Contributors

<div style="columns: 2">

Emily Martin Ahern

Chung-min Chen

Lawrence W. Crissman

Hill Gates

Stevan Harrell

Lydia Kung

Harry J. Lamley

Sidney W. Mintz

Burton Pasternak

Gary Seaman

Lung-sheng Sung

Edgar Wickberg

Edwin A. Winckler

Arthur P. Wolf

Alexander Chien-chung Yin

</div>

The Anthropology of Taiwanese Society

Edited by

Emily Martin Ahern and Hill Gates

Subethnic Rivalry in the Ch'ing Period

Harry J. Lamley

Over the 212-year period of Ch'ing rule in Taiwan (1684–1895), interaction among diverse groups of inhabitants had a marked effect on local socioeconomic development and cultural change, an effect still discernible on the island today.[1] This paper deals with one major type of Ch'ing-period ethnicity: the interaction among rival Chinese groups in settled portions of Taiwan.[2] Although these groups shared a common Han Chinese background, they came from relatively isolated areas of southern Fukien and eastern Kwangtung. In Taiwan, they tended to form discrete communities and perpetuate the diverse customs of their native subcultures. The term "subethnic," as used in this paper, refers to such subcultural distinctions.[3] It is also useful in distinguishing Chinese *intra*ethnic competition from the better-

known Chinese-aboriginal *inter*ethnic contention, the other major type of ethnicity that prevailed on the island throughout the Ch'ing period.

Taiwan's Chinese subcultural groups differed primarily in dialect and provenance. In Ch'ing times, most of the island's Chinese inhabitants were Hokkien and Hakka speakers, whose dialects remained mutually unintelligible. The Hokkien speakers, locally referred to as "Hoklo" (*Fu-lao*),[4] hailed mainly from Ch'üan-chou and Chang-chou prefectures in southern Fukien and areas peripheral to these prefectures. The Hakka (*K'o-chia*),[5] by contrast, came chiefly from eastern Kwangtung. Thanks to a further division of the Hokkien speakers into rival Ch'üan-chou and Chang-chou subgroups there developed in effect three, extensive, mutually exclusive subcultural groups in Taiwan. Within these groups, especially the Ch'üan-chou group, there was a further tendency to divide into communities based on county (*hsien*) origins. Except among some Ch'üan-chou communities, however, competition among county-level subgroups never seems to have been intense.

Subethnic feuding in Taiwan during the Ch'ing period has recently attracted the attention of a number of scholars.[6] This paper assesses more fully the background and nature of this intense and pervasive rivalry. It also attempts to demonstrate that the study of subethnicity may be of value in gaining a clearer perception of change and development in a heterogeneous Chinese society—in this case a premodern one that arose during the late imperial era.

[1] Interethnic relations in Taiwan have been recorded for even earlier times. In the seventeenth century, Dutch and Spanish colonists came into contact with local aborigines as well as with early Chinese settlers and traders and a number of Japanese residents. More extensive Chinese relations with the aborigines developed between 1662 and 1683 when Taiwan was controlled by the Ming-loyalist Cheng family. This earlier and less pervasive ethnic interaction, however, was not of such importance in the historical development of present-day Taiwanese society.

[2] Ethnicity is construed here as "essentially a form of interaction between cultural groups operating within common social contexts" (Abner Cohen 1974: xi). I am indebted to Hill Gates and T'ang Mei-chun for their comments on the original draft of this paper, which was submitted to the Conference on Anthropology in Taiwan. Other conference members also offered valuable insights and suggestions. I am particularly grateful to G. William Skinner and Edgar Wickberg for their help and encouragement.

[3] Cynthia Enloe has attempted (1973: 23–25) to distinguish different categories of ethnic groups by referring to the origins of their separate identities. She points out that tribal, national, and racial ethnicity are the most prevalent forms of ethnicity. However, in China—as in other parts of the world where pervasive cultures or civilizations with "great traditions" have existed—major subcultural distinctions have often led to separate ethnic identities apart from tribal, national, or racial ascriptions. Hence "subcultural ethnicity" may also be recognized as a widespread type.

[4] Hokkien speakers who migrated from southern Fukien to coastal areas farther south probably as early as the ninth century (and eventually to areas overseas) became known as "Hoklo"—i.e., "People of Fukien" (Skinner 1957: 37). In eastern Kwangtung as well as in Taiwan, other speech groups referred to these people as Hoklo in Ch'ing times. The Hokkien (i.e., "Fukienese") originally hailed from Honan and other regions of North China, and first began to settle southern Fukien extensively during the seventh and eighth centuries (Lo 1971: 169).

[5] *K'o-chia* means "guest families," indicating that the Hakka were latecomers in regions of southeastern China. Like the Hokkien, the Hakka originally came from North China, began to advance southward in the seventh and eighth centuries, and started to enter eastern Kwangtung at the end of the Southern Sung. Chia-ying, the chief center of Hakka culture in Ch'ing times, became a purely Hakka area during the latter half of the fourteenth century when heavy concentrations of emigrants from T'ing-chou (in southwestern Fukien) and southern Kiangsi converged there (Wen 1903: *chüan* 7, 85b–86b).

[6] Anthropologists who have recently called attention to Ch'ing subethnic strife in Taiwan include Hsü Chia-ming (1973) and Shih Chen-min (1973); historians who have lately expressed specific interest in the rivalry and feuding include Chang T'an (1974, 1976), Fan Hsin-yüan (1974), Huang Hsiu-cheng (1976), and myself (1977a, 1977b). Maurice Freedman has dealt with comparable strife involving feuds among lineages and surname aggregates in Fukien and Kwangtung (1958: 105–13; 1966: 104–17). Prevalent in the home region, this form of communal strife is discussed below.

The first part of this paper presents general background information on Taiwan and the southeastern mainland region from whence Taiwan's population came. The second discusses the major subcultural groups that emerged on the island. The third focuses on the settlement of Taiwan and the processes by which local communal groups of different home-area provenance were established and then acquired more cohesion as intercommunity rivalry intensified. The fourth deals with the phase of exceptionally severe subethnic strife that lasted from the 1780's to the 1860's, and contrasts communal feuding in Taiwan during this period with that in the home region. This final part also considers the response of the Ch'ing government to subethnic feuding in Taiwan and treats briefly the island's late Ch'ing turbulence and rivalry.

Taiwan and the Fukien-Kwangtung Home Region

Southern Fukien and eastern Kwangtung have an area of about 33,340 square miles. The entire region is set apart from most of the rest of China by massive mountain ranges. The five prefectural-level administrative territories into which southern Fukien was divided under Ch'ing rule were also generally set off from one another by mountain peaks and ranges. The rugged borders of Ch'üan-chou and Chang-chou bounded separate river systems. Similarly, the three principal administrative territories that made up eastern Kwangtung were separated from one another by spurs of the Nan-ling ranges that extend across much of South China.

The region's physical features tended to divide it into highland and lowland sections. In the highland Hakka country of Chia-ying and T'ing-chou, the population was thinly scattered in small villages. There were few large towns and cities. Farming was generally restricted to narrow strips of cultivated fields in the valleys or along the terraced hillsides, except in the upland basins. Similar conditions existed in other interior areas, Hakka and Hokkien alike. By contrast, the Hokkien-dominated lowland areas supported more extensive agriculture and a much denser population. Here, there were many large villages and urban centers, and shipping flourished at downriver and coastal trading ports.

Taiwan, an area of 13,884 square miles, is only a little over one-third the size of the home region. Moreover, much of the island is rugged: hills, tablelands, and high mountains occupy an estimated 76

percent of the total area; plains and basins merely 24 percent (Hsieh Chiao-min 1964: 29). The narrow alluvial plains along the western coastline were quite extensively settled during the Ch'ing period, as were the Taipei Basin in the north and the I-lan Plain in the northeast. Foothills rise sharply from the coastal plains and Taipei Basin, then spread inland to elevations of over 3,000 feet before giving way to the lofty central mountain ranges that run north and south the length of the island. Many of the habitable foothill areas were also settled during the Ch'ing period, as were the larger interior valleys. In these upland areas, where cultivable land was not as plentiful and the soil generally less fertile than in the lowlands, Chinese settlement tended to be sparser.

Contrasts in Taiwan's terrain tended to divide the island, like the mainland home region, into highland and lowland sections. In the hilly areas, where agricultural output was limited, the Chinese inhabitants depended on the lumber and camphor industries and, to a lesser extent, on mining. The coastal plains and lowland basins supported most of the island's rice and sugarcane production; in addition, salt fields operated in tidal flats, and offshore fishing flourished. Port towns located along Taiwan's flat western coastline, the northeastern Keelung and I-lan seacoasts, and the navigable Tanshui River in the Taipei Basin served as central markets and commercial outlets for their respective hinterlands.

During the Ch'ing period, only a few Chinese settled along Taiwan's inhospitable east coast, and even fewer in the mountain areas that until 1875 were reserved by Ch'ing policy for the "wild aborigines" (*sheng-fan*). The great bulk of the Chinese population was concentrated in the western and northern portions of the island.

Speech groups and local society.   In the home region, as we have seen, the population consisted mostly of Hokkien and Hakka speakers. The Hokkien spoke varieties of the Southern Min dialect, most of which were to some extent mutually intelligible.[7] On the whole the Hakka spoke a more uniform dialect. However, the predominantly Hakka areas were relatively isolated from each other, and there were

[7] According to natives of southern Fukien, each county in Ch'üan-chou and Chang-chou supported variations in Min-nan speech (Li Han-ching 1974: 1099). Even in a single county, such as Hui-an in Ch'üan-chou, the local vernacular varied with respect to intonation and idiom (Chang K'ai-ch'üan 1963: 6). Examples of differences in Hokkien speech in Ch'ao-chou and Hui-chou are listed by Li Yung-ming (1959: 1–5) and by Liu Kuei-nien (1881: 842–43). The Hokkien in Ch'ao-chou (who call themselves "Teochius" and are also referred to as "Hoklo") resembled the Chang-chou inhabitants in their speech.

several Hakka subdialects, plus many local variations in speech. Moreover, Hakka in areas of Hui-chou accessible from central Kwangtung were influenced to some extent in their speech by contact with Cantonese speakers (Liu Kuei-nien 1881: 842–43).

