

Extended family and Tribal-Consanguineous State: Lawrence Krader on the social history of central Asia

Hongshan Lv

School of Marxism, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan, 430074, China

Abstract

Lawrence Krader is one of the representatives of Mongolian academia in the United States. He has a detailed discussion on the traditional social structure of central Asia and the formation of the Mongol Empire. He believes that traditional central Asian society is supported by kinship and regulates the specific operation of politics; Mongolian society in the 11th to 13th centuries was neither an egalitarian tribal society nor a nomadic feudal system; class differentiation and individual loyalty work together for forming of the tribal-consanguineous Mongolian state; however, the organizational characteristics of particularism buried the hidden danger of the collapse of the empire. Based on his argument, the methods of cultural area and cultural history that Krader relied on were both the mainstream paradigms of American anthropology. However, he adopted extended family, corporate body, nation-state and universalism as theoretical models without examining their appropriate boundaries, this also reflects the predicament of Western Mongolian studies in cross-lingual research.

Keywords

Lawrence Krader; Extended family; Kinship; Tribal-consanguineous state.

1. Introduction

Lawrence Krader (1919-1998) was a well-known American socialist anthropologist who became famous for editing and publishing the ethnological notes of Marx in 1972. From 1945 to 47, Lawrence Krader studied linguistics at Columbia University and at the same time, began to work on the study of the peoples of central Asia. In the following 15 years, he made significant contributions to the cultural history, socio-political organization, and ecological research of various central Asian peoples; at the same time, he was also the first Western ethnologist to enter Mongolia for fieldwork after World War II [1]. Krader's specialty was the evolution of the state and social organizations. He was one of the contributors to the landmark book *The Early State* and had a detailed discussion on the traditional social structure of central Asia and the formation of the Mongol Empire [2]. This article aims to excavate and summarize Lawrence Krader's exploration of the social history of central Asia from three aspects: traditional social structure, nomadic feudalism, and the formation of the state.

2. Traditional Social Structure

Krader believed that the cultural traditions of the Tatar steppe had historical continuity: "Although the steppe peoples were of various ethnic origins, earlier they were Turks, and latterly Mongols. The economy and the relation to the habitat of all these was a stable one, and the tradition of pastoral nomadism in the Mongolian steppe persisted ... Turkic and Mongols remain in contact in Mongolia and neighboring areas in central Asia, southern Siberia, and western China, thereby furthering their cultural similarities [3]. " This similarity was reflected in language, social organization, and economic model. Krader believed that Turks and Mongols, and most of the Altaic language groups except the Koreans, constituted a cultural area [4].

Krader pointed out that in this cultural area, the social structure of each people had a consistent principle, which is divided into two aspects: the consanguineal and the political, " The consanguineal is exclusively patrilineal-agnatic, the political is identical with it both in general and in detail ", based on the principle of patrilineal succession, " the unit of exogamy is a patrilineal unit; the rule of residence is patrilocal; authority is patriarchal or generally vested in the senior unit [5]. " Krader emphasized that the strict adherence to patriarchy in the social organization of traditional central Asian peoples was rare in the world, and they were classic cases that demonstrate the principles and structures of such kinship and social organization [6].

According to Lawrence Krader, the traditional central Asian family belonged to what Maine defines as an extended family, which includes " a patriarch, his wife, his married and unmarried sons, his unmarried daughters, and the children of his son. In the past, if a man was wealthy, the household of the family was even further extended by poor relations, hangers-on, servants [7]. " Such a family was male-centered, and membership depended on birth or adoption; unlike the nuclear family consisting of parents and children, the extended family of the central Asian peoples did not split due to the generation, thus showing greater stability; it was a permanent organization, belonging to what Maine called a corporate body [8]. In this patriarchal system, authorities of economic, social and legal affairs was concentrated in the patriarch. " The patriarch is the ultimate arbitrator of all disputes within the family [9]. " His words are the law, but his authority is " great but not boundless [10]"; contrary, it is subject to the constraints of social customs. It was difficult for the public law of society to penetrate the family, and the extended family thus showed greater independence than the modern Western family; similarly, as a continuation of patriarchal power, the first wife also exercised authority over women within the family.

