

## &lt;前期：キリスト教と近代的知&gt;

オリエンテーション——「キリスト教と近代的知」

1. テイリッヒと近代的知	4/20
2. マクグラスと自然神学構想	4/27
3. テイリッヒのカント1	5/11
4. テイリッヒとカント2	5/18
5. マクグラス——自然神学と真理	5/25
6. テイリッヒとフィヒテ	6/1
7. テイリッヒとヘーゲル1	6/8
8. テイリッヒとヘーゲル2	6/15
9. マクグラス——自然神学と美	6/22
10. テイリッヒとシュライアマハー1	6/29
11. テイリッヒとシュライアマハー2	7/6
12. テイリッヒとシェリング1	7/13
13. テイリッヒとシェリング2	7/20
14. マクグラス——自然神学と善	7/27

**1. テイリッヒと近代的知****(1)キリスト教思想史とその課題**

1. 思想研究とは何か——何を、いかに論じ、解明するのか  
 思想：生のあり方の反省的表現（生の形態→反省）  
     生の歴史性→思想(Denken, Thought)と歴史  
     歴史に規定されつつも、歴史を超える  
     永遠の真理の歴史性
2. 思想史：伝統とその構成要素（思想的動向）  
     類型・動向→構成諸要素のダイナミズム（マクロ）  
     地平融合と地平内部における諸要素の相互作用  
     ヘレニズムとヘブライズム、啓蒙
3. 思想の動態の記述と類型論  
     波多野精一「プロティノスとカント——宗教哲学の二つの任務」（1925）  
     「かれ（プロティノス）の宗教哲学は一個の典型——タイプを代表する」（399）、「このタイプとは異り、むしろそれと対立の位置を占める、他のタイプを捉へ来つて相対照せしめつつ、宗教哲学——宗教哲学一般の問題と任務とを眺めて見たいと思ふ」（399-400）  
     「この立場に立つ宗教哲学こそカントの出現に至るまで千数百年の思想の歴史を支配した大勢力であった」、「宗教哲学においても新しい時代はカントによって開かれた」（406）  
     「神を対象とし原理とする形而上学的体系の形に展開された」「宗教哲学」（404）  
     「宗教そのものの哲学的研究であるという新しい意義」（407）「批判的宗教哲学」「批判的と名くべき宗教形而上学」（412）  
     cf. スピノザとカントの総合（テイリッヒ）

#### 4. 類型とダイナミズム（マクロな動向）

外的要因：歴史一般（個人・集団、出来事、文化）と自律的諸領域の複合性

内的要因：思想の諸要素の相互連関と目的論

#### 5. 文化システムの分化と世俗化

石原謙『キリスト教の展開』（著作集第九巻）岩波書店、1972年。

##### 第三部 中世カトリシズム

###### 第一章 中世史序説

###### 第二章 中世カトリシズムの歴史的 premise

###### 第三章 教皇権の最高潮

###### 第四章 中世末期のカトリック教会

###### 第五章 過渡期、ルネッサンス時代

##### 第四部 宗教改革

###### 第一章 宗教改革時代のドイツにおけるキリスト教

###### 第二章 マルティン・ルター

###### 第三章 宗教改革運動

###### 第四章 福音主義教会

###### 第五章 信條形成

###### 第六章 プロテスタンティズムの動静

###### 第七章 プロテスタント諸教会の成立（カルヴァンとその影響）

##### 第五部 近世キリスト教

###### 第一章 近世カトリシズム

###### 第二章 近世プロテスタンティズム

###### 第三章 結び、近代史におけるキリスト教の態勢

「下巻の内容の対象は中世初期以来近代まで十数世紀に亘り、殊にその期間におけるヨーロッパの歴史は政治・社会・道徳・法律・学芸等すべての文化がキリスト教を基本また指針ないし枢軸として展開された過程でもある故に、その全貌を簡単な条項に要約することは不可能である。しかもこれをキリスト教の展開という角度から概観しようとするとき、中世期はとも角として、近世にあっては政治・文化の各部門が独立して発展し始めているので、一層の困難がというよりもむしろ偏向的史観に陥るのは止むを得なくなる恐れがある。それにもかかわらずキリスト教史の課題はそれなりに意味があると信じる。」（3 頁）

