

Puyuma Ethnohistory and Linguistics

A Review Article

By

KANEKO ERIKA and TSUCHIDA SHIGERU

In his *Taiwan Aboriginal Groups: Problems in Cultural and Linguistic Classifications* (1969), Raleigh Ferrell gives vivid and distinct descriptions of the individual Upland Cultures (Atayal, Bunun, Tsou, Rukai, Paiwan), but deals collectively with the Kuvalan, Ami and Puyuma under the heading "Littoral culture complex." This layout reveals how little we know about the intricate ethnohistory of East coast Taiwan. Every shred of evidence that will hopefully afford help in unravelling this intertwined ethnic fabric is therefore highly welcome, all the more so if it promises to throw light on the ethnogenesis of the Puyuma in their own traditional understanding.

Publication of the extensive Puyuma texts collected by the late Dr. D. Schröder in cooperation with P. Veil has long been eagerly awaited by everybody in the field. Anton Quack has been entrusted with Dr. Schröder's scholarly estate, a great privilege, and, no doubt, also a formidable challenge for his confrere.

This volume of Schröder/Veil texts assembles myths of origins and primeval times, traditions about migrations and life in earlier ages, and, finally, genealogical accounts of the chiefly houses. The texts are presented in the Katipol dialect and are accompanied by a free German translation. An anticipated scholarly evaluation has not materialized, and a few comments must suffice here, but the fact that this book is simultaneously a fountain of information on the ethnohistory of the Puyuma on the one hand and an important contribution to Austro-

Das Wort der Alten. Erzählungen zur Geschichte der Pujuma von Katipol (Taiwan).
Gesammelt von D. Schröder und P. Veil. Edited by Anton Quack. Collectanea
Instituti Anthropolos 12. D-5203 St. Augustin 1: Haus Völker und Kulturen, Anthropolos
Institut, 1981. Paper DM 80.—

nesian linguistics on the other has made a joint review advisable. In what follows, Kaneko will first comment on the former aspect of the book, its contributions to our knowledge of the ethnohistory of the Puyuma, and Tsuchida will take up the various linguistic problems posed by the volume.

ETHNOHISTORICAL COMMENTS

This volume of Katipol Puyuma traditions tends to confirm the broad ethnohistorical perspectives gleaned from previous studies, the impression being one of considerable ethno-cultural complexity. The very beginnings, startling even to the informant by their contradictory involutions (p. 39), are presented as a tangled web of mythical concepts, inherently (?) Puyuma, or manifestly adopted from neighboring ethnic groups. The first exploits and migrations of the mythical pre- and post-flood founding ancestors closely involve adjacent Rukai, Ami and Paiwan. Strikingly, the Katipol Puyuma acknowledge the chronological and cultural precedence of the Ami, relegated to the position of last-comers on the ethnic scene by many learned authorities. There is little doubt that the Puyuma version does more justice to historical reality. One feels even tempted to speculate on the role of the Rukai (cf. the husband of the founding ancestress of Katipol after the second flood was a man from Taromaq) and Ami in the ethnogenesis of the Puyuma. Close contact with Paiwan, obviously predating the eastern and southern expansion from their ancestral "homeland" in the Pa'uma'umaq region, is also indicated in the traditions. The tale about the east migration of the Paiwan into Puyuma territory, their acceptance by the Puyuma (p. 73, p. 74), leading in historical consequence to increasing inter-marriage, cultural "Paiwanization" and complete loss of Puyuma cultural identity in some areas of co-residence (Taimali and Heng-ch'un), is not necessarily a figment of Puyuma selfglorification (p. 74, p. 333), but probably very close to historical facts. This is also true for the prior political superiority of the chiefly house of Katipol, later lost to Puyuma (village) by a transfer of authority by marriage.

The vivid memory retained of the Dutch is another salient feature of Katipol Puyuma traditions. This gives us a rare opportunity of contrasting oral traditions with written (Dutch) records. Accordingly, the forerunner of Katipol, the village Kazekalan, representing the "Golden Age" of traditional Katipol Puyuma history, evidently predates the coming of the Dutch, because the Dutch census of 1650 lists "Typol" and other recent-historic Puyuma settlements. The listing of Padain, one of the most ancient villages in the Paiwan homeland, in a Puyuma context and its absence in the proper (Pa'uma'umaq) Paiwan context,

may, like the mythical post-flood exploration of the Kavuluŋan area by one of the five surviving Puyuma ancestors, reflect a particularly close contact between this village and the Katipol Puyuma.

