

**<インタビュー>**

1. エコロジの神学の諸問題
2. ティリッヒ 生の次元論

2 - 1 : なぜ次元論か2 - 2 : ティリッヒの次元論2 - 3 : 次元論の適用例**<健康・病> 問題群**

- ・ 次元論の形成過程
- ・ イエスの奇跡物語 (治療奇跡)

**<ポイント> 医療人類学**

- ・ 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、複数の次元が複合的に関与する

- ・ 奇跡は物理的現実である前に社会的現実である

癒しの社会的次元 : 関係性の回復という奇跡

和解のない世界、にもかかわらず

驚くべき出来事 = 恩恵・贈与

2 - 4 : 次元論の展開・具体化のために**<次元論の展開・展望>**

- ・ 次元論は、「自然の宗教哲学」の中心的議論となる
- ・ 次元論の現実化に向けて

ティリッヒのアウトラインの素描から、議論の精密な仕上げるを試みる

形而上学的枠組みと次元の生成論

議論の方向 : 自然から精神の誕生 (次元の生成論)

1. 古典的な問題設定へ
  - ドイツ観念論の自然哲学
2. 現代的な議論のコンテキストへ
  - 化学進化
  - 宗教論

後期の講義へ

**3 . 宗教言語と科学言語**

- 3 - 1 : 隠喩とモデル
- 3 - 2 : レトリックから見た宗教と科学
- 3 - 3 : 言語・想像力・倫理

### 3 - 1 : 隠喩とモデル

#### ( 1 ) マクフェイグ神学

##### 1 . 著作

Sallie McFague: Distinguished Theologian in Residence at the Vancouver School of  
Theology and Carpenter Professor of Theology, Emerita, Vanderbilt University  
, *Speaking in Parables: A Study in Metaphor and Theology*, Fortress 1975  
, *metaphorical theology. Models of God in religious Language*, Fortress 1982  
, *Models of God. Theology for an Ecological, Nuclear Age*, Fortress 1987  
, *The Body of God. An Ecological Theology*, Fortress 1993  
, *Super, Natural Christians. How we should love nature*, Fortress 1997  
, *Life Abundant. Rethinking Theology and Economy for a Planet in Peril*,  
Fortress 2001  
, *Is God in Charge ? Creation and Providence*, in: William C. Placher  
(ed.), *Essentials of Christian Theology*, Westminster John Knox Press  
2003 pp.101-116

##### 2 . マクフェーグの前提・背景

###### ・言語論的転回とその実質的な具体化

What has been labeled "historicism" is the epistemological presupposition that the content of literary works and in general of cultural documents receives its intelligibility from its connection to the social conditions of the community that produced it or to which it was destined.

anti-historicist reaction influenced by Frege and Husserl

P.Ricoeur, *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning*,  
The Texas Christian University Press 1976 pp.89-90

###### ・宗教言語論・イエスの譬え研究

60年代中頃以降のイエスの譬え研究の新しい展開

リクール、クロッサン、ヴァイア、ファンク、ペリン、ワイルダー  
イエスの譬え研究の基礎論としての新しい隠喩論、モデル論  
フェミニスト神学との共通の問題意識

###### ・解放の神学・フェミニスト神学 エコロジーの神学

It comes out of a post-Enlightenment, Protestant, feminist perspective, a perspective which I would characterize as skeptical, relativistic, prophetic, and iconoclastic. [1982: viii]

the feminist critique of religious language is especially relevant in this regard, for more than any of the other liberation theologies, feminist theology in this has focused on language, its power and its abuses.

the Genesis story

For many feminists, this is a model of Western culture, including Christianity, which has been and still is a "man's world." [ibid.,:8]

Western religious language, its patriarchal character, the Western way of life  
an idol

[ibid.,:9]

## ( 2 ) 現代思想における隠喩論・モデル論

### < 伝統的な隠喩論の特徴 >

Roland Barthes: *L'ancienne Rhétorique*

Paul Ricoeur: *Biblical Interpretation*, in: *SEMEIA* 4, 1975

This is a very schematic summary of a long history which begins with the Greek sophists, moves through Aristotle, Cicero and Quintilian, and which ends with the last treatises on rhetoric of the 19th century. What remains constant in this tradition can be summarized in the following six propositions: (1) Metaphor is a trope, i.e., is a figure of discourse naming. (2) Metaphor is an extension of naming by a deviation from the literal sense of words. (3) The reason for this deviation in metaphor is resemblance. (4) The function of resemblance is to ground the substitution of the figurative meaning of a word borrowed from the literal sense of a word which could have been used in the same place. (5) The substituted meaning does not include any semantic innovation; we can thus translate a metaphor by restoring the literal word for the figurative word which was substituted. (6) Since it admits of no innovation, metaphor gives no information about reality; it is only an ornament of discourse, and therefore can be categorized as an emotional function of discourse. (76f.)

