

<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

International Journal of Sino-Western Studies : A Special
Volume on Celebrating Adjunct Professor David Jenkins (Ph.
D,Th. D, M. Div.) Contributions on the Ethical Dimensions of
Current Social Issues

Nordic Forum of Sino-Western Studies
2020-06-01

Huang , P (ed.) 2020 , International Journal of Sino-Western Studies : A Special Volume on
Celebrating Adjunct Professor David Jenkins (Ph. D,Th. D, M. Div.) Contributions on the
Ethical Dimensions of Current Social Issues . International Journal of Sino-Western Studies ,
vol. 18 , vol. 18 , 1 edn , Nordic Forum of Sino-Western Studies , Helsinki .

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/318752>

unspecified
publishedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

国学与西学
(国际学刊)

International Journal of
Sino-Western Studies

主编 黄保罗
Editor-in-chief Paulos Huang

A Special Volume on Celebrating Adjunct Professor David Jenkins' (Ph. D. ,Th. D. ,M. Div.)

Contributions on the Ethical Dimensions of Current Social Issues

“庆祝大卫·杰更斯教授(哲学与神学双博士、道学硕士)
关于目前流行社会事件之伦理学维度学术成就”专辑

No. 18, 2020

Resume of David Jenkins

Ph. D. , Th. D. , M. div. , Dos. Adjunct Prof. of philosophy and theology in Univ. of Helsinki

David Jenkins was born on August 22, 1946 in Washington DC in the United States of America. He was separated from his birth parents within the first two months of his life due to family matters, being the male twin of Camille Huntley, his sister. He was raised by a U. S. Air Force family, and he lived in numerous places in America as well as in Japan. He attended public schools in Florida, Alabama, and Illinois, graduating from O'Fallon Township High School in 1964.

1964 O'Fallon Township High in O'Fallon, Illinois, USA.

1967 Seminole Community College, Seminole, Florida. (part-time class teaching in philosophy)

1970 Florida Presbyterian College (now Eckerd College), St. Petersburg, Fla. , BA, (published senior thesis "The Marcelian 'ManMan' "). Won Woodrow Wilson and Danforth Scholar designations. (tuition fellowship)

1972 Vanderbilt University (teaching assistant) in Nashville, Tennessee 1970–71 University of Miami (Fla.) (teaching assistant and M. A.

1972–1975 Duke University, Durham, N. C. (pastor in various locations in North Carolina). M. Div, Magna Cum Laude, 1975. (emphasis in ethics and systematic theology. (tuition fellowship)

1975–1976 Eckerd College (Director of Housing), St. Pete.

1976–81 Loyola University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. (graduate assistant in philosophy). Winner of the Schmitt Dissertation Fellowship. Ph. D. 1981 Published "A Polanyian Ethic".

1981–81 Trinity College, Deerfield, Ill. Associate Prof. of Philosophy.

1982–1983 United Methodist Missions, N. Y. , N. Y. , mission training and teaching in Mulangwishi, Zaire (Congo) in philosophy. Medical negotiator for desert health centers.

1983–1985, 1987 Uppsala University, Sweden. Studies in Moral and practical Philosophy. Th. D. 1987. Published "The scope and Limits of John Macquarrie's Existential Philosophy" by Uppsala Press.

1982–1986 Loyola University of Chicago. Part-time teacher in Ethics and Political Philosophy. Daughter Cherie born 1985 while wife Leena worked as an intern at Cook County Hosp. , Chicago.

1987–onward. University of Helsinki, part-time teaching. Courses: Modern Philosophy, Seminar on David Hume, Medieval Philosophy, Hegel and German Philosophy, Phenomenology, Existentialism, Existentialist Ethics, Philosophy of Law, Philosophy of science and Advanced Philosophy of science, the Political Philosophy of John Rawls Vs. the Political Philosophy of J. P. Sartre, Christian Ethics, Sociological Philosophy, Philosophy of Religion, Contemporary Anglican Theology, The theology of John Macquarrie, the Hermeneutical Philosophy of Paul Ricoeur.

1995 Became Adjunct Professor (Dosentti) at the University of Helsinki and full time Teacher of The English School. Permanent English School courses, repeated each year: Religion (studied as a cultural phenomenon), Lutheran Church History, Christian Ethics, Finnish Religious History, Religions of the World, Intro to Philosophy, Philosophical Ethical Thought, Metaphysics and Epistemology, Introduction to Ethics, Ethical Issues, and, one course I developed, Symbolic Logic.

2008 Teacher at The English School and teaching docent at the University of Helsinki until retirement in 2008, though teaching continues in the university. Many public appearances and conferences. Published "Ketä Hoidetaan". Interchurch activities.

2014–2020 Assistant Pastor of St. Matthew's Lutheran Fellowship.

国学与西学：国际学刊（半年刊）

第十八期：二零二零年六月

主编及出版总监

黄保罗（上海大学特聘教授，芬兰赫尔辛基大学国学与西学北欧论坛主席/博睿《中国神学年鉴》英文版主编）

网络电子版（www.SinoWesternStudies.com）和微信版（国学与西学国际学刊）

副主编：肖清和（中国：上海大学历史系副教授），苏德超（武汉大学哲学学院教授）

执行编辑

包克强（美国：康耐尔大学历史系副教授），英语

陈永涛（金陵神学院副教授、博士），汉语

郭瑞珠（澳大利亚，西澳大利亚大学神学系研究员，珀斯），英语

陈杰（武汉大学哲学学院），微信版编辑

K-H. Johanna（芬兰 TD 出版公司编辑），英语

Jørgensen, Knud（挪威神学院兼职教授），英语

丁雨珊（武汉大学哲学学院），微信版编辑

学术顾问（以姓氏拼音为序）

陈来（清华大学国学研究院院长、教授）

戴德理（美国：世华中国研究中心主席）

格勒格森（丹麦：歌本哈根大学系统神学教授）

汉科克（英国：牛津亚洲宗教社会研究院院长）

郭齐勇（武汉大学国学院院长、教授）

江怡（长江学者教授、山西大学哲学系资深教授）

赖品超（香港中文大学文学院院长、教授）

罗明嘉（芬兰：赫尔辛基大学系统神学系主任、教授）

麦格拉斯（英国伦敦英王学院，神学、宗教与文化中心教授、主任）

南乐山（美国：波士顿大学神学学院前院长、教授）

施福来（挪威：斯塔湾格神学与差传学院教授）

孙向晨（复旦大学哲学学院院长、教授）

田默迪（奥地利维也纳大学哲学博士、澳门圣约瑟大学哲学教授）

王晓朝（中山大学哲学系珠海校区教授）

王学典（山东大学儒家高等研究院执行院长、教授、《文史哲》主编）

魏克利（美国伯克利神学研究院教授 / 香港圣公会大主教之神学及历史研究特别顾问）

杨富雷（瑞典：哥登堡大学教授）

杨熙楠（香港：汉语基督教文化研究所总监）

杨熙生（北京大学高等人文研究院世界宗教与普世伦理中心主任、教授）

张福贵（吉林大学文学院院长、教授）

钟鸣旦（比利时：皇家科学院院士、天主教鲁汶大学汉学系主任、教授）

张志刚（北京大学宗教文化研究院院长、教授）

钟志邦（新加坡三一神学院前院长）

卓新平（中国社会科学院学部委员、中国宗教学院会长、教授）

特约评委（以姓氏拼音为序）

爱德华多·丹尼尔·奥维耶多（阿根廷 科技研究委员会研究员、罗萨里奥国立大学教授）

曹剑波（厦门大学哲学系教授）

陈建明（四川大学道教与宗教文化研究所教授、主任）

陈声柏（兰州大学宗教文化研究中心副教授、主任）

樊志辉（黑龙江大学哲学学院教授、院长）

高师宁（中国社会科学院世界宗教研究所研究员）

李向平（华东师范大学宗教与社会研究中心教授、主任）

梁工（河南大学圣经文学研究所教授、所长）

刘家峰（华中师范大学基督教研究中心教授、副主任）

刘建军（东北师范大学教授、社科处处长）

宋刚（香港大学文学院助理教授）

王志成（浙江大学基督教与跨文化研究基地教授、主任）

游斌（中央民族大学哲学及宗教学学院教授、副院长）

亚达夫·阿润·库玛尔（印度新那烂佛教大学巴利语和佛教助理教授）

张先清（厦门大学人类学及民族学系教授、主任）

赵杰（山东大学哲学及宗教学系教授）

赵林（武汉大学欧美宗教文化研究所教授、所长）

朱东华（清华大学哲学系副教授）

封面题款：刘大钧（中国周易学会会长，山东大学终身教授）；封面设计：黄安明；本刊 logo 取自汉砖图案，一首两翼四足一尾的飞龙，象征中国精神体系的实然形象。

引用索引：本刊已被收入芬兰艺术 & 人文学索引（芬兰国家图书馆）、美国宗教学 & 神学提要数据库（www.rtabstracts.org）、科睿唯安新资料引用索引（ESCI, Clarivate）和美国神学图书馆协会数据库（ATLA RDB ©, www.atla.com）、the Bibliography of Asian Studies, EBSCO's Academic research database as a part of a collection of Ultimate databases, SCOPUS, Globethics.net library (a journal collection and the Online Chinese Christianity Collection / OCCS), ELSEVIER and DOAJ (<http://bit.ly/1IPWhdD>), European Reference Index for the Humanities and Social Sciences (ERIH).

International Journal of Sino-Western Studies (IJS) (Semi-annual)

No. 18: June 2020

Editor-in-chief and Publishing Supervisor:

HUANG Paulos (Ph. D., Th. D., Distinguished Prof., Shanghai Univ., Chairman of the Nordic Forum for Sino-Western Studies, Finland, and Chief editor for Brill Yearbook of Chinese Theology, Leiden & Boston)

Vice-editor-in-chief for Electronic Version (Online: www.sinowesternstudies.com)

XIAO Qinghe (Associate Professor, Ph. D., Dept. of History, Shanghai University, China)

Vice-editor-in-chief for Wechat Version (Guoxue yu xixue guoji xuekan)

SU Dechao (Professor, Ph. D., School of Philosophy, Wuhan University, China)

Executive Editors

BARWICK John (Associate Professor, Ph. D., Department of History, Cornell University, USA), English

CHEN Abraham (Associate Professor, Th. D., Nanjing Union Theological Seminary, China), Chinese

GUOK Rose (Researcher, University of Western Australia, Perth, Australia), English

CHEN Jie (Researcher, School of Philosophy, Wuhan University, China), Wechat version editor

JORGENSEN Knud (Adjunct Professor, Ph. D., Norwegian School of Theology, Oslo, Norway), English

K-H Johanna (Editor, TD Publishing Company, Helsinki, Finland), English

DING Yushan (Researcher, School of Philosophy, Wuhan University, China), Wechat version editor

Editorial Advisory Board (in alphabetical order)

CHEN Lai (Prof. & Dean, Institute of National Studies, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China)

CHOONG Chee Pang (Previous Principal, Trinity Theological Seminary, Singapore)

CHRISTIAN Matthias (Prof. of Philosophy, St. Joseph University, Macau/Ph. D. Vienna University, Austria)

DOYLE G. Wright (Director, Global China Center, Virginia, USA)

FÄLLMAN Fredrik (Researcher, Dept. of East Asian Studies, Göteborg University, Sweden)

GREGERSEN Niels Henrik (Prof., Dept. of Systematic Theology, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark)

GUO Qiyong (Prof. & Dean, Institute of National Studies, Wuhan University, Wuhan, China)

HANCOCK Christopher (Director, Institute for Religion and Society in Asia, Oxford, UK)

JIANG Yi (Prof. & Dean, School of Philosophy, Shanxi University, Taiyuan, China)

LAI Pan-chiu (Prof. & Dean, Faculty of Arts, Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong)

LAITINEN Kauko (Previous Director of Confucius Institute in the University of Helsinki / Director & Professor, Finnish Institute, Tokyo, Japan)

McGRATH Alister (Professor & Head, Centre for Theology, Religion and Culture, King's College, London, UK)

NEVILLE Robert C. (Prof. & Previous Director, School of Theology, Boston University, Boston, USA)

RUOKANEN Miikka (Prof. & Head, Dept. of Systematic Theology, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland)

STANDAERT Nicolas (Member of Belgian Royal Academy of Sciences; Professor & Director, Dept. of Sinology, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium)

STRANDENAES Thor (Professor, School of Mission and Theology, Stavanger, Norway)

SUN Xiangchen (Prof. & Dean, School of Philosophy, Fudan University, Shanghai, China)

WANG Xiaochao (Prof., Department of Philosophy, Zhuhai Campus, Zhongshan University, Zhuhai, China)

WANG Xuedian (Prof. & Executive Dean, Advanced Institute of Confucian Studies, Shandong University and Chief editor for Wenshizhe [Literature, History and Philosophy], Ji'nan, China)

WICKERI Philip L. (Prof. of Interdisciplinary Studies, the Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, CA, USA / Advisor to the Archbishop on Theological and Historical Studies, Hong Kong Anglican)

YANG Xusheng (Prof. & Director, Institute for Advanced Humanistic Studies, IFAHS, Peking University, China)

ZHANG Fugui (Prof. & Dean, School of Humanities, Jilin University, Changchun, China)

ZHANG Zhigang (Prof. & Director, Academy of Religious Studies, Peking University, Beijing, China)

ZHUO Xinping (Prof., Institute for World Religions Studies, China Academy of Social Sciences / CASS Member / Chairman, Chinese Association for Religions Studies, Beijing, China)

Special Reviewers (in alphabetical order)

CAO Jianbo (Prof., Dept. of Philosophy, Xiamen University, Xiamen, China)

CHEN Jianming (Prof. & Director, Institute for Daoism and Religious Studies, Sichuan University, Chengdu, China)

CHEN Shengbai (Prof. & Director, Center for the Study of Religion and Culture, Lanzhou University, Lanzhou, China)

FAN Zhihui (Prof. & Dean, Faculty of Philosophy, Heilongjiang University, Harbin, China)

GAO Shining (Researcher, Institute for World Religions Studies, China Academy of Social Sciences, Beijing, China)

LI Xiangping (Prof. & Dean, Center for Religion and Society, East China Normal University, Shanghai, China)

LIANG Gong (Prof. & Director, Institute of Biblical Literature Studies, Henan University, Kaifeng, China)

LIU Jiafeng (Prof. & Vice-Director, Center for Christian Studies, Central China Normal University, Wuhan, China)

LIU Jianjun (Prof. & Director, Council of Research, Northeastern Normal University, Changchun, China)

Oviedo, Eduardo Daniel (member of the Argentine National Research Council (CONICET) and Professor at University of Rosario, Argentine)

SONG Gang (Assistant Professor, School of Humanities, Hong Kong University, Hong Kong)

WANG Zhicheng (Prof. & Director, Institute of Christian and Cross-Cultural Studies, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China)

Yadav, Arun Kumar (Prof. Dr., Department of Pali, Nava Nalanda Mahavihara University, India)

YOU Bin (Prof. & Vice-Dean, Faculty of Philosophy and Religious Studies, Minzu University of China, Beijing, China)

ZHANG Xianqing (Prof. & Director, Dept. of Anthropology & Ethnicity, Xiamen University, Xiamen, China)

ZHAO Jie (Prof., Dept. of Philosophy, Shandong University, Ji'nan, China)

ZHAO Lin (Prof. & Director, Institute for European and American Religious & Cultural Studies, Wuhan University, Wuhan, China)

ZHU Donghua (Associate Professor, Dept. of Philosophy, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China)

Calligraphy of journal title by Prof. **LIU Dajun** (Chairman of the Chinese Yiching Association, Shandong University). Cover design is by **Joonatan Anming HUANG**. The logo of journal is taken from a Han Dynasty brick carving. It is a flying dragon with one head, two wings, four feet and one tail; and it symbolizes the reality of Chinese thought.

Index: This journal has been indexed by Finnish National Library, Religious & Theological Abstracts (R&TA), Clarivate the Emerging Sources Citation Index (ESCI), the ATLA Religion Database © (ATLA RDB ©, <http://www.atla.com>), the Bibliography of Asian Studies, EBSCO's Academic research database as a part of a collection of Ultimate databases, SCOPUS, Globethics.net library (a journal collection and the Online Chinese Christianity Collection / OCCO), ELSEVIER and DOAJ (<http://bit.ly/1IPWhD>), and European Reference Index for the Humanities and Social Sciences (ERIH).

目 录

Contents

卷首语 From the Editor's Desk *

黄保罗, 李天纲	只有中西兼容, 方能成为大家	1
Paulos HUANG	Only with Chinese and Western Compatibility can a Scholar become a Real Master	
Tiangang Li	20

人学、神学与国学 Humanities, Theology, and Chinese National Studies

David JENKINS	The Limits of Education and Technology for Ethical Thinking	25
大卫·杰更斯	教育和科技对于伦理思考的局限性	38
Miikka RUOKANEN	Remarks on Tuomo Mannermaa's Interpretation of Martin Luther's Lectures on Galatians	39
罗明嘉	评析曼多马对马丁·路德《加拉太书讲义》的诠释	63

实践神学与中西教会和社会 Practical Theology and Sino-Western Views on Church and Society

冯建章	公民宗教之道场建构研究	67
FENG Jianzhang	A Study on the Construction of Civil Religious Dojo	76
Matthew OSEKA	How the Emerging Protestant Theology Took Shape in the Reformation Concept of Theological Studies as Enunciated by Philip Melancthon in His Prolegomena to All Latin and German Versions of Loci	77
岳诚轩	如菲利普·墨兰顿在其对所有德语和拉丁语版本的 LOCI 前言中所阐明的那样, 新兴新教神学关于神学研究的改革概念是如何形成的?	99

中西经典与圣经 Chinese and Western Classics and the Bible

Donald WANG	Spirit in Atrahasis	103
王东	《阿特拉哈西斯》中的灵观	111
赵盼	“不变”与“万变”: 陈崇桂的圣经诠释与中国社会的努力	113
Pan ZHAO	Unchangeable and Changeable: Chen Chongui's Biblical Interpretation and Chinese Society	123

教会历史与中西社会 Church History in the West and in China

孙尚扬	全球化与 Modernity: 略论澳门在早期中欧文化交流中的桥头堡地位	127
郭建斌	
Shangyang SUN	Globalization and Modernity: On the Bridgehead Status of Macau in the Early Cultural Exchange Between China and Europe	136
Jianbin GUO	

刘诗伯	教育人类学视角下的民族教育史一例	137
Shibo LIU	An Example of Ethnic Education History from the Perspective of Educational Anthropology	145

比较宗教文化研究 Comparative Religious and Cultural Studies

戴永富	“窥视诸神的诞生”:对偶像崇拜的形成的一个哲学诠释	149
Leonard Sidharta	“Looking Into the Birth of Gods”: A Philosophical Interpretation of the Origin of Idolatry	158
刘君君	中希传统的两种诠释	159
Junjun LIU	Two interpretations of Chinese and Hebrew traditions	166

书评与通讯 Reviews and Academic Reports

Jing LIU	ACADEMIC NEWS PART ONE: A Review on the Joint International Conference of Nordic Forum of Sino-Western Studies and 20 th International Symposium on Bicosmology	169
Miao JIANG	PART TWO: A Report on the International Research Project Regarding the Topic of the Impact of Religious Values on Chinese Social Life	174
刘伟冬	论耶可比小说《沃尔德玛》中的爱的哲学	177
Weidong LIU	The View on the Philosophy of Love in Jacobi's Novel Woldmar	185
黄保罗、李焯昌	文学作品、人文经典、神的话语、还是神人交碰的记录?	187
Paulos HUANG	Is it a literature, humanistic document, the Word of God, or a record of God-man interaction? A Dialogue on the Hebrew Biblical Studies?	218

投稿须知 Notes for Contributors 220

注释体例及要求 Footnote Format and Requirements 224

* Neither English abstracts nor key words are provided for the foreword from the editor's desk, book reviews and academic reports.

卷首语 From the Editors' Desk

只有中西兼容,方能成为大家^[1]

黄保罗,李天纲

摘要:本对话首先从李教授个人如何走上学术研究的道路谈起,分析了阅读经验和1972年尼克松的访华事件所引起的社会性思考之后,追溯和探讨了从1976到1979年的高考与上海留城经历而走向逍遥派的思想发展历程,而复旦大学历史系的四年学习,导致了向古今中外四个方向推进的学术路径。而通过对中国近代历史、宗教和上海史的研究,特别是旧金山大学利玛窦中西文化历史研究所与《礼仪之争》和马相伯研究和《徐光启全集》编撰,发现了中学与西学不但不冲突,而且是相互发挥,相得益彰的“互补”概念。而“儒家的傲慢”与“儒家过分的人性乐观主义”都与简单和单一的理解彼此有关,特别是孟子升格运动混淆了原儒/古儒与今儒的区别,而利玛窦则为中国带来了双重文艺复兴,今天国学的讨论中有必要区分“绝对的神人关系”和“相对的人在这个世界的关系”,对于问题不要简单地本质化。关于国人对西学的理解,特别要批判性地分析章太炎的东方主义与梁漱溟的简单本质化,而欧洲《圣经》研究的历史和形式批判法与中国民初的疑古运动之间的关系及康有为孔教运动的问题也值得关注。

关键词:儒家过分的人性乐观主义、中西兼容、章太炎的东方主义与梁漱溟的简单本质化、欧洲《圣经》研究的历史和形式批判法与中国民初的疑古运动之间的关系、康有为孔教运动

作者:黄保罗,哲学与神学双博士,上海大学特聘教授,《国学与西学国际学刊》和《Brill Yearbook of Chinese Theology》主编。电子信箱:paulos. z. huang@gmail. com;李天纲,1957年生于上海,现任复旦大学哲学学院宗教学系教授、系主任,利徐学社主任,中华文明国际研究中心副主任。博士生导师,中国宗教学会理事,上海宗教学会副会长。电子信箱:tgl@fudan. edu. cn

黄保罗(简称“黄”):今天是2018年5月30号,在上海师范大学,非常高兴和复旦大学宗教学系主任李天纲教授一起来做一个对话,天纲兄,非常感谢您抽时间来做一个对话。

李天纲(简称“李”):谢谢保罗兄,认识那么多年,还要那么正式地来讲一个话题。

黄:是。今天主要想围绕三个话题,我来讲一讲,一个,请您回顾一下自己的人生经历和求学经历,中间有哪一些比较有意思的或者重要的事件?导致您或影响了您走向今天来做这个学术研究,这条路。这是第一件事情。

第二件事情,您主要的研究有哪些问题,或者您的成就成果,主要关注的东西。

第三点,就是在中国所谓的大发展的今天和全球化的世界语境,这两个相碰撞的这样一个特殊语境中,中国现在特别强调国学、传统的复兴,然后我们来看看在这种语境中,所谓的国学和西学的发展,应该走向什么前途。我们从第一个问题谈起。

李:三个问题,我们慢慢地讲。第一个问题,关于个人的经历,少讲一点,讲讲我们后面的学术性问题。

[1] 对话于2018年5月30号在上海师范大学进行,黄保罗负责成文,李天纲校对。

一、您个人如何走上学术研究的道路?

黄:您可以讲,比如您哪一年在哪里出生的,您的基本经历。

李:我是 1957 年 10 月出生在上海。小时候的生活还算安定,我们那一代人的父母都会参加社会运动。父亲下乡参加的“血防”“四清”等运动我还是记得的,但 1964 年读小学时上海还是平和稳定的。出幼稚园,进小学都是按部就班,开开心心。1966 年,“文革”开始的时候我八岁,小学二年级,然后就是一个“乱”字。一直到中学毕业,学校就不是以学习为目的那种上学,早期常常上街游行,后来天天开会。我的中学在上海是 75 届,但毕业不是 1975 年,宕了一年,1976 年进工厂工作,没有下乡。大学停考,有“七二一”大学,还有复旦这样的大学都只招工农兵学员,所以必须先去做工。有一年忽然说“大学还是要办的”,于是,大家都在等,苦巴巴地等。

黄:您说的那个中学是高中,还是初中?

李:那时候不分高中、初中的,“文革”中上海带头搞“九年一贯制”改革,小学五年,中学四年,结果“大跃进”那年的生育潮爆发,中学没有校舍,小学生都待到“七年级”。然后 1972 年初,进了中学,其实就是三年多吧。中学不分初、高中,就是因为要打破“文革”前的学制,为“文革”而文革,搞“教育革命”。

阅读经验

黄:十几年没有正常教学,那你们是怎样阅读、学习的呢?我晚几年参加高考,真的很好奇你们这一代学者是怎样从“文革”中走出来的,后来还能接续学术,从事研究。这里面有些什么重要事件记得比较深呢?对您的思想发展影响较大。

李:我的阅读开始较早,父母有自己的报纸、刊物,也为我们订《小朋友》杂志。幼儿园时已经能读小学二、三年级的课本了。没有正常的课堂教学,不等于没有书读。环境当然是“读书无用论”,社会上确实不鼓励读书,但家长还是抱着希望,希望孩子念书。念书待在家里,至少可以不到外面去闯祸了嘛。“文革”动乱,确实很不安全。记得那几年的孩子都在弄堂里玩,从黑龙江插队和农场回来的孩子,尤其学会了摔跤、练武,因此打架的都有。但我的少年生活和其他同学稍有不同,我把大部分时间花在学校里,干什么?就是玩呀!学校所有的器具,单杠、双杠、气枪、篮球、乒乓球,都可以玩。老师叫我们几个“小干部”看护学校,我们就在空空的学校里尽情玩。我从三年级起打篮球,小、中学校队,工厂时参加厂队,大学时做系体育委员,我们系的篮球、足球、排球都不错的。“文革”中我们家并没有受到冲击,父母填表是“城市平民”、“职员”,他们这个年龄档都是要求“进步”的。“文革”初是保皇派,但很快就解脱了。父亲 1974 年在奉贤科技五七干校劳动时心情很不好,发病去世。但我们孩子感受到的气氛,并不像是受迫害。在父母的呵护下,身心都没有受到大的伤害,今天看来还算是健康、阳光吧。

黄:考大学之前,您读书,您有没有什么特殊的情况?读些什么书?中国的古典或者小说还是什么?

李:我们这些“新三届”考上大学的人,读书确实有些特殊的经历。大概来讲,一般家里都保留了一些书。运动高潮过后,上海稍稍稳定,喜欢读书的孩子就交换家里的书读。一本好书,如《红与黑》、《牛虻》、《约翰·克里斯朵夫》等被列为“进步”的作品,是可以暗中拿出来读的。后来新印了像《第三帝国兴亡史》、《基度山伯爵》等作品,更是开放的。“文革”后期,上海编辑、翻译、出版了一大批“白皮书”,有苏联文学《车间主任》、《多雪的冬天》、《回忆与思考:朱可夫元帅回忆录》等,这些书一个礼拜可以周转三次。说起来都是抓到什么读什么,不成系统,没什么选择,但确实是如饥似渴地读。上海有好几位同年龄段的学者、作家朋友,如陈丹燕、张献、吴亮、孙甘露都写过自己的“文革”阅读经历,都差

不多。印象深刻的几本工具书如《读报手册》、《各国概况》,提供了一些百科知识。还有1972年以后提倡“学理论”,重印了范文澜的《中国通史》,中央编译局的《马克思恩格斯选集》(四卷)。父亲是上海纺织科学研究院工程师,楼上的阿姨调到了复旦大学党委工作。大的文教单位分派着买书,我们家买了就是我在啃。那时倒还真不是翻阅,是啃的。只是方法不一定对,老师、家长辅导不足,最终也就了解个大概。年轻人好奇心强,什么都想知道,不知道的就遐想。后来进大学了,我们那几届没有下乡,留在上海考上大学的学生,对照了一下,读的书都差不多。没有学校的系统教学,学文科也没有“家学”传承,是个缺陷。但是,读书不用考试,凭兴趣读书,读得津津有味,也是真的。要说我个人还有什么特殊的读书经历,就是我上面讲的,我在学校找到了堆满一房间的图书仓库,把小学、中学图书馆下架的书,能读的都读了。我出生到三岁以后,家里从虹口搬到了母亲工作的吴淞,我就读的淞兴西路小学原来是中纺公司的子弟学校,是1930年代的老学校。说起来,上海大公司的子弟小学,比不过老牌的名校,但常常是好过一般的公、私立学校的,校舍、操场、器械、图书、实验室都很全。以前说资本家剥削工人,其实职员、工人的福利是不错的,子弟学校从幼稚园,到小学、中学、职业学校都是配齐的。我们那个小学设施很好的,老师把钥匙交给我们,让我们看管学校。“文革”来了,图书馆里面的书全都下架,堆满一间大仓库。这些书都需要清除“封资修”,经过审查才能加以“利用”。打开仓库,“老鼠掉在米缸里”,这么多书可以读,有时干脆不回家了。很多个夏日,都是晚上在仓库里的竹塌上,就着电灯泡,边读边睡,直到天明。《安徒生童话》、《伊索寓言》的插图本,深一点的《十万个为什么》,都是在这个仓库里读的。进了中学以后,图书馆准备开放,陆续上架新书。放学后就去图书馆帮着老师补书、包书、理书。记得新书如李约瑟《中国科学技术史》,鲁迅的杂文集单行本《华盖集》、《呐喊》等,郭沫若的《十批判书》、《甲申三百年祭》,他考证的《胡笳十八拍》,还有张春秋、姚文元在“文革”前的文集《访苏见闻杂记》、《照相馆里出美学》等,都是在中学图书馆读的。那时候,对郭沫若的文史学问还是蛮佩服的,和老师一起讨论鲁迅、郭沫若谁第一。到大学里才知道,很多人读书都讨论这个话题。吴淞三中是一所1960年代新建的学校,一幢苏式的四层楼。设施和师资都是新的,图书馆几乎没有线装书,旧平装也很少。我拿来背诵的《古文辞类纂》、《古文观止》是家里自有的,上海世界书局的平装本。还记得《鲁仲连义不帝秦》、《五柳先生传》、《伯夷颂》等文章的片段,就觉得古人怎么都很有气节。还有,在中学图书馆仔细读了《上海的故事》、《上海外滩南京路史话》,日后研究上海历史就很容易。

黄:据说“文革”中还有一种“地下阅读”。

李:对的,上海的73届到76届中学生,就没有“老三届”那样“一片红”上山下乡,一部分55到58年出生的中学生留城了。高层陷入内斗,运动也在僵持。社论、号召早已无人关心,现在看起来那种无政府状态下,也呈现了一些社会空间。大城市里堆积了无数年轻人,无所事事的居多,但也有积极阅读,听听靡靡之音,聊聊文艺的,甚至还有在苦闷中想想问题的,当时叫做“逍遥派”。我们这一批“红小兵”,基本上就属于那种没有“豪情壮志”的人,又是少数。后来所谓的“地下阅读”,在这一群体中间流行较广。相比较而言,“红卫兵”下乡知青在农场、集体户的阅读条件就不及留在城市的。越往后,越多的“知青”回到上海,情况变得有点崩溃。彷徨、焦虑、无助感非常普遍。我这个年龄段的还好,大龄青年就绝望得多。就业、健康、婚姻、住房问题很大。“无聊才读书”,沉闷的气氛,反而助推了城市阅读生活。说“地下阅读”有点不确,“文革”后期的上海,其实什么书都是可以读的。侠义、言情、侦探、鸳鸯蝴蝶派,都在流通中看过,顶多用书皮包起来。问题是你手上还有什么书?找得到什么书?苏联作品《青年近卫军》、《卓娅与舒拉》、《钢铁是怎样炼成的》很容易得到,但巴金的《家》、《春》、《秋》三部曲,矛盾的《子夜》就更抢手。要是能找到巴尔扎克、罗曼罗兰的小说,那就是极品。再怎么样的苏联文学比法国文学“进步”,因而更有价值的话,在上海是很少有人相信的。

黄:另外还有手抄本。

李:对,手抄本也是地下流传的,什么《一只绣花鞋》、《梅花党》等,晚上乘凉的时候,讲讲恐怖故事,吓吓小孩子可以,文字水平都很差的。好一点的《第二次握手》,“文革”后还出版了,就是这水平。

尼克松访华后的社会变化

黄:这个阅读经验是很重要的一件事情,那有没有什么其他的事件?包括在您的家庭生活、个人生活或者是作为老师、朋友的生活,或者是国家大事的一些事件,在您的心中产生一个比较重要的影响的?

李:我这个年龄,印象最深的是中学一年级时的 1972 年春天尼克松访华。事先在上海市民中传达、培训、教育了差不多一个月,弄得人人都知道美国人回来了。那天美国代表团访问东海舰队,“帝国主义”的车队从市区下来,从校门口经过去吴淞军港,前呼后拥,兴师动众。上海的老一辈人知美、亲美,再怎么批判也没有用,民间气氛一下子松动了。正式的气氛虽不是友好,但已经不是敌对。家里是订了《参考消息》的,读报道就知道另一个时代要来了。上海人都说,美国人把卫星地面站都建在七宝了,中美关系肯定是要转好了。不久,“最大的走资派”邓小平又回到中央,开始了“治理、整顿”。1973 年,新任教育部长周荣鑫说要恢复考试录取大学生,老师们抓功课学习积极得不得了,一下子就重视分数了。那一阵子,看上去“文化大革命”就是快要结束的样子。父亲本来已经把两个皮箱子修好了,准备让我中学毕业后“上山下乡”用。这时却说,还有希望,说不定“文革”这几年真的要结束了。我父亲没有等到“文革”结束,他那时是上海纺织科学院无纺布研究室主任,本来已经是“抓革命,促生产”,发明了多种无纺布,在全国各地的纺织厂推广。结果要带头去“五七”干校,三个月轮期到了没有人替换,结果肝癌发病,1974 年 4 月回来住院诊疗,不久就去世了。父亲是边学徒,边补习,永安公司的资方和“公司合营”后的党团组织都培养他,脱产学习到纺织工业学校中专,毕业后进了纺织研究院。我们家亲戚朋友,多是从常州、无锡出来做纺织业的,祖父、外祖父那一辈,有做公司账房,有开店做小业主,也有做职员。上海待久了,学书画、唱票房的有,但少有靠卖文营生的。上一辈人开始上大学,读的也多是工科,直到 1950 年代才有两个年长的表哥、表姐夫读了复旦大学中文系,工作分配和后来的遭遇都不好。所以家里是不赞成学文科,信奉的是“学好数理化”,靠技术吃饭的生活准则。

黄:那你们的觉悟是比较早,因为上海是大城市,而消息又比较灵通的缘故吧。

李:是的,上海在大城市中是最突出的,一般的教育基础、社会上的文化水平是领先的。我一直以为,上海、汉口、天津等大城市在 1930 年代已经完成了“早期工业化”、“第一次的城市化”,形成了比较完整的城市化生活,有了一个蛮像样的中产阶级生活方式。上海曾经是一个国际化的大都市,在 1990 年代以前一直为中国的城市生活输出活力。后来研究上海文化,为了说服那些总想着要批判老上海的人,就常常说这个看法,说的有点多了。

1972 年以后,形势变化在上海是感受到了。1973 年,上海市革会到中学 73、74 届学生中选人参加外语培训班,将来从事外交工作。这次选拔是革委会造反王王秀珍管的,读书和成分都要好的。班主任纽老师把我报上去了,初选通过。结果选的不是我,说是出身还不够好,同班另一位山东转业军人家庭出身的女同学去了。当时上海各行各业的中下层干部很多“南下”的山东人,子女也比较沾光。

1972 年以后,上海开始编辑、写作和出版新的出版物,有书,有杂志,还有丛书。这些也是我们的“文革”读物。文学有《朝霞》,社会科学有《学习与批判》,介绍西方文艺的有《摘译》。1973 年,上海还出版一套《自然辩证法杂志》,这套杂志令人兴奋。作者都用笔名,如“李柯”什么的,一看就是复旦大学教授们写的。至今还记得几篇篇名,如《宇宙的来龙去脉》、《生命的生生不息》,讲天体物理和相对论,讲生物学进化论。从里面第一次知道了“大爆炸”理论,中学“工基”(数理)、“农基”(生物)教材上是没有的。当时上海的新华书店里开始出售“青年之学丛书”,我们几个“理论学习小组”的同学见一本买一本,《数学》、《物理》、《天文》,后来还有《社会发展史》、《中国近代简史》等,各学科的基础知识都是在校外读物中补上的。那个时候,因为“学理论”的提倡,有一种畸形的钻研兴趣。比如说,《自然辩

证法杂志》上登了一篇《物质的无限可分》，是用“一分为二”说法来讨论物理学的基本粒子问题，所谓“一尺之棰，日取其半，万世不竭”，说就是“物质的无限可分”。因为日本物理学家坂田昌一用“毛粒子”命名某质子，加上杨振宁、李政道回国访问也参加讨论，理论家们就很兴奋。我中学是作物理课代表，借着“学理论”，跟着数学老师啃恩格斯的《自然辩证法》，实在看不懂。但原子、质子、中子、电子概念，还有“波粒二重性”、“测不准”理论倒是好像读通了。原来真是想学理科，因为“化学”啃不下来，只能考文科。进了复旦大学历史系，选择了“中国思想文化史”专业，遇到了朱维铮、纪树立老师以后，才知道“自然辩证法杂志”上的文章正是他们在上海市委写作班子时组稿、修改和定稿的。我凑趣地说，你们既启蒙了我们，也是误导了，他们都会意地笑了，原谅了善意的冒犯。

黄：你的“文革”阅读经验非常有意思，或者是一个“非典”的案例。这令我想起，其实在任何时代，我们每个人都首先是自己的个人。时代和社会一定会影响我们，但我每个人还是会以不同的方式在既定的条件下选择生活，选择思想。可能是因为你的年龄和生活环境，几方面放在一起，促成了成长过程中的独特性。

社会性思考

李：拗不过时代，高考时还是选择了文科，进了复旦大学历史系，继续的是“文革”中的社会思考。和学术有关的社会性思考，出发点也肯定来自于“文革”中的一套说辞，比如“法家—儒家”、“进步—反动”、“生产力—生产关系”。但是我还是很快地意识到，这些话题的意义非常有限，真正的学术不应该在这些问题上纠缠，“文革”后“拨乱反正”要恢复和建树的学术体系要全面得多。大家不是要抛弃“阶级斗争为纲”的思维方式吗？我们这一代学人，当初是想有一个整体性的社会的思考。这种思考有的是回到传统，有的是融入世界，总之是不能低水平地争来争去了。大概是受1972年事件的影响，我们觉得世界展开了，中国和世界的关系需要重新考虑，更加长久的“中西文化”关系需要重新讨论。

黄：当时对传统的认识是怎样的？

李：关于传统文化，当时我们接触到的观点都是批判的。“五四”新文化对传统批判，对“现代性”启蒙，我觉得是很有意义的。但是“文革”中的大批判，扫四旧，表彰法家，歌颂农民起义，主张以暴力清除旧文化，以联共（布）观点来批判中国传统是没有道理的。进大学以前，我们很多人都读过了范文澜的《中国通史简编》。范著是唯物史观，国学根基是很好的，但其中对传统文化如佛教的批判，一看就是教条主义的。

黄：中学就读了范文澜《中国通史简编》？阅读经验已经进入到历史学，真的算比较丰富，看起来上海的文化积累确实比较深。

李：应该就是这样一些原因，近代以来，上海的文化氛围是全国最好的，新文化中心嘛。无论是现代的、西洋的，还是传统的、本土的，上海都有深厚的土壤。还有，家庭、学校和社会的教育，都比较均衡，一般只要资质可以，足够努力，都能完成学业，做点事情。这方面我和批评上海社会和文化的人看法不一样，不是一般的感受，是经过思考的，虽然我也批评上海的很多现象。

黄：您毕业还到工厂待过？上了班？

李：是的，在上海国棉八厂做了三年学徒工，做机修车间的钳工。那一年，已经有不少应届毕业生分配到上海的企事业单位，只有一半的同学去市郊农场工作。我是三兄弟中的长子，因为父亲去世，照顾一点就不分配去农村了。

黄：这是哪一年的事情？

李：1976年春天报到，到9月9日，毛泽东去世时已经在工作单位了。所以说，我至今在国内没有离开过上海居住。出生在江湾医院，家住在吴淞，进工厂也不离吴淞。1979年上大学，是五角场的复旦，再分配工作是在徐家汇的上海社会科学院历史研究所，2003年回到复旦大学。如此说来，除了在美国、法国、香港做访问学者，加起来有4年左右，真的是都没有离开过上海。

黄:您考大学是哪一年? 高考以前,留在上海的经历是否对你的社会思考有什么不同的影响?

李:考大学是 1979 年。1977 年也参加考试的,初试是录取的。母亲当时在同一家工厂的教育科做总支书记,通报的情况是考区第一,政审、外调也做了。最后没有录取,是填报的唯一志愿复旦大学新闻系满了。那一年的想法还是不愿意放弃国营大企业工作,而且年龄比较小,毕业后多半要分配到外地工作。你看,还是不愿意离开上海。看起来是很“小儿科”的心态,但当时上海人十之八、九都是这样想的,“支内”、“回乡”、“上山下乡”搞怕了。本不想啰嗦这些,您要问,只能坦白了给大家,做个时代的标本,被观察一下也好。

黄:最后为什么又考了,考取的是哪个学校?

李:1979 年是第三次高考,仅仅是一年半以后,高考迅速升温。一年多里,舆论转过来大批“读书无用论”,反复宣讲“四个现代化”,看起来社会真的面临变革。记得那年本市积累的报名考生就有 23 万多,复旦在上海只录取 500 人。这次第一志愿是历史系,即使考不上复旦大学,财经学院的文科也要去。那一年复旦大学经济系,上海财经学院各系的取分还是低于文、史、哲专业的。1979 年复旦新建世界经济系招生,这个专业的考分是很高的,考生是识货的。其他如政治经济学、工业经济、经济管理专业,都不高。现在回想起来,当时选择文科还是受到了“文革”话题惯性的影响,没有真正的意识到“改革、开放”开展以后给各行各业带来的变化。

黄:从你的经历来看,在 1972 年,1979 年这些关键节点上比较早的意识到了社会的变化,还是很突出的吧?

李:不是,不是,并不是突出地先知先觉啊,大家都看到了实际情况。“文革”那个样子是搞不下去的,社会一定会变。很多人都在积极应变,不愿做牺牲品。最后几年我在工厂里边干活,边思考,厂里的青工、老师傅都是疏离运动的,有一位参加“一月风暴”,结果进“革委会”的,辞了公司和局里的位置,下来车间学做技术工人。社会面临崩溃是大家看到的,上海市民各种运动经历得多了,就比较有经验。

逍遥派

黄:1979 年,进入复旦大学的历史系,是否有一种“思想解放”的感觉? 原来抱着学好数理化,走遍天下也不怕的想法,是怎么决定考历史系,从事思想文化史研究的?

李:对的,进复旦确实有一种解放感。我对文科还是很有兴趣的,读过复旦中文系的表哥、表姐夫都说历史系学问扎实,周谷城、周予同、谭其骧先生是著名教授,校外都知道。有机会把社会上的散乱阅读,在大学里系统地整理一下,将来无论做什么都有专门知识。很幸运是在“拨乱反正”时期进入复旦,老师都愿意谈专业了,资料室的图书也是外面不常见的,加上非常活跃的“新三届”学生聚在一起,交锋很激烈,学问和思想观念上的进步很大。那时复旦师生之间的关系要比今天密切,一个原因是规模不这么大,像 college 不像 university,系科、大楼、学生和老师都不多,文、史、哲、经、新闻系学生宿舍、教室都挤在一起,交流就比较充分。比如说历史系、新闻系男生都住在 6 号宿舍楼,还合上一节体育课,交往就比较多。新闻系学生入学分数文科最高,更加活跃。但几年学习之后,文、史、哲专业的学生都赶上来了,谈到深入的学术问题反而更活跃、更自信。大约是二年级学完中国通史以后,我就对历史学有感觉了,忽然觉得历史学是文科中的理科,比较严谨,有科学性,决定一直研究下去。

黄:你在“文革”中有三年社会经历,有一定的社会思考,这毕竟和理工科不一样,那是怎样处理的?

李:对的,我们 77、78、79 年入学的,现在被称为“新三届”了,一个特点就是返回校园的大龄学生较多。77、78 级只有很少几个应届毕业生,我们 7914 班已经是近一半应届生,但还有大半是有社会阅历的。年龄从 32 岁到 16 岁,我的年龄中间偏下。读书这事情,也需要童子功,要不断积累和连续思考。大家对“文革”期间的“蹉跎岁月”痛心疾首,也就是这个原因。但是,社会科学不同于自然科学,

它最终是要跳出书本,以社会现象(无论是历史的,还是现实的)为对象。如果历届生的社会阅历,能够帮助打通书本和社会,用社会经历理解书本知识,又从书本知识中理解社会,那校外的经历就不是蹉跎岁月,而是做研究的优势了。也可以这样说,历届生们带着问题回到校园,书本和社会结合好了,就会有好的研究。当然,借用社会阅历搞其他事情,说的是另一回事情。

年轻人都一样,喜欢阅读,常常是想去优游另一个浪漫、虚幻的世界。但是生活很现实,有它自己的逻辑。我们这个年龄的人阅读、思考的时期,全都是在“文革”十年,遇到的一个最大的问题,就是书本和现实很不吻合。大家都说,回到校园发现理想与现实,理论与实践,口号与人心,主义和问题,都是极端的三不一,根本就是两回事情。我们较早地发现书本与现实严重冲突的现象,很多书本理论在生活现实中说不通啊!要想明白的话,你必须独立思考啊!我确实是在工厂的三年里,开始想这些问题。独立思考,首先要有自己的思想基点,不在运动中照着标语、口号,人云亦云。对这些标语、口号背后的主张、概念、问题,以及思想方式都要警惕和怀疑。那我要说,“文革”中有很多人还是清醒的,反而是在社会上,在基层人群中,对历来的运动有免疫力,有超然态度,独立看法和不介入的做法。我觉得“文革”中的“逍遥派”,可以拿来形容这样的态度。“文革”初期有造反派、保皇派,后来出现了逍遥派,而且是多数派。你们的运动,我们不参加,在一边旁观玩自己的。“文革”逍遥派在上海很普遍,有越来越多的人,不愿意参加政治活动。比如上班前都要读报,但心里都烦,就是应付,说怪话,说反话。我后来想明白,近代以来,左的右的,洋的土的,上海的外地的,那么多的运动都在发生,上海人什么没有见过?没有一点逍遥自在的精神怎么能应付?主流人士可能对逍遥派不以为然,以为是老于世故,我却认为这种态度有助于独立思考。到今天我也不愿跟着一个口号,在公开场合相互辩论,对着人呼喊。我愿意在边上听你喊,观察了解,弄明白你背后的想法和逻辑是什么?

黄:这个逍遥派对您产生了影响。那您学历史,在大学的四年里,主要有些什么收获,或者印象比较深的。

复旦大学历史系的四年学习,从您这个环境发现了问题,追它的根源,就走到了历史的这条路线

李:中学生的文科兴趣,一般都是从文学开始,很少人一开始就喜欢历史,更少的人在中学是开始哲学思考。这个和我们中学教育的课程顺序一致,语文、史地,没有哲学,但法国、德国的中学有大量哲学课。因为中学作文每每被老师读,然后搞诗社,油印诗歌集,就想到读新闻、中文专业。但是79年报考时已经知道做学问不是写文章,是要研究问题。这时候在工厂思考的问题确实起了作用,系统地背诵了中国近代史,就在想了,书本上总是说旧中国“一穷二白”,但我们修理的机器是1917年英国制造的,改造改造还在用。事实上,上海的大工业生产很早就发达了,比世界上大多数城市都早,是后来才落后的。

黄:那么老?

李:真的,后来我才查到,上海的发电厂是1882年开办的,就在南京路的华东电业局大楼的地方。我们知道,世界上第一家实验性发电站在巴黎,是1875年。第一座商业性电站在旧金山,还是1879年。那上海电气化的起源和规模,在世界上是名列前茅的。后来还发现,上海远郊朱家角镇的电厂是1902年,金泽镇是1912年。不但如此,老师傅都知道,1928年江南造船厂已经建造过四艘万吨轮,比“文革”前后宣传“国产第一艘”的“跃进号”、“风庆轮”早得多。你再看外滩、南京路,那么集中的大楼,集中了这么多的金融、商业机构,可想当年的规模有多大?所以,历史系师生争论中国社会的“封建”、“小农”落后性质的时候,我就提出不同意见。你不能把上海和全国1930年代的现代化估计得太低,给它安上了“帝国主义”、“洋奴”、“买办”的帽子就不承认了。我后来提出中国有“第一次现代化”,意思是现代化早就开始,并不始于1980年代。但是你去看,至今的经济学、政治学、社会学,甚至历史学家,很多人的研究前提和结论,都没有考虑这个“早期现代化”。历史教科书之所以这样叙述,强调如何地“伟光正”,其实还是一个预定的历史观、意识形态在起作用,是为了完成一个自我设定的逻辑关

系,在作循环论证。

黄:上海确实早就带着中国开始了现代化。你反思了这个问题,把中国的现代性问题推进到更远的历史中去看。你的反思和朱维铮先生很相似,是不是影响到你?他本科就教你了吗?

李:朱老师本科就给我们上课了。他出来上课比别的老师晚,正好是 79 年,上中国经学史、中国史学史。所有老师中间,朱维铮先生对“文革”是最痛心疾首的。他反思“文革”有切肤之痛的,所有同学都感觉到的。朱老师上课,有办法把学术的内容讲学术了,对现实的问题不著一字,但听着就是活生生地与之有关。朱老师对马列经典确实很熟,对整个共产主义运动的反省很深刻,这和历史系其他老师都一样,但更突出。但是,更突出的是他的史学史、经学史讲授,把我们的一些思想困惑真正引到了古籍中间,在学术里面尝到了滋味。《走出中世纪》是朱老师后来结集出版的,但不少段落都在课堂上讲了。登堂入室做学问的时候,好的老师作指引非常重要,他导你深入堂奥。对我来说,朱老师的经学史、史学史、思想文化史,还有我自己从事的中西文化交流史,都是通过朱老师才把一些零星的思考导入完整的学术领域。至今的学术成果,除了上海文化、中国宗教学方面和朱老师的领域稍远之外,很多都是和他讨论,得到他的指导形成的。

怎么又开始“西学”,对西方文化的了解,向古今中外四个方向推进是怎样形成的?

李:四年本科把小学、中学里读过的那些零零散散,断断续续的书,按照自己摸索的问题,做了一个系统的思考和整理。记得本科二年级的时候决定报考研究生,住在留学生楼里,和同班的王立诚、苏勇等人经常讨论,怎样走一条学术新路。这样的独立探讨风气很普遍,北大、华师大等各高校学生也都是这样。学校鼓励本科生就撰写学术论文,我们系 77 级的程洪、马小鹤、刘申宁都是在本科时就在学报上发表文章了。77 级牵头,“新三届”加上 76 级,创办了史翼社,我代表 79 级。好像是因为在“西方史学史”课上的小论文《金字塔下话王权》,被张广智老师挑出来朗读了,推荐登在《史翼》上。“思想解放”运动当然影响很大,但是我仍然对论证像“真理标准”、“历史逻辑”、“农民战争”等一线题目兴趣不大,总觉得还是标语、口号。我还是喜欢找书读,确实是把系资料室,校文科图书馆的西方哲学书尽可能借来读。洛克《人类理解论》、休谟《人性论》、伏尔泰《风俗论》、孟德斯鸠《论法的精神》,除了汤因比《历史哲学》,这些哲学著作历史系学生并不是必读的。因为过去读恩格斯《家庭、私有制和国家的起源》搞不懂,我就趁机找这些书来系统地补读。我课程考试分数不是最高,50 名同学中不掉出前 10 名,但很少前三名,但读书数量肯定是多的。还是像小学、中学时读图书馆的样子读了一些书。

复旦历史系“新三届”有一个特点,好像没有人说过。77 级同学多喜欢中国史,而且是古代史;78 级同学多喜欢外国史,所以拼命啃外语。我们 79 级说不出特点,比较平衡吧,就说是“中西兼通”。我决定做中国,但发现中西隔绝是学者的一大缺陷,中字头学者很少读西书,西字头学者也不太懂国学。历史系一级教授周谷城先生兼写了《中国通史》和《世界通史》是个特例,仅限于教学性的通史。周先生给我们做讲座,说“博大精深”当然对,但做起来非常难。我的想法是先从简单做起,带着一个课题,去了解西方,一边开掘中国,以便融入西方。近 400 年来的欧洲文化已经和中国近代融为一体,影响到上海这样的大城市,不全面和深入地接触西方文化是没有办法解释近代中国的。我的硕士专业是中国思想史,博士是中国文化史,虽然都是中字头,但一直在思考 400 年来中国与西方的关系。本科的时候从中西文化交流史上关注到了徐光启,发现背后的耶稣会士利玛窦。朱老师很厉害,1983 年他就帮助顾廷龙、胡道静先生编辑了《徐光启著译集》。

黄:从中国问题为起点,一面朝外推,另一面又朝上推,从点上突破,慢慢把古今中外四个方向打通,确实是每个人都可以做的。

李:是的,1983 年我考入本系中国思想文化史研究室做研究生,方向是“中国近代思想史”,导师是李华兴老师。硕士论文就做了《基督教传教与晚清“西学东渐”:〈万国公报〉思想研究》,是我排除争

议,坚持要选的题目。这份传教士报纸和清末中国变法思想密切相关,很少人知道,知道了也不承认,不能承认变法和西方宗教活动有关。1994年,我从工作单位上海社会科学院历史研究所回到同一个研究室,跟朱老师读博士,方向是“中国文化史”,论文就做了《中国礼仪之争:历史、文献和意义》,这就是追溯到400年前的耶稣会与中国文化关系了。所以,研究层面就是这样展开,从当下的困境思考开始,然后朝上推,从清末民初,到明末清初,“追求上进”,探寻中国“近代性”起源。同时,也不断回溯同时代的西方文化,作为历史的背景,更作为思想的因子。这样看的话,400年来的所有重要学者和改革思想家,都受了西方文化的影响,仔细查的话,一个都逃不掉。

黄:对,这样就明白了为什么你们要并列着做徐光启、利玛窦的研究,还搞了“利徐学社”。你是学思想文化史的,一直在宗教的课题上打转,对宗教本身有什么思考吗?