#### 6. 近代的知・近代思想の動態：神学と哲学の複合体としてのキリスト教思想

↓

近代の歴史状況における、キリスト教の弁証

神学史・教理史にはキリスト教思想の動態は集約できない。

キリスト教思想史の範囲を拡張すること。

ティリッヒ：文化の神学と宗教社会主義

諸学の体系、芸術神学

#### 7. 個人／共同体

神学者 教会・教派

↓

近代的知の変動、中間共同体の規範形成力の低下

#### 8. ペリカンと『キリスト教の伝統 教理発展の歴史』

Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition. A History of the Development of Doctrine*, 1 ~ 5, The University of Chicago Press, 1971-1989. (鈴木浩訳『キリスト教の伝統——教理発展の歴史』全5巻、教文館)

キーワード：教理(doctrine)／教義／神学、教理史、伝統(tradition)

キリスト教思想＞キリスト教神学＞教理＞教義。世界史、一般的な世俗的歴史

#### 「若干の定義」(35-45)

##### (1) 教理

What the Church of Jesus Christ believes, teaches, and confesses on the basis of the word of God: this is Christian doctrine. Doctrine is not the only, not even the primary, activity of the church. The church worships God and serves mankind, it works the transformation of this world and awaits the consummation of its hope in the next.

The church is always more than a school; not even the age of the Enlightenment managed to restrict or reduce it to its teaching function. But the church cannot be less than a school. Its faith, hope, and love all express themselves in teaching and confession.

The Christian church would not be the church as we know it without Christian doctrine. (1)

All this is, strictly speaking, a description rather than a definition of Christian doctrine.

For "doctrine" has not always meant the same, not even formally. (1)

Christian doctrine may be defined as the content of that saving knowledge, derived from the word of God. (2)

##### (2) 教理と生・共同体

Paul, "dogmatic sermons", "ethical exhortation" (2)

The two branches of theology were not permanently separated until the work of the seventeenth-century Protestant theologian, Georg Calixtus, but the distinction between doctrine and life had been in force long before that division of labor was effected.

The history of doctrine is not to be equated with the history of theology or the history of Christian thought.

It is usually difficult, and sometimes impossible, to draw the line of demarcation between the teachings of the church and the theories of its teacher.

Yet it is this development of church doctrine that will be the special object of our investigation here. (3)

Doctrine is what is believed, taught, and confessed. (3)

##### (3) 17世紀から18世紀のプロテスタンティズム

Even since its emergence as a distinct field of investigation in the eighteenth century, the history of doctrine has concerned on what is confessed, on dogma as the normative statements of Christian belief adopted by various ecclesiastical authorities and enforced as the official teaching of the church. (3-4)

Since most of Protestantism had concluded its confessional development by the middle of the seventeenth century, there could not be a history of Protestant dogma, but only a history of Protestant theology. Yet there was more to the history of doctrine within than the sequence of its theological systems. (4)

cf. Adolf von Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Gogmengeschichte*

#### (4) 教理史／教義史／神学史

what the church confesses is what the church has believed and taught --- or at least part of what the church has believed and taught. In the history of dogma, what the church believes and teaches apart from its normative statements of faith is important as a commentary on creed and dogma. In the present history of the development of doctrine, the creed and dogma are important as an index to what the church believes, teaches, and confesses. (4)

its professional expositors, the theologians

the responsible spokesmen of the church (5)

#### (5) 教理と伝統

The form which Christian doctrine, so defined, has taken in history is tradition. Like the term "doctrine," the word "tradition" refers simultaneously to the process of communication and to its content. Thus tradition means the handing down of Christian teaching during the course of the history of the church, but it also means that which was handed down. (7)

