

<前回：2. 現代聖書学の動向：歴史・文学・思想>

言葉の宗教としてのキリスト教 → 現代思想 → 聖書学

(1) 近代的知と歴史主義

1. 自然主義と歴史主義：近代的知の二つの動向（因果律の二つのタイプ）
2. 「近代」と人間的現実の歴史化。現実は無常不変ではなく、変化する。人間の諸活動の集積、所産。
3. 「歴史主義」の多義性あるいは混乱。
「歴史主義」「その悪しき側面から完全に引き離され、人間とその文化や諸価値に関するあらゆるわれわれの思惟の根本的歴史化という意味において理解されねばならない」(トレルチ、諸問題・上、158)。
4. 存在レベルにおける歴史・歴史化（存在論的概念）
 - ・人間存在の歴史性
 - ・聖書的な歴史的思惟（聖書の宗教が歴史的思惟であるという意味）
 - ・近代化が歴史化であるという意味での歴史
5. 知・人間的現実の地平としての歴史
倫理的なあるいは宗教的な価値・理想は、歴史的な形成物(歴史的な原因と結果の連鎖の中にあり、その意味はこの連鎖という全体の中で規定される)である。
価値や理想の妥当性はそれが形成生成してきた歴史的連鎖（文脈）の範囲内に限定される。この限界を超えた普遍化は不可能あるいは間違っている。といった認識あるいは感覚。
相対性の意識＝歴史相対主義→ニヒリズム
9. 知・人間的現実の地平としての歴史（歴史化）→歴史主義・歴史的思惟
倫理的なあるいは宗教的な価値・理想は、歴史的な形成物(歴史的な原因と結果の連鎖の中にあり、その意味はこの連鎖という全体の中で規定される)である。

(2) 近代聖書学と近代的な「歴史」理解

1. 近代的知・歴史主義に基づいたキリスト教思想（研究）＝近代聖書学の成立
近代世界（近代的な日常性）へのキリスト教の適応という歴史的動向において。
2. 近代歴史学の成立→近代的知の基礎学としての歴史学
言語学、法学、哲学、神学、地質学、生物学など
イッガース、シュトゥールマッハー
4. トレルチ
「第一は歴史批判にたいする原理的習熟であり、第二に類推の意味であり、第三はあらゆる歴史的現象間に生ずる連鎖がそれである。」(10)
「蓋然性の判断」(10)
「批判を始めて可能にする方法は、類推を適用すること」、「類推の全能とは、あらゆる歴史的出来事の原則的同質性を含むものである」、「聖書批評自体もまた諸伝承の類推によって成り立っている。」(11)
「歴史的生のあらゆる現象の相互作用」、「すべての出来事が恒常的な相互連鎖のなかにあり、全体も個体も互いに関連し一つの事象が他のものと関係しつつ、必然的に潮流を形づくることになるのである」、「われわれ自身の追体験能力」(12)

5. パネンベルク：方法論的現在中心主義＝歴史的思惟の解釈学的構造
6. 帰結：批判＝懐疑あるいは不可知論 → A・シュヴァイツァー、ブルトマン
- ・歴史的批判的方法：文献学＋歴史学→近代聖書学のパラダイム
 - ・伝承史：イエス → 断片的な口承伝承（弟子たち） → 収集・文書化 → 編集
 - ・現存のテキストから最古層へ遡及し再構成する。
 - 弟子集団＝共同体における伝承の法則性の確定→逆算（様式批判：文学様式と「生活の座(Sitz im Leben)」との対応）、「生活の座」は真に社会的カテゴリーか？ブルトマン『共観福音書伝承史』『イエス』、
 - ・編集者の意図・神学の解明（編集批判）
 - ・様式批判・編集批判から文学社会学（テキストと社会との相関関係・相互連関）へ。
 - そして、新しい新約研究の動向＝方法論の拡張・総合化（歴史的批判的方法を超えて）
 - ・「歴史」、しかも狭い意味の「歴史」へテキストの意味を限定する結果。
 - 「科学的」学派は、史料の批判的検討を強調したにもかかわらず、歴史研究のイデオロギー的機能を弱めることに貢献しなかったばかりか、むしろ歴史研究が内政や外交上の目的のためにますます多く利用されるのを促進さえしたということなのである」（イッガース、26）。 ↓

民衆史、心性史（アナル学派）

（3）反歴史主義と聖書学の新展開

1. 近代聖書学的な「イエスの譬え」研究
- 20世紀中頃の譬え研究は、聖書学全体の動向を反映して、ユリヒャーの示した議論の内の歴史性の議論の線上で展開してきた。
- ・歴史性への過度の集中、歴史への偏重
 - 文学的言語的な分類の問題は歴史的社会的問題設定に従属している。
 - ・エレミアス：新約聖書テキストはもっぱらその歴史的原初形態（イエス自身の言葉）の再構成のための資料として理解されている。
2. 1960年代頃から、文学性の復権、反歴史主義：構造主義的譬え解釈
文学性と歴史性とのバランスの回復から思想へ

↓

解釈学的プロセスに基づく譬え解釈：80年代リクルの意味

これは歴史概念と言語概念との本格的な問い直しを要求する。

3. 解釈学的プロセス「歴史→文学→思想」、三重のミメーシス

（4）新しいイエス研究とパウロ研究

- ・M・J・ボーグ『イエス・ルネサンス——現代アメリカのイエス研究』教文館、1997年（原著1994年）。
 - サンダース、ホースレイ、バートン・マック、マーカス・J・ボーグ、エリザベス・シュスラー・フィオレンツァ、ジョン・ドミニク・クロッサン
 - ↓
 - ・アメリカの聖書学会（SBL）の「聖書と帝国」分科会（*The Bible and Empire Unit*）
パウロ・ルネサンス、イエスからパウロへ
2. 現代思想におけるパウロ