During the Ch'ing dynasty (1644–1911), the distribution of the Hakka and Hokkien populations within the Fukien-Kwangtung home region remained relatively fixed. In eastern Kwangtung a zone of mixed habitation, dividing the more purely Hakka highlands from the Hokkien lowlands, followed the contour of the mountains that rise from the coastal plains and stretch northeastward from Hai-feng county in Hui-chou. After crossing into the southern Fukien highlands, this zone formed a less distinct Hakka-Min dialect boundary that extended inland in a northerly direction through rugged areas of Chang-chou and western sections of Lung-yen, then crossed the northern portion of mountainous T'ing-chou.[8] This entire zone apparently remained stable in Ch'ing times. Although disorder was rife throughout Fukien and Kwangtung, severe Hokkien-Hakka conflicts similar to the Hoklo-Hakka contention in Taiwan were not reported in areas of mixed habitation along this sociolinguistic boundary.

Neither was there widespread conflict between the Hokkien populations of Ch'üan-chou and Chang-chou. These inhabitants of southern Fukien were connected by intimate ties, and had long shared similar customs and practices. Even in areas where they associated together, people from these adjacent prefectures or counties within them did not exhibit the mutual antagonism that came to prevail among Hoklo groups in Taiwan. After Amoy (Hsia-men) was reopened to maritime trade in 1684, for example, Ch'üan-chou and Chang-chou people resided together there in relative peace amid a growing community that reflected the customs of the nearby counties of both prefectures (Chou K'ai 1839: 317–18, 639). Subethnicity, then, was not a critical factor in the home region under Ch'ing rule as it came to be in Taiwan.

Coastal and highland populations differed, however, in respect to economic well-being and modes of livelihood. The Hokkien speakers dwelling along the seacoast had been dependent on trade and seafaring activities for many centuries, and suffered great hardships when

they were ordered to move ten to fifteen miles inland at intervals from 1661 to 1683, the period in which Ch'ing imperial forces fought against Taiwan-based opponents—the Ming-loyalist Cheng Ch'eng-kung (Koxinga) and his successors (Hsieh Kuo-ching 1932: 589–90). After Taiwan was surrendered, the coastal populations of southern Fukien and eastern Kwangtung soon reverted to their familiar maritime pursuits, the inhabitants of Ch'üan-chou and Chang-chou profiting from the flourishing trade that developed at Amoy. Local merchant and shipping interests made this sheltered island harbor of T'ung-an county their base of operations, and reestablished trading links with Luzon in the northern Philippines and other Nan-yang (South Sea) areas. They also engaged in extensive coastal shipping (Fu 1948: 43–46).

Southern Fukien merchant-shippers came to dominate trade with Taiwan. They cooperated closely with local Ch'ing officials during the period from 1684 to 1783, when Amoy served as the only designated port for both government and merchant shipping to and from the island. They established *chiao* (literally, "outskirt") guilds at An-p'ing (serving the prefectural center at Tainan) and subsequently at other Taiwan port towns as well. In 1784, a Han-chiang port near the Ch'üan-chou prefectural center was also opened for legitimate trade with the island, as was Wu-hu-men (serving Foochow to the north) in 1792. Yet Foochow merchants were unable to gain much advantage from direct trade with Taiwan by way of this northern port. By then, southern Fukien commercial interests, particularly those of Ch'üan-chou, were in nearly complete control of the cross-channel junk trade. Their monopoly on the Taiwan side was handled by the *chiao* guilds that had begun to control nearly all major aspects of maritime trade and shipping.[9]

Meanwhile, those inhabitants residing in the more distant highland districts of the home region gained few commercial advantages from the resettlement along the seaboard. The Hakkas, in particular, still controlled only small trading areas and established few if any discrete merchant guilds in major urban centers beyond the bounds of Chia-ying and T'ing-chou (Liang 1956: 152). Even in recent times, the Hakka dialect has been recognized as "not being a language of

---

[8] The general Hokkien-Hakka boundary in eastern Kwangtung is shown in a map entitled "Swatow Mission Field" (drawn by Rev. W. Riddel) in Gibson 1901. Professor G. William Skinner has kindly provided me with a map showing his own estimate of Hakka boundaries in eastern Kwangtung and southern Fukien. I have relied on both maps.

[9] Fang Hao has recently written a series of articles dealing with the *chiao* guilds at various port towns in Taiwan. For an idea of their general nature and operations, see especially Fang 1971: 21–27. Fang believes that the Amoy *chiao* associations mentioned by Fu (1948: 55) were similar to many of those in Taiwan.

commerce" (Forrest 1948: 238). To compensate for the relatively low remuneration from trade and agriculture in their highland districts, many Hakka men sought to advance themselves by earning academic degrees (Lin Yün-ku 1956: 30, 32), while Hakka women, who did not bind their feet as was customary among the Hokkien, replaced them in the fields.

In the main, however, both the Hakka and the upland Hokkien labored to wrest a meager living from their poorly endowed mountainous surroundings. Ming and Ch'ing accounts portray both populations as sturdy and thrifty highlanders (Hu 1923: chüan 4, 8). In fact, Hakka and Hokkien populations, no matter whether of highland or lowland residence, shared many of the same traditions, beliefs, and forms of social organization.

Both people were also characterized by the prevalence of powerful kinship and surname groups, except in the poorest and most sparsely inhabited districts. Frequently, large lineages occupied sections of villages and towns and suburbs of walled administrative seats. Single-lineage villages were also common, and common descent groups of a more inclusive sort prevailed as well. Extensive Hakka clans were formed during the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century in Chia-ying, where local agnatic groups established joint ancestral halls (tsung-tz'u) in county seats and higher-level "great halls" (ta tsung-tz'u) at the departmental center. These clan buildups apparently occurred when the fashion of communal feuding spread upriver from Ch'ao-chou (Huang Chao 1899: 157–58, 166). Surname aggregates of a less structured nature were also widely formed, usually on a more or less temporary basis for some particular purpose, often a feud (Lamley 1977b: 9–10, 17). Since a majority of the inhabitants in most districts bore the same few surnames, such loosely knit aggregates could, if need be, embrace sizable portions of the local population.

Surname aggregates also became widespread in Taiwan during the Ch'ing period. Immigrants who settled in newly opened areas sometimes regrouped along common-surname lines (Chou Hsi 1832: 284). Settler bands that migrated from other parts of Taiwan often organized themselves on a surname basis as well.[10] Through the gradual fusion of small agnatic groupings, local surname aggregates contin-

[10]For example, the various bands of settlers that migrated to newly opened areas in the I-lan Plain and the P'u-li Basin (in central Taiwan) are usually identified in Ch'ing sources by their predominant surnames rather than by their subcultural or home-region extraction.

ued to form and expand. Powerful aggregates, or "great surnames" (ta-hsing), were established in Taiwan's major port towns (Huang Ch'i-mu 1953: 57). Similar groupings, composed of lineages and extended family groups, played dominant roles in rural communities and appear to have wielded proportionally more power within areas where subethnic feuds had subsided and contending enclaves were weaker and less cohesive. In localities where subethnic rivalry was not prevalent, aggregates at times formed rival alliances and spawned surname feuds resembling the large-scale conflicts waged by surname confederations in the home region.

When circumstance allowed, both Hoklo and Hakka agnatic groups established ancestral estates in common and, in effect, developed into corporate lineages. These lineages tended to be less powerful than the local lineages that spread in Fukien and Kwangtung by natural fission, as Burton Pasternak (1969) has pointed out. Nor did they become as extensive and highly structured as the clans that formed in Chia-ying. Nevertheless, within their respective communities corporate lineages throughout Taiwan proved to be relatively strong and wealthy and helped support subethnic rivalry.

Ch'ing authorities generally regarded southern Fukien and eastern Kwangtung as disorderly regions and the inhabitants as rapacious, greedy, and vindictive. After the Manchus extended their sway over South China in the mid-seventeenth century, the inhabitants of the region experienced several more decades of turmoil, especially in areas where Ming loyalist forces contended with Ch'ing troops and along the seaboard, from which the population was periodically evacuated.

After the coastal areas were resettled, disputes arose among the inhabitants over property boundaries and tideland rights. By the Yung-cheng reign (1723–35), frequent outbreaks of well-organized feuds, described as "lineage fights" (tsu-tou) and categorized officially as hsieh-tou ("armed affrays") were reported in Ch'üan-chou and Chang-chou (Lamley 1977b: 17). The spread of communal feuding from these two prefectures to other portions of the home region was accompanied by a resurgence of other types of disorder—coastal piracy, pervasive banditry, secret society activity, and occasional uprisings.

Conditions in Taiwan were generally even more turbulent during the Ch'ing period than conditions in the home region. Violence was particularly common in frontier areas, where relentless Chinese pres-

sure to reclaim lands and exploit wilderness resources was countered by reprisals from aborigines. Banditry and offshore piracy were rife, making travel hazardous. Vagrant bands and dissident settlers, including secret society members, added to the trouble by fomenting disturbances and insurrections. According to a popular adage, Taiwan could expect "an uprising each three years, a rebellion every five."

Government. The problems of governing southern Fukien and eastern Kwangtung were compounded by the region's isolation from Foochow and Canton, their respective capitals. Following the capitulation of the last Ming loyalist forces in 1683, provincial authorities in Foochow and Canton, together with the Ch'ing court in Peking, attempted to normalize conditions in the region by allowing civil functionaries stationed there to exercise greater authority. Meanwhile, Green Standard (*Lu-ying*) units, consisting mainly of local Chinese troops and their officers, were redeployed about the coastal and interior areas to help maintain order.

In Taiwan, the form of government resembled that in the home region for most of the Ch'ing period. The island was placed under Fukien jurisdiction in 1684, and a prefecture with three counties was then established in the west coast sections where scattered Chinese settlements already existed. The two highest officials, an intendant and a brigade-general both stationed at the prefectural center (present-day Tainan) in the south, were at first assigned duties related to defense; but as the needs of an expanding population increased, they were eventually granted much broader authority than their counterparts in southern Fukien and eastern Kwangtung. Additional Green Standard troops were also gradually assigned to Taiwan and new military posts established, primarily in the northern half of the island where the population growth was most rapid. Moreover, units of civil authority continued to be created in newly settled areas until another county, along with three subprefectures (*t'ing*), had been established in the west-central and northern portions of the island by the middle of the nineteenth century.