#### (6) 伝統と歴史

There is a sense in which the very notion of tradition seems inconsistent with the idea of history as movement and change. For tradition is thought to be ancient, hallowed by age, unchanged since it was first established once upon a time. It does not have a history, since history implies the appearance, at a certain point in time, of that which had not been there before. (7)

orthodox Christian doctrine did not really have a history, having been there true eternally and taught primitively; (7-8)

Tradition without history has homogenized all the stages of development into one statically defined truth; history without tradition has produced a historicism that relativized the development of Christian doctrine in such a way as to make the distinction between authentic growth and cancerous aberration seem completely arbitrary. In this history we are attempting to avoid the pitfalls of both these methods.

Tradition is the living faith of the dead; traditionalism is the dead faith of the living. (9)

#### (7) 思想とマクロな動態

S. Ashina

both the variety of Christian teachings within history and their possible unity within tradition are integral to the subject matter of this book, as well as to its theological position. The theological presupposition of this history, a presupposition which is in turn based upon a particular reading of history, is the variety of theologies and the unity of the gospel --- the unity as well as the variety, and the unity within the variety. It is based on an acceptance of genuine novelty and change in Christian history and on an affirmation of true development and growth. (9-10)

## 9. 思想史：「過去、現在、未来」のマクロな動向の解明

### 課題

未来への展望、宗教的問い・何を問うべきか

↓

問いの根本へ・人間存在

思惟の基本構造（存在構造）

一元論／二元論、宇宙論・存在論／倫理・精神、同一性／差違・参与／分裂

## （２） ティリッヒと近代

### 7. ティリッヒの近代理解

ティリッヒは、啓蒙的近代の特徴を、「数学的自然科学、技術、経済」の「三重の活動性」(dreifache Tätigkeit)とその担い手としての「市民社会」として捉え(Tillich, 1926, 32-36)、また啓蒙主義に関しても、その内実について、理性概念（普遍的、批判的、直観的、技術的理性）、自然概念（超自然に対する）、調和概念（世界観的、教育的、経済的）という観点から分析を行っている(Tillich, 1972)。

しかし、ブルジョワ社会、つまり近代について、革命(17-18世紀)、勝利(19世紀)、崩壊・変容(20世紀)という三つの段階を区別していることからわかるように(Tillich, 1945)、ティリッヒの関心は、革命とその勝利の中から形成された18世紀以降の近代がどのように崩壊・変容し——啓蒙主義の成立とその内的な葛藤、そして諸伝統の総合の試みとその挫折——、また現代の錯綜した動向の中に、どのような新しい精神状況の萌芽を見いださうか、という点に向けられている。つまり、ティリッヒの世代はトレルチの世代以上に、近代世界の崩壊（第一次世界大戦と革命）の実感の中で、近代以降の（その意味では、ポスト近代の）精神的動向に関心を払っていたのである。宗教社会主義の構想、現象学と存在論への注目、実存思想への共感、そしてポスト・プロテスタント時代の展望、科学と宗教との対立図式の克服、といったティリッヒの一連の思想的試みは、こうした思想的文脈に位置付けることができるであろう。

近代とは、諸伝統の緊張関係に規定されて展開した、中世からポスト近代へと至る動的プロセスであるが、それ自体の中にいくつかの決定的な変遷・段階的区分が認められる。つまり、近代とは単純な一様性において理解できるのではなく、諸伝統と諸領域（諸サブシステム）のゆるやかなネットワークとでも言うべき構造と動的プロセスとによって、捉えられねばならないのである。

## 8. 『キリスト教思想史講義』 (A History of Christian Thought) の構想から

### (1) 思想史という研究領域とその目的

the tremendously large subject of Protestant theology in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The primary purpose of this course is to understand our own problems by seeing their background in the past. ... I want to show you how we have arrived at the present situation. In view of this purpose it will be possible to draw from a great amount of material.

