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＜前期内容＞
1. 宗教史と現代（問題提起のために）
   スピリチュアリティと神秘主義
2. 宗教経験とその評価基準
3. 宗教経験と認識論、その合理性
4. 宗教的多元性とその理論形成
two important distinctions

One is historical, between pre- and post-axial religion
the other, within the latter, between on the one hand the human religious institutions, and ,
on the other, their living heart (3)

the transforming idea of a radically better possibility
the real possibility of a radical transformation of human life
the sense of being a unique responsible individual (6)

the institutional balance sheet
the mixed black-and-white picture (11)

Religion as institution is the subject-matter of the academic study of religion. (11)
it is within this mystical dimension that we must look for the kinds of religious experience in
which we are to be interested here. (13)

1. 考察の範囲の限定と、その中で現代の宗教状況をどのように捉えるか。

プレ基軸時代とポスト基軸時代
宗教的伝統の重層構造と遠近構造

2. 宗教における制度的外的側面と信仰的内側面

もちろん、両者は不可分であり、相互に影響し合っているが。
制度から内の信仰へ
この視点の移行は多元主義の議論にいかなる関連性を有するか

the massive subjective turn of modern culture
this New Age spirituality as 'spirituality'
the inner aspect of religion, the individual's response to the Transcendent

the word becomes so vague and indefinable as to be of no serious use.
the 'sift from religion to spirituality' runs alongside a continuing widespread belief in God. (18)

What I want to examine is the 'inner aspect of religion' in the sense of religious experience or
mysticism. The term 'mysticism', however, also needs some clarification. (19)

Pseudo-Dionysius
Julian of Norwich
William James
The Advaita Vedanta philosophy
Radhakrishnan
the great advatic (non-dualist) Shankara
John Scotus Eriugena, Meister Eckhart
the notion of unity is being used here metaphorically, not literally. For Christian belief maintains a
fundamental distinction between the eternal Creator and the creature. (23)

Bernard of Clairvaux
agreement of wills
the human person's being remains
St. John of the Cross
Neo-Platonism, theosis (24)

the Sufi mystics of Islam
Rumi (25)
Sufi mysticism is essentially love mysticism
mutual love presupposes two personal centres of consciousness

Kabbalah
Scholem
while it could be, as many strands of mystical thought teach, that our ultimate state will be one of
total absorption (or re-absorption) in the Ultimate, the Real, this must lie far beyond this present
life. (26)

epipistemology

To be conscious is to be experiencing.
Religious consists in modifications of consciousness.
an experience is a momentary or prolonged modification of consciousness.
a part of our stream of consciousness.
the impact of our physical environment
many are created by ourselves

our central question in this book is going to be whether some of all religious experience is
veridical and, if some, how the veridical is to be distinguished from the false.

religious experience
that is structured in terms of religious concepts or consists in religious images. (27)
in a thoroughly secular culture which rejects religious ideas and belief, the Transcendent
nevertheless impacts people's minds and affects their lives in moral or political rather religious
terms. (28)

these two aspects of religion, spirituality and the institutions, are mutually dependent. But the
spiritual life, the transforming personal response to the Ultimate, is the living heart of religion.
(37)
openness to the Ultimate that I am calling spirituality, or mysticism
The central question
authentical
self-delusion (38)

3. 現代におけるスピリチュアリティの動向→Part II + III, 17-18
近代社会における形態変化、近代は宗教に何をもたらしたか
個と共同体の関係性の変化
個人主義と共同体主義、大衆社会論
トレルチの類型論の改訂

4. 神秘主義への注目→宗教経験の諸特性
神秘主義は、宗教、とくに日常的実践に対していかなる意義を有するか。典型か逸脱か

（2）宗教経験とその評価基準（Part I）
an enormously wide range
from the sublime to the ridiculous and beyond that to the positively evil (39)
religious experiences as such are not always authentic. (41)

Such criteria
in relation to mystical experience with its claim to an authority by-passing that of the ecclesiastical authorities.
St. Teresa of Avila (41)
conformity with Holy Scripture. But this was not sufficient by itself.
appealed to ordinary common sense as a second criterion
using her reason
the even more important universal criterion, common to all the great traditions, both theistic and non-theistic, has always been the observable spiritual and moral fruits of the experience in the individual's life.
Matthew 7:18
This was how Teresa authenticated her own experience. (42)

Within Islam the criterion is again practical.

