

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
- 1 - 2: 新約聖書と治癒者イエス (5/7,14)
- 1 - 3: ドイツ観念論と生の動態 (5/14,21)
- 1 - 4: ティリッヒの生の現象学
 - 1. 生の多次元統一的性 (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**

1 - 2：新約聖書と治癒者イエス

<問題> 全体性の回復としての救済と諸次元の区別

「しるし」の両義性：呪術と宗教

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？

Peter Biller and A.J.Minnis(eds.), *Medieval Theology and the Natural Body*,
York Medieval Press 1997

<悪霊に取りつかれたゲラサ人をいやす>

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。

5:2 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。

5:3 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。

5:4 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。

5:15 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。

5:16 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。

5:17 そこで、人々はイエスにその地方から出て行ってもらいたいと言いだした。

5:18 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。

5:19 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。」

<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

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*, Routledge & Kegan Paul 1966

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)

<まとめ>

健康・病・治療は、人間の生の全体性に関わる事柄であり、それは、相互に区別された諸次元を含む。宗教が人間の全体的救済を主張するとするならば、それはこの全体を視野に入れることが要求される。また同時に、宗教的癒しはこの全体の中にそれ固有の場所を持っている。

disease: 身体的、心的

基本的に特定の次元に限定

illness: 精神的・宗教的を含む全人格的態度

1 - 3 : ドイツ観念論と生の動態

1 . 生ける自然の象徴性

1 . 金子晴勇『近代人の宿命とキリスト教 世俗化の人間学的考察』(聖学院大学出版会)

「自然には神の創造のわざを指し示す象徴機能が備わっていた。しかるに近代の工業化による自然の改造は人間の手による世俗化を来したのである。自然はもはや人間にとって神秘ではなく、それは荒涼とした原野に過ぎず、自然の象徴機能が喪失している。」(51-52)

Peter L. Beger, *A Rumor of Angels. Modern Society and the Rediscovery of the Supernatural*, Doubleday & Company 1969

signals of transcendence within the empirically given human situation (52)

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

nature represents an *imago dei*, an image and likeness of its divine creator.

This is important because if nature is in truth an image or mirror of the divine, then nature, like humanity, has an integrity in itself, a value for itself. It is not just an object for us, a means for our use, but an end in and for itself, in and for God. In this context image is taken to mean --- as John Calvin interpreted it --- a sign or symbol of the divine, a mirror, in that sense, of the divine glory; or as I have discussed nature, an image replete with the power, life, order, and redemptive unity bestowed on it by God. It is in this important sense that humanity has been considered to be an *imago dei*, namely, insofar as humans manifest in and through their humanity the intelligence, will, freedom, and love that are --- or can be --- characteristic of human existence. Many persons look at nature or at humans and do not find there traces of the divine. In neither case, therefore, is this an issue of proof, an uncontested argument that the characteristics of power, life, order, and redemptive unity in nature and of intelligence, will, freedom, and love in human being are in fact images or mirrors of God. (175) Is faith

necessary for seeing these signs as signs, as signs of the sacred, of the divine in creation (or in history)? Yes. Does "faith" --- our subjective receptivity --- therefore create these signs so that they can be said not to be there objectively but to be illusions, so that there is no discourse about them as they appear in ordinary experience? No. Why, if there signs are present in nature to be looked at, can we not describe them and speak of them as "pointers" to the presence of God (a kind of natural theology), as well as signs of God for the faithful ? (181)

nature discloses itself as power, a power in process, converting itself into energy and into matter.

Power, like life and order, manifests itself on different levels, in a kind of hierarchy of modes which modulate and suddenly change as they appear in different ranges of finite being.

in all religious awareness disclosure is accompanied by demand, a presence signaled by law or obligation, which is acknowledged and witnessed by obedience and service. The ultimacy of what is real, of power, is thus balanced by an ultimacy of obligation, an undeniable and unavoidable sense of "ought" that has accompanied each religious tradition from its beginning. (182)

nature exhibits an order, one apprehended universally by the humans participating in it and witnessing to it but one sensed differently by various cultures and so articulated in widely diverse symbols in that human response to order. (183)

This order combines paradoxically with radical spontaneity and openness; (184)

The intuition of order and its relation to value -- of form as both sacred and "good" --- has been almost universal. (185)

with each disclosure of order, there again comes a corresponding demand. (186)

nature has apparently prepared for the various unexpected levels that are a part of it. an aspect of the "story"

nature as power and order discloses itself as inclusive of nature as source and fulfillment of meaning. These too are traces of the sacred, ...

the final trace of the sacred is the strangest of all.

unity of death and life (188)

The most baffling and most pressing problem for reflection is the opposition and yet the unity of life and death, of value and the threats to value, of the positive and its negation, of being and nonbeing. No one escapes this painful and disturbing problem.

(189)

the dialectic of life and death

The God of nature and so of life and death --- and so also the God of history --- is hence the deus absconditus whose mystery within this dialectic is impenetrable. (192)