

問題 1 次の英文で述べられている内容について、具体例も含めできるだけ詳しく説明したうえで、ここでとりあげられている文化人類学の議論についてあなたの考えを書きなさい。（日本語で回答すること）

Postmodern criticism prompted anthropologists to engage in ongoing reappraisal of their discipline and, in particular, to rethink what was involved in fieldwork and the writing of ethnography. While cultural anthropologists continue to value careful observational methods and accurate, systematic data gathering, many of them also take seriously certain parts of the postmodern critique. Perhaps the earliest reappraisal involved a consideration of how to understand the relationships between anthropological fieldworkers and the human subjects with whom they worked. Modernist, "positivist" views of this relationship likened the fieldwork situation to a "living laboratory": placing the ethnographer in the role of the curious human investigator behind the microscope, and placing the subjects of research in the role of inert matter under the lens. But this analogy ignored the fact that anthropological fieldwork always involved a social relationship involving at least two curious human individuals; that is, research is always entangled with social relations. This meant that the cultural and personal characteristics of fieldworkers had to be taken into account when attempting to analyze and write about the research experience. Put another way, fieldwork had to become a reflexive activity in which anthropologists carefully scrutinized both their own contribution to fieldwork interactions and the responses these interactions elicited from the subjects of their research. That is, rather than assuming that they were, for all intents and purposes, invisible to the people they were studying, anthropologists began to recognize that who they were as individuals and as socially situated actors had an effect on their research.

Most contemporary cultural and linguistic anthropologists have long taken reflexivity for granted as a necessary component of the ethnographic research process; indeed, sociocultural anthropologists Martin Holbraad and Morten Axel Pedersen have argued that the contemporary developments in anthropological theory collectively referred to as "the ontological turn" are best understood as efforts to intensify the commitment to reflexivity in anthropology. What do they mean by that? First of all, in Western philosophy, "ontology" is the field of inquiry concerned with determining what does and does not exist in reality; and philosophers have relied on traditional Western forms of reason and logic to make these determinations. Euro-American scientists (and social scientists, including anthropologists) have carried out their research largely without questioning basic Western assumptions about what exists in the real world: for instance, the assumption that autonomous entities are more basic (more "real") than the relations that they might have among themselves. However, a key feature of ethnographic inquiry involves experiencing what Michael Agar (1996) called "rich points," and what

Holbraad and Pedersen call "a-ha! moments" (2017, 1). These are experiences that utterly challenge the ethnographer's taken-for-granted assumptions about the way the world works. To take an example, we discuss in chapter 4 that the indigenous *runakuna* in Peru apparently regard Andean mountain peaks like Ausangate as living beings who monitor and intervene in human affairs and with whom bargains may be struck (de la Cadena 2015). But this view is flatly contradicted by Western ontological views of mountains as "really" nothing more than inert matter. Anthropologists have long recognized that a rich point of this kind relativizes Western claims about mountains and also pushes ethnographers into more reflexive awareness of ontological commitments about mountains that they have always accepted but must now reconsider anew. One outcome might be that the ethnographer writes that although "we know" that mountains are inert matter, indigenous Andean peoples "believe" that they are living beings involved in human affairs.

So what would it mean to intensify the anthropological commitment to reflexivity? According to Holbraad and Pedersen, it means to take anthropology's relativizing rich points and a-ha! moments and "to run with them. Instead of encasing them within generalizing theories about culture, society, human nature, and so forth, or trying to explain them away with a good dose of common sense, this way of thinking in anthropology seeks deliberately to take these moments as far as they will go, making fully virtue of their capacity to stop thinking in its tracks, unsettling what we think we know in favour of what we may not even have imagined" (2017, 2). To continue the previous Andean example, taking the ontological turn would mean rethinking, from top to bottom, what mountains are—but this time beginning with the ontological assumptions of *runakuna*. This is what de la Cadena attempts in her ethnography *Earth Beings*, exposing in the process just how tricky translation becomes when the ethnographer is not free to ignore (or to dismiss as mere "beliefs") the foundational ontological principles of the people with whom she is working. One way to think about taking the ontological turn in this instance is that it would mean attempting to provide an anthropological account of mountain peaks like Ausangate that might have been produced if the anthropologists, and their theories, had been developed by *runakuna* rather than Western thinkers. In Holbraad and Pedersen's words, to take the ontological turn is "to keep open the question of what phenomena might comprise an ethnographic field and how anthropological concepts have to be modulated or transformed the better analytically to articulate them" (2017, 10-11).

※WEB掲載に際し、以下のとおり出典を追記しております。

From "Core Concepts in Cultural Anthropology 7th Edition".  
Lavenda, Robert H. and Schultz, Emily A.  
Copyright © 2019 by Oxford Publishing Limited (Academic).  
Reproduced with permission of the Licensor through PLSclear.



———これより先の余白には絶対に記入しないこと———

——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——