

**第一章：文化から自然へ**

- 自然はいかなる仕方でキリスト教思想の問いとなるか -

**1. マクフェーグの隠喩神学と自然の問い**

1 - 1: マクフェーグ神学の見取り図

1 - 2: 言語・隠喩・モデル

1 - 3: 「神 - 自然」のモデル化とその意味

**1 - 4 : 倫理の基盤を求めて、構想力の問題****(1) 感受性・構想力の問題**

Martin Heidegger, *Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik*, Vittorio Klostermann 1929(1973<sup>4</sup>)

Die folgende Untersuchung stellt sich die Aufgabe, Kants Kritik der reinen Vernunft als eine Grundlegung der Metaphysik auszulegen, um so das Problem der Metaphysik als das einer Fundamentalontologie vor Augen zu stellen. (1)

die ontologische Analytik des endlichen Menschwesens (1)

Grundlegung der Metaphysik im ganzen heißt Enthüllung der inneren Möglichkeit der Ontologie. (12)

die endliche Erkenntnis ist nichts schöpferische Anschauung. (24)

intuitus derivativus

Rezeptivität, affizieren

hinnehmend bestimmende Anschauung des Seiendes (36)

Hieraus ergibt sich: zur Einheit des vollen Wesens der reinen Erkenntnis gehören drei Stücke.

das Mannigfaltigkeit der reinen Anschauung

die Synthesis dieses Mannigfaltigen (Verstand)

die reine Synthesis der Einbindungskraft (die Mitte) (60)

Schemabildung ist die Versinnlichung von Begriffen. (93)

Sie (die transzendente Einbildungskraft) bildet als ursprüngliche reine Synthesis die Wesenheit von reiner Anschauung (Zeit) und reinem Denken (Apperzeption)

Die transzendente Einbildungskraft ist demnach der Grund, auf den die innere Möglichkeit der ontologischen Erkenntnis und damit die der *Metaphysica generalis* gebaut wird. (122)

Die transzendente Einbildungskraft als Wurzel der beiden Stämme

Die Kantische Grundlegung ergibt: Begründung der Metaphysik ist ein Frage nach dem Menschen, d.h. Anthropologie. (199)

Alles Interesse meiner Vernunft (das spekulative sowohl als das praktische) vereinigt sich in folgenden drei Fragen: 1. Was kann ich wissen ? 2. Was soll ich tun ? 3. Was darf ich hoffen ? (A804f., B832f.) (200)

#### 4. Was ist der Mensch ?

Aber nach dem oben Erörterten steht es außer Zweifel, daß nur eine philosophische Anthropologie die Grundlegung der eigentlichen Philosophie, der *Metaphysica generalis*, übernehmen kann. (202)

Pascal Boyer (ed.), *Cognitive aspects of religious symbolism*, Cambridge Univ. Press 1993

#### (2) 神モデル: 「神 - 世界」 相関

S. McFague , *Models of God. Theology for an Ecological, Nuclear Age*, Fortress 1987

メッセージ

a common reading of the material norm of Christianity

story of Jesus

Christian faith is seen as destabilizing conventinal expectations and worldly standards

Christian faith is inclusive, reaching out to the weak, to the stranger, to the outcast

Christian faith is antihierarchical and antitriumphalist

Three aspects that appear to be characteristic of the story of Jesus are his speaking in parables, his table fellowship with outcasts, and his death on a cross. (47-49)

The interpretation of the parables of Jesus

a pattern of orientation , disorientation, and reorientation

table fellowship: an "enacted parable" (51)

状況の相関

There are, I believe, other metaphors, such as those of mother, lover, and friend, that express dimensions of that love more fully and appropriately for our time. If one accepts that salvation in our time needs to be understood as a destabilizing, inclusive, nonhierarchical vision, these metaphors with their associations of caring, mutuality, attraction, nurturing, supporting, empathy, responsibility, service, self-sacrifice, forgiveness, and creativity are highly suggestive. (56)

To see God's relationship to the world through the paradigm of the cross of Jesus is illuminating of salvation for our time if neither the servant nor the king is a major model but some other highly significant and very rich metaphors are investigated for their potential as expressions of the destabilizing, inclusive, nonhierarchical vision in an ecological, nuclear age. That is my thesis. (56)

神のモデルと自然のモデル

The Monarchical Model

prevalent in mainstream christianity

the relationship of king to his subjects

The model's anthropocentrism can be seen in classical Protestantism's

emphasis on the Word of God. (66)

a dualism of king and subject

The World as God's body

we have been given central responsibility to care for God's body, our world. (73)

The immanence of God in the world implied in our metaphor raises the

question of God's involvement with evil. (74)

To say that God is present in the world as mother, lover, and friend of the last and least in all creation is to characterize the Christian gospel as radical, surprising love.