The test lies in their behavior.

brain activity, in the area of the brain
this is a long-lasting effect expressed in 'Subsequent persisting positive changes in attitude and behavior.' (44)
Individual and social fruits
During the pre-democratic centuries
the fruits of religious experience
necessarily occurred in the transformation of individuals, but not directly of society.
the wider social fruits of individual enlightenment (45)
In this new situation we see the emergence of the 'political saint' (50)
While the spirituality of the solitary individual and of the enclosed community continue to make a
necessary, but invisible contribution to the welfare of the world, typically today, the fruits of the
religious way of experiencing life, whether or not expressed in religious terms, are to be found in
dedicated social action. (51)
the universal criterion of the authenticity of religious experience consists in its moral and spiritual
fruits in human life.
This fact distinguishes a global recognition of the significance of religious experience from a
moral relativism which requires and indeed permits no criterion of authenticity. (51)

5. 宗教経験の多様性と真偽問題（価値評価）
普遍的基準は設定可能か
伝統的なと普遍的
ポストモダンの問題状況
歴史相対主義と多元性

6. 帰結・結果から（その暫定性　cf. 終末論）
基準を複合的に用いること（優勢順位）
二つの愛（形成と批判、基準と具体化）

（3）宗教経験と認識論、その合理性（Part III, 11-12）
We all believe that it (a surrounding world) exists, and yet we cannot provide any logical
argument to back up this belief.
This anomalous epistemological situation
British empiricist tradition
John Locke (127)
George Berkeley
solipsism, the work of God
David Hume
we believe in the reality of the external world simply because it is our nature to do so and
but as a result of, or justified by, philosophical arguments. (128)
To trust our senses is a matter of what can be called natural belief, or pre-philosophical common
sense. And this natural belief is a pragmatic necessity
G. E. Moore
we know many things that we cannot prove.

Ludwig Wittgenstein

the ordinary knowledge that we all share, and express in the ordinary language that we have in common, neither needs nor is able to be backed up by philosophical arguments.

This ideal sense (Platonic sense of 'know' as a direct vision of truth) would reduce our ordinary use of 'know' to 'believe' and thus rule out our ordinary use of 'know'. It is therefore preferable in practice to mean by it well-justified, or warranted, belief, even though this never amount to the Platonic ideal of knowledge.

implicit principle by which we life all the time
This is that we accept what appears to be there as being there, except when we have reason to doubt it. (129)

We normally trust our experience
This is not a blind but critical trust, always in principle open to revision.

a difference between illusion and delusion
We live all the time by a trust which is the most basic kind of faith. And we do not feel any need to justify it --- which, as we have seen, is in any case not possible. Critical trust, then, is part of our working definition of sanity. We would count as insane someone who lacks it.

Why, then, sould not this principle of critical trust apply to apparently cognitive experience generally, including religious experience? (130)

the naturalistic thinker
there are, from a naturalistic point of view, good reasons not to trust it.
These 'good reason' lie in the differences between sensory and religious experience.

universal (recognisably the same world) / not universal (131)
not compulsory

very largely uniform / an enormous variety of different forms within different religious cultures, both around the world and through the ages mutually conflicting reports (132)
even within the same religion, ... there are differences some of which amount to contradictions. (133)

taking religion globally, the problem of diversity is real. And so the fact that sense experience is compulsory, hence universal and globally uniform, whereas religious experience is neither compulsory nor universal nor uniform constitutes a strong argument for the conclusion that the critical trust principle cannot be applied to both. (135-136)

Epistemologists distinguish three main positions concerning the relation our conscious experience of the world and world of which we are conscious.
One is naive realism. (137)
As the extreme opposite of naive realism is the 'idealistic' which holds that the perceived world exists only in our consciousness, or rather in my consciousness since the other people with whom I interact are also part of my perceived world. (137-138)

The third, middle, position is critical realism. Its basic principle goes back beyond Immanuel Kant, the most influential philosopher of the modern period.

to signify a realist affirmation of a world existing independently of us while recognising the creative contribution of the mind to our awareness of that world. This have been amply confirmed since and has become long established in cognitive psychology and the sociology of knowledge.

In speaking of experience as interpreting in the sense in which we are all the time interpreting the impacts of our environment upon our senses. And I am using 'meaning' to mean (among it's many meanings) the character of a sense of affairs in virtue of which we can act and react purposefully within it. (138)

The basic structure of meaning is integral to our human nature as part of the world; but the further and 'higher' levels of meaning are created by our culturally formed creative imagination. Wittgenstein

'seeing as'

As Wittgenstein says, we 'see' it as we interpret it. We can readily expand 'seeing as' into 'experiencing as', using all the senses in concert, as we do all the time in daily life.