李:这正是问题,1986年硕士毕业以后,我实际上已经进入宗教学研究了。宗教问题虽然敏感,但做起来很有突破。《万国公报》研究得到了答辩组唐振常、罗竹风、陈旭麓等先生的肯定。朱老师后来告诉我,谭其骧先生任主任,复查本系本届的论文质量,该论文是优秀的。论文把梁启超说的“西学东渐”上推到伦敦会等传教士,但这个突破太容易了。只要把《万国公报》仔细读一遍,就会有此看法,“突破”只针对了过去意识形态的限制,于思想本身意义不大。我自觉我们这一辈学者,不应该再陷在观念、立场和主张的争议中,仍然去和那么简单的意识形态作战,虽然是一种很有刺激的诱惑。做学术得不到更多的知识收获和心智提升,那是很没有劲的事情。我发现宗教问题值得研究,要说刺激的话,宗教学更有刺激。但是,我的这种看法既对也错。学术肯定应该独立,但意识形态的纠缠其实很难摆脱,做宗教研究更是如此。

二、中国近代历史、宗教和上海史的研究

黄:这样,您的学术框架基本上形成了,我看这三块东西比较明确。一个是近代思想史,然后是宗教,最后怎么还搞了上海史?

李:我们那届研究生毕业分配,可以自寻单位了。我就联系了上海社会科学院的宗教研究所,就是晏可佳兄在任的那个所,介绍信都开好了。答辩的时候,唐振常先生非常喜欢这篇论文,他说“你研究‘西学东渐’,我们这边很需要,应该到我这里来。”唐先生在历史研究所主持工作,图书资料、课题设置、研究时间都更加充分,所以我就去了。唐振常先生是成都人,出身“南唐北李”的士宦人家,抗战时毕业于燕京大学新闻系,是内战时期《大公报》的名记者。“文革”前是《文汇报》文艺部主任,后来反省历史,决计要做上海史研究。他来历史所,是要编多卷本上海通史,为此就先集体写一本《上海史》。唐先生问我愿不愿意兼做一点,不愿意的话只做思想文化史也可以。我回答得不好,居然说“上海历史离得太近,不怎么算学问。但是既然来了,就兼着做吧,反正不难。”唐先生是有名的开明和宽容,不以为忤,还鼓励写出自己的想法。《上海史》原来是按照年代,从鸦片战争到五四运动竖着写,我那一章是横着写,分析了上海的市民社会、知识分子、海派文化和西学东渐等,算是为后来热闹起来的“上海学研究”提出了一些课题和想法。后来结集了《文化上海》、《人文上海》,给《外滩》等大型纪录片做学术总顾问等等,是对唐先生情谊的一点交代。唐先生对年轻人是那种带着大家一起下馆子的好。朱老师,还有元化先生都有这种秉性,让我们在课堂之外的言谈中学到很多。

黄:那怎么办又回到复旦大学,做起了宗教学?这是怎么决定的?

李:1986年硕士毕业以后,朱老师一直让我在他身边,协助编辑《中国文化史丛书》、《中国近代学术名著》,1992年我从旧金山大学回来后,还帮着主持了“基督教与中国文化”、《马相伯集》等项目,好像一直在复旦做事。在历史研究所工作期间,在旧金山大学利玛窦中西文化历史研究所、哈佛燕京学

社做访问学者,在香港城市大学跨文化研究中心做研究院,每次都是一个整年。1994年,朱老师初次公开招考博士生,我就回到原来的教研室在职读博。以副研究员资格读博是反潮流的,当时很多人都在离开学校,出国、下海、调机关,所谓“商品经济大潮”冲击,本专业只有我一人报考,一人录取。

正式跟朱老师做学生之后,要求更高了。原想把为“中国文化史丛书”写的《基督教与中国文化》作为博士论文,但到交卷时觉得手头这种通史型的写作有负先生的期望,在最后三个月内做了彻底改写,成了《中国礼仪之争:历史、文献和意义》样子。素材都是长期积累的,说“十年功夫”也是可以的。朱维铮先生确实是“严师”,他用对自己近乎苛刻要求,以身作则地要求我们。他拿着任何人的稿子,几分钟之内就给出意见,针针见血,让你不得不服。他给新手们改稿子,通篇都是红笔,再读一遍文章一下子就立起来了。朱老师的治学风格,不但影响自己的学生,历史系,乃至文、史、哲系科的学生,读他的书,听他的课,追他的学术报告,都受他风格的影响。朱维铮先生1955年从无锡考入复旦大学历史系,在土地制度史、中国经学史专业师从陈守实、周予同等先生,打下了扎实的学术根基。“文革”后“拨乱反正”,在思想史和文化史领域开拓,朱老师和校内外的一批优秀学者推动了“文化史研究”热潮。我们那几年的学生受到他们的影响,加入到“文化史”研究队伍。

旧金山大学利玛窦中西文化历史研究所与《中国礼仪之争》和马相伯研究

李:1989年的事件以后,学界失望。继80年代初出国潮之后,90年代初又出现了一波留学高潮。我的出国,不是留学,尽管可以转为留学项目,但目的很明确是做研究,肯定要回来的。朱老师联系,和加拿大多伦多大学高等教育研究所合作研究马相伯,项目由美国亚联董基金会资助,委托利玛窦中西文化历史研究所马爱德先生执行,因此去了旧金山大学。和马爱德先生相处一年,交往十年,对我的学术影响也非常大,他让我看到了西方文化一些非常深入的地方,很多中国学者未必能够触摸的。比如他安排我选修USF两门课程的同时,还带我去他义务讲授的社区查经小组活动,令我对天主教社群和圣经内容有了全新的理解。如果说朱老师带我们到中国文化的深处,那马爱德神父在十多年里引导我了解基督教的精髓,了解到宗教生活在欧美文化中仍然具有重要地位。马爱德(Edward Malatesta, 1930—1997)是耶稣会士,他的专业是《圣经》学,曾在罗马传信部大学教授《约翰福音》。因为酷爱中国文化和中国人民,年近五十学中文,创建利玛窦研究所,接续了徐家汇耶稣会士汉学家的工作,集中了很多从上海、巴黎、罗马收集到的档案、图籍、回忆录和各类文献,很快聚集了一批专家学者,成为世界各地的利玛窦研究机构中最有活力的一家。到所之后,马爱德神父向我展示了一批从罗马耶稣会档案馆收集来的有关中国礼仪之争的中文文献,要我做中文译名的回译和订正工作,给一些文献上的建议,就此开始接触到这批珍贵文献。在旧金山,后来在巴黎的访问,我对耶稣会与中西文化交流中的重要地位有了触摸式的理解。上一代学者治学的封闭状态,是随着“开放”政策改变的。朱老师总会语重心长地说,有这样的机会来之不易,我们做中国研究的人,也要多出去,多闻才能多疑、多思,学术才会进步。

黄:您1998年的博士论文出来之后,我记得很快就获得了2001年度香港道风山汉语基督教文化研究所颁发的“徐光启奖”,我们这些基督教神学学者正是在这个时候注意到你的。那你2003年回复旦之前还做了些什么?

李:前面说了,98—99年度,在哈佛燕京学社当了一年访问学者;01—02年度,在香港城市大学,跟张隆溪教授做研究员。张教授从北大到哈佛,博士毕业在UC河滨分校当系主任,学问和研究方法都是一流,他的邀请当然立即就去了。张隆溪教授对“中国礼仪之争”的题目很感兴趣,用他的研究经费聘请了一年。香港回来以后,我决心研究宗教了,就去了哲学系。去哲学系是帮助王雷泉教授负责的宗教教研室,2005年建立了宗教学系。

黄:我们已经在谈第二个问题了,那你的研究成果除了“中国礼仪之争”,随后就是马相伯研究,还有《徐光启全集》的编订,这里面的关系是怎样连接的?

《徐光启全集》

李:2002年香港汉语基督教文化研究所授予“徐光启奖”著作奖之后,刘小枫学术总监和杨熙楠总监要我吧徐光启、李之藻、杨廷筠“三柱石”有关天主教的著述编辑成集,并作出适当的注释。于是,我就正式开始了编订工作,至2007年由该所出版《明末天主教三柱石文笺注》。徐光启不算是一个冷门人物,民国以来一直在纪念这位“科学家”,有时候也谈论他练兵抗清的功绩,是“爱国者”,但作为“儒家天主教徒”的身份,从明末到现在,一直是能隐则隐,可以不讲就不讲。这本合集是把明末三位最重要的天主教徒的思想状况做了披露。很多西哲、中哲的学者都说是第一次读到这些文字,颇感惊讶。就汉语基督教文化研究所来说,是想通过推出这一类作品,引导学术界对400年以来的“汉语神学”做出研究。不过这项工作进展不是很顺,刘小枫的兴趣转移并离开后就停了下来,另外的一本是《汉语景教文典诠释》。2008年,上海古籍出版社后立项了《徐光启全集》,请朱老师和我共同主编。不久,朱老师罹患恶疾,主编工作靠着朱老师的指导,由同门师兄弟一起协力完成。杨熙楠总监信守承诺,仍然从所里有限的经费中挤出一笔资助了编辑费。徐光启陵寝所在的徐汇区和徐家汇街道也资助了部分资料费。历时二年,2012年底《徐光启全集》以十大册的规模出版,我自己编了《徐光启文集》和《增订徐光启年谱》二册。深陷病榻的朱老师,最后看到了我们用超短的时间做出的成果,大家很是欣慰。

黄:你们完成了《徐光启全集》,那杨廷筠和李之藻有全集吗,有人做这个工作吗?

李:非常可惜,他们的文集散落在各处,都还没有编好。徐光启官场地位显赫,教会也是一直利徐并称,后来还有上海显赫的宋家来攀后裔,所以是有人做。其实,李之藻的“西学”翻译之功不在徐光启之下,杨廷筠在天主教义的理解上花了大功夫。但是由于清末民初的学者不了解这些内容,就没有进入到现代学术体系中。近年来学者们慢慢知道了,亚里士多德的《论灵魂》已经被徐光启翻译为《灵言蠡勺》,《论天》被李之藻翻译为《寰有论》,《形而上学》被李之藻翻译为《名理探》,《尼可马可伦理学》被高一志翻译为《修身西学》。这些中文本虽然是摘译、选编和教材,但亚氏的哲学著作已经介绍得相当完整。由于梁启超在《清代学术概论》中的误导,说利徐的翻译,只有天文、历算、地理,不及哲学、神学。学术界信以为真,就不去发掘清理,导致“西学东渐”研究方向偏离。梁启超有错就改,错了就会告诉大家的,但他确实没有发现这个错。

黄:我记得还有一本叫做《超性学要》,是什么样的哲学书?

李:《超性学要》就是阿奎纳的《神学大全》,利类思翻译的。“超性学”是“神学”,“要”就是概要,也就是“大全”的意思。还有一本,叫做《性学初述》,是艾儒略翻译的。“性学”是哲学,“初述”就是导论吧,那就是最早翻译过来的《哲学导论》了。欧洲中世纪哲学,亚里士多德、阿奎那哲学,在明末清初就已经大量翻译成中文,但不为人知晓。这段历史既然已经淹没,那我们从事“汉语神学”研究就要从基本文献入手,这是急不得的事情。

黄:按你的计划,《徐光启全集》完成了,还有什么文献整理计划吗?

李:还想做《马相伯全集》,这也是要完成朱老师留下来的工作。不说是朱老师的遗愿吧,他并没有明确交代。但是,1996年编完《马相伯集》的时候,朱老师和我说过将来编一部马氏兄弟全集。朱老师有这个想法是在他执行主编《中国近代学术名著》丛书的时候产生的。钱钟书先生担任本丛书的名誉主编,他提出要编《马氏兄弟文集》,而我们也觉得马相伯、马建忠二人的学术地位确实很高,而文献却是不足。朱老师曾说,编完了文集,还要继续收集,将来做个全集。

黄:从您现在所看到的,马相伯主要的成就在什么地方?我是指著述,除了活动家、教育家这些方面之外,学问主要在什么方面?

李:马相伯的学问很大,很可惜的是他晚年编订自己文集的文稿,1917年从北京回上海时散失了一次,1937年到南京去以后,不久内迁西南,又丢失了一次。方豪先生重新收集,编辑为《马相伯先生文集》,很不完整。保留较多的是他晚年的演讲、采访记录,和两部有关《圣经》的翻译作品《新史合编

直讲》、《救世福音》。他的早年作品大部分没有留下来,做幕僚时的那些文牍、书信,都没有了。

黄:知道马相伯是耶稣会士神父,这样的书生还做过幕僚?

李:马相伯、马建忠都是李鸿章的大幕僚,他们有书生意气是真的,但可不是只会读书的书呆子。他们在上海洋场长大,办事麻利,当外交官,出使朝鲜、日本,处理棘手的难题。也出访美国、欧洲,处理大合同。还主持招商局、矿务局,都是大手笔的买卖。兄弟两人平时住在上海,一到谈判,李鸿章就把他们召到天津去,只有马氏兄弟能应付各国使节。马相伯通法、英、德、意、日、拉丁、希腊等七国文字,马建忠则是巴黎高等政治学院的博士。

黄:他们弟兄两个都是虔诚的天主教徒,是吧?我知道马建忠是《马氏文通》的作者,研究语法。我是语言学出身的。

李:马相伯虔诚,后来回到徐家汇。马建忠和他们的大哥马建勋就不大虔诚了,都不在教会了。马相伯晚年说《马氏文通》是他和弟弟一起做的,记在马建忠的名下。现在语言学界大概也只能存着这个说法,并不能把马相伯的名字也署上《马氏文通》了。但是马相伯确实整理了《马氏文通》的原稿,早年写作的时候,兄弟两人一定也是一起讨论的。相伯和建忠,被王韬称为一对“难兄难弟”,被侮蔑为“汉奸”,事实上却是近代少见的爱国者。马相伯晚年抱着对社会失望,对教会补赎的心情回到徐家汇,他的补赎工作就是翻译《圣经》。好在这些著作都找到了,可以编辑出版。另外,我们还找到了马相伯自编的《拉丁文通》,加上以前找到的《致知浅说》,我认为这就是 1903 年震旦学院,1905 年复旦公学马相伯用来教课的两部教材。也可以说,我们发现了复旦最早由老校长亲自开设的两门课程,即哲学、拉丁文教学的原样。据此判断,复旦的西方哲学教学比北大“哲学门”早了十多年。

黄:马相伯的学术成就确实被忽视了,经过你们的发掘、整理和推介,他在政治教育和宗教方面的贡献得到了全面的评价。以前真是不知道,马相伯在西学方面有这么深的造诣。

李:欧洲 15 世纪末开始的“大航海”,清末学者称之为“海通”。中国与欧洲“海通”以后的 400 年中,从明末清初到清末民初发生了一股强大的思想文化潮流——“西学东渐”。中国的知识也有回流欧洲的,我们称之为“中学西传”。但是作为中国学者,我们更关心在本土发生的文化变革,也就更加专注于本土人物的思想变化。徐光启到马相伯,加上后来中辍研究的王韬,我把他们算作“西学东渐”中的“三个上海人”。他们的“西学”造诣都是一流的,他们的想法超越时代,历史对他们思想成就却低估了,或者说都是低开高走。徐光启《几何原本》的翻译成就,到清代“乾嘉学派”中才肯定下来,而他的神学翻译成就《灵言蠹勺》,要到我们的《徐光启全集》中才作披露。马相伯是鸦片战争以后最早学习“西学”的人,1870 年代,没有离开过徐家汇,就已经是七国外语在身。马相伯在学界崭露头角已经年届六十,“戊戌变法”前后才被梁启超、汪康年、麦孟华、张元济、蔡元培人发现,奉为导师,跟他学拉丁文。由此,他创办了震旦、复旦,又培养出右任、邵力子、项骧、黄炎培、胡敦复、胡仁源、谢无量、李叔同等,这些“大师”级的人物都称他为老师,这时他已经是七、八十岁的老人了。近代中国学者中间的民族主义情绪非常强,对于“西学”总是那么扭扭捏捏,那些卷入西方知识体系的人物就不太容易被承认。康有为、梁启超、章太炎、钱穆对“西学”阅读后的体会作品,很容易就被人谈论,而徐光启、马相伯这样的人翻译介绍之功,以及他们的深入思考,就常常会被抹杀。其实,读书深入的章太炎,知道“西学家”的甘苦,他曾明言自己推崇“严马辜伍”,重视严复、马相伯、辜鸿铭、伍廷芳的学问。章太炎晚年很多次和马相伯一起出场演讲、签名、开会,都是列名在后。率真学者之间总是谦虚、谦让,专注于学问本身。

中学与西学不冲突,而且是相互发挥,相得益彰的

在跨文化研究中西学术人物的过程中,我形成了一个看法:中学与西学不冲突,两者相互可以兼容,不但不冲突,还可以相互发挥,相得益彰。所以,我甚至冒大不韪,还想对“中体西用”做一个新的解释。我做硕士论文时发现一个问题,原来“中体西用”是主持上海中西书院的著名传教士林乐知和

他的华人同事一起提出来的,比张之洞《劝学篇》借用这个口号早了十多年。我发现传教士版本的“中体西用”不错的,林乐知、沈毓桂说我们要让学生半天学中文,半天学西文,所以是“中西书院”。只有把中文学好了,西文才能学得好。在中文里面把数学、物理、哲学、神学、伦理、法律的概念知识体系建立起来,西文里的知识只是语言、文字不同,学生就容易掌握。如果中文只会讲“洋泾浜英语”,科学、人文都不同,那学的英文也只能做生意的。把现代知识体系,西方思维方式,用中文有效地解释出来,林乐知在《万国公报》公布的《中西书院课规》里说:“中西并重,毋稍偏颇”。用林乐知助手沈毓桂的说法,就是“西学必以中学为本”;用李提摩太的说法,就是“借中国旧有的语言,发扬基督教义;以耶稣真理为骨子,妆饰为中国化。”中西书院创办于1882年,张之洞《劝学篇》刊行于1898年,两者对于“中体西用”的解释有延续性,但志趣却有根本的不同。前者为文化进步主义,后者为文化保守主义。

“互补”的概念

黄:最近一段时间,我写了三篇文章,都是谈“天人合一”问题的。我想从西学的视野来看这个天人合一的问题,这里,我也是主要提出这样一种看法。您看利玛窦时代,在讲到基督教和儒家的时候,有这种补儒和超儒之说,当然中国的儒家可能是因为民族主义的缘故,一听说补儒超儒,特别是超儒,可能会觉得有点被冒犯或不高兴。但现在的话,我将之称为“互通有无”,也就是基督教和儒家,我指的基督教是指新教和广义的天主教,甚至包括东正教,它和儒家来比,这是两个系统,各有所管辖的领域。比如儒家是比较关注此世的生活,基督教也关注此世,但还关注所谓永恒。所以,我就提出“互补”这个概念,这样的话,是不是更温和一些?

李:你讲“互补”,就是说基督教可以“补儒”,反过来儒教也可以“补耶”。先不讲“补耶”,“补儒”的观点是利玛窦和徐光启一起商量出来的,就是他们两个人的文集中都讲了一个“补儒易佛”。400年前的学者提出不同信仰可以互补,这是非常了不起的,那时代可没有“宗教融合”、“宗教对话”的理论。

黄:在“宗教对话”的前提下,我们可以来讲一讲“补耶”,特别是新教,可以用儒家来补充。我研究马丁·路德,儒家里有一些东西是可以来补充新教的。路德有一个“二分法”,他从奥古斯丁和贝拉基关于人的主动性、人的自由意志问题进行讨论。路德和伊拉斯谟有关于意志自由的争论,他的核心点就是讲:在人得救这件事上,在人达到上帝的要求这件事情上,人能不能发挥决定性的作用。新教因为有原罪这一关,强调“因信称义”,所以,基督徒常常就会说,人得救是全靠上帝、全靠信基督,人的行为是没有意义的。

李:新教强调上帝恩典的唯一性,认为人的得救完全是靠和上帝建立了一种直接的关系,因信称义, Bible Only。过分强调了上帝的恩典,有的教派就会把有一些人性、社会性的东西忽视了。人的自由意志完全靠上帝的赋予,并不能通过修行、学习、认知、实践等等环节去加强的话,是会有很大的障碍。我知道,西方有些学者也想引进儒教的修身养性,道德伦理,加强人性,用人性去接近上帝。但是,我本人也对这种“补耶”的做法保持警惕,因为在中国“仁义道德”常常被士大夫、官绅和皇帝操控为“德政”,成为一种社会控制手段,反而束缚了个人的自由意志。

黄:这个“补耶”的做法完全错了,儒教需要发展自由意志学说,增强西方人的信心,用此人性去会合上帝。

李:所以,利玛窦、徐光启等天主教徒,他们接受的阿奎纳理论就很有意义。他们强调人的拯救可以是双向的,天主的恩典自上而下地拯救人类,给人以信仰之心;人的理性,人的自由意志(新教强调)、人的自然智慧(天主教强调)也能不断地完善自我,顺着人性,达成天主性。我在杨廷筠的《代疑编》里读到过这种思想的表述,有些段落从中文一下子看不懂,但回去多看看阿奎那的《神学大全》就理解了。

黄:对的,上边靠上帝的恩典超拔,下边用自己的人性去提升,人和上帝,终将会合。

“儒家的骄傲”、“过分的人性乐观主义”与对人性的简单理解

李:我理解的天主教神学,指明末至今在中国天主教思想中比较流行的托马斯·阿奎那神学,他们主张:天主的显现有两种,一种是他自身存在的显现,这是永恒的,亘古不变,无时不刻,无所不至的存在,你们新教比较强调这样一种超然的上帝存在。另一种,则是天主在造物的同时,赋予了大自然、生物自然和人类以不同的天主性,并以“人是万物之灵”的设计,赋予人性以智慧,并通过这种智慧,发展人的善心,扩展人的知识,提升人的能力,最终达成对天主的完美。从这两种天主性来看,新教比较强调上帝的“临在”,面临他时的认真虔诚的“惕惕然”;天主教教义则放松一些,他们当然也是认定上帝的“临在”,但更主张在生活中发现天主,在人性中培植超越性。这种天主性,我能不能说是一种“性在”?即基于人类本性的上帝性存在。我们可以看到,天主教神学和儒家思想在“临在”与“性在”的结合上很接近。利玛窦发现,儒家“五经”,即如《易经》、《诗经》、《尚书》中的“上帝”,威仪万状,奖善惩恶,是一种“临在”;至于宋明理学中的“上帝”,通过大自然的“理”、“气”,化为人类的“性”、“心”,如此则成为一种“性在”。当然,利玛窦本人,以及他以后的耶稣会士一派,对于宋明理学的“性在”能不能作为天主性是有争议的。但是这个争议在“中国礼仪之争”把儒家学说摊到罗马的宗教裁判所之后,那些主张自然神学的哲学家们如莱布尼兹、伏尔泰等人认为儒家思想在“上帝”观念上的纯洁性是没有问题的,甚至是优于欧洲信仰的。从“临在”和“性在”的两种天主性来看,新教与宋明理学思想比较隔膜,而天主教就比较能够理解。明末徐光启、李之藻、杨廷筠之所以能够喜欢上利玛窦,我觉得和天主教义有这个特征有关系。双方后来都意识到,拉丁民族和我们江南地区的社会思想中,都有一种类似的“人文主义”,在气质上接近。

我是从历史学进入基督宗教研究的,不会单单从教义上来理解天主教、新教,而是联系每一次的社会变动来理解不同时期的神学发展。历史地看基督宗教,他有教义上的延续性,更有对于各种思想的包容性,不能本质化地认为基督宗教内的天主教是一种思想,新教又是另一种思想。然后,学者们又想当然地认为:儒家是一种“天不变,道亦不变”的东方思想,与基督宗教完全不一样。所以,我非常不赞成把儒家定义为“内在超越”、“人文精神”,别人就不是!中国的佛教不是,西方的天主教、新教不是,他们都是“外在超越”,都没有“人文精神”。我觉得这是一种本质主义,原教旨主义。事实上,基督宗教教义既讲“临在”,也讲“性在”,既有虔敬精神,也有人文精神。中国原教旨主义者强调的儒家“内在超越”的优越性,其实并不是一种绝对的存在。先秦儒教经典中早有“上帝”的“临在”,中国佛教思想中也有“性觉”的“内在”。要我说的话,当代新儒家发明那种本质化了的“内在超越”说法,只是宋明理学中的阳明心学强调的一些特点,并不是中国思想的全部。而且,这种儒家思想优越性的说法,本身就是来华天主教耶稣会士和欧洲启蒙思想家讨论中国信仰合理性的时候发明出来的。它本来是顺着西方近代“人文主义”思想而来的,中国学者把它接过来又去抵御西方、颠覆基督宗教,好像在逻辑上就说不通。

顺着这种本质主义化的理解,认为儒家思想最高明,别的都不行,佛教不行,道教不行,基督宗教更不行,我把这种想法称为“儒家的骄傲”。儒家的骄傲不是后来才有的,它是在汉代儒家定于一尊之后,心存魏阙的士大夫们看待别家思想时常有的态度。当然,儒家也发展出一种精神上的骄傲。按照王阳明心性论理解的人性,一个人完全就是完善自我,立功、立德、立言,尽善尽美,全德成性之后,就“天人合一”,然后就成为圣人了。完成了这样的过程,从人群中脱颖而出,当然就很骄傲,可以随心所欲,可以“内圣外王”,这就是一种儒家式的骄傲,弄不好就是一种傲慢。

黄:我很认同这一点。你用“儒家式的骄傲”这个词,我讲的是“儒家过分的人性乐观主义”,我想对人性,有些儒家人士是过分乐观了。这一点是一种学术判断,也是一个批评。我认可儒家拥有积极入世进取优点的同时,它就存在一种产生偶像的危险。

李:我觉得,儒家不能单单按照阳明心学来理解,尽管我也认为阳明学说有它的“自由主义”、“人

文主义”面向,是有意义的。但是按照“当代新儒家”牟宗三、熊十力、冯友兰以来的解释,都没有做出历史的区分,基督宗教二千年的发展,从希伯来到希腊地区,到拉丁民族,再到德意志,盎格鲁·萨克逊,最后在大航海以后到达美洲、非洲、亚洲,时间、空间那么广阔,文化类型如此众多,怎么能以一种本质主义的说法来概括。我有历史研究的惯性思维,但也肯定是受了天主教“大公主义”的影响,文化是“多”不是“一”。从不同的文化出发,我们在信仰上寻求的是“一”——上帝,但出发点只能是“多”,因为我们原来都有自己的文化。我还是比较熟悉中国近代思想史,知道许多近代人物对西方文化的误解是怎样发生的。由于清末新教传教运动中李提摩太、林乐知等人对于“儒教”的维护,加上明末耶稣会士已经对于中国文化“人文主义”的推崇,抬高了儒家的地位。另外一方面,由于新教传教士和神学家在中文著述方面具有影响力,民国学者大致是按路德式的、圣公会式、长老会式的教义来理解整个的基督宗教。这种理解是片面的,世界上没有抽象的基督宗教,也没有单一形式的天主教。

黄:应该说,基督教也被理解得过分单一,儒家也被理解得过分单一了。我最近就在梳理这个东西,在儒家里面,我们讲,除了思孟(子思、孟子)到阳明心学这一块之外,其实还有荀子这一派,其实,儒分八门,儒家里面还有很多流派。

李:孔子之后,儒分为八,韩非子这一句话很有意思。儒家学说历来是多元思想,“儒分为八”就是儒家学说的多样性。孔子本人是道存三代的,夏礼、商礼、周礼,文献足徵就可以讨论。还有,孟子学说不过是孔门八说中的一说。孔子、孟子在儒家中的地位,并非是一种“至圣”、“亚圣”的“道统”关系。儒家思想作为一种文化传统,原本还是比较雍容大度的。

黄:最近我也很注重讲儒家的多样性问题,我和台湾的林安梧与杜保瑞对谈,我写了两篇文章来对谈、来谈这个问题。我们现在讲儒学,确实多数是以心性之学为根基的。牟宗三他们讲康德,但其实最后归结点,考虑的问题却还是前现代的。用心性论来归纳儒家学说,就造成了很多的问题,其实是把中国丰富的传统文化资源简化了。

李:基督宗教有两千年历史,有不同的文化特征,对《圣经》的解释有很不同的神学。中国的儒学如从汉代经学算起,那也是两千多年,也有很丰富的不同。况且,我同意清代经学家的观点,儒学不是从孔子开始的,“制礼作乐”是从周公开始的。说儒家的历史是三千年,不就是因为推崇周公吗?基督宗教比较容易处理,天主教、新教、东正教,都信奉二千年的《新约》,但三千年的《旧约》仍然有地位,《创世纪》以下的摩西五经不能不讲啊!不讲的话,历史就没有了,教义也就单一了。所以,最近我提出儒家不是“孔孟之道”,而是“周孔之教”。

黄:这个问题我们在很多地方都谈了,我也在谈这个问题。我在上海三联刚出《曼多马著作集—芬兰学派路德新诠释》,专门诠释路德的,这个诠释是怎么诠释的呢?就是它从路德宗和俄罗斯的东正教对话,这里边也是谈恩典和人性的问题,最后再回到罗马天主教,最后谈到因信称义,这里面有很多找共同点的问题。其核心就涉及到人的主观能动性的本质问题。

原儒/古儒与今儒,以及孟子升格运动

李:我还是在我熟悉的领域讲这个事情。利玛窦到了中国以后,发现了儒家的不同传统,他发现、肯定,加以诠释儒家是“古儒”、“原儒”,即“六经”中含有“上帝”的那种古代儒家。原因无他,就是周孔时代那种讲创造,行惩罚,具威仪的“上帝”可以帮助天主教在中国建立自己的教会和神学。同时,为了和当时流行的阳明心学区别开来,他不能接受宋明理学的“心性论”,认为这是违背“古儒”的“世儒”、“俗儒”。利玛窦这一招是很厉害的,他把三千年的儒学拆解了,分成了原/俗、前/后、古/今,拉一派,打一派,在儒学不同门派的隙缝中,见缝插针,建立天主教会。利玛窦采用的这个方法有两个思想来源,一是在和徐光启等儒生的交谈中受到的启发,明末学者开始讨论“汉学”和“宋学”的不同。另一就是他在耶稣会罗马学院,就是今天的额我略大学,天主教经院哲学的课程里学到的知识。利玛窦的学习课程里有阿奎那哲学,我们看《神学大全》就是区分古希腊“哲学家”(philosopher)亚里士多德和

中世纪亚氏著作的发掘、整理人阿威罗伊, 后者被称为“注释者”(commentator)。欧洲神学家在阿奎那以后就严格区分古代思想奠基人与后来经典注释者, 利玛窦就是用这种方法, 从儒家传统中区别出“古儒”和“今儒”。

注重“古儒”和“今儒”的区分, 对儒家思想来讲是一条非常重要的原理。这条原理明代以前的学者并不是不知道, 儒家学者都知道读朱熹《四书集注》里的注释, 和孔子“六经”的原文有很大不同。尤其是再去看《性理大全》、《朱子语类》把朱熹和理学家平时讲授的内容, 和“六经”本文对照看, “理学”和“礼学”看上去就是两种学说。当然, 受“道统论”影响的儒生强调“天不变, 道亦不变”, 注重的是他们之间的一致性, 不顾及周公、孔子奠定的儒家学说, 与二程、朱熹讲的儒学是两码事情, 经是一本经, 说已经是两种学说。但是, 像徐光启这样的求学者, 是区分周代以“六经”为特征的儒学体系, 和宋代以后变异为“理学”、“性学”的诠释理论。我猜想 1600 年利玛窦和徐光启在南京一拍即合, 他们会见的谈道内容, 除了“三位一体”的教义之外, 应该还谈了“古儒”和“今儒”的分别, 后来他们两人共同商量出来一个“补儒易佛”的天主教中国文化改造方案, 就是这场“利徐谈道”的结果。

利玛窦、徐光启的“补儒易佛”主张, 是贬低宋明时期流行的“性理”学说, 主张回归汉代以前的“六经”学说。为什么? 因为他们觉得“六经”里面有“上帝”, 而朱熹的“性理”学说已经把“上帝”化为“理”和“气”了, 上帝不见了, 主宰者没有了, 终极的创造者被隐去了, 这个不行。而且, “理”和“气”到底是什么? 是物质? 还是精神? 它和“上帝”是什么关系? 如果像“理学”讲的“万物皆理”, 那是物质主义; 如果像“心学”讲的“吾心即是宇宙”, 那是藐视上帝。利玛窦这一派耶稣会士就是这么理解“宋学”的, 不无道理。为了在中国建立天主教教义, 他们不能接受这个教义。

北宋、南宋时期兴起的“心性论”, 它的来源是《孟子·告子》。告子讲性“无善无不善”、“食色性也”, 讲“人禽之辨”, 讲“恻隐之心”, 这些都是孟子学说的特点。孔子之后, 儒分为八, 孟子只是一家, 而且并不是当时的“显学”。汉代初年恢复儒学的时候, 无论是古文经学, 还是今文经学, 经学家们传下来的版本和解释, 大多是“子张之儒”, 即孔子大弟子子夏那一派的学问。直到唐代, “孟氏之儒”的地位还是很低, 以至于有文学家韩愈出来打抱不平, 说“五百年必有王者兴”, 主张以“孔孟”代替“孔颜”。用孟子取代颜回的地位, 接续孔子, 意思是孟子的“心性论”更能抗御佛学, 这样就能从佛教入华以后风靡全中国的“衰世”中扳回胜局, 恢复“道统”。这是讲中国哲学史的人都知道的一段经历, 不需要多讲。但从周予同、朱维铮先生在复旦大学历史系传承的经学史的角度来讲, 讲这一段故事的学术侧重点有所不同。周先生、朱老师定义这一段儒家经学历史上的重大转折, 称之为“孟子升格运动”。孟子取代了颜回, 在孔庙祭祀时成为“亚圣”, 在儒生的著述和讲学中, 甚至取代了孔子, 成为主导学说。孟子“心性论”主导宋明思想以后, 儒生士大夫的思想精度是提高了, 讲学问比较注重概念的准确性。但是知识范围却缩小了, “六经”里本来有很多学问, 礼、乐、射、御、数, “六艺”齐全, 连天文、历法都有, “宋学”就只有章句了。好了, 回顾了一阵之, 把话说回来。利玛窦在徐光启、李之藻的帮助下, 看到了儒家学说在这个方面还有一个重大缺陷, 除了忘记了“六经”中的“上帝”, 还忘记了“六经”中的自然和社会领域的一般知识, 这个不正是欧洲耶稣会士最擅长传授的吗?

黄: 我很认可您这个观点。其实这里, 您觉得是否就是利玛窦所说的今儒、原儒、古儒? 也应该说是利玛窦的一个重要贡献。

李: 就是。把儒家从先秦与宋明做区分, 这是哲学史上的一个关键问题, 也是思想史上的一个大的创见。我一直以为, 这是利玛窦和徐光启、李之藻、杨廷筠一起贡献的。那个时候, 明末的学风已经转了嘛, 大家都对万历年间流行的心性论开始有反省。当时的狂禅, 已经讲得不可收拾了, 大家都在想办法改进嘛。

黄: 遍地都是圣人, 是不是我们前面讲的“过分的人性乐观主义”?

李: 确实有点相像, “人皆为尧舜”, 说起来是一种思想解放, 自由主义, 人人平等。徐光启的时代

已经有问题,人心找不到归向。万历年间,生活富裕没有问题,文化生活也很发达,连明代的皇帝特有的专制也有放松,万历、天启都不怎么管事嘛。像徐光启这样的内阁成员并不感受到皇帝的直接压力,但是官僚体系的腐败和宦官与朝臣勾结起来专权,成为大问题,实际上也是很绝望的。人心在这个时候想要有所依靠,想要依靠一个有信仰的群体,也是自然的。徐光启、李之藻、杨廷筠等“三柱石”皈依了天主教会,得到了很多新的知识,成为“西学”家,但也是接受天主教义约束的,需要放弃不少儒家士大夫的习惯。因此,他们就不是“过分的人性乐观主义”者了。

双重文艺复兴

黄:我记得你曾经有一篇文章,平反利玛窦带来的思想学说,说他们不是“殖民主义”,而是“文艺复兴”?这个评价对过去看待天主教、基督新教的传教结果,也是根本性的改变。

李:是的,我在2004年9月鲁汶大学“南怀仁文化协会国际讨论会”提交的论文《人文主义还是殖民主义》中提出,17、18世纪耶稣会士带来的欧洲知识是“人文主义”不是殖民主义。这一点很容易理解,时至17世纪,“文艺复兴”已经完成,欧洲人的知识体系已经更新。耶稣会士都是知识人士,他们传播“西学”的时候,直接关联的是“人文主义”的思想学说。“殖民主义”并不是一种学问,当时也没有形成一种理论,天主教会的在华利益和欧洲商人并不一致。这个很容易被证明,是一个说得清楚的问题。现在我们这一代从事明末清初“西学东渐”研究的学者,已经很少有人用“殖民主义”来分析问题了。海外有很少的人用“后殖民主义”批判耶稣会士,如詹启华的《捏造儒家》。尽管也获得了一个什么奖项,但这种左翼意识形态下的表达,并没有什么影响力,因为不能说明明末清初“西学东渐”中的普遍问题。

李:没有,利玛窦否定了中世纪。伊拉斯谟,包括路德他们,就是文艺复兴的时候,他们有一个理想,就是古代有一个好的学说,搞的好的学问,中世纪都不行,利玛窦没那么完整、那么深刻,但是这个一般的概念他有,所以对文艺复兴的一个复古,中国学者也在做复古。

黄:你好像还提出过一个“双重的文艺复兴”说法,是说利玛窦到中国也发动了一次“中国的文艺复兴”,真有这么回事情?

李:有此说法,1999年10月在旧金山大学利玛窦中西文化历史研究所开会纪念马爱德神父的学术研讨会“Burdened Past, Hopeful Future”上,我发表了一篇“Chinese Renaissance, The Role of Early Jesuits in China”,提出了一个“双重文艺复兴”(Double Renaissance)的说法。这篇文章,收录在2000年吴小新博士编辑的论文集中,是用英文发表的,中文没有发表过。其实,这个概念在上面已经讨论过了,就是说利玛窦把欧洲“文艺复兴”提倡的“古学”——古希腊之学,带到中国,和江南地区的儒家士大夫中正在兴起的“复古”风气结合起来,发动了明末的“古学”——“汉学”、“经学”复兴运动。欧洲和江南的两股“古学”思潮,提倡“古儒”、“原儒”,他们是以梁启超讲的“以‘复古’为解放”,打破当前的文化局限,建立新的学说。

用“宋学”这个概念来定义周敦颐、张载、二程、朱熹等人的“理学”,最后成型是要到清代“乾嘉学派”,但是这个思想在明代中叶以后就渐渐萌发了。清代学者用“汉学”这个词来对应“宋学”,那么就把汉代儒生恢复“六经”,建立“经说”的特征表达出来了。因此原因,“汉学”也被说成是“经学”,即以经典本身为对象作研究的学问。经典研究和教义诠释在方法上有很大不同,经学家用文字学、版本学、音韵学的方法处理经典本文的疑难问题,清代学者又被称为“考据学家”。好了,我们可以看到,在明末清初,也就是利玛窦等耶稣会士来到中国的时候,中国思想正好发生了一个变化,儒家学说至少在思想方法上发生了一次变革,出现了一种全新的气象。

黄:好,我们总结一下,您研究利玛窦和徐光启这一段,我觉得和我自己的想法比较呼应的一点,就是利玛窦的“补儒”。我把它理解为,不仅仅基督教可以来补儒,而且儒家也可以补基督教。具体地说,儒家学说在伦理道德层面,可以补充基督教的不足。另外,你讲的“双重文艺的复兴”,我也很认

可,我的理解就是,传教士把西方的神学、古希腊的哲学和近代科学带到中国,而且中国人对古儒和原儒也产生了兴趣。

“绝对的神人关系”和“相对的人在这个世界的关系”

李:“补儒”是有效的,合法的,思想肯定是要交流的,也是相互激荡的。当然,“补耶”、“补基”原则上也没问题,中国思想对欧洲也会有补益作用。但具体怎样补,补什么?要由欧洲、西方学者去研究,至少是像你这样在欧洲生活很多年,了解西方文化需求的学者去做。不能对西方文化没什么体会和了解,就指手画脚,还要人家磕头作揖,这个不行。利玛窦等耶稣会士提出宽容中国经典、中国礼仪和中国文化,那一方面是客气和策略,另一方面也确实了解欧洲文化的缺陷和需求。

黄:对的,我在欧洲生活三十年了,和利玛窦居华时间也差不多了。以我对基督宗教的理解,我觉得儒家确实可以补基。我引用一点路德,路德和您刚才讲的他们这几个人,特别天主教的思想家还是有点差异的。从路德的角度来看,儒家和佛教里面所说的修养工夫的这种努力,也是有价值的,但是,路德把它分为一个“绝对的神人关系”和“相对的人在这个世界的关系”,这两个不一样。他认为,在神人关系的绝对性上,儒家和佛教搞的这套东西,都是达不到至善的;但是,在伦理道德和社会学的层面上,儒家和佛教做的这些东西都是有意义的。这里的核心问题在于,儒家里所说的超越,除去内在超越、外在超越的话,还有另一个术语的表述,叫做从下往上,而基督教讲的超越,是从上往下。

国人对西学的理解:章太炎的东方主义与梁漱溟的简单本质化

黄:你的研究,从清末民初新教传教士的“西学东渐”开始,又上溯到明末清初的耶稣会士的早期翻译。这其中,你们编订了《徐光启全集》、《马相伯集》,还有王韬的《弢园文新编》、林乐知等人的《〈万国公报〉文选》。我发现你的研究都是自己做资料整理,然后再开始做仔细的研究。这样是很累的吧,以后还会做些什么进一步的研究?

李:对啊,我们跟着朱老师做研究的学生们,都是自己做资料的。朱老师自己是这样的,他也要求学生这么做。板凳要坐十年冷,文章不做一句空。这样的研究从产出效率来说是不高的,但持久的效果确实不错的。即使是你的研究被修正了,甚至失败了,留下来经过整理的资料文献,别人是可以利用的。以后还有不少活要赶,还要完成《马相伯全集》、《马相伯年谱长编》,把从徐光启到马相伯中国人对于西学的理解搞清楚。还有余力的话,我想把马相伯研究做完了以后,回到我的老本行,就是近代思想文化史。我还没有做过中国近代文化的深入研究。编辑了传教士《万国公报》和王韬《弢园文录》之后,我对近代史也有很多困惑。最近发现,章太炎的晚年可以和马相伯放在一起研究,他们对民国有一致的看法。

黄:他们俩有私交?

李:对的,晚年章太炎和马相伯私交很好。1908年的时候,他们为“立宪”的政体问题,还是政见不同。但是到了后来,到了1914年反对康有为“孔教会”和抵制袁世凯帝制自为的时候,两人是紧密合作的。1931年抗战爆发后,他们更是经常在一起演讲、宣言,号召抗日,恢复民主,抨击国民党政治,主张地方自治。所有政见并不保守啊!

黄:从表面来看,一个是“西学”,一个是“国学”,他们俩的差异很大的。但因为章太炎尊重“西学”,马相伯懂得“国学”,两人肯定是有话可说的吧,而且看起来章太炎也不是一个晚年封闭的人。

李:不封闭的,章太炎去世时鲁迅给他的评价,说是“太炎先生虽先前也以革命家现身,后来却退居于宁静的学者,用自己所手造的和别人所帮造的墙,和时代隔绝了。”这是不公正的!章太炎和马相伯一起发表《二老宣言》很有影响,抗战言论“七君子”景从。在反对政党专制,抵制军政、训政路线上,马相伯、章太炎的言论更加明确和彻底。

黄:但是,章太炎的“国学”确实有保守主义的色彩吧?

李:可以这样说,辛亥革命建立以后章太炎在上海的活动,确实有保守主义的色彩,他在日本东京

讲学,就受日本的“国学”启发,回到上海就一直讲“国学”,行“国粹”。我觉得与其说“国学”运动是保守主义,不如往前推一步,说他是民族主义。二十世纪初年,温和的民族主义要求是可以接受的主张,他们想保留自己的文化传统、生活方式。1917年,章太炎得到江苏教育会的支持,在上海和旅沪的日本、印度学者们建立了一个“亚洲古学会”。他们提出“亚洲之文艺复兴”,并不反西方,可以算是“多元文化主义”的先驱,不是那种极端的民族主义,马相伯也是参与活动的。总的来说,我认为“国学”如作为一种“多元文化”,当然是可以存在于世界各民族文化之林的。但是,如果作为一种民族主义的精神支柱,用本质主义的方式去理解,好像独一无二,舍我其谁,那就是不被兼容的,很难在今天的世界上生存。

黄:你讲这些,我也发现梁漱溟的《东西文化及其哲学》就可以联系起来。梁先生比较中国、印度和西方,是不是和章太炎同样的旨趣?

李:你提到了梁漱溟,我们就岔开去稍微比较一下。章太炎被誉为“民国元勋”、“革命文豪”的时候,梁漱溟还是一个在佛、儒之间寻求人生答案的彷徨青年。非常可能是章太炎在上海提倡比较中、日、印的“亚洲古学”,蔡元培才在北大破格录用梁漱溟讲印度哲学。章太炎虽然没有夸夸其谈地讲印度,但他唤起了“新青年”们对印度文化的兴趣。直到1924年,江苏教育会资助接待印度文豪泰戈尔访华,把中国知识分子对于印度文化的浪漫想象推到了顶点。章太炎没有参与接待泰戈尔,可能是他看到梁启超在出面张罗,而对蔡元培、胡适之所行之事又不太感冒的缘故。

黄:您这个讲得真不错,我发现国内很少有学者敢提到这一点,好像大家对梁漱溟比较推崇,忘记了章太炎在前面的提倡。今天和你谈了这么多,觉得非常有意思。我们的主要话题似乎是集中在“中学”和“西学”的关系上。最近几十年,我们面临着“国学”复兴热潮,一些人夸大了中国文化的特殊性,要求西方文化到中国后,就要屈尊服从。我觉得和你谈这个话题,这个所谓的中西文化冲突明显是不存在的。如果我们能够像徐光启、马相伯那样处理好与“西学”之间的关系,吸取明清以来国人对西学的理解之经验和教训,我们就可以避免走弯路。只有中西兼容,方能成为大家。

English Title:

Only with Chinese and Western Compatibility can a Scholar become a Real Master

Paulos Huang

Distinguished Professor at Shanghai University and Chief editor for International Journal of Sino-Western Studies and Brill Yearbook of Chinese Theology. Email: Paulos. z. huanhg@gmail. com

Tiangang Li

Professor, Ph. D. supervisor and Director at Department of Religious Study in Fudan University, Director for Institute of Matteo Ricci and Xu Guangqi, and vice director for International Research Center of Chinese Civilizations. Board member for China Society of Religious Study, and vice President for Shanghai Society of Religious Study. Email: tgl@fudan. edu. cn

Abstract: Starting from the social events of reading in middle school and President Nixon's visiting Shanghai, the two scholars analyzed the stimulations of social events on the development of a youth's way of thinking. The basic approach to explore the ancient and contemporary, Chinese and Western has left a deep mark for academic research in history. Many topics such as Modern Chinese history, religions and the history of Shanghai City, especially the academic visiting in the Institute of Matteo Ricci in St. Francisco has resulted in a monograph on the Controversy of Rites and the Whole Collection of Xu Guangqi's Works. It is important to find that Chinese and Western Studies are not in conflict but are complementary. However, the pride of Confucians and Confucian excessive optimistic opinion on human nature have much to do with the simple understandings of each other. Especially the promotion of Mencius in China has confused the distinctions among ancient Confucianism, Neo-Confucianism and contemporary Confucianism. However, Matteo Ricci has brought the Double-Renaissance to China. Thus, it is necessary to distinguish the different roles of human beings playing in front of God (coram Deo) and in front of the world/other people (coram mundo/hominibus). Regarding Chinese understandings on the Western Studies, it is necessary to critically analyze Zhang Taiyan's Orientalism and Liang Shuming's simple essentialism. It is also important to study the potential relationship between European especially German historical and form critical studies of the Bible and the Doubtful Movement to Chinese Ancient History since the 1920s among Chinese scholars. Finally, it is also crucial to hold a critical attitude to Kang Youwei's Movement to treat Confucianism as a religion.

Key Words: Confucian excessive optimistic human nature; Chinese and Western compatibility; Zhang Taiyan's Orientalism and Liang Shuming's simple essentialism; relationship between European especially German historical and form critical studies of the Bible and the Doubtful Movement to Chinese Ancient History; Kang Youwei's Movement to treat Confucianism as a religion

本期是特别纪念大卫·杰更斯教授的学术成就专刊,共刊发如下论文。

在“人学、神学与国学”栏目收录了大卫·杰更斯教授(美国?? 大学和瑞典乌普萨拉大学双博士)的“教育的有限性和技术对于伦理思考的意义”与赫尔辛基大学教义学荣休教授、金陵协和神学院博导教授罗明嘉(赫尔辛基大学和剑桥大学双博士)关于路德研究芬兰学派的最新成果“曼多马关于路德《加拉太书讲义》评析”。

在“实践神学与中西教会和社会”发表了三亚学院冯建章教授的“公民宗教之道场建构研究”和香港路德会协同神学院岳诚轩教授的“如非利普·墨兰顿在其对所有德语和拉丁语版本的 LOCI 前言中所阐明的那样,新兴新教神学关于神学研究的改革概念是什么?”

在“中西经典与圣经”栏目,我们发表了美国芝加哥三一国际大学旧约博士候选人王东的“《阿特拉哈西斯》中的灵观”与武汉大学赵盼的“‘不变’与‘万变’:陈崇桂的圣经诠释与中国社会”。

在“教会历史与中西社会”栏目,我们发表了北京大学孙尚扬和郭建斌的“全球化与现代性:略论澳门在早期中欧文化交流中的桥头堡地位”和大理大学刘诗伯的“教育人类学视角下的民族教育史一例”。

在“比较宗教文化研究”栏目,我们发表了新加坡神学院戴永富教授的“窥视诸神的诞生:对偶像崇拜的形成的一个哲学诠释”和清华大学刘君君的“中希传统的两种诠释”。

在“书评与通讯”,我们发表了“两条学术新闻”、黑龙江大学刘伟冬教授的“论耶可比小说《沃尔德玛》中的爱的哲学”,以及黄保罗与李焯昌(香港中文大学、山东大学)教授关于希伯来《圣经》研究的对话“文学作品、人文经典、神的话”。

语、还是神人交碰的记录?”