### < レイコフ >

George Lakoff: *The contemporary theory of metaphor*, in: Andrew Ortony (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge 1993<sup>2</sup>

The metaphor involves understanding one domain of experience, love, in terms of a very different domain of experience, journeys. More technically, the metaphor can be understood as mapping ( in the mathematical sense ) from a source domain ( in this case, journeys) to a target domain ( in this case, love). The mapping is tightly structured. There are ontological correspondences, according to which entities in the domain of love (e.g., the lovers, their common goals, their difficulties, the love relationship, etc.) correspond systematically to entities in the domain of a journey ( the travelers, the vehicle, destinations, etc.). (206f.)

現実の認知・認識 ( 思想と経験の方法・あり方 ) との関わりにおける隠喩

the mapping themselves are not propositions.

metaphors are mappings, sets of conceptual correspondences. (207)

The metaphor is not just a matter of language, but of thought and reason. The language is secondary. The mapping is primary. (208)

many of the most basic concepts in our conceptual systems are also normally comprehended via metaphor - concepts like time, quantity, state, change, action, cause, purpose, means, modality, and even the concept of a category. (212)

写像・構造的同型性 目標領域の構造の発見的理解

George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, The University of Chicago Press

1980

### < 隠喩の意味と指示 >

Ricoeur: *ibid.*

Metaphor depends on a semantics of the sentence before it concerns a semantics of the

word. Metaphor is only meaningful in a statement; it is a phenomenon of predication. (77)

blue angelus, white twilight, green night: two terms in tension  
tenor/vehicle

Metaphor proceeds from the tension between all the terms in a metaphorical statement.  
the first phenomenon is not the deviation from literal or proper meaning of words, but the very functioning of predication at the level of the whole statement. What we have called a tension is not just something which occurs between the two terms of the statement, but between the two complete interpretations of the statement. (ibid.)

Metaphorical interpretation presupposes a literal interpretation which is destroyed.  
Metaphorical interpretation consists in transforming a self-defeating, sudden contradiction into a meaningful contradiction. twist / shift / a semantic impertinence (78)

What is at stake in a metaphorical statement is making a "kinship" appear where ordinary vision perceives no mutual appropriateness at all. resemblance (79)

In this respect, metaphor is an instantaneous creation, a semantic innovation. (ibid.)

Two conclusion: (80)

1: true metaphors are untranslatable.

2: It includes new information.

In short, metaphor says something new about reality.

### ( 3 ) マクフェーグの隠喩神学

隠喩

倫理・実践

認知・経験の問題として

緊張、新しい見方

be / not be

cf. 象徴

問題：物語・譬えの位置？

モデル

隠喩（言語）の外？

概念

[1982] Chapter 2 Metaphor, Parable, and Scripture

Metaphor / Model (pp.32-42), Parable(pp.42-54), Scripture(pp.54-66)

the essence of our uniqueness is that we use our bodily sensations as signs to stand for something else. Signs become symbols: the thing stands for and represents something else.

(ibid.,:33)

Whitehead, Wittgenstein, Heidegger or Ricoeur. (ibid.,:34)

Kenneth Berk, Mary Hesse, Jacob Bronowski, Coleridge, Arther Koestler  
I.A.Richards, Max Black

Douglas Berrgren, Walter Ong, Nelson Goodman, Paul Ricoeur

metaphor as unsubstitutable

the interaction of two thoughts, tension

metaphor belongs to the semantics, not the syntax of language

not words but sentences with a subject and a predicate

cf. rhetorical, ornamental view of metaphor (ibid.,:37-38)

the tension of duality is between a literal or conventional interpretation and an extended, new interpretation.

metaphorical meaning depends on a literal, conventional base as our point of contact, but through being applied to a new field, new meaning is created.

reality is redescribed through metaphor. (ibid.,:39-40)

The centrality of metaphor in all constructive fields means that the question of the truth of metaphor cannot be dealt with in a direct, literalistic, positivistic way.