Sweeping administrative reforms were initiated in Taiwan during the last two decades of local Ch'ing rule, mainly in response to the incursions of foreign powers. Yet these reforms helped to alleviate some of the worst domestic problems. In 1875, obsolete restrictions on immigration and settlement were removed, and formal Ch'ing authority was extended over the entire island including remote aboriginal territories now opened to Chinese settlers. Also, semimodern Chinese forces began to be stationed in Taiwan in partial replacement of the ineffective Green Standard troops. Again, a second prefecture was established in the north and three counties created there in lieu of the Tan-shui and Ko-ma-lan (I-lan) subprefectural administrations. Finally, in 1886, Taiwan was made a separate province, and Taipei, the center of a third prefecture newly established in the northernmost portion of Taiwan, came to serve as the provincial capital.

All in all, however, Ch'ing rule tended to be relatively ineffective in Taiwan, due in part to the poorly trained Green Standard land and water forces that were assigned to posts in Taiwan at three-year intervals. These troops were rotated from brigades and regiments stationed throughout Fukien and at Nan-ao in eastern Kwangtung. Those hailing from Ch'üan-chou and Chang-chou proved the least reliable, since they were inclined to side with belligerent island inhabitants from the same home area (Li Ju-ho 1970: 4). Corrupt mandarins and yamen underlings also provoked rather than alleviated local discord, as did the restrictive regulations that Taiwan officials were obliged to enforce until the final two decades of the Ch'ing period. As argued below, subethnic rivalry in its most virulent form was essentially a phenomenon of an era of weak and restrictive government in Taiwan.

Major Subcultural Groups in Taiwan

The main flow of Chinese settlers to Taiwan took place during the eighteenth century. As noted, this flow came largely from southern Fukien and, to a lesser extent, from eastern Kwangtung: up to 1895, in fact, 98 percent of all Taiwan's Chinese immigrants had come from these two areas (82 percent of the total were Hoklo, and 16 percent were Hakka).[11] This cross-channel migration fluctuated in

[11]The population percentages and ratios that appear in this section are based mainly on Ch'en Han-kuang's summary (1972: 85–104) of the 1926 census survey of Taiwan's Chinese inhabitants and their home-region registries. However, since only southern Fukien and eastern Kwangtung origins are given in this survey, the Hoklo and Hakka percentages presented here are not calculated entirely on the basis of the figures shown in the survey. (Relatively small numbers of Hoklo and Hakka came from other regions of southeastern China, including areas of Fukien north of the Min-nan speech region: Ch'en Chi-lu, for example, mentions (1972: 130) Fukien emigrants who belatedly crossed over from the Hsing-hua and Fu-chou coastal

volume, but never assumed the massive proportions of some of the great interregional migrations of the Ch'ing dynasty (Ho 1959: 136–65). Nevertheless, considerable migration occurred: Taiwan's Chinese population increased from about one hundred thousand in 1683, after Ch'ing forces assumed control of the island, to almost two million by 1811. By 1895, this population had risen to nearly three million, although natural increase rather than immigration accounted for much of the later growth (Ch'en Shao-hsing 1964: 117, 164–66).

Though Hoklo and Hakka people were principally distinguished by their mutually unintelligible dialects, they could also be differentiated by other features. Hakka women, for example, did not bind their feet and favored distinctive hair styles. There were also religious differences in regard to festivals, temple names, and deities. Veneration of San Shan Kuo Wang, for instance, was generally a characteristic of Hakka settlers from eastern Kwangtung. Distinctions in dress, architecture, and eating habits likewise led Hoklo and Hakka to associate with their own kind and to discriminate against others.

Although there were fewer Hakka in Taiwan than Hoklo, the Hakka came from nearly as many prefectures and departments. By 1895, Hakka from Chia-ying made up almost 8 percent of Taiwan's Chinese population; Hakka from Hui-chou about 4 percent; Hakka from Ch'ao-chou (unfortunately not distinguished from Hoklo from Ch'ao-chou in population records) probably about 3 percent; and Hakka from T'ing-chou (in southwestern Fukien) at least 1 percent. Immigrants from these areas reportedly spoke four separate Hakka subdialects (Chung 1973: 19–20), yet each of the subdialects could be understood by all Hakka-speaking people (Wang Ta-lu 1920: 14b). The Hakka dialect thus seems to have had a unifying effect on Taiwan's Hakka, allowing them to band together as a solidary minority group. Indeed, there is no evidence of massive confrontations between Hakka of different backgrounds, whereas there is evidence of such confrontations between rival Hoklo groups.

Throughout the Ch'ing period, Ch'üan-chou and Chang-chou Hoklo made up the overwhelming majority of Taiwan's Chinese population. By the end of the period, Ch'üan-chou people constituted almost 45 percent of this population, and Chang-chou people more than 35 percent. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the combined Ch'üan-chou and Chang-chou population was proportionately larger. However, a marked decline in Hoklo immigration together with a small but steady stream of nineteenth-century Hakka immigrants eventually reduced the relative sizes of the Ch'üan-chou and Chang-chou groups.[12]

Like the more inclusive Hoklo and Hakka identities, Chang-chou and Ch'üan-chou identities were also fostered by differences in speech and mainland provenance. In general, however, religious distinctions proved most effective as cultural markers setting off Chang-chou from Ch'üan-chou communities.[13] The inhabitants of Chang-chou communities tended to worship K'ai Chang Sheng Wang, a patron deity peculiar to their home prefecture. Again, Chang-chou and Ch'üan-chou immigrants are reported to have made offerings to their ancestors at different hours during the prescribed days of the lunar year and to have offered different meats and delicacies.

In areas of Taiwan where a Ch'üan-chou population was predominant, the inhabitants tended to form more discrete communities reflecting their different home-county origins. Such Ch'üan-chou subgroups generally worshiped major deities brought over from their home areas. Thus Three Counties (San-i) people (from Chin-chiang, Hui-an, and Nan-an) venerated Kuang Tse Tsun Wang as a principal communal god; and people from T'ung-an and An-ch'i counties honored Pao Sheng Ta Ti and Ch'ing Shui Tsu Shih (or Pao I Ta Fu) respectively (Wang Shih-ch'ing 1972: 12–13, 19).

Hakka and Hoklo group formation. In general, one finds relative solidarity among the Hakka and relative disunity and divisiveness among the Hoklo. Such a contrast does not mean that Hoklo groups were incapable of achieving unity or of creating effective alignments when the need arose. Accounts of subethnic feuds show that the in-

---

prefectures and generally engaged in the "three blades" (*san-tao*) trades as cooks, tailors, and barbers.) In this section general population estimates are based on the two most accurate Taiwan population surveys of the Ch'ing period, those of 1811 and 1893. (See Ch'en Shao-hsing 1964: Tables X-2 and X-3, pp. 159–62.)

[12] At the end of the Ch'ing period, the approximate ratio among Taiwan's Ch'üan-chou, Chang-chou, and Hakka populations was 47 : 37 : 16. The approximate ratio among Taiwan's three major Ch'üan-chou subgroups (Three Counties, T'ung-an, and An-ch'i), who together made up almost 45 percent of the island's Chinese population, was 40 : 33 : 27. (These estimates are based on the 1926 census: see Note 11.)

[13] This, of course, is an oversimplification owing to the variety of mainland deities worshiped. For example, Hoklo communities of diverse prefectural origins tended to establish Ma Tsu temples; Ch'üan-chou inhabitants worshiped a number of different Wang Yeh deities; and some groups or subgroups enshrined special territorial gods brought over from ancestral community temples. Shih Chen-min briefly lists (1973: 198) a few home-county or prefectural deities.

volved groups functioned cohesively and became adept at forming alliances with their neighbors. Large Hoklo alignments emerged in areas where the Hoklo inhabitants were pitted against adversaries of at least equal strength. For example, in the Hsia-tan-shui River basin of southern Taiwan, Ch'üan-chou, Chang-chou, and Ch'ao-chou Hoklo cooperated to oppose Chia-ying, Ch'ao-chou, and T'ing-chou Hakka. In contrast, where both Ch'üan-chou and Chang-chou Hoklo outnumbered local Hakka—as in most areas of western Taiwan from Chia-i northward—separate Ch'üan-chou and Chang-chou aggregates generally contended against Hakka groups (Tai 1963b: 213). In these areas, Hakka survival depended on cooperation and unity to counter more powerful but disunited Ch'üan-chou and Chang-chou foes.

Throughout Taiwan, in fact, local conditions encouraged Hakka community and intergroup solidarity. In many areas Hakka settlers were latecomers, or else a distinct minority, and had to endure great hardships in opening only moderately productive wilderness lands. Consequently, Hakka communities were generally smaller and poorer than Hoklo communities and had to face almost continuously a level of insecurity that Hoklo communities experienced only during periods of extreme turbulence. Even the inhabitants of the island's most extensive Hakka enclave, the Liu-tui confederation in the Tung-kang River area of southwestern Taiwan, felt continually threatened by nearby Hoklo and aboriginal populations (Chung 1973: 82–83, 265–66).

Various socioeconomic factors also fostered Hakka unity. Hakka communities, for instance, had few exceptionally wealthy families of the sort that often dramatized disparities of wealth and divided people in Hoklo communities.[14] Hakka solidarity was also encouraged by large Hakka investments in corporate estates and religious societies, institutions that provided for community needs and undertakings. Chung Jen-shou claims (1973: 270) that various chi-ssu kung-yeh (ancestral estates) and shen-ming-hui (religious societies) held from 50 percent to 70 percent of the cultivated land within the extensive Liu-tui confederation. The managers of such holdings decided which community projects merited support from these investments.

[14]See Chung 1973: 265–71. Burton Pasternak has discovered similar contrasts between Hakka and Hoklo villages in present-day Taiwan. The households of the Hakka village that he studied frequently acted in concert, coordinating their efforts at the village level to achieve common objectives; in the Hoklo village, by contrast, there was "no comparable stress on ways of unifying the community or reinforcing alliances between communities" (1972: 128).

Related to the practice of forming shen-ming-hui was the Hakka inclination to build community temples in lieu of ancestral halls (an inclination initially shared by Hoklo settlers). These temples became local political centers and served as symbols of unity, centers of self-government, and (in times of strife) headquarters for local militia. Some community temples—like the Lin-chao Kung and Yung-an Kung in Chang-hua county—not only provided numerous services for their own settlements but also administered to many neighboring villages (Hsü Chia-ming 1973: 171–85). Other temples assumed highly specialized paramilitary functions within local alliances and confederations. The Chung-i Tz'u, which served as the command center of the Liu-tui confederation from 1721 to 1895, is the foremost example of this type of Hakka temple.