The family of traditional central Asian society attached great importance to genealogy, emphasizing the position of family members on the genealogy and carefully determining each person's rank according to birth and priority, so this is a particularised family " no person has his equal [11]. " Difference in rights and duties of members is evident in the position of women; " In childhood, up to the age of puberty, the female was regarded as though she did not exist as a person ... On gaining puberty, however, she finally achieved a definite social status. Marriage arrangements were initiated on her behalf ... She no longer belonged wholly to her father's house, but partly, potentially, to her betrothed's. She was no longer a chattel, but had social rights of a limited sort ... On marriage, the girl's social status rose higher. She had a tent, her dowry, and a menial position in her husband's family ... If the marriage was fruitful, the girl's position rose even higher ... The woman who had borne her husband a son achieved full female status, and was a legal person with a complement of rights and responsibilities, with this restriction: she could not administer her husband's property in her own right, but as guardian of her son's right. This body of rights could not be infringed upon. If her husband died, her future status depended on whether she had already borne his family a son [12]. " The principle of particularism was also reflected in the attitude towards outsiders. An outsider on the steppe had no other way of assimilating into the society of the Tatar regime unless he had a host who provided hospitality; if he resided there temporarily, his only identity, his only protection, was to be entertained.

The status of women revealed the marriage operation of traditional central Asian families from one aspect. It implemented the system of exogamy, and the marriage had fixed procedures such as matchmakers, betrothal gifts, dowry. The parties to the marriage did not have the freedom to choose a spouse; since neighbors were often relatives, in order to avoid inbreeding, families sometimes had to go to distant places to seek spouses and produced reciprocal marriage. The patriarchal family, as a social entity whose continuity was depended on the passing of generations by sons, determined the primary task of the family and the primary duty of women

[13]. In order to ensure continuity, the family would take means such as adoption and recruitment. Women without sons may face the danger of being divorced, and widows without children had to marry the brothers of their deceased husbands per the requirements of adopting step-marriage to achieve the goal of marriage. Krader believed that, in a certain sense, marriage was more like a contract between two families [14].

Due to the principle of inheritance, most property was distributed among sons, except the dowry for daughters. Under the rule of the paternal father, the property was collective; and every time the son married, became an adult, or when the father died, the property was distributed, and the property of the unmarried son was temporarily managed by his mother; generally speaking, according to the ancient tradition of nomads, the eldest son inherited his father's rank and title and the younger son guarded the household and inherited his father's tent and appurtenances. In short, the extended family continued to exist through the principles of marriage and inheritance and maintained geographic, economic, and emotional coherence and stability.

The foundation of traditional central Asian society lied in kinship, and nomadic society built and relied on kinship from the bottom up. Krader writes: " The nomadic society in form was a series of concentric circles. The nomadic village was composed of a series of extended families. The village was thus related by ties of blood and marriage. The nomadic village in turn combined with related villages into a larger unit, the clan, all the members of which were descended from a single ancestor many generations back [15]. " A village as the basic unit of society was a kinship community, usually including 10-12 tents, while villages where nobles, princes or chiefs were located had a maximum of 50 tents. Each tent was both neighbors and relatives to each other, the village undertook daily affairs such as organizing economic life, regulating neighborhood relations, operating local authority, and holding religious ceremonies [16]. Krader noted that cities and settled agriculture weakened the organizational role of kinship, but " there were many practices and customs which the city-dwellers shared with the kin-bound farmer or nomad [17]. "

According to Krader, the formation of kinship villages resulted from long-term husbandry. When wealthy herders set up summer pastures, there was often a shortage of workforce, and some poor relatives and herders were gradually gathered around to form a village-kin community of nomads. So the herders's village as a kinship community, its degree of aggregation would fluctuate seasonally according to the time of husbandry. In Winter, the degree was the most compact and was also " the time for the sacrifices to clan, lineage, village and family spirits, ancestors and deities [18]. " " The leader of each community was the senior member of the leading family [19]. " So the coercive force of the local authority of the village in maintaining order came from both kinship and wealth [20].

