

## 導入 2 宗教言語とメタファー

< 前回 > 民族と宗教

民族：自然と文化（現実と虚構） 古さと新しさ

課題としての民族

社会的構想力

宗教言語・メタファー論

< メタファー論に向けて >

Jürgen Moltmann, *Erfahrungen theologischen Denkens. Wege und Formen christlicher Theologie*,  
Chr. Kaiser 1999.

Theologische Erkenntnistheorie (S.139-165)

他なるもの・異質なものの認識プロセス

区別（区別 1）	より大きな類似	より大きな区別（区別 2）
異	同・類似	異
虚構と現実とは異なる	虚構と現実の相互依存・絡み合い	それでも虚構と現実とは区別されねばならない

< メタファー論の前提・背景 >

現代思想と言語論

共通認識：言語から人間・社会を論じる

cf. ドイツ観念論

意味と指示の区別、言語の階層性（語 / 文 / 文章 / テキスト）

< メタファー論 >

Michael A. Arbib and Mary B. Hesse

*The Construction of Reality*, Cambridge University Press 1986

( 1 ) 区別 1 : 伝統的古典的な言語論（伝統的な隠喩論）とその問題性

隠喩は、指示機能を有しない（現実について語らない）、真理には関わらない、装飾的語の置き換え、意味のずれ・偏差

理解するにはもとの字義的意味を復元すればよい

宗教言語は、主観的・情動的

rejection of the literalist view of language as an ideal static system with fixed meanings

Metaphors have as such no truth value and therefore no cognitive value in expressing knowledge of the world.

to suggest on the contrary that metaphor after all has cognitive status is to question the grounds of most of applied logic and semantics. Nevertheless, if we are to make any sense of

most everyday speech, let alone the language of ideology and religion, we must give some cognitive status to metaphor. (148)

To understand the connection between scientific realism, the positivist theory of knowledge, and the literalist view of language, we need to go back to the seventeenth-century scientific revolution and beyond that to Aristotle. Much of Aristotelian philosophy was discredited and explicitly rejected by the pioneers of modern science, but his theory of language remained essentially unscathed. In the seventeenth century, the rise of science was accompanied by the conception of an "ideal language"..... The metaphor of "two books" is pervasive:

Bacon: *Natural and Experimental History*

Leibniz: *characteristica universalis*

cf. Umberto Eco, *La ricerca della lingua perfetta nella cultura europea*  
Roma-Bari, Laterza 1993

The notion of an ideal language perfectly reflecting the world has a philosophical pedigree going back at least to Aristotle.

Aristotelian world in which all objects and events fall into complexes of a finite (though perhaps very large) number of fixed species or natural kinds. This is exactly the world Aristotle adopted for his ontology...

nature as a treelike hierarchy of species and genera (149)

formal analysis of language in terms of precise and stable meanings. In this formal analysis, metaphoric uses of words are in some way improper or deviant. If metaphor is to be taken seriously, it implies changing meanings; in a literalist theory, however, there is no room for understanding metaphor as implying continual shifts of meaning, because literal meanings are either constant, that is univocal, or equivocal. (150)

( 2 ) 類似 ( ブラック、ヘッセ/リクール/レイコフ、瀬戸 )

隠喩の認知機能・現実の再記述、隠喩的真理

発見的機能、世界の見方を教える ( これまでとは別様に )

メタファーの認知機能、再記述、発見的

～と見る ( 世界を別様に見る、ユートピア機能 )

「である」と「ではない」

現実・真理概念の拡張

人間の現実認識・現実構成 ( 理解 / 行為、理論 / 実践 ) のしくみ

We are going to argue for a nonliteralist theory of meaning and metaphor compatible with an account of language as rooted in schemas. Specially, we argue for the thesis that "all language is metaphorical." (150)

Lying behind this notion of "proper" and "improper" application of terms, and behind almost all subsequent discussion of metaphor, is an Aristotelian philosophy of universals. Universals are the correlates in reality of the "proper" use of universal terms; it is therefore at this level that the significance of metaphor must be analyzed. An alternative to the Aristotelian theory of universals can be found in Wittgenstein's (1953) account of "family resemblances"(FR)...

Understood in terms of this FR analysis, metaphorical shifts of meaning depending on similarities and differences between objects are pervasive in language, not deviant, and some of the mechanisms of metaphor are essential to the meaning of any descriptive language whatever. This is what is meant here by the thesis that "all language is metaphorical." (152)

The thesis that all language is metaphorical rejects this classical analysis to highlight the fact that explicit use of metaphor and simile are themselves based on the most fundamental linguistic fact of all --- namely, that linguistic reference always depends on perceived similarities and differences. ... metonymy (parts/whole, effects/causes) ... We assume that "all language is metaphorical" in a fundamental sense that underlies all meaning tropes; but this is only the beginning of our problems. (153)

Our starting point is Max Black's interaction theory of metaphor as modified in the light of Wittgenstein's FR. We use the term meaning loosely as an inclusive term for reference, use, and the relevant set of what Black calls the "associated commonplace" ... called up by metaphoric usage. (154)

We saw that if "truth" is understood in the sense of ideal correspondence and if it has the meaning in propositional logic, then metaphorical utterance are effectively equivocal in meaning, have no truth value, and do not permit deductive inference. But we have abandoned strict correspondence and deduction, except as special limiting bases; it thus remains to find a new sense of "truth" more adequate to the new view of meaning and language. (154-155)

the use of metaphor in language has the functions not only of extending meaning and defining new meanings but also of the interaction and redescription of domains already seen through one metaphor frame in terms of another. Such redescription can have disruptive effects on previously complacent ways of looking at the world.

