

2025年度

大学院文学研究科博士課程前期2年の課程入学試験

(夏期・一般選抜) 問題

専門科目 社会学 専攻分野

試験開始の合図があるまで、この問題冊子を開いてはいけない。

受験記号番号	
--------	--

成	
績	

2025年度

大学院文学研究科博士課程前期2年の課程入学試験

(夏期・一般選抜) 問題

専門科目 (社会学 専攻分野)

以下の【問題1】から【問題3】までの3つ「問題」すべてに解答しなさい（解答は、所定の「解答欄」に、記入のこと）。

【問題1】次の5つの語句すべてについて、簡潔に説明しなさい。

- (1) デュルケムにおける社会的事実
- (2) 生活世界の植民地化
- (3) 相対的剥奪
- (4) 市民的無関心 (civil inattention)
- (5) サンプルング (標本抽出)

(【問題1】の解答欄)

(1)

(2)

受験記号番号	
--------	--

(3)

(4)

(5)

【問題 2】以下の英文を読み、次の問 1～4 に答えなさい（解答欄は英文の後にある）。

問 1 下線部(a)を日本語に訳しなさい。

問 2 下線部(b)について、筆者が“anti-sociological”と述べている理由を日本語で説明しなさい。

問 3 下線部(c)を日本語に訳した上で、a general feeling of uncertainty and crisis が何を指すのか
本文に沿って説明しなさい。

問 4 下線部(d)を日本語に訳しなさい。

One characteristic of sociology in Germany, as we will continue to see throughout this book, is that it is deeply influenced by philosophy. This was already the case with the founders of sociology. Tönnies' work was deeply influenced by Hobbes and Arthur Schopenhauer. The central influence on Simmel and Weber was not only Wilhelm Windelband's and Heinrich Rickert's Neo-Kantianism, but also Friedrich Nietzsche and Wilhelm Dilthey's *Einleitung in die Geisteswissenschaften (Introduction to the Human Sciences)* published in 1883. Weber and Simmel, who had positively received Spencer until 1892, both shared Dilthey's criticism of philosophical movements that were committed to positivism, organicism, and historical speculation, and that were dominant in English and French sociology. Dilthey emphasized the differences between the humanities and the natural sciences. ^(a)While the natural sciences strive for the discovery of causal relations that allow for an explanation of natural phenomena, the humanities and social sciences try to reconstruct meanings that allow for an understanding of cultural phenomena. In a way, Dilthey's approach caught the spirit of the age since, in those days, a central concern was how to interpret and understand the dramatic and pervasive social changes (rather than to explain them). ^(b)In a certain sense, the beginning of sociology in Germany, with Simmel and Weber, was “anti-sociological”.

It was especially Max Weber who promoted the formation of sociology as an independent discipline by attempting to mediate between the two opposing approaches toward investigation, explaining, and understanding. Accordingly, he defined sociology as an undertaking that was to combine both understanding and explaining:

(次頁に続く)

“Sociology [...] should mean: a science which attempts the interpretive understanding of social action in order thereby to arrive at a causal explanation of its course and effects” (Weber 1988b [1921], p. 542). Furthermore, it was Weber who strongly advocated a new understanding of science and scholarship in general. As Weber argues in his famous lecture “Science as a Vocation” (“Wissenschaft als Beruf”), research requires an austere fulfillment of duty and self-critical specialists (*Fachmenschen* as Weber would say) who have to refrain from any “academic prophecy” (Weber 1994 [1917] [1919], p. 23), that is, any claim to be a spiritual leader, prophet, or redeemer. A scholar should devote himself/herself to the cause. He or she should not indulge in sensationalism or self-idolization.

^(c)Basically, Weber’s focus on pure science and academic specialization can be interpreted as a reaction to a general feeling of uncertainty and crisis widespread among the educated German bourgeoisie. Due to the rise of mass culture, this class feared for its superior social status as well as for the primacy of its traditional pattern of interpretation that revolved around culture and education. Trust in science as well as the traditional ideal of self-cultivation vanished, thereby questioning the bourgeoisie’s self-understanding as culture-defining group. The functional change of science was accompanied by fears of a functional loss of education and self-cultivation. ^(d)On the one hand, this led to an appreciation of “culture,” as one can see from the establishment of “new” disciplines like “cultural philosophy,” “cultural sciences,” “cultural history,” and “cultural sociology”; on the other hand, it led to a widespread perception of a prevailing cultural crisis. This perception of a crisis was caused partly by internal processes in the academic field, such as an increasing criticism of historicism, and partly by the expansion of higher education, a “growing numbers of students,” and an “increasing specialization” of the academic field. Many feared that science and scholarship, decoupled from education and self-cultivation, would no longer be meaningful and prestigious. In these debates around culture and education, Weber adopted a kind of “midpoint in the field of power” between the “Mandarin and modernist positions inside the university social sciences field”.

*Mandarin : 保守的官僚

[出典] Moebius, Stephan, 2021, *Sociology in Germany: A History*, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 14-16. (一部改変)

(次頁に続く)

受験記号番号	
--------	--

（【問題 2】の解答欄）

問 1

問 2

問 3

問4

【問題3】 マックス・ウェーバーの価値自由論以来、社会学においては科学的認識と研究者の価値判断との関係が様々な形で議論されてきた。これらの議論を踏まえて、社会学における認識と価値の関係についてあなた自身の考えを述べなさい。

（【問題3】の解答欄）

(次頁に続く)

受験記号番号

7 / 7

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.