We know from the dag register of the Dutch East India Company (made available in Nakamura 1949) that contacts of the Dutch with the Pimaba (Puyuma) date back to 1636 and that a Dutch representative, one Marten Weselingh, with an entourage of interpreters and soldiers, made Pimaba his home base for frequent gold prospecting journeys to the north, some of them in company of the Puyuma (village) chief. We also understand that the Dutch stationed representatives in several other villages on the East coast for the express purpose of learning local languages and customs. In September 1641 the villages of Tamalakaw and Rikavong (of the Katipol group) conspired and killed Marten Weselingh and his companions. Early in 1642 the Dutch mounted a punitive expedition aided by their Puyuma (village) allies, and razed the offending village(s). Surely these close and prolonged contacts with the Dutch, known for their proselytizing zeal in other parts of Taiwan, cannot be left out of consideration in appraising the naquithas-demawai "Hochgottglauben" established for the Katipol Puyuma by D. Schröder (1968. Cf. p. 20 and footnote on p. 32).

Close affinal and cultural ties with Rukai, Ami and Paiwan, presumably throughout Puyuma history, make a working knowledge of these other ethnic groups a prerequisite for understanding the Puyuma. The following comments are offered in the good faith of a co-combatant.

p. 33 #17, and other contexts: *Ka-vulun-an* (*Kavorongan*), is the Paiwan name for Mount Tawu, derived from *vulun* ("old, venerable") and denotes the Paiwan ancestral homeland in a general sense, the sacred mountain to which all ancestral souls congregate. Cf. also *vulun*=hundredpacer snake, *Agkistrodon* acc.

p. 55 #104: "Arawayan. This former settlement has not been localized." The site of Arawayan is localized and described in Miyahara 1936: 20-21.

p. 69 #279, and other contexts: Longkiao is not simply the name of a settlement near present-day Heng-ch'un as indicated in the footnote. The Dutch mention fifteen, sixteen or seventeen villages of Longkiao situated in the lowlands of Heng-ch'un peninsula. A delegation from Longkiao requested Dutch help in their war against the Puyuma and this was, in fact, the cause for the first Dutch expedition to Pimaba. The Longkiao, under the sway of one great chief, appear to have included Paiwan villages, but their ethnic composition was probably complex. Makatao (Pangsoia/Dolatek) with whom the Puyuma had

- early contacts, also later migrated to this area. (Inō 1908)
- p. 83 #454: "Arapawan. This village could not be identified." Arapawan is a prominent Ami village (Chinese: T'ai-yuan), formerly a tributary to Puyuma.
- p. 118: "Rarangus—designation for a group of Amis. Meaning and derivation of this name could not be ascertained." Rarangəs is one of the populous and widely dispersed matri-clans of the Ami. (Utsurikawa et al. 1935: 421–435).
- p. 164: *Marai Xonto* is a loanword from Japanese.
- p. 180: Papian (slave), one of the two discriminatory designations for Ami. Pa'pian is the name of an Ami matri-clan now predominately distributed in the Shiu-ku-lan area, but originally settled near Puyuma (Nanwang). (cf. Kaneko 1980: 685).

Minor grumbles: the footnotes to the texts are repetitive, yet the volume is often taciturn where a reader would have appreciated an explanatory note. *Übernahme* for *Übername* is a recurrent misprint.

In connection with the advisability, or inadvisability, of using the term "clan" in the case of the Puyuma, the observation that Mabuchi (1976) does not detail the villages where he has collected his material (p. 19, footnote 6) is inappropriate. Particulars are tabulated on p. 102 of Mabuchi's paper.

In contrast to the rest of us and his own first volume (1979), Quack has now given preference to the spelling "Pujuma" instead of "Puyuma." This reviewer is no stickler for consistency, if inconsistency means an improvement, but fails to see the benefits of this innovation in a field already crippled by confusingly complex and divergent nomenclature.