3. 隠喩・レトリック 1

(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。

- ・浅薄な知性主義への迎合・同化ではなく。理神論的ネオロギー的キリスト教批判。
- ・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。

「批判主義はその主義と精神とをカントから継承する」、「歴史においてその具体的内容を実現する文化の諸領分に関して、その理性における根拠、その各に一定の意味、一定の価値を与える原理を研究することに、批判主義の根本精神は存在する」、「カントは先ず『純粹理性批判』において、かかる新しい方法、新しい態度を学問の範囲について提出し、遂行した。そして彼は次第に道徳や美的生活の領域へ、同じ態度、方法の適用を広めていった。宗教に関する彼の議論は、幾分の不完全と不徹底とを免れ難いが、しかも原理的には同一の精神に立脚しておるといえることができる」、「カントにおいて、宗教哲学が批判主義の指示す新しい道を出発し、進行しておるのを見るのである」(波多野精一「宗教哲学の本質及其根本問題」(1920)、201頁)

「批判主義の宗教哲学は、主理主義的形而上学や超自然主義のそれと異なって、宗教の対象の哲学的考察ではなく、宗教そのものを対象とする哲学である」(201)

3. カント主義の諸潮流

Ernst Troeltsch, Zur Frage des religiösen Apriori. Eine Erwiderung auf die Bemerkungen von Paul Spieß. 1909, in: *Gesammelte Schriften*. 2. S.754-768.

(2) 哲学的象徴論(象徴形式の哲学)から言語論へ

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

(Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1985)

In dem Maße, als sich diese Einsicht in der Wissenschaft selbst entfaltet und durchsetzt, wird in ihr der naiven Abbildtheorie der Erkenntnis der Boden entzogen. Die Grundbegriffe jeder Wissenschaft, die Mittel, mit denen sie ihre Fragen stellt und ihre Lösungen formuliert, erscheinen nicht mehr als passive Abbilder eines gegebenen Seins, sondern als selbstgeschaffene intellektuelle Symbole. Es ist insbesondere die mathematisch-physikalische Erkenntnis gewesen, die sich dieses Symbolcharakters ihrer Grundmittel am frühesten und am schärfsten bewußt geworden ist. Heinrich Hertz (5)

wird jetzt nach einer Regel gefragt, die die konkrete Mannigfaltigkeit und Verschiedenheit der Erkenntnisfunktionen beherrscht und die sie, ohne sie aufzuheben und zu zerstören, zu einem einheitlichen Tun, zu einer in sich geschlossenen geistigen Aktion zusammenfaßt.

Sie ist eine Gestaltung des Mannigfaltigen, die von einem spezifischen, damit aber zugleich von einem in sich selbst klar und scharf begrenzten Prinzip geleitet wird. (8)

Dies gilt für die Kunst, wie es für die Erkenntnis gilt; für den Mythos wie für die Religion. Sie alle leben in eigentümlichen Bildwelten, in denen sich nicht ein empirisch Gegebens einfach widerspiegelt, sondern die sie vielmehr nach einem selbständigen Prinzip hervorbringen. Und so schafft auch jede von ihnen sich eigene symbolische Gestaltungen, die den intellektuellen Symbolen, wenn nicht gleichartig so doch ihrem geistigen Ursprung nach ebenbürtig sind. Keine dieser Gestaltungen geht schlechthin in der anderen auf oder läßt sich aus der anderen ableiten, sondern jede von ihnen bezeichnet eine bestimmte geistigen Auffassungsweise und konstituiert in ihr und durch sie zugleich eine eigene Seite des "Wirklichen." (9)

5. 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」、『基督教学研究』(京都大学基督教学会)、第7号、1984年、78-92頁。)

Uneigentlichkeit : 象徴における内的行為の意図、象徴と象徴されているもの
象徴素材とその固有の本来の意味と象徴の意味 → 象徴と記号
の意味構造

Anschaulichkeit : 象徴の具象性・具体的直観性、形態化。

Selbstmächtigkeit : 参与(participation)、記号(恣意的、規約的)との差異。

Anerkennung : 社会的次元

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

Symbols of Faith : point beyond、participate、open up、grow out of the individual or
collective unconscious

6. リクール

象徴 : Logos / Bios

<参考文献>

1. 池上嘉彦『記号論への招待』岩波新書。
2. 森哲郎他編『経験と言語』大明堂。
3. 島藺進他編『宗教のことば』大明堂。
4. リクール『聖書解釈学』ヨルダン社。
5. 長谷正當『象徴と想像力』創文社。
6. 丸山圭三郎『言葉と無意識』『言葉・狂気・エロス』講談社現代新書。
『カオスモスの運動』講談社学術文庫。
7. 並木浩一『旧約聖書における文化と人間』教文館。
8. ソンターク『隠喩としての病』みすず書房。
9. 宮本・山本・大貫『聖書の言葉を超えて ソクラテス・イエス・グノーシス』東京大学出版会。
10. 立川健二・山田広昭『現代言語論』新曜社。

(3) 現代思想の言語論

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

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,

< Language as Discourse >

言語論の諸潮流を集約する。

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 générale* 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 hypostasized. 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-expression, 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; signs only refer to other signs 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。

<参考文献・和書>

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。

1. 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。

2. 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。

3. 解釈学的哲学（ドイツ哲学の言語論）

ガダマー『真理と方法 ⅠⅡⅢ』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。