Shen-ming-hui and chi-ssu kung-yeh were also formed in Hoklo communities and became principal sources of communal wealth. Besides defraying the costs of religious worship, such corporate enterprises met a variety of local needs, including those associated with sustaining armed feuds (Ssu-fa hsing-cheng pu 1969: 608–9, 612). In both Ch'üan-chou and Chang-chou communities, these organizations helped to maintain local subethnic identity and also, through temple affiliations, occasionally rendered support to larger aggregates. The well-endowed Lung-shan Ssu (a Kuan Yin temple) in the northern port town of Meng-chia provides an example of this type of support. Built in 1740 from contributions by early Three Counties immigrants, this temple was initially patronized by local merchants. Later, it served as a military command center for Three Counties people during their feud with newcomers from neighboring T'ung-an. Not long after this feud ended in 1859, the temple became the main command center for a Ch'üan-chou aggregate drawn from a much wider area that was fighting against a similarly large Chang-chou force (Huang Ch'i-mu 1953: 55–57).

Some Hoklo temples performed specialized military roles akin to those performed by the Hakka Chung-i Tz'u. The latter temple, in fact, was the first of a number of i-min ("righteous commoner") shrines dedicated to local militia members who sacrificed their lives in wars against rebel, aboriginal, and subethnic opponents. After the Lin Shuang-wen Rebellion of 1786–87, both Hoklo and Hakka i-min shrines were founded throughout Taiwan. Some of these shrines even served as centers of resistance when Japanese forces entered the island more than a century later. However, most i-min shrines—

including the well-known Pao-chung shrines near Hsin-p'u in Hsin-chu county and near Chung-li in T'ao-yüan county[15]—were established by Hakka.

Because Taiwan's Hoklo and Hakka shared many social institutions and practices (as they had in their home areas), they responded to rivalry and disorder in largely similar ways. But whereas Hakka communities depended upon close cooperation and cohesiveness almost continuously, Hoklo communities relied on these factors only occasionally as circumstances warranted.

Immigration and Settlement

From the beginning of Ch'ing rule in Taiwan in 1684, cross-channel migration was subject to a variety of restrictions. These included traditional controls on trade and travel abroad as well as new restrictions imposed by a Ch'ing court more interested in keeping Taiwan as a protective shield than in developing it as a region for further settlement. Neither women nor the families of settlers already in Taiwan, for example, were allowed to immigrate there. Although these restrictions were set aside for brief periods during the eighteenth century, they were not relaxed on a continuous basis until the 1790's and not rescinded until 1875 (Chuang 1964: 1, 50). Moreover, Fukien authorities in Taiwan discriminated against Hakka settlers (labeled "Yüeh" or "Kwangtung" people) until the end of the Chu I-kuei Rebellion of 1721, when, in return for Hakka assistance against Hoklo rebels, they began to treat immigrants from eastern Kwangtung on a more or less equal basis with those from southern Fukien (Huang Shu-ching 1736: 92—93).

Troublesome restrictions, however, did not stop large numbers of immigrants from entering Taiwan in response to the attractions of virgin land and commercial opportunities. The earliest Ch'ing immigrants hailed largely from Ch'üan-chou and Chang-chou, though a few came from the coastal areas of Ch'ao-chou and Hui-chou. During the eighteenth century, Hoklo people from further inland within southern Fukien (including Yung-ch'un and Lung-yen highlanders) crossed over as well. The Hakka exodus to Taiwan from Chia-ying

[15] These two shrines have been treated briefly in recent articles (Ts'ai Mou-t'ang 1976; Lin Hui-ling 1977). The term pao-chung refers to a decoration for loyalty conferred by the Ch'ing emperor—in this case to honor Hakka braves (yung) who perished while fighting against rebels.

and adjacent areas in Hui-chou and Ch'ao-chou seems to have peaked during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. This migration mainly followed the Han River route to the seacoast, where arrangements were made for secret crossings. However, various Chia-ying officials tried to encourage Hakka emigration from the eastern Kwangtung highlands by facilitating transit through southern Fukien. There was thus some legitimate Hakka migration by way of overland routes and sailings from Amoy.[16] But ineffective supervision of shipping and stringent immigration restrictions encouraged the great majority of both Hakka and Hoklo migrants to enter Taiwan illegally (Chuang 1964: 40—42, 50).

Government restrictions on shipping and immigration had a profound effect on settlement in Taiwan because they made the simultaneous migration of large lineages and village groups impossible. Immigrants were forced to cross over in small and often diverse bands to Taiwan, where they formed new communities that depended on a variety of ascribed relationships. Moreover, during the seventeenth century and the first half of the eighteenth century, the island's Chinese population remained predominantly one of male settlers without local family ties. Consequently, social conditions in all but the oldest settled areas continued to be frontierlike for years after the lands had been cleared and the threat of attack from aborigines had ended (Chang T'an 1970: 25—27).

Migration to Taiwan resembled Chinese overseas emigration in other respects. During the early decades of the Ch'ing period, for example, many male settlers evidently hoped to retire to their native mainland villages. However, except for immigrants engaged in seasonal or temporary labor, most remained in Taiwan—the normal circumstance in overseas Chinese communities. Migration to Taiwan also frequently resulted in the familiar chain pattern: early settlers induced others from their home areas to join them.[17] Such locally in-

[16] Huang Chao 1899: 117, 153. Huang (1789–1853), a Hakka scholar of Chen-p'ing (present-day Chiao-ling) county in Chia-ying, complained that emigrants from his county seeking legal entry into Taiwan had to secure certificates from both the Chen-p'ing authorities and the subprefect stationed at Amoy. Thus they had to pay two sets of customary fees (lou-kuei) in order to move from eastern Kwangtung to Taiwan via Amoy.

[17] For example, kinsmen of a Chou-surname lineage in An-ch'i crossed over to Taiwan after two brothers had migrated there and eventually opened a shop in the Taipei area. These Chou kinsmen proceeded to establish a shipping company (Huang Shih-ch'iao 1971: 103). James L. Watson, discussing Chinese chain migration overseas in more recent times, notes that "the lineage is ideally suited to the needs of large-scale chain migration" (1975: 101). However, the extent of continuous chains of migration to Taiwan among lineage members or single-lineage

tensive migration eventually contributed to the growth of discrete, homogeneous communities that were set apart from one another by differences in speech, customs, and provenance.

Ch'ing-period migration to Taiwan was socially as well as subculturally diverse. Though many of the immigrants who opened up new land were destitute peasants, many of those who initiated land reclamation projects or who invested in commercial enterprises were wealthy. Increasing numbers of merchants and tradesmen (sometimes from areas outside the home region) also migrated to Taiwan and established guilds and shops in towns and in administrative centers. Moreover, outlaws and outcasts entered Taiwan illegally, resulting in a sizable vagrant (*liu-min*) population of often desperate men without local household registry or means of livelihood (Tai 1963b: 204–6).

The initial restrictions on immigration, however, inevitably favored the wealthy, who were able to enter Taiwan legally. These privileged immigrants included landed proprietors and large-rent holders (*ta-tsu yeh*) dependent on the goodwill of Taiwan's authorities for land grants and tax concessions, and large merchants and shipping magnates dependent on official endorsements and protection. Importantly, wealthy immigrants and their descendants often maintained strong links with their native areas and thereby helped to perpetuate Taiwan's subcultural heterogeneity.[18]

Immigration from southern Fukien to Taiwan slowed down markedly around the end of the eighteenth century after the island's western lowland areas and the Taipei Basin were fully opened and the choice lands reclaimed. Although Hakka from eastern Kwangtung continued to cross the channel in appreciable numbers, the great majority of emigrants from both eastern Kwangtung and southern Fukien went to Southeast Asia. This modern era of Chinese emigration to Southeast Asia had little effect on subethnic relations in Taiwan

or on the nature of the diminished flow of cross-channel migrants. Ch'ing-period migration to Taiwan, like the subethnic rivalry it helped to spawn, remained essentially a product of premodern political and socioeconomic conditions.

Settlement. Prior to the establishment of Ch'ing rule in 1684, Chinese settlement in Taiwan was concentrated on the southwestern coastal plains in portions of present-day Tainan, Chia-i, and Kaohsiung counties. A few isolated settlements were scattered along the west-central and northern coasts. During the latter part of the seventeenth century and the first half of the eighteenth, the already colonized areas in the southwest acquired much denser populations. From early in the eighteenth century, west-central areas also began to attract considerable settlement; and from the second half of that century (following the opening of the Taipei Basin and additional northern coastal areas), the north received a substantial influx of settlers as well. Upland areas and interior mountain basins—usually held by aborigines—tended to be settled later, often during the nineteenth century. Finally, steady settlement in the island's southern tip and along its rugged eastern coast did not begin until late in the Ch'ing period, except in Keelung and I-lan. (The first permanent settlers arrived in I-lan in 1796.)

Maps prepared by Ch'en Cheng-hsiang (1959: 24, no. 39; 119–25, nos. 153–64) indicate the general distribution of Taiwan's subcultural groups at the end of the Ch'ing period. They show Ch'üan-chou and Chang-chou populations in the old, established areas of the southwest, early Hakka settlements in the interior of what was once Feng-shan county (Kaohsiung and P'ing-tung), and later Hakka settlements in the mountainous areas of present-day T'ao-yüan, Hsin-chu, and Miao-li counties. The maps also show heavy concentrations of Ch'üan-chou people (mainly from T'ung-an and the Three Counties) along nearly the entire western coastline. Chang-chou people dominated stretches of coastline only in Kaohsiung, Tainan, Yün-lin, and T'ao-yüan counties, along with the northeastern coastline around Keelung and I-lan; and Hakka groups occupied only a few western coastal areas in Miao-li, northern T'ao-yüan, and P'ing-tung counties.

These maps tend to support the standard view of Chinese settlement in Taiwan. According to this view, Ch'üan-chou immigrants arrived first and established villages and towns near harbors and mouths of rivers; Chang-chou immigrants arrived next and settled

---

villagers is difficult to assess. Besides, there was a high degree of risk and uncertainty involved in cross-channel migration to Taiwan. In 1814, for instance, a sizable group of Huang-surname kinsmen from Chin-chiang departed for Taiwan on two junks. One junk arrived at the northern port of Pa-li-fen, but the other was driven southward by strong winds and tides to the mid-island port town of Lu-kang. The men from this second junk settled nearby on the Chang-hua county border (Huang Shih-ch'iao 1968: 122).