This number is a special volume to celebrate Dr. David Jenkins's academic achievement.

In the column of Humanities, Theology, and Chinese National Studies we have published Dr. Adjunct Professor David JENKINS' "The Limits of Education and Technology for Ethical Thinking" and Miiikka Ruokanen's newest research on the Finnish School of Martin Lutheran studies "Remarks on Tuomo Mannermaa's Interpretation of Martin Luther's Lectures on Galatians".

In the column of Practical Theology and Sino-Western Views on Church and Society, we have published Professor FENG Jianzhang's (University of Sanya) "A Study on the Construction of Civil Religion" and Matthew OSEKA's (Concordia Theological Seminary, Hong Kong) "What the Emerging Protestant Theology Was about the Reformation Concept of Theological Studies as Enunciated by Philip Melanchthon in His Prolegomena to All Latin and German Versions of Loci".

In the column of Chinese and Western Classics and the Bible, we have published Donald WANG's (Trinity International University, Chicago, USA) "Spirit in Atrahasis" and Pan ZHAO's (Wuhan University) "Unchangeable and Changeable; Chen Chonggui's Biblical Interpretation and Chinese Society".

In the column of Church History in the West and in China, we have published Shangyang SUN's and Jianbin GUO's (Peking University) "Globalization and Modernity: On the bridgehead Status of Macau in the early Cultural Exchange" and Shibo LIU's (Dali University, Yunan) "An Example of Ethnic Education History from the Perspective of Educational Anthropology".

In the column of Comparative Religious and Cultural Studies, we have published Leonard Sidharta's (Singapore Bible College) " 'Looking Into the Birth of Gods': A Philosophical Interpretation of the Origin of Idolatry" and Junjun LIU's (Tsinghua University) "Two interpretations of Chinese and Hebrew traditions".

In the column of Reviews and Academic Reports, we have published an academic news of Jing LIU (Macau University of Science and Technology) "A Review on the Joint International Conference of Nordic Forum of Sino-Western Studies and 20th International Symposium on Bicosmology". Part two is from Miao JIANG's (China Academy of Social Sciences) "A Report on the International Research Project Regarding the Topic of the Impact of Religious Values on Chinese Social Life". Weidong LIU's (Heilongjiang Univeristy) "The View On the Philosophy of Love in Jacobi's Novel Woldmar". In the last, we have published a dialogue between Paulos HUANG and Archie Lee on the Hebrew Biblical studies with the title "Is it a literature, humanistic document, the Word of God, or a record of God-man interaction?"

人学、神学与国学
**Humanities, Theology,
and Chinese National Studies**

The Limits of Education and Technology for Ethical Thinking

David JENKINS

Abstract: In this article the present author explores briefly the benefits and limits of education and technology for ethical thinking. Due to the time limits imposed by the seminar this article was prepared for, he speaks only generally about education and restricts his comments to technology to computer technology. He also limits his analysis of ethical thinking to four major western theories concerning judgement about right and wrong, good and evil. They are: Utilitarianism, deontological (duty) ethics, existential ethics, and virtue ethics. The author finds in the case of each ethical theory some advantages in the use of educational strategies or computer technology to support ethical thinking; but he thinks that education and computer technology fail to solve the fundamental problems of each ethical theory. The reason for this failure is not the limits of education or computer technology themselves but the inherent difficulties of each of these ethical theories. However advanced may be the “thinking” of artificial intelligence or the sophistication of educational programs, the same difficulties that people confront in trying to utilize these ethical theories also confront artificial intelligence and those who believe that ethical issues can be solved by a little more education. In the end, neither education nor computer technology can help us choose from among these theories the one that functions best or to use any of them as a final ethical justification for judgements of right and wrong, good and evil.

Key Words: Limits, Education, Technology, Ethical Thinking, judgement about right and wrong, good and evil

Author: David JENKINS, Ph. D. , Th. D. , Adjunct Professor in Department of Systematic Theology, Department of Philosophy, University of Helsinki, Finland. Email: david1964jenkins@yahoo.com

Can we learn better how to make ethical choices? This question is much more than one about just distinguishing between doing right or wrong. We often identify “ethics” with “morality”, and certainly these two terms overlap in meaning. But they also indicate three aspects of a broader concept of moral life that are not identical. Moral life involves policies, rules, strategies, etc. for determining and pursuing right action (and eschewing wrong actions) and a delineation of a mode of human existing that describes the one who pursues right or wrong action. Moreover, this latter aspect of moral life is not merely a neutral phenomenological description of the “who” that acts rightly or wrongly but an evaluation of a quality of goodness or evil in respect to the one who acts. That quality is as well intrinsically related to an experience of being, *e. g.* , of a general sense of well-being, moral integrity, or an enduring sense of meaningfulness in living and the possession of both joy and peace. Thus, when we consider ethical thinking, we must take into account three important aspects of ethical action: the context and situation of the one who is choosing and acting in specific instances, a moral description and evaluation of the whole of that person, and the person’s experience of life as mediated by their moral choices.

The concept of moral life must include these aspects and involve an ontological reference to the

one who lives and acts in the world as well as an understanding of how to determine essentially the grounds for acting rightly. In the history of western thought, four basic types of moral strategies for human living commonly underlie human life either in a very explicit philosophical form or within a religious tradition: consequentialism (e. g. , Utilitarianism and hedonism), deontological, or, duty ethics (e. g. , Kantian philosophy, the humanistic emphasis on human rights, and many book-centered religions such as Judaism, Islam, and Christianity), virtue ethics (e. g. , the ethical theories of both Plato and Aristotle as well as the related Christian moral philosophy of Aquinas), and existential ethics (e. g. , the notions of authenticity, freedom, and responsibility as we find them similarly related in the works of Soren Kierkegaard, Martin Heidegger, Gabriel Marcel, and Jean-Paul Sartre). Each of these moral typologies, with all of their variations, promote their own strategies for achieving right and just action in the world and point to a way of being in the world that solidifies as a *who*, a who that enjoys a fundamental experiential quality of being.

In the following sections I will take up these four major types of ethical theories concerning how concepts of right, wrong, justice, the Good, and Evil might be justified in order to disclose something of their value for achieving the positive value of a good moral life. The task before us then will be to see how education and computer-based technology might help people respond better to moral values and the requirements of moral life.

The first ethical strategy for living a moral life that I shall analyze is, in a general sense, the position of consequentialism, and, more specifically, the movement known as Utilitarianism.^[1] As evident from their name, consequentialists seek to determine what should or should not be done by analyzing the consequences of a person's actions. If the consequences of an action are deemed to tend toward producing happiness, not just for the individual but for a more general condition of happiness in society, it is "right", or, at least the most preferred action of all other possibilities. The early consequentialism of ancient hedonism was modified and developed toward something more resembling its contemporary form by John Stuart Mill,^[2] whom we might call the true father of utilitarianism, though Jeremy Bentham and Mill's own father used the term for their more classical version of it. Important in this modification was the incorporation of the notion that persons are inextricably interrelated with others to the extent that one can act for the good of others even to the detriment of oneself, a concept known as altruism (from "alter-ism", or, "otherism"). Further, Mill took up the notion of "happiness" in the light of the classical understanding of it in Aristotle's writings to argue that happiness is not identical to pleasure but includes higher pleasures than those that are related to the senses. Happiness includes the enjoyment of friendship and a good reputation at the end of life as well as a sense of accomplishment and integrity. It is not a passing sensual series of pleasures but an enduring sense of the goodness of life. For this reason, one cannot be said to be happy until toward the end of life. A third modification, one rarely recognized, is the primacy of the

[1] John Stuart Mill, *Utilitarianism*. (New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Co. (The Liberal Arts Press, 1957). Since Mill takes into account the consequentialism of the Hedonists, to which his father John Mill and Jeremy Bentham adhere, and seeks to develop hedonism beyond its emphasis on self-seeking pleasure, I will concentrate in this article on John Stuart Mill's understanding of the term "Utilitarianism".

[2] Cf. , Mill, 9-33 ("What is Utilitarianism?"). Cf. , also Mill, "On Causation and Necessity", *A system of Logic*, 8th ed. (New York: Harper and Row, 1874).

development of virtues in Mill's concept of utilitarianism. That is, actions are valued not so much for their proximal physical consequences in the world as for their effect in building a character that engages in habitual actions that tend to produce the greatest amount of happiness for the greatest number of people. This latter modification has often raised the question whether the virtue theory of Aristotle might have affected Mill's thinking in such a way that he himself slides into a virtue theory of ethics. Mill's utilitarian consequentialism remains evident, however, in that the actions stemming from one's character are still evaluated in terms of the societal happiness they produce. Good persons are those who naturally act for the happiness of the greatest number, and evil persons are those who are egoistic, uncaring of the happiness of the whole, or even deliberately destructive of it for reasons of personal satisfaction. If Mill cannot be understood in the end as a virtue theorist, however, he does seem at least to offer to virtue theory a reason beyond the mere cultivation of virtues themselves for developing and actualizing them.

Utilitarianism has been an ethical presumption in the development of democratic regimes, which seeks to be guided by the happiness and will of the majority within a society. It also seems self-evident that the telos of human action is the achievement of a purpose that brings pleasure rather than pain and, in a wider sense, happiness. Such purposes range from the satisfaction of the fundamental biological necessities of life to the enjoyment of the most complex societal activities. Most people living in western societies presuppose some sort of utilitarianism in the societal, political, and global structures of interchange. But it has its difficulties as well. We can ask, *e. g.*, what ethical principle governs that point at which, in deciding about any ethical issue, we should stop calculating the consequences of a proposed action or even how to distinguish between one distinct action from another in the continuous flow of events. Consequences flow on with both positive and negative results that vary and interchange so often that no one can determine anything like a "final" result of any particular action, and any decision to settle upon any intermediate consequential event is always arbitrary. Mill himself had to think more deeply about what the good is and how it is related to happiness, considerations that continued through the work of G. E. Moore^[3] and many other contemporary thinkers. A major consideration that creates problems for contemporary utilitarianism, moreover, involves the nature of our participation in society. Why should we consider that living in a society places upon us an ethical obligation to join in on its projects and make life better for the majority living in it? What about the rights of the minority that might be fundamentally critical of the nature, values, aims, and purposes of their own society? After all, might it not be the case that certain criticisms of a particular society might be correct and warrant withdrawal from participation (*e. g.*, Nazi Germany). What about those who just want to "march to the beat of another drum", as Whitman put it, or simply opt out of society, to "turn on, tune in, and drop out"? We ought to remain open to the possibility that certain people might really have moral insights that are superior to the values of the majority in a society and ought to stand against it. As Thoreau was no doubt justified in wondering why those who railed against him when he was in jail for refusing to pay a poll

[3] G. E. Moore, *Principia Ethica* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1903), 41 ff.

tax^[4] why they were not there.

Such a criticism leads to the fundamental question of rights in a utilitarian society. According to utilitarian strategies, the oppression of the minority by the majority might well be more effective for preserving peace and forwarding economic growth as well as offer many other advantages to the greater number. Slavery certainly worked well for the majority whites in 19th century America. The concept of a right seems to be reduced to a permission given by society as long as it serves the interests of the majority. Utilitarians have tried to remedy this difficulty by modifying its focus on acts of a person to the rules that guide what can and what cannot be done in society. Thus, one speaks of a shift from act utilitarianism to rule utilitarianism. The aim of ethics is to produce rules that facilitate the greatest amount of happiness for the greatest number of people within a society. One does right when one acts in accordance to the rules that guide the society as a whole toward that end and wrong when one acts against such a rule. But rules then become synonymous with “rights”, and rights remain permissions of the majority of society rather than something that is possessed by nature and that must be observed and protected by society. Utilitarian “rights” serve other purposes within society and may be denied marginalized minorities for reasons fitting to the majority. The problem of calculating consequences also remains, as no one can finally determine the result of putting into practice the rules a society decides to follow. Adverse consequences can arise at any point. Moreover, general societal rules may cut across religious and cultural beliefs, values, and practices in ways that make participation in society by some impossible. Christians may be advantaged while Muslims, Jews, Buddhists, and Hindus are not. The pursuit of happiness by cultural, linguistic, and religious minorities may be made impossible in their own terms. A more extreme solution, i. e. , negative utilitarianism, is less helpful as a modification, because it undercuts any supportive context for life in a society. If people act with the aim of producing the least amount of pain for the greatest number of people in a society, they have a much greater freedom to do as they like, and rights are no longer mere permissions; but permissiveness as such then becomes a general right. One can act as he or she likes as long as what is done does not cause pain to others or infringe upon their right to do as they wish. In such a society one can hardly find a justification for welfare, public education, charity organizations, or tax-funded works such as road-building and public maintenance. Negative utilitarianism erodes societal structures so radically that being forced to participate in society as an “act utilitarian” might be preferable.

The criticisms I have offered of utilitarianism in its various forms are fundamental and, I think, not merely contingent difficulties that can be mended by a little moral education or help from a super intelligence that can solve difficulties that ordinary humans cannot solve. This does not mean that education and the application of computer support or even artificial intelligence would not be helpful in applying a utilitarian ethic. While we must not confuse descriptive norms with prescriptive ones, utilitarianism necessitates an alignment with sociological knowledge, i. e. , knowledge of what is actually going on in contemporary society. Education focusing on history, psychology, sociology, ethical theory, anthropology, etc. , would be useful in providing the factual data and statistical

[4] Cf. , Henry David Thoreau, *Civil Disobedience* (An Essay of 1849) (New York: Penguin Books, 1964). Cf. , *The Portable Thoreau*.

knowledge requisite for any analysis of the life context of people in any given society. Computer analysis would be an essential advantage in providing statistical knowledge, revealing the actual desires, preferences, and choices of people. Moreover, education in political theory and economics will disclose value preferences; and computer analysis, commonly used for statistical information in these areas, can greatly extend our understanding of relevant and possible worthwhile choices. This being said, we return to our caveat that such knowledge is descriptive, not prescriptive. We must not confuse the two by falling into the temptation to argue that what people in a given society generally want is in an ethically necessary sense what they should want or do. Even admitting that no description avoids using value-laden terms and prejudices any decision whether a described state of affairs ought to be valued as a goal, the discovery that people in a certain society value a certain goal and that an underlying prejudice exists that we too should value it is still factual information. Not even the best education can provide certainty that a given goal will in the long term lead to the happiness of the majority. Knowing what people prefer and even what seems good for them at a certain time in history and in a certain situation of the society does not guarantee that goals based on this knowledge will lead to general happiness. Even a phenomenal computer that achieved artificial intelligence would simply be aware of incomparably more data but still unable to solve any of the problems I have pointed out about utilitarianism. The difficulties pertaining to the ethical theory itself cannot be solved by a greater power of calculation and analysis or a better education (or data base). We must resolve these theoretical problems by dealing with the theories themselves.

In this next section I shall move the discussion of ethical theories forward to deontological theories and raise similar questions about the role and value of education and computer-based intelligence in applying deontological theories to ethical issues. There are a number of different sorts of deontological ethical theories, though the one that arises out of the difficulties of utilitarianism, as we have already noted, concerns the question of the objectivity of human rights. When I discussed utilitarianism, I said that it seems that it defines rights as permissions given by society. This definition is antithetical to the concept that seems essential to the notion of a right, namely, that persons possess rights regardless of their advantages for society. A proper understanding of a right is that society has an obligation to protect and preserve rights which everyone already has just for being human regardless of their position or role in society. Rights define a kind of framework for the sort of society people can have rather than having their definition according to the way they support and facilitate a particular society. Nowadays the notion of human rights, given concrete expression in the Universal Declaration on Human Rights,^[5] has much influence especially in international affairs. But two major difficulties confront those who believe in human rights; first, how is a right to be defined, and, second, how are rights discerned?

The first difficulty is often resolved by one of two strategies. One is to insist that basic rights are obvious to any normal person and can be understood in the light of the universal “golden rule”, “Do unto others as you would have them do unto you.” Perhaps the concept of a right is better served by the negative formulation given by Confucius; “Don’t do anything to anyone that you would not

[5] A document accepted by the UN National Assembly in 1948. *The Universal Declaration on Human Rights* is a Document passed by the United Nations General Assembly (1948).

want done to yourself. ”The second is to argue that they can simply be discerned as objective patterns of behavior common to man and desired by all, which is to rely on something like a phenomenological strategy to define what they are, perhaps the one presupposed by the Declaration on Human Rights. If this approach is used to define rights, it suffers from the basic difficulty of phenomenology, i. e. , the inability to tie ideal essences (values, rights) to concrete realities, a problem Husserl never solved. ^[6] But without a phenomenological foundation, rights might seem to be arbitrarily set by cultural prejudice. And that leaves the acceptance of the golden rule as the principle for defining a right. But the golden rule is rather limited in its application. What one person might be willing to have done to him or her (receive drugs, trade wives, engage in fights, etc.) might be considered immoral by others. One needs to know what the good is in order to do it and receive it rather than count as good whatever one is willing to receive at the hands of others. The Christian version of this rule ties it to loving God in such a way that an ethic of love is the context for ethical relations with others according to the rule, restricting its function to a particular religious community. Moreover, moral rules that are accepted as revealed in religious terms, such as those found in the Bible, the Koran, and the teachings of other religious traditions, all treated as objective moral rules in a deontological sense, are similarly restricted in scope to their religious traditions. Clearly the religious teachings of some traditions even contradict the consciences of many, though conscience itself cannot be the arbiter of right and wrong, since it is produced by cultural, social, and psychological experience and not by an essential insight into the nature of moral life.

We must note that even in societies in which religion is separated from the other secular functions of the state or society, the ethical teachings of its major religions are restricted to their religious communities and are not (except in the case of religious radicalism) imposed outside the religious context. Religious education treats its ethical traditions as matters of obligation, but these obligations are not imposed upon the “ faithless ”. Hence, they are not universal ethical teachings, nor are they universally applied. Education about how people all over the world live may increase a certain amount of understanding and tolerance for different people of different cultures and may promote a more open globalism and multiculturalism, but it also generally forbids any evaluation of these cultures concerning their moral and religious beliefs. Indeed, the more we know about cultures other than our own, the more we are under pressure to let them be as they are. Otherwise, we are prejudiced, Xenophobic, militant, oppressive, intolerant, and a host of other morally negative names. Thus, education, which emphasizes a tolerant descriptive attitude (“ openness ”), generally is not a means of deciding what is right and wrong in society. And an education already supplied with beliefs about right, wrong, and what is good is untrusted in respect to what it says is true because of its ethical prejudices. Computer-based technology can be helpful in the educational process in many ways, but it cannot overcome this paradox of intercultural education.

The most famous voice of duty ethics was that of Immanuel Kant. Kant believed that reason alone could establish an awareness of the duties that were the foundation of moral life. Just as he disclosed in his *Critique of Pure Reason* the ground for the possibility of knowledge of the world (as

[6] Edmund Husserl, *Ideas: General Introduction to Pure Phenomenology* (Trans. By Boyce Gibson) (New York: Collier Macmillan Publishers, 5th ed. , 1975), 377-394.

it appears) to be the categories of Reason, so in the *Critique of Practical Reason* does he disclose the ground for the possibility of moral knowledge to be a fundamental principle of moral reasoning called the Categorical Imperative: “Always act according to that maxim (principle, teaching) that you can will to be universal”.^[7] Thus, in any situation in which we might seek moral guidance, we need only let reason itself reveal the basic principle that all people would find appropriate to guide moral action in any specific situation. The universality of the principle acts in the *Critique of Practical Reason* in much the same way that the universality of perception and thought functions in the *Critique of Pure Reason*; it provides objectivity and rational necessity in Kant’s limited sense, *i. e.*, in the sense of being universal necessities of thought. Duties, then, can be known by reason. One acts rightly when one acts in accordance with the duty disclosed by the categorical imperative (in one of its three versions) and wrongly when one acts against a knowledge of duty. Right action must be motivated by a will to follow duty, though, and not just a contingent action, done for other reasons, that happens to be in accordance with duty. Right is measured by motive here rather than consequences.

As important as Kant’s work in ethics is, it suffers from obvious vulnerabilities. First, Kant is very much influenced by Hume’s rejection of metaphysics, which leads him to settle for a universality of the structure of Reason as the defining notion of objectivity and truth. But his assertion that no one can know anything about the “noumenal” (read “real”) structure of the world is an assertion that science does not necessarily capture the world as it is. And, thus, the assertion that the categorical imperative reveals an objective moral truth in the duty it discloses is as well a truth grounded in the structure of Reason and not a discovery of moral truth in the world as such. Moreover, Kant escapes the problem that Hume encountered in deriving the moral “ought” from the factual “is” of the world only by separating Reason into different rubrics in which, in the case of the *Critique of Practical Reason*, the “ought” is already imbedded in the duty that is disclosed by reason. Second, even Kant recognized that people seek to be happy, even if seeking pleasure or happiness is not the solution for knowing what is right and wrong. But doing one’s duty very often leads to very unpleasant consequences that are never repaired in one’s lifetime. Kant himself, viewing this difficulty head on, simply declared that it was an excellent proof of a guarantee of justice by Divine action in the afterlife. In this way, God, the soul, and immortality were re-established by Kant as necessary presuppositions of moral life.^[8]

While the concept of duty as the justifying criterion for what is right or wrong in moral arguments may have led to a loss of any notion of an experienced good in Kantian terms, the contemporary concept of it is tied more closely to the notion of human rights than to the idea that reason can illuminate what our duties are. My possession of a right is at the same time your obligation to honor it. *I. e.*, a duty is an obligation to honor a right. People may pursue their individual life plans to achieve happiness in their own terms within the framework of honoring rights and attending to obligations. Freedom within a liberal democratic society, *e. g.*, is exercised only within the context of agreed upon rules and restrictions based on a common recognition of rights and

[7] Immanuel Kant, *The Critique of Practical Reason*, (Trans. by L. W. Beck from the 1788 work) (New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1956), 30.

[8] Kant, 126-137.

obligations. Such a political structure may forward educational goals that establish knowledge of rights and duties in society and encourage individual educational accomplishments for achieving particular life plans. Rights, of course, cannot be considered all equal to each other, since some are more fundamental for human life than others. The right to life, *e. g.*, must be viewed as trumping the right for education, while the right for education in a society trumps the right to a 35-hour work week. In other words, rights are hierarchical; thus, a more important or higher right can be exercised to some degree of detriment to others that are less important when such encroachment is deemed necessary. The application of computer-based knowledge would be helpful in the analysis of a right: what policies, programs, activities, and limits pertain to the logic of applying a right, and how that logic pre-empts the function of other rights or stands vulnerable to pre-emption presents a very complex interrelationship of rights that can be understood better through computer-enhanced interrelating logic structures. Artificial intelligence, gifted with a capacity to learn (in a limited sense), can place our interrelated rights and duties into the motion that characterizes their application within a society and predict conflict points and points of facilitation. But can artificial intelligence itself place a universally acceptable value on some human activities over others and determine the “correct” hierarchy of values, rights, and duties? Can artificial intelligence establish what I *ought* to want in its own terms so that my life plan will correspond to what it supposes are the proper rights relevant to human life? I think that artificial intelligence can only value what it is told that humans value or that it ought to value, so that prime value directives are always already part of its logic structure and are not decided by itself. It lacks the experience of good living, which requires a visceral, embodied presence in the world. Thus, equipped with only information about human life, it lacks what Nagel says we lack when we cannot know what it is like to be a bat. Even if such intelligence can determine the very flow of hormones, electrolytes, or molecules themselves that are implicated in what we report as “good feelings”, it can never determine what those good feelings are about: a deep sense of meaning? The day of one’s wedding? The loving embrace of your child? And it cannot determine whether we *deserve* to feel good about anything. Nor can it determine for itself the means by which pursuing duties that are disadvantageous to us can lead eventually to a good experience of living, such as a Divine reward in the afterlife for suffering for moral purposes in this one. I do not think that an artificial intelligence could follow the logic of Kant in forwarding the existence of God and an apocalyptic justice as a reason for doing our duty.

The third ethical strategy that has had much influence in contemporary thinking centers on the philosophical movement known as “existentialism”. This movement includes a number of thinkers who asserted a notion of “authenticity” as an ethical criterion for action in the world, though this concept takes on different meanings in different philosophers. The main proponents of authenticity as a fundamental ethical criterion for moral decisions are Soren Kierkegaard,^[9] Martin Heidegger, Jean-Paul Sartre, and Gabriel Marcel. Other existential thinkers tend to prescind from these. Kierkegaard conceives authenticity as a form of individualism that asserts itself against a Hegelian

[9] Søren Kierkegaard, *Either/Or* (Vol. II) (Trans. by Walter Lowrie) (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1959), 234 and ff. Kierkegaard should be credited as having first used the term “authentic” in an ethical sense that had import for the 20th century. The work of Kierkegaard is completed in the 19th century, but his importance and his influence on existential thinkers is reserved for the 20th century.

notion of society in which each person is defined by the place and role given by a historically defined destiny. To exist is to stand outside the historically defined roles that make a people who they are and to decide the issues of one's own life according to one's own beliefs and standards. But both Heidegger and Sartre think more directly in reference to an ontology of man, Heidegger speaking of *Dasein*^[10] and Sartre speaking of the *for-itself*.^[11] The former understands man as that place where being shows itself, and Sartre understands man as a nothingness that collapses in upon itself, creating experience of a world. Kierkegaard is influenced by the Hegelian concept of Spirit and does not depart far from Hegel's identification of consciousness with Spirit even in his insistence on the unique individuality and freedom of man. But both Heidegger and Sartre focus on an underlying ontology that identifies what we in ordinary language call "man", Sartre deriving his notion of consciousness from this ontology. Marcel, for whom authenticity is a fundamental moral criterion, also proposes an ontological foundation for it, though it is one that is critical of Sartre's "for-itself" and the emptying out of all but the place where being shows itself in Heidegger's concept of *Dasein*. Marcel asserts a "blinded intuition" into Being, which grounds all things, including man.^[12] Authenticity is achieved as we come into a greater and greater appropriation of Being so that our need of Being is fulfilled. In all of these thinkers the concept of authenticity is fundamental to their moral thinking such that one is moral to the extent that one is authentic. For Heidegger and Sartre authenticity is a matter of *choosing*^[13] what we will be and resolving to act and think according to that choice.

Authenticity poses a number of difficulties for those who would adopt it as a criterion for right and wrong or as a means of differentiating between good and evil persons. For one thing, a certain ambiguity lies at the heart of the concept. Do we choose to live in accordance with who we already *are*, or do we become who we are by choosing to be a certain way? Heidegger would ground authentic action in an attitude of "listening" to one's historical destiny, thus grounding the existence of *Dasein* in an attunement to one's cultural history wherein Being speaks.^[14] Kierkegaard, on the other hand, seeks to identify authenticity in an assertion of an individuality that distinguishes and, indeed, separates one from his cultural history. Freedom for him means the power, in Whitman's terms, to march to the beat of another drum. Sartre, who believes that the ego is nothing more than what we construct by our radically free decisions, nonetheless finds that what has already been constructed by our previous choices provides us a "true" self to which we can continue to relate authentically or from which we can flee. Marcel holds that we are authentic when we live in accordance with our intuition into Being, which itself entices us as the value of fills our "ontological lack".^[15] Both Kierkegaard and Marcel are confessing Christians who identify the object of faith (SK) or Being (Marcel) with God. Heidegger's thought lent itself to the support of the Nazi party of Germany

[10] Martin Heidegger, *Being and Time* (Trans. By John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson) (New York: Harper & Row, Pubs., 1962), 279-304.

[11] Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness* (Trans. by Hazel Barnes). (New York: Pocket Books, 1956), 119-133, 404-445.

[12] Gabriel Marcel, *The Mystery of Being* (Vol. 1) (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1950), "Introduction and Lecture I".

[13] Cf., Heidegger, *op. cit.*, pp. 312-341; also, cf., Sartre, *op. cit.*, 559-619 ff.

[14] Heidegger, 319-325.

[15] Gabriel Marcel, *Du Refus à L'Invitation* (Paris: Librairie Gallimard), 135.

while Sartre, a member of the resistance in France, was an atheist with no purpose other than, in his later thought, the establishment of a political system grounded in a philosophical Marxism.^[16]

Clearly the notion of authenticity in the wide-ranging movement of existential thought does not mean the same thing from thinker to thinker. But a rough family resemblance obtains in each formulation of it. In the end, whether one conceives the true self to be one's historical destiny, one's depositum of past decisions, one's inmost grasp of freedom from determination, or a grasp of what is one's true good and a pursuit of it, authenticity refers to the value of selfhood. One acts rightly when one expresses oneself. Of course, none of these thinkers thought that pure self-expression was a value in itself or that it constituted ethical correctness, as we have seen. But it is the *sine qua non* of any ethical act, a point that seems trivial, since obviously no disingenuous act can be a moral one. Nor is the Holocaust or any selfish and harmful life moral by virtue of being the true self-expression of evil persons. Each of the philosophers who asserted authenticity as essential in moral life searched further for a more proper moral grounding of authentic acts. Kierkegaard found his in his Lutheran faith, Heidegger listened to the voice of being as expressed in the hope of Germany through the Nazi party, Sartre found ethical progress through Marxism, and Marcel was fulfilled in the Catholic faith.

The existentialists had considerable influence on philosophy and the arts during the 20th century. Moreover, philosophical anthropology, psychology, and sociology have all shown the influence of existential thinkers, and education itself has had to take account of such issues as intuition, the role of selfhood in the growth of the person, the value of free exploration, etc. None of those except the most bizarre movements spawned by existential thinking, such as EST, have supposed that self-expression in itself is the prime moral value. They suppose rather that the values of human living cannot be found without explorations that are self-expressive and self-building. The notion of authenticity led to an interest in the concept of intersubjectivity and of the grounds of commonality in human society. Hence, ethical thinking has been a natural completion of the existential emphasis on an ontology of selfhood. Indeed, Sartre ends his first great work *Being and Nothingness* with a lament that he had failed thus far to establish an existentialist ethic, and only his later work on the *Critique of Dialectical Reason* moves forward to an ethic grounded in a form of Marxism.

Education functions weakly in respect to an existentialist ethic. Learning about the world or man is not much of an advantage for turning in upon oneself to grasp oneself in one's own authentic way of being. Indeed, higher education can be a barrier to existential knowledge. Kierkegaard made fun of Bishop Nielsen as he led his waddling geese all in a row into the church. The well-educated institution of the church preached a concept of faith that was full of facts but possessed no real truth of faith, the truth about man as an "absolute relation to the absolute". Heidegger despised the anonymous "they" who spoke of this and that, who knew what was going on in the world without knowing its meaning, who distracted everyone from themselves by absorbing them in a world of interesting facts, figures, and suppositions. Sartre proposed a Marxism that was sensitive to the needs of the people, distinguishing between solutions to societal problems that had their origin in genuine

[16] Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness* (Trans. by Hazel Barnes). (New York: Pocket Books, 1956), 797-8. Cf. , Sartre's briefer work *Search for a Method*, which is an abbreviated form of the *Critique of Dialectical Reason*.

class conflicts and those that were basic human problems (a “philosophical” Marxism). He preferred to see rolled-up sleeves to open books. Marcel took refuge in the teachings of Roman Catholicism, which cannot be established by general education. In each of these philosophers, knowledge gained by education must be “bracketed” in order to get to who it is that appropriates that knowledge, rightly or wrongly.

Neither does the notion of authenticity in existential thought lend itself easily to any sort of computer-based or AI facilitation. Indeed, it zeros in on a critical question concerning artificial intelligence: does artificial intelligence constitute a “self”? Can it do what it does because it chooses to do it rather than merely because it is programmed to do so? Does the ability to learn imply the possession of selfhood and freedom? Can AI not only grasp selfhood as an imminent non-programmed data laden with value and direction of its own and choose to express it in its thought and action? Obviously knowing the history of its acts is not the same thing as grasping a wholeness of self that is at the origin of them or as modified over time by them. And even if AI could demonstrate selfhood in the context of intersubjective relations, as do people, its calculative capacity could not overcome the weakness of authenticity as an ethical criterion; it could not show that self-expression itself constitutes right action, since such an assertion cannot be universally true.

The fourth ethical theory that I am considering in this article is that of virtue ethics. I shall consider only western ethical theory here, ignoring Confucian and Buddhist virtue ethics. Here, of course, we have to do with the virtue ethics of Plato and of Aristotle. I shall also ignore the virtue theory of Aquinas, since it is essentially that of Aristotle with Christian virtues insinuated into his theory and directed toward a certain relation with God rather than to a more sedate aim of the full flowering of the human being. Other more contemporary thinkers such as Jacques Maritain and Alasdair MacIntyre rely too much on Aristotle or Aquinas to require specific treatment.

Plato and Aristotle have to be read in tension with each other. Plato views the Good as something that reason can discern when reason leaps beyond its mundane bonds to see the Form of the Good as it is, something made possible only by education and determination. And he asserts that knowing the Good in this way is itself an *ontological* change in the knower such that in knowing the Good one becomes good. And from the good man flows good actions. One cannot know the Good without *being* good, and one can be a good man only through knowledge of the Good.^[17] Aristotle, however, being a critic of Plato’s doctrine of the Forms, holds that the Good is something that pertains to the whole life of the human being and is something that must be learned by observing good people. The Good is the *telos* of human life as the oak tree is the *telos* of the acorn. We can see evil for what it is when it presents itself in the form of violence to others and taking what does not belong to one and can understand that such actions do not lead to a good society or to a good life. And we can see how following extremes in the way we live leads to self-damage and even self-destruction. For a good life is not constituted simply by being rich or gaining some advantage for power and fame in life but in gaining a general happiness that pertains to the whole of one’s life: good health, friendship, good family relations, good repute, the achievement of understanding and even of some wisdom, and a contemplative grasp of the deep truths of life. Developing good habits based on

[17] Plato, *The Republic* (Trans. by F. M. Cornford) (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1945), 211-220.

moderation (something reason can discern) are the *sine qua non* of the full flowering of the person and the achievement of the human *telos*. But we must note that for Aristotle knowledge of virtue (action according to reason) is an act of knowing and choosing but not a fundamental change of being. One's action is guided by rational choice and, eventually, habitual choice; but one can always act against reason and do what one knows to be wrong (*akrasia*).^[18]

According to Plato and Aristotle, then, human life has an ethical goal: to become a certain kind of person. For Plato that goal is to become a good person by virtue of knowledge of the Form of the Good, *i. e.*, to enjoy the vision of the Good. For Aristotle the goal of human life is a deep and abiding happiness that permeates the whole of life. Both of them view virtue as the *sine qua non* of their ethical goals. For Plato virtue is the achievement itself, and it leads to becoming a good man. For Aristotle, virtue mediates the *telos* of the fullness of human life with its attendant happiness, as long as fate does not forbid it by immersing one in tragedy.

Education plays an important role in the ethical development of the person for both Plato and Aristotle. Plato believed that the human mind must be cultivated by a long process of education that begins in early life with physical training and ends at mid-life with training in politics and the study of philosophy. The purpose of this education is to achieve not simply knowledge of things of the world but to eventually prepare the mind for *anamnesis*, or, recollection of the Forms. Few people are expected to manage the whole program of education that Plato sets out in the *Republic* and drop out as the years progress to become laborers, soldiers, artisans, or, if they complete the whole program, leaders of the state. Indeed, from these latter are to be chosen the philosopher king, who alone can govern by knowledge of the Good.^[19] Growth of knowledge was growth in virtue, and the virtuous man becomes the empowered man (*Virtu, virtutis L.*, "empowered").

According to Aristotle, action according to reason is virtue. But reason is not just a matter of deductive relations between ideas; it involves inductive knowledge of the nature of things and of the causes that bring things into being and to pass out of being. Such knowledge is required to understand the world of nature and of people, and without it we cannot know how to pursue just relations or build the good society. We must learn the consequences of the extremes of the common choices people make in order to determine the point of moderation that fits our particular constitution and situation. Only then can we form healthy habits of life that can lead to happiness.^[20] While epistemology and ontology do not coincide in Aristotle as they do for Plato, an education that enables one to achieve wisdom is essential for the state of being Aristotle calls *eudaimonia*.

This education can be facilitated, of course, by computer technology. The statistical data base that computers can generate to determine sociological patterns, the general consequences of various ways of being, and the points of moderation for individuals of different types (e. g., how many calories a thin, slight man who is a librarian might need to consume in order to be healthy compared to those a wrestler might need to consume). Computer facilitated education can be useful in mapping personality types, assessing the consequences of behaving according to a virtue, and those of choosing

[18] Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* (Trans. By Martin Ostwald) (New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1962), "books 2 and 3".

[19] Plato, *ibid.*, books 5-7.

[20] Aristotle, *ibid.*, books 2, 3, 6.

not to put virtues into practice. But we must note that virtues are a rather fuzzy concept. Roman Catholic scholars have identified around 50 patterns of acting, attitudes, or commitments that they might call “virtues”. Basically, the word itself is a guide for how to identify them: the word “virtue” refers to an empowerment to live in a certain way that promotes the personal and social good. When we looked at Mill’s utilitarianism, we noted that Mill emphasized character as the habitual source of one’s actions. Thus, he identified virtues as the habits of action that tend toward the happiness of the whole society. Now, as we look at virtue theory, we see the same thing; virtues are virtues because they create a better society and a sense of personal satisfaction. Here, of course, it is not just actions that count in one’s estate of life but the attitudes, values, and predispositions toward doing good that identify virtues; and one might suppose that Mill would agree to such an extension of the concept.

We can note as well that many of the objections concerning computer technology that pertained to utilitarianism also pertain to virtue ethics. The calculative and analytic capacity of computers are finite and cannot solve the question of when to stop calculating, *i. e.*, when one has “the final answer”. Neither is it able to identify what it is like to *be* virtuous. Just as the utilitarian must be satisfied to suffer a disadvantage for the sake of the rights of another, the computer must know when to suffer being virtuous at the disadvantage of its own happiness. But virtues require great sensitivity to notions of what is right, the values of those involved, what tends toward producing happiness, and what builds character. Does a computer have the capacity to build a particular character? Character building requires a sense of self and of how that self can be fulfilled according to its full potential. But the full potential of a computer cannot be that of a human being, since an essential aspect of human potential is the development of everything pertaining to being human, much of which is left out of the construction of artificial intelligence. Moreover, virtues, as habitual patterns of behavior sustained by attitudes and values, do not function either alone or without the *telos* of which Aristotle spoke. But such interconnections of virtues cannot be fashioned out of some particular context of life in a way flexible to other important ethical notions, such as rights, concepts of good and evil, right and wrong. And the *telos* that governs this effort must be implanted in order to work even before it is learned. Thus, a computer could not model the virtues or be much more help than a calculating device for people who are developing virtues.

To conclude, I have argued in this article that education and computer-based technology have only limited roles to play in the development of ethical knowledge. The reason for this limitation is not primarily the fault of education itself or the functions of computer-based knowledge but the difficulties of the various ethical theories to which they might be applied. The major western theories by which ethicists justify their concepts of right and wrong and their evaluations of good and evil suffer from theoretical limitations that education and artificial intelligence cannot resolve or circumvent by their own functions and virtues. While they can to some degree facilitate the application of particular theories to ethical issues, they fail to make an essential improvement in thinking through an issue by means of any of ethical theories I have discussed. We must rethink the ethical theories rather than bolster them by improved education or computer facilitation.

中文题目:

教育和科技对于伦理思考的局限性

大卫·杰更斯

哲学博士、神学博士,芬兰赫尔辛基大学哲学和神学兼任教授。电子邮箱:david1964jenkins@yahoo.com

摘要:作者在本文简要地探讨了教育和技术对于伦理思考的局限性和益处。出于论述的方便,作者着重讨论了通识教育,并把技术限定为电脑技术。关于伦理思考,他也主要集中于四个主要的西方理论,即关于是、非、善、恶的判断上。它们是功利主义、非本体论(责任/义务/道义)伦理学、存在主义伦理学和美德伦理学。作者发现,在推广教育战略以支持伦理思考和使用电脑技术时,每种伦理学理论都有一些积极之处。但是,他认为,教育和电脑技术在每种情况下都不能成功地解决每种伦理理论的根本性问题。这个失败的原因,并不是教育或电脑技术本身,而是每种伦理学理论内部的困难。然而,人工智能的“思维”或教育程序的复杂性可能是先进性的;人们在尝试运用这些伦理理论时遇到的同样困难,也面临着人工智能的挑战,那些相信伦理问题可以通过多一点教育来解决的人们也面临着同样的困难。最后,教育和电脑技术都不能帮助我们在这些理论中选择一个最能发挥作用的理论,也不能帮助我们把握其中任何一个理论,为判断是、非、善、恶提供最终的伦理依据。

关键词:局限性;教育;科技;伦理思考;关于是非善恶的判断

Remarks on Tuomo Mannermaa's Interpretation of Martin Luther's Lectures on Galatians^[1]

Miikka Ruokanen

(Professor Emeritus of Dogmatics, University of Helsinki; Professor of Systematic Theology, Nanjing Union Theological Seminary)

Abstract: Professor Tuomo Mannermaa accomplished an ingenious ecumenical achievement in opening up a new perspective on Luther's theology of grace: Analyzing Luther's Lectures on Galatians (1531/1535), Mannermaa concludes that justification does not only mean a forensic-judicial declaration of the guilty non-guilty, but it also is an intimate union of the sinner with Christ, *unio cum Christo*. In this union the believer participates in the divine person and in the divinity of Christ. This kind of a union can be called the "deification" of the human being, Mannermaa claims.

The present article agrees with the fundamental notion of participation and union discovered by Mannermaa, but at the same time, it raises some problems concerning Mannermaa's interpretation of Luther. There are three problematic limitations in Mannermaa's model: First, he overlooks the Holy Spirit as the sole agent and power which can create the faith that justifies. Second, Mannermaa concentrates on the idea of the union between Christ and the sinner basing justification solely on the person of Christ, his divinity and divine love, in which the sinner may participate. Luther's powerful teaching in his Lectures on the historical facts of atonement, reconciliation, and redemption by the cross of Christ, as well as the resurrection of Christ, is clearly underemphasized. Third, Mannermaa lays no emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit in the union between Christ and the sinner; the personal union between God and the justified sinner is deeply a Trinitarian reality for Luther, Christology and Pneumatology are substantially inseparable.

I propose three amendments to Mannermaa's interpretation of Luther's doctrine of justification. First, the Pneumatological understanding of *sola fide* should be emphasized; it is God's Holy Spirit who alone monergistically converts the sinner and creates "the faith in which Christ is present." Second, paying serious attention to the simultaneity of Christological and Pneumatological realities in Luther's understanding of *unio cum Christo* in *Spiritu sancto*, strongly related with Patristic soteriology, would abolish the ambiguity involved with Mannermaa's use of the philosophical ontological concepts leading to misunderstandings that contradict his true intention. Third, recognizing the link between the theologians of the Patristic period and Luther in their similar teaching on the inseparability of the person of Christ (incarnation) from the work of Christ (cross and resurrection) in soteriology would also make an important amendment to Mannermaa's interpretation of Luther.

Union with Christ in the Holy Spirit means participation in the person, life and divine properties of Christ, as well as in his cross, and resurrection——this participation can be called "deification" (theosis). The three amendments would strengthen the ecumenical relevance and reception of Mannermaa's interpretation of Luther's Trinitarian doctrine of grace/justification.

[1] Published in: *Apprehending Love: Theological and Philosophical Inquiries, Festschrift for Professor Risto Saarinen*, ed. by Pekka Kärkkäinen and Olli-Pekka Vainio, Helsinki: Luther-Agricola Society, 2019, 371-398. Chinese translation of this article's title, abstract, keywords and info about the author was by Paulos Huang. Concerning introduction and studies of Mannermaa School in Chinese academia, cf. , Paulos Huang 2019: "Jingshen renwenzhuayi; Mading Lude yu Rujia gongzuofang baogao" (A Report on the Workshop Spiritual Humanism Martin Luther and Confucianism). *International Journal of Sino-Western Studies*, no. 16 (June 2019): 173-234 (<https://www.sinowesternstudies.com/back-issues/vol-16-2019/>).

Key Words: Holy Trinity; grace; atonement; sola gratia; sola fide; faith; justification sanctification; participation; deification/theosis; union with Christ; union in the Holy Spirit

Author: Miikka Ruokanen, Professor Emeritus of Dogmatics (Systematic Theology), University of Helsinki; Professor of Systematic Theology, Nanjing Union Theological Seminary. Email: miikka.ruokanen@helsinki.fi

When introducing new Finnish research on Luther, Risto Saarinen points out in his recent book *Luther and the Gift*: “I believe that the critics are right on this point; we do have a program but we also have to work it out in more detail.”^[2] And then Saarinen goes on making his own proposal to outline such a theological program which is closely related with Risto’s philosophy and theology of giving which we have learned, for instance, from his book *God and the Gift: An Ecumenical Theology of Giving*.^[3]

In the following, I intend to offer my little contribution to the discussion on how to work out in more detail the Finnish interpretation of Luther. I will make some remarks on Tuomo Mannermaa’s interpretation of Luther’s doctrine of grace in his *Lectures on Galatians*. My comments are linked with my analysis of Luther’s *De servo arbitrio* in my forthcoming book *The Trinitarian Doctrine of Grace in Martin Luther’s The Bondage of the Will*. The more comprehensive and detailed justification of my argumentation represented in the article at hand can be found in this book.^[4]

Tuomo Mannermaa’s analysis of Luther’s *Lectures on Galatians* (1531/1535) establishes the idea of the justification of the sinner through the personal presence of Christ in the sinner: in a union between Christ and the sinner the sins are “absorbed” and “destroyed” by the divinity of Christ and the sinner participates in the very divine nature and divine life of Christ himself. In a union with Christ, the believer is taken into a process of growth in which the increasing “ruling by the Spirit of Christ” and participation in divine love, the essence of divine life, makes him/her more Christ-like. Mannermaa sees a close affinity between Luther and the Patristic concept of *theosis*, deification, although he does not show this connection in detail, there are no references to the church fathers or to Patristic research in Mannermaa’s work.^[5] Mannermaa does not claim that Luther’s teaching on justification would be the same as the church fathers’ teaching on deification, but he assumes that a certain parallelism exists between these two conceptions of grace. Moreover, Mannermaa’s interpretation exposes the truly Augustinian character of Luther’s doctrine of grace: justification as participation in the divinity of Christ means participation in divine love.

Mannermaa’s interpretation of *Luther’s Lectures on Galatians* is the foundation of the so-called Finnish school of Luther interpretation. Mannermaa presented his seminal interpretation in his miniature magnum

[2] Saarinen 2017, 182.

[3] Saarinen 2005. Saarinen pointed to the potential of elaborating the Finnish Luther interpretation in terms of the theology of giving also in his article in *The Oxford Handbook of Martin Luther’s Theology*; see Saarinen 2014.

[4] Mannermaa regarded Luther’s *Lectures on Galatians* as one of his major theological treatises; Luther himself saw that *The Bondage of the Will*, along with his catechisms, was his magnum opus. Building up a connection between these two works is meaningful.

[5] In fact, it is a bit amazing that no Finnish Luther scholar so far has done research on the Patristic ideas of deification, no accurate comparison of the early Christian teachings of *theosis* with Luther’s theology has been provided. Stephen J. Chester, 2017, 203, for a good reason, says that assessing the claims made by the Finns “would require both a careful analysis of Orthodox concepts of *theosis* and a careful comparison of them with Luther.”

opus *In ipsa fide Christus adest: Luterilaisen ja ortodoksisen kristinuskonsäilyksen leikkauspiste* (Helsinki: Finnische Gesellschaft für Missiologie und Ökumenik, 1979). The English translation is *Christ Present in Faith: Luther's View of Justification* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005).^[6] Criticizing the modern interpretations which impose on Luther's theology alien philosophical paradigms, it was Mannermaa's intention to rediscover the Reformer who is a true inheritor of the best tradition of classical theology.^[7] Typical of the modernistic interpretations is to emphasize in soteriology the distance between the human being and God. Mannermaa, on the contrary, establishes the paradigm of an intimate union between the sinner and the Savior. Mannermaa's interpretation of Luther's doctrine of justification, having a point of contact with the Patristic concept of deification, has drawn a great deal of attention in Luther research and in modern ecumenical theology.^[8]

As a student of Mannermaa, I have learned to greatly appreciate my teacher's and my first *Doktorvater's* ingenious ecumenical achievement in his opening up a new perspective on Luther's theology of grace. In the following I shall not introduce Mannermaa's interpretation of Luther per se, but I will only pay attention to some evident limitations in his interpretation of Luther's *Lectures*. I intend neither to analyze other publications of Mannermaa nor to discuss with the other Finnish Luther researchers who have carried on Mannermaa's ideas; I limit my focus on the mentioned foundational work of Mannermaa. Moreover, I am not going to discuss the critical comments made by the international commentators of Mannermaa.

As we shall see below in my analysis, Luther's *Lectures on Galatians*, as a matter of fact, includes the same three dimensions of the doctrine of grace which I have found in his *The Bondage of the Will*:^[9] (Point 1:) The work of God's Holy Spirit is the power creating conversion and justifying faith, *sola fide*; faith is not a product of any function of the human psyche but the sole gift of divine grace, effected by God's Spirit. (Point 2:) The cross and the resurrection, the work of Christ, are the foundation and the true content of grace; justification *sola gratia* means participation in the sacrificial atonement of Christ which brings about the forgiveness of sins, *favor Dei*, as well as participation in his imperishable life which overcame death in the resurrection (point 2a). But justification also includes, using Mannermaa's expression, the "real-ontic" personal presence of Christ in the sinner, *donum Dei*, or participation of the sinner in the person, righteousness, and divine life of Christ, the incarnated Son of God himself-*unio cum Christo in Spiritu sancto* (point 2b). (Point 3:) The Holy Spirit of the Father and Christ, indwelling the person, involves him/her in a life-long process of change, a growth in love in participation through the Holy Spirit in Christ's divine life and love. This is Luther's understanding of sanctification.

All of these three main aspects, which I have found in *The Bondage of the Will*, are explicit and fundamental in Luther's *Lectures on Galatians* which is the source of Mannermaa's interpretation of

[6] The English translation by Kirsti Stjerna is a faithful translation of the original Finnish, but there are some slight differences too. I use the English version but check its text with the original Finnish version.

[7] Risto Saarinen's first doctoral dissertation, which he accomplished under the supervision of Mannermaa, is the best analysis on the philosophical preconceptions which exercised great influence on the research and interpretation of Luther. See Saarinen 1989.

[8] Braaten & Jenson 1998; Vainio 2010 & 2004, 35-57; Saarinen 2014 & 2017, 181-203.

[9] I represent the three dimensions of Luther's doctrine of grace/justification in my forthcoming book *The Trinitarian Doctrine of Grace in Martin Luther's The Bondage of the Will*.

Luther's doctrine of justification. The sinner's forensic-judicial justification and participation in the atonement of the cross, as well as his/her participation in the resurrection of Christ are more explicit in *Lectures* than in *The Bondage of the Will*. Moreover, the notion of the sinner's participation in the person of Christ is also more emphasized in the *Lectures*. Now we turn to some of the problems involved in Mannermaa's analysis of Luther.

Three problems in Mannermaa's interpretation

There are three problematic limitations in Mannermaa's analysis of *Luther's Lectures on Galatians*. First, Mannermaa overlooks the Holy Spirit as the sole agent and power which can create the faith that justifies (*sola fide*; point 1). Second, Mannermaa concentrates on the idea of the union between Christ and the sinner basing justification solely on the person of Christ, his divinity and divine love, in which the sinner may participate (point 2b). Luther's powerful teaching in his *Lectures* on the atonement, reconciliation, and redemption by the cross of Christ, as well as the resurrection of Christ, is clearly underemphasized (point 2a), in fact, Mannermaa's interpretation is silent in regard to these. Third, Mannermaa lays no emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit in the union between Christ and the sinner (point 2a & b); the personal union between God and the justified sinner is deeply a Trinitarian reality for Luther, Christology and Pneumatology are substantially inseparable.^[10] Mannermaa brings in Pneumatology only when analyzing Luther's idea of Christian life and sanctification (point 3). At this point, my findings in *The Bondage of the Will* and Mannermaa's interpretation of the *Lectures on Galatians* converge; no substantial differences exist here. I will not pay much attention to Luther's teaching on sanctification because here I do not find any significant difference between Mannermaa's and my own reading of Luther's *Lectures*.^[11]

In the following, I will demonstrate how Luther himself emphasizes all the mentioned aspects in his *Lectures on Galatians*. Being justified in a personal union with Christ (point 2b) and being taken into the process of change or sanctification (point 3) means simultaneously also being justified because of the faith created by God's Holy Spirit (point 1), and being participating in the atonement in the blood of Jesus resulting in the forgiveness of sins, as well as in his resurrection (point 2a). All these elements are essential in Luther's doctrine of justification in his *Lectures* and in his overall theology. I will relate my own findings to a critical and creative discussion on Mannermaa's work. In the present exercise, I take my analysis of Luther's *The Bondage of the Will* as a background for my evaluation of Luther's *Lectures* and Mannermaa's interpretation of it.^[12]

[10] It is symptomatic that in one of his most important articles, "Hat Luther eine trinitarische Ontologie," Mannermaa pays no attention to the third person of the Trinity as God's soteriological agent but gives this role solely to God's word. In this aspect, Mannermaa echoes the Luther interpreters whom he criticizes for the lack of the classical Trinitarian perspective. Mannermaa 1993.

