

<インタビュー>

1. エコロジーの神学の諸問題
2. ティリッヒ 生の次元論

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
 - (1) 宗教と科学における言述の説得力
 - (2) 社会的構想力から見た宗教と科学
 - 説得性の担い手の移行 (宗教から科学へ) ニュートン主義の自然神学、広教主義
 - (3) キリスト教の社会的構想力
 - 知恵思想とイエスの宗教運動、二つの知恵：慣習的知恵と転換的知恵
 - (4) 社会的構想力の説得性と象徴機能
 - 宗教におけるユートピア機能とイデオロギー機能の二重性
 - 説得力と象徴との関連：多次元的な作用 (意味と力)
 - ヴィジョン喚起力、多次元的な作用

3 - 3 : 言語・想像力・倫理

- (1) 言語 想像力 倫理 (リクールの図式)

Paul Ricoeur, *Listening to the Parables of Jesus*, in: Charles E. Reagan, David Stewart (eds.),
The Philosophy of Paul Ricoeur. An Anthology of His Work, Beacon Press 1978

William Schweiker, *Mimetic Reflections. A study in hermeneutics, theology, and ethics*, Fordham
 University Press 1990

, *Responsibility & christian Ethics*, Cambridge University Press 1995

There is more to think through the richness of the images than in the coherence of a simple concept. What confirms this feeling is the fact that we can draw from the Parables nearly all kinds of theologians... (242)

We must say in more positive terms, that taken all together, they say more than any rational theology.

The Parables obviously teach, but they don't teach in an ordinary way. (243)

The challenge to the conventional wisdom is at the same time a way of life. We are first disoriented before being reoriented.

reorientation by disorientation, an element of extravagance.

a dramatization of what in ordinary experience we call seizing the occasion, but this dramatization is both paradoxical and hyperbolic; (244)

To listen to the Parables of Jesus, it seems to me, is to let one's imagination be opened to the new possibilities disclosed by the extravagance of these short dramas. If we look at the Parables

as at a word addressed first to our imagination rather than to our will, we shall not be tempted to reduce them to mere didactic devices, to moralizing allegories. We will let their poetic power display itself within us.

Decision, we said, moral decision comes third. Reversal precedes. But the Event opens the path. The poetic power of the Parable is the power of the Event. Poetic means more than poetry as a literary genre. Poetic means creative. And it is in the heart of our imagination that we let the Event happen, before we may convert our heart and tighten our will. (245)

(2) 想像力の問題

Martin Heidegger, *Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik*, Vittorio Klostermann 1973(1929)

芦名定道 『ティリッヒと弁証神学の挑戦』創文社 1995年、252-257頁

1. 人間存在の本質構造としての有限性の分析

カントの『純粋理性批判』を、存在するものの認識(存在認識)を可能にする人間存在の先行的な存在理解(存在論的認識、純粋認識 ア・プリアリな総合)の可能性の解明として解釈。「人間の自然的本性に属する」形而上学のための基礎を準備するような、有限な人間存在の存在論的分析論(基礎的存在論)。

2. 一般形而上学(=存在論)の基礎付けの問題基盤は人間の有限性の問題である。人間の認識行為は、神の行う認識が無限な認識、根源的直観、つまり直観することによって直観される存在を創造する表象作用であるに対して、派生的直観であって、常に対象が外から与えられねばならない(受容性)。神の行う認識が存在者を端的に全体として直観するのに対して、人間の有限な直観は思惟を「も」必要とする、つまり対象を受容しつつ規定する認識である。

3. 対象の創造者であることなしに、なぜその対象を認識できるのか、そのためにはあらゆる受容に先立って人間存在はどのような固有の存在構成を持たねばならないのか。

4. ア・プリアリな総合(純粋認識)の三つの要素:「感性的直観の形式」としての純粋直観(空間と時間)、「純粋悟性」と「純粋統覚」、「純粋構想力」(範疇の感性化、すなわち総合の規則の形象化である図式を産出する能力としての超越論的構想力)。第一版によって、「カントが述べようとした」と思われることを「ことさらに」「暴力を用いて」顕わにする作業

5. 感性的直観と悟性的思惟の中間にあって両者を媒介する能力として位置づけられた純粋構想力が、純粋認識(存在論的認識)を可能にする三つのものの単なる一つではなく、むしろそこから直観と思惟が発現してくる根。超越論的構想力は根源的時間である。

6. 純粋直観と純粋思惟を純粋構想力に還元すること:直観も思惟も表象作用である ことと純粋構想力が根源的時間であること:純粋構想力が「今-系起」(時間系列)としての時間を発現させるという点