(91)

All three loves --- creative, salvific, and sustaining --- are united in that each points to a desire for union.

Creative love (or agape), Salvific love (or eros), sustaining love (or philia)

Justice(agape), healing(eros), companionship(philial)

A Christian lifestyle modeled on God as parent, lover, and friend

The Love of God as Mother: Agape

The Activity of God as Mother: Creating

Sophia / Logos

The Ethic of God as Mother: Justice

an ethic of care, justice through care

### モデルの限界

God as mother does not mean that God is mother(or father). We imagine God as both mother and father, but we realize how inadequate these and any other metaphors are to express the creative love of God, the love that gives, without calculating the return, the gift of the universe.

It is partial at best, inadequate and false at places, and in need of other balancing models. Yet this bit of nonsense is, I believe, also an illuminating expression of an inclusive Christian vision of fulfillment appropriate to a holistic, nuclear age. (122-123)

### (3)「自然の神学」:神学的な自然理解、自然観の転換

新しい感受性へ

A new shape for humanity, a new way of being in the world

decentered / recentered

We are as members of God's body qualified by the liberating, healing, and inclusive love of Christ. ([1993:197])

to change consciousness, to develop a new sensibility,

thinking differently, behave differently

each model contains within itself a way of being in the world. (203)

### 存在の善性 - モデル

[1997] Super, natural Christians. How we should love nature,

My suggestion is that we should relate to the entities in nature in the same basic way that we are supposed to relate to God and other people.

We read in Genesis that God looked at creation and said: " It is good"---- not good for people or even for God, but just good. We should say the same thing. If we did so, we would simply be extending Christianity's own most basic model, the subject-subjects one, to nature. (1)

The ecological model says that the self only exist in radical interrelationship and

interdependence with other and that all living and nonliving entities exist somewhere on this continuum. In other words, everything is in some sense a "subject" ---- an entity that has a center, a focus, an intention in itself, for itself (often an unconscious one), but it also at the same time in radical relationship with others. (2)

individuation-participation

a. The basic model in the West for understanding self, world, and God has been "subject" versus "object." Whatever we know, we know by means of this model: I am the subject knowing the world (nature), other people, and God as objects.

nature has become the object par excellence. nothing but object (7)

hierarchical dualisms: male/female, straight/gay,whites/people of color,  
Westerners/Easterners

The first named is the subject, the second the object. Objects are "things" (8)  
"Nature"とは？

If "Christian" has many meanings, "nature" has more.

there will be many views of what nature is, depending on different historical,  
cultural, geographical, political. economic, and personal contexts.

In other words, nature is not one thing, but many things. (17)

nature is constructed by us. (20)

the big answer, the worldview

the medieval picture, the Newtonian view of nature, ecological model  
the ecological,evolutinary  
understanding of nature

the small answer, nature in the near neighbor

seeing the face of Christ in a suffering human sister or brother  
enviromental slogan of "think globally and act locally"

We will not care for what we do not know, and we cannot know what we do not  
experience. (23)

Im sum, a Christian nature spirituality is Christian paraxis extended to nature. It is becoming sensitive to the natural world, acknowledging that we live in this relationship as we do also in the relationships with God and other people. It means extending the way we respond to God and other people --- as subjects and not as objects --- to the natural world.

as valuable in itself, as a "subject" (25)

attention-love、目のあり方

Simone Weil deepens the meaning of pay attention with her comment that "absolute attention is prayer." She does not say that prayer is absolute attention, but that absolute attention is prayer. By paying attention to something she says, we are, in fact praying.

We are asking the question, how should a Christian love nature ? The answer emerging is that we must pay attention --- detailed, careful, concrete attention --- to

the world that lies around us but is not us.

We must, as Murdoch says, try to see "the world as it is " in order to love it. To really love nature, we must pay attention to it. Love and knowledge go together; we can't have the one without the other. (29)

I would like to suggest that a branch of science, nature writing, can help us learn to pay attention. The kind of paying attention that one sees in good nature writing suggests a paradigm for us. Nature writing is not scientific writing that hides behind pseudo-objectivity; rather, it combines acute, careful observation with a kind of loving empathy for and delight in its object. It is a knowing that is infused with loving, a love that wants to know more.

