

オリエンテーション - 宗教と科学という問題・問題群 -

第一部:自然の宗教哲学の構築を目指して

第一章:自然の宗教哲学の構想とティリッヒの次元論

1 - 1: 宗教的問いとしての健康と病 (4/23)

1 - 2: 新約聖書と治癒者イエス (5/7)

1 - 3: ドイツ観念論と生の動態 (5/14)

1 - 4: ティリッヒの生の現象学

1. 生の多次元的統一性 (5/21)

2. 神学体系における生 (5/28)

第二章: 宗教言語と科学言語

第一章: 自然の宗教哲学の構想と ティリッヒの次元論

< 前回 >

キリスト教思想と健康・病

ティリッヒ、モルトマン

Stated in this way, the distinction between religion and magic is a clear and simple one. Magic is a special kind of interrelation between finite powers; religion is the human relation to the infinite power and value. Magic can be creative and destructive, while religion stands essentially against the destructive powers. Magic is the exercise of immanent power, religion is the subjection to the transcendent power, etc. But these differences are clearly visible only on the basis of a religious development in which prophetic or mystical criticism has definitely established the unconditional character of the Unconditioned, or the ultimate character of the Ultimate. (31)

技術としての呪術、17世紀

1 - 2 : 新約聖書と治癒者イエス

< 問題 >

健康の神学(文化の神学) 生の次元論 自然の宗教哲学

新約聖書において、とくにイエスの宗教運動のコンテキストにおいて

イエスによる病の癒し、治療者イエス

1. しるしの両義性

< ヨハネ >

2:23 イエスは過越祭の間エルサレムにおられたが、そのなされたしるしを見て、多くの人がイエ

スの名を信じた。24 しかし、イエス御自身は彼らを信用されなかった。それは、すべての人のことを知っておられ、25 人間についてだれからも証してもらう必要がなかったからである。イエスは、何が人間の心の中にあるかをよく知っておられたのである。

<コリ1:22> 「ユダヤ人はしるしを求める」

2 . S. Kierkegaard:

The Sickness unto Death. A Christian psychological Exposition for Upbuilding and Awakening (Translated by Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong), Princeton University Press 1980

"This sickness is not unto death" (John 11:4). And yet Lazarus did die;

But even if Christ had not resurrect Lazarus, is it not still true that his sickness, death itself, is not unto death ?

But even if Christ had not said that, does not the mere fact that He who is "resurrection and the life"(11:25) approaches the grave signify that this sickness is not unto death: the fact that Christ exists, does it not mean that this sickness is not unto death ! What good would it have been to Lazarus to be resurrected from the dead if ultimately he had to die anyway ---

Humanly speaking, death is the last of all, and, humanly speaking, there is hope only as long as there is life. Christianly understood, however, death is by no means the last of all; in fact, it is only a minor event within that which is all, an eternal life, and, Christianly understood, there is infinitely much more hope in death than there is in life --- not only when in the merely human sense there is life but this life in consummate health and vitality. (7-8)

Christianly understood, then, not even death is "the sickness unto death";

Christianity had in turn discovered a miserable condition that man as such does not know exists. (8)

Part One: THE SICKNESS UNTO DEATH IS DESPAIR.

Part Two: DESPAIR IS SIN.

イエスは疾病の治癒なしに、病の癒しを行ったとは言えないか？

3 . 聖書学的に奇跡物語をどのように解釈するか

・様式批判(ブルトマン): イエス運動あるいはキリスト教共同体内部(+ 同時代のユダヤ教)

・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)
大貫隆 『福音書と文学社会学』(岩波書店)

・新しい新約研究の動向: 方法論の拡張

言語そのものへ: 言語行為の諸機能、レトリックの理解

方法論の総合化(歴史的批判的方法を超えて):

<悪霊に取りつかれたゲラサ人をいやす、マルコ>

5:1 一行は、湖の向こう岸にあるゲラサ人の地方に着いた。2 イエスが舟から上がられるとすぐに、汚れた霊に取りつかれた人が墓場からやって来た。3 この人は墓場を住まいとしており、もはやだれも、鎖を用いてさえつなぎとめておくことはできなかった。4 これまでにも度々足枷や鎖で縛られたが、鎖は引きちぎり足枷は砕いてしまい、だれも彼を縛っておくことはできなかったのである。5 彼は昼も夜も墓場や山で叫んだり、石で自分を打ちたたいたりしていた。6 イエスを遠くから見ると、走り寄ってひれ伏し、7 大声で叫んだ。「いと高き神の子イエス、かまわないでくれ。後生だから、苦しめないでほしい。」