(3) マクフェイグの隠喩神学

Sallie McFague, *Super, Natural Christians. How we should love nature*, Fortress 1997

配慮の倫理:エコロジーから倫理へ(見る・目・視線の問題)

The ethic that emerges front, the ecological model is care for all those in the community. Because all of us exist together and because we know these others to be subjects, who are more or less like ourselves, the proper way to treat the others is with the care that one extends to community members, This does not mean that we necessarily like all the others, or even that we do not eat or kill them. The first dimension of care is simply respect. (151)

Respect means nothing more (or less) than acknowledging the otherness of the other:

Respect is simply the recognition that there are other subjects, that the world is not arranged for my well-being or even, necessarily, for the well-being of human beings, then respect for them is our first response. (151)

In some cases, that is all that we can manage. An ethic of community is not all love and harmony; it is not just mutual enrichment, cooperation, and friendship. (151)

killer bees, poison ivy, cancer cells, AIDS virus.

Nevertheless, they are all members of the community, in the sense that their existence has its own ends and is not simply for our benefit, displeasure, or death. Of course, we may decide to fight and if possible kill cancer cells and the AIDS virus..... But even as we do so, our sensibility will be different if we respect others, even the most difficult cases, as subjects in their own worlds. At the very least, it will make us realize that cancer cells and the AIDS virus are not "out to get us": we are not the center of creation around which everything else is oriented.

(151-152)

If the first step is respect, the second step is to accept "community" as the metaphor within which to understand our responsibilities to others,

It implies a society of subjects, and is significantly different from the organic metaphor as used by deep ecologists, which does not respect subjecthood, either of human beings or other lifeforms.

(152)

モデルの複数性と相補性・統合

Another alternative ethical metaphor is the "rights of the individual" from the Kantian tradition. It extends the Enlightenment ideal of individual rights ("life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness") to other lifeforms and even to ecosystems. This position appears to recognize different subjects (by extending them rights), but the subjects are atomistic and unrelated.

(152)

In the organic model, all subjects are fused into one: in the rights model, all subjects are individual and separate. In the first, all differentiation is lost; in the second, individuals are related only by contract. While, as we shall see, both of these metaphors---organism and rights---should be included within a community model, each is problematic when standing alone. In contrast, the model of community allows different subjects to be related to one another through respect and care. (153)

The model of community, then, implies an ethic of care: care for the whole, for a sustainable planet, and also care for the parts. for the local, particular bit of the planet that is our own neighborhood. This big caring and the small caring are related: (153)

Real caring depends on this sort of knowledge: on local, detailed knowledge.

To care for another (person, animal, forest, river), appropriately one must learn what *they* need to flourish. Care means "planning with care," giving serious attention and thought;

we remember not to think solely about what we want. We need to be informed about what the natural world needs to survive and flourish.

If we learn how to think locally as ecological subjects, we may be able to act in appropriate ways globally.

The kind of caring that the community model suggests is more like the care given by a friend than a parent. (154)

On a much larger scale, people who see themselves as Friends of the Earth have the same sensibility: one of respect, care, and gratitude. (155)

Over the centuries, friendship has been privatized,..... The public realm is where rights and justice reign, while care and friendship have been relegated to the private domain.

we can see that the contractual rights model is a poor fit with reality as currently understood. (155)

The Enlightenment rights tradition reveals its bias in Immanuel Kant's words: "Animals are not self-conscious and are there merely as a means to an end. That end is man."

The rights tradition in North American culture. One sees its darker side in the right of the individual to carry a gun.

libertarianism, the radical freedom of the roving, cowboy, do-what-you-want ethic.

On the brighter side, however, the rights tradition is also the foundation of egalitarian justice: the assumption that all persons in a society deserve equal treatment.

The merits of the justice tradition are evident, but its limitations are clear as well. Its greatest fault is that it is based on a false view of reality: we are not separate individuals who choose relationships. (156)

It does not create healthy, sustainable communities of human beings and other species, living together with relative success. Hence, the rights model should not be the basic one, but it ought to be included within the community model. (156-157)

(When the reverse occurs and the community model is included within the rights model, care becomes merely palliative, band-aid treatment to patch up its failures)

There is nothing intrinsically alien about care and justice language; in fact, they belong together. "I care about your being treated right" makes perfect sense. The rights / justice tradition is necessary to the community model: it keeps it from being soft, from becoming private or personal, from depending merely on good feeling. (157)

then the rights model cannot be the basic one. A community model, a care model, a model that has the disinterested concern of the friendly eye, can manage better (remember, we are always working from within relative, inadequate models, none of which will be perfect). (157)

the stories of two places, Curitiba, Brazil, and Kerala, India, (160)

