

考試科目	民族學理論與方法	所(組)別	民族學系(2171/2176)	考試時間	4月29日 星期六	08:20 ~10:00
------	----------	-------	-----------------	------	--------------	-----------------

本卷共回答四題，每題 25 分，請依序答寫，橫直寫均可，不必抄題

一、請說明「現代性」(modernity)在當前民族學・人類學的研究取向中具有那些重要的研究意義？請以實例說明之。

二、請說明歷史記憶的當代再現與重新詮釋，對於研究族群認同(ethnic identity)現象會產生哪些重要的影響？請舉出兩個你(妳)認為最有代表性的例子。

三、當前民族誌研究方法，對於自我民族誌(autoethnography)研究的認知中，來呈現主體性與客體性思維的過程裡，有哪些值得注意的論述與觀點？

四、請從族群文化認知的建構與解構、政治力量介入與社會整體關注這三個層面，來檢視當代台灣平埔族正民運動的「得失」與「正當性」。

備考	試題隨卷繳交		
命題委員	(簽章)	年	月 日

命題紙使用說明：
1. 試題將用原件印製，敬請使用黑色墨水正楷書寫或打字(紅色不能製版請勿使用)。
2. 書寫時請勿超出格外，以免印製不清。
3. 試題由郵寄遞者請以掛號寄出，以免遺失而示慎重。

考試科目	英文	所(組)別	民族學系(2171/2176)	考試時間	4月29日 星期六	10:20 ~12:00
------	----	-------	-----------------	------	--------------	-----------------

This exam has three components for a total of 100 points:

Write an abstract or brief summary of a journal article excerpt (100 words - 35 points)

Write a short essay (800 - 1000 words) discussing research ethics and representation. (40 points)

Describe your research goals (250 words) (25 points)

Excerpt from:

Dattatreyan, E. G., & Marrero-Guillamón, I. (2019). Introduction: Multimodal anthropology and the politics of invention. *American Anthropologist*, 121(1), 220-228.

Multimodal reinventions

We pick up the term multimodality and its (occasional) double, multisensoriality, as terms that have recently been utilised in anthropology for thinking about and with the media ecologies - i.e. the multiple media(tions) - we live in. As Collins, Durlington and Gill (2017) argue in the paper that marked the birth of this section of *American Anthropologist*, multimodality points to the “centrality of media production in the everyday life of both anthropologists and our interlocutors,” and signals the opportunities and affordances that mediating technologies have to rewire relations between anthropologists, publics, students, and research participants and colleagues in other disciplinary domains. In other words, multimodality does not only refer to an actually existing condition (the media-rich worlds we inhabit) but also to the potential the latter offer for rethinking anthropological practice. Indeed, it is multimodality’s potential to reimagine the relationship between research, teaching, publishing, and public engagement (Collins et al. 2017) that we set out to explore in this collection of articles. Each of them points at a specific refunctioning of anthropology through multimodal engagements; together, they sketch the multiple reconfigurations of the discipline that an inventive engagement with multimodality makes possible. As a whole, the collection provides an image of another, multiple anthropology, creatively engaged in the task of enacting new relations, new narratives, new possibilities. Both multiple media and senses are central to multimodality. The authors included in this special collection, however, favour a focus on the modes of encounter and address between media and subjects, rather than an emphasis on either one in and of themselves. In other words, we don’t see the sensorial as distinct from the relations that emerge out of engagement. While we owe a debt to the ways in which those who have claimed and theorized the sensorial have moved us away from a text-centric approach to ethnography (e.g. Cox et al. 2016; Pink 2009; Stoller 1997), our interest in this special section is on how multimodality can offer an approach to the sensate/sensible that moves away from phenomenology (which tends to privilege a more or less unitary knowing subject, see Pink 2011). Similarly, while we are indebted to a body of work that has reclaimed the