8 イエスが、「汚れた霊、この人から出て行け」と言われたからである。9 そこで、イエスが、「名は何というのか」とお尋ねになると、「名はレギオン。大勢だから」と言った。10 そして、自分たちをこの地方から追い出さないようにと、イエスにしきりに願った。11 ところで、その辺りの山で豚の大群がえさをあさっていた。12 汚れた霊どもはイエスに、「豚の中に送り込み、乗り移らせてくれ」と願った。13 イエスがお許しになったので、汚れた霊どもは出て、豚の中に入った。すると、二千匹ほどの豚の群れが崖を下って湖になだれ込み、湖の中で次々とおぼれ死んだ。14 豚飼いたちは逃げ出し、町や村にこのことを知らせた。人々は何が起こったのかと見に来た。15 彼らはイエスのところに来ると、レギオンに取りつかれていた人が服を着、正気になって座っているのを見て、恐ろしくなった。16 成り行きを見ていた人たちは、悪霊に取りつかれた人の身に起こったことと豚のことを人々に語った。17 そこで、人々はイエスにその地方から出て行ってほしいと言いだした。18 イエスが舟に乗られると、悪霊に取りつかれていた人が、一緒に行きたいと願った。19 イエスはそれを許さないで、こう言われた。「自分の家に帰りなさい。そして身内の人に、主があなたを憐れみ、あなたにしてくださったことをことごとく知らせなさい。」

4. 新約聖書学の代表的議論から

荒井 献 『問いかけるイエス 福音書をどう読み解くか』(NHK出版)1994年

「第一五講 「自分の家に帰りなさい」 - 「悪霊に取りつかれたゲラサ人」
のいやし マルコ五・一 - 二〇」 190-202頁

荒井献の新約聖書学のポイントの一つ

『イエスとその時代』(岩波新書 1974年)

・イエスにおける「民衆の視座」(民衆と共にあるイエスの振る舞い)と「相対化の視座」(神は相対化の視座として機能する)の明確化。「民衆と」「権力に」。

・奇跡物語伝承の様式史法則 「理念型」の再構成

Marcus J. Borg,

1. *Jesus in Contemporary Scholarship*, Trinity Press International 1994

My own portrait of Jesus in two books, *Conflict, Holiness and Politics in the Teachings of Jesus* (1984), and *Jesus: A New Vision*(1987). In these two books, a sketch of Jesus with four main strokes emerges: he was a charismatic healer or "holy person," a subversive wisdom, a social prophet, and an initiator of a movement the purpose of which was the revitalization of Israel. (26)

One of the most notable features of contemporary Jesus scholarship is a reopening

of the question of Jesus and politics.

This is a new development, even though the claim that Jesus was political goes back to the birth of the discipline over two hundred years ago. Hermann Samuel Reimarus (97)

The Exclusion of Politics

Jesus scholars have most often used the narrow definition of politics. the Gestalt of Jesus as an eschatological figure the individualistic orientation of much of modern Jesus scholarship

Seeing from New Perspectives

they enable us to see that Jesus was a sociopolitical critic as well as an advocate of an alternative social vision --- in short, that he was "political" in the broad sense of the word. (101)

The perspectives of peasant, patriarchal, and purity society analysis provide a compelling social context for understanding Jesus' action in the temple. (112)

- Peasant Society and Politics in First-Century Palestine

Mark 12:38-40

the perspective provided by understanding the dynamics of a peasant society suggests that, whatever else needs to be said about Jesus, he was a social prophet.

And, given what else can be known about him, social critique was accompanied by an alternative social vision. (105)

- Patriarchal Society and Politics in Palestine

hierarchical and male-dominated

The patriarchal structure of the society was mirrored in the family. The patriarchal family was a microcosm of society as a whole.

It was the primary unit of economic production and society, as well as the primary center of identity and loyalty. (106)

Luke 11:27-28, Matt.23:9

there is a source of identity outside of the structures of patriarchal, which thereby also subverts those structures. (107)

- Purity Society and Politics in First-Century Palestine

Of first importance is the awareness of what a purity society is. Found in many times and places, such societies are explicitly organized around the polarities of pure and impure, clean and unclean. Pure and impure apply to persons, behaviours, places, things, times, and social groups.

In purity societies, purity and purity laws have a significance much different from what they mean in the modern Western world.

to a large extent, for us purity has been trivialized, individualized, and internalized.

This way of seeing purity has affected the way scholars have seen texts

pertaining to purity.

But in a purity society, it is not so. In such societies, purity is the core value or paradigm structuring the social world. (108)

I have argued that first-century Jewish Palestine was a purity society. Its two centers and foundations were the temple and a particular interpretation of the Torah.

the temple's "holy of holies"

Third, of major importance is the way purity and impurity applied to persons and social groups. It got attached to the contrast between righteous and sinners: the pure were the righteous, and the radically impure were sinners (within a purity system, sin often becomes a matter of being unclean). (109)

the purity system was the ideology of the ruling elites.

the purity system was the result of social activity.

It was an interpretation of the Torah coming from a scribal class, that is, from a retainer class attached to the elites.

the temple elites (110)

2. Marcus J. Borg, *Conflict, Holiness and Politics in the Teaching of Jesus*, Trinity Press 1984

My own understanding of purity is somewhere in the middle between a minimalist and maximalist definition. I think there is only limited usefulness in defining a purity system so broadly as to be virtually synonymous with culture. Its limited usefulness is that it makes the point that all cultural classifications (and thus all language) divide up the world so that some things are valued more than others, and some things are "out of place." But if all culture are purity systems, then the notion loses most of its precision.