Relative villages formed clans, which were single lineage groups; their maintenance depended on genealogy, by which each member confirmed his or her social status. Because the recognized ancestors of the clan were often mythological characters, and sometimes they expanded their members utilizing fiction, the genealogy was partly natural and partly fictional or fictional. Krader argued that, like extended families, clans were corporations, empires within empires, " they are lacking sovereignty but are usually component parts of a state or empire; they are not dissolved with each generation and then reformed [21]. " Clan was the primary organization of social life and political operation, which enabling members to identify and form identity. " Each clan had a body of ritual which was special unto itself: ceremonies venerating clan ancestors, clan spirits, territorial spirits, the natural forces and phenomena of the territory [22]. " Economically, it had clearly assigned territories and pastures. It was also a taxing unit; politically, the clan under the management of the chief and the council of elders was the core of resolving clan conflicts, formulating foreign relations, implementing alliance orders, and organizing military teams. Krader pointed out that within the clans of the traditional central

Asian society, according to the order of birth, there were hierarchies: the elders became nobles, and the younger became commoners, as shown by black and white bone; although the blood is the same, but not equal as the eldest son has priority. Moreover, many factors such as origin, wealth, military exploits, and conformity were the characteristics of clan leaders who are competent to lead [23]. The further expansion of clans was the formation of the alliance. Krader believed alliances between Turks and Mongols usually took the forms of the principality. Clans in alliances were related to each other, and all members were relatives; there was a certain degree of autonomy to join or withdraw from alliances, while princes came from lines of eldest sons [24].

3. Nomadic Feudalism

The structure and nature of traditional central Asian society are critical to understanding the formation of the Mongol Empire. The Soviet school represented by Vladimirtsov used nomadic feudalism to define Mongolian society, and the 11th to 13th centuries were the beginning of this system. According to Vladimirtsov's explanation, as the traditional Mongol clan society was disintegrating, Khan and his companion (nokor) played the most crucial role in establishing feudal relations. " Chingis Khan made extensive use of the already existing nokor system in order to organize the formal system of vassal relations that bear the military service; Chingis Khan had a genius insight into the process of feudalization that was already taking place in Mongolian society at that time, and utilized the most active and vital force - the nokor, to achieve their own goals [25]. " The companions (nokor) had the following characteristics: first, they served the chiefs of other clans; second, freedom fighters and personal soldiers who served their masters; third, used oaths to meet relationships with masters; fourth, shared adversity and enjoyment with leaders, and were the family members of masters; fifth, were supported by masters; sixth, had functions of envoy and economy.

Vladimirtsov believed that during the formation of the Mongol Empire, these warriors with military merit, relying on their ties with Chingis Khan, were entrusted with certain lands and people and established vassal relations with Khans or kings. Under this relationship, the Mongol emperor is the highest lord, and the kings are the lords of their vassals and the emperor's vassals. In the same way, the noyan who obtained ten thousand households, thousand households, or hundred households was first the vassals of the kings and then the emperor's vassals. " At the same time, the heads of hundred households were almost always the vassals of the heads of thousand households, and the heads of thousand households were often the vassals of the heads of ten thousand households "; thus, the whole vassal system of the nomadic feudal system could be summarized as " Emperor(Khan)→ Prince(Prince)- Divisions-Lord of ulus→ ten thousand households→ thousand households→ hundred households = ... noyan ". Noyans had their Ötögü boyol(subordination), and they " like the kings, performed the ritual of homagium to the lord, and showed their recognition of the vassal relationship with the ceremony of prostration [26]. "

Vladimirtsov discussed his theory of the nomadic feudal system by comparing the feudal system, aristocracy, military entourage, serfs, and oaths in the Middle Ages in Europe; it is inevitable that there were indeed some formal similarities between the traditional society of central Asia and the feudal society of Western Europe. For example, they both emphasised blood ties and, none of them relied on the currency trade. In historical theory, Vladimirtsov's theory has two basic premises: first, the feudal period was a general historical stage; second, the origin of the state was the process from tribal society to feudalism. Nevertheless, there is an apparent contradiction in these two premises: because according to the original meaning of feudalism, it refers to the political situation of a weak central authority, which usually occurred

on the periphery of great empires, which is precisely the opposite of the situation when the state forms.