#### 二つの目のあり方

two very different ways of seeing the world (30)

Seeing Ellery and seeing the earth from space: behind these two very different ways of seeing, of paying attention, lie two different ways of knowing: what one commentator calls "the loving eye" versus "the arrogant eye." (32)

The arrogant eye simplifies in order to control, denying complexity, since it cannot control what it cannot understand. (33)

good for me and their human beings

the distant eye, the arrogant eye, the eye that can objectify the world. This eye lies behind the Western scientific understanding of objectivity.

Feminists and others have criticized this view of objectivity, seeing it as a mask for Western male privilege as well as for technological exploitation of women and nature. (36)

practicing the loving eyes, that is, recognizing the reality of things apart from the self and appreciating them in their specialness and distinctiveness, is a critical first step.

it suggests a different basic sensibility for all our knowing and doing and a different kind of knowing and doing. (37)

care ethic: an environmental ethic of care

A rights ethic seeks to extend the rights accorded to human beings since the Enlightenment --- the right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness --- to all animals and even forests, oceans, and other elements of the ecosystems. A rights ethic functions on the model of the solitary human individual.

A care ethic is based on the models of subjects in relationship, although the subjects are not necessarily all human ones and the burden of ethical responsibility can fall unequally. The language of care --- interest, concern, respect, nurture, paying attention, empathy, relationality --- seems more appropriate for human interaction with natural world, for engendering helpful attitudes toward the environment, than does the fights ethic. (40)

It appears to be, for Jesus is reputed to have made the classical subject-subjects statement when he said, "Love your enemies." Treat the person who is against you, perhaps even out to kill, as a subject, as someone deserving respect and care, as the

Good Samaritan treated his enemy in need. The subject-subjects model is counter-cultural: it is opposed to the religion of Economism, to utilitarian thinking, to seeing the world as for me or against me.

Christianity is not easy religion. (41)

#### モデルの歴史性: 中世との対比

a historical overview: the medieval model / the Enlightenment / the ecological model

The medieval picture was a sacred world order uniting God, human beings, and nature into a coherent whole through a complex network of interconnections.

The medieval picture of the world was structured on a vertical grid of decreasing value: God was at the top (in heaven), followed by the angels (49)

While this unified world order is not credible to most of us today, there is another kind of radical relationality and interconnection among all things that is possible for us: ecological interdependence. It has many of the benefits of the medieval sacred order, for it is, as that was, a functional cosmology.

It is hard to imagine individuality and unity in a more radical way. The medieval understanding of unity did not preserve individuality as well. It was based on a symbolic ontology: the assumption that all things participate in the ground of being and hence symbolize one another due to ontological similarities.

Ecological interdependence does not rest on a symbolic ontology. Rather, it is closer to a metaphorical understanding of connection: things are and are not similar, with the emphasis on the latter, on the surprise and delight in the ways things are nonetheless connected when they seem so disparate. Symbol underscores unity; metaphor, difference. (51)

Our sacred world order cannot be the medieval one. It must protest the sense of continuity and connection, optimism and harmony, the subservience of many to the one, the gradations of being and power, implicit in the medieval sacramental order. It must be more "Protestant" while at the same time remaining "Catholic." "Protestant" here stands for the disjunctive, divided, skeptical, postmodern mind-set that sees difference and difficulties wherever it turns. "Catholic" here stands for the wish, nonetheless, for connection, continuity, and coherence, (53)

The celebration of difference is the corrective that an ecological interdependence will suggest to the medieval sacred order.

#### 具体例との関わりで

The Great Chain of Being, Hildegard of Bingen, emblemism

Francis of Assisi, a step beyond emblemism

a step toward appreciating things in themselves

the willingness to let things be

toward seeing nature as intrinsic subject (55-57)

The interior, vertical route that started with Augustine continues into the Reformation, especially in Martin Luther as well as into the twentieth century, epitomized

n Existentialism. Nature falls into the background, serving as a backdrop or stage for God's important work: redemption. (58)

Nature became a mere object with no meaning or vocation beyond its utilitarian value to human beings. (59)

Since the seventeenth century the Western attitude toward animals has wavered between objectification and sentimentality, with zoos and pets examples of each. Both are forms of introversion: (63)

If we could develop such a sensibility, we might become, following Francis of Assisi, super, natural Christians. Developing this sensibility, we will suggest, involves the "loving eye," the eye that sees ourselves and others, including earth others, as profoundly related while at the same time able to respect real differences. (66)

## 2 . ティリッヒの文化の神学と自然の問い