[18] Little attention has been paid to migrants who returned to the home region. Some could afford to retire at home as a matter of preference, but others were forced home by rebellions or feuds (Huang Shih-ch'iao 1968: 128), by family or lineage orders, and by jobs—for example, to copy genealogical records (Huang Shih-ch'iao 1969: 108, 112). Those returnees who went back to Taiwan undoubtedly contributed to the cultural enrichment of their particular island communities.

farther inland along the western plains; and Hakka immigrants arrived last and were forced to settle in less productive hilly areas (Ch'en Chi-lu 1972: 87). The problem with these generalizations is that they are accurate only for certain areas of Taiwan and do not do justice to the complexity and diversity of settlement patterns. The first settlers along parts of Yün-lin's coast, for example, were Chang-chou immigrants, who were subsequently pushed inland by larger groups of Ch'üan-chou immigrants. Similarly, various groups of Hakka settlers were forced inland by the arrival of larger groups of Hoklo settlers. Moreover, the standard view of settlement does not take into account local conditions. Few areas in the plains and basins, for instance, came under the exclusive control of one subethnic group—a fact made clear by the extensive subethnic feuding that occurred in many parts of Taiwan from the late eighteenth century until well into the second half of the nineteenth century.

Taiwan's history of subethnic conflict is not merely evidence that most parts of the island were ethnically mixed; it also indicates that settlement patterns changed. Internal migration—whether forced or simply in response to newly opened land—was frequent and important. Lien Wen-hsi shows (1971: 9–24; 1972: 6–7) that Hakka laborer and settler groups often remained highly mobile, not only reclaiming lowland areas but opening up mountainous tracts as well. Many Hoklo likewise remained mobile. Chang-chou people, for instance, made up a majority of the more than forty thousand inhabitants of northern Taiwan who poured into the I-lan Plain during the first decade of settlement there. Similarly, in the middle of the nineteenth century Chang-chou and Ch'üan-chou settlers opened up the mountainous P'u-li Basin in central Taiwan. Feuds broke out among subethnic groups in both I-lan and P'u-li; in I-lan, the feuds escalated into local warfare when the Chang-chou majority fought allied Ch'üan-chou, Hakka, and aboriginal opponents (Hsu Cho-yun 1972: 53–54). The subethnic strife in I-lan and P'u-li is especially significant because it shows how easily intense rivalry developed during the eighteenth century could later spread to frontier territories, often necessitating still further internal migration and making Taiwan's settlement patterns even more complex.[19]

[19] In I-lan, for example, the Chang-chou majority succeeded in driving Ch'üan-chou and Hakka settlers from the central part of the plain to localities as far south as Lo-tung (Lamley 1977a: 181). In Yün-lin, Ch'üan-chou immigrants drove both Chang-chou and Hakka settlers from the coast, not only seizing their lands, but installing different community and surname

Towns and walled cities. Taiwan's market and port towns were often affected by the same kinds of subethnic rivalries that affected the countryside. Indeed, as the population grew and as competition over trade and resources increased, subethnic rivalry naturally assumed an urban dimension. In fact, subethnic feuds sometimes dramatically changed the composition of town populations and even altered towns' sizes and locations. For example, the Chang-chou townspeople of Pei-kang moved east and formed a new market town at Hsin-kang because of friction with Pei-kang's more numerous Ch'üan-chou residents.[20] In southwestern Miao-li, recurrent feuds among Ch'üan-chou, Chang-chou, and Hakka groups during the middle of the nineteenth century led to the formation of three separate port towns (Ts'ai Chen-feng 1897: 118).

Although there was a tendency for towns to become the exclusive territory of one or another local subcultural grouping, this was not always the case. As a result of a feud between Three Counties and T'ung-an townspeople in Meng-chia, for instance, the T'ung-an inhabitants fled downriver and joined with Chang-chou people to develop Ta-tao-ch'eng as a rival port. Accommodation, then, was an alternative to separation as a response to subethnic strife. Successful efforts to survive by means of accommodation also took place in rural areas—as in parts of Chang-hua county where neighboring Chang-chou and Hakka communities learned to live together (leading to the eventual assimilation of the Hakka) as a result of pressure from powerful Ch'üan-chou alignments (Hsü Chia-ming 1973). In the turbulent Tou-liu area of Yün-lin county, Hakka inhabitants similarly acquired the speech and religious practices of their dominant Chang-chou neighbors (Ni 1894: 30).

Conditions in Taiwan's walled cities—its prefectural, subprefectural, and county seats, largely postdating pioneering settlements—also favored accommodation. In these protected localities, the inhabitants generally enjoyed relative peace and order, except in times of uprisings and urban riots. The "guest" residents, including offi-

deities in their abandoned temples (Yün-lin Record 1972: 120). Again, most Hakka settlers moved southward from the Taipei Basin when menaced by intense Chang-chou and Ch'üan-chou rivalry during the middle part of the nineteenth century. These Hakka even abandoned their major commercial and religious center at Hsin-chuang (Lien 1971: 21–24; 1972: 13–14).

[20] Thereafter, animosity continued between Pei-kang Ch'üan-chou and Hsin-kang Chang-chou. Pei-kang Ch'üan-chou would not marry their daughters to Hsin-kang Chang-chou, but they would accept wives from them. Such discriminatory practices led to subethnic feuds between the two townspeople (Yün-lin Record 1972: 120).

cials and their entourages, hailed from many mainland areas besides the home region, and this helped to create a cosmopolitan environment in which local elites often developed interests and ties that transcended particular communities and subethnic groups. However, Taiwan's administrative centers contained mainly mixed Hoklo populations. Sizable Hakka communities rarely formed in the walled cities and their suburbs.

The literature of the period, in fact, suggests that Hakka were discriminated against in some walled cities by the Hoklo populace and, at times, by local officials. Around 1720, for example, Tainan residents were cautioned by the authorities not to rent to Hakka so as to stop them from becoming too numerous within the city's four wards (Lien 1971: 5). Thereafter, with the exception of wealthy individuals and outstanding gentry-scholars, the island's Hakka appear to have been treated as outsiders in that prefectural center. This seems to have been the case in Hsin-chu city as well. Hakka went there for business and scholarly purposes (Huang Chung-sheng 1960: 16), but were denied the full advantages of city or suburban life because of their dialect, troublesome reputations, and relative lack of commercial experience.[21]

Subethnic rivalry and island development. In order to understand more clearly how settlement and subethnic rivalry were related, we may envision three general stages of development for the areas of Taiwan settled during the Ch'ing period. First was a pioneering stage in which wilderness territories were opened for cultivation; next came an intermediate stage of economic growth; and finally came an advanced stage in which local society more closely resembled that prevailing in long-established communities in the home region.

Although subethnic conflict sometimes occurred when diverse settlers converged on the same wilderness areas, cooperation was often the rule during the pioneering stage. Settlers worked together on land reclamation and water control projects and fought together against hostile aborigines. Many settler bands were naturally close-knit groups of kinsmen and associates with "common locality" (*t'ung-hsiang*) ties. But at other times, tenants and laborers of diverse

[21] At the Chang-hua county seat, where a predominantly Chang-chou population existed, Hakka residents were apparently tolerated. The Chang-hua gazetteer (Chou Hsi 1832: 289) mentions that both Min (Fukien) and Yüeh (Kwangtung) family schools (where learning was carried on in separate dialects) were located within the city as well as in county market centers and villages.

origins had to be collected to gain sufficient manpower for large-scale undertakings. Such cooperative ventures were usually arranged through proprietorships established to open up specific localities. In lowland areas, Ch'üan-chou and Chang-chou proprietors officially authorized as "reclamation householders" (*k'en-hu*) sometimes recruited mixed Hoklo bands. They also appear to have employed Hakka laborers who had no tenancy privileges. Lien Wen-hsi lists (1971) many instances when Hakka and Hoklo together reclaimed lands in wilderness areas from Chia-i northward. The pioneer settlements that evolved from these joint ventures generally housed Hoklo and Hakka workers in close proximity (sometimes in separate neighborhoods, sometimes "roof-to-roof" within the same villages).

Hakka proprietors normally operated apart from their Hoklo counterparts and formed settler bands from among their own people. Beginning in the late eighteenth century, however, a number of joint Hoklo-Hakka proprietorships were established to open up mountainous terrain in northern Taiwan. Though the Hoklo and Hakka partners (or major shareholders) cooperated directly in management, they generally recruited separate bands of tenant-settlers, who lived and worked apart. These joint proprietorships proved especially effective in coordinating land reclamation projects in sections of the island already beset by subethnic tension. The most outstanding proprietorship of this nature—bearing the corporate name Chin Kuang Fu—was formed in 1834 and partly subsidized by the Tan-shui subprefect. This proprietorship enlisted around twenty-four bands of Hoklo and Hakka settlers (mostly the latter), and in thirteen years succeeded in opening sizable areas of rugged terrain southwest of the subprefectural center in present-day Hsin-chu county (Lien 1971: 17).

The intermediate stage of development began in each area after the better lands had been reclaimed and more immigrants had arrived on the scene. This second stage was marked by the spread of new market centers, the construction of irrigation systems (coupled with increased agricultural production), the attainment of more balanced age and sex ratios, and the appearance of new kinds of local leaders in keeping with significant cultural and commercial advances. Moreover, population growth and economic expansion led to more competition for land and other limited resources as well as to more commercial and social rivalry—all factors that tended to intensify subethnic conflict. This increase in local discord occurred as pioneer

settlements segmented or disappeared, leaving in their stead communal groups based largely on shared provenance, dialect, and religious customs.

The competition that disrupted older mixed settlements in turn fostered solidarity within these more discrete communal groups. Indeed, as local discord assumed the guise of intercommunity strife, people's interests and loyalties became closely linked with the welfare of their respective communities regardless of their status, wealth, and kinship affiliations. At the same time, conflict among rival communities impeded the development of full and open intercommunity relationships, which remained precarious and strained.

