

1 自然神学から公共神学へ

1 環境論とキリスト教思想

- 環境・経済・政治 -

1 - 1 : 環境論と聖書解釈 - 創造論から終末論へ -

- (1) 論争の舞台としての創造論
- (2) 創造論から終末論へ
- (3) 環境論にとっての聖書の意義

1 - 2 : 経済的政治的な問いとしての環境論

- (1) キリスト教思想と環境論との積極的な結びつきとその条件
- (2) 環境論と政治・経済とのリンク キリスト教的な公共性論の構築
- (3) John B. Cobb, Jr.: Christianity, Economics, and Ecology
- (4) Larry Rasmussen, Global Eco-Justice: The Church's Mission in Urban Society

2 生命論とキリスト教思想

- 生命・経済・政治 -

2 - 1 : 脳死論、そしてクローニング

- (1) 生命倫理の諸問題
- (2) 生の次元論から脳死論の宗教的次元へ
- (3) クローニング

2 - 2 : 自己決定論と共同体論

3 コミュニケーション論としての自然神学

3 - 1 : 自然神学とは何か

3 - 2 : コミュニケーション合理性と自然神学

3 - 1 : 自然神学とは何か

- (1) 通俗的な理解に対して

1 . Natural Theology

The body of knowledge about God which may be obtained by human reason alone without the aid of Revelation and hence to be contrasted with 'Revealed Theology'. The distinction was worked out in the Middle Ages at great length, and is based on such passages as Rom. I:18ff., acc. to which man is capable of arriving at certain religious truths by applying his natural powers of discursive thought. In a definition of the First Vatican Council (De fid. cath., cap.a,

can.2) the possibility of this knowledge is explained by the dependence of the creature upon God. The chief objects of Natural Theology are God in so far as He is known through His works, the human soul, its freedom and immortality, and Natural Law. Hence, strictly speaking, Natural Theology is part of philosophy and treated as such in the systems of Scholasticism. Reformation theology generally rejected the competence of fallen human reason to engage in Natural Theology; and in modern times this incompetence has been reasserted with emphasis by K. Barth and the Dialectical School. Modern theologians sympathetic towards the ideals of Natural Theology often present their views under the heading of 'Philosophy of Religion'.

The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, 3rd. edition, p.1132r.

2 . 「自然」: 自然神学は人間の自然理性の能力（推論能力など）によって獲得されるという意味で「自然的」であり、他方では、自然神学は神に創造された被造物としての自然世界（自然世界の諸現象）を通して獲得された神についての認識という意味で「自然的」。

3 . Anthony Kerry, *What is Faith ? Essays in the Philosophy of Religion*, Oxford University Press 1992

Natural Theology, it is sometimes said, is neither natural nor theology. It is not theology, but philosophy, it is the philosophical study of questions concerning the existence and nature of God. It is not natural, but highly artificial: it is a discipline which came into existence only after both philosophy and theology had reached a mature stage of their development.

Some philosophers deny that there can be any such thing as natural theology, because, in their view, all talk of God is an idle use of senseless language. But if that is true, it takes philosophical argument to show it; and that argument will itself be, in a broad sense, a form of natural theology. (63)

4 . Alister E. McGrath, *The Foundations of Dialogue in Science & Religion*, Blackwell 1998 pp.98-118

Objections to Natural Theology: Theological

Karl Barth, whose controversy with Emil Brunner...

a point of contact for divine revelation within human nature

any such "point of contact" was itself the result of divine revelation

the orders of creation

to justify a racial ideology, Hitler

Thomas F. Torrance

what Barth objects to in traditional natural theology is not any invalidity in its argumentation, nor even its rational structure, as such, but its independent character

the proper locus for the discussion of natural theology is not debate about the possibility of a hypothetical knowledge of God, but within the context of the

positive and revealed knowledge of creator God.

The Barthian challenge can thus be met, in a manner which Torrance believed had Barth's support.

Objections to Natural Theology: Philosophical

Plantinga understands "natural theology" to be an attempt to prove or demonstrate the existence of God, and vigorously rejects it on the basis of his belief that it depends on fallacious understanding of the nature of religious belief.

belief in God / a basic belief

natural theology is to be understood as a demonstration, from the standpoint of faith, of the consonance between that faith and the structures of the world. In other words, natural theology is not intended to prove the existence of God, but presupposes that existence,

to reinforce the plausibility of an already existing belief

his conception of natural theology goes beyond such narrow proofs, and encourages the engagement with other areas of human life and concern, amongst which he explicitly includes science.