Wittgenstein did not take this further step.

But I think that he was mistaken at this point.

Experiencing-as is recognising something as having meaning in the sense that we can behave appropriately in relation to it. (139)

experiencing-as, using our conceptual resources to find meaning in the world as it presents itself to us.

some of our concepts ... are almost universal, but very many others arise out of, and are part of, the development of human cultures.

there are culture-specific concepts, as well as the globally operative ones that Kant identified.

We normally live on the situational level of meaning.

we are aware of different layers or levels of meaning.

An empirical situation may also have the higher level of meaning moral significance

we feel some degree of moral obligation arising from our common humanity. For ethical meaning is essentially social, concerned with our relationships with other people as people.

And it is a 'higher' level of meaning in the sense that it presupposes empirical meaning. For there would be no ethical meaning without empirical situations to be experienced as having this further kind of significance. (140)

yet another of meaning
nature mysticism
the physical situation is experienced as having religious meaning.
the purpose and 'rightness' of everything (141)
the religious imperative was not an alternative to the purely moral imperative, but a further
dimension of meaning. This further dimension is, for those who experience it, the ultimate
horizon in the expanding circle of meaning.

This hierarchy of levels of meaning is correlated with a hierarchy of degrees of cognitive freedom.
a greater degree of freedom in our awareness of the ethical significance of situations (142)
We have an even greater degree of cognitive freedom in religion.
the teaching of each of the world faiths that the divine reality does not force itself upon us, but
leaves space for an un compelled response on our part.
God must be initially at a distance of us --- not a spatial distance but a distance in the dimension
of awareness
In order to give us that freedom, God must 'stand back' as, in Martin Luther's famous phrase,
deus absconditus, the hidden God.
Pascal, sign (143)
Hugh of St. Victor
Sufi
John Oman (144)
This is why experience of the Transcendent is neither universal nor uniform. It is not universal,
because it is not forced, or does not force itself, upon anyone.

My conclusion is that the obvious differences between sensory and religious experience do not
constitute a valid reason to rule out the latter as delusory. It is entirely reasonable, rational, sane,
for those who participate in what is apparently an awareness of the Transcendent to believe, and
to base their lives on the belief, that in living as physical beings within the natural world we are
at the same time living relation to a transcendent-and-immanent reality whose presence changes
the meaning for us of everything that we do and that happens to us. (145)

7. カント以降の実在論
批判的実在論
カント主義的な宗教哲学の可能性
8. 経験の解釈学的意味論的構造
階層性の意義（自然／文化・社会／宗教）
これは生の次元論へ精密化できるか、あるいはこれ自体が一つの生のモ
デル化（類型・要素から構造へ）にとどまるか
この階層構造の起源は？ 近代的？

9. 批判的信念としての合理性
it is generally best to remain within one's inherited religion, tying both to live it out fully and yet at the same time to take part in its continual development and reformation. However, today more people than in the past are actually aware of the reality of faiths other than their own.

the new multi-faiths Western societies

Which religion?

for those for whom it is a genuine question, how can it be answered? If given an open choice, which multi-faith religious education makes more possible than in the past, it is a matter of temperament and preference --- cultural, aesthetic and philosophical as well as spiritual.

I believe that the factors involved are so complex, and often incommensurable, that no overall ranking is realistically possible. We can identify particular respects in which at a particular point in history one tradition is at some point manifestly causing more harm or doing more good than some other, ... Taking them as historical totalities, at any given time they may be at different stages of their development. (148-149)

we have to face the fact that it reports different and incompatible transcendent realities, giving rise to different and incompatible belief-system. (149)

It is sometimes that each faith is an answer to a different question. But this is misleading. The concepts and the paths are different, but for each the basic question is, in the generic sense of 'salvation' that I have indicated, What must I/we do to be saved? (150)

I have argued that both exclusivism and inclusivism are manifestly inadequate. The basic reason for this is that equally intelligent, informed, genuinely religious, and morally and spiritually advanced people belong to different faith traditions. This fact alone is enough to lead us to religious pluralism, because it is incompatible with both exclusivism and inclusivism.

But there are many forms of religious pluralism. (154)

Multiple aspect pluralism, Peter Byrne
Polycentric pluralism, Stephen Kaplan, Mark Heim

like Kaplan's religiously neutral hypothesis, Heim's distinctively Christian and trinitarian theory does not help us to find any comprehensive understanding of the relationship between the existing religions. I shall in next chapter what I believe to be a more adequate hypothesis. (161)

a philosophy of religious pluralism

The Transcendent

The premises:

1. it is reasonable to believe that religious experience in its different forms around the world is not purely human projection but is at the same time a response to the universal presence
of the transcendent reality.

the religions have as their common criterion the moral and spiritual fruits of the experience in human life.