備考	試題隨卷繳交	
命題委員	(簽章)	年 月 日

命題紙使用說明：
 1. 試題將用原件印製，敬請使用黑色墨水正楷書寫或打字（紅色不能製版請勿使用）。
 2. 書寫時請勿超出格外，以免印製不清。
 3. 試題由郵寄遞者請以掛號寄出，以免遺失而示慎重。

考試科目	英文	所(組)別	民族學系(2171/2176)	考試時間	4月29日 星期六	10:20 ~12:00
------	----	-------	-----------------	------	--------------	-----------------

epistemological specificity of different media (e.g. MacDougall 1998; Taylor 1996), we are more interested in identifying what these media do in our ethnographic encounters, and how they may enact the possibility of another anthropology – more public, more collaborative, more political. Multimodality, for us, points directly at a plurality of ways of doing anthropology - a plurality which is best appreciated when thought of in relation to invention. Our use of invention primarily comes out of a genealogy that may not be the most obvious in an anthropological context (although, arguably, it constitutes something of a ‘lingua franca’ at Goldsmiths, University of London, the institution we both inhabit). At the center of our understanding of invention is the work of philosophers such as Gabriel Tarde, Alfred North Whitehead, Gilles Deleuze and Isabelle Stengers, later operationalized by a group of scholars coming out of Science and Technology Studies (STS) (see Marres et al. 2018). As our colleague Martin Savransky’s (2016) explains, up until the 18th Century, “invention” meant both the act of “finding out”, of “discovering”, as well as “fabricating” or “constructing” something. It is precisely this “pre-modern, conjunctive sense” (2016: 78) that he reclaims for the social sciences, and that we will too for multimodal anthropology. Invention, in this sense, refers to a creative, immanent mode of engagement with the subjects and objects we work with, through which unforeseeable knowledges, events and encounters may be produced. In Savransky’s own work, this translates into cultivating what he calls an “alter-realism”, that is, a “realism that takes the risk of asserting the reality of what is deemed improbable, implausible, marginalised, suppressed, irrelevant, even scandalous, and seeks to draw out its possible implications for the transformation of what is considered credible, reliable and serious” (2017: 22). The arguments we develop in this article also echo, expand and politicise recent work on “inventive methods” (Lury and Wakeford 2012) and “inventive social research” (Marres et al. 2018). Like these scholars, we are interested in fostering creative approaches to inquiry that participate in the performativity of social life; that indeed experiment with the what is to contribute to the what may be. Invention here signifies a commitment to creatively partake in the production of what they call “the social” – that is, the multiple relations and associations that tie people, ideas, objects, institutions, etc. together. For these authors, invention is closely related to experimentation, understood not in the narrow scientific sense, but as a form of inquiry that “attempts to purposefully deploy creative aspects of social life – including performance, materiality, reflexivity – with the aim of rendering social phenomena interpretable and knowable” (Marres et al. 2018: 18). We are interested in bringing all of these sensibilities around invention, experimentation, speculation into a conversation with anthropology in ways that produce inventive engagements that, rather than attempting to capture pre-existing ideas or relations through representational techniques, aspire instead to contribute to enacting new entities, new relations, new worlds. An anthropology, then, whose political character is derived from its “resistance to confining reality and being confined by it” (Marrero-Guillamón 2018a). Arguably, there is nothing new in this provocation. Multimodal invention could be interpreted as a fanciful 21st century rearticulation of the “shared anthropology” of the not too distant past. Indeed, an excellent example of the ethics and politics of invention that precedes our current articulation

備考	試題隨卷繳交		
命題委員	(簽章)	年	月 日

- 命題紙使用說明：
1. 試題將用原件印製，敬請使用黑色墨水正楷書寫或打字（紅色不能製版請勿使用）。
 2. 書寫時請勿超出格外，以免印製不清。
 3. 試題由郵寄遞者請以掛號寄出，以免遺失而示慎重。