Natural theology offers "metaphysical reasons for the truth of theism as a general world-view.

Objections to Natural Theology: Historical

Deism,

John Locke, Tindal

The ideas English Deism percolated through to the continent of Europe through translations the obvious consonance between deism and the Newtonian worldview

it was an unstable amalgam

The term "deism" now has strongly pejorative overtones to many Christian theologians.

an emphasis on natural theology is associated with a mechanistic worldview and a significant reduced conception of God.

the exploration of the affinities between Christianity and the natural sciences leads to an emphasis being placed on the doctrine of creation; this does not mean that the denial or marginalization of the doctrine of redemption. Rather, it entails recognizing that one broad area of Christian thought has particular relevance to this significant issue, resulting in a focusing on the doctrine of creation for the specific purpose of the dialogue in question.

these are criticisms which seem to concern potential abuses of natural theology

it has been necessary to attempt to clarify the status of natural theology before making a firmer connection between natural theology and the natural sciences.

(2) ブルトマンの自然神学論

Rudolf Bultmann, Das Problem der „ natürliche Theologie “, in: *Glauben und Verstehen. Erster Band*, Mohr 1958³

In der *katolischen* Tradition bedeutet, „ natürliche Theologie “ die Lehre von Gott, soweit

sie dem Menschen ohne die Offenbarung möglich ist.

Für die *protestantische* Theologie ist eine solche natürliche Theologie unmöglich. (294)

Da mit der theologischen Aufgabe die natürliche Theologie von vornherein gegeben ist, und da sie die theologische Arbeit ständig durchzieht, so muss die Frage nach dem Sinn und der Möglichkeit von Theologie überhaupt. (312)

(3) 自然神学の歴史

5 . Ingolf U. Dalferth, *Theology and Philosophy*, Basil Blackwell 1988

「神学は哲学の部門あるいはその部分として出発した。……それゆえ神学は合理的な起源を持ち、その主要な源泉は宗教的伝統ではなく、哲学的反省である」(Dalferth[1988], p.19)、「神学はギリシャの発見であった」(ibid., p.32)、「キリスト教神学は本質的にキリスト論であった(し、キリスト論なのである)。……キリスト論の合理性は神学的合理性の試金石である」(ibid., p.38)。

6 . アウグスティヌスが『神の国』第六巻において紹介している神話的神学、国家的神学、自然的神学の三分枝体系(ウァルコの言う三種類の神学)

7 . 有賀鐵太郎『キリスト教思想における存在論の問題』(1969)(『有賀鐵太郎著作集 4』創文社 一九八一年)

「神学的原理としてのトノーシス」(1973)、『信仰・歴史・実践 有賀鐵太郎著作集 5』創文社 一九八一年。

<ハヤトロギア>

「普遍と特殊とが契約関係において弁証法的緊張をはらんで結合されている、そのような構造がヘブライの基本構造である。それはヤハウエおよびエヒイエということ論理的出発点とするものと考えられるゆえに、その語根がハヤー(hayal)であるところから、そのような発想および思考法を私はハヤトロギア(英語では hayathology)と呼んでいるが、それは単なる言語的概念ではなく、言語学的考察を援用しながらも主として歴史解釈学的に、ヘブライ思想に内在する原理として、それを取り出したものである。(有賀[1969], p.54)

<トノーシス>(緊張)

「もともとハヤトロギア的思考そのものが力動的(dynamic)なもの、すなわちデュナミスに満ちたものであるが、そのデュナミスは緊張なしには考えられない」、「ハヤトロギアとオントロギアとの間における緊張関係が問題とならざるをえない。私の言いたいことは、その何れか一方を切りずてることではなく、また両者の早急な総合を求めることでもなく、むしろ両者の相異を認めながら、その関係を緊張関係、すなわちトノーシスとして捕えるべきだということである」、「ここに言うトノス、またトノーシスは、そうではなく、むしろ創造的・生産的な力の場を志向する。その『場』はコーラやトポスよりも、むしろ場の理論におけるフィールドの意味に解すべきであって、それとのアナロギアにおいて考えられたトノーシスの場を、あらゆる関係に即して開いてゆくのが神学の仕事ではないかと私は思うのである」(有賀[1973], p.182-183)

