考 試 科 目 民族學理論與方法　所 別 民族學系　考試時間 5月12日(六)第 1 節

◎ 本卷共回答四題，每題 25 分，依序答寫，橫直寫均可，不必抄題。

一、台灣人類學與民族學的學科建制及其學術傳承，基本上可以分成日本殖民時期的人類學與民族學（土俗人種學）、近代中國人類學與民族學的「南派」、以及當代英美西方人類學這三個不同的源流。如果以完整的「學科史」的角度來看，你（妳）個人如何評價這三個源流的特色、影響及其歷史地位？

二、民族學與人類學進行實證研究一向強調學科倫理規範的概念及其實踐意義。請就此回答：

1. 你（妳）個人如何看待遵守田野倫理規範、展現學術研究成果與落實人文關懷三者之間的基本關聯性？（13 分）

2. 近年來，台灣學界在國科會的主導下，亦完成民族學與人類學學科倫理規範的具體內容。但有說法認為若是完全落實其規定，將有可能增加田野與相關研究的「難度」。對於此點應如何解讀？（12 分）

三、何謂社會生態學（socioecology）？其對於當代民族學與人類學理論的建構有那些特點與影響？

四、民族主義（nationalism）的研究一般都歸類在政治學的範疇中，但亦有民族學者與人類學者在研究族群與族群性（ethnicity）的議題時，會涉及民族主義的理論及其相關討論。請就此來分析論述民族主義與當代民族學與人類學研究的關係。

備　註　試 題 隨 卷 繳 交

考 試 科 目	外文（英文）	所　別	民族學系	考 試 時 間	5 月 12 日(六) 第 二 節

Part I. Please choose from the list of words below to fill in the blanks in the passages that follows. (20%)

1. so	2. for	3. In	4. to	5. at
6. of	7. on	8. with	9. hence	10. outside

We all know that anthropology has the potential _____ be immensely influential, and has relevance in relation to all sorts of social and practical problems. However, how do we establish the limits to our discipline, and of our competence? In June, a group of anthropologists and others will come together in the British Museum to discuss precisely this problem; looked _____ historically, practically and actually, what is the influence and reach of the discipline outside academia?

We need to take care as to what sort of anthropology we are referring to. The transforming influence of archaeology _____ the universities, though it can be argued how and why this has taken place, can hardly be in question – whether pressed into service as part of nationalism or the infinite number of localisms which can emerge and remerge around any part of the historical built environment, imagined or otherwise. This wide appeal means that archaeology never has been purely a university discipline, and surely is very unlikely ever to become _____. This is all the more the case as the squeeze _____ universities may mean that amateur archaeologists – already a long and distinguished tradition – regain some prestige simply because they are freer to practice archaeology, and their contribution thereby grows comparatively in importance.

_____ similar fashion, but in rather a different way, the same may be said _____ biological anthropology. The growth of forensic anthropology for example, has had a huge impact on the way that evidence can be marshalled in both national and international cases, and in doing so has captured the wider public's imagination. We can see the immediate result _____ this in the high profile cases in which forensic anthropology is involved, and the consequent sudden expansion of university courses in the subject. We can applaud and study these developments, and caution too that they should be properly and appropriately considered, so that there is no easy lapse into scientism at the expense of the complex social context which governs so much of the way the evidence is produced. Nevertheless, there is no conceptual puzzle as to how this jump has been made: sophisticated analytical technique combines _____ technical advances to yield physical insights which were not previously evident, _____ forensic anthropology's use and applicability.

(D. Shankland, Anthropology in the World, Anthropology Today, Vol. 28, No. 2, p.3)

Part II. Please translate the following TWO paragraphs into Chinese. (40%)

The word 'anthropology' is ultimately from the Greek (*anthropos*, 'human', plus *logos*, 'discourse' or 'science'). Its first usage to define a scientific discipline is probably around the early sixteenth century (in its Latin form *anthropologium*). Central European writers then employed it as a term to cover anatomy and physiology, part of what much later came to be called 'physical' or 'biological anthropology'. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, European theologians also used the term, in this case to refer to the attribution of human-like features to their deity. The German word *Anthropologie*, which described cultural attributes of different ethnic groups, came to be used by a few writers in Russia and Austria in the late eighteenth century (see Vermeulen 1995). However, this usage did not become established among scholars elsewhere until much later.

Eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century scholars tended to use 'ethnology' for the study of both the cultural differences and the features which identify the common humanity of the world's peoples. This English term, or its equivalents like *ethnologie* (French) or *Ethnologie* (German), are still in use in continental Europe and the United States. In the United Kingdom and most other parts of the English-speaking world 'social anthropology' is the more usual designation. In continental Europe, the word 'anthropology' often still tends to carry the meaning 'physical anthropology', though there too 'social anthropology' is now rapidly gaining ground as a synonym for 'ethnology'. Indeed, the main professional organization in Europe is called the European Association of Social Anthropologists or l'Association Europe´enne des Anthropologues Sociaux. It was founded in 1989 amidst a rapid growth of the discipline across Europe, both Western and Eastern. In the United States, the word 'ethnology' co-exists with 'cultural anthropology'.