[11] The second main part of Mannermaa's magnum opus is titled "The Presence of Christ in Faith and the Holiness of Christians" and it concentrates on sanctification and growth as a Christian. See Mannermaa 2005, 47-86.

[12] While completing the essay at hand, my *The Trinitarian Doctrine of Grace in Martin Luther's The Bondage of the Will* was still in the process of publication, consequently, I could not quote it.

The cross and justification

One might argue that Mannermaa does not link his interpretation of justification as a personal union with Christ with the cross because, in traditional dogmatics, the doctrine of atonement, reconciliation, or redemption do not belong to justification but to Christology, to the soteriological “work of Christ” in distinction from the ontological “person of Christ.” But in his *Lectures*, Luther explicitly states that the doctrine of atonement and the doctrine of justification are essentially the two aspects of one and the same reality: the gospel of the crucified Jesus Christ and the justification of the sinner through this gospel of grace are two dimensions of the same reality of salvation. In Luther's theology, the gospel of the cross and justification are essentially united, one cannot speak about justification without speaking about the cross and the holy blood of Jesus. It is impossible to create a doctrine of justification without the doctrine of atonement, reconciliation, and redemption.

Luther links the cross and justification in this way in his *Lectures*: “Then there comes, at the appropriate time, the saving word of the gospel, which says: ‘Take heart, my son, your sins are forgiven’ (Matthew 9:2). Believe in Jesus Christ, who was crucified for your sins. If you feel your sins, do not consider them in yourself but remember that they have been transferred to Christ, ‘with whose stripes you are healed’ (Isaiah 53:3). This is the beginning of salvation. By this means we are delivered from sin and justified and eternal life is granted to us (*hoc modo liberamur a peccato, iustificamur et donatur nobis vita aeterna*), not for our own merits and works but for our faith, by which we take hold of Christ (*propter fidem qua Christum apprehendimus*).”^[13] There are several instances in the *Lectures* where Luther clearly and directly links justification with the atonement and redemption on the cross which bring about the forgiveness of our sins.

According to Mannermaa's main thesis in the opening section of his work, the very incarnation of the Son of God brings about the abolition of the sins of all humanity; Mannermaa has no reference to the cross of Jesus. Mannermaa states in the Introduction of his work: “The first part of this study shows that Luther's doctrine of justification rests on the Christological thinking of the early church, which he interprets in a particular way. In his human nature, according to Luther, Christ *really* bears the sins of all human beings; in his divine nature, he is eternal righteousness and life. Christ wins the battle between sin and righteousness, and this takes place within his own person. Faith, in turn means participation in the person of Christ. When a human being is united with God, he or she becomes a participant not only in the human but also in the divine nature of Christ. At the same time a ‘communication of attributes’ (*communicatio idiomatum*) occurs: the attributes of the essence of God—such as righteousness, life, power, etc.—are communicated to the Christian.”^[14]

Mannermaa adapts the Chalcedonian Christology of the two natures of Christ to a certain type of “personalism” in his interpretation of Luther. In a peculiar way, he equates the Patristic Christological notion of *communicatio idiomatum* with Luther's favorite term *commercium admirabile* (*fröhlicher Wechsel*; this expression also has Patristic roots). The first concept speaks

[13] WA 40/1, 232, 16–23; LW 26, 131–132. The references here are all, unless otherwise mentioned, to the in 1535 published text of the *Lectures on Galatians*.

[14] Mannermaa 2005, 8. All italics in my quotations from Mannermaa are by Mannermaa himself.

about the mutual exchange of the two natures of Christ, the latter about the exchange of the qualities of Christ (holiness, righteousness, eternal life, etc.) with the qualities of the sinner (unbelief, sinfulness, corruption, mortality, etc.). The first is an ontological Christological (in fact, a Trinitarian) concept; the latter is a soteriological term. Mannermaa mingles the two.

In Mannermaa's interpretation, the decisive battle between the powers of evil and righteousness took place in the "person" of Christ; in Mannermaa's entire work, there is no discussion on the "work" of Christ, his cross and resurrection. Mannermaa says explicitly that Luther "does not separate the person (*persona*) of Christ and his work (*officium*) from each other." "Instead, Christ himself, both his person and his work, is the Christian righteousness, that is, the 'the righteousness of faith.' Christ—and therefore also his entire person and work—is really and truly present in the faith itself (*in ipsa fide Christus adest*). The favor of God (i. e., the forgiveness of sins and the removal of God's wrath) and his 'gift' (*donum*, God himself, present in the fullness of his essence) unite in the person of Christ."^[15]

It is easy to agree with Mannermaa that Christ in person and his work belong together, the Giver and his gifts are inseparable. But this does not mean that we should not pay any distinct attention to the office or the work of Christ, to the historical facts of salvation, the cross and resurrection. Mannermaa discusses the person of Christ but is silent about the work of Christ. Luther also keeps the person and work of Christ inseparably together, yet he speaks about both of them in a distinctive way.

Mannermaa explains his understanding of salvation through incarnation: "According to Luther, however, the Logos did not take upon himself merely human nature, in a 'neutral' form, but precisely the concrete and actual human nature. This means that Christ *really* has and bears the sins of all human beings in the human nature he has assumed. Christ is the greatest sinner (*maximus peccator, peccator peccatorum*)."^[16] In Mannermaa's subsequent direct quotation Luther says: "In short, he has and bears all the sins of all men in his body (*qui habet et portat omnia omnium peccata in corpore suo*)—not in the sense that he has committed them but in the sense that he took these sins, committed by us, upon his own body, in order to make satisfaction for them with his own blood (*pro illis sanguine proprio satisfactorius*)."^[17] Luther clearly teaches that the incarnated body of Christ bears and takes away the sins of the world on the cross, not before the cross on the basis of incarnation alone.

A very long quotation from Luther reproduced by Mannermaa just a bit later demonstrates extensively the Reformer's idea of atonement and redemption on the cross; in this quotation Luther says, for instance: "...the Son of God is a sinner and a curse. . . he suffered, was crucified, and died. . . the Son of God was crucified and underwent the torments of sin and death...the suffering Christ, who undertook to bear the person of all sinners and therefore was made guilty of the sins of the entire world (*qui personam omnium peccatorum gerendam suscepit ideoque reus factus est peccatorum totius mundi*)."

Quite surprisingly, in his comments Mannermaa ignores Luther's words about the

[15] Mannermaa 2005, 5.

[16] Mannermaa 2005, 13.

[17] WA 40/1, 433, 32-434, 12; LW 26, 277.

cross and the atonement, although they are in the center of Luther's own argumentation. ^[18]

Mannermaa's view is based on the idea that salvation happened already in the "person" of Christ when his divine attributes overcame sin and death: "As a human being, Christ is the 'greatest sinner of all'; at the same time, as the Logos, he is God, the 'perfect righteousness and life.' Therefore his person is marked by an extreme tension and a most profound contradiction. By his divine nature Christ is the 'Divine Power, Righteousness, Blessing, Grace, and Life.' These divine attributes fight against sin, death, and curse—which also culminate in his person—and overcome them. Hence, there is no sin or death, or curse anymore because 'all sin is gathered together' in Christ and he was thus the 'only sinner.' It is important to appreciate that the conquest of the forces of sin and destruction takes place within Christ's own person. He won the battle between righteousness and sin 'in himself.' Sin, death, and curse are first conquered in the person of Christ, and 'thereafter' the whole of creation is to be transformed through his person." ^[19]

Differing from Luther, Mannermaa needs no reference to the "work" of Christ in order to explain the drama of salvation; concentration on the incarnation and the "person" of Christ is enough for him. This, of course, can be seen as an essential part of the drama, but why should Mannermaa be silent on the other essential parts; Where is the drama of the cross and resurrection, so important for Luther and, of course, for Paul whom Luther is interpreting in his Lectures? For Luther, the concrete locus where Christ "overcomes sin, death, and curse" is not just "within Christ's own person," as Mannermaa says, but on the cross and in the resurrection.

Mannermaa explicitly states: "Salvation is participation in the person of Christ." ^[20] He continues to explain: "It is a central idea of Luther's theology that in faith human beings really participate in the person of Christ, and in the divine life and victory that come with him. Or, to say it the other way round; Christ gives his person to us through faith. 'Faith' means participation in Christ, in whom there is no sin, death, or curse. ... In Luther's view, faith is a victory precisely because it unites the believer with the person of Christ, who, in himself, is the victory. ... Christ himself is life, righteousness, and blessing, because God is all this 'by nature and in substance.' Therefore, justifying faith means participation in God's essence in Christ." ^[21] Moreover, Mannermaa adds, participation leads to the "happy exchange" in which "Christ takes upon himself the sinful person of a human being and bestows his own righteous person upon him or her." ^[22]

In Mannermaa's explanation, the victory of Christ took place at his incarnation; he does not refer to the cross or resurrection as a victory over evil powers—this is the essential truth for Luther. Consequently, in Mannermaa's interpretation, salvation means participation in the person, the divine attributes and the divine essence of Christ—participation in the cross and resurrection of Christ is never mentioned by him, although it is several times clearly mentioned by Luther in the quotations reproduced by Mannermaa.

After these explanations, Mannermaa quotes extensively from Luther's Lectures; in this

[18] Mannermaa 2005, 14-15. Mannermaa quotes WA 40/1, 434, 29-36; 435, 21-436, 16; LW 26, 278.

[19] Mannermaa 2005, 16.

[20] Mannermaa 2005, 16.

[21] Mannermaa 2005, 16-17.

[22] Mannermaa 2005, 17.

quotation Luther explains the profound meaning of the atonement on the cross and of the resurrection of Jesus as the foundation of justification and salvation. In Mannermaa's quotation Luther, explaining Christ as "the Propitiator and Cleanser of the church," says for instance: "For, according to the theology of Paul, there is no more sin, no more death, and no more curse in the world, but only in Christ, who is the Lamb of God that takes away the sins of the world, and who became a curse in order to set us free from the curse (*qui factus est maledictum, ut nos a maledicto liberaret*). ... But the true theology teaches that there is no more sin in the world, because Christ, on whom, according to Isaiah 53:6, the Father has laid the sins of the entire world, has conquered, destroyed, and killed it in his own body. Having died to sin once, he has truly been raised from the dead and will not die anymore (*Is semel mortuus peccato, resuscitatus vero ex mortuis, amplius non moritur*)." [23] In spite of quoting this text of Luther, Luther's teaching on the cross and the resurrection are left unremarked by Mannermaa. Luther follows his logic of *theologia crucis*, whereas, it seems, Mannermaa does not.

Participation both in the work and in the person of Christ belong together

In many of the quotations from Luther used by Mannermaa, the Reformer himself speaks about the atonement and redemption on the cross as the foundation and essence of grace and justification. Without the cross of Christ, there is no gospel, no forgiveness, and no grace. In his analysis Mannermaa does not pay attention to this aspect. In the following I will pick up some further evidence from Luther's *Lectures* on the importance of the cross; these are quotations not used by Mannermaa. Unfortunately, so far, no proper research on Luther's comprehensive teaching on the doctrine of atonement exists. It may well be that it would be difficult to do such research because Luther employs a variety of biblical and traditional concepts and imagery of atonement, reconciliation, and redemption; Luther probably has no systematic view of the various dimensions of the cross. Here a plurality of views prevails in Christian theology; the church has never created any detailed or normative doctrine of the cross. [24]

Atonement and redemption by the blood of the Son of God is a frequent theme in Luther's *Lectures on Galatians*; here we refer to texts not quoted by Mannermaa. On his cross Jesus paid an "infinite price *pro me*"; his "own holy blood" brings about the "redemption" of humanity. Luther frequently uses expressions such as "Christ, the Son of God, was made a victim," "sacrifice," "propitiation," "expiation," and "satisfaction" for our sins. He is the "substitute" and "representative" of humanity who on his cross takes the sins of the world on himself. Luther dedicates extensive space to explaining these traditional motifs of the doctrine of atonement and redemption. [25]

Luther seems especially fond of speaking about the blood of Jesus: "He might have made satisfaction for all the sins of the world with only one drop of his blood (*potuisset enim per unicam*

[23] Mannermaa 2005, 17-18. WA 40/1, 445, 19-32; LW 26, 285-286.

[24] "Indeed, while the conviction of redemption through Christ has always been the motive force of Christian faith, no final and universally accepted definition of the manner of its achievement has been formulated to this day." Kelly 1958, 163.

[25] See, for instance, WA 40/1, 83-89, 232-233, 273-278, 295-299, 433-437; LW 26, 33-36, 132, 159-163, 176-178, 277-279.

guttulam sanguinis satisfacere pro peccatis mundi), but now he has made abundant satisfaction.”^[26] “God...cannot be placated except by this immense, infinite price, the death and the blood of the Son of God, one drop of which is more precious than all creation (*eum non placari posse nisi hoc immenso et infinito pretio, scilicet morte et sanguine Filii sui, cuius una gutta praetiosior est tota creatura*).”^[27]

It is the cross of Christ that destroys sin and its consequences: “...on his shoulders lie all the evils of the human race—the law, sin, death, the devil, and hell—all of which die in him, because by his death he kills them (*quae omnia moriuntur in eo, sua enim morte occidit ea*).”^[28] “... Jesus Christ, the Son of God, dies on the cross and bears my sin, the law, death, the devil, and hell in his body (*in corpore suo*)”; “he bears all the sins of all men in his body...upon his own body, in order to make satisfaction for them with his own blood (*pro illis sanguine proprio satisfactorius*).”^[29] In addition, Luther loves to speak about the “victory” of Christ on his cross over the powers of evil and over the law and God’s wrath; this is the gospel which “liberates” the sinners from the consequences of sin.^[30] Luther summarizes: “...I immerse my conscience in the wounds, the blood, the death, the resurrection, and the victory of Christ (*immergo conscientiam meam in vulnera, sanguinem, mortem, resurrectionem et victoriam Christi*). Beyond him I do not want to see or hear anything at all.”^[31] This is the central teaching of Luther in his Lectures overlooked by Mannermaa.

If compared with Gustaf Aulén’s famous *motivforskning* on the three paradigmatic models of interpreting the suffering of Jesus,^[32] it is clear that Luther combines the “classical” *Christus victor* motif with the Anselmian doctrine of satisfaction and the post-Anselmian doctrine of penal substitution. Moreover, the Abelardian motif of the cross of Jesus deeply moving the human heart and molding the form of Christian existence is not absent in Luther’s theology either. One of the great weaknesses of Aulén’s analysis of the three main motifs of the atonement is that he does not link the cross of Jesus with its Old Testament background; the Passover meal (“the Lamb of God,” emphasized in all of the four Gospels and by Paul) and the sacrificial system of the temple (Leviticus, interpreted typologically by Paul and by the Letter to the Hebrews). The notion of the sacrifice is lacking in Aulén’s analysis, yet it is an essential part of Luther’s interpretation of Paul.

Because Luther uses an abundance of soteriological imagery, it is impossible to place him in any particular interpretational framework, even though Aulén places him in the paradigm of *Christus victor*. Luther’s theological understanding of the cross of Jesus is rich; it includes elements of atonement, sacrifice, reconciliation, redemption, vicarious representation, penal substitution, expiation, satisfaction, transference of guilt, victory over the evil powers, participation in his death, etc. It is also evident that Luther does not follow the Patristic notion of the impassibility of the divine nature of Christ. Following the realistic and dynamic biblical language, Luther freely speaks about

[26] WA 40/1, 232, 31-33; LW 26, 132.

[27] WA 40/1, 295, 30-34; LW 26, 176.

[28] WA 40/1, 273, 26-29; LW 26, 160.

[29] WA 40/1, 274, 24-25; LW 26, 160. The unpublished text of Luther’s Lectures emphasizes that Christ, when crucified, “kills sin in his body”: “*Christus solus tollit et occidit peccatum in corpore suo*.” WA 40/1, 274, 8-9. WA 40/1, 433, 32-434, 12; LW 26, 277.

[30] See, for instance, WA 40/1, 260-261, 439-441; LW 26, 151, 281-282.

[31] WA 40/1, 564, 12-14; LW 26, 369.

[32] Aulén 1931.

the suffering of the Son of God—“Christ, the Son of God was given into death for my sins (*Christus Dei Filius pro ipsis in mortem traditus est*)”—or even about “the blood of the Son of God (*sanguis Filii Dei*).”^[33] Moreover, his emphasis is in accordance with the notion of *communicatio idiomatum*: what concerns the human nature of Christ also touches his divine nature; although his divine nature cannot die, it can and it did suffer.

In his *Lectures on Galatians* Luther links his understanding of the cross inseparably with his doctrine of justification. He states that the gospel is the good news of the forgiveness of sins based on the atonement of sins on the cross of Jesus; “Believe in Jesus Christ, who was crucified for your sins. If you feel your sins, do not consider them in yourself but remember that they have been transferred to Christ (*ea translata esse in Christum*), ‘with whose stripes you are healed’ (Isaiah 53:3). This is the beginning of salvation. By this means we are delivered from sin and justified, and eternal life is granted to us (*iustificamur et donatur nobis vita aeterna*)…”^[34] “...he gave himself for me—for me, I say, a miserable and accursed sinner, I am revived by this ‘giving’ of the Son of God into death... these words are the purest proclamation of grace and of Christian righteousness (*ista verba sunt purissima praedicatio gratiae et iustitiae Christianae*)...”^[35] Because of his cross, Christ is “the Justifier and the Savior (*iustificator et salvator*).”^[36]

In a significant manner, in his *Lectures*, Luther combines the dimension of participation, emphasized by Mannermaa, with the cross and resurrection when explaining the key verse Galatians 2:20: “Here Paul clearly shows how he is alive; and he states what Christian righteousness is (*quae sit iustitia Christiana*), namely, that righteousness by which Christ lives in us, not the righteousness that is in our own person. ... But here Christ and my conscience must become one body (*oportet Christum et conscientiam meam fieri unum corpus*), so that nothing remains in my sight but Christ, crucified and risen (*in conspectu meo nihil maneat nisi Christus crucifixus et resuscitatus*).”^[37] After explaining at length the meaning of the atonement on the cross in another key verse, Galatians 3:13, Luther concludes: “This is how we must magnify the doctrine of Christian righteousness in opposition to the righteousness of the law and of works (*Ita oportet nos magnificare articulum de iustitia Christiana contra iustitiam legis et operum*)...”^[38] Here Luther powerfully emphasizes a union with Christ as a union with the crucified and resurrected Jesus Christ, true man and true God, not just with his divine nature.

In a way of a summary, we may conclude that Luther’s teaching about the cross is rather traditional, not as original and systematic as his teaching on the application of the fruit of the cross in his doctrine of the justification of the sinner. Mannermaa’s interpretation has a bias towards focusing solely on the reception of grace in terms of a personal union between Christ and the sinner at the expense of the historical dimension of salvation, the work of Christ. For Luther, the historical cross

[33] See, for instance, WA 40/1, 88, 29–89, 11; LW 26, 3. WA 40/1, 84, 14. The passibility of the Son of God in Luther’s theology has been rightly emphasized by Jürgen Moltmann in his vindication of Luther’s theology of the cross. Moltmann 1974.

[34] WA 40/1, 232, 18–22; LW 26, 132.

[35] WA 40/1, 297, 19–24; LW 26, 177.

[36] WA 40/1, 298, 34; LW 26, 178.

[37] WA 40/1, 282, 16–22; LW 26, 166.

[38] WA 40/1, 438, 18–19; LW 26, 280.

and the historical resurrection are the foundation which makes the personal union possible. Some might defend Mannermaa by saying that he takes the historical dimension of the cross and resurrection for granted, there is no need to mention it. But if Luther in his *Lectures* continuously speaks about it, why should Mannermaa never mention this essential content of Luther's doctrine of grace? *Argumentum ex silentio* in defense of Mannermaa is not convincing here.

It is obvious that Luther understands justification in terms of the forgiveness of sins and of the imputation of the gift-righteousness of Christ (juridical or forensic justification, *favor*), based on the atonement and the penal substitution of the cross. But simultaneously, he also sees justification as participation in the fruits of the cross and the resurrection of Jesus as well as in the personal righteousness and the divine person of Christ (Mannermaa's "real-ontic" union with Christ, *donum*). Mannermaa concentrates on the latter, and even then he emphasizes only participation in the divinity of Christ with no mention of the fruits of his cross and resurrection.

We may raise this concern: Even the participation in the person of Christ is necessarily bound up with his deeds, the person and the work of Christ are both necessary for the justification of the sinner. As seen above, Mannermaa also underscores the inseparable unity of the person and the work of Christ, although he does not speak about the latter. The Giver and the gifts enter the life of the sinner simultaneously; the Giver cannot come without the gifts of his cross and resurrection, nor can the gifts be separated from the Giver and his righteous, divine person. Luther follows the Patristic understanding according to which the person of Christ is always in his saving work, and the saving work is always in his person. ^[39]

Luther's deep commitment to Chalcedonian Christology is another fact which cannot possibly let him see salvation as the work of the divine nature of Jesus Christ only—that would lead into some sort of monophysitism; salvation is simultaneously the work of both of the natures, the human and the divine. For Luther, the historical man of Nazareth on the cross, the son of Mary, being simultaneously his Father's divine Son, is at the core of salvation. Moreover, the physical, historical resurrection of the same man is the guarantee of our future salvation.

God's Holy Spirit creates both faith and the sinner's union with Christ

Now we take a look at the deficiency of Pneumatology in Mannermaa's interpretation of Luther's *Lectures*. Mannermaa criticizes the way later Confessional Lutheranism (*Formula of Concord*) separates justification and sanctification; first the sinner is justified by Christ, then the Holy Spirit will begin his sanctifying work in the believer. In a programmatic manner, Mannermaa

[39] This is the integral view of Irenaeus in which the cross of Jesus is the precondition of divinization, because it abolishes guilt and corruption so that the corrupt may be transformed into incorruption, and death is overcome by the resurrection of Christ so that the mortal may put on immortality. Hans Urs von Balthasar, 1990, 3, emphasizes that, according to Irenaeus, redemption depends on more than just the incarnation. It depends on three things: "the real incarnation, the real suffering on the cross, and the real resurrection of the flesh." As to Athanasius, Thomas G. Weinandy, 2007, 43, states: "It would ... be erroneous to interpret Athanasius' soteriology as merely incarnational, that is, by merely assuming our humanity he divinized it and made it incorruptible, thus diminishing the significance of the cross and the resurrection. ... [Divinization is] achieved only through the whole of the soteriological economy—the incarnation of the Word and the salvific actions that he undertakes as man, especially his death on the cross."

states that justification and sanctification cannot be separated; they are one and the same reality based on participation in the person of Christ who is “present in the faith” of the believer. ^[40]

Yet, in a peculiar way, in his magnum opus Mannermaa makes an important distinction: The first main part of his book (“The Doctrine of Justification and Christology”) concentrates on justification in terms of Christology as participation in the divinity of Christ with no reference to the work of the Holy Spirit. But in the second main part of his work (“The Presence of Christ in Faith and the Holiness of Christians”), which concentrates on Christian life and sanctification, the theme of the Holy Spirit becomes the dominant one. This is a paradox because Mannermaa seems partly to commit the same mistake which he criticizes in later Lutheranism: justification and sanctification, though linked, yet are somewhat different realities. One might argue that Mannermaa places the work of the Holy Spirit in the sphere of sanctification because Paul’s *Letter to the Galatians* speaks about the Spirit mostly, but not exclusively, in its latter part. But in Luther’s *Lectures* this is not the case; Luther sees the work of the Holy Spirit as crucially important from the very beginning of his commentary on Paul.

In Mannermaa’s magnum opus, there is no mention of the Holy Spirit effecting justifying faith, converting the unbeliever into a believer (point 1), or the presence of the Holy Spirit being a synonym of the “real presence” of Christ in the Christian (point 2) — the themes which are essential for Luther’s theology of grace in *The Bondage of the Will*. ^[41] For Luther, the Pneumatological understanding of *sola fide* is crucially important to safeguard the theocentric nature of the conversion of the sinner from unbelief to faith. This is one of the main themes of *The Bondage of the Will*: faith is not a human accomplishment but a sole creation of God’s Holy Spirit. ^[42] Moreover, following Paul’s theology, Luther understands the union with Christ simultaneously as a union with his Holy Spirit—Christology and Pneumatology coincide. For Luther, the Holy Spirit is not only a reality belonging principally to the dimension of sanctification (point 3), but the Spirit is crucially important at every phase of the justification of the sinner; also in creating conversion and faith—justification *sola fide* (point 1), and in the sinner’s union with the work and with the person of Christ (point 2a & b). It is exactly in and through his Holy Spirit that “Christ is present in faith” and present in the sinner.

Mannermaa’s interpretation of justification is clearly lacking the strong Pneumatology characteristic of

[40] See Mannermaa 2005, 49.

[41] Mannermaa’s *Two Kinds of Love* is another important work where he analyzes Luther’s doctrine of grace. It is symptomatic of Mannermaa’s partial dependence on the traditional paradigm of Luther research, as he employs the vocabulary of *kerygma* theology, “Luther’s theology of the word/Word” and lays no emphasis on Pneumatology when interpreting Luther’s view of justification. See Mannermaa 2010, 57–66.

[42] Olli-Pekka Vainio correctly warns about the danger of making faith a human achievement when separating the forensic favor aspect of grace from the notion of *donum* as a union with Christ: “If, however, we wish to argue for the view that *unio cum Christo* or *inhabitatio Dei* is the consequence of imputation, we face some surprising problems. What is faith, then? If the presence of Christ is just a logical consequence of faith, then faith has to be a human achievement.” Vainio, however, does not bring in Pneumatology here. Vainio 2015, 468.

Luther and his understanding of Paul in his *Lectures*.^[43] Someone might say this is self-evidently presupposed in Mannermaa's interpretation with no need to mention it. Again, we might ask: How convincing is this kind of *argumentum ex silentio*? If Luther so often explicitly mentions the Holy Spirit in the very work analyzed by Mannermaa, why then should that be overlooked and not mentioned at all by Mannermaa? Luther's Pneumatological expressions are present even in many quotations used by Mannermaa, but he pays no attention to them.^[44]

Here we look at some teachings of Luther in his *Lectures* overlooked by Mannermaa. As to the first function of the Holy Spirit effecting the conversion of the sinner and creating faith (point 1), Luther explains Paul's teaching on justification *sola fide* as the work of the Holy Spirit: God's Spirit creates faith in the unbeliever through the preaching of the gospel. When commenting on Paul preaching the gospel to the gentiles, Luther often uses expressions such as "the Holy Spirit came upon those who heard the word" and "cleansed their hearts by faith," etc.^[45] "For just as through the gospel God gave the Holy Spirit to gentiles who lived without the law, so he gave the Holy Spirit also to the Jews, not through the law... but solely through the proclamation of faith (*per solam fidei preadicationem dedit Spiritum sanctum*)."^[46] "... the Holy Spirit, who comes with the preached word (*qui cum verbo praedicato venit*), purifies our hearts by faith (*qui fide purificat corda*), and produces spiritual motivation in us."^[47] "We are justified solely by faith in Christ, without works, and the Holy Spirit is granted solely by hearing the message of the gospel with faith (*solo auditu fidei Spiritum sanctum dari ad vocem Euangelii*)..."^[48] "Then what does justify? ... hearing the proclamation of faith-when this is heard, it justifies (*audire sermonem fidei, is sermo auditus iustificat*). Why? Because it brings the Holy Spirit who justifies (*Quia affert Spiritum sanctum qui iustificat*)."^[49] "We are justified through the Spirit by faith (*Iustificamur Spiritu ex fide*");

[43] Among the Finns, Pekka Kärkkäinen has done substantial research on Luther's Pneumatology. He notes that in his writings before 1520, Luther sees the role of the Holy Spirit "in bringing about the union between Christ and the human being, but the union itself is mostly described in Christological terms." Kärkkäinen comes to the conclusion that, from 1520 onward, Luther emphasized more clearly "the parallelism of the divine sending of the Son and of the Spirit": the presence of the Spirit is a reality in itself, not just a derivation from Christology. See Kärkkäinen 2003, 134, 137, 198-199. This is an important notion, and in *The Bondage of the Will* this development has reached its peak; Luther adapts Pneumatological terminology to the very idea of the participation of the sinner in Trinitarian life. The role of the Spirit is not just that of an "instrument," but the Spirit is Christ himself in the sinner.

Simo Peura, a student of Mannermaa, somewhat differing from Mannermaa, fully recognizes the simultaneity of the Christological and Pneumatological dimensions of justification. It is typical of Luther to understand the terminology of Christological grace and the terminology of Pneumatological grace as nearly synonymous ways of speaking of one and the same reality. Referring to Luther's *Lectures on Romans*, Peura speaks about "the totality of the gift": "Zu dieser Totalität des Schenkens gehört auch ... die Gabe des Heiligen Geistes. Der Reformator ist der Ansicht, dass der Heilige Geist durch den Glauben in das Herz und in das Innerste des Menschen eingegossen wird, wenn das Wort der Gnade an die Ohren klopft. Der Heilige Geist wird aber nicht nur als Gabe unter anderen Gaben geschenkt, sondern er ist auch selbst an der Eingießung der Gnade, der Gerechtigkeit und der anderen Gütern Christi beteiligt." Peura 1990, 211-212.

[44] One curiosity in Mannermaa's magnum opus shows a certain belittling of the person of the Holy Spirit; in his original Finnish work he always calls God's Spirit by the impersonal demonstrative pronoun "se," "it," not by the personal pronoun "hän," "he/she."

[45] WA 40/1, 150-156; LW 26, 79-82.

[46] WA 40/1, 332, 26-29; LW 26, 205.

[47] WA 40/1, 572, 20-23; LW 26, 375.

[48] WA 40/1, 336, 25-26; LW 26, 208.

[49] WA 40/1, 336, 30-31; LW 26, 208.

“righteousness...is achieved by the Spirit through faith in Christ.”^[50]

When interpreting Galatians 3:2, Luther creates a sharp contrast between “being justified by works of law” and “being justified by the Holy Spirit.” “For whatever is not the Holy Spirit or hearing with faith is clearly the law (*Quidquid enim non est Spiritus sanctus vel auditus fidei, hoc plane est lex*). We are dealing here with the issue of justification (*Versamur enim iam in causa iustificationis*).”^[51] Luther implies that preaching of the gospel brings the gift of the Spirit to its hearers; God’s word gives the Spirit who brings about faith in those who hear the word. The human being does not have a free choice in matters of unfaith and faith or of sin and grace, only God’s Spirit, using God’s word as his instrument, can change the orientation of the human heart and create faith.

Faith and the work of the Holy Spirit belong together—this teaching is constantly repeated by Luther in his Lectures: “you received the Holy Spirit merely by hearing with faith (*solo auditu fidei accepistis Spiritum sanctum*)”; “the Holy Spirit was granted to you solely by your hearing with faith (*solo auditu fidei vobis datum esse Spiritum sanctum*)”; “through the gospel God gave the Holy Spirit to gentiles...he gave the Holy Spirit also to the Jews...solely through the proclamation of faith (*per solam fidei praedicationem dedit Spiritum sanctum*).”^[52] Luther himself follows Paul’s teaching according to which justifying faith is the sole creation of the Holy Spirit, effected by the proclamation of the gospel. Consequently, without the monergistic work of God’s Spirit, there is no justification *sola fide*.

Curiously, Luther confronts Erasmus by name in his *Lectures on Galatians* of 1531, he criticizes Erasmus’ interpretation of the conversion of Cornelius in Acts 10. Following Peter Lombard’s interpretation in his *Sententiarum libri quatuor*, Luther says Erasmus holds the view that “Cornelius was a good man, righteous, one who feared God, gave many alms to the people, and prayed to God continually. Therefore he merited the forgiveness of sins and the sending of the Holy Spirit ‘by congruity.’” In fact, referring to the case of Cornelius, in his *Diatribes* Erasmus speaks about preparation for receiving grace: “...a man may, with the help of God, prepare himself by morally good works for the divine favor (*per opera moraliter bona sese praeparare favori divino*), as we read of Cornelius, the centurion, who was not yet baptized and had not been inspired by the Holy Spirit ...”^[53] Here Erasmus represents the standard Nominalist doctrine of *facere quod in se est*. Luther, of course, fiercely denies that God pardoned Cornelius because of his seeking God’s favor by the manner of doing good works; he argues that Cornelius “received God’s Spirit” and “was justified by hearing with faith (*per auditum fidei iustificatus est*). Hence God does justify without the law.”^[54]

The very conversion of a sinner and the birth of faith in his/her heart—the coming into existence of justifying faith—is already the very work of the Holy Spirit. This important aspect of Luther’s doctrine of grace is lacking in Mannermaa’s interpretation. The very title of Mannermaa’s magnum opus, *In ipsa fide Christus adest*, is a quotation from Luther’s *Lectures* implying the presence of Christ in faith in and through

[50] WA 40/2, 23, 25; LW 27, 20. WA 40/2, 32, 30-32; LW 27, 27.

[51] WA 40/1, 329, 23-24; LW 26, 203.

[52] WA 40/1, 330, 21-22, 26-27; 332, 26-29; LW 26, 203, 205. “Euangelium vero affert Spiritum sanctum...” WA 40/1, 336, 34. For more documentation, see WA 40/1, 329-337, 400-403, 572-580; LW 26, 202-208, 255-256, 374-381.

[53] *Diatribes* IIIb3; Walter, 62, 22-26; LCC 17, 75.

[54] WA 40/1, 337, 23-338, 18; LW 26, 209. Luther explicitly refers to Erasmus a few times in his *Lectures on Galatians*; his main criticism is that Erasmus teaches salvation by law, emphasizing human free preparation for receiving and even meriting divine grace, in the sense of *meritum de congruo*. See WA 40/1, 220, 4-29; 259, 26-33; 291, 29-294, 22; 500, 25-34.

his Holy Spirit—by definition the actuality of the “real-ontic” presence of any of the persons of the Trinity is a Pneumatological reality: “Christ...is present in the faith itself (*in ipsa fide Christus adest*). ...Therefore faith justifies because it takes hold of and possesses this treasure, the present Christ (*apprehendit et possidet istum thesaurum, scilicet Christum praesentem*).”^[55]

It is typical of Luther research and Lutheran theology to use the expression *sola fide* with no reference to God's Holy Spirit. Consequently, there is a great danger of comprehending faith as an anthropological reality, something accomplished by the human psyche. The reality of “Christ being present in the faith itself” (*in ipsa fide Christus adest*) is by definition a Pneumatological reality; it is in his Holy Spirit that Christ is present in faith. Faith is a perfect gift of the Trinitarian God or otherwise it is a human achievement and thus a merit.

In regard to the second function of the Holy Spirit in uniting the sinner with Christ (point 2), in his *Lectures* Luther frequently equates participation in Christ as participation in the Spirit. The justified sinner is “the temple of the Holy Spirit,” and it is just because of this that he/she can be justified. Commenting on Galatians 4:6, Luther says: “God has also sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, as Paul says here. Now Christ is completely certain that in his Spirit he is pleasing to God. Since we have the same Spirit of Christ, we, too, should be certain that we are in a state of grace (*cum eundem Spiritum Christi habeamus, debemus certi esse nos esse in gratia*), on account of him who is certain.”^[56]

Mannermaa quotes a similar text from Luther where the Christological and Pneumatological dimensions of justification are closely connected, but Mannermaa neither comments on nor even mentions the Holy Spirit here. In this quotation Luther says: “But so far as justification is concerned, Christ and I must be so closely attached that he lives in me and I in him (*oportet Christum et me esse coniunctissimos, ut ipse in me vivat et ego in illo*). What a marvelous way of speaking! Because he lives in me, whatever grace, righteousness, life, peace, and there is in me is all Christ's; nevertheless, it is mine as well, by the cementing and attachment that are through faith, by which we become as one body in the Spirit (*unum corpus in Spiritu*). Since Christ lives in me, grace, righteousness, life, and eternal salvation must be present with him; and the law, sin, and death must be absent.”^[57] Moreover, Luther sees the idea of “being filled with God” as a Pneumatological reality. In his interpretation of Luther's *Lectures*, Mannermaa quotes a sentence from Luther's *Predigten des Jahres 1525* and highlights the idea of being “filled with God” but makes no reference to the Spirit, although Luther clearly says: “We are filled with God, and he pours into us all his gifts and grace and fills us with his Spirit, who makes us courageous.”^[58]

The Trinitarian reality of divine grace

It is clear that in his *Lectures* Luther sees the work of the Holy Spirit as crucial in the

[55] WA 40/1,229,15-23; LW 26,131-132.

[56] WA 40/1,577,20-25; LW 26,378-379.

[57] WA 40/1,284,20-28; LW 26,167-168. Mannermaa 2005,40.

[58] *Predigten des Jahres 1525* (Predigt 61), WA 17/1,438,16-18; the original text says: “Wir erfüllet werden auff alle weise, damit er voll macht und voll Gotes werden überschuttet mit allen gaben und gnade und erfüllet mit seyden geyst, der uns mutig mache ...” Mannermaa 2005,45. (The English translation of Luther is taken from Mannermaa's book.)

justification of the sinner; First, God's Spirit converts the human mind and heart from lack of faith into faith—the faith which justifies the sinner—*sola fide*, is a monergistic gift of the Spirit (point 1). Moreover, second, the Holy Spirit unites the sinner with the gifts of the cross and resurrection of Jesus Christ (point 2a), and makes Christ present in faith enabling the believer to participate in Christ's divine person and life (point 2b)—a union between Christ and the believer is simultaneously a union between the Holy Spirit and the believer, *unio cum Christo in Spiritu sancto*. This conception is fully in accordance with Luther's Trinitarian scope of the doctrine of grace: *opera Trinitatis ad extra indivisa sunt*. By definition, for Luther, this union also means a simultaneous and inseparable participation both in the work of Christ and in the person of Christ.

Finally, third, the Holy Spirit renews the Christian in the life-long process of sanctification (point 3) in which “the rule of the Spirit of Christ” and the believer's participation in divine love through participation in the divine nature of the Trinity can gradually increase and become stronger. Mannermaa only emphasizes the influence of the Holy Spirit in the last dimension (point 3)—at this point I agree with Mannermaa's interpretation—the other dimensions of the work of the Spirit are overlooked by him.^[59]

Luther represents a powerful theocentric and monergistic doctrine of the justification of the sinner. In order to be so, this doctrine must be essentially Trinitarian; the salvation the Father has given to his creatures in his Son can be objectively, monergistically, and effectively delivered to humanity only through the living and effective activity and presence of God's own Holy Spirit. A big problem in Mannermaa's interpretation of Luther is the weakness of Pneumatology, which leads into a weakness in the Trinitarian nature of justification and the doctrine of grace.

This weakness in Pneumatology is even more surprising because Mannermaa created his new interpretation of Luther in the context of the Lutheran-Orthodox ecumenical dialogue—Pneumatology acquires a central role in the very heart of Orthodox soteriology. Moreover, Mannermaa's vision of Luther's doctrine of grace reflects the Augustinian paradigm of grace as participation in divine love. For Augustine, the entire reality of salvation—not only sanctification—means participation in God's substantial quality, love. For Augustine, this is the same as participation in God's Holy Spirit, because the Spirit is the *vinculum caritatis* between the Father and the Son, *i. e.*, the Holy Spirit is the very essence of divine love.^[60] Why does Mannermaa, in his exposition of Luther's teaching on justification, emphasize only love and not also the Spirit?

Conclusion: Luther's doctrine of grace in the context of Patristic theology

Here we cannot but come to the conclusion that Mannermaa's interpretation of Luther's *Lectures on Galatians* has some significant limitations. These appear, first, in Mannermaa's inability to link Luther's doctrine of justification with the work of Christ, *i. e.*, with his cross, atonement, reconciliation, and redemption, as well as with his resurrection. Luther himself explicitly emphasizes

[59] In his other major work, *Two Kinds of Love*, Mannermaa offers a lively description of Luther's teaching on Christian life; Christians are called to be “Christ” to their neighbors; “do to your neighbor what Christ has done to you.” See Mannermaa 2010, 67–75.

[60] On Augustine's concept of love, see Ruokanen 1993, 43–69.

the participation of the sinner both in the work and in the person of Christ as the content of divine saving grace. Second, Mannermaa reduces the scope of Luther's Pneumatology to the sphere of the sanctification of the justified sinner (point 3). In his *Lectures* Luther, however, clearly underscores the crucial role of God's Holy Spirit both in creating the justifying faith, *sola fide* (point 1), and in making both the divine person and the gifts of the work of Christ realistically and truly "present in the faith itself," i. e., present in the sinner (point 2). It is the Holy Spirit of Christ and of his Father alone who enables the presence of Christ in the faith and accomplishes the realistic union between Christ and the sinner: *unio cum Christo in Spiritu sancto*.

My remarks on Mannermaa's interpretation of Luther's *Lectures* are based on my close reading of Luther's *Lectures on Galatians*, and at the same time, as a framework of a wider reference, I pay attention to some of the results of my forthcoming volume analyzing Luther's *The Bondage of the Will*. This will eventually show that my remarks on Mannermaa have a foundation in the larger framework of Luther's theology. ^[61]

Why does Mannermaa offer a reduced, narrowed interpretation of Luther's comprehensive doctrine of grace in his *Lectures*? One might argue it is because of the context in which he wrote this small book of his; for the ecumenical dialogue between the Finnish Evangelical-Lutheran Church and the Russian Orthodox Church. He wished to emphasize that there is a relevant point of contact—although not a full similarity—between the Orthodox doctrine of grace understood in the Greek Patristic term of *theosis* and Luther's special emphasis on understanding justification as participation in the divine nature of Christ. Perhaps it was not Mannermaa's intention to present the entire structure and content of Luther's doctrine of grace in the *Lectures*. Even if this were the case, there is a danger that a selective approach to Luther's thought may give the reader a twisted picture of the Reformer's teaching on grace. We need to present an authentic understanding of the true, complete, and coherent Trinitarian doctrine of grace in Luther's *Lectures* and in his overall theology. As we have seen, connecting *Lectures on Galatians* with *The Bondage of the Will* is helpful for seeing the more comprehensive view of Luther's doctrine of grace.

This is also an ecumenical imperative; paying due attention to all the above-mentioned aspects of the Trinitarian doctrine of justification will strengthen ecumenical dialogue on the doctrine of grace among the churches of the Reformation and between them and the Orthodox and the Catholic churches. For example, Pneumatology is a crucially important element in the Orthodox doctrine of *theosis*; therefore, strengthening the Pneumatological aspect of Mannermaa's interpretation of Luther's doctrine of justification will strengthen Mannermaa's intention of bringing Luther's view closer to Orthodox soteriology. It will also bring Luther's doctrine of grace closer to Pentecostal, Charismatic, and non-denominational interpretations of divine grace; these interpretations are becoming more and more influential in the development of global Christianity in our times. Moreover, highlighting the atonement, reconciliation, and redemption on the cross of Christ keeps Luther's doctrine of grace strongly connected with several Protestant interpretations of grace as well

[61] Antti Raunio, one of the students of Mannermaa, sees the soteriology of Luther in a wider perspective which emphasizes Pneumatology and the cross. In his remarks on *The Bondage of the Will*, Raunio follows Mannermaa's paradigm by seeing Luther's conception of grace as "participation of the human being in divine love." But then Raunio continues: "Das Evangelium ist also ein Wort, mit dem der Geist und die Gnade zur Vergebung der Sünden durch den gekreuzigten Christus dargebracht werden." Raunio 1997, 85.

as with Catholic soteriology.

Mannermaa has been criticized for employing philosophical ontological terminology in his interpretation of Luther. Most importantly, the substance ontological term “real-ontic” participation, frequently used by Mannermaa, has been under attack. Using this expression, Mannermaa emphasized the justified sinner’s actual participation in the “divine nature” of Christ. According to the critics, Mannermaa’s terminology is ambiguous enough to imply the possibility of an ontological mingling of the human essence with the divine essence. Surprisingly, the harshest critic of Mannermaa, Reinhard Flogaus, makes no reference to Luther’s Pneumatology in his criticism. He could have used Pneumatology to highlight the difference between the Patristic view of deification, which is part of his own research, and the presumed “mix of divine substance with human substance” by Mannermaa. A typical German theologian under the influence of the paradigm of relational ontology, Flogaus only operates with the concepts of “word” and “faith.”^[62] Andrea Vestrucci criticizes Mannermaa for mixing ontological and theological claims, for even “reducing theology to ontological speculation.” Neither does Vestrucci introduce Pneumatology as an alternative approach for understanding Luther’s concept of the union between Christ and the believer.^[63] Both of these critics of Mannermaa focus on ontological problems only and lack reference to Luther’s Pneumatological language and mode of thought.

Patristic theology, which Mannermaa willingly refers to, strictly denies the possibility of the union of the created substance with the divine substance. Commenting on 2 Peter 1:4 was common among the church fathers, the expression “partakers of the divine nature” was understood as Christ “making us partakers of his divine nature through the Spirit,” not as a partaking in divine essence. The human being as a creature can just participate in divine person, divine life, and divine attributes, and this happens through the Holy Spirit. There is fluctuation between persons and personal properties through the presence of Christ in the Holy Spirit—this is how the properties of Christ are given to the sinner. Divine grace, which the sinner partakes of, remains alien justice, *iustitia aliena*, the property of the righteous person of Christ and of his gifts of salvation, made present and effective in the human being by the Holy Spirit. Therefore, when speaking about union, participation, and deification, theosis, the fathers did not use ontological terms of philosophy but the Biblical language of Pneumatology. The human being’s union with divine life is a mystery which is by definition

[62] Flogaus 1997, 377-379. Mannermaa coined the term “real-ontic” in Finnish as “reaalis-onttinen.” It has been translated into German as “real-ontisch,” but, unfortunately, for instance, in the translation of Mannermaa’s main work *Christ Present in Faith*, an English translation “ontological” was used, which, of course, increased critical voices.

[63] “The Finnish school thinks of ontology very generally as ‘theological’ in order to avoid ‘reference to any philosophical (Platonic, Aristotelian, Kantian, existential) ontology.’ ... Thus I wonder whether aiming to speak of ontology with no reference to a tradition does not mean taking already a position within the plurality of ontologies. This applies to the Finns. Their ontology is based on a clear theoretical claim; the rejection of the exclusively relational ontology. This implies that the position of the Finnish school must present something that overcomes the limits of relational ontology.” Vestrucci 2019, 79.

Vestrucci wonders whether the conception of *unio cum Christo* can at all be an ontological statement; “such a statement implies knowledge of this unio.” “In sum, either the presence is not hidden and the ontological statement of its reality is possible, or it is hidden and no ontological statement is possible whatsoever. ... My position avoids mixing theology and ontology—or, more precisely, avoids reducing theology to ontological speculation.” Vestrucci ends up claiming that the ontological critique of the Finns is not valid; all ontologies are paradigmatic propositions and as such they are “formally identical—they are all paradigms—and thus it is fallacious to criticize one of them in light of another one.” *Ibid.*, 81-83. (Italics by A. V.)

simultaneously and inseparably both a Christological and a Pneumatological reality. The fathers did not try rationally to explain the mystery of the union, they contended themselves with using the language of Paul and John in the New Testament. So did Luther, he follows the fathers, his conception is similar to that of Irenaeus and Athanasius.

Norman Russell explains Irenaeus' use of the Pauline "exchange formula": "The 'exchange formula' has its roots in Pauline thinking; though Christ was rich, 'yet for our sake he became poor, so that by his poverty you might become rich' ... The 'exchange' signifies precisely that; an exchange of properties, not the establishment of an identity of essence." Russell continues to expose Irenaeus' thought: "The incarnation is part of a larger economy that enables us to participate in the divine attributes of immortality and incorruption and attain the telos which had been intended for Adam." Irenaeus employs the concept of adoption: "He who was Son of God by nature became a man in order to make us sons by adoption. ... The Spirit is at work throughout this process ... The Spirit is the Pauline 'guarantee of our inheritance.'" [64]

After Irenaeus, especially Athanasius and Cyril of Alexandria continued to emphasize that Christ makes the humans "partakers of the divine nature through the Spirit." [65] The fathers deny "an identity of essence" between Christ and the human being, and teach participation in the divine attributes. It seems obvious that the fathers do not understand the statement of 2 Peter 1:4, also quoted by Mannermaa, in terms of a union of divine essence with human essence, but rather as participation in the person, life, and attributes of Christ—especially his incorruption and immortality—through the Holy Spirit. "There is no confusion between the essence of God and that of the human

[64] Russell 2004, 108, 113. "Recapitulation" is a central concept of Irenaeus' theology; Irenaeus teaches that recapitulation of the human being with the Triune God can be accomplished solely by God's Holy Spirit: "These things, therefore, He recapitulated in Himself; by uniting man to the Spirit, and causing the Spirit to dwell in man, He is Himself made the head of the Spirit, and gives the Spirit to be the head of man; for through Him (the Spirit) we see, and hear, and speak." *Adversus Haereses*, V, 20, 1; *The Ante-Nicene Fathers Down to A. D. 325—The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus* 1, 548.

[65] Russell 2004, 203-204.

soul...”^[66] John Behr confirms this understanding of Athanasius; “To whatever degree human beings partake of the divine nature, they do so from the outside; the gift remains other than what they are, and they are external to the divine essence.”^[67]

John D. Zizioulas underlines the teaching of the Greek-speaking fathers on theosis in terms of a personal-not an essential-union between the Triune God and the believer: “This legitimate and imperative soteriological necessity for ‘deification’ can be satisfied only by pursuing the path of the person. The path of essence or of nature cannot lead to deification, because man cannot break the barrier between the natures of created and uncreated and be deified by nature. The essence of God (‘what God is’) remains not only unknown but not susceptible of participation—at least according to the Greek Patristic tradition.”^[68] The Greek-speaking church fathers understand the union of humanity with divine life both in Christological and Pneumatological terms but make a distinction between the two inseparable economies of Christ and of the Holy Spirit; Christ divinizes humanity, whereas the Holy Spirit divinizes individuals. The Holy Spirit is the giver of grace to the human beings, he delivers God’s grace, the deifying gift. Vladimir Lossky interprets the Eastern doctrine of grace: “In Orthodox doctrine... the effect of the presence of the Trinity, is seen as uncreated grace, simply grace, the Gift or Gifts of the Holy Spirit, truly given ceded and truly received, acquired, appropriated by the person.”^[69]

Adapting the simultaneity of the Christological and of the Pneumatological language would mean an important amendment for Mannermaa’s project. It would abolish the ambiguity involved with the use of the philosophical concepts leading to misunderstandings that contradict Mannermaa’s

[66] *Ibid.*, 151-152. The term “divine nature,” *theia physis*, is a hapax legomenon in the New Testament, only 2 Peter 1:4 mentions it. As such it should not be placed over the other, frequently used soteriological terminology in the New Testament. Such terminology consists of, for instance, Paul’s frequently used expressions of personal union: “being in Christ,” “Christ in you,” “the Holy Spirit / the Spirit of Christ/ the Spirit of God in you,” “you in the Spirit,” etc. James Starr, 2000, argues that 2 Peter’s perspective is fundamentally Pauline, based on the simultaneity of Christological and Pneumatological realities.

David M. Gwynn maintains that, according to Athanasius, divine grace has a deeply Trinitarian nature: Grace is given from the Father, through the Son, in the Holy Spirit. The human being’s participation in Christ (Logos) and in God is possible exclusively through participation in the Holy Spirit. There is no communion in the gift of grace except in the Holy Spirit. Gwynn 2012, 73, 92.

