

第二章：自然神学の諸問題

1. 自然神学は過去の遺物か？
2. 自然神学とは何か - 歴史的起源 -

3. 自然神学をめぐる諸立場3 - 1 : 自然神学批判(哲学的な)

アンセルムスの論証	ヒュームの自然神学批判
ヒュームにおける自然神学批判のまとめ	カントの自然神学批判

3 - 2 : 自然神学批判(神学的な)

バルト神学と自然神学	バルトによるアンセルムス解釈
バルト神学の学的性格	

3 - 3 : 自然神学の再建に向けて

Alvin Plantinga, *God and Other Minds. A Study of the Rational Justification of Belief in God*, Cornell University Press 1990 (1967)  
 , *The Nature of Necessity*, Clarendon Press 1974  
 , *Warranted Christian Belief*, Oxford University Press 2000  
 James F. Sennett (ed.), *The Analytic Theist. An Alvin Plantinga reader*, Eerdmans 1998

1. クリフォードの原則：「どんな場合でも、決して、不十分な証拠に基づいて何かを受け入れてはならない」  
 基礎づけ主義(foundationalism)

2. *Warranted Christian Belief*, Oxford University Press 2000

This book is about the intellectual or rational acceptability of Christian belief. When I speak here of Christian belief, I mean what is common to the great creeds of the main branches of the Christian Church, ....

Classical Christian belief includes the belief that there is such a person as God. God is a *person*: that is, a being with intellect and will.

This is the *theistic* component of Christian belief. (vii)

Western thought since the eighteenth century Enlightenment has displayed two distinct styles of objection:

the most important *de facto* objection would be the argument from suffering and evil. objections to the truth of Christian belief. (viii)

Even more prevalent have been *de jure* objections.

These are arguments or claims to the effect that Christian belief, whether or not true, is at any rate unjustifiable, or rationally unjustified, or irrational, or non intellectually respectable, or contrary to sound morality, or without sufficient evidence, or in some other way rationally unacceptable, not up to snuff from an intellectual point of view.

Freudian claim (ix)

There are fundamentally three main candidates: that Christian belief is *unjustified*, that it is *irrational*, and that it is *unwarranted*. (x)

a belief has warrant for a person S only if that belief is produced in S by cognitive faculties functioning properly (subject to no dysfunction) in a cognitive environment that is appropriate for S's kind of cognitive faculties, according to a design plan that is successfully aimed at truth. (156)

3 . John Hick, *An Interpretation of Religion*, Yale University Press 1989  
the theistic hypothesis(religion) / naturalism

The question is whether having thus set them out in two opposed columns we can conclude that one list outweighs the other. It appears to me that no such outcome is realistically possible. (123)

If it is difficult to the point of impossibility to assign comparative values on any objective basis to different items on the same side of the ledger, it is even harder to evaluate comparatively items drawn from opposite sides.

And yet the differences between the theist and the atheist are precisely differences about such comparative weightings.

It seems that the universe maintains its inscrutable ambiguity. In some aspects it invites whilst in others it repels a religious response. It permits both a religious and a naturalistic faith, but haunted in each case by a contrary possibility that can never be exercised. Any realistic analysis of religious belief and experience, and any realistic defence of the rationality of religious conviction, must therefore start from this situation of systematic ambiguity. (123-124)

cf. Tillich: ambiguity, Zweideutigkeit

Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Towards a Theology of Nature. Essays on Science and Faith*  
(ed. by Ted Peters), Westminster / John Knox Press 1993

1 . Theological Questions to Scientist

4 . 問題状況

In their discussions with theologians few scientists seem motivated primarily by theoretical questions. There is rarely much desire for theologians' help in explaining the world of nature. Rather, there is a widespread awareness that science alone cannot cope with the consequences and side effects of scientific discoveries, especially in their technological application.

a sense of responsibility, to look for moral resource

In modern society the moral authority of the churches and their theologies is limited. the "warfare" of science with theology (15)

Scientists personally continuing to hold and develop religious views of their work did not alter the fact that, concerning human knowledge of the natural world, religious assertions were considered superfluous. Religion did not make any difference to the description of the reality of nature,

Perhaps Christianity survived only by temporarily separating the outlook of faith from the rational and scientific investigation and description of the natural world. But such an attitude cannot persist, because it is profoundly unacceptable on theological grounds.