I hope you will discover that the past can be interesting even in itself, (297)

there always exists this twofold purpose of a course in history, and especially of a course in the history of thought. The main purpose is to understand ourselves; (297)

### (2) キリスト教思想史の範囲

This double purpose ... leads us to emphasize the trends of thought more than the individual personalities who shaped them. We will see how these trends lead into our present situation.

The orientation of this course makes it impossible to limit ourselves to a discussion of theologians. We must relate ourselves also to philosophers. In some cases they are more important than the theologians of their time because their philosophy of religion made decisive inroads into the history of Christian thought. ... also literature and even music

I recommend Barth's book as an illustration of the greatest convergence between his thinking and my own. Therefore, we will have to trespass the limits of the theological circle by dealing with philosophers, men of science and literature. (298)

### (3) 思想の歴史性

There is another kind of limit that we must trespass in order to understand the problems of the nineteenth century. We will have to go back into the eighteenth century, and occasionally even before that, because the principles of the modern mind were formulated in the centuries preceding the nineteenth. (298)

it was only during the eighteenth century that these principles became fully formulated as criticisms of theology.

America experienced every little of the romanticist reaction against the eighteenth century.

We must also go beyond the nineteenth century into the twentieth because certain fundamental theological events have taken in the last sixty years. I will now mention only a few of them in passing: the end of liberalism represented classically by Adolf von Harnack; the great all-embracing victory of the existentialist point of view; then the resurgence of what is called neo-orthodoxy ... what one could call neoliberalism (299)

### (4) 歴史における事実と解釈

there are factual elements in an interpretation of the course of history. History has an inner telos. *Telos* means "end," the "end" toward which something runs. Every period has an inner telos, and a given period must be interpreted historically in the light of its "end." Everything in this period receives its significance for us from its relation to the telos. In every moment innumerable

S. Ashina

things happen. ... Therefore, the interpretation of history must be selective; everything depends on the point of view from which we select and on the principle used in establishing what is important. For example, what is most important in church history? The answer is, of course, the Christian Church and its theological work. This also includes Western culture and the relationship of cultural activities to religion. In any case, a point of view in the interpretation of history must be found. (299-300)

## (5) 思想史の諸動向・諸要素、思想のテロス

There is a point of view which I want to use, the continuous series of attempts to unite the diverging elements of the modern mind. The most important of these attempts will seek to unite the orthodox and the humanist traditions. If the word "orthodox" seems too narrow for you then we can speak of the "classical" tradition instead. All modern theology is an attempt to unite these two trends in the recent history of Christian thought.

no positive relation between them at all

a complete unity between them, either in the one direction or in the other.

But between these two opposite answers there can be many others, not as onesided as these two, which try to find a vital relationship, filled with many problems, tensions, and possible solutions. (300)

## (6) 近代という知的なプロジェクト

I will develop the different elements in this divergent situation which had to be united. After having shown these elements, namely, Orthodoxy, Pietism, the Enlightenment and Romanticism, etc., I will discuss the greatest the most embracing and effective, but in the last analysis unsuccessful attempts to bring about a union of all of them. I call these the great synthesis.

the theology of Schleiermacher and the philosophy of Hegel --- these two great representatives of the synthesis in the early nineteenth century --- ... They are very genuine and have had a tremendous impact on the whole history of thought to the present day. (300-301)

These two thinkers, Schleiermacher and Hegel, are the points toward which all elements go and from which they then diverge, last bringing about the demand for new syntheses. We will see how these new syntheses have been attempted again and again, and finally what in my opinion has to be done today.

the Ritchlian school, the Bultmann school

Thus we really have a drama before us, a drama in which many tragedies are involved. All the disruptions of inner, personal, spiritual life of countless people are involved in the conflicts of this drama... (301)

## (7) 近代ドイツ思想の意義

There is one thing in what I have said that you might tend to question, namely, the predominance of German theology in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. (301)

(8) 思想、体系と歴史

the kind of history of Christian thought to which I will introduce you is, so to speak, the historical dimension of systematic theology. (304)

9. 歴史の内的テロス : 『組織神学』 *Systematic Theology, vol.3* (1963)

The fragmentary victories of the Kingdom of God in history point by their very character to the non-fragmentary side of the Kingdom of God "above" history. But even "above" history, the Kingdom of God is related to history; it is the "end" of history.