Under tense and unstable conditions rivalry between such subculturally discrete communities led to subethnic feuds. Communities at feud often created alliances with other communities within their local subcultural grouping or with "friendly" communities nearby, thus spreading their feuds over much larger areas. In time, intermittent feuding turned territorial groupings into belligerent enclaves with enduring boundaries. This escalation of violence also forced "neutral" communities to choose sides, causing isolated Ch'üan-chou, Chang-chou, and Hakka inhabitants to seek protection among people of their own kind. The highest degree of rural "coercive closure"—to use G. William Skinner's term (1971: 279–80)—thus became normal for the polarized communities and enclaves in feud-afflicted areas of Taiwan.

Feuding of such magnitude occurred mainly during one long and severe phase of subethnic strife—a phase that began in 1782 when an affray between Ch'üan-chou and Chang-chou villagers in Chang-hua spread northward into Tan-shui subprefecture as well as south into Chia-i county. The problem was exacerbated in 1826 when Hoklo-Hakka feuding became widespread in the wake of a subethnic disturbance in the Chang-hua countryside (Inō 1928: 931–32). Thereafter, Ch'üan-chou, Chang-chou, and Hakka adversaries intermittently battled in feud-afflicted areas throughout the west-central and northern portions of the island. Elsewhere, extensive Hoklo-Hakka affrays, following feud patterns developed at the time of the Chu I-kuei Rebellion (1721), became commonplace in districts of Feng-shan in southern Taiwan. This virulent phase of subethnic strife, lasting roughly 81 years (from 1782 through 1862), largely coincided with the intermediate stage of Taiwan's development.

Though plagued by subethnic conflict, the intermediate stage (as noted) was economically constructive. During the 81-year period of severe strife, a number of irrigation systems were built through private or community endeavor (Hsieh Tung-min 1954: 228). Large city-building projects, also requiring considerable local capital and labor, were undertaken as well. Much of this development took place in the west-central and northern areas of Taiwan where economic growth was most evident despite the prevalence of subethnic feuds. It is apparent, however, that extensive subethnic feuding had an adverse effect on social development at levels higher than the discrete community or local enclave. Social intercourse and cultural interchange were impeded and marketing often severely constricted in the segregated countryside. Local government tended to become (or remain) ineffective and remiss. In sum, persistent large-scale feuding disrupted the many ties that customarily linked the villages, market towns, and walled cities together within a central-place hierarchy.[22]

Feuding gradually subsided and tension lessened during the mid-nineteenth century. In the 1860's, the last of Taiwan's great epidemics of subethnic fighting came to an end, and a more stable and open society evolved—an indication that the third stage of development had begun. Signs foreshadowing this more mature stage had in fact appeared earlier when Taiwan's gentry-scholar class had begun to assume more active leadership about the island (Lamley 1964: 92–124). Subsequently, reforms in civil and military government and improvements in administration helped to make society in Taiwan increasingly resemble that in the home region.

Subethnic Feuds and Government Response

In several important respects, Taiwan's subethnic feuds seem to have been patterned after the home region's feuds among lineages and surname aggregates. For one thing, feuds in both areas were highly organized—in fact, almost with the formality of ritual. For another, temples commonly served as headquarters for feud preparations. Moreover, the armed bands issuing forth from Taiwan's com-

[22] G. William Skinner has distinguished (1977: 275) two hierarchies of central places for late imperial China: a formal one created and regulated by the imperial bureaucracy, and an informal one reflecting the natural structure of Chinese society ("a world of marketing and trading systems, informal politics, and nested subcultures"). The two were interrelated. Extensive local feuding directly affected the informal hierarchy; but the formal hierarchy also suffered when officials became overburdened and, along with their underlings, were denied free access to towns and village localities in a state of war.

munity temples and *i-min* shrines (with banners, images of local deities, etc.) reflected community and temple influence in much the same way that the armed bands issuing forth from the home region's lineage temples manifested the strength of local lineages or of larger buildups of surname aggregates. Then, too, temples in both areas were important in financing feuds. In Taiwan, funds from local ancestral estates (*chi-ssu kung-yeh*)—formed by kinship groups to support ancestor worship—were frequently used for feuds. In the home region, proceeds from nearly identical "sacrificial land" (*cheng-ch'ang-t'ien*) associations were misappropriated for the same purpose (Liu Hsing-t'ang 1936: 37–39). This form of support was less substantial in Taiwan than it was in the home region because Taiwan's kinship groups had less corporate wealth. Nevertheless, local lineages with common property (though not always of demonstrated common descent, according to Wang Sung-hsing [1972: 175]) supplied funds and leaders for feuds, as did Taiwan's great families and surname aggregates.

However, *chi-ssu kung-yeh* did not become numerous in Taiwan until well into the nineteenth century. The extensive subethnic feuds of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries appear to have been financed largely by local religious societies (*shen-ming-hui*). These societies were usually organized to support the worship of particular deities and to finance the upkeep of these deities' altars and temples, although some served as organizations for supporting ancestor worship or as professional or artisan associations.[23] By and large, the versatile *shen-ming-hui* provided a network of mostly nonkin connections in communities lacking extensive agnatic ties.

The support that temples and religious associations provided for feuding groups was not limited to men and money but extended to supernatural aid from gods, ghosts, and ancestors. In Taiwan, for example, the ghosts of local braves who had fallen in previous subethnic feuds (or in battles against rebels or aborigines) were cared for in *i-min* shrines and called upon by shrine communities for help against common enemies. More often, gods and ancestors were appealed to for their aid and blessings and requested to "witness" oaths and contracts made in preparation for armed affrays.

[23] These remarks about Ch'ing *shen-ming-hui* are based mainly on descriptions by Sun Sen-yen in the compilation Ssu-fa hsing-cheng pu (1969: 605–48). For an account of *chi-ssu kung-yeh* in Taiwan during this period and thereafter, see Tuan Sheng-feng's discussion in the same compilation (1969: 693–820).

Taiwan and the home region differed, however, with respect to those who participated in the fighting. In the turbulent areas of southern Fukien and eastern Kwangtung, where lineage feuds were frequent, the fighting often led to the development of a professional mercenary class dependent on feuds for a livelihood. In some counties, powerful rival bands of mercenaries were able to extort vast amounts of lineage wealth, with a ruinous effect on the feuding lineages and on local society in general. Nineteenth-century accounts, for example, cite many cases of lineage leaders who were unable to control or stop the feuds that they had started: reportedly, wealthy lineage members became impoverished and powerful lineages grew weak as a result (Cheng 1887: 621).

Feuding was most destructive, of course, when entire villages or market towns were plundered and burned, and the survivors killed or forced to flee. In Taiwan, feuds on this scale were sometimes incited by bandits and vagrants merely anxious for an opportunity to pillage. Taiwan's authorities were appalled by the ease with which feuds could begin, intensify, and spread to distant areas with similar alignments of subethnic rivals. This matter was particularly serious because large-scale feuds posed a direct threat to governmental authority. Sometimes, in fact, subethnic feuds gave rise to rebellions, although more often rebellions (dependent on subethnic alliances) gave way to feuds. Taiwan's most serious rebellions of the Ch'ing period—those of Chu I-kuei (1721), Lin Shuang-wen (1786–87), Chang Ping (1832), and Tai Ch'ao-ch'un (1862)—all involved subethnic strife (Inō 1928: 937–40).

In the long run, however, it appears that Taiwan's subethnic feuds did not have as ruinous a local effect as the home region's lineage and surname feuds. Growth and development, at least, continued in those parts of Taiwan most affected by recurrent subethnic strife. Large projects that required considerable local organization and cooperation between rival communities were even carried out, some as joint community ventures (such as the construction of irrigation systems), others as projects initiated by Ch'ing officials and gentry leaders. In northern Taiwan, the building of the Ko-ma-lan subprefectural seat and the reconstruction of the walled Tan-shui subprefectural center were accomplished by gentry-managed bands of mutually estranged Hoklo and Hakka workers. Again, the wall-building project at Taipei, the site of the new northern prefectural center, was undertaken in the early 1880's by rival Ch'üan-chou and

Chang-chou managers and laborers who still bore grudges stemming from the feuds of previous decades (Lamley 1977a: 186–93, 199–200).

The ability of estranged rivals to work together helps to explain how a period of severe subethnic strife could also be a period of economic growth. Feuds, then, did not stop all productive pursuits, and did not even rule out some kinds of cooperation between enemies. The notion of "peace in the feud" (see Gluckman 1956: 1–26) is appropriate for this situation in Taiwan. Tightly organized "closed" communities imposed peace in their immediate locales, as did larger enclaves in their respective territories. Other factors besides in-group cohesion, however, helped to bring about this peace. The establishment of new and exclusive market towns, the departure of weak groups from strife-ridden localities, and the formation of extensive "religious spheres" tended to reduce friction within closed-off territories and to create more clearly delineated boundaries.[24] However, these same factors also helped to uphold the status quo among belligerent groups.

These observations suggest that Taiwan's local communal groups, as parts of larger enclaves, fared better than lineage communities in the home region did during prolonged periods of strife. Taiwan's communal groups were more sheltered within the island's closed off and subethnically homogeneous territories, and hence had a better chance of maintaining their strength and solidarity. Nor do they seem to have been as susceptible as feuding lineages in Fukien and Kwangtung to exactions by mercenaries. Also, organized bandit and vagrant bands tended to be treated as outcasts in Taiwan no matter what their provenance: such dissidents were rarely able to derive status and power by inciting violence and seldom gained access to corporate sources of community wealth. Moreover, island communities usually exercised more effective control over their fighting braves, enlisting mainly their own young men and usually demobilizing them—sometimes with the encouragement of wary local officials— when their services were no longer urgently required (Lamley 1977b: 25–26; Li Ju-ho 1970: 4–5). Similarly, the presence of discrete rival

[24] For reference to "religious spheres", see Shih Chen-min's recent work on Chang-hua (1973). There, during the Ch'ing period, the worship of home-region Hoklo deities was extended to neighboring villages, thus forming religious territories or spheres that amounted to subcultural ritual units. A complementary study by Hsü Chia-ming (1973) indicates that small Hakka communities under the threat of attack by Ch'üan-chou people joined Chang-chou villages in communal worship. Ultimately, the Hakka were assimilated.

communities and enclaves in so many settled areas of Taiwan tended to limit secret society activity.[25]

Extensive feuding in Taiwan, as in the home region, tended to occur in periods of chronic local disorder. Indeed, Taiwan's 81-year phase of severe subethnic strife coincided with a period of island-wide turbulence highlighted by serious rebellions.[26] The animosity bred by feuding and insurrections set the stage for further violence, so that even minor incidents were sufficient to spark great epidemics of subethnic strife. In such a troubled environment, the "peace in the feud" often proved frail and short-lived, and local Ch'ing rule was frequently imperiled.