考試科目	英文	所(組)別	民族學系(2171/2176)	考試時間	4月29日 星期六	10:20 ~12:00
------	----	-------	-----------------	------	--------------	-----------------

is the work of Jean Rouch in West Africa in the late 1950s and 60s. Films such as *Moi un Noir* (1958) and *Jaguar* (1967) famously pioneered the use of fiction in ethnography (“ethnofiction”) – opening a light of flight from the conventions of ethnographic cinema that far from derailing the possibility of doing anthropology, inventively pursued it by other means. In these films, the young men he befriended and worked with in Ivory Coast, Niger and Ghana created fictional characters and improvised the latter’s lives. These characters, in turn, became powerful vehicles through which the desires, aspirations and difficulties of young migrants in (post)colonial Africa could be poetically explored. Writing about these films, Gilles Deleuze argues that Rouch’s work breaks with a certain understanding of the distinction between fiction and reality - a task which is as poetic as it is political: What is opposed to fiction is not the real; it is not the truth which is always that of the masters or colonizers; it is the story-telling function of the poor, in so far as it gives the false the power which makes it into a memory, a legend, a monster... What cinema must grasp is not the identity of a character, whether real or fictional, through his [sic] objective and subjective aspects. It is the becoming of the real character when he himself starts to ‘make fiction’, when he enters into ‘the flagrant offence of making up legends’ and so contributes to the invention of his people... He himself becomes another, when he begins to tell stories without ever being fictional. And the filmmaker for his part becomes another when there are ‘interposed’, in this way, real characters, who wholly replace his own fictions by their own story-telling. Both communicate in the invention of a people. (1997: 150). Deleuze’s praise for Rouch is based in establishing a connection between invention and politics; between becoming another and inventing a people. Our goal is admittedly more humble – to reclaim for multimodal anthropology the potential that certain forms of inventive engagement may have to create an otherwise. i Politics, in this reading, are the ways in which subjectivity in the present and for the future are co-produced by participants through performance, images, installations, interactive web platforms – towards specified goals, in some cases, and unanticipated ends in others. Our genealogy of invention, as is probably clear by now, follows a different set of concerns than the better known (in anthropology) work of Roy Wagner, for whom invention is the crucial mechanism through which anthropologists can understand other cultures – that is, the device that allows cultures to be compared. As he puts it: the relation that the anthropologist builds between two cultures – which, in turn, objectifies and hence “creates” those cultures for him [sic] – arises precisely from his act of “invention,” his use of meanings known to him in constructing an understandable representation of his subject matter. The result is an analogy, or a set of analogies, that “translates” one group of basic meanings into the other, can be said to participate in both meaning systems at the same time in the same way that their creator does (1981, 16-17). ...

... Academic texts, for the most part, are the opposite of good collaborative devices: they are constructed around exclusive forms of expertise, written in an impenetrable language shared by an elite minority, and distributed in closed circuits, often behind exorbitant paywalls. The idea that text (alone) can somehow become a vehicle for capturing the complex exchanges between anthropologists and their various interlocutors as collaboration suggests

備考	試題隨卷繳交		
命題委員	(簽章)	年	月 日

- 命題紙使用說明：
1. 試題將用原件印製，敬請使用黑色墨水正楷書寫或打字（紅色不能製版請勿使用）。
 2. 書寫時請勿超出格外，以免印製不清。
 3. 試題由郵寄遞者請以掛號寄出，以免遺失而示慎重。

考試科目	英文	所(組)別	民族學系(2171/2176)	考試時間	4月29日 星期六	10:20 ~12:00
------	----	-------	-----------------	------	--------------	-----------------

that anthropology's fetishization of ethnography as text continues to dominate our modes of production and engagement (Conquergood 1988). ...

備考	試題隨卷繳交					
命題委員	(簽章)			年	月	日

命題紙使用說明：
1. 試題將用原件印製，敬請使用黑色墨水正楷書寫或打字（紅色不能製版請勿使用）。
2. 書寫時請勿超出格外，以免印製不清。
3. 試題由郵寄遞者請以掛號寄出，以免遺失而示慎重。