worship at the temple (he is referring especially to the Jiao) is often conducted by professionals so that they may give the appearance of conforming to a universal mode.”

I. What Are the Respective Roles Played by the Worship of the Ancestors and the Gods in Local Society?

The word “worship”, in my usage, refers to “the total investment of the society in maintaining the living presence of the two invisible entities called ancestors and gods.” This includes the time and money invested in rituals (including not just rituals of “worship” as such, but all lineage-related — marriages, birthdays, cappings, funerals — and geomancy-focused rituals), buildings (including ancestor halls, temples, tombs, and open-air sites of god worship), banquets, and tales. To answer the question, therefore, we need descriptions which are as full and precise as possible of the organization and history of those four elements. What follows is a summary of our conclusions based on fieldwork reports from the three primary Hakka areas of southwestern Fujian, southern Jiangxi, and northeastern Guangdong:

1) To “take sides” as to the relative importance of the worship of the ancestors and the worship of the gods in structuring traditional social life is not very helpful. Increasingly, I would myself be inclined to see this way of phrasing the problem as an example of the use of Western either / or, as opposed to Chinese both / and logic. The latter is far more useful, I suggest, if our aim is to give a balanced, non-argumentative account of what we observe. Not only are both cults massively present at every turn, their worship is so thoroughly interwoven that it is in some sense hard to draw the line between them.³ We must speak, in short, not

³ I refer here to two facts: first and most important, one of the most basic functions of the territorial village gods is to protect the — often single lineage — village from invasion by the demons of epidemic, drought, and other threats to crops, domestic animals, and the human population. Second, field observation in Hakka areas has thrown up many cases in which lineage members have become local gods; see further below.

so much of an opposition between a “Confucian”, lineage China and a “Daoist” China of the gods — even though that opposition may be shown to exist — as of a complementarity between the two basic modes of worship and their related socio-economic organization. In this last regard, it is perhaps worth noting that, if we base our judgment on lineage registers, infinitely more land is set aside in trusts linked to ancestor worship than in trusts for the worship of village gods.

2) That said, it is also possible and desirable to underline the fact that the Chinese people described in our books seem to be quite clear in their minds that there is a basic distinction between the two spheres of ancestor-worship and god-worship: the one, however large the lineage, is “private”, the other “public”. Faure had described the difference in terms of “lineage” and “territory”, and the essays we have published give considerable evidence that that is a most useful distinction: over and over again, we find territory, even that occupied by single lineages or segments thereof, defined with reference to the gods who “control” them. But it seems to me that the distinction between the private and public functions of the two modes of worship is perhaps even more fundamental and more general in its import: the gods are the ultimate recourse, for example, in the settling of disputes between private parties. The importance of mechanical methods like lot-drawing and rotation for distributing access fairly to the “valuable goods” represented by the gods and their rituals gives expression to the same distinction.

3) As Arthur Wolf stated long ago in his article on “Gods, Ghosts, and Ancestors”, “Chinese ancestors are not feared because they are not conceived of as powerful beings.”⁴ The much-debated

⁴ Arthur Wolf, “Gods, Ghosts, and Ancestors”, *Studies in Chinese Society*, 1978, p.168. The full statement is worth quoting, as it highlights a frequent misunder-

question of their “general benevolence” as opposed to their “occasional malevolence” must be seen in this light: even in local society, ancestors rarely have the power to restore health and seem never to have the power to put an end to drought or epidemics. As regards sense of identity, the importance of lineage and ancestors on a local level is obvious, but beyond a narrow geographic scope ancestors cease to function. This can be seen not only in the many descriptions of township and county seat-level temple festivals in our published volumes, it can also be seen in the foci of worship of those who are “away from home”, whether it be in the “merchant guilds” (會館) or the “same place of origin congregations” (同鄉會) found in the diaspora: they are built around gods and their festivals.

