

社会学 専攻（博士前後期共通）

試験科目：専門科目（社会学）

試験時間：（75）分

※問題1,2,3への解答はそれぞれ1枚の解答用紙を使用し、冒頭に問題番号を記入すること。

1. 以下の概念について、それぞれ150字～200字で説明しなさい。

- ア. ジニ係数
- イ. 生活世界
- ウ. 社会関係資本(social capital)
- エ. ダブルバーレル質問

2. 以下のa～cの問いから1つを選び、500字から1000字程度で論じなさい。（どの問いを選択したかを冒頭に記すこと。）

- a 方法論的個人主義(methodological individualism)と方法論的集合主義(methodological collectivism)について、各立場を代表する研究者を1名ずつ挙げ、創発的特性(emergence)という概念を用いて、それぞれの特徴と相違点を説明しなさい。
- b 社会調査で標本(sample)を抽出する際に重視される代表性(representativeness)という基準について説明し、この基準を満たすために取られる主要な方法を挙げなさい。
- c 社会的逸脱の発生にかかわる主要な学説であるアノミー論(anomie theory)とラベリング論(labeling theory)について、対比しながらそれぞれの特徴をまとめなさい。

3. 「社会秩序はいかにして可能か？」という問いは、これまで少なからずの社会学者が問うてきた。この問いにかかわる社会学者2人を取り上げ、以下の①から③について論じなさい。

なお、論じるにあたっては、社会学者それぞれの名前を明記し、合計700～1,000字で論じること。

- ① それぞれの理論の概要、および、それぞれどのように社会秩序が可能だと論じているかについて。
- ② 2人の理論の共通点と相違点について。
- ③ 現代社会における事象について論じる時に、それらの理論がどのように有用か、または限界があるかについて。

社会学 専攻（博士前後期共通）

試験科目： 外国語（ 英語 ）

試験時間：（ 45 ）分

次の文章を読んで、以下の問いに答えなさい。

（なお、一部英語以外の言語については、註にその英訳を載せている）

① My point of departure is that nationality, or, as one might prefer to put it in view of that word's multiple significations, nation-ness, as well as nationalism, are cultural artefacts of a particular kind. To understand them properly we need to consider carefully how they have come into historical being, in what ways their meanings have changed over time, and why, today, they command such profound emotional legitimacy. I will be trying to argue that the creation of these artefacts towards the end of the eighteenth century was the spontaneous distillation of a complex 'crossing' of discrete historical forces; but that, once created, they became 'modular,' capable of being transplanted, with varying degrees of self-consciousness, to a great variety of social terrains, to merge and be merged with a correspondingly wide variety of political and ideological constellations. I will also attempt to show why these particular cultural artefacts have aroused such deep attachments.

### CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS

Before addressing the questions raised above, it seems advisable to consider briefly the concept of 'nation' and offer a workable definition. Theorists of nationalism have often been perplexed, not to say irritated, by these three paradoxes: (1) The objective modernity of nations to the historian's eye vs. their subjective antiquity in the eyes of nationalists. (2) The formal universality of nationality as a socio-cultural concept—in the modern world everyone can, should, will 'have' a nationality, as he or she 'has' a gender—vs. the irremediable particularity of its concrete manifestations, such that, by definition, 'Greek' nationality is *sui generis*<sup>1</sup>. (3) The 'political' power of nationalisms vs. their philosophical poverty and even incoherence. In other words, unlike most other isms, nationalism has never produced its own grand ( a ): no Hobbeses, Tocquevilles, Marxes, or Webers. [...]

Part of the difficulty is that one tends unconsciously to hypostasize the existence of Nationalism-with-a-big-N (rather as one might Age-with-a-capital-A) and then to classify 'it' as *an* ideology. (Note that if everyone has an age, Age is merely an analytical expression.) It would, I think, make things easier if one treated it as if it belonged with 'kinship' and 'religion', rather than with 'liberalism' or 'fascism'.