<ハヤ・オントロギア、カハル・エクレシア構造>

「それはモーセの啓示体験と、それに基づくシナイ契約のうちに、その原型を示している。ヤハウエ（かれは有らしめる）がエヒイエ（われ〔汝とともに〕有り）としてイスラエルを契約の民（qahal = カーハール、神のみまえに招集された民）たらしめる」、「その原理（ヘブライ思想に内在する原理として取り出されたハヤトロギア。引用者補足）によってイスラエル史の意味関連が、従ってその本質構造が開明されるのであり、また後者によってその原理の意味もまた明らかにされる。それゆえ、ここに私はその本質構造を『ハヤトロギア的カハル構造』と名づけたいのである。この構造はやがてキリスト教のエクレシア構造として現われるものである。それゆえ、その両者に共通の構造を『ハヤトロギア的カハル・エクレシア構造』と呼ぶことができよう。」（有賀[1969], p.54）

- 8 . Jaroslav Pelikan, *Christianity and Classical Culture. The Metamorphosis of Natural Theology in the Christian Encounter with Hellenism*, Yale University Press 1993
, *What Has Athens to Do with Jerusalem? Timaeus and Genesis in Counterpoint*, The University of Michigan Press 1997

キリスト教自然神学の原点としての4世紀：ヘレニズムとの出会い

the perennial issue of the Christian encounter with Hellenism, because that has been the historical matrix for the very idea of "natural theology."

the encounter and the synthesis were embodied in the thought of the so-called Three Cappadocians, Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil of Caesarea, and Gregory of Nyssa, and of "the Fourth Cappadocian," Macrine, sister of the last two. ([1993], p.ix)

キリスト教思想史における決定的位置づけ：基本的枠組み

Because of the place of these fundamental assumptions in the dogma of the fourth century and in the dogmatic theology of the Cappadocians, they assumed a position of historical dominance for all the subsequent centuries of the history of the church, up to and including the twentieth century. The controversy between Augustine and the Pelagians, , the efforts in the ecumenical movement to address these problems --- through these historic changes and many others, these "fundamental assumptions which adherents of all the variant systems within the epoch unconsciously presuppose" continued their authoritative hold. (185)

ギリシャの伝統に依拠しつつそれを批判する

Each of the three (or four) Cappadocians stood squarely in the tradition of Classical Greek culture, and each was at the same time intensely critical of that tradition. (9)

哲学的伝統への高い評価・継承

It was a favorite device of the Cappadocians to recite a catalog of the Greek philosophical schools, (19)

there was probably no writing within the Platonic corpus that stood above Timaeus for sheer importance in Cappadocian thought, and not only because both Basil and Gregory of Nyssa were authors of Christian cosmogonies bearing the title Hexaemeron in which Timaeus and Genesis were played off against each other in continuing dialogue. (20)

The natural theology of the Cappadocians, and of the Greek Christian tradition as a total

enity from the Patristic through the Byzantine period, was the product of these encounters with Hellenism (21)

哲学者の自然神学と神話的寓意的神学との区別

They also distinguished,...,between the "myths" of Greek religion and literature, ..., and the "natural theologians" among the Greek thinkers. The Christian encounter with Hellenism had to do primarily with these "natural theologians." (24)

On the positive side, this method of apologetics proceeded by attempting to tease out doctrines that were, however indistinctively, implicit in the natural theology of the Greeks.(28)
弁証としての自然神学 (Natural theology as Apologetics)

As apologetics, the natural theology of the Cappadocians was, in the formula of Gregory of Nyssa quoted earlier, a "moral and natural philosophy" (30)

The apologetic method of pointing out parallels but also contrasts between Christianity and Classical culture, and then of tease out the truth in the parallels, suited the doctrinal realm at least as well as it did the ethical. (31)

Gregory enumerated four specific doctrines of Classical philosophy, sound in and of themselves

doctrine of the immortality of the soul / God / creation /
a good and powerful divine providence (32)

前提としての自然神学 (as Presupposition)・対異端論争 (一神教内部での論争) 異端に対する論証のための諸前提

Just as that modern change of presuppositions was associated at least in part with a transformation in the audience to which theology, especially natural theology, was being addressed, so the continuities as well as the discontinuities between Cappadocian natural theology as apologetics and Cappadocian natural theology as presupposition were rooted at least in part in the shift of audience brought about by the revolutionary political, ecclesiastical, and cultural events of the fourth century, as these have been described in the preceding chapter. (186)

the Cappadocians' consideration of the Christian case against Greek philosophy had much in common with their presentation of the orthodox case against heresy. That was particularly true of their use of natural theology as presupposition. There were also, of course, presuppositions in their arguments against heresy, (186)

The difference was that the orthodox drew the correct trinitarian and christological conclusions from this shared Christian presupposition while the heretics did not. (186)