In Krader's view, the Mongol Empire and its society differed significantly from medieval Europe in terms of the economic system, nature of power, and social foundation. The land of the feudal system in Western Europe was privately owned by the king, but the manor was owned by the lord, and even as long as the rent was stable, the land was the private property of the tenant; while in the empire of Chingis Khan, the country as a whole was the hereditary property of the golden clan, however, most herds and land were actually owned by collectives. Therefore, in terms of land ownership, unlike Vladimirtsov, who believed that lords owned the Mongol Empire's division of land and there was an individual economy in movable property, Krader emphasized the underdevelopment of private property in the Mongol Empire. Like power, the public law of the feudal system in Western Europe based on the private law of the land, so the baron was the lord and private owner of the fief. He collected taxes and rent from the tenants and had robust control over the tenants and serfs in the territory. At the same time, the division of the land and private property matched the public rights and responsibilities system, and the delimitation of private property corresponded to the boundaries of public power, so " my subordinate subordinates are not my subordinates ", even the king cannot directly called the baron's tenants to serve him directly, which contained restrictions on supreme authority. In Mongolia, there was a clear difference between Alban, who payed taxes for the state, and Khamjilga, who served individuals; at the same time, Chingis Khan exercised absolutist rule. It is true that the Mongolian government was not oriental absolutism, and the Khan must followed the existing laws and customs. However, there was no power limitation, nor the two-way relationship between lords and vassals in Western European feudalism. On the social basis, the feudal system of Western Europe relied on the relationship between lords and serfs, while the traditional Mongolian society based upon kinship. " Mongols with the worst social conditions can claim to have a common ancestor with the supreme ruler Chingis Khan [27]. " Mongolian elites and commoners shared the same pedigree, which was unimaginable for the medieval European aristocrats who emphasized their origins.

Therefore, Krader believed that conceptual misuse in the Soviet school was a situation. However, Krader's criticism of Vladimirtsov also reflects a bitter problem in Mongolian history research: when analyzing the social history based on narrative works such as *Jami'al—Tarikh* and *Secret History*, the process of interpretation and results are strongly influenced by interpreters. The rationale for Krader's critique comes from Maitland's interpretation of feudalism who summed up feudal society as a system in which public law and private land law were directly linked [28].

As for the problem of the state formation in central Asia, Krader believed that the usurpation theory proposed by Radloff and Barthold also had shortcomings. In Radloff's view, the determination of the central authority of nomadic societies based on the forced acceptance of powerful figures by society, and " assertion of authority, when backed by force or its threat, which is not based on tradition or precedent, is a usurpation ". Barthold further pointed out that among nomads who did not pursue political unity, the Khan " took the hegemony unto themselves by their own initiative, without having been nomination or elected ", and the people could only " were faced with an accomplished fact [29]. " According to Barthold, the rise of the Mongol Empire depended on Chingis Khan's relationships with his guards, and " the masses of the people were nothing but instruments at the mercy of those whom Chingis Khan had chosen [30]. " According to Radloff and Barthold's usurpation theory, the state formation on the steppe was a two-way process: first, the powerful people actively sought hegemony and self-appointment; second, the ordinary people, families, and villages attached and found new nobility in the polity. In a word, the usurpation theory emphasizes that within the rising of the Mongol Empire, the emergency of individual characters preceded the differentiation of social

systems; compared with the Soviet school, this theory pays more attention to the historical role of individual characters, and its comments on the usurpation's process contain moral denials. Krader pointed out two implicit premises in Radlov and Barthold's usurpation theory: first, before the Mongolian state formed, there was already established power to usurp; second, the people had not voluntarily recognized the central government's authority. These two preconditions were not convincing, since before the formation of the empire, the coercive force it controlled was not concentrated, and naturally, there was no usurpation. Moreover, the state's formation consisted of the centralization of power when Chingis Khan " sent messages to all the nomads and assembled them to witness, participate in, and support his election as Mongol Khan. By their assembly they expressed their consent. There is no sense of usurpation [31]. " Thus, the Khan " represented the unity of the people, the maintenance of social being, the continued existence of culture [32]. " At the same time, Krader also pointed out another premise hidden in Barthold's discourse: nomadic society was politically homogeneous and self-sufficient, and there was no need to cede *carte blanche* to a permanent ruler as a representative of the group [33]. In an egalitarian society that was not permanently divided, individuals could only gain power by usurping. However, Krader believed that this underestimated the complexity of society when the Mongol Empire formed in the 13th century. In fact, in the era of Chingis Khan, Mongol society had a clear distinction between the noble and the common; hence the inferences of Radloff and Barthold had obvious methodological problems. Firstly, they mistakenly historicized the ethnographic material, using the 19th-century Kirgiz with more spartan social conditions as an analogy to the 13th-century Mongols; secondly, they forgot that Mongols have borrowed and learned complex political systems from agricultural civilization in their exchanges; thirdly, their practice of simplifying the institutional problem of the state formation into a problem of individual roles could not help but be superficial [34].

