

* **キリスト教学特殊講義** * * * ***第三章：形而上学再考****3 - 4：形而上学の可能性**

1. ホワイトヘッド哲学へのアプローチ
2. ホワイトヘッドの形而上学の枠組み
3. ホワイトヘッドと宗教論
4. プロセス神学とキリスト教思想

4. プロセス神学とキリスト教思想

(1) ホワイトヘッドの神論とその意味

< 神の本性の三重性 >

1. 神も一つの現実的存在である
2. 神の本性の三つのアспект: 原初的本性、結果的本性、自己超越的本性
 - 原初的本性(「神から世界へ」1 - 働きかけ・誘因)
 - ・神による永遠的諸客体の非時間的評価が、時間的世界の経過に先立って非派生的になされる
 - ・最初の主体的目的を供給、説得的誘因(persuasive lure)
 - ・外延的連続体の原子化、選択的制限は神の決断にもとづく
 - 結果的本性(「世界から神へ」)
 - ・展開する宇宙の諸現実的存在の神による自然的抱握
 - ・神の本性は世界の創造的前進の結果としてある。
 - ・神による世界の自然的抱握は選択的であり、あるものは消極的抱握を通して神から排除される(= 神の審判)
 - 自己超越的本性(「神から世界へ」2 - 世界への内在)
 - ・神が自らを後続する現実的存在に与件として与えること

< 神と世界の逆対応 >

3. 神と世界の逆対応ともいうべき力動的な関係
 - 神に関しては原初的本性が優先、他の現実的存在の場合は過去によって与えられたという性格から出発
4. 神は能動から受動へ、世界は受動から能動へ展開する

< 万有在神論 >

5. 神は永遠的恒常的であるとともに時間的流転的、世界超越的であるとともに世界内在的、世界に含まれるとともに世界を含む、人格的存在者である

(2) 「宗教と科学」の問題連関において

John Hick, *An Introduction of Religion. Human Responses to the Transcendent*,
Yale University Press 1989

We have seen that the universe, as presently accessible to us, is religiously ambiguous in that it is capable of being interpreted intellectually and experientially in both religious and naturalistic ways. (129)

(3) キリスト教思想についての意義 - プロセス神学 -

1. 存在論とキリスト教思想

有賀鐵太郎 『キリスト教思想における存在論の問題』創文社

大林 浩 『アガペーと歴史的な精神』日本基督教団出版局

three strains of thought emerge which, amid many variations in detail, respectively fashion God in the image of an imperial ruler, God in the image of the personification of moral energy, God in the image of an ultimate philosophical principle.

The three schools of thought can be associated respectively with the divine Caesars, the Hebrew prophets, and Aristotle. But Aristotle was antedated by Indian, and Buddhist, thought; ... There is, however, in the Galilean origin of Christianity yet another suggestion which does not fit very well with any of the three main strands of thought. (404)

This is the notion of redemption through suffering, (412)

God is the great companion --- the fellow-sufferer who understands. (413)

2. プロセス神学: ホワイトヘッド形而上学の概念枠によるキリスト教思想の構築

Charles Hartshorne, John B. Cobb, David Ray Griffin, Lewis Ford

1897-2000

ホワイトヘッドの神 宗教の神へ

「科学と宗教」 新しい有神論の定式化

3. Charles Hartshorne, *A Natural Theology for Our Time*, Open Court 1967

神概念の規定

What is a philosopher to mean by 'God' --- assuming he uses the word? There are three ways of reaching an answer to this question. (1)

1. to ask theologians

2. (if) analogy with the central operative idea in the practices, not simply in the theological theories, of one or more of the high religions, he may call his conception by the religious name.

3. In theistic religions God is the One Who is Worshipped. This is in some sort a definition. We have, therefore, only to find out what worship is to know the proper use of the name 'God'. (3)

礼拝の対象としての神

it must be worship as more than a mere fact of terrestrial human culture. The definitional problem has a clear solution only if there is a rationale, an inner logic, to the idea of worship such that inferior forms violate or fail adequately to express this logic. ...

an a priori possibility for rational animals generally ... only God can in the full sense be worshipped. (4)

consciousness is part of the definition of worship. To worship is to do something consciously.... Worship is the integrating of all one's thoughts and purposes, all valuations and meanings, all perceptions and conceptions..... worship is a consciously unitary response to life. It lifts to the level of explicit awareness the integrity of an individual responding to reality.... individual wholeness flooded with consciousness. (4-5)

God is the wholeness of the world, correlative to the wholeness of every sound individual dealing with the world. (6)

Simply every response, every aspect, must be a way of loving God. That the God correlative to this integrity of response is Himself 'One' (8)