Yet from these same grounds, Gregory insisted in his later *Refutation* against Eunomius, it was possible to argue in such a way as to validate the orthodox doctrine. His first premise seems to have come also from natural theology:.... The second premise came from revealed theology.

divine apatheia and unchangeability (189)

Gregory of Nyssa was also the most explicit about the place of presuppositions in a theological system. (192)

異端の体系：誤解された前提・誤った推論

From a mistaken "presupposition" heresy could proceed "by logical consequence" to the conclusion of its false doctrine. (194)

The heretical systems also illustrated that it was possible, while holding to valid presuppositions, to draw false conclusions from them. perhaps because they had been negated or distorted by other invalid presuppositions. The confession of God as Maker was an a priori presupposition on which all of Christian thought, but also the best of Classical thought, could agree.

"The divine nature,...., always remains the same,....," was a valid and universal teaching both of natural theology and of revealed theology. (194)

弁証としての自然神学と前提としての自然神学との相補性

What might have been sufficient for natural theology as apologetics was insufficient for natural theology as presupposition in church dogmatics.

For all four of the Cappadocians, Nicene orthodoxy presented itself as a system that was simultaneously "congruous" with the presuppositions of natural theology and "consistent" with those of revealed theology. (195)

the first an exercise in apologetic theology and the second an exercise in systematic theology. In fact, the points that Athanasius had set forth as conclusions in the apologetics of the first went on to become presuppositions to help shape the systematics of the second. Almost a century earlier, a similar complementarity between apologetic theology and systematic theology had manifested itself,...., in Origen's two speculative masterpieces, *Contra Celsum* and *On First Principles*. (37-38)

ギリシャ的自然神学の変貌としてのキリスト教自然神学

What the subtitle of the entire book is calling "the metamorphosis of natural theology" is to be seen in the subtle and complex interactions of this natural theology as apologetics with this natural theology as presupposition. For in the Classical systems, natural theology tended to present itself primarily as an alternative --- or even as an antidote --- to the cultic practices and sacred narratives of traditional religious observance. Its principal expositors were not the official spokesman for traditional observance, nor the priests of the cult, but lay philosophers and apologists, and sometimes opponents and critics who were akeptics or agnostics or even atheists.

But at the hands of such thinkers as the Cappadocians --- who were philosophers and apologists and yet at the same time priests and prelates, but neither opponents nor critics of the orthodox cult --- natural theology underwent a fundamental *metamorphosis*. It became not only an apologetic but a presupposition for systematic dogmatic theology. (38)

For it was characteristic of this Christian philosophy, by contrast with the antireligious or even atheistic philosophy and natural theology of Classical thinkers, that it could be accommodated to the faith and understanding of simple believers. (180)

(4) 広義と狭義の自然神学

9. ペリカンの議論から、キリスト教自然神学とは何か。

自然神学は異文化に対する弁証（古典文化への弁証）と異端に対する論駁（教会に対する教義学）という二つのフロントにおいて成立し - 「二つのフロントの戦い」(ibid., p.199) - 、これらを相互に関連づけている神学的思惟である。

キリスト教神学は論理の整合性を基本とする自然神学的合理性との一致と、啓示内容への相関性という二つの条件によって規定される。「カッパドキアの四人のすべてにとって、ニカイア的な正統主義は、自然神学の諸前提と〈一致〉すると同時に、啓示神学の諸前提と〈首尾一貫〉した体系として存在しているのである」(ibid., p.195)。自然神学は啓示神学の内容を弁証あるいは論駁という場において合理的に展開するという課題を担っており、そのために有効な概念構築が試みられたのである。

自然神学は、弁証と論駁という他者とのコミュニケーションにその成立の場を有しているものであり、自然神学は、この意味において、キリスト教思想のコミュニケーション合理性の問題と解することができる。「キリスト教神学は、古典文化の最良のものとの間で、多くの他のアプリアリな諸仮定だけでなく、〈神〉や〈神的自然〉の定義をも共有しているという点を前提することができたのである。キリスト教神学は、それらの仮定や定義と正統主義とが〈首尾一貫〉し〈一致〉していることを、ギリシャ的体系と他のキリスト教の諸体系とに対して弁護する義務を負っていたのである」(ibid., p.196)。

10. 神学に普遍的な問いとしての広義の自然神学（理解と論争の前提）

弁証と論争の合理性の基盤として

西洋キリスト教神学の特殊な文脈において展開され、典型的な模範的な例と考えられる狭義の自然神学