Government response. Ch'ing authorities acted harshly, though not always effectively, to suppress subethnic feuding in Taiwan whenever armed affrays spread and threatened to engulf entire localities. In the eyes of the government, such feuding was tantamount to local rebellion. The precedent for dealing with large-scale feuding was established in 1782 in response to the first major outbreak of fighting between Ch'üan-chou and Chang-chou settlers. Officials quickly dispatched troops to pacify troubled areas and ordered the execution of rival leaders. The onset of extensive Hoklo-Hakka fighting in 1826 provoked a similar response, even prompting the governor-general, stationed in Foochow, to tour Taiwan and to devise a plan for bolstering local defenses in the northern half of the island (Lamley 1977a: 186–87).

Military efforts, however, proved insufficient to curb local violence, largely because such efforts did nothing to lessen the intense animosity that gave rise to the violence. In fact, this animosity was sometimes exacerbated by local civil and military functionaries who regarded Hakka settlers as "outside provincials" from Kwangtung. Moreover, the actions of the Green Standard troops stationed in Taiwan constantly posed a problem. These rotated troops shared backgrounds and traits with the island's Ch'üan-chou and Chang-chou

[25] When rebel leaders with secret society affiliations fomented uprisings, subethnic friction invariably occurred among subordinates and followers. Moreover, rival communal groups not represented in local rebel forces often sided with the government or else remained neutral. During the Lin Shuang-wen Rebellion, for example, Ch'üan-chou and Hakka alignments in disturbed areas formed *i-min* units to oppose predominantly Chang-chou rebel forces (Chang T'an 1974: 82–83). In the Ch'ing period, Taiwan's Hakka never fomented large uprisings, although members of Hakka communities occasionally joined rebellions.

[26] Lists of disturbances in Taiwan under Ch'ing rule are given in Chang T'an 1970: 35–43; and Ch'en Shao-hsing 1964: 190–93. Together, these lists indicate that the period 1782–1862 was highly disorderly in respect to both feuds and uprisings.

inhabitants and were therefore apt to take sides in feuds rather than act impartially to stop the fighting (Li Ju-ho 1970: 18–19). Furthermore, officials, officers, and yamen runners often tried to extract bribes or fees by offering to intervene in feuds or in litigation following outbreaks of violence. With unreliable subordinates and underlings, even the best officials were unable to maintain order, much less devise means of reducing subethnic tension.

The makeshift solution to which local officials most frequently resorted was to pit rival groups against each other, "using the people to control the people" (*i-min chih-min*). The government's formal recognition of armed Hakka bands as a legitimate militia in southern Taiwan and the awards bestowed on these "righteous commoner" (*i-min*) forces for their stand against rebels during the Chu I-kuei Rebellion provide a notable instance. Thereafter, Hakka forces were deployed as far north as Chia-i in later engagements with Hoklo rebels.

Spurred in part by the fear that internal disorder might invite foreign intervention, Taiwan's authorities experimented with other forms of local control during the early nineteenth century. Local directors (*tsung-li*) and overseers (*tung-shih*) were selected from commoners living in rural communities, charged with keeping the peace, and reprimanded whenever subethnic fighting took place in their localities. The authorities also began to introduce collective security measures based on the existing *pao-chia* system under which registered households were organized into small units and the inhabitants held accountable for each other's actions. In 1833, a united *chia* (*lien-chia*) system was briefly established in central areas of the island to unite "law abiding people" (*liang-min*) within much larger units made up of towns and nearby rural localities. In other parts of Taiwan, officials initiated "united village compacts" (*lien-chuang yüeh*) that embraced entire rural districts. Under these compacts, large villages were required to protect small villages, and powerful kinship groups were obliged to defend weak ones. United militias were also formed to guard against local uprisings, banditry, and feuding.[27]

These early experiments in collective security were not very successful in curbing subethnic strife. United *chia* and united village systems functioned only as long as dedicated officials were on hand, and

[27] For discussions of the various forms of militia and local control that operated in Taiwan under Ch'ing rule, see Inō 1928: 941–46; and Tai 1963a: 77–82. The Ch'ing *pao-chia* system and its different functions (including those related to police and militia operations throughout many areas of China) are dealt with in Hsiao 1960: 43–83.

even then were introduced in only a few areas. Furthermore, in most instances such security measures called for the inclusion of rival communities within the same units. During the latter half of the nineteenth century, however, local officials assumed a more realistic view of Taiwan's deep-rooted subethnic rivalry and allowed separate Hoklo and Hakka confederations and militia bands to maintain order within their own territories (Inō 1928: 941–42, 946).

Taiwan's officials also tried to persuade rival communal groups to refrain from violence—sometimes, by calling upon local leaders to mediate disputes in their areas (Huang Hsiu-cheng 1976: 82). The problem with this approach was that subethnic conflict frequently involved competition between the leaders of rival groups. Indeed, the power and prestige acquired by leaders provided direct benefits to their respective groups—such as more favorable treatment from local civil and military functionaries. Ch'ing authorities fully understood this kind of competition among rival elites and attempted to make use of it. One way of doing this was to give gentry status to local notables. Throughout the Ch'ing period, in fact, the government was generous in granting academic and expectant-office titles (conferring gentry status and privileges) to eminent members of all three major subcultural groups as rewards for services. Moreover, special Yüeh (Kwangtung) quotas were established for civil and military *sheng-yüan* degrees in 1741 in an attempt to appease Taiwan's Hakka population. Thereafter, the competition became so keen among Hoklo and Hakka scholars about the island that quotas applicable to both groups were gradually enlarged. Early in the nineteenth century, a separate Yüeh quota was also introduced for island Hakka competing in the provincial examinations held in Foochow (Chuang 1973: 80–84, 474).

As an expanding and privileged class, Taiwan's gentry came more into their own as leaders and community spokesmen during the first half of the nineteenth century. Hence, Ch'ing authorities began to rely more heavily on them to intercede in subethnic disputes. Fengshan officials, for example, made headway in reducing long-standing tensions between Hoklo and Hakka in the Hsia-tan-shui River area after encouraging local gentry from both sides to act jointly as managers of local irrigation systems and ferry services (Inō 1928: 949–50). Such members of the gentry had much to gain in terms of wealth and influence from helping to alleviate chronic local disorder. As

the gentry gradually formed wider ties and interests, they naturally tended to take a firmer stand against subethnic strife—not only in their own localities but in other areas as well. One well-known result is the discourse "Exhortation for Peace" (*Ch'üan ho lun*), delivered by a northern gentry-scholar in an effort to end feuding between Ch'üan-chou and Chang-chou communities in the Tan-shui sub-prefecture (Inō 1928: 950–51).

By the middle of the nineteenth century, officials in Taiwan were making even greater use of the gentry in their efforts to maintain order. Hoklo and Hakka militia units, under local gentry commanders, proved effective in quelling uprisings and in curbing subethnic violence (Lamley 1964: 102, 108). Even when these units were not actively deployed, power still gravitated into the hands of the gentry commanders, whose interests and responsibilities increasingly transcended the confines of their own communities. As a result, this gentry elite was able to play a major role in curtailing subethnic strife on an island-wide basis from the 1860's on.

Comprehensive reforms in government policy and administration during the final decades of Ch'ing rule also helped to reduce subethnic tension in Taiwan by allowing reform-minded gentry to serve the state in various managerial capacities and to become advisers to the island's new senior officials. Moreover, Taiwan's gentry leaders began to foster a wider sense of provincial identity that tended to override local prejudice. Finally, the arrival of semimodern troops recruited outside the home region also helped to bring about more orderly conditions in areas of mixed settlement. Their presence on the island also allowed the opening of remote coastal and mountainous areas by mixed bands of settlers without subethnic strife.

Late Ch'ing turbulence and rivalry. Despite late Ch'ing reforms and the lessening of subethnic tension, local conditions remained turbulent in Taiwan. Banditry was still rife, and conflict with aborigines increased as greater numbers of Chinese troops and settlers entered wilderness areas. Above all, conflict involving kinship and surname groups became more widespread and intense. Previously, serious conflict between such groups had been limited mainly to port towns and to those rural localities where there was little subethnic rivalry. However, as subethnic tension lessened in areas of mixed settlement, massive affrays among bellicose lineages, great families, and surname aggregates began to take place, and communal feuding revived. Hence, in rural areas where powerful enclaves had fragmented

and created more open conditions (especially in mixed Hoklo localities), neighboring villages turned against one another, and new feud patterns and cycles of "community closures" set in. Countryside affrays (*hsiang-tou*), sustained by the predominant surname groups of rival villages, proved awesome and destructive in both Hoklo and Hakka localities.[28]

Meanwhile, rivalry among the island's three major subcultural groups assumed new dimensions when prominent Hoklo and Hakka gentry leaders began to represent their respective groups at the prefectural and provincial levels of Taiwan's much revised government. Competition arose over the familiar issue of quotas in Taiwan's enlarged examination system as well as over efforts to obtain patronage and official favors. From time to time, hard-pressed authorities also endeavored to secure the cooperation of important rival leaders.[29] Such high-level competition among subcultural elites generally transcended intercommunity rivalries and precluded the subethnic feud strategies of the past.

Though subethnic conflict persisted, it was increasingly confined to fights between Hoklo and Hakka groups—local affrays evident even during Taiwan's resistance to the Japanese in 1895 (Lamley 1970: 30, 51). On an island-wide basis, subethnic strife was largely overshadowed by escalating kinship and surname disturbances, which came to resemble the extensive lineage and surname-aggregate feuds in Fukien and Kwangtung. This escalation took place as aggressive common-surname groups formed networks of affiliations over wider areas (Huang Hsiu-cheng 1976: 82). Thus in the late Ch'ing period, the authorities were confronted with a familiar but grave type of disorder that threatened to equal or exceed the bounds of previous epidemics of subethnic feuds, for at that period most of the nearly three million Chinese inhabitants of Taiwan shared only a

[28] See, for example, a Chang-hua scholar's description of the widespread damage caused by these rural feuds in the 1880's (Hsü Tuan-fu 1970: 2723–24). Other evidence of this strife is still at hand. Myron Cohen (1969: 179) translates a circular written sometime during the latter part of the nineteenth century announcing a meeting of lineage members to prepare for an affray in the Hakka district of Mei-nung (then in Feng-shan county). David Jordan (1972: 20–26) describes the "great" surname wars that took place in at least seven Hoklo villages north of the Tainan prefectural center sometime between 1855 and 1870.