The English word "end" means both finish and aim; as such it is an excellent tool for the expression of the two sides of the Kingdom of God, the transcendent and the inner-historical.

But "end" also means aim, which the Latin *finis* and the Greek *telos* designate as that toward which the temporal process points as its goal.

The end of history in this sense is not a moment within the larger development of the universe (analogously called history) but transcends all moments of the temporal process; it is the end of time itself --- it is eternity. The end of history in the sense of the inner aim or the *telos* of history is "eternal life." (394)

10. 現在をどう論じるか

Paul Tillich, *Die religiöse Lage der Gegenwart* (1926), in: *MainWorks 5*, de Gruyter, 1988.

Darum geht es jedem, der von der Gegenwart reden will, unvermeidlich so, daß er von der Vergangenheit redet der näheren oder ferneren und daß er von der Zukunft redet, der fernsten oder der nächsten. .... So hätten wir denn drei Antworten auf unsere Frage nach der Gegenwart: Gegenwart ist Vergangenheit, Gegenwart ist Zukunft und Gegenwart ist Ewigkeit. Diese drei Antworten wollen wir zunächst betrachten. (28)

Und die Gegenwart erkennen, heißt, ihr Ja und Nein zur Vergangenheit, der näheren und ferneren, begreifen. (29)

Und nun die zweite Antwort: Gegenwart ist Zukunft. Alles Leben im Gegenwärtigen ist ein Gespanntsein auf das Zukünftige; jede Gegenwart ist wesentlich ein Schreiten aus der Vergangenheit in die Zukunft. Geist ist immer Gerichtetsein von dem, was ist, zu dem, was sein soll.

Wer aber vom Lebendigsten der Gegenwart reden will, also von dem, worin sie zeugungskräftig ist, der kann es nur, insoweit und insoweit, wie er selbst eingetaucht ist in diesen schaffenden Prozeß, der aus der Vergangenheit die Zukunft werden läßt. (29)

Ohne ein Fünkchen dieses Glaubens kann kein Geist; denn geistig leben heißt doch im Sinnvollen leben, und ohne einen letzten Sinn versinkt alles im Abgrund der Sinnlosigkeit. (29-30) ... Hat irgendeine Gegenwart Sinn, so hat sie Ewigkeit. Nur weil Gegenwart Ewigkeit ist, hat sie eine Bedeutung, die sie wert macht, betrachtet zu werden. --- *Und so können wir unsere drei Fragen zusammenfassen und nach dem Ewigen fragen, das in der Gegenwart aus vergangener nach zukünftiger Verwirklichung drängt.* (30)

Träger des Daseins der Gegenwart als geschichtlicher Wirklichkeit ist die Gesellschaft; sie ist



S. Ashina

das Daseiende im Sinne unserer Fragen und Betrachtungen. Eine religiöse Lage ist also immer zugleich die Lage einer Gesellschaft. (31)

11. キリスト教学にとってのキリスト教思想史

- ・キリスト教思想史の試み

ペリカン、マクグラス、トレルチ、パネンベルク

- ・近代思想の統一的な展開という把握

ドイツ啓蒙、古典主義からカント、そしてドイツ観念論までを、一つの思想運動を見る。

H.Nohl, *Die deutsche Bewegung*.

大橋良介『絶対者のゆくえ——ドイツ観念論と現代世界』ミネルヴァ書房。

- ・近代的知の基本型としての近代ドイツの古典的思惟

原理から体系化、公共性

弁証、哲学

大学・学会・出版