Lakoff and Johnson: "Argument is war" ( *Metaphors We Live By*, The University of Chicago Press, 1980 )

Metaphor is potentially revolutionary. (155-156)

In such cases, the question "Which metaphor is true ?" cannot expect a single or simple answer. There is no "fact" to which "argument" corresponds that has the natural character of "war" or "logic" or "negotiation." The extended metaphors are not in that sense true or false but are appropriate or inappropriate, more or less revealing, more or less useful, depending on the context of application and their coherence with evaluative judgements made about particular situation. (156)

Metaphor causes us to "see" the phenomena differently and causes the meaning of terms that are relatively observational and literal in the original system to shift toward the metaphoric meaning. ... In terms of the metaphor, we can find and express deeper analogies between diverse phenomena; or, of course, in the case of bad metaphors we may find we are misled by them. (156)

This interaction view of theoretical models is compatible with the thesis that observations are theory laden. It entails the abandonment of the a two-tiered account of language in which some observational uses are irreducibly literal and invariant with respect to all changes of the language

and content of explanatory theory. The interaction view sees all language, including the scientific, as dynamic. (156-157)

(3) 区別2

- ・ 神の国とは何か。イエスの譬えと言葉の出来事 (Sprachereignis, Wortgeschehen)  
神の国の譬え
- ・ 宗教的実在とは如何なるリアリティか  
常に新しくあるために、古い地平を絶えず越えてゆく推進力としての宗教的実在  
究極的目的の具体的提示・神の国
- ・ 現実の見方と関連した自己のあり方の転換、つまり救済的機能

In the metaphorical view, logical consistency is no longer at the heart of language. Rather, as we in our discussion of Piaget, the reconciliation of logical discrepancies assumes a driving role for change of meaning; similarly in science, we reconfigure both theory and observation language to allow us to describe and explain a wider range of phenomena. This does not mean, however, that the metaphoric view entails abandonment of logic and deduction in science. Indeed, we may see this as chief distinction between use of metaphor in science and in poetry. Good poetic metaphors are initially striking, unexpected, and perhaps shocking. They extend and ramify by association and analogy not by logic..... Scientific metaphor, on the other side, may be initially unexpected; once established as useful, however, they are extended and developed by logic as well as by analogy. They are meant to be internally tightly knit by logical and causal interrelations. (157)

Scientific theory provides constructed models of scientific reality that are distinguished from other types of social and poetic construction by being constrained by feedback loops involving experimentation in the natural world. (159)

Scientific models are a prototype, philosophically speaking, for imaginative creations or schemas based on natural language and experience, but they go beyond it by metaphorical extension to construct symbolic worlds that may or may not adequately represent certain aspects of the empirical world. These symbolic worlds all share with scientific models the function of describing and redescribing the world; and for all of them it is inappropriate to ask for literal truth as direct correspondence with the world. Symbolic worlds differ from scientific models, however, in that it is not their function to represent the state of the natural environment for purposes of prediction and control. As their functions differ, so their means of validation will also be expected to be different. (161)

< マクファークのモデル論 >

McFague, Sallie (1987): *Models of God. Theology for an Ecological, Nuclear Age*, Fortress Press  
(1993): *The Body of God. An Ecological Theology*, Fortress Press

複数性と相対性、相補性

cf. 概念的表現の一義性・体系性

神学する新しい感受性

### 神学言語の隠喩的性格

「神学とは構成的で隠喩的なものであるが、それは<非神話論化>を行うのではなく、<再神話論化>を行うのである」(McFague[1987],p.32)。

### 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。

### 隠喩・モデル選択とその条件(伝統と状況)

「相関の方法」の定式(ibid.,p.41)

「最近の四半世紀におけるイエスの譬え解釈が明確に主張しているのは、イエスの譬えが期待と慣習的な道徳的規範とを流動化と混乱を通して転倒させるということである」(ibid.,p.50)。

母・恋人・友としての神(God as Mother, Lover, Friend)

### <文献>

1. 神野慧一郎編 『現代哲学のバックバーン』 勁草書房 1991年  
「プロローグ - 一九世紀後半の歴史的背景」「インターリユード(1) - 主として二〇世紀前半にむけて」「インターリユード(2) - 主として二〇世紀後半にむけて」「エピローグ - 哲学的分析はどのような貢献をなしうるのか」
2. 飯田隆 『言語哲学大全』 勁草書房 1987-2002年
3. 星川啓慈 『言語ゲームとしての宗教』 勁草書房 1997年
4. 瀬戸賢一 『レトリックの宇宙』 海鳴社 1986年  
『レトリックの知』 新曜社 1988年
5. 佐々木健一編 『創造のレトリック』 勁草書房 1986年  
ブラック、ピアズリー、サール他
8. 芦名定道 『ティリッヒと現代宗教論』 北樹出版 1993  
「宗教言語と隠喩」(pp.155-196)  
<http://www.bun.kyoto-u.ac.jp/~sashina/sub6.htm>
9. 宗教学における隠喩・象徴  
宮家 準 『宗教民俗学』 東京大学出版局  
竹沢尚一郎 『象徴と権力 儀礼の一般理論』 勁草書房  
脇本平也・柳川啓一編 『現代宗教学2 宗教思想と言葉』 東京大学出版会