However, Krader also admitted that Radloff and Barthold's usurpation theory does have specific logical premises as this theory aimed to solve the structural problems in the traditional social research of central Asia: if expanding families and clans were self-governing but non-sovereign permanent groups, so how can central power be concentrated? Therefore, Radlov and Barthold were nothing more than looking for individuals outside elements of the social structure to explain the formation of the Mongolian state [35]. Finally, Krader pointed out that the concentration of power was usually accompanied by personal relationships between leaders and followers. Radloff and Barthold mistakenly attributed these relationships to the Mongolian world alone, and could only misunderstand the universality and the particularity of Mongolian state formation [36]. Similarly, " Since none of these traits is specific to feudal Europe and the Tatars of the Asian steppes, it is not defensible to consider them a single political and social system, namely feudalism [37]. "

4. The Formation of the State

According to Krader's point, firstly, the formal similarity of the social structure in relationships between lords and vassals could not determine the consistency in content; secondly, the research on how the Mongolian state formed should start from the perspective of social development. Indeed, a hereditary class existed in Mongolian society in the 12th century. For Krader, the Mongol Empire was a specific variant of the general state [38].

Abstractly, states form when societies become increasingly complex; economics become specialized; populations grow in size; societies are divided into classes, strata, ethnic groups, or associations. Local loyalty or blood ties are overcome, and authority concentrates in central institutions, monopolizing violence and committing to the universal ruling. The process of centralization is divided into delegations of power, and the government must maintain internal order and defend against foreign invasion. The government's functions are diverse, permanent,

and divided, while the meaning of the territory to polities becomes more critical with the appearance of the state. Finally, the formation of the state means that society has achieved the greatest degree of integration. This unity of power, people, territory, and law is embodied in ideology and national rituals. As a derivative of society, the state seems to have independence [39].

Specifically, traditional central Asian society relied on blood, and class differences began from birth. Institutional differentiation predated the rise of individual characters, and " the principle of unity is transformed into the principle of division [40]. " Such as the Altai Turks, " Among a group of lineages occupying a common territory, one lineage may be known as the 'white bone', with concomitant dominating position [41]. " As another example, the Buryats would order lineages according to the principle of primogeniture, which was the basis for the division of society into two social classes, nobles, and commoners, with slaves insubordination, forming a three-fold class differentiation. Therefore, the traditional social structure of the Buryats presents the essential characteristics of both synchronicity and diachronicity. The diachronic pattern of society's organization formed on common descendant groups; on the other hand, all members of society were distributed in three social classes or strata - nobles, commoners, and slaves - which was the synchronous or horizontal organization of society. This conceptualized social structure pattern was also reflected in Buryat mythology and religion, such as Buryats revered for the number 3, making the spiritual world and the human soul into a three-fold distinction, arranging in the highest-middle-lowest hierarchy. At the same time, each unit of social organization, such as extended family, and kinship village, all corresponded to a unit or level of the spiritual hierarchy [42]. Krader believed that the class antagonism in the social system is the prerequisite for the triumphant rise of individual characters. Just as, before Chingis Khan, the traditional Mongolian society was no longer an egalitarian tribal society, and Chingis Khan himself was the son of a petty nobleman [43].

