

**<前回>：後期オリエンテーション****後期：自然神学の新しい可能性**

## 後期オリエンテーション

**1. 言語・解釈学から聖書へ**

1-1：リクール 10/8, 15

1-2：マクフェイグ 11/5/

1-3：リューサー 11/12

**2. 聖書学の諸動向**

2-1：イエス研究とクロッサン 12/3, 10

2-2：パウロ研究から 12/17

**3. 聖書学から政治思想へ**

3-1：聖書と政治思想 1/7

3-2：アガンベン 1/14

3-3：ジジェク 1/21

**Exkurs**

・アガペーとエロス 10/22, 29

・脳科学からキリスト教思想へ 11/19, 26

**<問題の再確認>**

「キリスト教思想の新しい展開——自然・環境・経済・聖書——」というテーマは何を意味しているのか。その意味を再確認し、本年度の後期授業へつなげて行く。

この特殊講義のテーマは、次の科研費による研究（2013年度～15年度）との密接な関連において進められている。

**A. 研究題目：**自然神学の言語論的転回とその社会科学への拡張—聖書・環境・経済—

**B. 研究目的**

本研究は、現代の思想的状況におけるキリスト教思想の多様な動向を視野に入れつつ、社会科学（とくに、経済学と政治学）との関連で自然神学を再構築することを目的とする。自然神学は、古代以来、各時代の知的状況に即応しつつ、キリスト教思想と他の諸思想（諸科学）との創造的な関わり合いのために必要な理論的基盤の構築を担ってきた。本研究は、この自然神学の営みを現代の思想状況において継続的に発展させるとともに、環境と経済をめぐる現代の深刻な危機的状況に対して、宗教・キリスト教が蓄積してきた伝統的な知恵を、有意味な仕方で再提示することを意図している。そのために本研究では、言語論的な視点（宗教的象徴と宗教言語、特に聖書との論理的修辭的連関）に基づく自然神学の拡張が試みられる。ここに本研究の独自性がある。

**C. 研究の学術的背景**

現代キリスト教思想は多岐にわたっており一見混沌として様相を呈しているものの、この動向を詳細に分析するとき、次の二つの中心問題を確認することができる。

1. キリスト教と科学技術（自然科学が担う近代的合理性と技術的革新）との関わり
2. 多元的社会におけるキリスト教の課題・意義（公正・正義に対するキリスト教の寄与）

**4. 言語・解釈学から聖書へ****4-1：リクール**

## A. 言語の意味と指示、そして実在論

### (1) カントとドイツ古典哲学の課題

1. 近代的知（啓蒙主義的合理性）とキリスト教的伝統の新しい関係構築、自律と他律の二分法を超えた知的世界の形成。

波多野の言う合理主義と超合理主義、これらは「誤れる宗教哲学」

- ・ 浅薄な知性主義への迎合・同化ではなく。
- ・ 頑迷な伝統主義の超合理主義でもなく。

↓

宗教の固有性と合理性の確立

それに従った、知の再編（原理と体系）

2. 合理主義的神論から哲学的人間学・宗教論へ。カントとシュライアマハーの宗教哲学。
3. カント主義の諸潮流 Ernst Troeltsch, *Zur Frage des religiösen Apriori*.

### (2) 哲学的象徴論の展開——自然／文化／宗教

4. Ernst Cassirer, *Philosophie der symbolischen Formen, Erster Teil. Die Sprache*, 1923.

5. 哲学的象徴論

波多野精一『宗教哲学』（1935）、『宗教哲学序論』（1940）、『時と永遠』（1943）

6. リクール

象徴：Logos / Bios → 隠喩・言語、テキストへ

7. Paul Tillich, "Das religiöse Symbol (1928)," in: *MainWorks*. 4, pp.213-228.

（芦名定道「パウル・ティリッヒと象徴の問題」、『基督教教学研究』（京都大学基督教学会）、第7号、1984年、78-92頁。）

, *Dynamics of Faith* (1957), in: *MainWorks*. 5. pp.231-290.