Athanasius teaches the human being’s Pneumatological participation in God in his *Orationes contra Arianos*: “Therefore because of the grace of the Spirit which has been given to us, in him we come to be, and he in us; and since it is the Spirit of God, therefore through his becoming in us, reasonably are we, as having the Spirit, considered to be in God, and thus is God in us. ... the Spirit does not unite the Word to the Father, but rather the Spirit receives from the Word. And the Son is in the Father, as his proper Word and radiance; but we, apart from the Spirit, are strange and distant from God, and by the participation of the Spirit we are knit into the Godhead.” *Orationes contra Arianos*, III, 24; *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* 2/4, 406-407.

Also in his *De decretis* Athanasius expresses clearly his Pneumatological accent in teaching deification; the humans participate in the incarnated divinity of Christ through the Holy Spirit, without losing their human substance: “... that the Word was made flesh in order to offer up this body for all, and that we, partaking of His Spirit, might be deified, a gift which we could not otherwise have gained than by His clothing Himself in our created body, for hence we derive our name of ‘men of God’ and ‘men of Christ.’ But as we, by receiving the Spirit, do not lose our proper substance, so the Lord, when made man for us, and bearing a body, was no less God; for He was not lessened by the envelopment of the body, but rather deified it and rendered it immortal.” *De decretis*, III, 14; *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* 2/4, 159.

[67] Behr, 2004, 237.

[68] Zizioulas 2010, 31. (Italics by J. D. Z.)

[69] Lossky 2014, 81. Vladimir Lossky explains: “The work of Christ concerns human nature which He recapitulates in His hypostasis. The work of the Holy Spirit on the other hand concerns persons, being applied to each one singly... the one lends His hypostasis to nature, the other gives His divinity to the persons.” Lossky 1957, 166-167.

true intention. Thus it would strengthen the ecumenical relevance and reception of Mannermaa's interpretation of Luther.

Tuomo Mannermaa opened up a new, fresh perspective on an ecumenically relevant interpretation of Luther's doctrine of grace. We need to take some further steps on this road, clarifying and further developing his vision. Risto Saarinen has already started his elaboration, as indicated above. In addition, we need to invest more attention and energy on working out in more detail the full ecumenical potential of Martin Luther's Trinitarian doctrine of grace in terms of *unio cum Christo in Spiritu sancto*. This union is a mystery which cannot be fully explained by rational concepts, it is best preserved and transmitted by employing the realistic Scriptural language, just as Luther himself did.

References

Aulén, Gustaf, *Christus Victor: An Historical Study of the Three Main Types of the Idea of Atonement* (London: SPCK, 1931).

Athanasius, *De decretis or Defence of the Nicene Definition, The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, Second series*, vol. 4, ed. and trans. A. Robertson (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 150-172.

Athanasius, *Orationes contra Arianos or Four Discourses against the Arians*, *ibid.*, 306-447.

Balthasar, Hans Urs von, *The Scandal of the Incarnation: Irenaeus against the Heresies* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1990).

Behr, John, *The Nicene Faith, Part 1: True God from True God*, *The Formation of Christian Theology*, 2 (Crestwood: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2004).

Braaten, Carl E. & Jenson, Robert W. (eds.), *Union with Christ: The New Finnish Interpretation of Luther* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).

Chester, Stephen J., *Reading Paul with the Reformers: Reconciling Old and New Perspectives* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017).

Erasmus, *De libero arbitrio diatribe sive collatio*, ed. Johannes von Walter, *Quellenschriften zur Geschichte des Protestantismus* 8 (Leipzig: A. Deichert 1910). In English: LCC 17, *Luther and Erasmus: Free Will and Salvation*, ed. E. Gordon Rupp and Philip S. Watson, *The Library of Christian Classics* 17, Ichthus Edition (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press & London: SCM Press, 1969).

Flogaus, Reinhard, *Theosis bei Palamas und Luther: Ein Beitrag zum Ökumenischen Gespräch*, Forschungen zur systematischen und ökumenischen Theologie, 78 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997).

Gwynn, David M., *Athanasius of Alexandria: Bishop, Theologian, Ascetic, Father* (Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2012).

Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses/ Against Heresies*, The Writings of Irenaeus, The Ante-Nicene Fathers Down to A. D. 325-The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus, vol. 1, trans. A. Roberts and W. H. Rambaur (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994), 309-567.

Kärkkäinen, Pekka, *Luthers trinitarische Theologie des Heiligen Geistes* (Helsinki: University of Helsinki Press, 2003).

Kelly, J. N. D., *Early Christian Doctrines*, 4th ed. (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1958).

Lossky, Vladimir, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* (London: James Clark, 1957).

Lossky, Vladimir, "The Doctrine of Grace in the Orthodox Church," *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 58:1 (2014): 69-85.

Luther, Martin, *Predigten des Jahres 1525*, WA 17/1.

Luther, Martin, *In epistolam S. Pauli ad Galatas Commentarius ex praelectione D. Martini Lutheri collectus* (1531 / 1535), WA 40/1, 1-40/2, 184. In English: *Luther's Works*, vols. 26-27.

Mannermaa, Tuomo, "Hat Luther eine trinitarische Ontologie?" in *Luther und Ontologie: Das Sein Christi im Glauben als strukturierendes Prinzip der Theologie Luthers*, ed. Anja Ghiselli & Kari Kopperi & Rainer Vinke, Schriften der Luther-Agricola-Gesellschaft 31 (Helsinki: Luther-Agricola-Gesellschaft & Erlangen: Martin-Luther-Verlag, 1993), pp. 9-27.

Mannermaa, Tuomo, *In ipsa fide Christus adest: Luterilaisen ja ortodoksisen kristinuskonkäsityksen leikkauspiste* (Helsinki: Missiologian ja ekumeniikan seura, vol. 30, 1980). = *Christ Present in Faith: Luther's View of Justification*, trans. Kirsi I. Stjerna (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005).

Mannermaa, Tuomo, *Kaksi rakkautta: Johdatus Lutherin uskonmaailmaan* (Helsinki: WSOY, 1983). = *Two Kinds of Love: Martin Luther's Religious World*, trans. Kirsi I. Stjerna (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2010).

Moltmann, Jürgen, *The Crucified God*, trans. R. A. Wilson & John Bowden (London: SCM, 1974).

Peura, Simo, *Mehr als ein Mensch? Die Vergöttlichung als Thema der Theologie Martin Luthers von 1513 bis 1519*, Reports from the Department of Systematic Theology, University of Helsinki 10 (Helsinki: University of Helsinki, Department of Systematic Theology, 1990).

Peura, Simo, "Christus als Gunst und Gabe: Luthers Verständnis der Rechtfertigung als Herausforderung und den ökumenischen Dialog mit der Römisch-katholischen Kirche," *Caritas Dei: Beiträge zum Verständnis Luthers und der gegenwärtigen Ökumene*, Festschrift für Tuomo Mannermaa zum 60. Geburtstag, ed. Oswald Bayer, Robert W. Jenson, and Simo Knuuttila (Helsinki: Luther-Agricola-Gesellschaft, 1997), pp. 340-463.

Raunio, Antti, "Das liberum arbitrium als göttliche Eigenschaft in Luthers *De servo arbitrio*," in *Widerspruch: Luthers Auseinandersetzung mit Erasmus Rotterdams*, ed. Kari Kopperi, Schriften der Luther-Agricola-Gesellschaft 37 (Helsinki: Luther-Agricola-Gesellschaft, 1997), pp. 63-91.

Ruokanen, Miikka, *Theology of Social Life in Augustine's De civitate Dei*, Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte, 53 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993).

Russell, Norman, *The Doctrine of Deification in the Greek Patristic Tradition* (Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2004).

Saarinen, Risto, *Gottes Wirken auf uns: Die transzendente Deutung des Gegenwart-Christi-Motivs in der Lutherforschung*, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Europäische Geschichte Mainz, 137 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1989).

Saarinen, Risto, *God and the Gift: An Ecumenical Theology of Giving* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2005).

Saarinen, Risto, "Justification by Faith: The View of the Mannermaa School," in *The Oxford Handbook of Martin Luther's Theology*, ed. Robert Kolb & Irene Dingel & L'ubomír Batka (Oxford et al.: Oxford University Press, 2014), pp. 254-263.

Saarinen, Risto, *Luther and the Gift*, Studies in the Late Middle Ages, Humanism, and the Reformation 100 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017).

Starr, James, Sharers in Divine Nature: 2 Peter 1: 4 in *Its Hellenistic Context*, *Coniectanea Biblica New Testament Series* 33 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2000).

Vainio, Olli-Pekka (ed.), *Engaging Luther: A New Theological Assessment* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2010).

Vainio, Olli-Pekka, "Luther and Theosis: A Response to the Critics of Finnish Luther

Research,” in *Pro Ecclesia* 24/4 (2015):459-474.

Vestrucci, Andrea, *Theology as Freedom: On Martin Luther's "De servo arbitrio," Dogmatik in der Moderne* 24 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019).

Weinandy, Thomas G. , *Athanasius: A Theological Introduction* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2007).

Zizioulas, John D. , *The One and the Many: Studies on God, Man, the Church, and the World Today*, ed. Gregory Edwards, Contemporary Christian Thought Series 6 (Alhambra: Sebastian Press 2010).

中文题目:

评析曼多马对马丁·路德《加拉太书讲义》的诠释

罗明嘉

博士, 赫尔辛基大学教义学(系统神学)荣休教授, 金陵神学院系统神学教授, 电子信箱: miikka.ruokanen@helsinki.fi

摘要:曼多马教授在为路德的恩典神学开辟一个新的视角上完成了一个巧妙的普世神学成就:通过分析路德的《加拉太书讲义》(1531/1535),曼多马得出结论说,称义不仅表示一个关于罪人无罪的法庭式-法律性宣告,而且表示一个罪人与基督的亲密联合(或合一)(*unio cum Christo*)。在这个合一中,信徒有份于(或:参与)基督的神圣位格(the divine person)和神性(the divinity of Christ)。曼多马宣称,这种类型的合一可以被称为人的“神化”(the “deification” of the human being)。

本文赞同曼多马所发现的基要性概念“有份于”和“合一”,但同时,本文提出曼多马诠释路德时的一些问题。在曼多马的模式中有三个问题性的局限:第一,他忽略了作为能够创造称义的信心的唯一施动者和权力的圣灵。第二,曼多马集中于基督与罪人的合一上,而这称义的基础是惟独以罪人可以有份于其中的基督的位格、他的神性和圣爱。路德在其《加拉太书讲义》中关于赎罪、和好、通过基督的十字架而来的救赎、及基督的复活的有力教导,很明显地被强调的不够充分。第三,曼多马在基督与罪人的合一中没有重视圣灵的角色;对于路德来说,上帝与被称义的罪人之间的人格性合一(the personal union between God and the justified sinner)深深地是一个三一事实,基督论和圣灵论是本质上不可分的。

我对曼多马关于路德称义教义的诠释提出了三点修正。第一,对于“惟独信仰”进行圣灵论的理解,应该得到强调:是上帝的圣灵独作性使罪人皈依并创造出“基督就在其中的信”(the faith in which Christ is present)。第二,在路德理解“在圣灵里与基督合一”(unio cum Christo in Spiritu sancto)时,特别关注基督论和圣灵论的真实的的同时性,与教父救赎论强烈相关,将可以消除曼多马使用哲学本体论的概念所涉及的模糊性,避免产生与他的真正动机相矛盾的误解。第三,辨认出教父时期的神学家们和路德之间的连接,他们关于基督的位格(道成肉身)和基督的工作(十字架与复活)在救赎论里的不可分割性的类似教导,对于曼多马的路德诠释来说,也会成为一个重要的修正。

在圣灵里与基督合一,表示有份于基督的位格、生命/生活和神性、以及祂的十字架和复活-这个有份于/参与可以被称作“神化”(deification / theosis)。这三个修正将有益于加强曼多马对路德关于恩典/称义的三一性教义的普世神学意义和从而使其更容易被接纳。

关键词: 圣三一; 恩典; 赎罪; 惟独恩典; 惟独信仰; 信; 称义; 分享(有份于); 神化/成神; 与基督合一(联合); 在圣灵里合一

实践神学与
中西教会和社会
**Practical Theology and Sino-Western
Views on Church and Society**

公民宗教道场建构研究

冯建章

(三亚学院艺术学院,海南省,中国)

摘要:公民社会建构已经成为当代中国社会长时段的公共事件。公民社会是一个多维的系统,而其核心的“信仰”属性,即公民宗教之研究,十多年来,在陈明的推动下,已经得到了越来越多学人的首肯与回应。当下,道场建构已经成为关于公民宗教研究的紧迫课题之一。与其他宗教相比较,公民宗教道场有其自身的特质,包括“终极实在”的“公共性”、时空的“非法律与宪法性”、言说的“公共利益”性、仪式的神圣化与形式化和参与者的公民身份性等。由于公民宗教道场,指向“公共性”,因此主要表现为官办的许多“神圣性”时空。当代中国,要建构公民宗教道场,就要从几千年的人文资源与当代的凡俗社会中寻找具有超越性的信仰资源,建构其“终极实在”和制定其礼仪。公民宗教道场是公民宗教发展的平台与强大推动力。如果公民宗教道场能够得到充分发展,将大大推动公民社会发展的进程。

关键词:公民宗教;道场;终极实在;礼仪

作者:冯建章,艺术学博士,副教授,三亚学院艺术学院,海南省三亚市,迎宾大道学院路高知园,中国,电话:18708983570,电子邮箱:746087665@qq.com

学术的责任在于求真,同时也在于社会的担当。有着几千年儒家文化影响的知识界,“民族”“国家”“天下”是其学术放不下的“重扼”。百年前批判传统的“五四”一代知识精英如此,反思“五四”学术与精神的当代知识精英也是如此。如何让学术为社会发展提供更切实的建设性建议,是儒教^[1]型知识分子的思维逻辑与思维范式。陈明即是这样的学者。十多年前,他提出的“公民宗教”,已经成为当代思潮重要一极。

公民宗教属于传统儒教的现代转型,但又超越儒教的转型。柳河东认为:“儒家文化复兴注定是一个特定历史阶段的特殊形态,是一个短时的快速集聚社会资源和扩大社会影响的过程。其主要任务有以下4个方面:学理、制度的重建;道场、阵地的建设;儒产、资金的积累;组织、人员的培育。”^[2]柳河东是从系统论的角度,展开对儒家文化或儒教建构的论述。从其对儒教转型的论述中,我们可以推导出公民宗教作为一个社会系统,其“道场”建构也是重要一环,是四个方面整合的平台。从学理上讲,没有公民宗教道场的平台,就不可能有真正的公民宗教。

[1] 本文作者肯定历史上有儒教存在,其有自身的教义、组织、教主、道场和仪式等宗教要素。

[2] 柳河东 LIU Hedong,“儒家文化复兴与当代青年担当 Rujia wenhua fuxing yu dangdai qingnian dandang”[The revival of Confucian culture and the responsibility of contemporary youth],《衡水学院学报》Hengshui xueyuan xuebao [Journal of Hengshui University], No. 6, (衡水 Hengshui:2012), 14.

一、中国语境公民宗教内涵

18 世纪后期卢梭提出了公民宗教。随后, 公民宗教思想进入美国社会, 但直到 1960 年代, 贝拉才对美国的公民宗教有了系统论述。

二十世纪后期, “政教分离”原则执行将近 200 多年后, 美国拥有了一个比较健全的公民社会和一个与之相适应的公民宗教。美国公民社会的形成, 一方面是出现了众多“信仰但不归属”不入道场的美国人; 另一方面是各色“道场”如鳞次栉比的超市, 予人信仰的便利。由于宗教信仰各异, 宗教符号难以沟通, 对特定社会现象的看法千差万别, 甚至相悖。为了促进人际沟通与社会秩序化发展, 具有普遍意义的“公民宗教”应运而生。有的学者把其称为民主信仰、社会宗教、文化宗教、宗教民族主义、宗教国家主义、美国信条、共和国宗教、美国神道教、美国第四信仰、美国生活方式宗教等等^{〔3〕}。贝拉在《公民宗教各形态》一书中, 指出公民宗教具有宗教性和政治性、边缘性和形式性四种特质, “宗教性是指它满足人性中对宗教和信仰的倾向, 政治性是指其体现的感情和观点是社会性的, 边缘性则指它在法律和宪法体系中缺乏官方支持, 形式性则指其信条的稀少和抽象”^{〔4〕}。

陈明是研究中国语境公民宗教第一人。他研究中国公民宗教有两个肇始点: 一是以美国公民宗教为参照系; 二是立足于传统儒教转型与建构。关于儒教作为“宗教”建构, 他表示不支持, 他认为儒教在历史上的功能具有高于其他宗教的“一般性”, 李存山也有过同样的观点, “我觉得在中国大陆要成立儒教, 就有一个很复杂的问题, 如果说成为国教不可能, 那么儒家是否自甘居于几大宗教之一, 就像香港似的与基督教、天主教、佛教、道教、伊斯兰教等并立, 儒教居于其中之一, 我觉得这的确就有点小了”^{〔5〕}。陈明所谓的“一般性”, 我们可以理解为李秋零所谓的“善的生活方式”^{〔6〕}。

陈明正是在思考儒教历史地位与当代功能的前提下展开了对公民宗教的研究, 至今仍具现实意义。他认为“公民宗教概念成立的前提是公共领域或公共性与宗教或神圣性。公共性意味着政治的合作性、协商性而不是斗争性、暴力性。宗教性则是指某种宗教或某种神圣性话语在公共领域里作为某种元素的功能发挥或承担”^{〔7〕}, “在公民宗教的语境里, 重要的不是神, 而是神圣性; 它使人们对某种政治价值、政治合法性产生理性认同甚至牺牲的激情”^{〔8〕}。公民宗教是中国宗教和政治特定关系的产物, 是中国宗教意识形态和政治意识形态的重要组成部分, 是中国政府要灌输给公民的一套价值

〔3〕 徐以骅 XU Yihua, “美国关于国民宗教的一场辩论 Meiguo guanyu guominzongjiao de Yichang bianlun” [A debate on national religion in the United States], 《复旦大学学报》Fudan daxue xuebao [Journal of Fudan University], No. 6, (1996), 103.

〔4〕 贝拉 BELLA、哈蒙 Hamon, 《公民宗教各形态》Gongmin zongjiao ge xingtai [Various forms of civil religion], (北京 Beijing: 世界知识出版社 Shijie zhishi chubanshe [World Culture Publishing House], 2003). 转引自聂迎娉 NIE Yingping: 《美国公民宗教及其在公民教育中的作用研究》Meiguo gongminzongjiao jiqi zai gongmin jiaoyu Zhong de zuoyong yanjiu [A study of American Civil Religion and its role in civic education], (武汉 Wuhan: 中国地质大学硕士论文 Zhongguo dizhi daxue shuoshi lunwen [master dissertation in China Geosciences University], 2011), 65.

〔5〕 李存山 LI Cunshan, “儒家的意义与当代中国的信仰、宗教问题”论坛纪要“Rujia de yiyi yu dangdai zhongguo de xinyang zongjiao wenti” luntan jiyao [“The Significance of Confucianism and the Problems of Belief and Religion in Contemporary China” Forum Summary], 《中国儒学》Zhongguo ruxue [Confucianism in China], No. 10, (北京 Beijing, 中国社会科学出版社 Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe [China Social Science Press] 2015), 373.

〔6〕 “人们惟一能够用来取悦或者事奉这样一个上帝的东西就是善的生活方式”。见李秋零 LI Qiulin, 《从释经原理看康德对路德神学的态度》Cong shijign yuanli kan kangde dui lude shenxue de taidu [Kant’s Attitude to Luther’s Theology in the Light of Hermeneutic Principle], No. 16, 《国学与西学国际学刊》Guoxue yu xixue guoji xuekan [International Journal of Sino-Western Studies], (2019), 72.

〔7〕 陈明 CHEN Ming, “对话或独白——儒教之公民宗教说随札” Duihua huo dubai——Rujiao zhi gongminzongjiaoshuo suizha” [Dialogue or monologue——on the religious theory of the citizens of Confucianism], 《原道》Yuandao [Original Tao], No. 01, (长沙 Changsha: 岳麓书院 Yuelu shuyuan [Yuelu Academy] 2007), 49.

〔8〕 同上 Ibid., 49.

观念。公民宗教不但能丰富公民参与政治的途径和方式,而且能予人以仪式感,凝聚国族心灵。

二、中国公民宗教“道场”之特质与可能形式

要建构公民宗教道场,我们就要先了解其道场与一般宗教道场相比较而言的特质,以及公民宗教道场的核心要素。就“道场”本身而言,它是一个使用非常广泛的语词。《汉语大词典》列举了其五种用法:1. 释道两教诵经礼拜的场所;2. 成道修道之所;3. 寺观;4. 和尚或道士做法事的场所,亦指所做的法事;5. 佛教界。^{〔9〕}就我们所谓的公民宗教“道场”而言,更接近于第二种用法,即“成道修道之所”。

中国公民宗教道场,是“成道修道之所”,所谓的“道”就是指公民宗教的核心价值观,即“诚敬上苍”“生生之德”和“知不可而为之”等。这里所谓的“场”,或所谓的“所”,可以是实指的空间,如孔庙、南京大屠杀纪念馆、人民大会堂、天安门广场等,也可以是特定时间虚拟的空间,比如2008年汶川大地震后默哀三分钟时,中国的任何一片疆土,都可以成为公民宗教的道场。

(一)公民宗教道场的特质

中国语境下的公民宗教是一个系统,中国历史上与当下均不缺道场要素。陈明认为,“如果不拘泥公民宗教这个概念的提出与美国社会情境的连接,不拘泥公民这个概念的现代性背景而将其理解为一种公共性(就像前面已经提到的),说中国是公民宗教发展最充分的国家也不为过。我们可以清楚且轻松地给出儒教叙事中赋予‘国家生活’以崇高意义的神圣人物(尧、舜、禹、汤)、神圣地点(‘右社樱,左宗庙’)、神圣仪式(祭天、祭祖)以及神圣信仰(敬天法祖)等”^{〔10〕}。统合公民宗教具有的“公共性”,即“政治性”;“边缘性”,即“非法律与宪法性”;“形式性”,即“信条稀少和抽象性”三大品格,以及“诚敬上天”“生生之德”和“知不可而为之”三大核心价值,与“政治权威合法性建构”、“社会有机度提升”和“中华民族认同”三大功能,这决定了中国公民宗教道场理应具有以下几大特质。

1. 道场“终极实在”的“公共性”

由于公民宗教是超越一般意义上的宗教,所以它的“终极实在”应该能超越一般宗教的“神”。在世界范围内,这似乎是一个宗教难题。但符合这一要求的“终极实在”在儒教经典里一直存在,那就是《四书》《五经》中的“昊天上帝”。由于儒经中的“上帝”不苟言说的品格,道教的“神仙系统”、佛教的“佛菩萨金刚”,甚至一神教的最高神,在“解释学循环”的语境中,都可与之相互生发。

在中国公民宗教的建构中,最易找到的超越性符号就是“上天”,或言“帝”“天”“天帝”“上帝”“上苍”“苍天”“太一”,甚至“老天爷”等。只有具备了“终极实在”的超越性,公民宗教才具有了功能上的“公共性”或“政治性”,也才具有了“普遍的理性”,并回归到“真正的道德宗教”^{〔11〕}。

2. 道场时空的“非法律与宪法性”

中国有自己的民俗节日,如春节、清明节、端午节、中秋节等,还有南京大屠杀纪念日、宪法日、环保日等非民俗节日。这些节日共有的特质是都具有“公共性”,都具有或多或少的“政治功能”。这些

〔9〕 汉语大词典·道场(下) *Hanyu dacidian daochang xia* [Chinese Dictionary Daochang Part Two], (北京 Beijing: 汉语大词典出版社 Hanyu dacidian chubanshe [Chinese Dictionary press], 1994), 15045.

〔10〕 陈明 CHEN Ming, “对话或独白——儒教之公民宗教说随札 duihua huo dubai——Rujiao zhi gongminzongjiaoshuo suizha” [Dialogue or Monologue——on the Religious Theory of the Citizens of Confucianism], 《原道》*Yuandao* [Original Tao], No. 01, (长沙 Changsha: 岳麓书院 Yuelu shuyuan [Yuelu Academy] 2007), 53.

〔11〕 “康德认为必须以具有普遍性的理性对不具有普遍性的历史性的信仰做出诠释,赋予历史性的信仰以普遍性,并使之回归到真正的道德宗教”。见李秋零 LI Qiulin, 《从释经原理看康德对路德神学的态度》*Cong shijing yuanli kan kangde dui lude shenxue de taidu* [Kant's Attitude to Luther's Theology in the Light of Hermeneutic Principle], No. 16, 《国学与西学国际学刊》*Guoxue yu xixue guoji xuekan* [International Journal of Sino-Western Studies], 2019), 72.

节日举行仪式基本不受时空限制,理论上讲“任何一个地方”都可能成为一个道场。

中国几千年的历史,还形成了许多具有“神圣性”“公共性”“政治性”的人物,如黄帝、炎帝、周公、孔子、屈原、冼太夫人、岳飞、文天祥、孙中山等。这些人物有的已经成为民间宗教修观、建庙供奉祭祀的人物,拥有自己的道场。但无论这些人物是否具有自己的道场,在特定的时间和地点都可举行仪式。比如孔庙祭祀,在任何一个孔庙,在某个特定的时间都可举行,比如孔子诞辰、教师节、高考前的某一天等;又如海南的冼太夫人信仰,在海口、文昌、琼海、儋州等海南北部市县的许多村峒,一年中都有属于自己的祭祀“公期”。

中国公民宗教所有时空构成的道场,都具有非法律与宪法规定性,遵循了“政教分离”原则。

3. 道场言说的“公共利益”性

根据“政教分离”原则,公民宗教道场一般不应该与某种特定的宗教合二为一。但偶尔借用其他宗教的道场来宣讲自己的“道”,是被允许的。在借助于某种宗教道场“宣道”时,其“道”之内涵即公民宗教之核心价值,指向的是国家、民族、公民、天下,而非特定宗教之核心价值,仅仅指向特定的宗教教徒。其道场言说,指向的应该是“公共利益”。

我们可以以香港沙田区的“车公神”为例。经过百多年的现代化进程,香港属于一个具有成熟公民宗教的地区。香港的公民宗教以各种形式存在,如呼吸的空气,无所不在,除掉各种选举拉票活动和立法会议员、特首就职仪式等之外,香港公民宗教的一大特点就是借助特定的宗教道场来言说自己的道。比如沙田区的车公庙。“车公神”具有的公、忠、勇、武的“能力”,不但可以保佑个别香客,还护佑着全体香港公民。每年大年初二,民政署长会陪同新界乡议局主席一起参加当地的车公庙祷告仪式,为城市繁荣求签。民政署长等官员代表港府莅临,不以个人身份参加,也不是“主祭”,只是受车公庙邀请列席作见证,祭祀和抽签的主角仍是庙方。但是,车公庙宣称为“全港福祉”抽签,港人趋之若鹜,港府便采取审慎而积极的态度来应对。^[12]这是公民宗教与一般宗教共生的中国故事。在现代中国大陆也不乏这样的故事,例子多多,此不赘言。

4. 仪式的神圣化与形式化

公民宗教的道场仪式,虽然多没有一般意义的“神佛”在场,但因其对国家民族的担当,对亿万公民的护佑,所以公民宗教的道场仪式不可避免地具有了神圣性。但因其位格神的模糊性,所以整个仪式过程,相对于一般意义上的宗教更为抽象,更为形式化。其神圣性主要体现在参与者身上,需要依靠一定的外在仪式激发出来。比如 2008 年 5 月 19 日 14 时 28 分—30 分,汶川大地震三天后,中华民族所有的公民默哀 3 分钟,这属于典型的公民宗教仪式。其“神圣性”来自人所本有的“神性”,只是依凭了默哀仪式激发出来,以这种公民的“神圣性”与仪式的“神圣性”来表达对死者的哀思。其他的如南斯拉夫大使馆被炸与国家领导人去世后的哀悼日等,都属于公民宗教的仪式。但因为神性性格的缺位,这种仪式更为简单化与形式化。

5. 参与者的公民身份性

公民宗教道场举行仪式,一般来说,不需要与“皈依”二字联系起来。一般地说,只要具有中国国籍都可参加中国公民宗教举行的任何仪式。随着越来越多国家的公民放弃本国国籍,加入中国国籍,比如大量的非洲移民等,中华民族认同、中国公民宗教道场建构日渐迫切。

(二) 公民宗教“道场”可能形式

公民宗教道场与复兴中的儒教道场会有高度重合。儒教在历史上处于公民宗教的位置,起到了现代公民宗教的功用,但儒教绝对不是公民宗教,最多只能称为“臣民宗教”。儒教有自己的道场,像天地坛、日月坛、私塾、书院和宗祠等。但不幸的是从 1927 年至 1930 年短短四年间,天坛、社稷坛、先

[12] http://news.ifeng.com/gundong/detail_2014_02/02/33523914_0_shtml. 02. Feb. 2014-02-02.

农坛、文昌庙、孔子庙等官方儒教系统的祠祀被废。到1970代末在中国大陆儒教彻底失去了儒教祭祀集团与道场,所残留的也只是在西式大学中的一些个体儒者,或做外观式研究,或自称新儒家,基本聊胜于无。1980年代以来,随着社会的现代转型,社会层面的儒教道场,已经遍布大江南北。

当下,公民宗教道场主要为政府行为,因为它指向的是“公共事件”及其“政治属性”。可分为两种:第一种主要为政府行为,包括政府各种庆典,如国庆阅兵、外交阅兵礼等;纪念活动,如孙中山诞辰纪念日、香港澳门回归纪念日、宪法日纪念日、南京大屠杀纪念日、重大灾难纪念日等;重大会议,如每年的“两会”等;就职仪式,如国家主席就职仪式、各级法官就职仪式等。其他的还包括本属民间儒教道场而由官方主办,如祭孔、祭黄帝陵等。第二种主要属于学术研究,包括官办儒教经典研习场所与儒教道场纪念活动,如大学纷纷建立的国学院、国学班等。

理论上讲,中国960多万平方公里的陆地加上300多万平方公里的海洋国土,任何一个地方,只要是拥有中国国籍的公民所参与举行的具有“公共性”和“神圣性”的任何活动,都可能成为公民宗教的道场,如书院、文庙、讲堂等,乃至边防官兵举行升旗仪式的任何一艘军舰、任何一个礁盘、任何一个山岭等。

(三)公民宗教与一般宗教道场之区别

在中国大陆,无论佛教、道教、基督教、伊斯兰教,还是民间宗教,由于信徒到其道场祭拜,一般都是出于自己的虔信,或为着自身或为着家人的福祉,所以,这些归属于一般性宗教的道场,都不属于公民宗教的范畴。但在特定的情境下,公民宗教也会借用一般性宗教的道场。比如唐山大地震、汶川地震之后,在寺庙道观举行超度亡灵的“法会”时,因着佛道道场指向了“公共事件”,这种情况下,佛道道场就变成了临时性的公民宗教道场。

一般来说,公民宗教道场与一般性宗教之道场易于区别。难以区别的是公民宗教道场与儒教道场。一般来说,传统儒教可以分为以帝王为大祭司的“天帝”信仰,和以“大宗”或“族长”为主要祭司的“祖先”信仰。与前者相关的道场,如“天坛”“地坛”“日月坛”“城隍”等,就属于公民宗教道场,而与后者相关的,如家庙、祠堂、祖坟等,就不属于公民宗教道场的范畴,只能属于儒教道场。当然,历代帝王的家庙,虽然由帝王主祭,但也不属于公民宗教的范畴,只能属于儒教道场。

二、公民宗教道场“终极实在”与“仪式”建构

涂尔干认为“真正的宗教信仰总是某个特定集体的共同信仰,这个集体不仅宣称效忠这些信仰,而且还要奉行与这些信仰有关的各种仪式。这些仪式不仅为所有集体成员逐一接受;而且完全属于该群体本身,从而使这个集体成为一个统一体”^[13]。在当代中国语境下的公民宗教道场建构过程中,存在着两个最普遍问题,即“终极实在”模糊和仪式感不足。这是公民宗教建构道场急需建构的原委,也是公民宗教道场能否建构成功的关键。

(一)神格之“天”

公民宗教属于一种实实在在的信仰。一种真实的信仰,必须具有一种超越的指向性。这一超越性,最终会指向一位“神性位格”。中国传统文化的天、上帝、上天等,即是这样的存在。建构公民宗教的“位格神”,从传统儒家经典、各大宗教、民间宗教,甚至少数民族裔的宗教信仰中,都可以找到相应的资源。

1. “帝”“天”“道”之关系

儒教经典“四书”“五经”中不乏“天”“帝”与“鬼神”的概念。《中国文化背景下的宗教与信仰》一

[13] 爱弥尔·涂尔干 Emile DURKHEIM,《宗教生活的基本形式》*Zongjiao shenghuo de jiben xingshi* [The basic form of religious life],(上海 Shanghai:上海人民出版社 Shanghai renmin chubanshe [Shanghai People's Publishing House],2006),39.

文,不但梳理了“帝”“天”“道”的演进过程,而且建构了“帝”之主宰性、“天”之自然性、“道”之时中性的中华儒教之“三一”性的“终极实在”^[14]。这一儒教经典资源,是公民宗教道场“终极实在”建构的最充足、最直接的资源。

2. “天”与宗教神性性格之关系

杨凤岗认为“美国总统的公开讲话总是以‘上帝祝福美国’为结束语,白宫官员每年都举办早餐祈祷会,每届国会总是以向上帝祈祷为开始,遇到重大危机或危难时更会公开地集体向上帝祈祷。美国人也喜欢说美国是上帝治下的一个民族。不过,公民宗教超越各种具体的宗教和教派,公民宗教的上帝非具像化,所以无论是基督徒还是犹太教徒或者其他宗教信仰徒,都可以把这个上帝解读为自己所信奉的上帝或至高神,相信在上帝的保护和祝福之下,美国才得以坚持自由、民主、平等、正义等立国原则和理念”^[15]。美国公民宗教中的上帝具有模糊性,具有一种“召唤结构”“期待视野”,需要受众去“填充”。这一“上帝”内涵也许只有中国儒教中的“上天”可以与之相匹配。中国传统儒教的“帝”“天”“道”“三一”终极系统,可以囊括中国的五大宗教传统,甚至可以涵括各种民间宗教。比如一神教的基督教、伊斯兰教,多神的道教,有神的净土宗,都可以把自己的最高神归于“帝”,或用“帝”来置换,而禅宗的“般若智”或“色空”却可以与儒教“道”之“时中性”互解。

由于历代儒家“不语怪力乱神”,以“未知生,焉知死”回避生死、彼岸的问题,所以历史上的多教共存就表现为传统儒教徒不得不借助佛道仙佛系统来安顿生前死后。明代诗人冯梦祯,虔心佛教,为此不惜修改了儒教家礼,举行家祭时,“佛室礼佛、礼祖先及参神,如常仪”^[16]。杨庆中曾说过一句话“在解决生死的关键时刻,儒家不顶事”,并举了熊十力的例子。他说熊在临死前,一直在念佛经。^[17]李天纲曾提出了“中华宗教”(Chineseism)^[18]的概念,他认为在汉人地区的不同信仰,存在相当程度的一致性。在中国文化的“终极”系统中,“天”代表了理性,这个“天”离不开“帝”,这其实符合路德神学,“路德说,人如果有了对上帝的信仰,理性就是上帝给的最大的祝福之一。如果没有这个对上帝的信仰,那么,这个理性就会变成一个魔鬼的娼妇”^[19]。

3. 民间信仰资源

李天纲认为“民间宗教,是中华民族所有宗教的信仰之源”^[20]。他认为萨满教是人类更普世的信仰形式,影响西方基督教文明的希伯来、两河流域、波斯的宗教,并不是人类宗教的主流,萨满教才是

[14] 冯建章 FENG Jianzhang,《中国文化背景下的宗教与信仰》*Zhongguo wenhua Beijing xia de zongjiao yu xinyang* [Religion and Belief in the Context of Chinese Culture], (北京 Beijing: 中国艺术研究院博士论文 *Zhongguo yishu yanjiuyuan boshi lunwen* [Ph. D. dissertation in China Academy of Art], 2010), 60-71.

[15] 杨凤岗 YANG Fenggang“对于儒教之为教的社会学思考 *Duiyu rujiao zhi wei jiao de shehuixue sikao*” [Sociological Thinking on Confucianism as a religion], 《兰州大学学报》 *Lanzhou daxue xuebao* [Journal of Lanzhou University], No. 2, (兰州 Lanzhou: 2008), 13.

[16] 冯梦祯 FENG Mengzhen,《快雪堂日记》 *Kuaixuetang riji* [Kuaixue hall diary], (南京 Nanjign: 凤凰出版社 Fenghuang chubanshe [Phoenix Press], 2011), 146.

[17] 于春松 GAN Chunsong,“儒家的意义与当代中国的信仰、宗教问题”论坛纪要 *Rujia de yiyi yu dangdai zhongguo de xinyang zongjiao wenti* luntan jiyao [“The significance of Confucianism and the problems of belief and religion in contemporary China” Forum summary], 《中国儒学》 *Zhongguo ru xue* [Confucianism in China], No. 10, (北京 Beijing, 中国社会科学出版社 *Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe* [China Social Science Press] 2015), 399.

[18] 李天纲 LI Tiangang,“简论中国的宗教与宗教学 *Jianlun zhongguo de zongjiao yu zognjiaoxue*” [Brief commentting religion and Religious Sciences in China], 《天津社会科学》 *Tianjin shehui kexue* [Tianjin Social Sciences], No. 1, (天津 Tianjin: 2016), 146.

[19] 黄保罗 HUANG Paulos,“‘精神人文主义: 马丁·路德与儒家’工作坊报告” *Jingshen renwen zhuyi: mading lude yu rujia gongzuofang baogao* [Workshop report on “spiritual Humanism; Martin Luther and Confucianism”], 《国学与西学国际学刊》 *Guoxue yu xixue guoji xuekan* [International Journal of Sino-Western Studies], No. 16, (赫尔辛基 Helsinki: 2019), 213.

[20] 李天纲 LI Tiangang,“三教通体: 士大夫的宗教态度 *Sanjiao tongti: shidafu de zongjiao taidu*” [Three religions in general; the religious attitude of scholar officials], 《学术月刊》 *Xueshu yuekan* [Academic Monthly], No. 5, (上海 Shanghai: 2015), 108.

较为统一的人类信仰方式^[21],萨满教“天人合一”的特征,呈现出比犹太教、基督教、伊斯兰教等“亚伯拉罕宗教”更充分的“普世性”^[22]。他同时认为周代以来的儒教,其中一个面向就是萨满教,并由基层民众维持^[23]。

中国传统儒教的信仰对象是天、天命或上帝,现在农村,仍多有这一观念,“天理良心,那事咱可不能干”^[24]是他们的道德信条。从“经学考古”的角度看,清代学者揭示了不少“原儒”的信仰本质,其献祭、其仪式、其习俗、其神思,都来源于古代民众的宗教生活。^[25]从民众信仰的底层看,我们发现“三教同源”,源自基层的民众信徒——在他们日常的宗教生活中,根本就不分什么儒、道、佛。^[26]中国的民间宗教自古以来就有自己的神明、神祇、祭祀方式,有相当固化的基本信仰形式。后来进入中国的伊斯兰教、天主教、基督新教等外来宗教,所谓的“本色化”、“中国化”,归根到底就是“民间化”。^[27]

公民宗教“终极实在”建构不能不从民间宗教汲取营养,这是由儒教历史真实以及儒教与民间宗教的关系所决定的。

4. 少数族裔宗教资源

公民宗教建构不但是最大族裔汉人的事情,也是五十多个少数族裔的事情。只有五十多个族裔实现共构,才能形成中华民族政治共同体和文化共同体。公民宗教“神性”建构离不开少数族裔的参与,特别是其众多“位格神”的参与。比如蒙古人心目中的最高神是“长生天”。一定意义上来说,“长生天”就是蒙古传统社会“公民宗教”至高“位格神”,其他的还有海南黎族的“大力神”等。公民宗教“神性位格”建构不但要从少数族裔信仰中汲取营养,还要把少数族裔的“至上神”涵蕴进去,只有这样公民宗教才能得到少数族裔的认可。汉人“龙”图腾的出现就是公民宗教“终极实在”构建的一个成功先例,它是对众多部落图腾揉和之后形成的。“龙”图腾的形成,推动了众多族裔融合为汉人族裔的进程。

(二) 礼仪

关于中国宗教“礼仪”,李天纲有过深刻的论述,他认为“和西方亚伯拉罕宗教相比,中国宗教忽视‘教会’(Church)和‘神学’(Theology),重视的是礼仪(Ritual)和祭祀(Ceremony)。围绕着礼仪和祭祀,才有庙会、法会、香会、社会等各种组织形式。中国宗教与其说是‘讲’(神学)的宗教,不如说是‘做’(祭祀)的宗教;与其说是‘个人’的宗教,不如说是‘群体’的宗教”^[28]。中国语境下的公民宗教道场建构,在建构“终极位格”的同时,也离不开道场礼仪的构建。

中国称为“华夏”,“中国有礼仪之大,故称夏;有服章之美,谓之华”^[29]。为此,中国又称“礼仪之邦”,所谓礼仪,不是一套纯形式美的行为,而是中国先民对道、对规律的把控与呈现,“中国人在殷周

[21] 李天纲 LI Tiangang,“简论中国的宗教与宗教学 Jianlun zhongguo de zongjiao yu zognjiaoxue”[Brief commenting religion and Religiional Sciences in China],《天津社会科学》Tianjin shehui kexue[Tianjin Social Sciences],No. 1,(天津 Tianjin:2016),137.

[22] 同上 Ibid.,第 138 页.

[23] 同上 Ibid.,第 146 页.

[24] 李景林 LI Jinglin,“儒家的意义与当代中国的信仰、宗教问题”论坛纪要“Rujia de yiyi yu dangdai zhongguo de xinyang、zongjiao wenti”luntan jiyao[“The Significance of Confucianism and the Problems of Belief and Religion in Contemporary China”Forum Summary],《中国儒学》Zhongguo ruxue[Confucianism in China],No. 10,(北京 Beijing,中国社会科学出版社 Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe[China Social Science Press]2015),352.

[25] 同上 Ibid.,第 123 页.

[26] 同上 Ibid.,第 120-121 页.

[27] 李天纲 LI Tiangang,“简论中国的宗教与宗教学 Jianlun zhongguo de zongjiao yu zognjiaoxue”[Brief Comment on Religion and Religiional Sciences in China],《天津社会科学》Tianjin shehui kexue[Tianjin Social Sciences],No. 1,(天津 Tianjin:2016),147.

[28] 同上 Ibid.,第 151 页.

[29] 孔颖达 KONG Yingda,《十三经注疏》Shisanjing zhushu[Notes on the thirteen classics],(北京 Beijing:中华书局 Zhonghua shuju[Zhong Hua Book Company],1979),2148.

之际的神道观念, 强调和突出的与其说是它的主体、至高无上的人格和意志, 不如说是它的道、是它主宰人文与自然统一体的规律系统, 并且把这个规律系统具体化为各种特定的礼义形式”^[30]。正所谓“经礼三百, 曲礼三千”, 《周礼》所记载的八种礼“冠、婚、丧、祭、射、乡、朝、聘”, 涉及到先民生活的各个层面, 冠礼和婚礼涉及家庭和个人生活; 丧礼和祭礼涉及到宗教生活; 射礼和乡礼涉及社会生活; 朝礼和聘礼涉及政治生活等。中国宗教的同一性就存在于“礼仪”之中。^[31] 任何宗教在中国的本土化, 都离不开对传统礼仪文化的适应。要建构公民宗教道场的“礼仪”, 离不开对传统礼仪特别是西周雅乐舞、宗教礼仪和少数民族礼仪文化的研究与“拿来”。

1. 西周雅乐舞

因为商代王室认为自己是“上帝”的选民, 认为无论他们如何违背“上帝”的意志, “上帝”都会保佑他们, 所以严格意义是说, 商代没有“公民宗教”性质的宗教。而周代因为最少两个原因, 我们认为出现了“公民宗教”。一是周王室认为自己的最高神“天”具有“公共性”和“道德性”, 自己不再是上帝的选民; 二是家国天下体制的建立。“周公集大成地收集了自人文始祖黄帝、尧、舜、禹乃至成汤、周武的六代祭祀乐舞, 经整理、排练与传播纳入国家贵族教育体制, 制定了一套完整的礼乐典章制度和雅乐舞教育制度, 探索出一条政教合一、尊生重孝、知常明伦与身心同治的治国方略”^[32]。与祭祀相匹配的西周雅乐舞, 基本属于公民宗教礼仪范畴。一定意义上说, 西周雅乐舞奠定了中国古代官方礼仪的基础。中国的礼文化在《周礼·春官宗伯第三·大宗伯》中有比较全面的记载, 而西周雅乐舞是当时的主要祭祀仪式。

西周雅乐舞主要包括《六舞》(也称《六乐》)和《小舞》(也称《六小舞》), 都是西周初年由政府收集、整理、编排而成的, 用以对贵族子弟进行教育。西周雅乐舞作为当时的“公民宗教”仪式, 参与刚开启的封建、宗法和庙祭等政治制度的建构, 不但其背后所指向的西周最高神“天”可以为当代公民宗教所吸收, 而且其舞蹈仪式也应该经过专业人士的转化, 为公民宗教所吸收。“雅乐(舞)虽在创立后不久的春秋战国时代就‘礼崩乐坏’, 不再受到人们的喜爱和重视了, 但雅乐(舞)体系并未完全崩溃, 相反, 在两千多年漫长的封建社会中, 一直被视为‘正声’, 各朝代均不断增修变化, 以适应自身的政治需要。中国最后一个封建王朝——清朝灭亡之后, 祭孔子的雅乐仍然存在。”^[33]虽然在孔子的时代, 西周雅乐舞已经随着“礼崩乐坏”而走向瓦解, 但汉帝国建立后, 随着汉高祖刘邦开启的帝王祭孔礼仪、叔孙通制定的朝堂礼仪等, 西周雅乐舞在各个时代以不同的形式存在, 后汉“所谓乐者, 大率有四: 其一曰汉郊庙乐, 祭祀用之; 其二曰周雅颂乐, 辟雍乡射用之; 其三曰黄门鼓吹, 宫廷饮宴用之; 其四曰铙歌凯乐, 军旅用之”^[34], 而明朝“所谓乐者, 大率有三: 其一曰郊庙大祀乐, 太常寺所掌者是也; 其二曰庆成大宴乐, 教坊司所掌者是也; 其三曰卤簿大驾乐, 金鼓旗下作者是也”^[35]。

[30] 李景林 LI Jinglin, “儒家的意义与当代中国的信仰、宗教问题”论坛纪要“Rujia de yiyi yu dangdai zhongguo de xinyang、zongjiao wenti”luntan jiyao[“The significance of Confucianism and the problems of belief and religion in contemporary China”Forum summary], 《中国儒学》Zhongguo ruxue[Confucianism in China], No. 10, (北京 Beijing, 中国社会科学出版社 Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe[China Social Science Press]2015), 353.

[31] 李天纲 LI Tiangang, “简论中国的宗教与宗教学 Jianlun zhongguo de zongjiao yu zongjiaoxue”[Brief commenting religion and Religious Sciences in China], 《天津社会科学》Tianjin shehui kexue[Tianjin Social Sciences], No. 1, (天津 Tianjin, 2016), 146.

[32] 王晓茹 WANG Xiaoru, “古乐原义的历史考释及其千年久蔽的反思 Gule yuanyi de lishi kaoshi jiqi qiannian jiubi de fansi”[Textual Researching on the Original Meaning and Reflecting Defect of One Thousand Years of Ancient Music], 《民族艺术研究》Minzu yishu yanjiu[Research on National Art], No. 5, (昆明 Kongming: 2017), 128.

[33] 王克芬 WANG Kefen, 《中国舞蹈发展史》Zhongguo wudao fazhanshi[History of Chinese Dance], (武汉 Wuhan: 武汉大学出版社 Wuhan daxue chubanshe[Wuhan university press], 2012), 50.

[34] 朱载堉 ZHU Zaiyu, 《律吕精义: 进历书奏疏》Lvlv jingyi: jinlishu zoushu[The Essence of Lulu: A Memorial to the Almanac], (北京 Beijing: 人民音乐出版社 Renmin yinyue chubanshe[People’s music press], 2006), 3.

[35] 同上 Ibid., 第 3 页。

在中华文明复兴的今天,仅仅回到孔孟的心性之学是不够的,必须回到周公“制礼作乐”。如此,必须借鉴西周雅乐舞建构公民宗教的礼仪制度。

2. 民间祭祀舞乐

虽然经过“礼乐崩坏”的春秋战国西周雅乐舞遭到了破坏,但历代的中央政府为着社会秩序和社会管理的目的,都进行了变通与创新,代代都出现了许多新乐和新舞。但这些被奉为“雅正之声”的乐舞,并不被民间所喜欢,又因为这些舞乐完全受时空限制,多不能随性表演观赏,在民间真正被接受的是流传广泛、参与民间宗教活动的“傩舞”与“巫舞”。

正如孔子所谓“礼失而求之野”^[36]，“所谓宗教在社会,信仰在人心,从近三十年的情况看,民间祭祀已经复苏,中国人的宗教生活仍然‘活着’”^[37]。这里所谓的“民间祭祀”不但包括汉人参与的宗教活动,也包括少数族裔自己独有的宗教活动。公民宗教仪式建构离不开对汉人民间宗教祭祀仪式的研究与吸收,也离不开对少数族裔宗教祭祀仪式的转化。电影《漂洋过海来爱你》讲述了湖北巴东土家人纤夫谭大志与日本少女画家纯子感人至深的爱情故事。在电影的末尾,土家人祭祀亡灵的舞蹈“撒尔嗒”,给人留下了深刻的印象。祭祀亡灵舞蹈“撒尔嗒”里面的肢体语言、情感语言等可以转化为公民宗教的礼仪元素。其他五十多个族裔也不乏这样的祭祀舞蹈。壮、侗、瑶等族裔的师公舞,蒙古人的丹不尔舞、祭神树舞等,黎人的捉鬼舞、招福舞、年舞等,经过一定的提取与转换,都可变为公民宗教的仪式元素。

3. 宗教资源

当代中国政府与民间,由于缺乏公民宗教的建构意识,面对基督教或伊斯兰教等“一神教”的发展,往往上下一片错愕,进退失据。比如2016年山东曲阜的“尼山教堂事件”,至今问题没有解决。从全球化来说,任何宗教只要对中国人政治认同、社会凝结、族裔和谐有功用,都当一视同仁。我们不能狭隘地觉得基督教控制了中国人的精神,觉得存在一种现象叫“文化侵略”。宗教凸显的是社会性,而信仰多为个体行为。皈依基督教,也不能否定他还是一个中国籍公民。

其实基督教长期的“本土化”运动,其“本土化”程度已经超过了我们的想象。2012年清明节前夕,在上海市西南某天主教堂的入口处,竖着一块写有“诸神相通”的立牌,副题是“为炼狱灵魂祈祷,献弥撒、拜苦路、念玫瑰经”。立牌的下部,插有一二百张逝者的名片,印有照片、姓名、年龄、生平和事迹,类似于儒教、道教、佛教在超度亡灵中使用的牌位。上海天主教会把这种类似于“超度”的祭祀,称为“通功”。清明时节,他们以信徒的愿力,为“炼狱灵魂祈祷”,从形式看和儒、道、佛的道场仪式十分相像,只是用“炼狱”置换了“地府”。^[38]基督教“本土化”的现实对公民宗教仪式建构有很大借鉴作用。

公民宗教道场的建构属于公民社会构建的一部分,是一系统工程,非一日之功。但时下,需要各级政府养成“建构公民宗教道场”的自觉意识和主体意识。公民宗教道场的实践将大大推动公民宗教的理论完善与功能发挥,将促进公民社会的健康发展,加快中华民族复兴的步伐。

[36] 班固 BAN Gu,《汉书·艺文志》*Hanshu yiwenzhi*[History of art and culture of Han Dynasty],<http://www.shicimingju.com/book/hanshu/41.html>

[37] 李天纲 LI Tiangang,“简论中国的宗教与宗教学 Jianlun zhongguo de zongjiao yu zognjiaoxue”[Brief Comment on Religion and Religious Sciences in China],《天津社会科学》*Tianjin shehui kexue*[Tianjin Social Sciences],No. 1,(天津 Tianjin:2016),148.