2. the world faiths are on a par in respect of these fruits. (162-163)

the 'pluralist hypothesis' uses Kant's distinction between the things-in-themselves and their phenomenal appearance.

the only aspect of his philosophy that I want to borrow. I do not need (or want) his entire complex architectonic system of forms and categories. The distinction that I am using was not entirely new with him; but he was nevertheless the most original as well as the most influential philosopher of the modern period,

Thomas Aquinas (163)

Applied to religion, the distinction is between the Transcendent in itself and the various forms in which this is humanly thought and experienced and responded to within the different religions. This does not mean that the Real is an agent causing the many different human images of it that the history of religions records. It means that there is an inbuilt human capacity to be aware of the universal presence of the Transcendent, in virtue of its immanence within our own nature -- indeed according to some traditions an inner unity with the Transcendent -- which is, however, always manifested in particular culturally and historically conditioned ways. (164)

the indescribable nature of the ultimate
ineffable or transcategorical, 'formless'
three 'Bodies' of the Buddha (164)
Maimonides
al-Farabi and Ibn Rushd
Jewish Kabbalist
the mystical Sufi tradition of Islam
Hinduism and Buddhism
Gregory of Nyssa, Augustine, Thomas Aquinas (165)
Nicholas of Cusa, Meister Eckhart, Theologia Germanica
St. John of the Cross (166)

a serious problem
the theologian who declare God's ultimate nature to be beyond human description or comprehension nevertheless profess to know that this same God is ultimately triune, the developed system of Christian doctrine contradicts the principle of divine ineffability. But it is not possible to hold both of these within the same system of thought. (166)

The obvious solution is to see theological formulations, as distinguished from historical statements, as couched in symbolic or metaphorical language.
Pseudo-Dionysius, Denys (167)
His answer is that while the triune nature and 'transcendent Godness' of God as Creator are revealed in the sacred scriptures, its language is necessarily symbolic. The scriptures speak 'by way of representative symbols' and, that 'the Word of God makes use of poetic imagery'. The point of this symbolic language is to affect the hearers in such a way that they are helped to turn their lives towards the Transcendent (168).

Another way of dealing with the problem of theological language is the traditional idea of analogy. But formidable problems beset this venerable idea.

if we know that God is, in his own way, good more than evil, wise rather foolish, etc., we already know more than the doctrine of analogy itself offers.

the concept of analogy cannot produce any knowledge of God's nature, since we have no idea what the analogues in God are of our human qualities.

The outcome seems to be that the categories which in theology and religious practice we apply to the objects of worship do not apply to the Transcendent whether positively or negatively. The use them in that way is a 'category mistake'.

But such attributes do apply to the manifestations of the ineffable transcendent reality to humanity, to the personal deities and non-personal 'absolutes' which are the definable objects of religious worship, meditation and much mystical experience.

the universal presence of the Transcendent both beyond us and in the depths of our being the worshipped deities do not exist apart from the community that worships them. As Eckhart says, 'before there were creatures, God was not god, rather, he was what he was...' (169)

if someone asks how we can validate that common criterion, the love/compassion that is fellow-feeling with others, and seeing kindness as good and cruelty as bad, we can only say that it cannot be proved but that it is a basic and (apart from psychopaths) universal human insight. It is 'properly basic belief' reflecting a fundamental human moral insight.

we have to distinguish between purely formal attributes and substantial attributes (170)
It is the latter that cannot be attributed either positively or negatively to transcategorical reality. But if we cannot know it in its ineffability why suppose that there is such a Reality at all? The answer is that it is that which there must be if human religious experience globally is not purely projection but is at the same time response to a transcendent reality. Given the moral and spiritual parity of the world faiths, that to which they are responding clearly cannot be identified with the object of any one to the exclusion of the others. In Kantian terms, the Real is the necessary postulate, not as he proposed of the moral life, but of the religious life of humanity.

It turns aside the criticism that 'not all propositions reporting experiences of the Real can be true'. For, according to our hypothesis, the different traditions are not reporting experiences of the Real.
in itself, but of its different manifestations within human consciousness. (171)

10. 單行主義、包括主義、多元主義という類型論

11. 適切な理論構築（仮説）を目指して。宗教哲学的課題
仮説と検証
→ 研究プログラムの構築と実施