8. 意味と形態（言語論から実在論）、存在論、社会的次元（現実化の諸条件と機能）

↓

意味と指示、指示の二重性。批判的実在論と宗教（宗教経験）

### (3) リクールの解釈学

9. Paul Ricoeur, *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning*, The Texas Christian University Press, 1976.

- 1) Language as Discourse

Langue and Parole: The Structural Model

Semantics versus Semiotics: The Sentence

The Dialectic of Event and Meaning

Discourse as Event

Discourse as Predication

Dialectics of Event and Meaning

Utterer's Meaning and Utterance Meaning

The Self-Reference of Discourse

Locutionary and Illocutionary Act

The Interlocutionary Act

Meaning as "Sense" and "Reference"

Some Hermeneutical Implication

- 2) Speaking and Writing
- 3) Metaphor and Symbol
- 4) Explanation and Understanding

#### Conclusion

- 10. リクールの言語論の展開：象徴論→隠喩論→テキスト解釈学（1960年代～1970年代）  
*La métaphor vive*, Seuil, 1975.  
 "Biblical Hermeneutics "(*Semeia*. 4, the Society of Biblical Literature, 1975, pp.27-148.)

### < Language as Discourse >

#### 1. Langue and Parole: The Structural Model

構造主義的モデル：意味は自己充足的な記号体系内部の関係である。歴史に対する構造の先行性。言語から人間文化の全領域へ。記号の恣意性（概念／感覚的イメージ）

Yet if the term are modern, the problem itself is not a new one. (1)

Language here then means something other than the general capacity to speak or the common competence of speaking. It designates the particular structure of the particular linguistic system.

With the words "structure" and "system" a new problematic emerges which tends, at least initially, to postpone, if not cancel, the problem of discourse, (2)

The withdrawal of the problem of discourse in the contemporary study of language is the price we must pay for the tremendous achievements brought about by the famous *Cours de linguistique général* of the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure. (2) His work relies on a fundamental distinction between language as *langue* and as *parole*, ... *Langue* is the code --- or the set of codes --- on the basis of which a particular speaker produces *parole* as a particular message.

A message is individual, its code is collective.

A message is a temporal event in the succession of events which constitute the diachronic dimension of time, while the code is in time as a set of contemporaneous elements, i.e., as a synchronic system. A message is intentional. ... The code is anonymous and not intended.

More than anything else, a message is arbitrary and contingent, while a code is systematic and compulsory for a given speaking community. (3)

Extension of the structural model concerns us directly insofar as the structural model was applied to the same categories of texts that are the object of our interpretation theory. Originally the model concerned units smaller than the sentence.

A decisive extension occurred, however, with the application of the structural model to linguistic entities larger than the sentence and also to non-linguistic entities similar to the texts of linguistic communication.

the treatment of folktales by the Russian formalists such as V. Propp  
 myths by Claude Lévi-Strauss

Charles S. Peirce. Linguistics here becomes one province of the general theory of signs, albeit a province that has the privilege of being both one species and the paradigmatic example of a sign-system. (4)

the structural model as a model

First, a synchronic approach must precede any diachronic approach because systems are intelligible than changes. At best, a change is a partial or a global change in a state of system.

Therefore the history of changes must come after the theory that describes the synchronic states of the system.

Second, the paradigmatic case for a structural approach is that of a finite set of discrete entities. in the combinatory capacity and the quasi-algebraic possibilities pertaining to such sets.

Third, in such a system no entity belonging to the structure of the system has a meaning of its own; the meaning of a word, for example, results from its opposition to the other lexical units of the same system. As Saussure said, in a system of signs there are only differences, but no substantial existence.

Fourth, in such finite systems, all the relations are immanent to the system. In this sense, semiotic systems are "closed," i.e., without relations to external, non-semiotic reality. (5)

the sign is defined by an aspects are the signifier ... and the signified --- the differential value in the lexical system.