While clans remained the fundamental force for social integration and the state's origin: firstly, the larger kinship entities such as clan alliances, Khanates or principalities provided a realistic but ephemeral basis for state formations; secondly, clans were the core of the civil and military organization during the rise of the empire, responsible for providing taxes and armies, and after the establishment of the state, clans remained " in new ways - in taxation and in military and religious obligations - to serve the state [44] "; thirdly, blood ties supported rulers, clans directly participated in selection processes of the princes through representatives, and kinship ensured social mobility, even " the humblest Mongol could become a minister or a general if he showed administrative skill or bravery and leadership qualities in the army [45]. "

The formation of the Mongolian state was based on an inherently hierarchical social structure and presented in social rituals. In 1206, at the gathering at the source of the Onan River, people built a nine-legged white scorpion, elected Chingis Khan to the top, and recognized his delegated power to rule the people; the Khan then delegated the power to prominent followers as Muquli and jebe. The ceremony embodied the unity of the people and the delegations of power indicated the social operation of the highest authority. Chingis Khan and his followers were not outsiders who usurped power, but brook through the old institutional network and rebuilt the social order of the grasslands. Krader analyzed that the formation of the steppe state began with Chingis Khan's great-grandfather Qabul. At that time, two processes were unfolding simultaneously: using the ruler's power to promote unification and establish political unity; establishing political self-awareness and identity through state formation. In the end, Chingis Khan completed the transformation of the nature of the steppe society, developing into a vast empire and his image enriched by socially inherited rituals [46].

To sum up, kinship was the premise of the Mongolian tribal-consanguineous state: firstly. the clan was still the commoners' living world; secondly. under the clan system, the collective ownership of the real estate dominated; thirdly. the genealogy provided primary citizenship.

However, although the extended family-blood clan laid the organizational foundation for state formation, its particularised characteristics limited the definition of national citizenship, resulting in the dilemma of the Mongol Empire when it won the war of foreign conquest and absorbed different ethnic groups, which caused the Mongol Empire to wander between tribalism and national polity and was one of the reasons that eventually led to the empire's disintegration.

Of course, it is undeniable that nokor's bond with Chingis Khan played an essential role in forming of the Mongolian state. It was the result of the influence of personal aptitude and an alternative to local loyalty or blood ties; in this process, Khan's accumulated prestige was a prerequisite for his absolutist rule and rendered the state a solid individualistic characters [47]. Krader wrote: firstly. Ordo, the center of Mongol rule, was initially composed of the emperor's relatives, advisors, and nokor; secondly. the Mongols' ability to rise in the social hierarchy depended on the emperor; thirdly. nokor were privileged, even if they committed serious crimes, Chingis Khan will forgive them. At the same time, the Mongolian state also followed the universal demands of the general state, which typically showed in the rule of Chingis Khan: firstly. he implemented universal rule over the public and private life of the Mongols through Jassaq, while the authority used mandatory public law to crowd out the autonomy of extended families, blood clans, kinship villages, and other local communities; secondly. although there was the beki specializing in shamanic affairs, he used religious tolerance policies to deal with the religious issues of the empire in general. In short, the Mongolian state formation was the result of the combined effect of structural class opposition and individual loyalty bonds, which also determined that the state always faced the dual dilemma of conflicts between universalism and particularism. Just as the hidden dangers brought by subordination between individuals: firstly. personal ties hindered the implementation of universal laws; secondly. after the death of masters, the loyalty of the followers to the successor was no longer; thirdly. once there was a lack of powerful figure, such as after Chingis Khan, the empire easy to split. Krader concluded that the limitation of nokor-Khan " lay in its personal nature; it did not pass on systematically to the successors or inheritors of the sovereignty—but true states nevertheless were formed which integrated under one power the various social classes and groups [48]. " Thus, as a tribal-consanguineous state, the particularistic blood organization and ties of loyalty both contributed to the glory of Mongols and ultimately forced the collapse of the empire.

5. Conclusion

To sum up, the main views of Lawrence Krader on the social history of central Asia can be summarized as follows: firstly, the traditional central Asian society was supported by kinship and regulated the specific operation of politics; secondly, the Mongolian society in the 11th-13th centuries was neither an egalitarian tribal society nor a nomadic feudal system; thirdly, class differentiation and individual loyalty worked together in forming the Mongolian state, but the organizational characteristics of particularism buried the hidden danger of the collapse of the empire. Digging deeper into Krader's conclusion, we can also see that there are two basic methodological premises for his argument: firstly, the method of cultural area, which regards central Asia as a continuum with unique cultures and focuses on examining its basic characteristics and its relationship with the outside world. Second, the method of cultural history, which is to examine the history of all traditions of a people so as to study social organization as an independent cultural element diachronically, emphasizing that the organization of central Asian society has its own content. Therefore, it is not difficult to notice that Krader was highly vigilant about the concept's applicability and severely criticized the use of terms such as nomadic feudalism and absolutism to outline Mongolian society and polity. However, on closer inspection, although Krader's refutation of Vladimirtsov, Radloff and