Nevertheless, Quack's wistful query whether the results justify the prolonged exertions (p. 25) deserves—all critical comments apart—an emphatic "yes." Publication of further volumes of Puyuma texts is eagerly awaited.

LINGUISTIC COMMENTS

Puyuma linguistics, limited to texts contained in Ogawa / Asai (1935) in pre-war days, have greatly advanced since the mid-sixties, although studies have been restricted to phonology (Suenari 1969), limited word-lists (Suenari 1969, Ferrell 1969, Ting 1978), specific vocabularies, or grammar (Sprenger 1971, 1972). Tsuchida (1980) published a fairly extensive wordlist and a brief description of Puyuma grammar, mainly concentrating on verb structure, but few Puyuma texts have so far been available. Texts written in that language are indispensable for

a better grasp of grammatical structure and lexical meanings of any language.

The substantial amount of Puyuma texts (Katipol dialect) provided in this volume is, indubitably, a great contribution to Austronesian linguistics. The task of transcribing tape recorded text materials and translating them is a formidable piece of work, requiring perseverance and diligence of an order that only one who has done it himself can really appreciate. I, therefore, first of all, wish to express my deep respect and admiration for the authors D. Schröder, P. Veil, and A. Quack.

Nevertheless, this volume is not exempt from the deficiencies which usually beset this kind of study. Some of them will be detailed below, though, limitations of space regrettably prevent a full discussion. Moreover, every Puyuma village has its own dialect, as pointed out by Ting (1978), and this reviewer's knowledge is limited to the dialects of Tamalakaw, Rikavong, and Apapor. Some discrepancies may be due to lack of familiarity with the dialect in question.

1. The inventory of consonants on p. 7 distinguishes *h* and *x*, but *h* never even occurs in the texts. My own investigations of the Tamalakaw dialect suggest that /h/ appears usually as [h], occasionally [x] as a free variant (allophone), and that /h/ and /x/ are not in phonological opposition. If, however, the diagram on p. 7 was not meant as an inventory of consonant phonemes, but only as a key to transcription, a line to the effect that x, h=x should have been added.
2. A certain amount of misperception is noticed. Take pp. 38-39 for example. Even with a cursory glance at the texts we are surprised by the low frequency of the voiceless alveolar retroflex (*th*), and this is the result of mistaking *th* and *t*. Thus *t* in the following words should be *th*: *mitangoroq* (#3) "to have a head," *tinaqi* (##5, 13, 14) "entrails," and in personal names that appear in this context, such as *vatinon* (##8, 12, 14) "egg," *voltiq* (#8) "white," etc. This also applies to the village name in the title "Katipol."

Should not the voiced dental fricative *d* of *madalam* (#10) be the voiced alveopalatal fricative *z*? (Ogawa / Asai, Ferrell, Ting record *mazalam*, and Tsuchida-Tamalakaw and Suenari-Rikavong also record *mazalam*.)

Dangdarang (#8) "red" is another confusing item. Ogawa/Asai record *zangzarang*, Ferrell *dangdarang*, Ting *tangtarang* (i.e. our *th*). The dialect of Tamalakaw-Rikavong uses the non-cognate *zemiar* for "red," and a person uninitiated into the dialect of Katipol is simply left guessing which of these transcriptions is correct.

Misperception of *e* and *o* (and occasionally *i*) is not as frequent as

th and *t*, but is, nevertheless, noticeable: *pakamoli* (p. 35, #29) "different" (*pakameli?*), *komoda* (p. 43, #29) "what to do with" (*kemoda?*), *qidang* (p. 34, #25) "shrimp" (*qezang?*), etc.

3. Discrepancies either due to mishearing or different standards of transcription: *vate* (p. 38, ##1, 2) "tale, story." According to the vowel inventory on p. 8, *e* is a mid-central unrounded vowel. If so, *vate* would represent the sound [vatə]. However, [ə] in absolute final position is, except when it appears as a supporting vowel, unusual in Austronesian in general and rarer still in Formosan languages. Tsuchida's Tamalakaw material lists *vati*, whose final *-i* may phonetically appear as [-i] or [-e] as allophones. This gives rise to the suspicion that *vate* should rightly be transcribed as *vati* representing the actual sound [vate], and that phonetic representation strayed into phonemic representation. Other instances of the final *-e* as in *molixe* (p. 100, #60) "harmful", or *de* (p. 110, #15) "Gee!" are noted, but in the case of an interjection, any vowel may appear. In the instance on p. 100, it is conceivable that in the context of a ritual song, vowels may be slurred and become indistinct. On the same page, *kereo* (p. 100, #61) "hemp" is recorded. Since this corresponds to Tsuchida's phonemic representation /keriw/ [kəriw, kərew], it is another instance of /i/ [e] being represented as *e*.