(A. Barnard, History and Theory in Anthropology, pp.1-2)

Part III. Please read the following paragraphs carefully and write a 300-word summary. (40%)

The practice approach is diverse, and I will not attempt to compare and contrast its many strands. Rather I will select for discussion a number of works that seem to share a common orientation within the larger set, an orientation that seems to me particularly promising. I do not wish to canonize any single one of these works, nor do I wish to provide a label for the subset and endow it with more

reality than it has. What I do here is more like beginning to develop a photograph, to coax a latent form into something recognizable.

We may begin by contrasting, in a general way, this (subset of) newer practice-oriented work with certain more established approaches, especially with symbolic interactionism in sociology (Blumer 1962; Goffman 1959; see also Berreman 1962, and more recently Gregor 1977 in anthropology) and with what was called transactionalism in anthropology (Kapferer1 976, Marriott 1976, Goody 1978, Barth 1966, Bailey 1969). The first point to note is that these approaches were elaborated *in opposition to* the dominant, essentially Parsonian/Durkheimian, view of the world as ordered by rules and norms. Recognizing that institutional organization and cultural patterning exist, the symbolic interactionists and transactionalists nonetheless sought to minimize or bracket the relevance of these phenomena for understanding social life:

From the standpoint of symbolic interaction, social organization is a framework in side of which acting units develop their actions. Structural features, such as "culture," "social systems," "social stratification, "or "social roles," set conditions for their action but do not determine their action (Blumer 1962:152).

The newer practice theorists, on the other hand, share a view that "the system" (in a variety of senses to be discussed below) does in fact have very powerful, even "determining," effect upon human action and the shape of events. Their interest in the study of action and interaction is thus not a matter of denying or minimizing this point, but expresses rather an urgent need to understand where "the system" comes from-how it is produced and re-produced, and how it may have changed in the past or be changed in the future. As Giddens argues in his important recent book (1979), the study of practice is not an antagonistic alternative to the study of systems or structures, but a necessary complement to it.

The other major aspect of the newer practice orientation, differentiating it significantly from earlier interactionist and transactionalist approaches, re-sides in a palpable Marxist influence carrying through from the seventies. Partly this is visible in the way in which things like culture and/or structure are viewed. That is, although the newer practice theorists share with sixties anthropology a strong sense of the shaping power of culture/structure, this shaping power is viewed rather darkly, as a matter of "constraint," "hegemony," and "symbolic domination." We will come back to this position in greater detail later. More generally, the Marxist influence is to be seen in the assumption that the most important forms of action or interaction for analytic purposes are those which take place in asymmetrical or dominated relations, that it is these forms of action or interaction that best explain the

考 試 科 目	外文（英文）	所　　別	民族學系	考 試 時 間	5 月 12 日(六) 第 二 節

shape of any given system at any given time. Whether it is a matter of focusing directly on interaction (even "struggle") between asymmetrically related actors, or whether it is more broadly a matter of defining actors (whatever they are doing) in terms of roles and statuses derived from asymmetrical relations in which they participate, the approach tends to highlight social asymmetry as the most important dimension of both action and structure.

Not all of current practice work manifests the Marxist influence. Some of it - like symbolic interactionism and transactionalism themselves - is more in the spirit of Adam Smith. The members of the subset with which I am concerned, however, implicitly or explicitly share at least the critical flavor of seventies anthropology, if not a systematic allegiance to Marxist theory per se.

Yet to speak of a Marxist influence in all of this is actually to obscure an important aspect of what is going on: an interpenetration, almost a merger, between Marxist and Weberian frameworks. In the sixties, the opposition between Marx and Weber, as "materialist" and "idealist," had been emphasized. The practice theorists, in contrast, draw on a set of writers who interpret the Marxist corpus in such a way as to render it quite compatible with Weber's views. As Weber put the actor at the center of his model, so these writers emphasize issues of human praxis in Marx. As Weber subsumed the economic within the political, so these writers encompass economic exploitation within political domination. And as Weber was centrally concerned with ethos and consciousness, so these writers stress similar issues within Marx's work. Choosing Marx over Weber as one's theorist of reference is a tactical move of a certain sort. In reality, the theoretical framework involved is about equally indebted to both. (On theory, see Giddens 1971; Williams 1976; Avineri 1971; Ollman 1971; Bauman 1973; Habermas 1973; Goldmann 1977. For substantive case analyses in this Weberian-Marxist vein, see Thompson 1966; Williams 1973; Genovese 1976.)