Barthold is reasonable, his own research on the social history of central Asia still could not escape the existing paradigm of Western academics: firstly, Maine's concept of extended family; secondly, the theory of corporate body from Maine, Maitland, Weber to Fortes; thirdly, Weber's theory of nation-state and universalism. Krader did not answer the appropriate boundaries of these paradigms, from which we can also glimpse the theoretical predicament of Western Mongolian studies.

Acknowledgments

Project supported by the National Social Fund (Study on the Marx and Engels's Criticism of Classic Anthropology and its Current Value No. 18CKS005).

References

- [1] Dittmar Schorkowitz Hrsg: Ethnohistorische Wege und Lehrjahre eines Philosophen: Festschrift für Lawrence Krader zum 75. Geburtstag(Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, German 1995), S.7, S.11.
- [2] Henry Schwarz: Bibliotheca Mongolica: Works in English, French and German(Shanghai Chinese Classics Publishing House, China 2020), p.484. R. A. L. H. Gunawardana: The Early State and Theorization on the Evolution and Character of the State in Asia: Some Preliminary Observations, Social Evolution & History, Vol . 8(2008)No. 1, p.133.
- [3] Lawrence Krader: Formation of the State(Prentice-Hall, Inc. , America 1968), p.85-86.
- [4] Lawrence Krader: The Cultural and Historical Position of the Mongols. Asia Major, Vol. 3(1952) Part. 1, p.175.
- [5] Lawrence Krader: Principles and Structures in the Organization of the Asiatic Steppe-Pastoralists, Southwestern Journal of Anthropology, Vol. 11(1955)No. 2, p.68, 70.
- [6] Lawrence Krader: Peoples of Central Asia(Curzon Press Ltd. , America 1997), p.142; Lawrence Krader: Social Organization of the Mongol-Turkic Pastoral Nomads(Curzon Press Ltd. , America 1997), p.321, 372.
- [7] Lawrence Krader: Peoples of Central Asia(Curzon Press Ltd. , America 1997), p.141.
- [8] Henry Maine: Ancient Law(Commercial Press, China 1959), p.88.
- [9] Lawrence Krader: Peoples of Central Asia(Curzon Press Ltd. , America 1997), p.150.
- [10] Lawrence Krader: Social Organization of the Mongol-Turkic Pastoral Nomads(Curzon Press Ltd., America 1997), p. 340.
- [11] Lawrence Krader: Peoples of Central Asia(Curzon Press Ltd., America 1997), p. 142.
- [12] Lawrence Krader: Formation of the State(Prentice-Hall, Inc. , America 1968), p.88-89.
- [13] Lawrence Krader: Peoples of Central Asia(Curzon Press Ltd. , America 1997), p.150.
- [14] Lawrence Krader: Peoples of Central Asia(Curzon Press Ltd. , America 1997), p.147.
- [15] Lawrence Krader: Peoples of Central Asia(Curzon Press Ltd. , America 1997), p.145, 153.
- [16] Lawrence Krader: Social Organization of the Mongol-Turkic Pastoral Nomads(Curzon Press Ltd. , America 1997), p.335, 337.
- [17] Lawrence Krader: Peoples of Central Asia(Curzon Press Ltd. , America 1997), p.153.
- [18] Lawrence Krader: Social Organization of the Mongol-Turkic Pastoral Nomads(Curzon Press Ltd. , America 1997), p.337.
- [19] Lawrence Krader: Formation of the State(Prentice-Hall, Inc. , America 1968), p.87.