4. Where to set punctuation marks such as periods and commas is a complicated problem. The breath group is a convenient divisor, the sentence unit being another one. The volume under review seems to make use of both standards, but if punctuation is to be based on sentence units, thorough knowledge of grammar is an obvious precondition. Take ##21-22 on p. 111 for instance. (In the following examples, to facilitate understanding, interlineal translation not provided in the original text is included, infixes being indicated by slanting bars, other morpheme boundaries by a hyphen. Abbreviations used are as follows: AF for Focus; Dur for Durative; R for Realis; NOM for Nominative; Per for Personal; LIG for Ligature; TOP for Topic Marker; Pun for Punctual; LOC for Locative; OBL for Oblique; Ir for Irrealis. For details, see Tsuchida 1980).

#21	<i>Me-na-na o i ma-qizang i Sixasixao</i>
see:	AF-Dur-R NOM-Per great LIG
	<i>mo, m-o-ko a kazi ka-nazo na</i>
	TOP go: AF-Pun-R there-LOC those-OBL LIG-OBL
	<i>lalak na k/em/e-ra-rawiz.</i>
	children LIG-OBL fish-out: AF-Dur-R

„Als das der alte Sixasixao sah, ging er hin zu jenen Burschen, die am Heraufischen waren.“

- #22 *Me-naqo-wa mo, mar-ka-raoz*
see: AF-Pun-Ir TOP go-toward-east: AF-Pun-R

izo na rokul zi
that-NOM LIG chest and

„Er kam und sah zu; die Kiste trieb weiter nach Osten.“

One wonders why, at the outset of #22, the punctual irrealis form *me-naqo-wa* should appear. The punctual irrealis is a form indicating an action or event that will take place at one point in time, in other words, the future. If the preceding sentence is terminated with *mer-arawiz*, then *menaqo*, i.e. the punctual realis form, is expected to follow.

It has been pointed out (Tsuchida 1980: 207) that in cases where a verb is used as a complement to a main verb, it is usually in the infinitive form. Some very few vector verbs like *mokoa* “to,” *zoa* “come,” *moverok* “leave” (and their derivative forms), are exceptional, for if they occur as a main verb other verbs used as a complement of these particular vector verbs appear not in the infinitive form but in the AF punctual irrealis form (i.e. the form with the suffix *-a*). Similar passages, too many to enumerate, are found in this volume: *m-o-ko* *majaq-a* (p. 34, #23), *kai ko me-naqo-wa* (p. 41, #7), *m-o-verok m-i-toros-a* (p. 41, #9), etc.

It is therefore suggested to consider #21 and #22 as one sentence unit: *menaqowa* of #22 is a complement to the main verb *mokoa* of #21, the meaning being “went to see.” Then #21 and #22, as one sentence, should, although somewhat awkwardly, translate as follows:

“The ancestor Sixasixao seeing them disappointed went to see where the children [=friends] tried to retrieve [the box] and found the box had drifted to the east.”

Since, however, the German translation of the texts is a free translation, it may not matter too much. Incidentally, *maqizang* (literal meaning “big, large, great”) is throughout the texts translated as “alt.” Although the authors will be aware that this adjective added to a personal name, irrespective of the chronological age of the person in question, denotes a man “of old,” or an ancestor, an explanatory note to that effect would have helped the general reader.

5. Following are a couple of minor points:

On p. 34, footnote 21 says that Tungsua—China is a “Lehnwort

aus dem Taiwanesischen ("Tionghoa")." This is, in fact, a Taiwanese loanword, not *Tionghoa* 中華, but *Tng-soa* 唐山. At the same place we also find "Dippong—Japan, Nippon; Lehnwort aus dem Japanischen." This is not a Japanese loanword, but is equally Taiwanese *Jit-pun* 日本.