The last postulate alone suffices to characterize structuralism as a global mode of thought, ... Language no longer appears as a mediation between minds and things. It constitutes a world of its own, within which each item only refers to other items of the same system, thanks to the interplay of oppositions and differences constitutive of the system. ... as a self-sufficient system of inner relationships. (6)

## 2. Semantics versus Semiotics: The Sentence

語と文の言語階層の区別。→ 記号論と意味論

I want to oppose a two dimensional approach for which language relies on two irreducible entities, signs and sentences, (6)

The object of semiotics --- the sign --- is merely virtual.

The sentence is not a larger or more complex word, it is a new entity.... A sentence is made up of signs, but is itself a sign.

Each stage requires new structures and a new description.

Emile Benveniste: language relies on the possibility of two kinds of operations, integration into larger wholes, and dissociation into constitutive parts. The sense proceeds from the first operation, the form from the second. (7)

Semiotics, the science of signs, is formal to the extent that it relies on the dissociation of language into constitutive parts. Semantics, the science of the sentence, is immediately concerned with the concept of the sense ... to the extent that semantics is fundamentally defined by the integrative procedures of language.

For me, the distinction between semantics and semiotics is the key to the whole problem of language, (8)

## 3. The Dialectic of Event and Meaning

言述における出来事と意味の弁証法。可能性と現実性、個別性と普遍性。「もしすべての言述が出来事として現実化されるとすれば、すべての言述は意味として理解される。」出来事の止揚と意味の保持。

the convergence of several approaches

All these partial achievements will be gathered under a common title, the dialectic of event and meaning in discourse, (8)

#### ***Discourse as Event***

Saussurean distinction between *langue* and *parole*

discourse is the event of language

Events vanish while systems remain.

to rectify this epistemological weakness of *parole* ... by relating it to the ontological priority of discourse resulting from the actuality of the event as opposed to the mere virtuality of the system.

this temporal existence of the message testifies to its actuality. The system in fact does not exist. ... discourse grounds the very existence of language since only the discrete and each time unique acts of discourse actualize the code.

#### ***Discourse as Predication***

the sentence ... a single distinctive trait: it has a predicate.

the theorists of ordinary language.

on the basis of the antithesis between predicate and subject.

The subject picks out something single --- Peter, London, this table, the fall of Rome, the first man ... --- by means of several grammatical devices which serve this logical function: proper names, pronouns, demonstratives, ... ,and "definite descriptions"(the so and so). What they all have in common is that they all identify one and only one item. (10) The predicate, in contrast, designates a kind of quality, a class of things, a type of relation, or a type of action.

This fundamental polarity between singular identification and universal predication gives a specific content to the notion of the proposition conceived of as the object of the speech event.

Discourse .... it is a structure in the synthetic sense, i.e., as the intertwining and interplay of the functions of identification and predication in one and the same sentence.

#### ***Dialectics of Event and Meaning***

Discourse considered as either an event or a proposition, that is, as a predicative function combined with an identification, is an abstraction, which depends upon the concrete whole that is the dialectical unity of the event and meaning in the sentence. (11)

If all discourse is actualized as an event, all discourse is understood as meaning. By meaning or sense I here designate the propositional content,

If language is a *meinen*, an intending, it is so precisely due to this *Aufhebung* through which the event is cancelled as something merely transient and retained as the same meaning. (12)

#### **4. Utterer's Meaning and Utterance Meaning**

意味とは何か。話者の意味と文の意味。意味の非心理学的概念化。

日常言語学派・言語行為論：発話行為、発話内行為、発話媒介行為、発話相互行為。

コミュニケーション論へ

経験され生きられた経験の私事性と、その意味の公共性。印象から表現へ。

#### ***The Self-Reference of Discourse***

The concept of meaning allows two interpretations which reflect the main dialectic between event and meaning. To mean is both what the speaker means, i.e., what he intends to say, and what the sentence means, i.e., what the conjunction between the identification function and the

predicative function yields. Meaning , in other words, is both noetic and noematic.