Thus I define "purity system" and "purity society" more narrowly than Douglas does, and more broadly than Sanders and Fredriksen do. To Douglas's definition of purity as a cultural system of classification, I add that a purity system is one that explicitly uses the language of purity (pure and impure, clean and unclean). (9)

John Diminic Crossan:

1. *The Historical Jesus. The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant*, HarperSanFrancisco 1991

13. Magic and Meal, pp.303-353

My wager is that magic and meal or miracle and table constitutes such a conjunction and that it is the heart of Jesus' program. (304)

2. *Jesus. A Revolutionary Biography*, HarperSanFrancisco 1995

In the Beginning Is the Body

(1) Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*,

The body is a model which can stand for any bounded system. Its boundaries can represent any boundaries which are threatened or precarious. The body is a complex structure. The functions of its different parts and their relations afford a source of symbols for other complex structure. We cannot possibly interpret rituals concerning excreta, breast milk, saliva, and the rest unless we are prepared to see in the body a symbol of society, and to see the powers and dangers credited to social structure reproduced in small on the human body. p.115

That extremely fruitful hypothesis explains why eating, in the previous chapter, and healing, in this one, are not simply private operations between individuals but social miniatures that can support or challenge, affirm or negate a culture's behavioral rules or a society's customary codes. Indeed, body to society as microcosm to macrocosm undergirds not only those chapters but my entire understanding of the historical Jesus.

(77)

lepra (covered several diseases)

That is why biblical leprosy applies not only to skin, as in Leviticus 13:1-45 and 14:1-32, but to clothes, as in 13:46-59, and to house walls, as in 14:33-53, and it renders each surface ritually unclean --- that is, socially inappropriate. The leprous person is not a social threat because of medical contagion, threatening infection or epidemic, as we might imagine, but because of symbolic contamination, threatening in microcosm the very identity, integrity, and security of society at large. And so, in Leviticus 13:45-46: (79)

Medical anthropology or comparative ethnomedicine has proposed a basic distinction between curing a disease and healing an illness.

(2) Leon Eisenberg: Patients suffer "illnesses"; physicians diagnose and treat "diseases"

A disease is, to put it bluntly, between me, my doctor, and a bug. Something is wrong with my body, and I take it to a doctor to be fixed. What is lacking in that picture is not just the entire psychological but, much more important, the entire social dimension of the phenomenon.

my family, my job, or wider and wider levels of society

(3) Arthur Kleinman: A key axiom in medical anthropology is the dichotomy between two aspects of sickness: disease and illness. (81)

the leper who met Jesus had both a disease(say, psoriasis) and an illness, the personal and social stigma of uncleanness, isolation, and rejection. And as long as the disease stayed or got worse, the illness also would stay or get worse. In general, if the disease went, the illness went with it. What, however, if the disease could not be cured but the illness could somehow be healed ?

This is the central problem of what Jesus was doing in his healing miracles. Was he curing the disease through an intervention in the physical world, or was he healing the illness through an intervention in the social world ? I presume that Jesus, who did

not and could not cure that disease or any other one, healed the poor man's illness by refusing to accept the disease's ritual uncleanness and social ostracization. Jesus thereby forced others either to reject him from their community or to accept the leper within it as well. Since, however, we are ever dealing with the politic body, that act quite deliberately impugns the rights and prerogatives of society's boundary keepers and controllers.

But miracles are not changes in the physical world so much as changes in the social world, it is society that dictates, in any case, how we see, use, and explain that physical world. (82)

we turn to spirits, good and bad, or to trance and possession
here we move toward the delicate interface between the psychological and the physical in the medical anthropology. (86)

trance, which I shall use as the single term for states variously called ecstasy, dissociation, or altered states of consciousness. Trance, therefore, can be produced by any critical change, be it decrease or increase, in the external stimulation of the senses, internal concentration of the mind, or chemical composition of the brain's neurobiology. It must, therefore, be accepted as a human universal, as another gift of neurobiological evolution, a possibility open, like language, to each and every human being. But, also like language, its actualization is specified by psychosocial patterning --- by cultural training, control, and expectation. (87)

the case of the Gerasene demoniac in Mark 5:1-17

Luke 11:14-15

Did Jesus sometimes, or always, heal while he himself was in a state of trance ? (92)

I am quite aware that there is not much evidence for Jesus as an entranced healer using contagious trance as a therapeutic technique,

I emphasize as strongly as possible that Jesus was not just a teacher or a preacher in purely intellectual terms, not just part of the history of ideas. He not only discussed the Kingdom of God; he enacted it, and said others could do so as well. (93)

5.まとめ

疾病(disease): 身体的、心的

基本的に特定の次元に限定

病(illness): 精神的・宗教的を含む全人格的態度