

EXKURS3

P. ティリッヒの科学論とその現代的意義P. ティリッヒの学問体系論
- 神学と科学の関係をめぐって -

1. 問題 - 学問体系論の意義 -
2. 1920年代の体系論
3. 1950年代の科学論
4. 展望

< 弁証神学プログラム >

1920年代の学の体系論: 意味意識の現象学、知の現象学

学の体系において示された科学性(科学一般の科学性)に合致する神学の科学性、学の体系内における位置の明確化。神学の固有性の明確化

神学は、精神科学(知「思惟 - 存在 - 精神」)に属する一科学である

神律的体系学としての神学

学問体系あるいは諸学の意味内実に関わる

意味内実をめぐる相互関係の可能性(神学はあらゆる科学に対して開かれている)

3 : 1950年代の科学論

「問いに答える」

Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology, vol. 1*, The University of Chicago Press 1951 (ST)

The analysis of the human situation employs materials made available by man's creative self-interpretation in all realms of culture. Philosophy contributes, but so do poetry, drama, the novel, theapeutic psychology, and sociology. The theologian organized these materials in relation to the answer given by the Christian message. In the light of this message he may make an analysis of existence which is more penetrating than that of most philosophers. Nevertheless, it remains a philosophical analysis. The analysis of existence, including the development of the questions implicit in existence, is a philosophical task, even if it is performed by a theologian, and even if it is a reformer like Calvin. (63)

哲学の中心的役割

common basis / common ground

There is, however, a more profound reason for the distrust of apologetic methods, e

specially on the part of the kerygmatic theologians. In order to answer a question, one must have something in common with the person who ask it. Apologetics presupposes common ground, however vague it may be. But kerygmatic theologians are inclined to deny any common ground with those outside the "theological circle." They try to demonstrate that in each case what was assumed to be common ground actually was the ground of the "situation"; that theology lost its own ground when it entered the situation. (ST.6)

A conflict presupposes a common basis on which to fight. But there is no common basis between theology and philosophy. Conflicts on the philosophical level are conflicts between two philosophers, one of whom happens to be a theologian, but they are not conflicts between theology and philosophy. (ST.26)

The point of contact between scientific research and theology lies in the philosophical element of both, the sciences and theology. Therefore, the question of the relation of theology to the special sciences merges into the question of the relation between theology and philosophy. (ST.18)

相関とは？

宗教と科学の関係の歴史

未分化から分化(専門化・内的緊張)

分裂(分離・対立)

区別

協力・再統合

協力という関係が重要、

J.Mark Thomas (ed.), *Paul Tillich. The Spiritual Situation in Our Technical Society*,
Mercer University Press 1988

Chapter 8. Expressions of Man's Self-Understanding in Philosophy and the Sciences,
1959

Chapter 13. The Relationship Today between Science and Religion, 1960

The word science is a stumbling block, especially if one comes from continental Europe. One does not know whether science is supposed to mean the mathematical sciences alone, or natural sciences generally, or the scholarly approach in all spheres, like the German word Wissenschaft. I feel that the idea underlying this lectureship demands restriction to the natural sciences. Such restriction, even if systematically not justifiable, allows the concentration on some problems that are most representative for the relation of religion and science today. (151)

The statement that religion and science do not interfere with each other (in their essential nature) presupposes above all a sharply defined concept of religion. Such a con

cept is a summary of a whole philosophy of religion and must be presupposed here.
It is partly created under the necessity of drawing the dividing line between religion and science so sharply that both must trespass this line in order to interfere with each other.

Religion can be defined as the encounter with the holy, and the holy can be defined as the manifestation of what concerns us ultimately and with unconditional seriousness. The holy is a dimension of reality that shines through the bearers of the holy, (151-152)

In every scientific approach there are two elements: the first is genuinely scientific --- the approach to reality is in terms of observation, hypothesis, experiment, theory, and all this is related to the processes in time and space with their mathematical and logical structure. In this element, science is autonomous, determined by its object alone and obliged to resist any interference from any side,.. (154)

For there is another element in science: its participation in the whole of man's spiritual life and, therefore, in the self-interpretation of man in the universe. Out of such self-interpretation in mythological and metaphysical terms has science once grown; and in on stage of its development has it left the ground completely. This is the point where science itself reaches into the religious dimension, for both myth and metaphysics express in symbols or concepts the encounter with the ultimate reality. Here is the realm of conflicts, humanly unavoidable, but not necessary according to the nature both of religion and of science. (155)

the distinction of the dimensions in which lie the religious and the scientific encounters with reality. Science is the cognitive approach to the whole of finite objects, their interrelations and their processes. Religion is the total approach to that which gives meaning to our life and, therefore, concerns us unconditionally and ultimately. Dimensions cross each other, but they do not conflict with each other. (155)

Chapter 14. Religion, Science, and Philosophy, 1963

Now this brings me to an end. And I sum up saying, the period of conflict between religion, science, and philosophy is in principle over, although there are still individuals who are back in older periods of thought. We are living in the period of tolerance. It is never satisfactory because it admits, but it does not unite. Tolerance can have in itself, as a result, a strict consciousness if it is not more than tolerance. And so we always strive for a period of reunion, and in this case, of cooperation, and this is a possible thing today. It has started in many places, and I want to express my hope that it may become a reality in ever-increasing power. (172)

Symbolic and Literal Statements

if you take other myths literally, then they become superstition. (163)

Chapter 15. Science and the Contemporary World in the View of a Theologian, 1961

4 : 展望

神学と科学をめぐる二つの関係モデル

意味論的モデル(意味形式と意味内実・根拠)

同一の体系に属する者どおしの、同一の内実に基づく対話

神学は、この意味内実の具体化に直接関わる。

対話論的モデル(問いと答えの対話)

諸科学は、相互独立性、つまりそれぞれの固有性に基づく対話を行う。

20年代と50年代の議論を統合するならば、

1. 対話には、相互の独自性と共通性の承認が必要になる
2. 50年代の状況から、新しい仕方での20年代的な体系論構築を構想すること
3. 共通課題の自覚と、共通言語の構築、そしてコミュニケーション論の具体化