[38] 同上 *Ibid.*,第148页。

English Title:

A Study on the Construction of Civil Religious Dojo

FENG Jianzhang

Ph. D. , Associate professor, Department of Arts, University of Sanya, Xueyuan Road 123, Jiyang District, Sanya City, Hainan Province, 572022 P. R. China. Tel: +86 18708983570; Email: 746087665@qq. com

Abstract: The construction of a civil society has become a long-term public project in contemporary Chinese society. Civil society is a multi-dimensional system, and its core “belief” attribute, the study of civil religion, has won increasingly scholarly approval over the past decade and more thanks to Chen Ming’s promotion. At present, the construction of Dojo has become one of the urgent issues in the study of civil religion. Compared with other religions, civil religion has its own characteristics, including “the public nature” of “ultimate reality”, “the non-law and constitution” of time and space, “the public interest” of speech, the sacredness and formalization of ceremony and the citizenship of participants. As the religious Dojo of citizens points to “publicity”, it is mainly manifested in the “sacredness” of state-related time and space. In order to construct a civil religious Dojo in contemporary China, we should use transcendent belief resources from human history and contemporary secular society, so as to construct its ultimate reality and formulate its etiquette. The Civil Religious Dojo provides a platform and strong impetus for the development of civil religion. If the religious Dojo of citizens can be fully developed, it will greatly promote the development of civil society.

Key Words: Civil Religion; Dojo; Ultimate Reality; Etiquette

How the Emerging Protestant Theology Took Shape in the Reformation Concept of Theological Studies as Enunciated by Philip Melanchthon in His Prolegomena to All Latin and German Versions of Loci

Matthew OSEKA

(Concordia Theological Seminary, Hong Kong)

Abstract: This present paper examines the rudimentary concept of Protestant theology as an academic discipline which was enunciated by Melanchthon in his prolegomena to all Latin and German versions of Loci which were indispensable in educating the next generation of Protestant divines and for disseminating the ideas of the Reformation worldwide.

Key Words: Philipp Melanchthon, Loci communes (Loci theologici, Loci praecipui), Wittenberg Reformation, Systematic Theology, Jean Calvin

Author: Th. D. (Christian Theological Academy, Warsaw / EU), lecturing at Concordia Theological Seminary, Kowloon, Hong Kong, email: matthew.oseka@yahoo.com

Melanchthon as a 16th-Century Pan-Protestant Theologian

Despite the fact that the contemporary Protestant theology is beset with questions and doubts, it is advisable to examine the 16th-century roots of Protestant theological endeavours. For 16th-century theologians espousing the Reformation tenets, it was evident that the old, Catholic theological paradigm was challenged by Martin Luther,^[1] while the foundations for a new, emerging Protestant theology as an academic discipline were laid by Philip Melanchthon who was acclaimed as Praeceptor Germaniae namely as the Teacher of the German-speaking world. In fact, Melanchthon's influence

[1] Philipp Melanchthon, "Praefatio," in *Corpus doctrinae christianae quae est summa orthodoxi et catholici dogmatis complectens doctrinam puram et veram Evangelii Jesu Christi secundum divina prophetarum et apostolorum scripta* (Leipzig: Voegelin, 1560), A2r. Reprinted in: Idem, *Opera quae supersunt omnia* (Corpus Reformatorum), vol. 9, ed. Karl Gottlieb Bretschneider (Halle an der Saale: Schwetschke, 1842), 1050-1055 [No. 6932 (16 February 1560)]. Idem, *Oratio in funere reverendi viri D. Martini Lutheri* (Wittenberg: [s. n.], 1546), passim. Idem, "Praefatio," in *Opera quae supersunt omnia* (Corpus Reformatorum), vol. 6, ed. Karl Gottlieb Bretschneider (Halle an der Saale: Schwetschke, 1839), 155-170 [No. 3478 (1 June 1546)]. Idem, "Der ehrbaren und tugendsamen Frau Anna," in *Opera quae supersunt omnia* (Corpus Reformatorum), vol. 22, ed. Karl Gottlieb Bretschneider and Heinrich Ernst Bindseil (Braunschweig: Schwetschke, 1855), 45-48 [Tertia Aetas (Loci Theologici Germanice)].

extended to other European territories as well. [2]

By his textbook of the systematic theology (*Loci*) and by the theory underlying that manual, Melanchthon initiated a new way of theologising which was treasured not only by the proponents of the Wittenberg Reformation. John Calvin, for instance, effected the French translation of Melanchthon's *Loci* which was published twice in the 16th century. [3] The translator(s) thereof could not be identified [4] but it is conceivable that Calvin himself translated *Loci* into French. Both editions of French *Loci* were almost identically prefaced by Calvin. [5] Additionally, the edition of 1551 contained a foreword [6] which was plausibly authored by its publisher Jean Crespin. The French translation of Melanchthon's *Loci* was based on the Latin edition of 1543. Moreover, in 1555 Calvin decided to provide a preface for the French translation of Melanchthon's commentary upon the Book of Daniel. [7]

Calvin's admiration for Melanchthon's theological enterprise is well-known and a close theological and personal bond between them has been thoroughly examined. [8] In Calvin's eyes, Melanchthon acted as a beacon to the 16th-century humanities and he was the most illustrious doctor of the renewed church founded on the Scripture alone. [9] In his writings Calvin paid homage to Melanchthon as to a pillar of Reformation theology [10] and did not hesitate to convey a sense of his profound Christian intimacy with Melanchthon publically. [11]

[2] Michael Beyer et al., ed., *Melanchthon Deutsch*, vol. 1-4 (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1997–2012). Irene Dingel and Armin Kohnle, ed., *Philipp Melanchthon: Lehrer Deutschlands, Reformator Europas* (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2011). Günter Frank and Martin Treu, ed., *Melanchthon und Europa*, vol. 1-2 (Stuttgart: Thorbecke, 2001–2002). Karin Maag, ed., *Melanchthon in Europe: His Work and Influence beyond Wittenberg* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1999). Frank Pauli, *Philippus: Ein Lehrer für Deutschland: Spuren und Wirkungen Philipp Melanchthons* (Berlin: Wichern-Verlag, 1996). Heinz Scheible, ed., *Melanchthon in seinen Schülern* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1997). John Schofield, *Philip Melanchthon and the English Reformation* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006). Birgit Stolt, ed., *Philipp Melanchthon und seine Rezeption in Skandinavien* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1998).

[3] Philipp Melanchthon, *La somme de theologie ou lieux communs*, ed. Jean Calvin (Geneva: Girard, 1546). Idem, *La somme de theologie ou lieux communs*, ed. Jean Calvin (Geneva: Crespin, 1551).

[4] "Interpretatio Locorum Theologicorum Melanthonis gallica," in Melanchthon, *Opera*, vol. 22, 667-670 [F, II].

[5] Jean Calvin, "Aux lecteurs," in Melanchthon, *La somme* (Geneva: Girard, 1546), 2r-4v. Idem, "Aux lecteurs," in Melanchthon, *La somme* (Geneva: Crespin, 1551), IIr-Vr. The aforementioned preface was reprinted in *Corpus Reformatorum*: Jean Calvin, "Préface de la somme de Melanchthon (1546)," in *Opera quae supersunt omnia (Corpus Reformatorum)*, vol. 9 (37), ed. Wilhelm Baum, Edouard Cunitz and Eduard Reuss (Braunschweig: Schwetschke, 1870), 847-850.

[6] "L'imprimeur av lecteur," in Melanchthon, *La somme* (Geneva: Crespin, 1551), 5v. Reprinted in: Melanchthon, *Opera*, vol. 22, 683-686 [F, II (Interpretatio Locorum Theologicorum Melanthonis gallica)].

[7] Jean Calvin, "Argument," in Philipp Melanchthon, *Commentaire sur le livre des révélations du prophète Daniel*, ed. Jean Calvin (Geneva: Crespin, 1555), 9-11. Again, the translator is unknown.

[8] Philip Schaff, "Calvin and Melanchthon," in *History of the Christian Church*, vol. 8 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1958), 385-398 [§ 90]. Randall C. Zachman, *John Calvin as Teacher, Pastor, and Theologian: The Shape of His Writings and Thought* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 29-53 [1, 2]. Günter Frank et al., ed., *Melanchthon und der Calvinismus* (Stuttgart and Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 2005). Barbara Pitkin, "The Protestant Zeno: Calvin and the Development of Melanchthon's Anthropology," *The Journal of Religion* 84, no. 3 (2004): 345-378.

[9] Jean Calvin, "Melanchthoni," in *Opera quae supersunt omnia (Corpus Reformatorum)*, vol. 17 (45), ed. Wilhelm Baum, Edouard Cunitz and Eduard Reuss (Braunschweig: Schwetschke, 1877), 386 [No. 2985 (13 December 1558)].

[10] Jean Calvin, "Defensio sanae et orthodoxae doctrinae de servitute et liberatione humani arbitrii adversus calumnias Alberti Pighii Campensis (1543)," in *Opera quae supersunt omnia (Corpus Reformatorum)*, vol. 6 (34), ed. Wilhelm Baum, Edouard Cunitz and Eduard Reuss (Braunschweig: Schwetschke, 1867), 229-230 [Ioannes Calvinus clarissimo viro Philippo Melanthoni].

[11] Jean Calvin, "Dilucida explicatio sanae doctrinae de vera participatione carnis et sanguinis Christi in sacra coena ad discutiendas Heshusii nebulas (1561)," in *Opera*, vol. 9 (37), 461-463.

In his preface to the French translation of Melanchthon's Loci Calvin recommended and endorsed Loci as an impeccable and lucid exposition of the biblical way of salvation. At the same time, Calvin admitted a difference between his own views and Melanchthon's system as far as the concept of human free will and the concept of divine predestination were concerned. This difference Calvin regarded as extraneous to the academic and theological excellence of Loci.^[12]

In his preface Calvin did not espouse the idea of counting absolution among the sacraments which he attributed to Melanchthon. Actually, Melanchthon's concepts of human free will and of divine predestination as enunciated in his Loci of 1543^[13] and later in his Response to the Articles of the Bavarian Inquisition (1558)^[14] did not entirely coincide with Calvin's position. Nonetheless, as regards absolution, in his Loci of 1543^[15] Melanchthon only pondered over a possible number of particular sacraments which would be contingent upon different definitions of the sacrament adopted for argument's sake. This approach was characteristic of his entire sacramentology.^[16] To put it simply, whether absolution was classified as a sacrament or not, depended on how sacraments were defined.

[12] The same reasoning is found in Calvin's letter to the members of the city council (seigneurs) of Geneva. In that official letter Calvin tried to explain why his own views on human free will and divine predestination appeared to be at variance with those expressed in Melanchthon's Loci published and affirmed by Calvin himself. Jean Calvin, "Au Sénat de Genève," in *Opera quae supersunt omnia (Corpus Reformatorum)*, vol. 14 (42), ed. Wilhelm Baum, Edouard Cunitz and Eduard Reuss (Braunschweig; Schwetschke, 1875), 378-383 [No. 1659 (6 October 1552)]. Cf. an indictment against Calvin brought by Jean Trolliet: "Trolliet contre Calvin," in Calvin, *Opera*, vol. 14 (42), 371-377.

[13] Philipp Melanchthon, *Loci communes theologici* (Frankfurt am Main; Braubach, 1544), 22v-26v [De humanis viribus seu de libero arbitrio]. Ibidem, 90r-92v [De praedestinatione]. The cited edition is a reprint of 1543 edition.

[14] Philipp Melanchthon, *Responsiones ad impios articulos Bavaricae inquisitionis*, ed. Ernst Sartorius (Marburg; Krieger, 1824), 45-64 [XXII].

[15] Philipp Melanchthon, *Loci communes theologici* (Frankfurt am Main; Braubach, 1544), 104r-122r [De sacramentis].

[16] Albert Herrlinger, *Die Theologie Melanchthons in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und im Zusammenhang mit der Lehrgeschichte und Kulturbewegung der Reformation* (Gotha; Perthes, 1879), 119-123 [I, III, B, II].

The literature on the history of Melanchthon's *Loci*,^[17] on the development of Melanchthon's theology^[18] and on the doctrinal features thereof^[19] is indeed vast, not to mention studies of Melanchthon's exegesis and of his reception of the church fathers, as well as analyses of his contribution to European philosophy and education. Therefore, the present paper aims to explore the rudimentary concept of Protestant theology as an academic discipline which was enunciated by Melanchthon in his prolegomena to all Latin and German versions of *Loci*.

A Classification of Melanchthon's Prolegomena to Latin and German *Loci*

The number of various editions of Latin and German *Loci* is enormous and it can hardly be estimate^{d[20]} because, on the one hand, Melanchthon was on a regular basis rewriting his *Loci*, and on the other hand, *Loci* were published countless times. Since Georg Theodor Strobel^[21] Melanchthon-

[17] Hermann Hardt, "Phil. Melanchthonis Hypotyposes theologicae An. 1521 opus rarissimum," in *Historia literaria reformationis in honorem iubilaei anno MDCCVII* (Frankfurt am Main and Leipzig: Renger, 1717), 20-30 [IV]. Moritz Rödiger, *Insunt quaedam de Philippi Melanthonis Locis communibus theologicis propediem in Corpore Reformatorum edendis* (Halle an der Saale: Gebauer, 1829). Georg Theodor Strobel, *Versuch einer Literärgeschichte von Philipp Melanthon's Locis Theologicis als dem ersten Evangelischen Lehrbuch* (Altdorf and Nürnberg: Schüpfel, 1776).

[18] Ernst Bizer, *Theologie der Verheissung: Studien zur theologischen Entwicklung des jungen Melanchthon 1519 — 1524* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1964). Alfons Brüls, *Die Entwicklung der Gotteslehre beim jungen Melanchthon 1518 — 1535* (Bielefeld: Luther-Verlag, 1975). Friedrich Galle, *Versuch einer Charakteristik Melanthon's als Theologen und einer Entwicklung seines Lehrbegriffs* (Halle an der Saale: Lippert, 1840). Hans-Georg Geyer, *Von der Geburt des wahren Menschen; Probleme aus den Anfängen der Theologie Melanthon's* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1965). Martin Greschat, *Melanthon neben Luther: Studien zur Gestalt der Rechtfertigungslehre zwischen 1528 und 1537* (Witten: Luther-Verlag, 1965). Peter Heinrich, *Die Frage der menschlichen Willensfreiheit in der Theologie Melanthon's; Eine kurze Darstellung und Beurteilung ihrer Aufnahme und Entwicklung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Loci communes* (Nordhausen: Bautz, 2003). Nicole Kuroпка, *Philipp Melanchthon-Wissenschaft und Gesellschaft: Ein Gelehrter im Dienst der Kirche 1526 — 1532* (Tübingen: Mohr, 2002). Wolfgang Matz, *Der befreite Mensch: Die Willenslehre in der Theologie Philipp Melanthon's* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001). Wilhelm Maurer, *Melanthon-Studien* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1964). Carl E. Maxcey, *Bona Opera: A Study in the Development of the Doctrine in Philip Melanchthon* (Nieuwkoop: De Graaf, 1980). "Melanthon's theologische Entwicklung bis zur Herausgabe der *Loci communes*," in *Die Loci Communes Philipp Melanthon's in ihrer Urgestalt*, ed. Gustav Leopold Plitt and Theodor Kolde (Erlangen and Leipzig: Deichert, 1890), 3-56. Wilhelm H. Neuser, *Die Abendmahlslehre Melanthon's in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung 1519 — 1530* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1968). Rolf Schäfer, *Christologie und Sittlichkeit in Melanthon's frühen Loci* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1961). Heinz Scheible, *Aufsätze zu Melanchthon* (Tübingen: Mohr, 2010). Karl Sell, *Philipp Melanchthon und die Deutsche Reformation bis 1531* (Halle an der Saale: Verein für Reformationsgeschichte, 1897). Paul Schwarzenau, *Der Wandel im theologischen Ansatz bei Melanchthon von 1525 — 1535* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1956).

[19] Irene Dingel et al., ed., *Philip Melanchthon: Theologian in Classroom, Confession, and Controversy* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012). Hans Engelland, *Die Frage der Gotteserkenntnis bei Melanchthon* (München: Kaiser, 1930). Gregory B. Graybill, *Evangelical Free Will: Philipp Melanchthon's Doctrinal Journey on the Origins of Faith* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010). Timothy J. Wengert, *Human Freedom, Christian Righteousness: Philipp Melanchthon's Exegetical Dispute with Erasmus of Rotterdam* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998). Timothy J. Wengert, *Law and Gospel: Philip Melanchthon's Debate with John Agricola of Eisleben over Poenitentia* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1997).

[20] Heinrich Ernst Bindseil, *Bibliotheca Melanthoniana* (Halle an der Saale: Hendel, 1868). Editorial introductions in: Philipp Melanchthon, *Opera quae supersunt omnia (Corpus Reformatorum)*, vol. 21-22, ed. Karl Gottlieb Bretschneider and Heinrich Ernst Bindseil (Braunschweig: Schwetschke, 1854 — 1855). Helmut Claus, ed., *Melanthon-Bibliographie 1510 — 1560*, vol. 1-4 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2014). "Die revidierten Druckausgaben (1542 — 1579)," in Philipp Melanchthon, *Heubartikel christlicher Lere; Melanthon's deutsche Fassung seiner Loci theologici nach dem Autograph und dem Originaldruck von 1553*, ed. Ralf Jenett and Johannes Schilling (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2012), 50-67. Georg Theodor Strobel, ed., *Bibliotheca Melanthoniana* (Nuremberg: [s. n.], 1782). Idem, *Versuch einer Literärgeschichte*.

[21] *Ibidem*.

scholars have been dividing Loci into three versions (sing. aetas, plur. aetates) and Corpus Reformatorum embraced that practice too.

Nonetheless, the above division seems to be inadequate as far the second and third versions of Loci are concerned granted that there are two types of Loci within the second version and two types within the third version. Although Corpus Reformatorum contained both types of Loci classified as belonging to the second version,^[22] in the case of the third version Corpus Reformatorum contained only the text of 1559, omitting the text of 1543 which was not identical with that of 1559 edition.^[23] The latter is commonly recognised as the ultimate version of Loci, yet in 1560, shortly before his death, the final text of Loci was approved of by Melanchthon and printed as a part of Latin Corpus Philippicum.^[24] To identify what version of Loci is dealt with, it is necessary to consult the text, not necessary the date of publication, given that earlier versions of Loci were occasionally released while later versions were already circulating.

Melanchthon's prolegomena (*i. e.* prefaces and dedicatory letters) scrutinised in the present essay are found in Corpus Reformatorum except for the elucidation (Argumentum) of Psalm 32 which was taken from Hesus' Psalter^[25] and which was included in many editions of Loci in Melanchthon's lifetime.^[26] It is not clear whether the text of that Argumentum was authored by Hesus himself or by Melanchthon who by writing the aforementioned elucidation could contribute to that new, annotated Latin Psalter. This Psalter was actually edited by Hesus and prefaced by Melanchthon.^[27] The manner of placing the Argumentum in Loci would point to Melanchthon as to its author.

In 1560 Johannes Nysaeus published the logical tables based on Loci which were prefaced by Melanchthon.^[28] Since Johannes Nysaeus was Melanchthon's student^[29] and his book was published by Oporinus whose publishing house was renowned for printing numerous editions of Loci in Melanchthon's lifetime, the aforementioned preface should be reckoned as genuine^[30] and by virtue of its content it should be counted among Melanchthon's prefaces to Loci. In that preface Melanchthon

[22] Philipp Melanchthon, *Opera quae supersunt omnia (Corpus Reformatorum)*, vol. 21, ed. Karl Gottlieb Bretschneider and Heinrich Ernst Bindseil (Braunschweig: Schwetschke, 1854), 253-332. Ibidem, 331-560.

[23] Benjamin T. G. Mayes, "Introduction to the Second Edition," in Philipp Melanchthon, *The Chief Theological Topics: Loci praecipui theologici 1559*, trans. Jacob Aall Ottesen Preus (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 2011), xiii-xv.

[24] Philipp Melanchthon, "Loci praecipui theologici," in *Corpus doctrinae christianae quae est summa*, 309-749.

[25] "Psalms XXXII," in *Psalterium Davidis carmine*, ed. Helius Eobanus Hesus (Strasbourg: Crato, 1544), 102-104.

[26] "Argumentum," in Philipp Melanchthon, *Loci communes theologici* (Leipzig: Papa, 1546), [A8r]. Reprinted in the following editions of Loci: (Leipzig: Papa, 1548), (Leipzig: Papa, 1549), (Leipzig: Papa, 1550), (Basel: Oporinus, 1550), (Leipzig: Papa, 1552), (Leipzig: Papa, 1553), (Leipzig: Papa, 1554), (Leipzig: Papa, 1556), (Leipzig: Papa, 1557), (Wittenberg: Crato, 1558), (Wittenberg: Crato, 1559).

[27] Philipp Melanchthon, "Clarissimo viro D. Eobano Hesso Poetae (1 August 1537)," in *Psalterium Davidis carmine*, 18-20. Reprinted in: Idem, *Opera quae supersunt omnia (Corpus Reformatorum)*, vol. 3, ed. Karl Gottlieb Bretschneider (Halle an der Saale: Schwetschke, 1836), 393-395 [No. 1596 (1 August 1537)].

[28] Philipp Melanchthon, "Pii lectoribus S. D.," in *Johannes Nysaeus, Tabulae locorum communium theologicorum Philippi Melanchthonis confectae* (Basel: Oporinus, 1560), A4v-A5r. Reprinted in: Melanchthon, *Opera*, vol. 9, 1024-1025 [No. 6903 (1 January 1560)].

[29] Johannes Nysaeus, "Illustrissimo Principi ac Domino," in *Tabulae*, A2r.

[30] Strobel, *Versuch einer Literärgeschichte*, 251-256 [Von einigen Erleuterungsschriften über die Locos].

himself admitted that he was prefacing Loci transformed into a tabular format by Nysaeus.^[31] Moreover, the phrasing of Melanchthon's preface published in Nysaeus' *Tabulae* resembles that of Melanchthon's preface to the Latin version of *Corpus Philippicum*^[32] which was also written in early 1560,^[33] and Melanchthon's disquisition on the authority of the Scripture found in his preface to *Tabulae* partially overlaps with his statement (*consilium*)^[34] from March 1560.

In the present article, Melanchthon's prefaces to the Latin and German versions of *Corpus Philippicum* are consulted too because they cast light upon his understanding of the emerging doctrinal texts which were to be held in high esteem (called later "symbolic books") and because they capture his insights into the formation of collections of such texts (*corpora doctrinae*).

Melanchthon was intent on using the prolegomena to define the new, emerging theology as an academic discipline, situating it against the ancient and mediaeval theological paradigm. In the case of Melanchthon, most of his prefaces to his own writings or to the works authored by others were concerned with methodology and verged on the meta-theory of a specific academic discipline. For instance, in his preface to *Physics* (1549)^[35] Melanchthon explicated the phenomenon of natural sciences from the philosophical and theological perspective.

The first German version of Melanchthon's *Loci* was translated by Georg Spalatin^[36] and published in 1522. That translation had subsequently been revised by Spalatin and printed many times by various publishers under various titles. From 1523 onwards Spalatin's preface^[37] had been added to that version of German *Loci*. In literary terms Spalatin's rendition slavishly imitated the Latin original and in the first edition of his translation Spalatin mishandled certain passages^[38] which were partially emended in the subsequent editions.

[31] Melanchthon, "Piis lectoribus S. D.," A5r.

[32] Melanchthon, "Praefatio," in *Corpus doctrinae christianae quae est summa*, A2r-A4r.

[33] To be precise, the preface to the Latin version of *Corpus* was written in February 1560, whereas the preface found in Nysaeus' logical tables-in January 1560.

[34] Philipp Melanchthon, "De norma iudicii in Ecclesia," in *Opera*, vol. 9, 1081-1083 [No. 6964 (March 1560)].

[35] Philipp Melanchthon, "Clarissimo viro," in *Initia doctrinae physicae* (Wittenberg: Crato, 1567), A2r-A6v. The *Physics* without the preface is reprinted in: Idem, *Opera quae supersunt omnia* (*Corpus Reformatorum*), vol. 13, ed. Karl Gottlieb Bretschneider (Halle an der Saale: Schwetschke, 1846), 179-412; whereas the displaced preface -in: Idem, *Opera quae supersunt omnia* (*Corpus Reformatorum*), vol. 7, ed. Karl Gottlieb Bretschneider (Halle an der Saale: Schwetschke, 1840), 472-477 [No. 4603 (29 September 1549)].

[36] Philipp Melanchthon, *Die Hauptartikel und vornehmsten Punkten der ganzen heiligen Schrift*, trans. Georg Spalatin (Strasbourg: [s. n.], 1522).

[37] Georg Spalatin, "Gottes Gnade und Frieden wünscht allen Christen," in Philipp Melanchthon, *Anweisung in die wahrhaftige heilige Schrift Gottes*, trans. Georg Spalatin (Augsburg: Grimm, 1523), A1v. Reprinted in: Melanchthon, *Opera*, vol. 22, 7-10 [E. I, a (Prima aetas Germanicae translationis Locorum Melanthonis)].

[38] For example, "[...] siquidem hoc est Christum cognoscere, beneficia eius cognoscere [...]" was initially misinterpreted as "[...] das ist den Herrn Christum erkennen seine Gottheit erkennen [...]", while in the edition of 1523 -translated correctly as "[...] das ist den Herrn Christum erkennen seine Wohltat erkennen [...]". Philipp Melanchthon, "Loci communes seu hypotyposes theologicae," in *Opera*, vol. 21, 85 [Prima Aetas]. Idem, "Von den gemeinen Orten, Artikeln oder klaren Anzeigungen der heiligen Schrift," in *Die Hauptartikel und vornehmsten Punkten der ganzen heiligen Schrift*, B1v. Idem, "Vorrede," in *Anweisung in die wahrhaftige heilige Schrift Gottes*, 5v.

The second version of Loci was translated^[39] into German and prefaced^[40] by Justus Jonas and released for the first time in 1536, while the German translation of the third version prepared by Jonas but refined by Melanchthon was published in 1542. The title page of that edition stipulated that in 1542 Melanchthon again proofread and refined the translation.^[41] Since that edition stemmed from 1542, it is arguable whether that note might imply that Melanchthon proofread former German translations of his Loci. In the next editions the date of Melanchthon's proofreading was adjusted accordingly.

The proposition that Melanchthon was involved in refining German translations of his masterpiece is plausible in view of his long-standing, close cooperation both with Spalatin and with Jonas.^[42] The examination of the Olomouc (German: Olmütz) manuscript of German Loci^[43] proved that Melanchthon himself prepared a draft of the German translation of the third version of his Loci which was later utilised by Jonas. The relationship between Melanchthon's rendition and the earlier German translation devised by Jonas but proofread and refined by Melanchthon still awaits further scrutiny especially in view of Melanchthon's own comments.^[44]

The note on the title page of 1542 edition ("in 1542 again proofread and refined by Melanchthon"), which represented the third version of Loci, might suggest that Jonas had access to the Latin original of the third version before its official publication in 1543. The final text of the third version of German Loci endorsed by Melanchthon was contained in the German Corpus Philippicum.^[45]

Speaking of numerous editions of German Loci belonging to every single version, it should be noted that while revising their translations, Spalatin and Jonas were not only refining their German but also took the opportunity to implement minor changes which were meanwhile made by Melanchthon in the new Latin editions. In the present paper German translations of Loci are construed as auxiliary to and illuminative of the Latin original and therefore are referred to occasionally.

[39] Philipp Melanchthon, *Loci communes das ist die vornehmsten Artikel Christlicher Lehre*, trans. Justus Jonas (Wittenberg: Rhau, 1536).

[40] Justus Jonas, "Dem durchlauchtigsten hochgeborenen Fürsten und Herrn Johann Friedrich, Herzog zu Sachsen," in Melanchthon, *Loci communes das ist die vornehmsten Artikel*, A2r-A4v.

[41] Philipp Melanchthon, *Die Hauptartikel Christlicher Lehre zusammen gezogen*, trans. Justus Jonas (Wittenberg: Rhau, 1544). The cited edition is a reprint of 1542 edition.

[42] Siegmund Jakob Baumgarten, *Nachrichten von merkwürdigen Büchern*, vol. 31 (Halle an der Saale: Gebauer, 1754), 408-411 [MDCCCCXXXI, No. 2193]. Samuel Leigh Sotheby, *Observations upon the Handwriting of Philip Melanchthon* (London: Davy, 1839), passim. The latter book documented Melanchthon's notes on German translations of Loci owned by him.

[43] Robert Stupperich, "Melanchthons Deutsche Bearbeitung seiner Loci nach der Olmützer Handschrift," in *Mededelingen: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeling Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks*, vol. 36/7 (Amsterdam and London: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1973), 351-370. "Einleitung," in *Melanchthon, Heubartikel christlicher Lere: Melanchthons deutsche Fassung seiner Loci theologici nach dem Autograph und dem Originaldruck von 1553*, 17-73.

[44] Philipp Melanchthon, "Laurentio Mollero (Hildesiae docenti Evangelium)," in *Opera*, vol. 7, 1137 [No. 5266 (16 November 1552)]. Idem, "D. Georgio Principi in Anhalt," in *Opera quae supersunt omnia (Corpus Reformatorum)*, vol. 8, ed. Karl Gottlieb Bretschneider (Halle an der Saale: Schwetschke, 1841), 58 [No. 5359 (30 March 1553)]. Idem, "Dav. Chytraeo," in *Opera*, vol. 8, 607 [No. 5871 (14 November 1555)].

[45] Philipp Melanchthon, "Hauptartikel Christlicher Lehre im Latein genannt Loci Theologici," in *Corpus doctrinae christianae das ist ganze Summa der rechten wahren christlichen Lehre des heiligen Evangeliums nach Inhalt göttlicher prophetischen und apostolischen Schriften* (Leipzig: Voegelin, 1560), 371-783.

Christian and Jewish Endeavours to Systematise Religious Instruction in Antiquity and in the Middle Ages

A systematic (topical) value of Melanchthon's *Loci* can be discerned by situating that manual against the ancient and mediaeval endeavours to systematise religious instruction within the Christian and Jewish traditions. Although the religious literature produced by the ancient church was vast and diverse, initially it was not abundant in the presentations of the Christian doctrine which could be construed as systematic from the contemporary point of view. Naturally, the contemporary concept of systematicity was largely formed in the late Antiquity or in the early Middle Ages, depending on a specific chronology adopted with reference to a particular region. Needless to say that the inception of the mediaeval period was less conspicuous in the Byzantine Empire than in the West.

The ancient church fathers were preoccupied with explaining and fortifying what was perceived by them as an orthodox Christian doctrine. This happened predominately through edifying or polemical expositions of basic Christian concepts^[46] or of specific ideas,^[47] through commentaries upon the Apostles' Creed (Western church)^[48] or upon the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed (Eastern church),^[49] through sermons and through catechetical^[50] or evangelistic^[51] lectures and tracts.

In the first half of the 7th century, Maximus the Confessor,^[52] the Greek church father, composed a theological compendium called "Chief Topics" (Κεφαλαία διὰ ἀφορὰς). As a matter of fact, a literal Latin translation of that Greek title would be "Loci praecipui". The latter phrase was used by Melanchthon as a title for the second and third versions of his *Loci*.^[53] Notwithstanding a mediocre deployment of theological content, Maximus' work was a harbinger of the systematic era within the Byzantine theology. This era was exemplified by the monumental exposition of the Christian doctrine prepared by John of Damascus^[54] in the first half of the 8th century.

In the Western church presentations of the Christian essentials by Ambrose^[55] and by Augustine of Hippo^[56] were conspicuous for their systematic treatment of doctrinal content. The tradition of such

[46] Origenes, "Περὶ Ἀρχῶν," in PG, vol. 11, 115-414. Eusebius Caesariensis, "Demonstratio evangelica," in PG, vol. 22, 13-794. Lactantius, "Divinarum Institutionum libri septem," in PL, vol. 6, 111-822. Ambrosius Mediolanensis, "De fide ad Gratianum Augustum libri quinque," in PL, vol. 16, 527-698. Augustinus Hipponensis, "De doctrina Christiana," in PL, vol. 34, 15-122. Idem, "Enchiridion ad Laurentium sive de fide, spe et charitate liber unus," in PL, vol. 40, 231-290.

[47] A vast literature arising from the trinitarian and christological controversies belongs to that category.

[48] Rufinus, "Commentarius in Symbolum Apostolorum," in PL, vol. 21, 335-386.

[49] Theodotus Ancyranus, "Expositio Symboli Nicaeni," in PG, vol. 77, 1313-1348.

[50] Cyrillus Hierosolymitanus, "Catecheses," in PG, vol. 33, 331-1060. Idem, "Catecheses mystagogicae quinque," in PG, vol. 33, 1059-1128.

[51] Eusebius Caesariensis, "Praeparatio evangelica," in PG, vol. 21, 21-1408.

[52] Maximus Abbas, "Κεφαλαία διὰ ἀφορὰς θεολογικὰ τε καὶ ἰκονομικὰ," in PG, vol. 90, 1177-1392.

[53] Calvin named his masterpiece after Lactantius' work. Cf. Lactantius, "Divinarum Institutionum libri septem,".

[54] Joannes Damascenus, "Expositio fidei orthodoxae," in PG, vol. 94, 789-1228.

[55] Ambrosius Mediolanensis, "De fide ad Gratianum Augustum libri quinque,".

[56] Augustinus Hipponensis, "Enchiridion ad Laurentium sive de fide, spe et charitate liber unus,".

comprehensive expositions of Christian belief was continued by the Latin church fathers in the early Middle Ages^[57] until the emergence of new theological genres called “Sentences” and “Summas”.

In the first half of the 12th century Hugh of Saint Victor composed his “Summa sententiarum”.^[58] From then on, mediaeval theologians were keen either on devising their own “Sentences” or on writing commentaries upon Peter Lombard’s “Sentences”^[59] which enjoyed considerable popularity even in the early 16th century. Subsequently, in the 13th century Thomas Aquinas began to popularise his concept of theological summa organised according the dialectical method (question -thesis cum arguments -antithesis cum arguments-adjudication).

The preponderance of “Sentences” and “Summas” did not eliminate other forms of systematic presentation of Christian doctrine. For instance, Peter Abelard’s “Sic et non”^[60] was a highly philosophical and theological disquisition, yet his “Theologia Christiana”^[61] was a communicative compendium resembling those of the ancient church fathers.

Although every “Summa” or “Sentences” should be studied in its own right, generally speaking, those forms of theological discourse put the emphasis on a philosophical argumentation to the detriment of the exegesis of the sacred writings. Moreover, neither ancient nor mediaeval Christian theology reflected upon the theological significance of systematising the Christian essentials and none of pre-Reformation theologians anticipated that the way of selecting and arranging the doctrinal content might be concomitant with theological tenets underlying any attempt at systematisation.

The Jewish tradition was focused on experiencing the LORD’s Covenant with Israel which was recorded in the multi-layered religious literature (such as Midrashim or Talmudim)^[62] that had been solidifying at least since the Siege of Jerusalem in 70 AD. On account of the orthopraxy characteristic of Judaism, the Jewish religious tradition for a long time had not felt the need to delineate and to systematise the essentials thereof except for liturgical expression.^[63] Plausibly, the systematic expositions of the Jewish way of living^[64] were precipitated by the encounter with the systematic methods of arguing religious ideas which were employed in Islam and in Christianity. Nonetheless, the mediaeval discussion about the status and function of the Thirteen Principles propounded by

[57] Vincentius Lirinensis, “Duo Commonitoria,” in PL, vol. 50, 637-686. Fulgentius, “De fide seu de regula verae fidei ad Petrum liber unus,” in PL, vol. 65, 671-706. The latter was also attributed to Augustine: Augustinus Hipponensis, “De fide ad Petrum sive de regula verae fidei,” in PL, vol. 40, 753-780.

[58] Hugo de Sancto Victore, “Summa sententiarum,” in PL, vol. 176, 41-174.

[59] Petrus Lombardus, “Sententiarum libri quatuor,” in PL, vol. 192, 521-962.

[60] Petrus Abaelardus, “Sic et non,” in PL, vol. 178, 1339-1610.

[61] Petrus Abaelardus, “Theologia Christiana,” in PL, vol. 178, 1123-1330.

[62] Ferdinand Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie aus Targum, Midrasch und Talmud* (Leipzig: Dörfling and Franke, 1880), passim.

[63] The comparison of the Rabbinic siddurim to the Karaite ones proves that the liturgical texts, which from the contemporary perspective could be viewed as doctrinally significant, were common to both traditions. In view of the moment of the separation of the Karaite movement from the Rabbinic Judaism it is arguable that some texts contained in the siddurim were circulating prior to the aforementioned division.

[64] Saadia Gaon, *Glaubenslehre und Philosophie*, ed. and trans. Julius Fürst (Leipzig: Wigand, 1845). Judah Halevi, *Kitab al Khazari*, trans. Hartwig Hirschfeld (London: Routledge, 1905). Maimonides, *Führer der Unschlüssigen*, vol. 1-3, trans. Adolf Weiss (Leipzig: Meiner, 1923-1924). Abraham ibn Daud, *Das Buch Emunah Ramah oder Der erhabene Glaube*, ed. and trans. Simson Weil (Frankfurt am Main: [s. n.], 1852). Joseph Albo, *Buch Ikkarim: Grund- und Glaubenslehren der Mosaïschen Religion*, trans. Wolf Schlessinger and Ludwig Schlesinger (Frankfurt am Main: [s. n.], 1844).

Maimonides demonstrates that the systematisation of religious propositions was not indispensable to the Jewish tradition which was perpetuated, preserved and transmitted by non-systematic forms of a religious literature, by practising the Law and by worshipping the LORD.

God's Word as the Sole Source and Means of the Saving Knowledge of God

In his prolegomena Melanchthon highlighted the supreme and unique authority of the Scripture within the church and defined the relationship between the Bible and other texts relevant in doctrinal terms. Furthermore, he propounded the method of biblical interpretation which he considered credible and implied by the Scripture itself.

In Melanchthon's view,^[65] the Scripture, which he identified as a written form of God's Word,^[66] was the sole source and means of the saving knowledge of the Divinity for human beings. Consequently, every single statement concerning a Christian belief or a Christian life had to be grounded in the Scripture in which, according to Melanchthon, the saving self-revelation of God towards humankind was fully and sufficiently enshrined.

Melanchthon maintained that by adhering to the Scripture as to the sole source of the saving knowledge of God, the church was retaining its biblical (whence orthodox) identity as envisaged in Ephesians 2:19-20. For that reason, Melanchthon commonly referred to the Scripture as to the "prophetic and apostolic writings or books" in order to emphasise that the church irrespective of its historical or regional form must be founded upon the Bible from which all Christian doctrine should originate and by means of which the complete self-revelation of the saving face of God was laid bare to humankind.

From Melanchthon's standpoint,^[67] theologians, who either taught contrary to the Scripture or conveyed a message not attested in the Bible, were to be considered heterodox. Accordingly, not only a proposition adverse to the Scripture but also a proposition not substantiated in the Scripture should be considered heterodox. Therefore, Melanchthon was passing strictures on divines who dared to "fabricate the doctrine(s)", namely, to make assertions which could not be proved from the Bible.

In his opinion, the Scripture itself laid claim to the church and imposed its uncompromising authority on the church. Therefore, by evoking terms such as "ecclesiastical doctrine" or "doctrine of the church", Melanchthon recalled that the biblical doctrine in its pure form was the only one which was supposed to be professed by the church regardless of its historical or geographical setting.

Realising that some knowledge of God, to be precise, a limited^[68] knowledge of the divine Law, could be known from the universe and from human innate moral awareness (the conscience), and

[65] Philipp Melanchthon, "Iuxta pio atque erudito viro D. Tilomano Plettenero," in *Opera*, vol. 21, 81-84 [Prima Aetas]. Idem, "Locī communes," in *Opera*, vol. 21, 253-255 [Secunda Aetas]. Idem, "Piis et studiosis scholasticis," in *Opera*, vol. 21, 341-348 [Secunda Aetas]. Idem, "Locī communes theologici," in *Opera*, vol. 21, 347-349 [Secunda Aetas]. Idem, "Pio lectori," in *Opera*, vol. 21, 601-604 [Tertia Aetas]. Idem, "Praefatio," in *Opera*, vol. 21, 603-607 [Tertia Aetas]. Idem, "Der ehrbaren und tugendsamen Frau Anna," 45-48. Idem, "An den Christlichen Leser: Vorrede," in *Opera*, vol. 22, 47-52 [Tertia Aetas (Locī Theologici Germanice)]. Idem, "Piis lectoribus S. D.," A4v-A5r. Idem, "De norma iudicii in Ecclesia," 1083 [No. 6964 (March 1560)].

[66] Thus, Melanchthon recognised the Scripture as inspired by the Holy Spirit.

[67] Melanchthon, "Pio lectori," 601-604. Idem, "Praefatio," in *Opera*, vol. 21, 603-607 [Tertia Aetas].

[68] On account of the original sin, as Melanchthon taught.

therefore was available apart from the Scripture, Melanchthon^[69] clarified that the Bible was the sole repository of all saving knowledge of God, to wit, of the entire message concerning the salvation of sinners (the Gospel).

Given the absolute primacy of the Scripture over the church, Melanchthon^[70] avowed that no other text could be equated with the Bible or might approximate to the Bible. Therefore, Melanchthon stated that his Loci were meant not to entice the audience away from the study of the Bible but rather, by acting as a guide to the essentials of the biblical teaching, to entice the readers to plunge into the Scripture and to guard the absolute authority thereof. For that reason, some editions of Melanchthon's German Loci were titled "Anweisung in die wahrhaftige heilige Schrift Gottes" (*i. e.* an introduction to the true and holy Scripture of God).^[71] The position of Loci as utterly subservient to the Scripture was also underscored both by Spalatin^[72] and by Jonas^[73] in their forewords to the German renditions. While working as a systematic theologian and as an exegete, Melanchthon was concerned that his expositions of the Christian doctrine or his biblical commentaries might be perceived by some readers as competing against the Scripture.

In the edifice of Melanchthon's theology non-biblical texts of paramount importance can be divided into the ecumenical creeds and the documents produced by the 16th-century Wittenberg Reformation. The ecumenical creeds, *i. e.* the Apostles' Creed, the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed and the Athanasian Creed, were regarded by Melanchthon as an accurate summary of the biblical doctrine and as a trustworthy recapitulation of the distinctive points of the biblical message functioning as a token (symbolum) of the doctrinal orthodoxy.^[74] Melanchthon affirmed that the ecumenical creeds were handed down as a comprehensive and comprehensible epitome of biblical teaching which ought to be professed by the church without reservation.

Therefore, Melanchthon^[75] did not hesitate to admit that the Scripture cum the ecumenical creeds, which were thought of as duly encapsulating its message, was the perennial fountainhead of the Christian teaching on the stipulation that the Scripture was the only source, while the symbols were merely affirming, reflecting and epitomising the biblical message. The Scripture as the sole source of doctrine was evoked in an exhaustive subtitle of *Corpus Philippicum* which was designated as "the summary of the orthodox and universal articles of faith embracing the pure and true doctrine of the Gospel of Jesus Christ according to the divine writings of the prophets and apostles" (*summa orthodoxi et catholici dogmatis complectens doctrinam puram et veram Evangelii Jesu Christi secundum divina prophetarum et apostolorum scripta*). Thus, the ecumenical creeds, which

[69] Melanchthon, "Loci communes theologici," in *Opera*, vol. 21, 347-349 [Secunda Aetas]. Idem, "Loci communes," in *Opera*, vol. 21, 253-255 [Secunda Aetas].

[70] Melanchthon, "Iuxta pio atque erudito viro D. Tilmano Plettenero," 81-84. Idem, "Loci communes," in *Opera*, vol. 21, 253-255 [Secunda Aetas]. Idem, "Praefatio," in *Opera*, vol. 21, 603-607 [Tertia Aetas]. Idem, "Der ehrbaren und tugendsamen Frau Anna," 45-48.

[71] E. g. Melanchthon, *Anweisung in die wahrhaftige heilige Schrift Gottes*.

[72] Spalatin, "Gottes Gnade und Frieden wünscht allen Christen," A1v.

[73] Jonas, "Dem durchlauchtigsten hochgeborenen Fürsten und Herrn Johann Friedrich, Herzog zu Sachsen," A2r-A4v.

[74] Philipp Melanchthon, "Vorrede," in *Opera*, vol. 22, 51-62 [Tertia Aetas (Loci Theologici Germanice)]. Idem, "Piis lectoribus S. D.," A4v-A5r. Idem, "Serenissimo Principi D. Henrico Octavo," in *Opera*, vol. 21, 333-340.

[75] Melanchthon, "Der ehrbaren und tugendsamen Frau Anna," 45-48. Idem, "Piis lectoribus S. D.," A4v-A5r. Idem, "Piis et studiosis scholasticis," 341-348. Idem, "Pio lectori," 601-604. Idem, "Praefatio," in *Opera*, vol. 21, 603-607 [Tertia Aetas]. Idem, "Vorrede," in *Opera*, vol. 22, 51-62 [Tertia Aetas (Loci Theologici Germanice)].

were contained in that collection of Melanchthon's writings (*Corpus Philippicum*), were a part of the summary and exposition of the doctrine which was construed by him as derived from the Scripture alone.

Treating of the relationship between the Bible and the church fathers, Melanchthon^[76] mentioned that in the Scripture as in the sole fountainhead of the divine wisdom the doctrine was revealed and laid down. This doctrine was subsequently epitomised in the ecumenical creeds, while the church fathers proved to interpret that doctrine more or less adequately. The ecumenical creeds were also held in high esteem by some of Melanchthon's associates who would say that the Christian doctrine was embodied in the Scripture and in the ecumenical creeds, yet only the "prophetic and apostolic writings" (*i. e.* the Bible) could enjoy the status of God's voice (*vox Dei*) and could be received as such.^[77]

Melanchthon^[78] did not advocate the apostolic authorship of the Apostles' Creed but settled for the statement that the aforementioned creed was formulated by the church in the apostolic age. Nonetheless, Melanchthon's approach to those three creeds, which he termed ecumenical, ignored their historical context because neither the Apostles' Creed nor the Athanasian Creed was acknowledged as ecumenical by the Eastern church which unwaveringly cleaved to the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed in its original Greek wording (*scilicet* without "Filioque") as to the only ecumenical symbol of faith endorsed by the ecumenical councils. To buttress the unique status of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, Eastern theology distinguished between that creed and the doctrinal definitions (*formulae*) made by the ecumenical councils. In short, Melanchthon's concept of the ecumenical creeds was a sheer product of Western mediaeval theology which *eo ipso* hindered any dialogue with the Eastern church in the 16th century.^[79]

Melanchthon did not accord to the documents of the 16th-century Reformation the same status which he assigned to the ecumenical creeds but rather construed the confessions of faith made by the proponents of the Reformation as a remedial work which in his opinion was a preliminary attempt at renewing the visible church by bringing it into compliance with the pure Christian doctrine embodied in the Scripture alone and genuinely mirrored in the ecumenical creeds.

Among the doctrinal texts produced by the 16th-century Wittenberg Reformation Melanchthon^[80] especially appreciated his own Augsburg Confession and its derivatives namely the Apology of the Augsburg Confession and the Saxon Confession. Although the Augsburg Confession, which was a public declaration of faith made by German princes and city councils, was authored by Melanchthon and consented to by Luther, Melanchthon did not inflate the status of that confession against the authority of the Scripture or against the position of the ecumenical creeds. Rather, Melanchthon asserted that the stark deviation of the Catholic

[76] Melanchthon, "Serenissimo Principi D. Henrico Octavo," 333-340.

[77] E. g. Paul Crell, "Pio lectori S. D.," in *Orationes aliquot recitatae in Academia Witebergensi eo tempore quo praelectiones publicas reverendi et clarissimi viri Philippi Melanthonis obitu huius interruptas aliqui ex professoribus de consilio Academiae continuare ceperunt* (Wittenberg; Creutzer, 1560), G1v-G2r. Cf. Melanchthon, "De norma iudicii in Ecclesia," 1081-1083 [No. 6964 (March 1560)].

[78] Melanchthon, "Vorrede," in *Opera*, vol. 22, 51-62 [Tertia Aetas (Loci Theologici Germanice)].

[79] *Acta et scripta theologorum Wirtembergensium et Patriarchae Constantinopolitani D. Hieremiae quae utriusque ab anno MDLXXVI usque ad annum MDLXXXI de Augustana Confessione inter se miserunt* (Wittenberg; Crato, 1584), *passim*.

[80] Melanchthon, "Praefatio," in *Corpus doctrinae christianae quae est summa*, A2r-A4r. Idem, "Admonitio ad lectores," in *Corpus doctrinae christianae quae est summa*, A5r-A6v. Idem, "Vorrede," in *Corpus doctrinae christianae das ist ganze Summa*, A2r-A3r. Idem, "Serenissimo Principi D. Henrico Octavo," 333-340. Idem, "Der ehrbaren und tugendsamen Frau Anna," 45-48. Idem, "An den Christlichen Leser: Vorrede," 47-52. Idem, "Vorrede," in *Opera*, vol. 22, 51-62 [Tertia Aetas (Loci Theologici Germanice)]. Idem, "Erinnerung des Lesers," in *Corpus doctrinae christianae das ist ganze Summa*, A4r-A5v.

mediaeval church from the biblical standards as understood by the Reformers necessitated the work of renewal to which *Confessio Augustana* contributed significantly as the instrument for rediscovering, formulating, disseminating and enacting the biblical teaching.

Melanchthon viewed his other writings purely in terms of their educational potential to transform the life and mind-set of next generations in compliance with the biblical doctrine and in accordance with the Reformation concept of the vocation which affirmed and promoted Christians' involvement in all social, educational, economical and political affairs. Thus, the Reformation assigned a supermundane value to the mundane activity by which Christians were said to serve the Creator of the universe who was believed to endow every single human being with his or her station in life.

For Melanchthon,^[81] a theological practice involved a continual and collective dialogue because in his view doctrinal issues should be brought up for constant discussion among Christian literati within the parameters defined by the authority of the Scripture in order to avoid an unnecessary discord and in order to reach a consensus. It should be noted that, according to Melanchthon, not only professional theologians but also Christian rulers and illustrious representatives of the entire society were authorised to participate in such a theological discourse because in his opinion the Christian community as such was responsible for the purity of the religious life.

Melanchthon appealed to the ecumenical councils which delineated the patristic orthodoxy, presuming that the collective and dialogical manner of solving theological controversies and of formulating doctrinal statements could provide a broad basis for Reformation theology. Affirming the authority of Scripture and the credibility of the ecumenical creeds, Melanchthon was prone to construe other theological propositions as provisional so that they might continue to be revisited and examined in the light of the Bible. As for his own doctrinal statements, Melanchthon did not consider them infallible but rather urged other theologians to evaluate his writings freely and openly from the perspective of biblical authority.^[82] The only credit, which Melanchthon was willing to take, was that for expounding the Scripture, particularly, the biblical message concerning the salvation of sinners (the Gospel), in a systematic way. This Melanchthon saw as his own contribution to the Reformation initiated by Luther.^[83]

Since in Melanchthon's opinion the Scripture lent credence to the ecumenical creeds and was the sole criterion for the verification of theological propositions, he was attentive to the method of the biblical interpretation. For Melanchthon,^[84] any certainty in the sphere of the doctrine could be derived only from the Scripture interpreted according to a simple, unequivocal and unchangeable meaning inherent in the linguistic and historical setting of the biblical text. Consequently, to treat the Bible as perspicuous in doctrinal terms, it was necessary to rely on its most natural sense which would have to be rooted in the literary and historical context. Therefore, Melanchthon was opposed to far-fetched interpretations of the Bible especially to the allegorical method.^[85] In his opinion, the

[81] Melanchthon, "Praefatio," in *Corpus doctrinae christianae quae est summa*, A2r-A4r. Idem, "Serenissimo Principi D. Henrico Octavo," 333-340. Idem, "Piis et studiosis scholasticis," 341-348. Idem, "Pio lectori," 601-604.

[82] Ibidem. Idem, "Der ehrbaren und tugendsamen Frau Anna," 45-48.