The event is somebody speaking. (12)

Languages do not speak, people do.

Discourse therefore has many substitutable ways of referring back to its speaker.

we are able to give a nonpsychological, because purely semantic, definition of the utterer's meaning. No mental entity need be hypothesized or hypostazised. The utterance meaning points back towards the utterer's meaning thanks to the self-reference of discourse to itself as an event.

(13)

### ***Locutionary and Illocutionary Act***

linguistic analysis ... of "speech act." J.L.Austin was the first to notice that "performatives" --- such as promises --- imply a specific commitment by the speaker who *does* what he says in saying it. ... This "doing" of the saying may be assimilated to the event pole...

all of them, besides saying something (the locutionary act), do something in saying (the illocutionary act), and yield effects *by* saying (the perlocutionary act). (14)

### ***The Interlocutionary Act***

the interlocutionary act or the allocutionary act

One important aspect of discourse is that it is addressed to someone. There is another speaker who is the addressee of the discourse. The presence of the pair, speaker and hearer, constitutes language as communication. (14)

Roman Jakobson, for example, starts from the threefold relation between speaker, hearer, and message, then adds three other complementary actors which enrich his model. These are code, contact, and context. On the basis of this six factor system he establishes a six function schema.

For the linguist, communication is a fact, even a most obvious fact. ... But for an existential investigation communication is an enigma, even a wonder. (15)

Yet, nevertheless, something passes from me to you. Something is transferred from one sphere of life to another. This something is not the experience as experienced, but its meaning. Here is the miracle. The experience as experienced, as lived, remains private, but its sense, its meaning becomes public. Communication in this way is the overcoming of the radical noncommunicability of the lived experienced as lived.

The event is not only the experience as expressed and communicated, but also the intersubjective exchange itself, the happening of dialogue.

discourse as event plus sense,

the self-transcendence of the event in its meaning

the grammatical devices which provide a singular experience with a public dimension. (16)

can we communicate the speech act as an illocutionary act? (17)

In many ways illocutionary acts can be communicated to the extent that their "grammar" provides the event with a public structure. (18)

To conclude this discussion of the dialectic of event and meaning, we may say that language is itself the process by which private experience is made public. Language is the exteriorization thanks to which an impression is transcended and becomes an ex-pression, or, in other words, the transformation of the psychic into the noetic. Exteriorization and communicability are one and the same thing for they are nothing other than this elevation of a part of our life into the *logos* of discourse. There the solution of life is for a moment, anyway, illuminated by the common light of

discourse. (19)

### 5. Meaning as "Sense" and "Reference"

言述<出来事と意味（意味と指示）>という二重の弁証法。

テキスト（テキスト世界）とテキスト外部の行為世界との統合機構。

what the speaker does

what the sentence does

This subjective-objective dialectic

The "objective" side of discourse itself may be taken in two different ways. We may mean the "what" of discourse or the "about what" of discourse. The "what" of discourse is its "sense," the "about what" is its "reference."

Gottlob Frege, "Ueber Sinn und Bedeutung," (19)

distinction between semiotics and semantics

Only the sentence level allows us to distinguish what is said and about what it is said. In the system of language, say as a lexicon, there is no problem of reference; sings only refer to other sings within the system. With the sentence, however, language is directed beyond itself.

language has a reference only when it is used.

That someone refers to something at a certain time is an event, a speech event. But this event receives its structure from the meaning as sense.

But the dialectic of sense and reference is so original that it can be taken as an independent guideline. Only this dialectic says something about the relation between language and the ontological condition of being in the world. Language is not a world of its own. It is not even a world. But because we are in the world, .... we (20) have something to say, we have experience to bring to language.

