

## 法國人類學的博物館時代——兼論 人類學物件之特性及實證人類學之建立\*

戴麗娟\*\*

一般人類學史研究多以重要學派思想或知名人類學家之理論入手，較少從學科發展制度、機構、實作規範等方面探討，然而這些面向卻是學科建制化過程中不可或缺的一環。本文以二十世紀上半期法國人類學建制化為討論對象，並指出博物館在此過程中所扮演的重要角色。

在人類學尚未被法國大學系統承認為一獨立學科之前，博物館其實提供了一個完整的工作環境，是一個讓對此新興學問有興趣的學子可以在其中求取專業知識的場所。位於巴黎的人類博物館在當時不僅是一個基本研究材料匯集和整理的地方，人類學知識生產和流通的中心，也是人才養成的場所，更是該學科與外界社會接觸的重要櫥窗。對於一九二〇、三〇年代從不同行業或學科轉入這個新興學科摸索學習的第一代學生而言，該博物館更是他們職業生涯認同的對象，也是他們晚年對自己職業生涯回顧時一個共同記憶的所在。

這樣的情況並沒有因為巴黎大學在一九二〇年代中期設立了第一個民族學中心而改變，要等到第二次世界大戰後，因為奠基者的凋零、第一代學者的流散、殖民戰爭所引起的辯論等等因素，法國人類學的博物館時代才悄然落幕，取而代之的是以理論見長的結構人類學。博物館時代所留下的知識遺產由此錯過了一個被客觀檢討的歷史時機，並且被逐漸遺忘。探討博物館對於人類學學科的貢獻和限制，正是晚近人類學史家著手處理的課題。

**關鍵詞：**法國人類學史 人類學博物館 人類學物件

\* 有關本文所使用的名詞問題，一般有以「人類學」、「民族學」或「民族誌」來指稱相關的研究領域和學科。由於各個時期、各國、各團體或各學者對此領域之範圍和內涵之認知有或自覺、或不自覺的差異，而產生一詞多義與一義多詞的情形。本文主旨既不在於釋辨字義，為行文之便，文中一律使用「人類學」一詞；僅在翻譯機構名稱或引文時，依照原文所使用的名詞作相對應的中文翻譯，因此會出現「民族學」或「民族誌」二詞。特此說明。

\*\* 中央研究院歷史語言研究所

## The Museum Age of French Anthropology: With Special Reference to the Characteristics of Anthropological Objects and the Establishment of Positivist Anthropology

Li-Chuan Tai

Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica

Studies on histories of anthropology usually focus more on the theories of important schools of thought or on the works of famous anthropologists, and less on the institutions, organizations and norms of practice related to the development of this discipline. These, however, are fundamental aspects in the process of the institutionalization of a discipline. Thus, this article tries to analyze the institutionalization of French anthropology in the first half of the twentieth century and emphasizes the important role that the museum played in this process.

Before anthropology was accepted by the university system as an independent discipline, the museum provided an independent and complete working place where young students attracted to this new field of knowledge could obtain a professional education. At that time, the Musée de l'Homme in Paris was not only the place where research materials were gathered and organized, anthropological knowledge produced and circulated, and new talents trained, but also an important channel for introducing this new discipline to the public. For the first generation of professional anthropologists who came from other disciplines or professions, that museum was the place with which they identified their working lives as well as their lieu de mémoire when they looked back at their career.

This situation did not change when the University of Paris set up the first anthropological centre in the middle of the 1920s. However, after World War II, museum anthropology emphasizing practical training declined, and structural anthropology emphasizing theory became increasingly influential. This shift of emphasis in the discipline was due to three reasons. First, the founding fathers gradually passed away. Second, the first generation of professional anthropologists trained in the 1930s became dispersed.

戴麗娟

Third, debates related to decolonization led to a general suspicion toward museum anthropology. The legacy of the museum age thus missed an historical opportunity to be examined objectively and was gradually forgotten. Research on the contributions and limits of the museum for this discipline is one of the issues that historians of anthropology now need to discuss.

**Keywords: history of French anthropology, anthropological museum, anthropological objects**