If the God of the Bible is the creator of the universe, then it is not possible to understand fully or even appropriately the processes of nature without any reference to that God. If, on the contrary, nature can be appropriately understood without reference to the God of the Bible, then that God cannot be the creator of the universe, and consequently he cannot be truly God and be trusted as a source of moral teaching either. (16)

The abstract investigation of the regularities underlying the emergence of these natural forms need not separate them from their natural context in the creation of God and thus from God himself. But in fact there has been a strong tendency in modern science toward such a separation by subjecting the knowledge of the abstract regularities of nature to human use for human purposes. (17)

## 5. 争点

It is one of the risks involved in the abstract study of the regularities that either are inherent in nature itself or can be imposed on natural processes. This risk cannot be met on the level of scientific description itself but must be met first on the level of philosophical reflection on the work of science. It is on this level that the abstract form of scientific description must be considered with special attention to what it is "abstracted from" and what is methodically disregarded in the abstract formulas of science. It is on this level, then, that theologians should address their questions to scientists, since God the creator and the nature of things as creatures belong to those aspects of reality which are abstracted from in the mathematical language of science.

There are five such questions that will be raised in the rest of this chapter.

The answers given to each of these questions will contribute significantly to any decision concerning the compatibility of modern science with faith in the biblical God as creator and redeemer of humankind and of the entire creation. (17)

- 1.慣性の法則の変更あるいは解釈の変更は可能か
- 2.自然の現実は無機的なものとして理解されるべきか、自然のプロセスは不可逆
- 3.生物学の中には生命の根源としての神的霊に等価なものが存在するか。
- 4.時間と永遠との関係、物理的宇宙の時空構造と永遠の概念との関係の中に何か

積極的なものがあるか。

5.キリスト教の終末論は科学的な未来像と調和できるのか。

Thomas Forsyth Torrance, *The Ground and Grammar of Theology*, University Press of Virginia 1980

#### 4.The Transformation of Natural Theology

Christian theology and natural theology operate with certain basic ideas, without which neither would be what it is, revealing that there is a deep interrelation between theology and science. These ideas arose in connection with the fact that since theology has to do not simply with God/man relations but with God/man/world or God/world/man relations, an understanding of the world inevitably enters into the coefficients of theological concepts and statements.... They are not ideas that natural science, let alone Greek science, could ever have produced on its own, but they have proved themselves utterly essential to our empirico-theoretical scientific enterprise and advance in knowledge.

(75)

In the history of thought, what is known traditionally as "natural theology" came to the fore and flourished during periods in which dualist modes of thought prevailed in science and philosophy and in which knowledge was allegedly derived by way of abstraction from sense-experience or deduction from observations.

(76)

This order prevailing the universe does not derive from some immanent cosmological reason, or *logos*, such as the philosophers envisage, but from the uncreated and creative *Logos* of God,

What Athanasius is doing there is to show that knowledge of God and knowledge of the world share the same ultimate foundations in the *Logos*, or Rationality, of God the Creator.

(77)

This relation of the division between natural and revealed theology to dualist thought of this kind is highly significant,..... there is involved here a deep (but usually covert) deistic disjunction between God and the world, with a stress upon the transcendence of God that carried with it no idea of an active relation between God and the world.

(79)

Within the context of this cosmological and epistemological dualism, it was inevitable that a natural theology should be thrown up, the primary task of which was to close the gap between the world and God by means of a logical bridge,

(80)

If natural theology is to have a viable reconstruction even in something like its traditional form, it can be only on the basis of a restored ontology in which our thought operates with a fundamental unity of concept and experience, or of form and being, within a contingent but inherently intelligible and open-structured universe.