His second example is Kerala in southern India, a very poor area with one-seventieth the income per person compared to the United States, but which has 100 percent literacy,

Early Marxist influences in Kerala created an atmosphere of sharing;

a low-level economy, Kerala produces a decent life for people, where health, education, and a sense of community are priorities. It is also an environmentally light economy, with low levels of energy consumption. (161)

The social self means that ethics---doing good for others---is not just altruism or self-sacrifice (as an ethic of case might suggest), for "their" good is also "my" good and vice-versa. (162)

Nonetheless, the sense of solidarity in the ecological model---that "I" am "I" only in relationship with other people and other species---creates a different sensibility for dealing with failure, accidents, injustices, losses, and death than is possible within the standard model of the self. Whereas the subject-object, individualistic model implies that whatever happens, good or bad, is mainly due to the merits or fault of the individual, the ecological model realizes things are not that simple. (162)

To put it simply: it enlarges the sense of self. The borders of the self do not stop with my own body: I am, I exist, only as I am in touch with the others, the other subjects who influence me and whom I influence. This enlarged sense of self

The organic, interdependent, interrelational model is, then, a necessary part of the community model. An ecological self pushes back the boundaries, enlarging the sense of who and what one cares for.

One of the most striking insights I have gained from reading religious autobiographies is how love gradually grows outward to include more and more others. St. Francis is a prime example: (163)

A Christian nature spirituality is Christian praxis extended to nature, It is treating the natural world in the same way we treat, or should treat. God and other people---as subjects, not objects. But, we have to admit, we seldom act this way, Only the saints seem able to do it; as signs of God

Post-Enlightenment Christians have bought into the subject-object arrogant eye when it comes to nature. What the ecological model offers to Christianity is a way of extending its *own most basic affirmation* on how others should be treated---as subjects---to nature. If Christians were to embrace the ecological model, they would not be doing something radical or discontinuous with their historical faith. On the contrary, they would simply be extending that faith to include nature. If we are to love God with our whole heart, mind, and soul, and our neighbor as ourselves, how, In continuity with that model, should we love nature? The answer is; with the loving eye, with the eye that realizes that even a wood tick or a Douglas fir is a subject---that each has a world, goals, intentions (though not conscious), and modes of flourishing that make them good in themselves and not simply good for us. (164-165)

エコロジーと宗教との積極的関わり

- ・ 行為のジレンマとしての罪（意志の転倒）
- ・ 範例の提示・伝承：意気に感じること（共感）、証人

But Christianity is not only the learner, the receiver, in this conversation. What does Christian faith have to offer that goes beyond the ecological model? Christianity makes several very significant contributions. First, we recall how difficult if not impossible it is for most of us to treat others as subjects, whether these others be God, other people, or nature.

It is at this point that Christianity makes one of its major contributions to the ecological model. We have noted how fragile the subject-subjects model is, how anxiety pushes us either to objectify and control others or to flip over into fusion with others in the search for self-affirmation. Being a self and relating to others as selves is difficult. In fact, one definition of sin is precisely the objectification of others, using others as a means to an end--one's self-fulfillment. The classic doctrines of justification and sanctification speak to this dilemma. Justification acknowledges that we do not and cannot live as subjects relating to other subjects, whether these be the divine Subject or other persons, but that God forgives us for our failure. we are given it as a gift. (168)

As we accept our acceptance, we are directed and encouraged through the doctrine of sanctification to go and do likewise: to accept others as they are, in their own subjecthood. These two doctrines together set out a tough-minded agenda: justification acknowledges the depths of human sin, while sanctification insists that once free of it we have a task to do. While Christianity is certainly not the only remedy for the anxiety of human self-awareness, it is a classic and profound one. (169)

A Christian ethic of care sides with the oppressed
a poor third-world woman of color, for she is a barometer of the health of both humanity and nature. (171)

Christian radicalism--love for the neediest humans and devastated nature--helps to push more moderate forms of the care ethic toward greater justice for the forgotten and the voiceless. (172)

Christianity also believes nature gives us intimations of the divine. As stated early on, the sacramental use of nature is the oldest and in many ways the noblest of Christian understandings of nature. (172)

To sum up: the conversation between the ecological model and Christianity is a rich one with important offerings from both sides. (174-175)

The ecological model offers Christianity a way to construe its own basic understanding of relationality between God and human beings, but extends it as well to nature; it also offers education in how to relate to other subjects with a loving eye.

Christianity with its doctrines of justification and sanctification offers the ecological model a remedy for the anxious self, poised between objectification and fusion, (175)