II. Is There Any Relationship between Them?

One of the biggest surprises yielded by our fieldwork among the Hakka is the number of ancestors who are worshiped as gods. The most typical form this takes is that of a founding ancestor who finds, upon arrival in a new place, a god of the soil who requires the annual sacrifice of a virgin lad and lass (童男童女). He then goes off, either to Lushan (閩山) or Maoshan (茅山), to “learn magic” (學法); when he comes home, he drives away the bloodthirsty god, whose place he

standing about the nature of Chinese ancestors: “Freedman has argued that ancestors are not feared in China as in some West African societies because the living are not conscious of having displaced their ascendants from coveted positions of power.” A simpler explanation might be that Chinese ancestors are not feared because they are not conceived of as powerful beings. The African societies Freedman discusses are stateless societies in which the senior men of the lineage dominate the social landscape. In traditional China the authority of senior kinsmen was overshadowed by the far greater power of the imperial bureaucracy. The gods, of course, are often portrayed as divine bureaucrats, and Taoists address them, as Faure rightly observed, with professional, bureaucratic methods.

then takes. Since I first noted this configuration in an article on the Tu lineage of Tufang (涂坊), in Changting County (長汀縣), Fujian, we have found it throughout the Hakka area.⁵ Sometimes such gods are worshiped only by the relevant lineage, but more often they come to be worshiped by other lineage groups as well. We have discovered a whole series of examples of this kind recently in Mingqi County (明溪縣), Fujian. Such stories, of course, are modeled on that of Chen Jinggu (陳靖姑), the chief goddess in the Lüshan shool of Taoism found throughout southeastern China. As such, they constitute an important aspect of Taoist influence on local culture and religion.

Conversely, gods, especially those gods who are closest to the people, are referred to using lineage terms, most frequently “grandpa” — Gongtai (公太), Gongdie (公爺), Agong (阿公) — or “grandma” : Gupotai (姑婆太). These may be purely local gods, unknown elsewhere, but even such important gods as Huaguang (華光) may be referred to locally as Gongdie. Gods like those of Tufang referred to above belong to a larger category of not necessarily Taoist gods, all of whom are known by their surname plus the word “grandpa”: Tugong (涂公). Essays from our project that have already been published contain many examples of this kind: Raogong, Zougong, Laigong, Zhanggong, Xiaogong. Some of the gods of this category, such as Zougong 鄒公, are worshiped in fairly small areas (in the border area between Liancheng [連城縣] and Qingliu counties [清流縣], Fujian), but others, such as Laigong (賴公), are found all along the border regions of the Hakka parts of Fujian and Jiangxi. One special case of gods-as-ancestors is

⁵ “Notes on the Symbolic Life of a Hakka Village”, *Minjian xinyang yu Zhongguo wenhua guoji yantao hui lunwen ji* 《民間信仰與中國文化國際研討會論文集》(二), p. 733-762.

Mazu (媽祖), whom many local Lin lineages (林姓) have adopted as their Gupotai. This, however, I suspect to be a relatively late phenomenon, linked to the rising importance of Mazu throughout Hakka Fujian from the mid-18th century on.

As regards the other questions mentioned above — **what is the degree of variation? what kinds of rituals are used?** — I would like to say, first of all, that the variety is such that we do better to speak of a “marked tendency toward individuation”. This refers not only to the obvious fact that villages and lineages have their own histories, inevitably particular, but also to the less obvious fact that contiguous villages and lineages consciously compete to be different. In joint parades, for example, one village or lineage segment will specialize in boat lanterns (船燈), another in decorated lanterns (花燈), one will have the longest dragon lantern (龍燈), another the tallest. Neighboring villages which worship the same Ligong taibao (犁公太保) identify him with different historic figures, the one with Li Shimin 李世民, the other with an emperor of the Latter Tang (後唐). “Essentially the same, different in details” (大同小異), so rightly says the Chinese phrase; but the pleasure of fieldwork comes from the details: jazz may be jazz, but what attracts the listener is the endless variations on themes. That is one reason we have, after considerable hesitation, decided to continue to solicit and publish accounts of marriages and funerals: the basic structures are always the same, but each new account adds something vital to our understanding of what constitutes a Hakka marriage or funeral.

Having made that statement, I should like to address the question of “sameness” in terms of the problem raised above regarding “popular” or “local religion”. One thing the field reports make abundantly clear is that, while the intellectual observer (or even the local participant) may be able to distinguish Confucian,