[29] For instance, when provincial officials undertook to bolster Taiwan's defenses against Japanese attack in 1894–95, they appointed an influential Chang-chou gentry leader to head an island-wide militia system. But because almost all the enrolled militia units consisted of Hoklo bands, the officials subsequently called upon the island's most prominent Hakka gentry-scholar to form a supplementary force composed of local Hakka braves and *i-min* bands (Lamley 1970: 35).

few common surnames.[30] Moreover, native-place ties within Taiwan, rather than subethnic identities per se, became increasingly important, particularly as north-south political rivalry developed between Taipei, the new provincial capital, and Tainan, the old prefectural center. This factor, too, had the effect of diluting subethnic feelings and limiting their influence.

Subsequently, Japanese rule over Taiwan (1895–1945) hastened the growth of a more distinctively Taiwanese perspective among the island's Chinese inhabitants. This perspective greatly reduced the significance of subethnic divisions. Furthermore, the Japanese had much more effective military and police forces at their disposal than their Ch'ing predecessors had, and were therefore more successful in curbing subethnic strife as well as kinship and surname violence. In most areas, the orderly conditions under Japanese rule led to the peaceful merging of Ch'üan-chou and Chang-chou peoples. Today, in fact, the descendants of Taiwan's Ch'üan-chou and Chang-chou settlers seem much less aware of their different mainland origins; often, they are only able to distinguish their backgrounds on the basis of slight distinctions in speech. A degree of Hoklo-Hakka discord has continued, however, nourished by long-standing differences in dialect, customs, and attitudes. In areas where sizable communities of Hoklo and Hakka coexist, subcultural boundaries are still evident despite the many modern influences that encourage assimilation.

Conclusions

Subethnic rivalry arose in Taiwan during the Ch'ing period as a result of heterogeneous Chinese immigration and settlement. Generally manifested through intercommunity competition among the three major subcultural groups that emerged on the island, this widespread form of rivalry in turn influenced internal migration and local patterns of settlement. In the case of Taiwan, however, subethnic rivalry cannot be construed simply as a product of the pioneer stage in which diverse settler bands contended with each other in an effort to survive and improve their lot. Such rivalry spread and intensified

during an intermediate stage of development, and persisted to a lesser degree (and also at higher levels of political competition) even after Taiwan had reached a relatively mature stage in the final decades of Ch'ing rule. Viewed over the course of many decades, subethnic rivalry may be seen to have been a factor that, to a greater or lesser extent, continuously affected socioeconomic development in many of the island's areas of mixed Chinese settlement.

Subethnic rivalry also affected cultural change, particularly when intergroup competition increased locally and communities of a more discrete sort formed as a consequence. From this point on, settlers and their descendants appear to have made concerted efforts to re-adopt customs and practices native to their home areas in southern Fukien and eastern Kwangtung. Their selective borrowing of religious traits proved especially significant: distinctions in home-area deities and religious observances (reinforced by differences in speech and other traditional customs) served as key cultural markers that imparted exclusive identities to rival communities and more clearly defined and reinforced the cleavages between them.

In a similar vein, the borrowing and adaptation of home-region practices was evidenced by the organized feuding that lent such a violent tone to subethnic rivalry in Taiwan. Preparations for costly armed affrays (*hsieh-tou*) entailed essentially the same institutional procedures as those preceding the outbreak of lineage and surname affrays in Fukien and Kwangtung. When the familiar *hsieh-tou* fashion spread among local bodies of Ch'üan-chou, Chang-chou, and Hakka adversaries, alarmed officials designated this version of armed feuding as *fen-lei hsieh-tou* (literally, "armed affrays among diverse types"), a term denoting the distinctively subethnic character of Taiwan's communal feuds (Lamley 1977b: 10–11).

The feud seems to have been an appropriate form of conflict for rival communities contending in an insecure environment plagued by disorder and weak government. Communities at feud tended to balance off each other, thus allowing for a relative status quo and for brief periods of peace. Moreover, feuding brought about a high degree of community organization and cooperation under "closed" conditions, factors that enabled local economic development to proceed. However, intermittent feuding also intensified and perpetuated local tensions and consolidated the boundaries between contending communities and enclaves, thereby enabling subethnic rivalry to become an enduring and deeply rooted phenomenon in Taiwan.

---

[30] Li Tung-ming estimates that 97 percent of the Taiwanese (not counting aborigines and mainlanders) share 100 surnames. However, 53 percent share just ten of these surnames; and almost 20 percent share the two most common ones, Ch'en and Lin. That is, about one out of every nine Taiwanese is a Ch'en, and one out of every twelve is a Lin (1976: 75–76). Hence, through rival surname networks among the ten most common surnames (especially the Ch'ens and Lins), it was possible to foment massive and extensive local strife.

316 Harry J. Lamley

Feuds also tended to spread and spark subethnic disturbances in other localities. As a result, extensive feud patterns formed among subcultural groupings in many parts of Taiwan during the island's 81-year period of severe subethnic stife. Subcultural configurations of this magnitude were in turn important in creating the rudimentary framework of a plural society—a society segmented into three groups with parallel structures and class hierarchies. Later on, however, a well-defined plural society did not take shape, for the lines between Taiwan's major subcultural groups became blurred by both peaceful and violent proceedings: namely, social integration among local groupings at peace, and widespread kinship and surname violence that revived intercommunity rivalries on the basis of common descent instead of ethnicity per se. Nevertheless, each major group continued to have representation by way of contacts between their respective gentry elites and local Ch'ing authorities.

The state, in fact, played a ubiquitous role in the development of subethnic rivalry in Taiwan. Ineffective restrictions and weak government helped to bring about the heterogeneous immigration and settlement that gave rise to Chinese subethnicity. Subsequently, weak governmental control allowed and, indeed, encouraged the formation and preservation of bellicose rival communities. The discrimination and prejudice shown by civil and military functionaries further stimulated subethnic contention. Finally, official concessions to one or other subcultural group or local grouping not only fostered subethnic rivalry but set precedents for competition of an economic, social, and political sort. Only when subethnic strife posed an immediate threat to local order did Ch'ing authorities normally take much heed of the disparities and tensions that made nearby communities such bitter rivals.

Despite the general negligence of Ch'ing officials, their reports about subethnic rivalry in Taiwan help to keep historical issues in proper perspective. One finds, for instance, that subethnic conflict eventually involved much larger segments of the island's population and occupied more time than did Chinese-aboriginal contention. Again, the divisive influence of ingrained rivalries among local communal groups usually hampered the spread of secret society and rebel activities during even the most serious uprisings. Ch'ing records also serve to refute the commonly accepted idea that subethnic dissension prevailed only among frontier settlements adjusting to a new environment.

Research on Ch'ing-period subethnic rivalry not only provides a better understanding of Taiwan's past, but sheds light on the present. Popular religion, for example, is still deeply rooted in the turbulent past when territorial boundaries also served as religious boundaries and when subethnic feuds were staged as religious wars. Something of this fierce and competitive legacy is reflected in the conspicuous consumption that accompanies Taiwanese religious festivals today. Other reminders of earlier subethnic dissension are the divine guardians and supernatural enemies figuring in local religious ritual. In addition, community graveyards and rural i-min shrines, devoted to the spirits of fallen village braves, commemorate subethnic disturbances of the past and vividly call to mind subethnic feuds and their grim consequences.

One discovers that Taiwan's subethnic rivalry had other long-lasting effects. The absence of periodic standard markets may be attributed, at least in part, to subethnic feuds and to the "closed" communities that prolonged conflict brought about (Crissman 1972: 253–54). Again, settlement patterns were affected, as were marriage patterns—the latter perhaps permanently in some localities. Above all, the prejudice against Hakka still apparent in Taiwanese society is a carry-over from the Hoklo-Hakka rivalry of the Ch'ing period.

Finally, the more general study of subethnicity in Taiwan may serve as a basis for comparative historical analysis of the interaction of immigrant groups within China as well as within (and among) Chinese settlements overseas. For over two millennia, groups of Han Chinese with different backgrounds and local origins have migrated, then intermixed along frontiers and in areas undergoing resettlement. As in Taiwan, these mainland immigrant groups often adjusted to their new environment and to other subcultural groups without losing their subcultural identities.[31]

For anthropologists and historians dealing with Taiwan's subethnicity, the prospects of comparative research on the immigrant backgrounds of the Nan-yang Chinese may be especially fruitful. In Ch'ing times, the majority of these overseas Chinese hailed from southern Fukien and eastern Kwangtung, like the Taiwanese. Also, there are historical resemblances with the Taiwanese in their overseas migra-

[31] Abner Cohen (1974: xiv) has called attention to similar situations in which immigrant groups, rather than losing their cultural identities through integration, have reorganized their own traditional customs or developed new customs under traditional symbols in an effort to become more distinct. He has called this process "ethnic continuity" or "revival."

Voluntary Associations and Rural-Urban Migration

Alexander Chien-chung Yin

Theoretical Orientation

This paper deals historically and statistically with the adaptation of P'eng-hu migrants to life in Kaohsiung, a fast-growing industrial city in southwestern Taiwan. Since the early part of the twentieth century, the people of P'eng-hu have been migrating to Kaohsiung, where they have relied largely on voluntary associations to solve problems, cope with economic and ideological demands, elevate their political and social status, and maintain contacts with their place of origin. The primary aim of this study of Kaohsiung voluntary associations (common interest groups) is to suggest that different periods and patterns of migration strongly affected the process of adaptation.

Kenneth Little provides a useful African model for the study of voluntary associations. He employs the concepts of adaptation and integration in studying the function of voluntary associations in social change, selecting for study a formerly "backward" area where industrial growth was fully under way. A subsistence economy had been replaced by a market economy, disturbing traditional ideas of status and creating new social roles. People in these new roles tended to interact with others on the basis of common economic, educational, religious, and political interests, rather than on the traditional basis of common place of origin and common descent. Little found that West African migrants in the urban areas adjusted to their new environment by adopting selected Western values, technology, and

This study began in 1967; fieldwork was conducted in both P'eng-hu and Kaohsiung in 1968–69 and 1972–73. See also Yin 1969, 1975, 1976, 1978a, 1978b, and 1978c.