In concluding my review, I should add that all these deficiencies I pointed out do not diminish the merit of this volume. We are nowhere near a satisfactory understanding of Puyuma grammar, and this volume will remain an inexhaustible treasure-trove for further studies of the Puyuma language and of Austronesian linguistics.

REFERENCES

- FERREL, Raleigh, 1969: *Taiwan aboriginal groups: Problems in cultural and linguistic classification*. Taipei: Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica, Monograph No. 17.
- INŌ Yoshinori 伊能嘉矩, 1908: *Taiwan ni okeru Kōshun no Jukuban to yobaruru ichigun wa hatashite nani naru ka* 台湾に於ける恒春の熟蕃とよばれる一群は果して何なるか [Who are the so-called sinicized peoples of Heng-ch'un?]. *Tōkyō jinrui gakkai zasshi* 東京人類学会雑誌, No. 271: 6-10.
- KANEKO, Erika 金子エリカ, 1980: *Sosen no isan: Nihon minzoku bunka to sono shūhen* 祖先の遺産. 日本民族文化とその周辺 [Ancestral heirlooms: Japanese folk culture and its environs]. In *Kokubu Naoichi hakase koki kinen ronshū* 国分直一博士古稀記念論集考古篇, pp. 665-736. [Shimonoseki].
- MABUCHI Tōichi, 1976: Optional cult affiliation among the Puyuma and the Mi-yako islanders. In *Ancestors*, William H. Newell, ed., pp. 91-103. The Hague: Mouton.
- MIYAHARA Atsushi 宮原敦, 1936: *Taiwan Paiwan-zoku ga yakinaseri to tsutafuru tsubo ni tsuite*. 台湾パイワン族が焼成せりと伝ふる壺に就いて [About pottery among the Paiwan]. *Nanpō dozoku* 南方土俗 IV, No. 1: 1-41.
- NAKAMURA Takashi 中村孝志, 1949: *Taiwan ni okeru Orandajin no tankin jigyō*. 台湾におけるオランダ人の探金事業 [The gold prospecting activities of the Dutch in Taiwan]. *Tenri Daigaku gakuhō* 天理大学学報, Vol. 1/1: 27-121.
- OGAWA Naoyoshi and ASAI Erin 小川尚義, 浅井恵倫, 1935: *Gengo ni yoru Taiwan Takasago-zoku densetsu shū* 原語による台湾高砂族伝説集 [Myths and traditions of the Formosan native tribes, with texts and notes]. Taihoku.
- SCHRÖDER, Dominik, 1968: Zum Hochgottglauben der Puyuma von Katipol. In *Anthropica. Festschrift P. W. Schmidt*, pp. 323-361. St. Augustin: Anthropos Institute.
- SPRENGER, Arnold, 1971: The numerals of the Puyuma language (Katipol dialect). *Fu-jen Studies* 4: 49-60.
- , 1972: Overt construction markers in Puyuma (Katipol dialect). In *Papers in linguistics in honor of A. A. Hill*, Charles T. C. Tang et al., eds., pp. 133-145. Taipei: Rainbowbridge.
- SUENARI Michio, 1969: A preliminary report on Puyuma language (Rikavong dialect). *Bulletin of the Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica* 27: 141-164.
- TING Pang-hsin 丁邦新, 1978: Ku Peinan yü ti ni ts'e 古卑南語的擬測, *Bulletin of*

- the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica.* 中央研究院歷史語言研究所集刊 Taipei. (In Chinese)
- TSUCHIDA Shigeru 土田滋, 1980: *Puyumago (Tamalakao hōgen) goi* プユマ語 (タマラカオ方言) 語彙 [Wordlist of Puyuma (Tamalakao Dialect)] In *Kuroshio no minzoku, bunka, gengo* 黒潮の民族・文化・言語, Kuroshio bunka no kai, eds., pp. 183-302. Tōkyō: Kadokawa Shoten.
- UTSURIKAWA Nenozō, et al. 移川了之藏, 1935: *Taiwan Takasago-zoku keitō shozoku no kenkyū* 台湾高砂族系統所属の研究 [The Formosan native tribes: A genealogical and classificatory study]. Taihoku.