(86)

As natural geometry is the space-time structure embedded in a dynamic and realist physics, so natural theology is the space-time structure embedded in a dynamic and realist theology.

(93)

A natural theology in this full sense will have its proper place in the dialogue between theological science and natural science within their common sharing of the rational structure of space and time conferred on the universe by God in his creating of it, and within their common sharing in the basic conceptions of the unitary rationality of the universe, its contingent intelligibility and contingent freedom, (94)

the unity of form and being

In St. Anselm's thought this unity of intelligibility and being characterized all created realities,

the inner connection between so-called natural theology and so-called revealed theology

The singularity of the universe

The kind of intelligibility with which we have to do here is contingent intelligibility, (102)

Since it is not self-originating, the universe can hardly be regarded as self-sustaining or self-explanatory: the mystery of the universe (102)

In this engagement with contingency in scientific inquiry, we are again thrust back on the original foundations laid for natural science by Christian theology. (105)

This is an area of overlap in the inquiries of theological and natural science that is of the greatest significance for us today. But it is in dialogue between theological and natural science with that overlap that natural theology has its natural place. There it is concerned with the connection between the material content of our knowledge of God and the empirical correlates of that knowledge in the spatio-temporal structures of the created universe --- and thus with the common concern that both theology and natural science have in the coherent singularity of the universe. What is required here is an appropriate transformation of the traditional cosmological argument, (106)

(If) natural theology has its natural place in the overlap between theological and natural science where they operate within the same rational structures of space and time and have in common the basic ideas of the unitary rationality of the universe --- its contingent intelligibility and contingent freedom, (107)

Longdon Gilkey, *Nature, Reality, and the Sacred. The Nexus of Science and Religion*,  
Fortress Press 1993

Creationism (naive realism)/ scientism (scientific positivism)

Critical realism / the new philosophy of science (Thomas Kuhn, Paul Feyerabend)  
the nonscientific Bases of Science

Whitehead / Tillich / Santayana : "soft" critical philosophy

Kant(dualism) + Metaphysics(ontology)

Whitehead

the "abstract" character of the cosmos as described by modern science

sensationalist dogmas are false:

only through sense data is reality known

science alone gives indication of what is real

There are other, more fundamental modes of experiencing, which are more directly in touch with actuality. These nonsensory perceptions are multiple.

the sense of "withness with the body" through which we are self-aware, or "know" ourselves as an organic unity

the sense of continuous and pervasive passage and yet of continuity with the immediate past

the sense of aims and of intentions for the immediate future

actuality is itself experienced through our own participation in being the organic

society we are, and this level of experience is rich in metaphysical

implications. It is therefore through nonsensory experience that the reality, the

"processing," the interconnectedness, and order of experience in time are

known;

"experience in the mode of causal efficacy"

concrete actuality more directly known

metaphysics provides the theoretical framework (the "rationality") for science, which

science by itself lacks

(63)

Tillich:

Many of these themes appear in Tillich --- in fact, the ontologies of Tillich and Whitehead are remarkably similar. For both thinkers, science represents an abstraction from actuality (from "finite being" in Tillich), of remarkable, if only relative, validity. Thus science, if understood correctly in its validity and its limitations, is of vast use to civilization. Again, only ontological inquiry can uncover and recover the full structure of finite being from which science (technical reason) has abstracted and thus give a more accurate and inclusive account of what is real. (64)

Self and World represents a mutually dependent polarity.

distance (separation of the self from its world)

negation is necessary, Self transcends world and itself. (65)

The conditions for our experiencing and especially for our knowing our environment are for us clues to the fundamental structure of reality, of "being." (66)

Philip Clayton, *Explanation from Physics To Theology. An Essays in Rationality and Religion*, Yale University Press 1989

Nancey Murphy, *Theology in the Age of Scientific Reasoning*, Cornell University Press 1990