

第一章 自然神学とその再構築

第二章 「宗教と科学」関係論の基礎

- 1 形而上学再考
- 2 ホワイトヘッドの宗教論
- 3 プロセス神学の挑戦
- 4 プロセス神学と「宗教と科学」関係論

7/8

3 . プロセス神学の挑戦

(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スペクト：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

<有神論的自然主義>

- ・ なぜ、いかにして形而上学か、自然主義そして有神論

有神論：なぜ（無神論的自然主義あるいは唯物論にとどまらない理由）
世界内の諸存在の多様性と秩序の説明
存在するものの生成と変化、そしてその全体はどこをめざすのか、
目的の存在
観念的なものの具体化の原因・根拠
観念的なものの実在性と現実化は、自然からは説明できない
自然主義：いかにして、現代の科学的世界観との整合性 始まりの問題
自然学からの一般化 形而上学・神（概念）
ホワイトヘッド：現代物理学から、有神論的自然主義
cf. Paul Davies

・形而上学（一般化・抽象化）と宗教（経験の具体性に根ざす、具体的ヴィジョン）
象徴、礼拝

Religion is the vision of something which stands beyond, behind, and within, the passing flux of immediate things; something which is real, and yet waiting to be realised; something which is a remote possibility, and yet the greatest of present facts; something that gives meaning to all that passes, and yet eludes apprehension; something whose possession is the final good, and yet is beyond all reach; something which is the ultimate ideal, and the hopeless quest. (191-192)

The immediate reaction of human nature to the religious vision is worship. (192)

(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) 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 (1897-2000), John B. Cobb, David Ray Griffin, Lewis Ford

< 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 'surpassible 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)

Charles Hartshorne, Anselm's Discovery. A Re-examination of the Ontological Argument for God's Existence, Open Court Publishing 1965

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を超えて 形而上学・存在論の再構築の正当性

広義と狭義の存在論

存在論という名称を採用する根拠

学問的思惟の伝統

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)

David H. Nikkel, *Panentheism in Hartshorne and Tillich. A Creative Synthesis*, Peter Lang
1995

Edgar A. Towne, *Two Types of New Theism. Knowledge of God in the Thought of Paul
Tillich and Cgales Hartshorne*, Peter Lang 1997

大塚稔「ハーツホーン」、長谷・山本編『現代宗教思想を学ぶ人のために』世界思想社
栗林輝夫『現代神学の最前線』新教出版社
宮平望『現代アメリカ神学思想 平和・人権・環境の理念』新教出版社

< John B. Cobb Jr,

**Postmodernism and Public Policy, Reframing Religion, Culture, Education,
Sexuality, Class, Race, Politics, and the Economy,
State University of New York Press 2002 >**

プロセス神学の射程：社会理論・共同体論という側面

actual entities Nexus / Society

日常的な経験におけるマクロな存在

What is Christianity ?

The dominant premodern answer was otherworldly. The other world was divided into realms of rewards and punishments.

In modernity, attention shifted to this world. (14)

To be a Christian was to be a member of that community that participated in the highest form of religious experience and life. (14f.)

As modernity advanced, the claim that Christianity is superior to other religious traditions and communities lost its persuasiveness. That claim has been superseded by the view that all the great religious traditions are paths to the same goal

the goal as transformation from ego-centeredness to centeredness in the Real.

From a postmodern perspectives this effort to find or impose unity on diverse communities is objectionable.

The influence of postmodernism on Christian theology.

They recognize Christianity as one community among others, with its own distinctive traditions and practices. To be a Christian is not to compare Christianity with others and make claims either to superiority or to equality.

It is to immerse oneself in one's own community, appropriating its values and meanings more deeply, and living from its stories and rituals.

It begins with the rejection of the notion that language mirrors an objective and independent reality. the world we inhabit is a linguistic one..... they constitute a system of symbols and meanings that can order understanding and life.

Christianity thus understands itself as a cultural-linguistic system. (15)

It is not clear that Christians who accept this understanding of what faith means can contribute, as Christians, to the shaping of policy in the wider society. If they do so, it seems, they do not act as Christians but in some other capacity.

There is another way for Christians to understand themselves that grows more naturally out of their tradition and yet breaks, as fully as does the cultural-linguistic proposal, with both pre-modern and modern views. This is the understanding of Christianity as a sociohistorical movement.

to be a Christian is to locate oneself in the Christian community. This community is a changing one, growing out of a long history and moving into a uncertain future. Being a sociohistorical movement does not of course, differentiate Christianity from other major traditions. What differentiates the Christian movement is its particular origin and history. It originated in events in Israel centering on Jesus and the community that grew up around him.

this complex of historical occurrences can be called "the Jesus-event"

The Christian movement regards the originating events as normatively significant. Some Marxists, secular humanists, existentialists, and post-Christian feminists recognize that their origins lie in the Jesus-event, but no longer find it a source of norms. They do not consider themselves Christians, and their preference should be respected. (16)

the effort to establish some unchanging pattern that must characterize all Christians

it is a mistake to identify them as the unchanging essence of Christianity. In this new century, we may discover problems with what characterized all of us until now.

If our fresh reflection about the meaning of our history for our new situation leads us to abandon those teachings or characteristics, we will not be less Christian for that. On the contrary, to refuse to change for the sake of a supposed unchanging essence would be a lapse of faithfulness.

(19)

Physician-assisted suicide

To take this position is to deny that human life as such is of absolute worth.

For a transformationist, the fact that there is no explicit support for suicide in the tradition does count against it in a changed situation. Reaffirming old view, just because they have been strongly established for a long time, is not faithfulness to Christ. (33)