[83] Melanchthon, "Piis et studiosis scholasticis," 341-348.

[84] Melanchthon, "Piis lectoribus S. D.," A4v-A5r. Idem, "De norma iudicii in Ecclesia," 1083 [No. 6964 (March 1560)].

[85] Melanchthon, "Iuxta pio atque erudito viro D. Tilmano Plettenero," 81-84.

allegorical interpretation was inadmissible because it consisted not in discovering a reliable meaning enveloped in the text but rather in fabricating a meaning at a reader's discretion. Such an approach Melanchthon regarded as subjective and as potentially deceptive.

Animadverting upon the allegory as an illicit method of the biblical interpretation, Melanchthon^[86] cited Epiphanius of Salamis^[87] who in his view disapproved of an excessive use of the allegory attributed to Origen. Actually, in the passage quoted by Melanchthon Epiphanius did not challenge Origen personally but rather admitted that the allegorical method, which was widely accepted and cherished by the Greek church fathers, should be used within the parameters defined by the doctrinal authorities of the imperial church. In the next sentence Epiphanius stated that regardless of an adopted method of the biblical interpretation the Scripture alone could not be acknowledged as sufficient in doctrinal terms because in his opinion the Bible must be interpreted in light of the ecclesiastical tradition and must be supplemented by that tradition.

In this respect, Melanchthon's reference to Epiphanius was taken out of context and was harnessed to Melanchthon's Reformation agenda. Clearly, Melanchthon was intent on emphasising that even the ancient church fathers were not pleased with an excessive use of the allegorical method and therefore he resorted to Epiphanius' remark. Let us examine the passage as cited^[88] in Greek and as paraphrased^[89] by Melanchthon in Latin. This passage was subsequently quoted by Bartholomäus Keckermann,^[90] the 16th-century Protestant luminary from Danzig, who drew on Melanchthon's preface and who provided another Latin translation of that piece:

Original (PG)	Quotation by Melanchthon	Quotation by Keckermann	Latin paraphrasis by Melanchthon	Keckermann's Latin rendition	English translation of the Greek original (PG)
Α λλά πάντα τὰ θεῖα ῥήματα οὐκ ἄλληγορίας δεῖται,	τὰ θεῖα ῥήματα οὐ πάντα ἄλληγορίας δεῖται,	τὰ ῥήματα θεοῦ οὐ πάντα ἄλληγορίας δεῖται,	Non trans for manda sunt omnia dicta in all egorias	Verba Dei non egent allegoriam	However, all divine words do not signify an allegory
ἀλλὰ ὡς ἔχει.	ἀλλ' ὡς ἔχει.	ἀλλ' ὡς ἔχει.	sed ritenenda est nativa verborum significatio in lege, promissione gratia et articulis fidei	sed	but [they should be taken] as they stand.
Θεωρίας δὲ δεῖται καὶ αἰσθήσεως,	Θεωρίας δὲ δεῖται καὶ αἰσθήσεως,	Θεωρίας δὲ δεῖται καὶ αἰσθήσεως,	[...]opus esse sensu et speculatione	potius iudicio et speculatione	Thus, [all divine words] signify a theory and an insight
εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ἕκαστης ὑποθέσεως τῆν δύναμιν.	εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ἕκαστης ὑποθέσεως τῆν δύναμιν.	εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ἕκαστης ὑποθέσεως τῆν δύναμιν.		ad cuiusque dicti scopum seu argumentumper spiciendum.	so that a power of every single proposition could be known.

Melanchthon's Latin paraphrasis of Epiphanius' comment coincided with Melanchthon's

[86] Melanchthon, "Piis lectoribus S. D. ," A4v.

[87] Epiphanius, "Panarium sive Arcula adversus octoginta haereses," in PG, vol. 41, 1047-1048 [II, I, Adversus Apostolicos (Haeresis XLI sive LXD), VI].

[88] Melanchthon, "Piis lectoribus S. D. ," A4v.

[89] Melanchthon, "De norma iudicii in Ecclesia," 1083 [No. 6964 (March 1560)].

[90] Bartholomäus Keckermann, *Rhetoricae ecclesiasticae sive Artis formandi et habendi conciones sacras libri duo* (Hanau: Antonius, 1606), 68-69 [I, VII, IV, 2].

assertion that the ancient and mediaeval theologians ventured to apply the allegorical method of the biblical interpretation to the doctrinal issues in order to vindicate theses which otherwise could never be argued from the Scripture. In fact, Melanchthon^[91] charged Catholic theologians with the statement that the Scripture was vague about the Law and the Gospel, and he countered it by declaring that if the Scripture was interpreted properly, it was indeed explicit about the distinction between the Law and the Gospel which in his opinion underpinned all articles of faith.

Melanchthon's opposition to the allegorical method of interpretation primarily arose from his commitment to entrench the perspicuity and sufficiency of the Scripture in the realm of the Christian doctrine. In the next section we will discuss the hermeneutic relevance of the distinction between the Law and the Gospel which, according to Melanchthon, was not simply one of the articles of faith but rather the category ensuring a proper perception and application of all articles of faith.

Pondering Epiphanius' remark, Melanchthon^[92] observed that through experience mediated by senses human beings were able to learn what words signified. Thus, the very experience disclosed to human beings what was meant by words such as life, death, fear, sorrow or delight. For Melanchthon, although the experience empowered people to capture what the words denoted, the text was invested with a definite meaning not by its original or contemporary readers but rather by its historical and literary setting. Therefore, Melanchthon argued that any experience on a reader's side could only illustrate the biblical text without altering or influencing its genuine meaning which, as inherent in the text, was not to be created but rather to be discovered by the audience.

For Melanchthon,^[93] the authentic signification of the text was not crafted by the process of analysing it or drawing inferences from it. In his view, human senses were occupied with discovering the meaning of words, while human reason was tasked with drawing inferences from them and with enunciating and organising concepts on that basis. Therefore, Melanchthon contended that the process of analysing and systematising theological data did not affect their veracity but rather put various elements of the biblical doctrine in order just as bricks must be put together properly and according to a blueprint to construct a durable building.^[94]

Nowhere in his works Melanchthon did espouse the idea that the Scripture should be interpreted according to non-biblical texts (such as church confessions, for example) because this would imply that the outcome of the biblical interpretation was posited prior to the linguistic and historical study of the text. Rather, Melanchthon maintained that the linguistic and historical analysis of the Scripture would eventuate and culminate in the teaching embodied in the ecumenical creeds. Actually, he could not imagine that results of the proper exegesis of the biblical text might be at variance with the "ecclesiastical consensus" which he identified with the ecumenical creeds.

Melanchthon's handling of the ecumenical creeds was ahistorical not only because he treated all three creeds as ecumenical but also because he detached them from the patristic legacy. Since Melanchthon found in writings of the church fathers many propositions, which were in his opinion orthodox, and some, which were heterodox, he had to separate the ecumenical creeds, which he called

[91] Melanchthon, "Piis lectoribus S. D. ," A4v-A5r. Idem, "De norma iudicii in Ecclesia," 1083 [No. 6964 (March 1560)].

[92] Supra.

[93] Supra.

[94] Melanchthon, "Vorrede," in *Opera*, vol. 22, 51-62 [Tertia Aetas (Loci Theologici Germanice)].

the “pure testimonies of the early church”, from the entire patristic legacy which in his view should be examined critically and utilised only as far as it conformed to the biblical teaching as understood by the Reformers. Historically speaking, neither the Greek church fathers nor the Eastern church upheld such a position because they perceived the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed as an eminent part of the indivisible patristic legacy embracing writings of the Greek church fathers and the Byzantine liturgy.

An Existential Orientation of Melanchthon's Theological Enquiry

Melanchthon defined the function of theology as conveying the divine voice perpetuated in the Scripture by communicating the biblical message in an orderly and efficient way. To carry out that task, Melanchthon employed the category of loci qualified as communes, praecipui or topici which played a prominent role in the ancient,^[95] mediaeval^[96] and Renaissance^[97] dialectics that combined the contemporary disciplines of logic and rhetoric.^[98] In his non-theological writings Melanchthon developed the theory of loci as focal points (capita, elementa) which could be used as a means of organising the material in the humanities.^[99] In fact, Melanchthon advanced the rhetorical concept of

[95] Aphthonius, *Progymnasmata Graece*, ed. Julius Petzholdt (Leipzig: Boehme, 1839), 27-34 [VII]. Cicero, “De inventione rhetorica,” in *Opera ex editionibus Oliveti et Ernesti*, vol. 1 (London: Rodwell, 1820), 59-122 [II]. Idem, “De oratore,” in *Opera*, vol. 1, 191-289 [II]. Idem, “Orator,” in *Opera ex editionibus Oliveti et Ernesti*, vol. 2 (London: Rodwell, 1820), 12-14 [XIV-XV]. Idem, “Topica,” in *Opera*, vol. 2, 71-97. Idem, “De finibus bonorum et malorum,” in *Opera ex editionibus Oliveti et Ernesti*, vol. 3 (London: Rodwell, 1820), 31-62 [IV]. Hermogenes, *Progymnasmata Graece*, ed. Arnold H. L. Heeren and Georg Veessenmeyer (Nuremberg: Lechner, 1812), 28-31 [VI]. Priscianus, “De praeexercita mentis rhetoricae ex Hermogene liber,” in *Libri omnes* (Basel: Bryling, 1545), 871-873 [De loco communi]. Quintilianus, *De oratoria institutione libri XII*, ed. Claude Capperonnier (Paris: Coustelier, 1725), 93-97 [II, IV]. Ibidem, 285-307 [V, X]. Ibidem, 660-662 [X, V]. Aelius Theon, *Progymnasmata*, ed. Christoph Eberhard Finckh et al. (Stuttgart: Loeflund, 1834), 95-100 [VII].

[96] Boethius, “In Topica Ciceronis,” in *Dialectica*, ed. Martianus Rota (Venice: Gryphus, 1549), 223-260. Idem, “De differentiis topicis,” in *Dialectica*, 261-272.

[97] Rudolf Agricola, *De formando studio; Epistola ad Jacobum Barbarianum* (Paris: Calvarin, 1550). Idem, *De inventione dialectica*, ed. Johann Matthias Phrissemius (Paris: Porte, 1554), 1r-143r [I/I-II/XIX]. Erasmus Rotterdamus, *Ratio seu compendium verae theologiae* (Basel: Froben, 1519), 177-179. Idem, “De duplici copia verborum ac rerum commentarii duo,” in *Omnia opera*, vol. 1 (Basel: Froben, 1540), 76-77 [II, Loci communes]. Ibidem, 86-91 [II, Ratio colligendi exempla].

[98] Quirinus Breen, “The Terms <Loci communes> and <Loci> in Melanchthon,” *Church History* 16, no. 4 (1947): 197-209. Peter Mack, *Renaissance Argument: Valla and Agricola in the Traditions of Rhetoric and Dialectic* (Leiden: Brill, 1993), 320-333 [XVI]. Robert Kolb, “The Ordering of the Loci Communes Theologici: The Structuring of the Melanchthonian Dogmatic Tradition,” *Concordia Journal* 23, no. 4 (1997): 317-337. Idem, “Melanchthonian Method as a Guide to Reading Confessions of Faith: The Index of the Book of Concord and Late Reformation Learning,” *Church History* 72, no. 3 (2003): 509-514 [III]. Martin Leiner, “Die Anfänge der protestantischen Hermeneutik bei Philipp Melanchthon: Ein Kapitel zum Verhältnis von Rhetorik und Hermeneutik,” *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 94, no. 4 (1997): 468-487. Siegfried Wiedenhofer, *Formalstrukturen humanistischer und reformatorischer Theologie bei Philipp Melanchthon*, vol. 1-2 (Bern: Lang, 1976), passim.

[99] Philipp Melanchthon, *De rhetorica libri tres* (Cologne: Cervicornus, 1525), [s. p.] [I, De locis communibus]. Reprinted as: Idem, “De locis communibus ratio,” in *Opera quae supersunt omnia (Corpus Reformatorum)*, vol. 20, ed. Karl Gottlieb Bretschneider and Heinrich Ernst Bindseil (Braunschweig: Schwetschke, 1854), 695-698. Idem, *De dialectica libri quatuor* (Strasbourg: Mylius, 1545), 168-199 [IV, De locis]. Idem, *Erotemata dialectices* (Wittenberg: Schleich, 1584), 224-351 [IV]. Reprinted in: Idem, *Opera*, vol. 13, 641-752 [IV]. Idem, *Elementorum rhetorices libri duo* (Wittenberg: Ruehel, 1592), 65-70 [I, De locis communibus]. Reprinted in: Idem, *Opera*, vol. 13, 451-458 [I, De locis communibus]. Idem, “Compendiaria dialectices ratio,” in *Opera*, vol. 20, 748-764 [IV, De locis]. Idem, *Institutiones rhetoricae* (Strasbourg: Hervag, 1523), 11r-12r [De locis communibus]. Idem, “In Ciceronis Topica scholia,” in *Opera quae supersunt omnia (Corpus Reformatorum)*, vol. 16, ed. Karl Gottlieb Bretschneider and Heinrich Ernst Bindseil (Halle an der Saale: Schwetschke, 1850), 807-832.

loci which were traditionally defined as reservoirs of arguments, and he viewed loci as the universal method of arranging the material in the humanities.

In Melanchthon's system, loci theologici (theological topics) served as focal points for theological discussion and instruction, and they were construed by Melanchthon as implied by the Scripture itself. Thus, by adhering to theological topics designated by the Bible, a student of the Scripture could be certain that he or she would be focused on what the Bible itself was focused.

According to Melanchthon, every theological topic should be studied from the perspective of Christ's work of salvation.^[100] Consequently, the most incomprehensible features peculiar to the Christian concept of the Godhead such as the doctrine of the Trinity^[101] were to be adored by Christians instead of being inspected in philosophical terms. For Melanchthon, the substantial knowledge indispensable to the Christian identity presupposed that the individual human being considered himself or herself a sinner (the Law) and accepted the free gift of salvation earned by Christ for sinners (the Gospel). Thus, all elements of the doctrine were to be explored from the viewpoint of Christ's work of salvation as far as they were revealed and embodied in the Scripture.

In his prolegomena Melanchthon criticised the main theological compendia brought forth by the church fathers (Origen,^[102] Rufinus of Aquileia,^[103] Fulgentius^[104] or John of Damascus^[105]) and by the mediaeval theologians (Peter Lombard^[106] and Thomas Aquinas^[107]). Melanchthon did not denounce them for departing completely from the biblical truth, because he realised that to a considerable degree those works contained what he recognised as the biblical teaching, but rather accused them of losing sight of the concept of salvation as central to Christian theology. According to Melanchthon, the vast majority of the ancient and mediaeval theologians became absorbed in philosophy, either by asking questions which could not be answered on the ground of the Bible or by adducing scriptural passages as proof in philosophical discussions.

Examining the focal points, which in his opinion were supplied by the Scripture, Melanchthon paid attention to the Epistle to the Romans and to the Book of Genesis. Actually, Melanchthon himself admitted^[108] that the first version of Loci (1521) originated from his early notes on the

[100] Melanchthon, "Loci communes seu hypotyposes theologicae," 83-85.

[101] Melanchthon's attitude towards the patristic concept of the Trinity was not ambivalent but clearly affirmative because he objected not to the doctrinal content thereof but rather to the philosophical, complex disquisition on the Godhead as embarked on by the Western mediaeval theologians. Peter Fraenkel, *Testimonia Patrum: The Function of the Patristic Argument in the Theology of Philip Melanchthon* (Geneva: Droz, 1961), passim. H. Ashley Hall, *Philip Melanchthon and the Cappadocians: A Reception of Greek Patristic Sources in the Sixteenth Century* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014), passim. Eginhard P. Meijering, *Melanchthon and Patristic Thought: The Doctrines of Christ and Grace, the Trinity and the Creation* (Leiden: Brill, 1983), passim.

[102] Origenes, "Περὶ ἰ Αρχών,".

[103] Rufinus, "Commentarius in Symbolum Apostolorum,". In Melanchthon's days that work was attributed to Cyprian of Carthage.

[104] Fulgentius, "De fide seu de regula verae fidei ad Petrum liber unus,". In Melanchthon's days that work was assigned to Augustine. Augustinus Hipponensis, "De fide ad Petrum sive de regula verae fidei,".

[105] Joannes Damascenus, "Expositio fidei orthodoxae,".

[106] Petrus Lombardus, "Sententiarum libri quatuor,".

[107] In the early 16th century an impact of Thomas' Summa on the Western theology was feeble as compared to that of Lombard's Sentences which still held sway in Melanchthon's time.

[108] Melanchthon, "Iuxta pio atque erudito viro D. Tilmano Plettenero," 81-84.

Epistle to the Romans^[109] in which Loci of 1521 were undoubtedly outlined and in which the foundations for Protestant theology as an academic discipline were laid.

It is legitimate to say that initially Loci were devised by Melanchthon as an explication of theological topics which in his opinion were accentuated in the Epistle to the Romans. This epistle Melanchthon viewed as the ideal summary of the Christian doctrine^[110] though neither the epistle itself nor the ancient church accorded such a status to the Book of Romans. In fact, an undisguised elevation of Corpus Paulinum to the status of the hermeneutic hub of the Christian Scriptures was distinctive of the Reformation divines but unknown to the ancient church except to Augustine and to some of his proponents. The Eastern church construed the Pauline Epistles and other books belonging to the Christian Scriptures as complementary voices, bringing the entire collection of the sacred writings unique to Christianity into balance, and if any prominence was given by the Greek church fathers, it was given to the synoptic Gospels and the Gospel of John.

Melanchthon stated that a series of narratives found in the Book of Genesis (1-3) unveiled the essentials of the Christian doctrine by treating of the creation, human fall into sin and the promise of salvation (Genesis 3:15).^[111] For him, all articles of faith could be perceived and applied properly only if the distinction between the Law and the Gospel was observed. Consequently, the Law was defined as God's will concerning human life by virtue of which every human being was assessed by God and either blessed in reward for fulfilling the divine precepts perfectly or punished for any breach of the divine commandments. On account of Adam's and Eve's fall into sin Melanchthon argued that every human being was conceived and born as a sinner deserving eternal damnation.

The Gospel, on the other hand, was defined as God's message of the remission of sins for Christ's sake which according to Melanchthon was proclaimed for the first time immediately after Adam's and Eve's fall and recorded in Genesis 3:15. On that occasion, it should be noted that the Jewish exegetical tradition did not expound Genesis 3:15 as prophetic of the messianic seed, while the Christian Scriptures never interpreted that passage with reference to Christ. Nonetheless, the christological reading of Genesis 3:15 was distinctive of the Wittenberg Reformation, yet doubted by Calvin.^[112]

[109] Philipp Melanchthon, "Lucubratiuncula," in *Opera*, vol. 21, 11-50. Idem, "Theologica institutio in Epistolam Pauli ad Romanos," in *Opera*, vol. 21, 49-60. Those early notes should not be confused with Melanchthon's mature commentaries on the Epistle to the Romans. Idem, "Commentarii in Epistolam Pauli ad Romanos," in *Opera quae supersunt omnia (Corpus Reformatorum)*, vol. 15, ed. Karl Gottlieb Bretschneider (Halle an der Saale; Schwetschke, 1848), 495-796. Idem, "Enarratio Epistolae Pauli ad Romanos," in *Opera*, vol. 15, 797-1052.

[110] Melanchthon, "Loci communes seu hypotyposes theologicae," 83-85. Idem, "Loci communes," in *Opera*, vol. 21, 253-255 [Secunda Aetas]. Idem, "Serenissimo Principi D. Henrico Octavo," 333-340. Idem, "Piis et studiosis scholasticis," 341-348. Idem, "Praefatio," in *Opera*, vol. 21, 603-607 [Tertia Aetas]. Idem, "Vorrede," in *Opera*, vol. 22, 51-62 [Tertia Aetas (Loci Theologici Germanice)]. Idem, "Brevis discendae theologiae ratio (1530)," in *Opera quae supersunt omnia (Corpus Reformatorum)*, vol. 2, ed. Karl Gottlieb Bretschneider (Halle an der Saale; Schwetschke, 1835), 456-461 [No. 953]. Arno Schirmer, *Das Paulusverständnis Melanchthons 1518-1522* (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1967), passim. Timothy J. Wengert, "The Rhetorical Paul: Philip Melanchthon's Interpretation of the Pauline Epistles," in *A Companion to Paul in the Reformation*, ed. R. Ward Holder (Leiden; Brill, 2009), 129-164.

[111] Melanchthon, "Loci communes," in *Opera*, vol. 21, 253-255 [Secunda Aetas]. Idem, "Loci communes theologici," in *Opera*, vol. 21, 347-349 [Secunda Aetas]. Idem, "Vorrede," in *Opera*, vol. 22, 51-62 [Tertia Aetas (Loci Theologici Germanice)]. Idem, "Praefatio," in *Opera*, vol. 21, 603-607 [Tertia Aetas].

[112] Jean Calvin, "Commentarius in Genesisin," in *Opera quae supersunt omnia (Corpus Reformatorum)*, vol. 51 (23), ed. Wilhelm Baum, Edouard Cunitz and Eduard Reuss (Braunschweig; Schwetschke, 1882), 69-72 [Genesis 3:15].

Melanchthon taught that the clarity of the presentation both of the Law and of the Gospel was progressing throughout the Scripture. Thus, the Law, which was engrafted in human heart at the moment of the creation, was put into writing as attested in the Book of Exodus (the Sinaitic legislation), while the initial promise of the messianic seed in Genesis 3: 15, as interpreted by Melanchthon, was fulfilled in Jesus to whom the Christian Scripture were said to bear testimony.

For Melanchthon, every proposition (Lehre) or narrative (Geschichte) found in the Scripture was indicative either of God's will embracing human life and its consequences (the Law) or of God's favour to sinners based on Christ's atonement (the Gospel).^[113] Disregarding a common patristic presupposition, that the Hebrew Bible was equal to the Old Covenant (i. e. the Law), while the Christian Scriptures were identical with the New Covenant (i. e. the Gospel),^[114] Melanchthon announced that both the communication of God's demands (the Law) and the communication of God's mercy (the Gospel) were distributed among all books of the Scripture. Moreover, he tried to interpret narratives in the Tanakh, even those purely historical, either as an account of God's disapproval of Israel's trespasses (the Law) or as an account of God's approval of his Chosen People based on the divine covenant of grace (the Gospel).

As a renowned humanist Melanchthon insisted that the relationship between the arts and theology, which he counted among the arts as well, should be defined clearly in order to be mutually beneficial.^[115] For Melanchthon, every academic discipline must invent its method of arranging its material properly in view of the cause-effect relationship because otherwise no learning or teaching would be possible within the compass of that discipline. In his opinion, God created human beings to act and to proceed in an orderly and efficient way.^[116] Granted that theology was defined as a study of the sacred texts bearing testimony to the religious phenomena, Melanchthon claimed that such a study must involve the use of human reason because every text would await interpretation.

Melanchthon argued that the method of loci, which was widely used in the humanities and which was advanced by him, could easily be applied to Christian theology. In fact, he supposed that the ecumenical creeds could be viewed as a product of an implicit use of that method because in those documents the rudiments of the Christians faith were gleaned from the Scripture and summarised according to the sequence of God's operation in the universe (creation - redemption - sanctification).^[117]

[113] Melanchthon, "Vorrede," in *Opera*, vol. 22, 51-62 [Tertia Aetas (Loci Theologici Germanice)].

[114] As a matter of fact, the labels "Old Testament" and "New Testament" were not implied by those two collections of the sacred texts but rather invented by the early Christian church. Those pernicious appellations not only contravened the views on the Hebrew Bible expressed in Corpus Paulinum and in the Epistle to the Hebrews but also must be considered derogatory from the Jewish perspective.

[115] Melanchthon, "Brevis descendae theologiae ratio (1530)," 460-461 [No. 953]. Idem, "Vorrede," in *Opera*, vol. 22, 51-62 [Tertia Aetas (Loci Theologici Germanice)]. Idem, "Loci communes seu hypotyposes theologicae," 83-85. Idem, "Loci communes," in *Opera*, vol. 21, 253-255 [Secunda Aetas]. Idem, "Vorrede," in *Opera*, vol. 22, 57-58 [Tertia Aetas (Loci Theologici Germanice)]. Idem, "Serenissimo Principi D. Henrico Octavo," 333-340. Idem, "Loci communes theologici," in *Opera*, vol. 21, 347-349 [Secunda Aetas]. Idem, "Piis et studiosis scholasticis," 341-348.

[116] Melanchthon, "Praefatio," in *Opera*, vol. 21, 603-607 [Tertia Aetas].

[117] Melanchthon, "Loci communes seu hypotyposes theologicae," 83-85. Idem, "Loci communes," in *Opera*, vol. 21, 253-255 [Secunda Aetas]. Idem, "Loci communes theologici," in *Opera*, vol. 21, 347-349 [Secunda Aetas].

For Melanchthon,^[118] the arts and theology could enrich one another because theology might benefit from the expertise of the arts in the method of organising the material and in the field of the interpretation of sacred texts. Moreover, the arts could facilitate the pursuit of the civil uprightness and help cultivate the civil morality. Thus, by fostering *loci philosophici* such as justice, temperance or beneficence, philosophy could to a certain degree explore things appertaining to the divine Law. On the other hand, theology was able to adjudicate spiritual matters which could be reached neither empirically nor logically.

Melanchthon was aware that the arts, especially philosophy, might influence theology in terms of its focus and content. Therefore, he acknowledged the message about the forgiveness of sins for Christ's sake as the cornerstone of theology which in his opinion should revolve around the assertion that by his life Christ fulfilled the Law in lieu of humankind (the active obedience), whereas by his death Christ experienced the penalty for humankind's transgressions (the passive obedience). As a consequence of that vicarious substitution, sinners were said to be declared not guilty in God's sight.

For Melanchthon,^[119] the arts and theology differed as far as their sources were concerned. Accordingly, all the arts except for theology verified their propositions either logically or empirically. These means of verification Melanchthon called the demonstration. Thus, the empirical verification consisted in the experience, whereas the logical verification was based on the logical principles which Philip considered innate. In theology, as Melanchthon claimed, the verification consisted in establishing whether a given statement could be substantiated by the Scripture interpreted according to its most natural (whence historical and literary) sense or not. Since the Scripture was designated by Melanchthon as the sole testimony to the saving self-revelation of God, a given statement was true if it could be argued from the Bible.

In Melanchthon's opinion, human heart could be convinced, that God's message was true, only by the Holy Spirit operating by means of that message, while the acceptance of the divine communication touching human sin and divine grace was said to cause a believer to recognise the Scripture as God's revelation (*testimonium internum Spiritus sancti*). Melanchthon contended that the Gospel disclosed God's favour to the world which human beings could know neither by experience nor by reason but solely by virtue of the divine revelation perpetuated in the Scripture.^[120] Therefore, only the Gospel was intrinsically empowered to make those, who were exposed to its message, accept it, by bringing them to faith. Thus, certainty in the arts except for theology was natural as wrought either by rational arguments or by empirical evidence, while in theology certainty was supernatural as created by the Spirit operating by God's Word.

Melanchthon remarked that genuine faith could not be regarded as a personal opinion resting on empirical or logical assumptions because faith as a sensible or rational inference would be vulnerable

[118] Melanchthon, "Serenissimo Principi D. Henrico Octavo," 333-340. Idem, "Vorrede," in *Opera*, vol. 22, 57-58 [Tertia Aetas (Loci Theologici Germanice)]. Idem, "Loci communes theologici," in *Opera*, vol. 21, 347-349 [Secunda Aetas]. Idem, "Praefatio," in *Corpus doctrinae christianae quae est summa*, A2r-A4r.

[119] Melanchthon, "Praefatio," in *Opera*, vol. 21, 603-607 [Tertia Aetas].

[120] Melanchthon, "Loci communes," in *Opera*, vol. 21, 253-255 [Secunda Aetas].

to doubt leading either to impiety or to despair.^[121] Rather, genuine faith was, for Melanchthon, a firm and steady knowledge of the divine truth and a constant commitment to God's Word as to the revelation of God's benevolence towards humankind. Therefore, faith was said to rule out any doubt or uncertainty.

Consequently, Melanchthon^[122] rejected epistemological scepticism as exemplified by ancient Pyrrhonism which advocated doubting every statement or refraining from making any assertions. Thus, such a sceptical approach must disregard a tradition which, for Melanchthon, was the knowledge accumulated by the past generations. In Melanchthon's view, the ancient legacy both in the humanities and in theology should be treasured, yet evaluated critically from the perspective of the sources peculiar to every academic discipline. In the case of theology Melanchthon accorded the status of the sole source of the credible saving knowledge of God to the Bible, admitting that the biblical teaching was subsequently mirrored in the ecumenical creeds.

Melanchthon argued that a sceptical stance could never be taken on the religion because it would nullify the divine assurance, that sinners were declared righteous in front of God for Christ's sake. In his opinion, the Holy Spirit created and sustained such an assurance in human heart through the means of grace and this assurance was the very essence of the Christian religion. In the case of the humanities exclusive of theology Melanchthon permitted of a doubt or of a suspension of assertions if there were no rational or empirical premisses to draw any inference or to make any assertions.

Conclusion

Melanchthon's Loci became the standard compendium by means of which generations of Protestant divines were instructed and edified. Luther did not object to this fact but rather appreciated the potential of Loci, realising that without Melanchthon's theological and educational insights the Wittenberg Reformation could not be fortified, might not expand beyond German-speaking territories and probably would not continue beyond Luther's own life.^[123]

To a considerable degree Melanchthon enunciated what is now commonly known as a doctrinal legacy of the 16th-century Wittenberg Reformation and unlike Luther, he was eulogised by Calvin as well. Between 1518 and 1519 Melanchthon^[124] formulated the Reformation concepts of free will, of the distinction between the Law and the Gospel, of the forensic nature of justification,^[125] of the

[121] Ibidem. Idem, "Loci communes theologici," in *Opera*, vol. 21, 347-349 [Secunda Aetas]. Idem, "Serenissimo Principi D. Henrico Octavo," 333-340. Idem, "Praefatio," in *Opera*, vol. 21, 603-607 [Tertia Aetas]. Idem, "Vorrede," in *Opera*, vol. 22, 51-62 [Tertia Aetas (Loci Theologici Germanice)].

[122] Ibidem.

[123] Martin Luther, "De servo arbitrio (1525)," in *Werke; Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, vol. 18 (Weimar; Böhlau, 1908), 601. Idem, "Vorrede zu Melanchthons verdeutschter Auslegung des Kolosserbriefs," in *Werke; Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, vol. 30/II (Weimar; Böhlau, 1909), 68-69. Idem, "An Melanchthon (Wartburg, 9. September 1521)," in *Werke; Kritische Gesamtausgabe (Briefwechsel)*, vol. 2 (Weimar; Böhlau, 1931), 382-386 [No. 428]. "Kaspar Heidenreichs Nachschriften (Winter von 1542 auf 1543)," in *Martin Luther, Werke; Kritische Gesamtausgabe (Tischreden)*, vol. 5 (Weimar; Böhlau, 1919), 204-205 [No. 5511].

[124] Melanchthon, "Lucubratiuncula," 11-50. Idem, "Theologica institutio in Epistolam Pauli ad Romanos," 49-60.

[125] Lowell Clark Green, *How Melanchthon Helped Luther Discover the Gospel: The Doctrine of Justification in the Reformation* (Fallbrook; Verdict Publications, 1980), passim.

Christian freedom and of the means of grace which subsequently solidified into his *Loci* of 1521. By 1518 Luther was not preoccupied with those topics and did not offer any systematic exposition of them. In the case of the concept of human free will in the spiritual sphere Luther's *De servo arbitrio* of 1525 could be viewed as an explication of Melanchthon's disquisition on that topic from his *Loci* of 1521. Actually, Luther himself did not deny that he drew upon Philip's masterpiece.^[126]

From a historical perspective, the reception of Melanchthon's writings, for instance in Scandinavia, overshadowed that of Luther's tracts. Given that Luther himself avowed his own inaptitude to create any systematic exposition of theological tenets peculiar to the Wittenberg Reformation,^[127] Melanchthon's *Loci* were the instrument indispensable for educating the next generation of Protestant divines and for disseminating the ideas of the Reformation worldwide.

Although a theological programme presented in Melanchthon's *Loci* could not withstand the test of the Enlightenment humanities inclusive of the Enlightenment theology, his interpretation and systematisation of the doctrinal tenets, which he identified in the Scripture, served the purpose of the 16th-century Reformation. Ultimately, religious symbols and concepts like all symbols and concepts are devised in a specific community at a specific time and in a specific place. Thus, Melanchthon's monumental work proved to be essential to the origin and formation of Reformation theology of the 16th century as an academic discipline and it paved the way for the further evolution of Protestant theology which demonstrated its remarkable ability to adapt to new and indeed every-changing circumstances.

[126] Luther, "De servo arbitrio (1525)," 601.

[127] Martin Luther, "Vorrede zum 1. Band der Wittenberger Ausgabe der Deutschen Schriften (1539)," in *Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, vol. 50 (Weimar: Böhlau, 1914), 657-658. Idem, "Vorrede zum ersten Band der Gesamtausgabe der Lateinischen Schriften (Wittenberg 1545)," in *Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, vol. 54 (Weimar: Böhlau, 1928), 179.

中文题目：

如菲利普·墨兰顿在其对所有德语和拉丁语版本的 LOCI 前言中所阐明的那样，新兴新教神学关于神学研究的改革概念是如何形成的？

岳诚轩

波兰华沙基督教神学院神学博士，香港路德会协同神学院讲师，香港九龙。电子邮件：matthew.oseka@yahoo.com

摘要：本文研究新教神学作为一个学科体系的基本概念，就如菲利普·墨兰顿在其给 Loci 所有的德语及拉丁语版本的前言中所阐明的那样，对于教育下一代新教神学和在世界范围内传播宗教改革来说，这是不可或缺的。

关键词：菲利普·墨兰顿；Loci communes (Loci theologici, Loci praecipui)；维滕贝格改革；系统神学；约翰·加尔文

中西经典与圣经
**Chinese and Western Classics
and the Bible**

Spirit in *Atrahasis*

Donald WANG

(Trinity International University, Chicago, USA)

Abstract: *Atrahasis* is the protagonist of an 18th-century BC Akkadian epic found in various versions on clay tablets. It has many parallels with the biblical account of creation in Genesis. This paper will closely examine the meaning and usage of spirit in *Atrahasis*. The point is that spirit in *Atrahasis* plays a vital role in the creation account of human beings and the spirit performs a bridging role in the overarching narrative of rebellion, creation, and flood.

Key Words: *Atrahasis*; Creation Account; Spirit (etemmu); Noise; Rebellion; Flood

Author: Donald WANG is a Ph. D. candidate in Old Testament in Trinity International University. Mail address: 2065 Half Day Road, Deerfield, IL, 60015 USA. cellphone: +18479439807 email: wuagedon@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Atrahasis is the protagonist of an 18th-century BC Akkadian epic comprised in various versions on clay tablets. It is one literary form of Sumero-Babylonian traditions about the creation and the early history of man. ^[1] The *Atrahasis* epic was comprised of three main tablets, included both were a creation myth and a flood account. The story is one of three surviving Babylonian deluge stories. Until 1965 about one fifth of the epic was known, now four fifths of the whole story has been restored. ^[2] The first tablet contains the most important single witness to Babylonian speculation on the origins and nature of the creation of man. ^[3] It is remarkable to note that “spirit” occurs four times in it, ^[4] there is only one article that solely discussed the role of spirit in *Atrahasis*. ^[5] In light of this, it is of great importance to study the role of spirit in the creation of human beings in

[1] W. G. Lambert and Alan Millard, *Atra-Ḫasīs: The Babylonian Story of the Flood* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1999), 1.

[2] A. R. Millard, “A New Babylonian ‘Genesis’ Story”, in Hess, Richard S., and David Toshio Tsumura ed., “*I Studied Inscriptions from before the Flood.*” *Ancient Near Eastern, Literary and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis 1-11* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1994), 115.

[3] William L. Moran, Ronald S. Hendel (ed.), *The Most Magic Word: Essays on Babylonian and Biblical Literature* (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2002), 75.

[4] line 215, 217, 228, 230.

[5] Tzvi Abusch, “Ghost and God: Some Observations on a Babylonian Understanding of Human Nature.” *Studies in the History of Religion* (1998): 363-383.

Atrahasis. This paper focuses on studying the meaning and usage of spirit in Atrahasis. The point is that spirit in Atrahasis plays a vital role in the creation account of human beings and the spirit performs a bridging role in the overarching narrative of rebellion, creation and flood.

2. The Double Creation of Human beings

It is highly significant that Atrahasis has two successive parallel accounts of the creation of man.^[6] Kikawada suggests that it is a literary convention in the Ancient Near East to telling the story of the origin of humankind in a doublet; the first part of the story of the creation of humankind in more general and abstract terms, while the second part of the story depicts it in more specific and concrete terms.^[7] The two creation accounts of human beings are found in the tablet I of Atrahasis. Kikawada divides the two creation accounts in this as follows:

Atrahasis 11—351

1—4 Introduction; A long time ago, “When the gods were man...”

5—245 Part I : The First Creation of Mankind (General)

5—6 The Anunnaki make the Igigi work; division of labour

7—38 Work of gods; administrative and labour classes

39—69 Complaint of the Igigi against Enlil; the Igigi call for a war

70—83 Enlil is frightened; Nusku tries to calm him

84—100 Anu and Enki are summoned together with the Anunnaki

101—185? Anu advises Enlil to find out the cause for the uproar, but the Igigi make themselves responsible collectively for the rebellion because of the excessive workload

186? —191 Anu gives a solution to the problem, that is, to ask Belet-ili/Mami/The Mother-womb to create offspring (li-gim[?]ma[?]—a)

192—234 Marni with the help of Enki creates mankind (lullu) from the flesh and blood of a slain god, mixed with clay

235—243 Marni completes her task and imposes labour on man

244—245 Gods rejoice

246—248 Transition; Marni is praised; her name is called Bélet—kala-ili

249—351 Part II : The Second Creation of Mankind in Seven Pairs; Marriage, Procreation and Work (Specific)

249—271? Enki and Marni come to the house of destiny to create seven pairs of people by snipping off clay

272? —276 Marriage is instituted (text broken badly)

277—282 The ten-month gestation period is established by Marni

283—295 Marni performs midwifery and childbirth is perfected

[6] Isaac M. Kikawada, “The Double Creation of Mankind in *Enki and Ninmah*, *Atrahasis I* 1-351, and *Genesis* 1-2.” in Hess, Richard S., and David Toshio Tsumura ed., “*I Studied Inscriptions from before the Flood.*” *Ancient Near Eastern, Literary and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis* 1 11 (Winona Lake; Eisenbrauns, 1994): 170

[7] *Ibid.*, 169.

296—304 Mami is praised for instituting marriage and childbirth. Nine days of rejoicing is decreed and Mami's other name, Istar, is now changed to Ishara

305—351 The people begin to labour for gods; "With picks and spades they built the shrines. They built the big canal banks. For food for the people, for the sustenance of the gods"^[8]

Kikawada's division of the first creation account of human beings is in line 5-245 and the second creation account is line in 249—351. According to Kikawada's list, in both accounts, the two processes of the creation clay is recorded as the same element in the creation of human beings.^[9] Both accounts make the same point that humankind was created of clay and destined to perform work.^[10] Moreover, Millard claims that "the underlying idea of the Atrahasis' Epic and other Babylonian Creation stories is that man was made to free the gods from the toil of ordering the earth to produce their food."^[11] There is no doubt that both accounts have some similarities, however, there are also some differences. One difference is that the creation account two focuses on fertility and sexuality in marriage. The human race does not start with a human being in abstract as in the first creation account. The account begins with seven pairs, giving the humans the possibility to multiply seven times faster.^[12] Another difference that Kikawada misses in his list in the first creation account is the element of "spirit" (etemmu),^[13] which is uniquely recorded as an important element in the creation of the human beings.^[14] Therefore, it is necessary to take a closer look at the first creation account in order to understand the different elements involved in the creation process of human beings.

3. Spirit in Creation Account One

In the first creation account, the main section is in lines-192-148, which constitute a thematic and structural unit, they are concerned with the first stage of the creation of humanity. They begin with the request that the gods give birth to a goddess to form man, and they end with the gods renaming her as the "mistress of all the gods" in gratitude to what she had done.^[15] It is helpful to refer to Moran's diagram of this section:

[8] Isaac M. Kikawada, "The Double Creation of Mankind in *Enki and Ninmah*, *Atrahasis* I 1-351, and *Genesis* 1-2." in Hess, Richard S., and David Toshio Tsumura ed., "I Studied Inscriptions from before the Flood." *Ancient Near Eastern, Literary and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis* 1 11 (Winona Lake; Eisenbrauns, 1994):172.

[9] Line 226 "Nintu Mixed clay", Line 256 "she nipped off fourteen pieces of clay"

[10] Isaac M. Kikawada, "The Double Creation of Mankind in *Enki and Ninmah*, *Atrahasis* I 1-351, and *Genesis* 1-2." in Hess, Richard S., and David Toshio Tsumura ed., "I Studied Inscriptions from before the Flood." *Ancient Near Eastern, Literary and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis* 1 11 (Winona Lake; Eisenbrauns, 1994):170.

[11] A. R. Millard, "a New Babylonian 'Genesis' Story", in Hess, Richard S., and David Toshio Tsumura ed., "I Studied Inscriptions from before the Flood." *Ancient Near Eastern, Literary and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis* 1 11 (Winona Lake; Eisenbrauns, 1994):119.

[12] Helge S. Kvanvig, *Primeval History; Babylonian, Biblical, and Enochic; an Intertextual Reading* (Leiden; Brill, 2011.), 29.

[13] Lambert and Millard also comments that "to this traditional concept the author of *Atra-Hasis* has added one item, which occurs in a passage (I. 208-30) full of perplexing phrases. It was a common Mesopotamian view that man had a spirit that survived death, which could, if not properly buried and supplied with offerings, trouble the living. It is this spirit (Bab. etemmu) that the author is explaining in addition to the usual material aspects of life. No other surviving creation account from Sumerians or Babylonians attempts to explain this." see W. G. Lambert and Alan Millard, *Atra-Hasis; The Babylonian Story of the Flood* (Winona Lake; Eisenbrauns, 1999), 22.

[14] lines 215, 217, 228, 230.

[15] William L. Moran, Ronald S. Hendel (ed.), *The Most Magic Word: Essays on Babylonian and Biblical Literature* (Washington, DC; Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2002), 75.

	narrative	192—193
A gods	speech	194—197
	narrative	198—199
B birth-goddess	speech	200—203
	narrative	204—205
	speech	206—217
C Enki	narrative	218—230
	narrative	231—236
	speech	237—243
B' birth-goddess	narrative	244—245
A' gods	speech	246—248 ^[16]

Importantly from the above structure, the creation account of human beings displays the literary feature of the intermingling of narrative and speech. The process of the creation of human beings is carried out with the narrative and the speeches of gods. The narrative of lines 192—193: they summoned and asked the goddess, the midwife of the gods, wise Mami. This narrative of the scene is a one of divine council, in which the gods make the decision to creating human beings.^[17] In so doing, the stage is set for the creation of human beings in the following lines.

It is easy to identify the main emphasis of this unit. Also, the concentric structure gives formal expression to the pivotal importance of Enki's speech (lines 206—217) on the nature of human beings.^[18] In this creation account, continued is the Sumerian tradition of forming man from clay, adding to the material the blood and spirit or “ghost” (*eṭemmu*) of a god.^[19] It is this “spirit” that the author is explaining in addition to the usual material aspects of life.^[20]

The question is what is the “spirit” (*eṭemmu*)? What does it mean in the creation account of human beings? In order to answer these questions, one needs to go to the texts and contexts to understand the meaning and usage of this word.

In order to gain a good understanding of the whole creation account, it is better to examine the portion of lines 206-217^[21].

206 On the first, seventh, and fifteenth day of the month

[16] William L. Moran, Ronald S. Hendel (ed.), *The Most Magic Word: Essays on Babylonian and Biblical Literature* (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2002), 76.

[17] The idea of “divine council” is a common concept in the Ancient Near Eastern world, see Mark J. Boda, J. Gordon McConville, *Dictionary of the Old Testament Prophets* (Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP Academic, 2012), 162.

[18] William L. Moran, Ronald S. Hendel (ed.), *The Most Magic Word: Essays on Babylonian and Biblical Literature* (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2002), 76.

[19] Richard J. Clifford, *Creation Accounts in the Ancient Near East and in the Bible* (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1994), 79.

[20] W. G. Lambert and Alan Millard, *Atra-Ḫasis: The Babylonian Story of the Flood* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1999), 22.

[21] the text is from Lambert and Millard, 58-59.

207 I will make a purifying bath
 208 Let one god be slaughtered
 209 so that all the gods may be cleansed in a dipping
 210 From his flesh and blood
 211 Let Nintu mix clay
 212 That god and man
 213 May be thoroughly mixed in the clay
 214 So that we may hear the drum for the rest of time
 215 Let there be a spirit (*e ĩmmu*) from the god's flesh.
 216 Let it proclaim living as its sign
 217 So that this be not forgotten let there be a spirit(*e ĩmmu*).

This is Enki's speech addressed to the divine council, with the detailed procedure for creating human beings. Lines 221-234 in the narrative form a depiction of the actual creation procedure, echoing the creating command by Enki.^[22] This literary feature of speech and narrative is a remarkable mark of creating human beings. The narrative is the actual forming of the human beings, almost in the same parallel with the command of Enki. In the creation account, "spirit" (*e ĩmmu*) occurs at lines 215, 217, 228, and 230. The usage of "spirit" (*e ĩmmu*) occurs in lines 215 and 217 in Enki's speech and the rest two usages occurs in lines 228 and 230 in the form of the narrative of the actual process of creating human beings.

This text states that the man is created from the mixing of clay, the blood and flesh of a slain god,^[23] with the third element of spirit (*e ĩmmu*). The spirit, is it from god or from man? Lambert suggests that the spirit is man's, he remarks that "it was a common Mesopotamian view that man had a spirit that survived death, which could, if not properly buried and supplied with offerings, trouble the living"^[24] However, in reference to the context, both in lines 215 and 228, all claim that "spirit from the god's flesh," and the fact that dead gods in Mesopotamia survived as ghosts is attested to.^[25] Thus, the spirit in this account is not from man, but from the slain god.^[26]

It is also of great significance to notice that after the god is slaughtered, the first step in creating man is to mix the clay with the flesh and blood from god (lines 210, 225), and the second step is to let there be a spirit from the god's flesh (line 215-228). After these two steps, the man is proclaimed living and this signifies with emphasis of the role of the spirit, "so that there be not forgotten let there be a spirit" (lines 217 and 230).

Having argued that the spirit is from god, then it is necessary to examine what kind of god it is. In line 208, "Let one god (*ilam isten*) be slaughtered," the key term is "one god" (*ilam isten*), which

[22] lines 206-207 is in parallel with lines 221-222, lines 208-209 is in parallel with lines 223-224, lines 210-211 is in parallel with lines 225-226, lines 214-215 is in parallel with lines 227-228, 216-217 is in parallel with 229-230.

[23] Tzvi Abusch, "Ghost and god: Some Observations on a Babylonian Understanding of Human Nature.", 366.

[24] Lambert, 22.

[25] Kvanvig points out that "we notice in KAR 4, Atrahasis, and Enuma Elish that the gods are slaughtered. They are not killed in the sense that their existence is ended. The gods will continue to live on in the body and mind of the new human being", see Helge S. Kvanvig, *Primeval History: Babylonian, Biblical, and Enochic: an Intertextual Reading*, 49.

[26] William L. Moran, Ronald S. Hendel (ed.), *The Most Magic Word: Essays on Babylonian and Biblical Literature*, 82-83.

is a difficult phrase. [27] Moran suggests that it should be boldly translated as “the leader-god”. [28] Kvanvig remarks that “the god slaughtered, out of whose flesh and blood human was created is the leading god in the rebellion of the Igigu”. [29] However he does not give an explanation of why this one god is identified as the leading god in the rebellion. In contrast, Moran gives a convincing reason that the one god whom at Enki’s advice puts the gods put to death is the leader god, for this explains why he is characterized as “who had personality” (*sa isu tema*), and later have been slaughtered “together with his personality” (*qadu temisu*), it could fit the rebel leader for his characteristic of having *temu*, which is most easily understood of the part he played in the rebellion. *Temu* carries the meaning of having schemed to overthrow Enlil, and it is this scheme that this god comes to his death. [30] Oden also supports the idea that this *etemmu* belonged originally to the slain rebel god, and that is placed within humans to remind them of their status and of the dangers of rebelling against the senior gods. [31] The spirit (*etemmu*) is from the flesh of the rebel god, and is of great significance in our understanding of the creation account of human beings in *Atrahasis*.

Furthermore, there are also some word plays in this creation account that express the deep thought of the author in regards to the composition of this epic. The slaughtered god is identified as the god who had “personality” (*temu*) (line 223). For the *temu*, Kvanvig translates it as “planning capacity,” [32] Jacobsen suggests it as “idea,” [33] and Kinsky renders it as “sense”. [34] This author agrees with Oden that given the term’s use in other literature it indicates “intelligence” or “plan”, and the fact that the rebel god, who clearly led the rebellion and who presumably plotted its course, is identified by his possession of this attribute suggest as translation of ability/capacity to plan/scheme. [35]

The *temu* is a word play with *etemmu*, Abusch recognizes a word play here that the god who possess *temu* is on the one hand, and the Babylonian word *etemmu* “spirit” on the other. This word play implicitly treats *etemmu* as having been formed from the slaughtered god that humankind possesses the spirit of and survives after death in the form of that spirit. [36] Oden is more accurately arguing that with the very creation of humans in this Epic comes an indication of the tension, which inevitably leads to rebellion. Humans are created with the “spirit” (*etemmu*) of the leader god, which is a reminder to them of the consequences of rebellion. Although, they are also created with that god’s “scheming” (*tëmu*) nature. It is difficult not to see in the play between *etemmu* and *tëmu* a pun, and it is equally not difficult to see in this pun a presage of the remainder of the Epic. [37] In the

[27] William L. Moran, Ronald S. Hendel (ed.), *The Most Magic Word: Essays on Babylonian and Biblical Literature*, 80.

[28] *Ibid.*, 80.

[29] Helge S. Kvanvig, *Primeval History: Babylonian, Biblical, and Enochic: an Intertextual Reading*, 45.

[30] William L. Moran, Ronald S. Hendel (ed.), *The Most Magic Word: Essays on Babylonian and Biblical Literature*, 81.

[31] Robert A. Oden, Jr., “Divine Aspirations in *Atrahasis* and in Genesis 1-11”, *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 93. 2 (1981): 202.

[32] Helge S. Kvanvig, 44.

[33] Thorkild Jacobsen, *The Treasures of Darkness: A History of Mesopotamian Religion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976.), 118.

[34] Tikva Frymer-Kensky, “The *Atrahasis* Epic and Its Significance for Our Understanding of Genesis 1-9.” *The Biblical Archaeologist* (1977): 149.

[35] Robert A. Oden, Jr., 202.

[36] Tzvi Abusch, 369.

[37] Robert A. Oden, Jr., 203.

creation account, the created human beings inherit the characteristics of *temu* and *etemmu* the slaughtered god.

This author argues that it is because of the element of *etemmu* in creation of human beings that envisages the flood narrative in the Epic. In lines 217 and 230, both emphasizes that with the help of the “spirit” (*etemmu*), there will be no forgetting, the spirit is to keep refreshing the memory of the dead god.^[38] We go back to the rebel scene, one line reads “[The lamentation was] heavy, [we could] hear the ‘noise’ (*rigmu*)” (line 179). Their rebelling and complaining is described as “noise” (*rigmu*). *Rigmu* is transferred from the *Igigu* to humankind in the creation^[39] after the creation of the human beings, Mami address the gods that “you raised a cry (*rigmu*) for mankind” (line 242),^[40] It is not surprising that after the creation of human beings and letting them do the work, Enlil heard their “noise” (*rigmu*) (lines 356) could not sleep because of “noise” (*rigmu*) (line 358), and eventually he sent the flood to wipe out the human beings. Kvanvig points out that *Rimgu* occurs 23 times in the text and appears in all sections of the poem:

The initial assignment of the responsibilities for the universe.