In an anthropological spirit, then, I propose the following definition of the nation: it is an imagined political community—and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign.

It is *imagined* because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion. Renan referred to this imagining in his suavely back-handed way when he wrote that 'Or l'essence d'une nation est que tous les individus aient beaucoup de choses en commun, et aussi que tous aient oublié bien des choses<sup>2</sup>.' With a certain ferocity Gellner makes a comparable point when he rules that 'Nationalism is not the awakening of nations to self-consciousness: it *invents* nations where they do not exist.' The drawback to this formulation, however, is that Gellner is so anxious to show that nationalism masquerades under false pretences that he assimilates 'invention' to 'fabrication' and 'falsity', rather than to 'imagining' and 'creation'. In this way he implies that 'true' communities exist which can be advantageously juxtaposed to nations. In fact, all communities larger than primordial villages of face-to-face contact (and perhaps even these) are imagined. Communities are to be distinguished, not by their falsity/genuineness, but by the style in which they are imagined. [...]

The nation is imagined as *limited* because even the largest of them, encompassing perhaps a billion living human beings, has finite, if elastic, boundaries, beyond which lie other nations. No nation imagines itself coterminous with mankind. The most messianic nationalists do not dream of a day when all the members of the human race will join their nation in the way that it was possible, in certain epochs, for, say, Christians to dream of a wholly Christian planet.

It is imagined as *sovereign* because the concept was born in an age in which ( b ) were destroying the legitimacy of the divinely-ordained, hierarchical dynastic realm. Coming to maturity at a stage of human history when even the most devout adherents of any universal religion were inescapably confronted with the living *pluralism* of such religions, and the allomorphism<sup>3</sup> between each faith's ontological claims and territorial stretch, nations dream of being free, and, if under God, directly so. The gage and emblem of this freedom is the sovereign state.

Finally, it is imagined as a *community*, because, regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship. ②Ultimately it is this fraternity that makes it possible, over the past two centuries, for so many millions of people, not so much to kill, as willingly to die for such limited imaginings.

These deaths bring us abruptly face to face with the central problem posed by nationalism: what makes the shrunken imaginings of recent history (scarcely more than two centuries) generate such colossal<sup>4</sup> sacrifices? I believe that the beginnings of an answer lie in the cultural roots of nationalism.

注 :

1. not like anyone or anything else.
2. 引用部 (Or から choses.まで : フランス語) の英訳は次の通り。The essence of a nation is that all individuals have many things in common, and also that all have forgotten many things.

3. structural correspondence.

4. extremely large.

出典 : Anderson Benedict, 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev. ed. London: Verso. pp.4-7.より抜粋、一部改変。

#### 設 問

(解答は、横書きとする。行の冒頭に 1. などと設問の番号を記すこと)

問1. 空欄 (a) にあてはまる最も適切な語を、以下の選択肢 (ア～カ) から 1つ選び、その記号を書きなさい。

ア games    イ medicines    ウ thinkers    エ societies    オ beliefs    カ この中に正解はない

問2. 空欄 (b) にあてはまる最も適切な語を、以下の選択肢 (ア～カ) から 1つ選び、その記号を書きなさい。

ア Philosophies and Constitutions    イ Enlightenment and Revolution    ウ Wars and Treaties  
エ Laws and Rights    オ Neoliberalism and deregulation    カ この中に正解はない

問 3. 下線部①を日本語に訳しなさい。

問 4. 本文で提示されている、ネーションの定義を日本語で記述しなさい (50 字程度)。

問 5. Gellner の議論について、筆者が本文中で批判している点はどのようなものですか。本文中の記述に即して、日本語で説明しなさい (150 字以内)。

問 6. 下線部②について、これに当てはまると考えられる歴史的事例を、本文で扱われていないものから 1つ挙げなさい。その事例が下線部②の記述とどのように関わるかを示しながら、具体的に説明しなさい (150 字以内)。