The criteria of truth for a hypothesis in science are not unlike criteria applied to metaphors in poetry and religion. (ibid.,:40)

In conclusion we recall that human thought and language grow and change by seeing one thing in terms of another: they are intrinsically metaphorical. Explicit or alive metaphors make us aware of this mobile, tensive characteristic of our way of being in the world. The distinctive features of alive metaphors can be summed up in the following way: a metaphor is an assertion or judgement of similarity and difference between two thoughts in permanent tension with one another, which redescribes reality in an open-ended way but has structural as well as affective power. (ibid.,:42)

Metaphor always has the character of "is" and "is not": an assertion is made but as a likely account rather than a definition.

"God is mother" is not to define God as mother, not to assert identity between the two terms "God" and "mother," but to suggest that we consider what we do not know how to talk about through the metaphor of mother. ([1987:33-34])

all talk of God is indirect: no words or phrases refer directly to God, for God-language can refer only through the detour of a description that properly belongs elsewhere.

It used to be that poetry and religion were thought to be distinctive in their reliance on metaphor, but more recently the use of metaphors and models in the natural and social science has widened the scope of metaphorical thinking considerably.

#### ( 4 ) ブラック、ヘッセのモデル論

Max Black, *Models and Metaphors. Studies in Language and Philosophy*,

Cornell University Press 1962

III: Metaphor pp.25-47

XIII: Models and Archetypes pp.219-243

Scientists often speak of using models but seldom pause to consider the presuppositions and the implications of their practice. (219)

In such all cases, I shall speak of scale models. This label will cover all likenesses of

material objects, systems, or processes, whether real or imaginary, that preserve relative proportions. (220)

In Peirce's terminology, the model is an icon, literally embodying the features of interest in the original.... In making scale models, our purpose is to reproduce, in a relatively manipulable or accessible embodiment, selected features of the "original": (221)

In such cases I propose to speak of analogical models. An analogical model is some material object, system, or process designed to reproduce as faithfully as possible in some new medium the structure or web of relationships in an original. ... by the more abstract aim or reproducing the structure of the original.... the dominating principle of the analogical model is what mathematics call "isomorphism." (222)

In order now to form a clear conception of the scientific use of "theoretical models," I shall take as my paradigm Clerk Maxwell's celebrated representation of an electorical field in terms of the properties of an imaginary incompressible fluid. (226)

Here we might speak of the use of models as heuristic fictions. In risking existential statements, however, we reap the advantages of an explanation but are exposed to the dangers of self-deception by myths (as the subsequent history of the ether sufficiently illustrates). The existential use of models seems to me characteristic of the practice of the great theorists in physics. (228)

they worked not by analogy, but through and by means of an underlying analogy. Their models were conceived to be more than expository or heuristic devices. (229)

To make good use of a model, we usually need intuitive grasp ("Gestalt knowledge") of its capacities, but so long as we can freely draw inferences from model, its picturability is of no importance. (233)

#### ( 5 ) マクファークのモデル論

Sallie McFague, *Models of God. Theology for an Ecological, Nuclear Age*. Fortress 1988

a model is a metaphor with "staying power." A models is a metaphor that has gained sufficient stability and scope so as to present a pattern for relatively comprehensive and coherent explanation. The metaphor of God the father is an excellent example of this. (34)

#### 隠喩・モデルの複数性

「隠喩は常に<である>と<ではない>という性格を持つ。ある主張がなされる場合、それは定義(definition)としてではなく適切な説明(account)としてなされるのである。すなわち、<神は母である>と言うことは、神を母と定義したり、<神>と<母>という用語の同一性を主張したりしているのではなく、我々がどう語ってよいのかわからない事柄を - 神に関連して - 母という隠喩を通して考察していることを示唆しているのである」(ibid.,p.33f.)。

「語りうる最大のことは、<神 - 世界>関係の一定の局面あるいは諸局面がこれこれのモデルによって特定の時間と場所にふさわしい仕方で照らし出されているということなのである」(ibid.,p.38f.)。

「隠喩神学は多元的」(ibid.,p.39)である。