This notion of bringing experience to language is the ontological condition of reference, an ontological condition reflected within language as a postulate which has not immanent justification;

If language were not fundamentally referential, would or could it be meaningful?

Finally, semiotics appears as a mere abstraction of semantics. And the semiotic definition of the sign as an inner difference between signifier and signified presupposes its semantic definition as reference to the thing for which it stands. The most concrete definition of semantics, then, is the (21) theory that relates the inner or immanent constitution of the sense to the outer or transcendent intention of the reference.

the utterer's meaning has to be expressed in the language of reference as the self-reference of discourse, i.e., as the designation of its speaker at the same time that it refers to the world. This correlation is not fortuitous, since it is ultimately the speaker who refers to the world in speaking. Discourse in action and in use refers backwards and forwards, to a speaker and a world. (22)

### 6. Some Hermeneutical Implication

They mainly concern the use and abuse of the concept of speech events in the Romantic tradition of hermeneutics. Hermeneutics as issuing from Schleiermacher and Dilthey tended to identify interpretation with the category of "understanding," and to define understanding as the

recognition of an author's intention from the point of view of the primitive addressees in the original situation of discourse.

Understanding a text, then, is only a particular case of the dialogical situation in which someone responds to someone else.

This psychologizing conception of hermeneutics has had a great influence on Christian theology. this speech event is the Kerygma, the preaching of the Gospel. (22)

The assumptions of a psychologizing hermeneutics --- stem from a double misunderstanding of the dialectic of event and meaning in discourse and the dialectic of sense and reference in meaning itself.

what is at stake in this discussion is the correct definition of the hermeneutical task.

These dialectical polarities allow us anticipate that the concepts of intention and dialogue are not to be excluded from hermeneutics, but instead are to be released from the onesidedness of a non-dialectical concept of discourse. (23)

↓

以上は聖書解釈学にいかなる帰結をもたらすか。

「イエスの譬え」解釈学の挑戦、聖書を読むとはいかなる行為か。

#### (4) 非実在論としての近代宗教批判

0. 宗教的現実を構成する象徴体系の理解困難化・解体という歴史的動向を背景にして。

とくに、教養市民層における宗教的状況の変容。

宗教自体の合理化と宗教を軽蔑する教養人たちに対して、何を語るのか。

1. カントから始まる認識論の近代的な動向。

認識の合理性と認識の限界 (物自体／現象)

↓

素朴実在論、超自然主義の解体。

その帰結あるいは拡張としての実証主義、懐疑派の宗教批判 (フォイエルバッハ、マルクス、ニーチェ、フロイト)、神は投影であり、神学は人間学に還元される。

2. カントとフォイエルバッハ以降の知的状況で、宗教哲学はいかなる仕方で可能なのか。

言語・解釈という迂回路を辿って (リクール)、科学と宗教との関係性の問いから、自然哲学あるいは形而上学を再考すること。

芦名定道「キリスト教思想と形而上学の問題」『基督教学研究』(京都大学基督教学会) 第24号、2004年、1-23頁。

「ホワイトヘッドの形而上学とプロセス神学」『基督教学研究』(京都大学基督教学会) 第25号、2005年、21-41。

#### (5) カントの批判哲学を経た実在論 (実在論の再興)

3. 批判的実在論: 批判+実在論

実在への関わりを心理や社会の内部の仕組みに還元しない。

それでも、人間は実在に触れることができる。偏狭な自然主義や極端な社会構成主義を斥ける。日常性の擁護。

実在への関わりの具体的な形態は、心理的社会的影響関係に規定される。

↓

宗教研究においては、



宗教現象の批判は必要であるものの、しかし、その実在的基盤は擁護されねばならない。シュライアマハー、トレルチ、ティリッヒ、波多野、リクール、ギルキー、ヒック、マクグラスなどなど。

