

問題 1 次の英文を日本語に全訳しなさい。

注) 斜体の文字は書籍の名称。

At its inception, Geertz's work lay far outside the positivist approaches to culture that defined the anthropological mainstream. By the 1980s, however, the *Interpretation of Cultures* had become a foundational work for the 'cultural turn' that overtook most of the humanities and some of the social sciences. Geertz did not identify himself with the corresponding postmodern (or poststructuralist) movement(s) in anthropology, but his ideas profoundly influenced their views of culture. The assumptions that many had earlier considered most problematic in his consideration of culture as text attained near-paradigmatic status by the end of the decade. Foremost of these was his assertion that culture was not amenable to reductive or generalizing explanation. Advocates of the cultural turn, for all their diversity, shared a common rejection of all explanatory 'meta-narratives' informing anthropological approaches since the time of Boas. In their place, they advanced the now-axiomatic view that culture is unevenly shared and contested, hybrid in origin, and subject to interpretation in myriad ways.

Most subsequent anthropologists have grappled with the implications of this view, even if it has led them to very different analytical emphases. For the contributors to the volume *Writing Culture* (1986), this inspired a radical critique of how ethnography itself is constructed. Traditional ethnography privileged anthropologists' accounts as authoritative while banishing any reference to their own subjective states or the political and personal complexities of fieldwork. Ethnographic descriptions are inherently 'partial' in both senses of the word: they are the product of a subjective observer, and by virtue of what they selectively report, cannot represent any culture in its entirety. They are, in Geertz's term, 'fictions' - not, he said, in the sense of being untruthful but as 'something made' or 'fashioned' to advance their authors' arguments (1973: 15). Yet, anthropologists long clothed their work in the dispassionate narrative language of science to impose order on a chaotic reality: in doing so, they represented themselves as omniscient and objective observers of a world that was, in actuality, of their own making. The notion of culture that animated such work was one such narrative convention, but, critics claimed, its assumptions of bounded, coherent, and uniform ways of life precluded consideration of the hybridity that defines the contemporary world. 'By defining culture as a set of shared meanings,' Rosaldo wrote (1989: 28), 'classic norms of analysis make it difficult to study zones of difference within and between cultures. From the classic perspective, cultural borderlands appear to be annoying exceptions rather than

central areas for inquiry.' This view of culture, if it ever existed apart from anthropologists' own categories, has certainly been rendered obsolete by globalization. In the modern world, Clifford observes (1986: 22), 'one cannot occupy, unambiguously, a bounded cultural world from which to journey out and analyze other cultures. Human ways of life increasingly influence, dominate, parody, translate and subvert one another.'

Increasingly, anthropologists joined a political dimension to these criticisms. If culture is seen in the traditional sense as a body of shared knowledge and meanings, then it follows that any social field operates according to a consensus from which dissenting views are absent. As traditionally understood, the concept of culture 'privilege[d] the kind of sharing, agreeing, and bounding that fly in the face... of unequal knowledge and the differential prestige of lifestyles, and ... discourage[d] attention to the worldviews and agency of those who are marginalized or dominated' (Appadurai, 1996: 12). Yet, in order to describe how 'the Trobrianders' or 'the Zuni' think and act, anthropologists distilled descriptions of these cultures that homogenized their complex and contested social realities. Within most 20th-century anthropology, non-normative views were disregarded as idiosyncratic or, worse, pathologized as 'deviant.' This notion of culture as normative consensus - whether identified by trait lists, kinship rules, or configurations - essentialized all members of any human group as following a static and uniform way of life. The effect was not unlike that of the concept of race, the very notion that culture was meant to replace. As seen below, these problems suggested to some that the concept itself had outlived its usefulness. Alternately, critics argued, if culture indeed consists of many voices it becomes incumbent upon anthropologists to attend as well (if not preferentially) to voices less often heard, above all those of the oppressed and marginalized.

【語注】

axiomatic	公理のような、自明な
omniscient	全知の、博識な
obsolete	使われなくなった、時代遅れの
subvert	転覆させる、滅亡させる、破壊する
idiosyncratic	特異な、独特な、変わった
pathologize	病的なものとみなす
deviant	逸脱した、逸脱者
incumbent	現職の、責務のある、行う義務のある

※WEB掲載に際し、以下のとおり出典を追記しております。

©Mark Moberg, 2021 from Chapter 1 Culture, Mark Moberg. The SAGE Handbook of Cultural Anthropology, Edited by Lene Pedersen & Lisa Cliggett, SAGE Publications Ltd, 2021; permission conveyed through Copyright Clearance Center, Inc.

———これより先の余白には絶対に記入しないこと———

(裏へ続く)

ここから記入すること

(裏へ続く)

——これより先の余白には絶対に記入しないこと——