(S. Ortner, Theory in Anthropology since the Sixties, pp. 146-7)

備　　　　註	試 題 隨 卷 繳 交

| 考試科目 | 外文(日文) | 所別 | 民族學系 | 考試時間 | 5月12日(六) 第 二 節 |

一、以下の文献を読んで中国語で解説してください。（35分）

移民指導所が発足すると、総督府は早速「台湾移住案内」と題するパンフレットを日本の各県に配布し募集勧誘を始めた。実際には台湾に近い九州、四国、中国等に重点を置き、愛媛、佐賀、福岡、山口、広島、徳島各県に関係官吏を派遣した。また遠くは群馬、福島まで出向いて移民説明会を開いた。その時の募集要綱には次のような厳しい条件が付されていた。官営移民の成功の要因のひとつには、この条件があげられる。

①台湾に永住の意思が堅固で、農を専業とし他業を営まないもの。

②身体が強壮で他人に嫌忌される疾病のないもの。

③素行正しくかつて刑罰を受けたことがなく、大酒トバクなど悪癖のないもの。

④すでに一家をなし家族を引き連れ在住するもの。

⑤渡航旅費のほかに、収穫のあるまでの食費として移住者二人の場合は百五十円以上、三人は四百円以上、四人以上は一人につき五十円以上を増し、現金か郵便貯金で持参できるもの。

⑥勤倹で業務に精励し、かつ母国人としての体面を保ちうるもの。

⑦渡台した後他の事業を兼営したり、怠惰で農業に精励せず母国人たる品位を損したり、善良な農民とならないと認めたときは、貸し下げた土地や物件を引き揚げ、移住地を退去させる。

⑧妻を同伴しないものは採用しない。

⑨多数移住者の仲介者となったり、または主宰者となってこれを引き連れ渡台するものは採用しない。

⑩応募地の市町村長の証明書に戸籍膽本を添えた許可証を持たなければならない。とくに④⑧については清朝諸外国でも植民地で移民にこのような条件をつけた例は恐らくない。厳しい条件をクリアして入植した者は、吉野村に続く豊田、林田を含めると明治四十三年から大正六年まで出願した千六百二十一人のうち四千四十四年は、出願者七百二人のうち許可は百七十三人で、実に四・一倍という競争率であった。

政府が台湾への渡航者に女を伴うことを禁じたのとは対照的であった。

指導所の募集に応じて入植した第一号は、明治四十三年二月の徳島県吉野川流域からの九戸、二十四人で続いて同年八月と十月に合わせて五十二戸が入植し、この地を宮前部落と名づけた。翌四十四年八月、これまでの「七脚川」の地名を故郷の吉野川に因んで「吉野村」と改め、ここに吉野村が生れた。明治四十一年ブラジルに移民船「笠戸丸」が到着した三年後のことである。以後大正五年までに三百六十四戸、千八百六十五人が徳島、福岡、佐賀、熊本、山口、広島各県より入植し、吉野村の基礎が固められた。こうして順調に移民が進むにつれて七脚川蕃社跡だけでは土地が狭くなり、二百余町歩を荳蘭社から一万三千円で買いとり、宮前部落に続き清水、草分、中園と村づくりが進められた。またその過程で賀田組から塩水港製糖会社の開拓予定地も譲り受けた。

| 考試科目 | 外文(日文) | 所別 | 民族學系 | 考試時間 | 5月12日(六) 第 二 節 |

二、以下の文献を読んで、日本語で簡略し解説してください。（35分）

三、論文又は研究の計画を日本語で書いてください。（30分）

淡廳風俗最稱淳厚，百姓遵官守法，居民不相欺，遇有鬥爭勸解即止，夜無強劫之盜，或小盜陰行竊掠，官為嚴捕，各自奔逃，蓋夜門不閉之風，幾近於古矣。

淡廳風俗儉樸，村農之輩，塗體跣足，而家貲累積，人莫得而知之者，蓋其愛惜物力然也。若夫素封之家，其子弟不免稍習侈靡，然絲衣紈綺，尚不致鬥競奢侈。至如服狀乖張，語言剽悍，三五成群，日入賭館，夜開娼家，土人稱為闖棍者，如此類則未之見焉。

臺地易生財，亦易用財，凡遇四神時誕，或賽願，生辰動輒演戲，莫如三月念三日為媽祖壽誕之辰俗，其冠昏喪祭隨家貲之厚薄，與各縣同，惟最浪費者，則稱為會錢，淡水風，值年屆期，鳩錢演戲，無論街村㊷，各分籍類，競為演祝，或積有會錢，會，經旬閱月㊸，舉處若狂，此亦風俗之不可解者也。至七月十五日為盂蘭會，俗稱此月初一日為開地獄，三十日為閉地獄，盡此月內，各廟演設道場，或二日、或三日，首一夜燃放水燈，火光燦爛，鼓樂喧闐，末夜陳牲饌、菓品、羹飯等物，謂之普度，間有張燈結綵，鋪設圖畫玩器，各色戲劇㊹，互相演鬧，觀者如堵，尤其甚者，牲物饌具，羅列堆積，所謂有酒如池，有肉如陵，殆不是過也。主事者各執器械，周圍守護，謂之押孤，火炬燭天，男女擠擁，四更乃散，遠民義而瀆鬼神㊺，風俗之浮華，將伊胡底？可慨也夫！