#### 4. 科学言語と宗教言語の共通の問題（「宗教と科学」関係論の主要テーマの一つ）

理論言語の指示対象と宗教経験の対象との有する問題点の理論的類似性。

公共的な観察・実験とのレベルの相違。理論的要請か、あるいは実在連関を有するものか。

### （6）言語の指示機能と実在論・真理論

#### 5. 実在論を言語の指示機能の問いとして定式化する。言語論の詳細な議論の成果を利用した理論構築を可能にする。

#### 6. 真理の対応説。

真理、実在は言語的な問題圏において論じられる。

現代思想の言語論的転回 → カッシーラーの夢の新たな仕方での実現の試み。

象徴論から一端言語論へ経由するという戦略。

#### 7. 実在論をめぐる多様なアプローチ

内部実在論（パトナム）

活動実在論（出口）

科学が合理的で有意義な営みとして成り立つためには、「活動存在者」（activity entity）の存在を信じ、「その信念にもとづいた一貫した行動をとること、すなわち、それにコミットする必要」である。

出口康夫「活動実在論の擁護——光速度の測定に即して」（中才敏郎・美野正編『知識と実在——心と世界についての分析哲学』世界思想社、2008年、4-46頁）。

科学実在論：ロイ・バスター（『科学と実在論』法政大学出版局）

### （7）指示と実在をめぐる

#### 8. 指示の記述説と因果説（芦名、160-167）

##### ・指示の記述説（フレーゲあるいはラッセル）

固有名の指示はその名の確定記述、つまりそのものを決定づける諸本質の記述によってなされる。言語の指示対象の理解には対象の認識が先行する。

アリストテレス＝「プラトンの弟子であり、アレキサンダーの先生である」

##### ・指示の因果説（クリプキ）

ある語句を使用する場合、その語句がそれに因果的に統合されている対象を何らかの仕方です指示言及すること、そしてその際に話し手はその指示対象を同定するための知識を持つ必要はない。

固有名は一種の命名式において（「私はこれをAと名づける」）、その名が与えられる対象を前にして導入され、その命名式の出来事は命名者とその場に居合わせた人々によって知覚され、その名をその対象を指示するものとして止揚する能力は、この命名式の見撃者から、命名式に立ち会っていない人に伝達される（言語共同体と指示の因果的連鎖）。

↓

#### 9. ソスキースは、この因果説を、「神は霊である」といった宗教言語に適応する。

伝統と聖書→言語共同体と指示の因果的連鎖。

<参考文献>

1. 芦名定道『ティリッヒと現代宗教論』北樹出版。
2. ソスキース『メタファーと宗教言語』玉川大学出版局。
3. Langdon Gilkey, *Nature, Reality, and the Sacred. The Nexus of Science and Religion*, Fortress, 1993.
4. John Hick, *The New Frontier of Religion and Science. Religious Experience, Neuroscience and the Transcendent*, Macmillan, 2006. pp.137-145.
5. Alister McGrath, *The Open Secret. A New Vision for Natural Theology*, Blackwell, 2008.
6. 言語学一般、隠喩論、宗教言語論、神学的言語論などの文献は別にして。
  - a. 言語論と現代哲学（とくに論理学・分析哲学の分野）  
飯田 隆『言語哲学大全』Ⅰ（論理と言語）、Ⅱ（意味と様相、上）、  
Ⅲ（意味と様相、下）、Ⅳ（真理と意味）、勁草書房、1987～2002年。  
神野慧一郎編『現代哲学のフロンティア』（1990年）、『現代哲学のバックボーン』（1991年）、勁草書房。
  - b. 分析哲学から現代思想全般へ  
野家啓一『言語行為の現象学』（1993年）、『無根拠からの出発』（1993年）、『科学の解釈学』（1993年）、勁草書房。
  - c. 解釈学的哲学（ドイツ哲学の言語論）  
ガダマー『真理と方法 Ⅰ Ⅱ Ⅲ』法政大学出版局。  
麻生 建『ドイツ言語学の諸相』東京大学出版会。  
塚本正明『現代の解釈学的哲学』世界思想社。