- [20] Lawrence Krader: Social Organization of the Mongol-Turkic Pastoral Nomads(Curzon Press Ltd. , America 1997), p.336.
- [21] Lawrence Krader: Peoples of Central Asia(Curzon Press Ltd. , America 1997), p.159.
- [22] Lawrence Krader: Formation of the State(Prentice-Hall, Inc. , America 1968), p.87.
- [23] Lawrence Krader: Principles and Structures in the Organization of the Asiatic Steppe-Pastoralists, Southwestern Journal of Anthropology, Vol. 11(1955)No. 2, p.68, 64.
- [24] Lawrence Krader: Formation of the State(Prentice-Hall, Inc. , America 1968), p.88.
- [25] Б· Я· Vladimirtsov: History of Mongolian Social System(China Social Sciences Press, China 1980), p.165.
- [26] Б· Я· Vladimirtsov: History of Mongolian Social System(China Social Sciences Press, China 1980), p.165, 169.
- [27] Lawrence Krader: Social Organization of the Mongol-Turkic Pastoral Nomads(Curzon Press Ltd. , America 1997), p.322.
- [28] F. W. Maitland. The Constitutional History of England(Cambridge University Press, England 1950), p.22-23.
- [29] Lawrence Krader: Formation of the State(Prentice-Hall, Inc. , America 1968), p.101.
- [30] V. Barthold: Turkestan during the Mongol Invasion(Shanghai Chinese Classics Publishing House, China 2011), p.438.
- [31] Lawrence Krader: Formation of the State(Prentice-Hall, Inc. , America 1968), p.102.
- [32] Lawrence Krader: Peoples of Central Asia(Curzon Press Ltd. , America 1997), p.154.
- [33] Lawrence Krader: Feudalism and the Tatar Polity of the Middle Ages, Comparative Studies in Society and History, Vol. 1(1958)No. 1: p.89.
- [34] Lawrence Krader: Feudalism and the Tatar Polity of the Middle Ages, Comparative Studies in Society and History, Vol. 1(1958)No. 1: p.91.
- [35] Lawrence Krader: Feudalism and the Tatar Polity of the Middle Ages, Comparative Studies in Society and History, Vol. 1(1958)No. 1: p.95.
- [36] Lawrence Krader: The Origin of the State among the Nomads of Asia, in Henry Claessen & Peter Skalník ed: The Early State(The Hague: Mouton Publishers, German 1978), p.103.
- [37] Lawrence Krader: Formation of the State(Prentice-Hall, Inc. , America 1968), p.37.
- [38] Lawrence Krader: The Origin of the State among the Nomads of Asia, in Henry Claessen & Peter Skalník ed: The Early State(The Hague: Mouton Publishers, German 1978), p.108.
- [39] Lawrence Krader: Formation of the State(Prentice-Hall, Inc. , America 1968), Introduction and Chapter One.
- [40] Lawrence Krader: Social Organization of the Mongol-Turkic Pastoral Nomads(Curzon Press Ltd. , America 1997), p.326.
- [41] Lawrence Krader: A Nativistic Movement in Western Siberia, American Anthropologist, Vol. 58(1956)No. 2, p.284 .
- [42] Lawrence Krader: Buryat Religion and Society, Southwestern Journal of Anthropology, Vol. 10(1954)No. 3, p.324, 338, 346.
- [43] Lawrence Krader: Qan-Qayan and the Beginnings of Mongol Kingship, Central Asiatic Journal, Vol. 1(1955)No. 1, p.20, 35.
- [44] Lawrence Krader: Formation of the State(Prentice-Hall, Inc. , America 1968), p.97.

- [45] Lawrence Krader: Social Organization of the Mongol-Turkic Pastoral Nomads(Curzon Press Ltd. , America 1997), p.322.
- [46] Lawrence Krader: Qan-Qayan and the Beginnings of Mongol Kingship, Central Asiatic Journal, Vol. 1(1955)No. 1, p.17-18, 35.
- [47] Lawrence Krader: The Origin of the State among the Nomads of Asia, in Henry Claessen & Peter Skalník ed: The Early State(The Hague: Mouton Publishers, German 1978), p.100-103.
- [48] Lawrence Krader: Formation of the State(Prentice-Hall, Inc. , America 1968), p.105.
- [49] Lawrence Krader: Social Life in the Arid Zones, in ES Hills ed. Arid Land(Methuen, England 1966), p.415.
- [50] Lawrence Krader: Social Organization of the Mongol-Turkic Pastoral Nomads(Curzon Press Ltd. , America 1997), p.1.