The clue to this likeness and this difference is in our hands: God is the all-inclusive reality; his knowing, accordingly, must like be all-inclusive; ours, by contrast, is fragmentary, as our whole being is fragmentary; (12)

The idea that worship is love with the whole of one's being is correlated, in many high religions, with the idea that what we thus wholly love is itself also love, divine love for all creatures, and for God himself as including all. (12)

Not completeness, but all-inclusiveness, is what is required. And here nontheistic theories of worship fail. (16)

I conclude that the wholeness view of worship and of the divine correlate of worship makes good religious sense and is more obviously relevant to the religious documents than the identification of deity with in finite, absolute, unconditioned (pace Tillich), immutable, uncaused cause, most real being, or kindred philosophical objects. (17)

アンセルムスの神概念:これ以上大きなものが考えられないあるもの

besides using the ideas of all-inclusiveness and universal love, to define the One Who is Worshipped. This third way was Anselm's discovery. God is the not conceivably surpassable being. (17)

he accepted the Platonic-Aristotelian argument that what is worshipful must be self-sufficient and perfect in the sense of complete, and that what is complete cannot change. Change is a sign of weakness, ... But there is nothing in the religious (unless in Hinduism or Buddhism) to indicate that change simply as such is a weakness; and the only sense in which 'perfection' is used biblically is the ethical sense. "Be ye perfect" does not mean, 'be ye immutable!' (18)

we cannot infer 'surpassable by another' from 'surpassable by self'. Moreover, our idea of wholeness throws a clear light on how 'self-surpassing' can be combined with 'unsurpassability by another'. (20)

Thus, God is infinite in what he could be, not in what he is; (21)

Only potentiality can be strictly infinite, nonrelative, and immutable; actuality, which is richer than potentiality, is finite, relative, and in process of creation. God as actual is more than the absolute (which indeed is a mere abstraction), not less. (24)

ホワイトヘッド哲学に基づく新しい自然神学

In what kind of philosophy is the religious idea of God most at home?

(1) It must be a philosophy in which becoming is not considered inferior to being. For the self-surpassing divinity is in process of surpassing itself.

(2) we need a philosophy which distinguishes between the bare or abstract truth that an individual exists and the how or actual concrete state in which it exists. ... the Buddhist-Whiteheadian type

(3) A theistic philosophy must be in some sense indeterministic. It must admit that process is creative of novelty that is not definitely implicit in the antecedent situation.

(25-26)

(4) A theistic philosophy must take 'create' or 'creator' as a universal category, rather than as applicable to God alone.

(5) A theistic philosophy must have a theory of internal relations and also a theory of external relations. Both types of relations are provided for by Whitehead theory of 'prehensions' and two 'natures' of God.

(26)

this 'neoclassical theism'

(27)

宗教と科学との統一性

The scientist seeing God in nature is more than just a scientist, he is a philosopher or a religious man as well. He has a belief, not about contingent nature and the actual state of science, but about any possible nature and any possible science, that it must declare the glory of God.

(91)

it must not be possible for any result of science,, to conflict with theism.

There seems nothing in quantum mechanics that conflicts with theism.

(92)

Somehow relativity as an observational truth must be compatible with divine unsurpassability.

(93)

Unless some sort of physical relativity is compatible with deity, theism cannot even be logical possible.

(94)

ギリシャの実体形而上学の不適切さを超えて

if what is neither individual nor concrete state is a mere abstraction, then the entire notion of a relationless absolute, devoid of inner plurality, the 'One' of Plotinus, ..., is an idolatrous abstraction, when taken as self-sufficient or as the most admirable object of contemplation.

(106)

the influence of Plato was not exactly helpful. The conception of an immortal soul, imprisoned in the body, and with its earth career but an incident in its ultimate destiny, is Platonism not at its best.

(107)

The monopoly theory is at best no more than a theory. To worship God need not be to accept the theory. But really, it is less than a theory, for no one knows what it means.

(119-120)

He is finite and infinite, eternal and temporal, necessary and contingent, each in suitable and unique respects. The Greeks tended to worship the eternal or necessary as such, but

we need not do so.

(128)

(4) プロセス神学の意義

A forest is the triumph of the organisation of mutually dependent species.

Every organism requires an environment of friends, partly to shield it from violent changes, and partly to supply it with its wants. The Gospel of Force is incompatible with a social life. By force, I mean antagonism in its most general sense.

Almost equally dangerous is the Gospel of Uniformity. The differences between the nations and races of mankind are required to preserve the conditions under which higher development is possible.

(Whitehead[1925],pp. 206-207)