The rebellion of the *Igigu*

The divine assembly and the creation of humans

The disasters sent by the gods

Deliberations in the divine assembly before the flood

The flood itself

Divine reactions during the flood.^[41]

The variety of *rigmu* is intended and contributes to the narrative’s ironic quality.^[42] In one sense *rigmu* is the thematic word running throughout the whole epic.

It is because of the “spirit” (*etemmu*) that keeps the memory of the past and presages the flood narrative, and which bridges the two “noise” (*rigmu*), namely the rebellion and the flood narrative. Potentially, there may be even be a world play of in the creation of human beings with the two elements of “blood” (*damu*) and “spirit” (*etemmu*)^[43] with “noise” (*rigmu*). With this word play, it would strengthen the connection to this rebel-creation-flood meta narrative.

4. Conclusion

Atrahasis adopts the literary device of double creation accounts of human beings. In the first creation account, the “spirit” (*etemmu*) from god is a vital element in the creation of human beings. This account features the speech of Enki, it follows the pattern of speech and narrative in the process of creation of human beings (lines 206-217).

[38] Moran, 83.

[39] Helge S. Kvanvig, 77.

[40] This is Lambert’s translation, see Lambert, 69, perhaps a better rendering is by Kvanvig, “you have cast off(?) the noise upon humankind” see, Kvanvig, 45.

[41] Helge S. Kvanvig, 76.

[42] *Ibid.*, 77.

[43] Abusch notices the word play of “blood” (*damu*) and “spirit” (*etemmu*) see, Abusch, 368.

The “spirit” (*etemmu*) occurs four times in the first creation account. “Spirit” (*etemmu*) signifies the importance and reality of passing the planning schemes from the dead god to the created human beings. This emphasizes that created human beings carry on the character of the rebellious leader god. Also, noted is the “noise” that they made in the rebellion. This is also passed on to human beings as the function of the spirit is to refresh of the past and envisages the flood narrative that the “noise” that the created human beings make.

In summation, “spirit” (*etemmu*) functions as the bridging point in the overarching narrative of rebellion, creation and the flood narrative.

中文题目:

《阿特拉哈西斯》中的灵观

王 东

三一国际大学旧约博士候选人, 地址: 2065 Half Day Road, Deerfield, IL, 60015 USA. 电话: +18479439807 电邮: wuagedon@gmail.com

摘要:《阿特拉哈西斯》是公元前十八世纪阿卡德史诗对大洪水记载中的一个, 保存在零碎的泥板中。《阿特拉哈西斯》与《创世纪》的记载有很多平行相对应的地方。本文对《阿特拉哈西斯》中的灵观进行详细地探讨和挖掘。本文的论点是《阿特拉哈西斯》的灵观在其对造人的记述中发挥了重要作用, 灵在叛逆-创造和大洪水的叙事中起着桥梁作用。

关键词:《阿特拉哈西斯》; 创造记述; 灵 (*etemmu*); 噪音; 叛逆; 大洪水

“不变”与“万变”：陈崇桂的圣经诠释与中国社会^{〔1〕}

赵盼

(武汉大学哲学学院)

摘要：陈崇桂(1884—1963)是民国时期重要的教会领袖和基督教文字工作者，他曾写作了大量关于基督信仰与圣经诠释的文章。陈崇桂坚信圣经的权威与绝对无误，并且主张圣经的教训应该被应用于社会和国家之中。本文主要研究陈崇桂如何在不同时期，藉由圣经诠释表达其社会思想。在三十年代前期，陈崇桂写作了圣经的逐章灵修注释，他将圣经中的以色列政治和人物故事与中国社会相联系，以阐发其社会改造思想。抗日战争爆发后，他主张以时事代入圣经文本的方法，来控诉侵略，寻求安慰。而在五十年代，他以对《腓利门书》的细心研读来表达自己的教会与政治立场。陈崇桂将「不变」的圣经思想应用于「万变」的社会和政治处境中，以回应时代和社会的需要。

关键词：陈崇桂；圣经诠释；中国社会；民国；基督教

作者：赵盼，武汉大学哲学学院博士后研究员，湖北省武汉市洪山区喻家湖路湖北省博士后公寓，邮编：430000，电话：15071263218，电子邮件：zhaopan813@gmail.com

“圣经是‘不变’的真理，它绝对无误，其中所讲述的教义字句都不可更改”。对于这一观点，活跃于二十世纪上半叶的中国教会领袖、基督教文字工作者陈崇桂坚信不疑。但是，人类的历史、国家的政治和社会环境则是复杂多变、风云诡谲的，对此，想必在满清、民国以及中华人民共和国三个时代中颠沛浮沉八十载的陈崇桂更加深有体会。陈崇桂坚持基要主义的圣经观，强调圣经权威，热爱读经解经。他不仅出版了《圣经总论》一书介绍圣经的主要内容，还写作了数千余篇释经文章。不同于很多基要派“不问世事”，陈崇桂对社会问题、国家命运甚是关心，这明显地反映在他的释经之中。陈崇桂生逢一个变迁的时代，这种“变”与基要主义者所坚持的圣经权威的“不变”之间，就不免产生巨大的张力。本文正是试图研究陈崇桂如何通过圣经诠释来表达其社会和国家思想，以及社会处境的变化如何影响他对于圣经的解释。

一、圣经的不变性

陈崇桂坚持圣经完全出自上帝启示、绝对无误，是基督教的绝对权威，这是始终没有改变的。他宣称：“我信圣经的内容，是神的道，全是人被圣灵感动说出神的话来。我信圣经是宗教信仰的和人生行为完全的无上的准则和权威。我信圣经最初的原稿本，是绝对正确，没有错误的。”^{〔2〕}陈相信，圣经

〔1〕 本文为教育部人文社会科学研究一般项目青年基金项目“民国时期基督教基要派的中国化研究”(18YJC730008)的阶段性成果。

〔2〕 陈崇桂 CHEN Chonggui, “我信圣经的理由 Woxin shengjing de liyou” [The Reasons I Believe in the Bible], in《布道杂志》*Budaozazhi* [Evangelism], No. 2, (1930), 64.

不仅无误,而且前后连贯,是一个完整的整体。“圣经新旧约六十六卷,是统一的整个的,是始终一贯的,是前后相连的。”〔3〕这种统一性体现在圣经主题的统一、教导思想的统一以及内容前后衔接的完整性上。陈写到他自己正是因为经历了圣经话语的神圣性和感动力,所以才完全归信基督,同时他也批评自由派神学的圣经立场。他不仅确信圣经的权威,也对圣经饱含热爱,他曾回忆道:“这二十余年来,每日有一个最大的快乐,即是研究圣经和讲关于圣经的书,而且愈读愈爱。”〔4〕圣经的真实性,对于陈来说,正是体现在一种不变性。他认为圣经成书上千年而流传至今,虽经各种诋毁批判,但圣经从未改变,而这“只有一个解释,就是圣经是神的书,内容是神的话,是神感动人的,因为是神的书,人就不能毁灭”〔5〕。

不仅如此,陈崇桂相信,圣经是一本“活”的书,它能够赐人以生命。“圣经真是生命之道,圣经的话真是有生命的,是活的。”〔6〕所谓“活的”,就体现在圣经不是抽象的知识学问,而是引导人认识基督,跟随基督的途径。“基督教就是基督,圣经就是启示基督。读圣经,就是追求知道,而认识耶稣基督。”〔7〕圣经可以解答人生的各种难题疑问,“圣经如镜照人的面,那镜却是神的眼睛……圣经是宝剑,活神拿在手中剖开刺入人的心内。”〔8〕所以,陈非常重视解经的应用,圣经诠释绝对不是为了学术研究,而是为了教导信徒认识基督。只有真实的践行,才能够明白圣经。正如他写道,读经“最不可少的,还是一个立志遵行的心,因为基督的真理,是行才知,不行则不知,行多少才算知多少”〔9〕。对于陈来说,圣经作为上帝所启示出的“不变的真理”,应该并且也可以被应用在“万变”的人生境遇与时代处境之中。

这种应用首先体现在个人“修身”之上。虽然陈崇桂强调圣经的绝对权威,但他并非一个极端的圣经主义者,反之,我们可以清晰看出他对于儒家文化的欣赏与认同。陈崇桂特别写道:“我是自幼发蒙读书,将《马太福音》和《论语》《孟子》是同时读的,同样读的。”〔10〕他虽强调圣经具有最高的启示地位,其他民族的经典同样也能传递上帝所启示的真理。“神既然藉埃及王尼哥说话,为何不能藉中国的孔子老子,希腊国的苏格拉底、柏拉图,印度国的释迦牟尼对我们说话呢?……凡与神的启示相合的,凡是真理皆是出于神。”〔11〕在释经中,他也常将圣经文本与《四书》中的君子境界相类比对照,使之更好地被国人理解。举例来说,陈在解释《列王记上》第三章中,他写道:“大学有这么一句话,物有本末,事有终始,知所先后,则近道矣。主耶稣亦说过:你们要先求神的国和他的义,这些东西都要加给

〔3〕 陈崇桂 CHEN Chonggui,“我信圣经的理由 Woxin shengjing de liyou”[The Reasons I Believe in the Bible],in《布道杂志》*Budaozazhi* [Evangelism],No. 4(1931),54.

〔4〕 陈崇桂 CHEN Chonggui,“我信圣经的理由 Woxin shengjing de liyou”[The Reasons I Believe in the Bible],in《布道杂志》*Budaozazhi* [Evangelism],No. 2,(1930),64.

〔5〕 同上 *Ibid.*,第 69 页。

〔6〕 陈崇桂 CHEN Chonggui,“我信圣经的理由 Woxin shengjing de liyou”[The Reasons I Believe in the Bible],in《布道杂志》*Budaozazhi* [Evangelism],No. 4(1931),49.

〔7〕 陈崇桂 CHEN Chonggui,“研究圣经怎样开始 Yanjiu shengjing zenyang kaishi”[How to Start the Biblical Research],in《布道杂志》*Budaozazhi* [Evangelism],No. 5/6,(1939),10.

〔8〕 陈崇桂 CHEN Chonggui,“我信圣经的理由 Woxin shengjing de liyou”[The Reasons I Believe in the Bible],in《布道杂志》*Budaozazhi* [Evangelism],No. 4,(1931),58.

〔9〕 陈崇桂 CHEN Chonggui,“怎样读圣经 Zenyang du shengjing”[How to Read the Bible],in《布道杂志》*Budaozazhi* [Evangelism],No. 6,(1932),109.

〔10〕 陈崇桂 CHEN Chonggui,“我信圣经的理由 Woxin shengjing de liyou”[The Reasons I Believe in the Bible],in《布道杂志》*Budaozazhi* [Evangelism],No. 2,(1930),64.

〔11〕 陈崇桂 CHEN Chonggui,“历代志下第三十五章 Lidaizhixia sanshiwu zhang”[2 Chronicles 35],in《布道杂志》*Budaozazhi* [Evangelism],No. 5,(1934),105.

你们了。”^[12]在解释《申命记》三十二章摩西的诗时，他写道约瑟的事迹：“神搅动约瑟的巢窝，让他被弟兄所卖，被主母所诬，受羞辱，坐监狱，使他学而时习之，以致成为埃及国的救主。如同孟子说：‘故天将降大任于是人也，必先苦其心志，劳其筋骨，饿其体肤，空乏其身，行拂乱其所为，曾益其所不能。’”^[13]类似很多的例子，都可以体现出儒家哲学对于陈崇桂思想的影响。

进而，陈崇桂强调以圣经来看待社会和国家，实践“治国平天下”。他曾犀利地写道：“宗教若限于个人则成为酸味抑郁有病，若与爱国及实际生活则出到露天，健壮活泼有力。”^[14]陈相信，一个人若有虔诚纯正的信仰，效法基督，便能建立基督化的家庭。这样的家庭推而广之，便可以建造一个正直公义的社会，一个文明公义的国家，一个和平友爱的世界。因此，在陈的文章中，圣经对人的启发和教导，不仅限于个人，也是家庭生活的指南，改造社会和救国的“良方”，以及迎合时代的思想资源。因此，陈崇桂释经的旨趣，正与儒家的“修身、齐家、治国、平天下”^[15]不谋而合，这种“内圣外王”的模式，也是陈社会理想中保持不变的框架。

接下来，我们将详细来看陈崇桂在不同的历史时期所写作的释经文章，如何反映出其社会思想；或者说，他如何将圣经诠释与时代处境和社会议题相结合。

二、释经默想“治国”

1933年到1936年，陈崇桂将自己写作的圣经逐章注释文章发表在《布道杂志》的「灵修日新」版块。陈的《灵修日新》与贾玉铭《圣经要义》虽然都是全本圣经的逐章解经，但二者最不同的是，贾注重对圣经文本、结构、神学信息完整的诠释，而陈则是笼统概括某章大意或挑选一两节经文解释，更重在阐发它对现实生活的启发与应用，他将其称为一种“灵修”、“默想”的解经方式。

陈崇桂对于政局十分关注，他曾担任过冯玉祥的随军牧师，对有基督教背景的政要人物都寄予厚望，也对社会福音倡导者如贺川丰彦、艾迪等极为推崇。而这一时期，外有日本占领东三省，内有国共内战，中国社会矛盾尖锐复杂。陈藉由灵修解经，阐发了很多对社会问题的思考和响应。在解释《以西结书》四十二章中“区分圣地与俗地”这句话时，陈便提出，社会福音精神应该与基要主义的信仰立场相结合。他先批判基要派说：“自以为虔诚精神的人，忽略人事，放弃人的本份，甚至出家出世。”^[16]他也批判社会福音派的自由神学立场：“宣传社会福音，以社会服务为口号的人，不祷告，不礼拜，甚至不信有神。”^[17]因此，基督徒应该既重视个人虔诚的信仰，又要在社会中积极服务。具体来说，他将圣经与现实相关联的方式主要有以下几点：

（一）以色列与中国

圣经旧约包含着以色列民族的历史、律法以及先知的预言。很多自由派神学家认为旧约不过是

[12] 陈崇桂 CHEN Chonggui, “列王记上第三章 Liewangji shang disanzhang” [1 Kings 3], in《布道杂志》*Budaozazhi* [Evangelism], No. 4 (1934), 68.

[13] 陈崇桂 CHEN Chonggui, “申命记三十二章 Shenmingji sanshier zhang” [Deuteronomy 32], 《布道杂志》*Budaozazhi* [Evangelism], No. 2, (1934), 80.

[14] 陈崇桂 CHEN Chonggui, 《圣经总论》*Shengjing zonglun* [Bible Survey], (香港 Hong Kong: 福音证主协会 Fuyin zhengzhu xiehui [Christian Witness Press], 1970), 103.

[15] 陈崇桂也非常“齐家”。在三十年代初期，《布道杂志》增加了“基督化家庭”版块，特别强调信徒应当带领家人一同信仰基督，建立“相爱和睦、敬虔圣洁”的基督化的家庭。正如他写道：“基督化家庭是我们中国教会今日最大的需要，许多基督徒的神和信仰，还是在礼拜堂，没有搬到家庭来。”陈崇桂 CHEN Chonggui, “把礼拜堂的基督教搬到家庭里来 Ba libaitang de jidujiao bandao jiatinglilai” [Move the Church Worship into the Family], in《布道杂志》*Budaozazhi* [Evangelism], No. 2, (1934), 69.

[16] 陈崇桂 CHEN Chonggui, “以西结书四十二章 Yixijie shu sishier zhang” [Ezekiel 42], in《布道杂志》*Budaozazhi* [Evangelism], No. 1, (1936), 71.

[17] 同上 *Ibid.*, 第 71 页.

以色列民族的宗教神话,没有太大价值。而基要派解经者则往往从“属灵意义”角度来看待以色列的历史,即认为它主要是“预表”基督和教会与信仰的灵性指导,正如贾玉铭写道:“当看以色列人之史事,实足表显神整个救恩的计划;亦适足映照我们的灵程。”^[18]而陈崇桂则不然,他在解读旧约历史书和先知书的时候,往往将其与中国相关联。以色列人饱受外辱,内战不息,在陈眼中,这都与中国极为相似。以色列的苦难来自于背弃上帝之约所受的刑罚,所以陈也相信,中国的内忧外患同样是因为人民对上帝的拒绝和不断“犯罪”。

举例来说,《士师记》记载了以色列人定居迦南地之后,由于背弃上帝而导致社会混乱,并反复被外族奴役。陈崇桂认为,它所讲述的也是中国人的故事。《士师记》第九章讲到亚比米勒残杀同族而成为以色列人的王,而后被一个妇人杀害。陈崇桂首先重述了这个故事的梗概,他写道:

从前是藉外国的侵略压迫,刑罚他们,此次是本国内乱,弟兄骨肉相残杀。亚比米勒雇了些匪徒杀死他弟兄七十个人;就像我们中国,今日有人受了雇请,暗杀政治的敌人……(亚比米勒)想用武力统一全国,结果杀了许多同胞,毁灭了许多城邑。读圣经读到这里,觉得不是古书,乃是新闻了。这就是我们中华民国二十多年来常有的现象啊!武力统一,某省独立,打倒某某,某某又主张以武力统一,结果也是古今相同,杀死了许多同胞,毁灭了许多地方,制造了许多孤儿寡妇弄得农村破产,民不聊生。^[19]

在文末陈写道:

国中有内乱,国人自相残杀,也是神的刑罚和报应。一百多年来神给我们中国听福音的机会,就全体说,我们拒绝真理,不肯悔改,归向真神;近年来更加顽梗悖逆,公然毁谤神,提倡打倒基督教,打倒道德……^[20]

在此文中,陈崇桂首先用一种政治化的语句重述了亚比米勒的故事,比如“外国侵略”、“内乱”、“武力统一全国”、“打倒”、“骨肉相残”,这些词语表明了作者对这一故事的重构,使之不是旧事,而是现实。其后,陈崇桂藉由这个被重构的“政治故事”,批判眼下的内乱对国家和人民造成的伤害。进而,他解释中国内乱的原因与以色列一样,根本在于宗教上离弃上帝、拒绝福音,而遭到上帝的刑罚。陈还顺便批判了“非基督教运动”的“顽梗悖逆”。在《士师记》第十章,陈崇桂继续用类似的方法讲述以色列遭遇“帝国主义的侵害压迫”的故事。^[21]以色列人与中国人所遭受的外辱,也是因为他们(或我们)在宗教上离弃上帝。

陈崇桂类似的解经还有很多,他以一种故事重述的方式,将以色列历史与中国现实结合起来,试图透过以色列人在历史上的兴衰,来寻求中国今日面临种种苦难和混乱的根本原因。

(二)上帝与世界

陈崇桂不仅关注中国社会,也对于世界局势非常关心,他同样努力在圣经中寻求上帝对于列国的

[18] 贾玉铭 JIA Yuming,《圣经要义》卷二 *Shengjing yaoyi* [Bible Survey], vol. 2, (上海 Shanghai: 中国基督教两会 Zhongguo jidujiao lianghui [China Christian Council], 2011), 1.

[19] 陈崇桂 CHEN Chonggui, “士师记第九章 Shishiji dijiuzhang” [Judges 9], in《布道杂志》*Budaozazhi* [Evangelism], No. 2, (1934), 106.

[20] 同上 *Ibid.*, 第 107 页.

[21] 陈崇桂 CHEN Chonggui, “士师记第十章 Shishiji dishizhang” [Judges 10], in《布道杂志》*Budaozazhi* [Evangelism], No. 2, (1934), 107.

旨意。我们以他对旧约《以西结书》的诠释为例。《以西结书》是先知以西结对以色列和当时的其他国家发出的预言。

一方面，陈崇桂将《以西结书》记载列国的罪恶都指向现代国家的纷争和弊病。《以西结书》二十七章先知预告推罗国将来的衰败，陈便将推罗联系当下，指出现代国家“在邻国制造灾难，即如赤化邻国人民，鼓起邻国内乱，藉以扩张本国的权力。”^[22]这里所指的显然是苏联。《以西结书》二十八章继续记载了关于推罗的预言，值得一提的是，在传统解经中，这一章是关于“撒旦的由来”的著名篇章。陈崇桂也提及了这一点，但是他对于神秘性的“灵界”解释并无太大兴趣，而是着力描述人类的罪恶。他指出，圣经中的列国“演出种种悲惨残忍的行为”，直到今天亦是如此。另一方面，他也反复要表明，无论列强如何有权有势，上帝仍旧是历史的主宰。他写道：“如今世界的强权，英国美国德国法国苏俄日本等，不过是舞台上的主角。我们万不可忘记的，神并没有退位，不但世界各国，无论古今，都在他掌握之中。”^[23]

（三）革心与革命

陈崇桂从圣经阐发的社会思想，不仅仅是上文提到的社会批判，也包含对社会改造途径的思索。陈虽然主张以基督信仰和耶稣人格改造社会，但他认为若是只有外在的改造和服务，而没有个人的道德信仰为支撑，是舍本逐末的。因此，他提出，若要“革命”，必须先要“革心，即一个人要先重生得救，有了耶稣的人格，才能“治国平天下”。而这些思想便藉着他对于圣经人物故事的诠释表达出来。很多基要派释经者都非常擅长并热衷于讲述圣经人物的“故事”和对今日的教导，但他们往往集中于这些人物的灵性或道德品格，如王明道写得最多的文章是《从某某所得的教训》。而陈崇桂则将这些人物与社会改造和革命的思想相联系起来，使得他对圣经人物事迹的解读有一种不同的视野。

举例来说，《士师记》记载了参孙的故事，参孙是以色列人的士师、政治领袖，在讲到参孙的失败时，陈便将其与中国的社会改造问题联系在一起。他写道：

一个人若要救国，若要服务社会，必须用个人道德，个人信仰为根基。民国二十多年来，如同有人说：好话说完了，坏事做尽了。弄得外交丧地，内政民不聊生；根本的原因，就是因一般自命救国，为社会服务的人，个人的信仰消失，个人的道德破产，个人的行为像参孙，怎么能做出像摩西的事业来；现在有人发起新生活运动，也是看出这个关键来，但是要求神开我国领袖的眼睛，使知道唯有主耶稣赐人新生命，才能有新生活。^[24]

在这里，陈藉由参孙的故事，尖锐地批判很多社会服务运动往往都只注重外表，而不注重个人信仰、品性和道德；并提出以信仰改造国家的思想。最后他也含蓄地对蒋介石的“新生活运动”表示了赞誉和期待。

再举一例，《路加福音》十九章讲述了财主撒该悔改的故事。通常人们都从个人认罪悔改的角度解读这个故事，但是，陈则从“耶稣愿意住在拉撒路家”引申到基督信仰所带来家庭的变革。他写道：“我们的家庭须要主耶稣这样变化，我们的社会须要主耶稣这样改良，我们的政府须要主耶稣这样革新……若是一个团体，一个社会有信心有胆量，实行耶稣的原则，那个社会和国家必定起革命，而且这

[22] 陈崇桂 CHEN Chonggui, “以西结书二十七章 Yixijie shu ershiqi zhang” [Ezekiel 27], in《布道杂志》*Budaozazhi* [Evangelism], No. 8, (1935), 106.

[23] 陈崇桂 CHEN Chonggui, “以西结书二十八章 Yixijie shu ershiba zhang” [Ezekiel 28], in《布道杂志》*Budaozazhi* [Evangelism], No. 8, (1935), 106.

[24] 陈崇桂 CHEN Chonggui, “士师记第十六章 Shishiji dishiliuzhang” [Judges 16], in《布道杂志》*Budaozazhi* [Evangelism], No. 3, (1934), 66.

个革命是从革心做起。”^[25]这也正是陈心中所向往的,从个人以信仰而“修身”,到效法基督而“齐家”,进而以耶稣人格“治国平天下”的模式。

陈崇桂的社会改造思想,以儒家政治伦理为框架,既吸取了基要派注重个人信仰纯正、灵性生命提升的重要性,又结合了社会福音派对社会改造、人格救国的理想。更重要的是,他将这种思想经由圣经而阐发出来。陈崇桂从民族的角度去看待圣经中所记载的以色列的历史,他们的兴衰荣辱、内忧外困,从而使得读者从这些原本陌生的异族历史中获得对民族命运的共鸣和思索。他所追问的,不再只是某个信徒,而是整个中华民族,可以从圣经中读到什么。陈崇桂的释经显然存在很多问题,如圣经中以色列历史是在其神学语境之下的宗教史,不应直接应用于中国处境。但是他的诠释拓展了基要派释经的视野,“修正基要主义的偏狭性,试图开出一条符合基要信仰的社会改革之路。”^[26]

三、读经寻求“救国”

1937 年“七七事变”的爆发使得关心国家命运的陈崇桂非常震惊和愤怒。在当年《布道杂志》第十、十一期起,他写作了大量关于“国难”的文章,其“灵修日新”版块也被改为“国难中的灵修”。在随后的数年中,《布道杂志》始终积极关注抗战局势,这在基要派的刊物中是甚为罕见的。在这一时期,陈仍旧将圣经与中国的现实处境紧紧地联系在一起。^[27]

(一)“代入式”读经法

陈崇桂反思了以往基督徒在读经中对社会和国家的忽略,“我们平日读圣经,多用个人的眼光,注重个人得救,个人灵修,这亦是要紧的,但是太少从国家的立场读圣经,追求明白治国平天下的道理。更没有用国际的眼光,研究圣经,查看神如何为‘万邦万国的主宰’。”^[28]他在此特别提到应该从圣经中寻找儒家式“治国平天下”的道理。他认为,基督徒不可对民族危机和同胞苦难装聋作哑,而应该从圣经中寻找上帝对民族的旨意和安慰。他也指出,“基督教并不是一系统哲学,供几个上智的人悬想空论。基督教乃是对于在罪恶、愚昧、痛苦之中的人类,供献生命、能力、智慧、启示、安慰、勉励。”^[29]

具体来说,陈崇桂提出了一种新的读经方式,以帮助人们在圣经中寻求国难中的安慰。这种方式事实上很简单,即词汇代入。举例来说,他将圣经中的一处经文直接改写为:“我为中国必不静默,为

[25] 陈崇桂 CHEN Chonggui,“路加福音第十九章 Lujia fuyin dishijiuzhang” [Luke 19], in《布道杂志》*Budaozazhi* [Evangelism], No. 2, (1933), 83.

[26] 邢福增 YING Fuk-tsang,《中国基要主义者的实践与困境——陈崇桂的神学思想与时代》*Zhongguo jiyaozhuyizhe de shijian yu kunjing: Cheng Chonggui de sixiang yu shidai* [The Praxis and Predicament of a Chinese Fundamentalist: Chen Chonggui (Marcus Cheng)'s Theological Thought and His Time] (香港 Hong Kong: 宣道出版社 Xuandao chubanshe [Alliance Bible Seminary], 2001), 163.

[27] 陈崇桂对于国家与抗战的关注,这在基要派中是比较罕见的。有学者便误认为陈是自由派。在李韦 LI Wei,“抗战时期自由派基督徒知识分子对于耶稣形象的民族主义诠释 Kangzhanshiqi ziyoupai jidutu zhishifenzi duiyu yesu xingxiang de minzuzhuyi quan shi” [The Liberal Christian Intellectuals' Nationalistic Interpretation of Jesus Image in Anti-Japanese War], in《世界宗教研究》*Shijie zongjiao yanjiu* [Studies in World Religions], No. 3, (2018), 148-156 一文中,多次引用陈崇桂在《布道杂志》中所写作的关于耶稣论述爱国的文章(页 149 注释 1、5, 页 150 注释 4),并称之为是「自由派基督徒知识分子」对耶稣爱国问题的论述,这是有误的,陈崇桂一直是明确反对自由派神学的,坚持基要主义立场的。在该论文的注释中,作者则将引文作者注为「编辑主任」,而引文中《布道杂志》的编辑主任正是陈崇桂本人。

[28] 陈崇桂 CHEN Chonggui,“国难中的信息 Guonan zhongde xinxi” [The Message in the National Sufferings], in《布道杂志》*Budaozazhi* [Evangelism], No. 10/11, (1937), 4.

[29] 陈崇桂 CHEN Chonggui,“得胜世界 desheng shijie” [Overcome the World], in《布道杂志》*Budaozazhi* [Evangelism], No. 3/4, (1937), 80.

南京必不息声，直到中国的公义如光辉发出，中国的救恩如明灯发亮……”^[30]这句话原文出自《以赛亚书》六十二章1节，在这里，陈将原文中的“以色列”改为“中国”、“耶路撒冷”改为“南京”，从而使读者将圣经与现实相联系，唤起民族情感，寻求上帝的安慰。他也将《以赛亚书》的另外一处上帝责备以色列和耶路撒冷的经文，改为上帝对中国人和南京政府的责备，呼吁人民要在国难中转向上帝。

陈崇桂也使用“代入式”读经法来控诉日本侵略，将圣经文本中的“侵略者”读作“日本”。在《以赛亚书》中，亚述作为以色列的侵略者，终究也受到了上帝的审判。因此，陈将经文改写为：“中国我的百姓啊，日本虽然用棍击打你，你却不要怕，因为还有一点时候，发的忿怒就要完毕。我的怒气要向日本发作使他灭亡。”^[31]他指出，这并非是狭隘的民族主义情绪，而是坚信圣经中上帝既然曾经拯救以色列人，今天也同样要为中国人主持公义，上帝必会审判日本侵略者的暴行。

陈崇桂同时也批评欧美所谓的“基督教国家”。在抗战全面爆发之前，陈对于国联抱有极大的希望，相信这些“基督教国家”会主持公道。然而，事实并非如此。所以，陈也将英美国家代入圣经中而写道：今天的英国就好像圣经中的推罗，推罗经济富庶却“因资材心里高傲”。但是，“英国对于外交的国策，也是以营业发财为主，不敢主持公道正义，他的势力能左右国际联盟，然而对于国际纷争却不敢说公道话，不肯以实力来维持正义。”^[32]

陈崇桂创造了一种生动的、现实性的读经方法，从而流露出他对国家苦难的深切关怀，并积极地从圣经中汲取力量，寻找民族的安慰和力量。可以说，这种方法是上文提到的陈崇桂从中国社会角度理解“以色列”思想的延续，也是在特殊时代下更加直接的表达。陈也将其称为“读经”而非“解经”，后者是一种“教导”，而前者则是倡导一种普通信徒同样可以仿效的方式。

此外，陈崇桂也从对耶稣生平的再诠释中寻找国难中的安慰。1939年，陈在再次解释^[33]《路加福音》二十三章耶稣受审的经文时饱含感情地写道：“我想今日的中国人更能同情主耶稣所受的毁谤，诬告，主耶稣精神上的痛苦……主耶稣更能同情中国人今日受异族侵略压迫，更能安慰我们精神上的痛苦。”^[34]陈认为，中国人虽然处在水深火热之中，但是耶稣也曾经经历被陷害、毁谤、虐待和背叛，因此耶稣完全能在情感与历史上认同中国人的痛苦，并与中国人一同受苦。这也与二战后莫尔特曼等神学家提出的耶稣与人一同受苦的神义论思想不谋而合。

（二）两个时期的对比

我们以一个对比来看陈崇桂在抗战前后释经的差异，或者说社会环境的变化对陈解释同一段经文的影响。在《布道杂志》第六卷中（1933年），陈曾经做过《启示录》的逐章灵修注释。1939—1940年，陈再次在《布道杂志》中刊发了他新作的《启示录》诠释。两次释经中，陈都将《启示录》的很多内容联系到国家与社会的话题。不同之处在于，1933年国内局势整体相对平稳，乐观的社会福音思想仍旧盛行；而到了1939年，日本铁蹄肆虐中国，国破家亡、螭蟾沸羹。这种社会处境的变革，极大地影响了陈崇桂对于圣经文本的解释。

陈在1933年解释《启示录》第六、七章时呼吁个人得救，写道：“我们唯一要紧的事，就是现在解决

[30] 陈崇桂 CHEN Chongui, “用中国文字读圣经 Yong zhongguo wenzi dushengjing” [Reading the Bible in Chinese], in《布道杂志》*Budaozazhi* [Evangelism], No. 10/11, (1937), 52.

[31] 陈崇桂 CHEN Chongui, “今日亚述国是谁 Jinri yashuguo shishei” [Which country is the modern Assyria], in《布道杂志》*Budaozazhi* [Evangelism], No. 10/11, (1937), 55.

[32] 陈崇桂 CHEN Chongui, “推罗的错误 Tuiluo de cuowu” [The Mistakes of Tyre], in《布道杂志》*Budaozazhi* [Evangelism], No. 10/11, (1937), 57.

[33] 陈崇桂 CHEN Chongui 曾经在《布道杂志》1933年第1期和第2期写过《路加福音》的注释。

[34] 陈崇桂 CHEN Chongui, “主耶稣爱国 Zhuyesu aiguo” [Jesus Loves the Country], in《布道杂志》*Budaozazhi* [Evangelism], No. 3/4, (1939), 72.

这个个人得救的问题。”^[35]而当陈 1939 年再次诠释《启示录》六章时,他恳切地写道:

他们相信神是圣洁真实的,他们求神给他们伸流血的冤。神本是施行报应的神。但是有他自己所定的时候日期,人有时候焦急地问神说,要等到几时? 圣洁真实的主啊,我们等候你给我们中国人伸流血的冤,减少敌人的罪恶,减少我们的痛苦。^[36]

整体上,抗战时期陈崇桂对《启示录》的诠释,转向了对于“光明”、“正义”、“胜利”、“上帝掌权”、“伸冤”等主题的强调。正如他写道:“启示录书的主题,就是主耶稣必得最后的胜利……光明将要战胜黑暗,真理和正义将要得最后的胜利。”^[37]由此,他将《启示录》中殉道者的苦难与上帝最终的伸冤,转移到中国民众在日本侵略下所承受的深重苦难,以及人们在黑暗的现实中对终将胜利的期待和寄托。

释经对于陈崇桂来说,既不是一项书斋中的学术工作,也不仅仅是教堂里的传道牧养,它也是为民族寻求出路,为国难寻求安慰的重要寄托和思想源泉。可以说,他是携带圣经投身于“万变”的时代洪流之中。在新中国成立之后,陈继续活跃于与政局紧密联系的“三自爱国运动”中。

四、研经实践“爱国”

1949 年,中华人民共和国成立,陈崇桂积极响应政府的宗教政策,参与到批判美帝国主义的“控诉运动”与三自革新运动(后改为三自爱国运动)之中,并成为核心领袖之一。在这一时期,陈崇桂写作了很多带有时代和政治色彩的文章,以体现对新时代的回音。1955 年,陈在极力劝说王明道一同加入“三自”而被拒绝的背景下,出版了《实践的基督教》一书,以诠释新约圣经的《腓利门书》(以下简称《门》)。在民国时期,陈的释经皆是灵修类的短文,从未就圣经中某卷书进行逐字逐句详细的阐释。但在《实践的基督教》一书中,陈则用两万多字的篇幅,来“研究”只有六七十字的《门》。通过该书,我们可以看到陈崇桂以圣经诠释来响应新时代的需要,表达对“三自爱国”的拥护。值得一提的是,他将此书命名为“实践的”基督教,似乎着力说明基督教对于现实的参与性和服务性;事实上,他的这本书也是一本紧密联系实际,极具“实践”目的的研经书。

(一)“奴隶”的故事

陈崇桂在 1955 年教会正处在激烈震荡的处境下选择《门》,进行前所未有的细致研究,显然是经过精心选择的。《门》是保罗为逃跑的奴隶阿尼西母向其主人腓利门写的一封信。因为阿尼西母已成为基督徒,故保罗希望腓利门能够重新接纳他。这卷书正是一个讲述“被压迫阶级”的故事,非常契合当时的时代精神。陈写道:“数百年来,最亏缺神的荣耀,给人类带来最大损害的,就是封建主义、帝国主义、资本主义、殖民主义者。他们歪曲圣经,利用保罗劝勉仆人的话来剥削人、压迫人,偏不听从保罗的教训——要待阿尼西母‘不再是奴仆,乃是高过奴仆,是亲爱的兄弟’。”^[38]而当下的基督徒

[35] 陈崇桂 CHEN Chonggui,“启示录第七章 Qishilu diqizhang”[Revelation 7],in《布道杂志》*Budaozazhi* [Evangelism],No. 5,(1933),81.

[36] 陈崇桂 CHEN Chonggui,“要等到几时呢 Yao dengdao jishi ne”How Long Until You Judge],in《布道杂志》*Budaozazhi* [Evangelism],No. 1,(1940),69.

[37] 陈崇桂 CHEN Chonggui,“主耶稣得胜 Zhuyesu desheng”[The Triumph of the Lord Jesus],in《布道杂志》*Budaozazhi* [Evangelism],No. 11/12,(1939),50.

[38] 陈崇桂 CHEN Chonggui,《实践的基督教》*Shijian de jidujiao* [Practical Christianity](上海 Shanghai:广学会 Guangxuehui [Christian Literature Society],1955),5.

应该效法阿尼西母“为人民服务”的精神。“一个真正的基督徒，是要效法耶稣的生活，努力工作，‘不是要受人的服事，乃是要服事人。’一切行为若是为人民服务，为人民的利益，那才是道德的行为。”^[39]

（二）“家庭化的教会”

陈崇桂从2节中“在你家的教会”，表达出对腓利门能够在家中建立教会、与家人一同服侍的大加赞誉。他写道：“使徒时代的教会是家庭化，家庭是教会化，我以为这是最合理的教会，也是最理想的家庭。腓利门的家庭作了一个模范家庭，真是基督化家庭”^[40]。如前文所述，在陈崇桂的释经和神学中，始终有一个“修身齐家治国平天下”的理想模式。即使在解放后，限于社会环境不能再提及“基督化社会”，他的“基督化家庭”理想也没有改变。

然而，在三自运动引发教会界巨大分歧的时代背景下，陈崇桂又担心上面这种表达会造成“政治错误”，而与那些因拒绝加入三自教会而建立的“家庭教会”划清界限。他指出，“‘家的教会’，却完全不是现今有人进入地下工作，设立家的教会，有意的，或无意的为美帝国主义的利益服务”。陈进而批判“地下教会”是“危害人民的利益，被美帝国主义利用，作为侵略的工具……读者切不可歪曲圣经的教义随便滥用，因而中了美帝国主义的诡计”^[41]。值得注意的是，无论是这里还是上文中，陈反复提及一个重要的罪名：“歪曲圣经”。在浓厚的政治色彩下，陈还是反复以“歪曲圣经”作为重要罪名，也或许表明了他对于圣经不变的尊崇。

（三）爱心与合一

陈崇桂认为，《门》的主题就是爱心与合一，而他反复地将保罗等人与现实中的一些人进行对比。陈提出保罗是有爱心的人，“保罗爱耶稣，因此也爱弟兄，爱众圣徒。因此也爱他的祖国，爱他同国的人”^[42]。保罗所要教导的，也是要“向众圣徒有信心”，即信徒应该效法耶稣，彼此饶恕接纳，使得教会能够合一。而现实中的教会或个人则违背了这些教导。他们“骄傲自大，目中无人”，自以为纯正，破坏教会合一。“常有人说自己的信仰纯正，是合乎圣经；说别的宗派是异端，是离经叛道，是拜巴力的。”^[43]“甚至相信在天下人间只有他一个人的信仰是纯正的，别人对圣经的解释都错了……以为全国的基督徒都背弃了神的约，都去拜巴力了，只剩下他一个人。”^[44]

总之，这卷书教导读者，教会应该学习彼此相爱，彼此信任，彼此饶恕；并对社会有公开的好见证，体现出基督徒的思想被改变，人格被改造，有爱祖国，爱人民的精神。反之，一切分裂教会、破坏合一的行为都是“帝国主义的侵略策略”^[45]，不“合一”即不“爱国”。全书最后，陈崇桂写下祷告文：

（我们）看见原始基督教会的弟兄姊妹们如何彼此相爱，合而为一，彼此洗脚，互相体谅……今天教会中有个别拦阻福音的，反而自以为是保卫圣道；亵渎圣灵的人，反而自以为是最属灵的……求圣灵给我们新的亮光，叫我们知道，承认有彼此相爱的信心，才是纯正信仰……父啊，洁净你的圣殿，复兴你的教会，团结你的儿女们，以致我们身上将活神显给人看，以致人在教堂里得见我们得复活的主耶稣。这样才能荣耀神而为人民服务。^[46]

一方面，从陈崇桂的言论中，我们看到在他此时的思想中，“相爱合一”的重要性是压倒一切的，是

[39] 同上 *Ibid.*，第5页。

[40] 同上 *Ibid.*，第25页。

[41] 同上 *Ibid.*，第26页。

[42] 同上 *Ibid.*，第35页。

[43] 同上 *Ibid.*，第37页。

[44] 同上 *Ibid.*，第41页。

[45] 同上 *Ibid.*，第45页。

[46] 同上 *Ibid.*，第50页。

纯正信仰的标志,而不再以是否符合圣经来判定“纯正”与否。另一方面,从他批判美帝“歪曲圣经”,批判不加入三自运动者“认为别人对圣经的解释都错了”、自以为“保卫圣道”,又反映出在陈崇桂心中,圣经仍旧分量甚重。在陈这里,美帝之错在歪曲圣经,异己者们之错在“自以为解经纯正”;并且他以解释《门》来发此批判,似乎也是为了说明,自己在这一时期的选择乃是符合圣经根据,而非违背其圣经信念。诠释这卷书,最直接的社会意义就在于:对教外,表明基督教并不违背社会主义思想,而是一个坚决反对帝国主义,为人民服务的宗教;对教内,巧妙地“从相爱合一”角度为“三自运动”确立圣经根据,批评不加入“三自”的教会,以实践爱国。

五、结论

在民国时期,可以大体上说,基要派重视圣经而不关心社会,社会福音派关心社会而不看重圣经。然而,从对陈崇桂的研究,我们看到一个特例。在他身上,坚持圣经权威的“不变”,与对于民族国家命运的关切和对政治的投入,从而导致其圣经诠释之“变”,二者是共存的。应该肯定的是,陈崇桂的圣经诠释是有其价值的。如陈所说,圣经本身应是“活的”,释经不应该是抽象而冷漠的。读者在自身处境下解读圣经时所做出的反省与叹息,都应该是圣经诠释中的重要部分。特别对于中国人来说,如何能够让异域舶来的圣经跨越复杂的文化、语言、历史鸿沟,而对中国社会处境言说,在这一方面,陈崇桂做出了重要的尝试。陈试图将圣经的精神和原则,从信徒个人与教会的应用推广至社会和国家。我们无需多花笔墨讨论他的“家国同构”的社会改造模式的不切实际之处,但是,他探索了一条基要主义圣经立场和社会福音思想的结合路线。“在心态上,陈突破了基要主义的限制,没有否定基督徒对国家社会的责任与关怀,但是在具体的内容方面,事实上陈崇桂并没有提出任何具体的社会重建方案。……其社会关怀的最大特色,主要是心态上的突破而不是内容上的创新。”^[47]

再者,今日的读者很容易认为陈崇桂的“代入式”读经法是肤浅和简陋的。对此,陈自己已经做出了响应。陈崇桂在“七七事变”后提出要以中华民族的眼光来读圣经时,援引了卡尔·巴特的故事。巴特在荷兰一个神学院讲学时被其他学者批评,他反驳说这些学者们坐在书斋安枕无忧,“我是住在德国,处在忧患逼迫之中读圣经。”^[48]陈进而声明:“本期《布道杂志》是中国基督徒在国难之中,从中国国家立场读圣经而写出来的。”^[49]因此,我们不能无视他的特殊处境而对他以一种“何不食肉糜”的态度求全责备。更重要的是,他提醒我们圣经诠释与释经者人生和社会处境之间的复杂关系。研究者往往可以轻易判定诠释水平的优劣,却或许需要以一种对历史的同理心才能对诠释研究有更深刻的体会。陈在三自运动期间对于圣经的解读,同样是在深处剧烈的教会变革漩涡之中做出的,其中也包含了复杂的政治抉择。

圣经的诠释离不开对外境的关注、对现实的反思,否则就会沦为死板的训诂而失去生命力,或成为基要主义者的“孤芳自赏”。但是,通过研究陈崇桂在不同时代下解经中得出的社会方面的结论,也给予我们以反思。圣经诠释者过于关注社会和环境,过于渴望使用圣经去迎合现实的浪潮,是否总是有益;而在文本诠释中,过于强调读者的世界和回应是否会走向“作者已死”、文本可以任意解释的极端。那么,作为白纸黑字的文本,圣经的「不变」与人类现实生活的「万变」之间的张力如何平衡,圣经如何对现实处境言说,引导个人与社会响应挑战、直面抉择,今天仍旧是摆在每一个诠释者面前的难题。

[47] 邢福增 Ying Fuk-tsang,《中国基要主义者的实践与困境》*Zhongguo jiyaozhuyizhe de shijian yu kunjing*, (2001), 166.

[48] 陈崇桂 CHEN Chonggui,《国难中的信息》*Guonan zhongde xinxi*, (1937), 4.

[49] 同上 *Ibid.*, 第4页.

English Title:

Unchangeable and Changeable; Chen Chonggui's Biblical Interpretation and Chinese Society

ZHAO Pan

Post-doctor, School of Philosophy, Hongshan District, Yujiahu Rd. Post-Doctoral Dormitory, Wuhan University, 430000 Wuhan City, Hubei Province, P. R. China. Tel. +8615071263218. Email: zhaopan813@gmail.com

Abstract: CHEN Chonggui (Marcus Cheng, 1884-1963), a famous Chinese Church leader in the Republican era of China, has written a lot of biblical interpretative articles. As a Fundamentalist, Chen insisted on the authority of the Bible and applied biblical teachings to not only the individual's life but also to social and political issues. In the 1930s, he wrote devotional interpretative articles on the whole Bible, expressing his social reform thought by associating Israelite history with China's social and political situation. In the Anti-Japanese War, being concerned with the fate of China, Chen proposed a new biblical reading approach that substituted "China" for "Israel" in the promises found in the Prophets. In the 1950s, Chen researched the book of Philemon to support the Three-self Patriotic Movement. Chen applied the unchangeable Scriptures to the changeable social and political context of China, attempting to meet social and political needs.

Key Words: Chen Chonggui; Biblical Interpretation; Chinese Society; Republican era of China; Christianity

教会历史与中西社会
Church History in the West and in China

全球化与现代性：略论澳门在早期中欧文化交流中的桥头堡地位

孙尚扬^{〔1〕}，郭建斌^{〔2〕}

(北京大学哲学系宗教学系，北京，100871)

摘要：明末乃是早期全球化时期，彼时的澳门就已经成为中欧文化交流的桥梁和窗口。著名传教士利玛窦等东来后，均由澳门登陆，并在澳门学习汉语，进而深入内地，为当时中西文化交流做出积极的贡献。当教难发生时，澳门也为部分传教士和教民提供了避难所，为中西文化的冲突提供了一个缓冲地，从而也避免了更大规模的中西冲突。本文以“容教”时期的利玛窦和“禁教”时期的高一志、曾德昭、蔡伯多禄为主要切入案例，探讨澳门在早期中西文化交流中的桥头堡作用。

关键词：全球化；现代性；澳门；传教士；早期中欧文化交流

作者：孙尚扬，北京大学博士，北京大学哲学系宗教学系教授，北京市海淀区颐和园路5号，电话+8613693058965。电子邮件：sunsy1965@qq.com；郭建斌，北京大学在读博士研究生，北京大学哲学系宗教学系，北京市海淀区颐和园路5号，电话+8618811581078。电子邮件：guojianbin@pku.edu.cn

在空间意义上，当今的人类生活在同一个“地球村”；在时间意义上，当今人类则生活在一个全球化时代。但是，全球化并非凭空而来，而是其来有自的。诚如《全球社会学》一书指出的那样：“当一些帝国的对外扩张和宗教教义四处传播时，原始全球化(Protoglobalization)就开始启动了。”^{〔3〕}此后，在资本逐利动机的驱动下，航海时代带来了地理大发现与欧洲的扩张。而“从大约17世纪起，欧洲开始在思想意识、军事力量、航海技术和经济发展等方面超过了世界其它地区。欧洲命运的这种惊人转变促使它把新的制度传播到全球各地，并且引发我们称之为‘现代性’的一种新现象，这正是当今全球化时代的逻辑起点”。^{〔4〕}而所谓现代性，则是“理性、领土、扩张、革新、应用科学、国家、公民权、官僚组织和其他许多因素的大融合”。^{〔5〕}全球化和与之相伴相随的现代性的产生与增长可以说是人类历史上意义重大的社会变迁，本文将在早期全球化的语境中，略论澳门在早期中欧文化交流中的桥头堡式的中介地位。

众所周知，澳门的独特地位开始形成于明朝嘉靖年间。嘉靖三十二年(1553)，葡萄牙商人借口“船触风涛缝裂，水湿贡物，愿借地晾晒”，通过贿赂海道副使汪柏得以在澳门居留，并逐步修屋建炮。

〔1〕 孙尚扬 SUN Shangyang, 北京大学哲学系宗教学系教授。

〔2〕 郭建斌 GUO Jianbin, 北京大学哲学系宗教学系博士研究生。

〔3〕 罗宾·科恩 Robin COHEN, 保罗·肯尼迪 Paul Kennedy, 《全球社会学》, *Quanqiu shehui xue* [Global Sociology], 文军 WEN Jun 等译, (北京 Beijing: 社会科学文献出版社 Shehui kexue wenxian chubanshe [Social Sciences Academic Press (China)], 2001), 62.

〔4〕 同上 *Ibid.*, 第 61 页。

〔5〕 同上 *Ibid.*, 第 65 页。

当时, 澳门地位的独特性在于, “(葡萄牙) 商人们完全意识到, 他们得以在澳门居住, 既不是由于葡萄牙武力征服的结果, 也不是对他们效劳的酬劳, 即葡萄牙人在剿灭强悍的海盗的过程中提供通力合作, 所做出的回报。因此, 他们信守两个原则, 一是与当时的政府保持良好的关系, 二是尽可能地发展他们与中国的独占贸易。为了维护这些有利条件, 有关的商人屈从于官员的经常勒索, 作为他们默许违犯中华帝国政令和法例的报偿。”〔6〕从这一权威的分析以及相关的史实来看, 当时的澳门主权仍属于中华帝国, 葡人只是澳门的租赁者, 很多时候, 他们的行为“更像是臣属”。〔7〕

为了给葡萄牙商人以精神上的慰藉, 并伺机向中国内地传教, 耶稣会传教士也随之东来, 他们“于 1542 到达果阿建立在东方的传教基地。1567 年, 澳门教区也正式成立。为了传教需要, 传教士利用这两个传教基地想方设法搜集东方各国的历史、地理、文化、政治情报, 耶稣会也定期向罗马呈送报告, 汇报有关情况和传教活动。”〔8〕这样, 澳门就成了“中国看世界, 世界看中国的一扇窗口”〔9〕。

明末著名传教士利玛窦等人东来后, 均由澳门登陆, 在澳门学习汉语, 了解中国文化, 进而深入内地, 为当时中西文化的交流做出了积极的贡献。当教难发生时, 澳门也为部分传教士和教民提供了避难所, 为中西文化的冲突提供了一个缓冲地带, 从而避免了更大规模的中西冲突与文化交流的中断。

一、早期传教策略的源发地

研究中外文化交流的著名学者季羨林先生曾对澳门留下深刻印象, “在 400 多年以前, 明代的末叶, 欧风东渐的突破口就在这里。许多赫赫有名的向中国和其他一些东方国家传播西方的宗教和科技艺术的人物, 很多都是先从澳门登陆, 然后逐渐散向中国内地, 直至中国的首都北京。鼎鼎大名的利玛窦就是其中之一。”〔10〕

而明末的中欧文化交流并不是单向的, 而是双向的。西方对当时中国文化的了解也大多借助于澳门的桥梁作用, 传教士把在中国各地搜集的情报汇总后, 经由澳门, 呈送到罗马, 使“西方人对中国的认识更加正确, 理性和接近现实, 理想化色彩也逐渐淡化。”〔11〕

利玛窦 (Matteo Ricci 1552—1610) 于 1582 年 8 月随范礼安神父抵达澳门, 立即投入到汉语学习中。刚来澳门的利玛窦, 对澳门的印象是“这个新的居留地位于那么多港口的中心, 他们在这里发现了一条途径, 通向不应忽视的传教活动的新天地。在北面是中国, 那比宽阔的摩鹿加群岛区要大得多。在东面是日本和菲律宾群岛, 西面是交趾支那, 柬埔寨、暹罗和其他几个国家。”〔12〕鉴于耶稣会在日本较为成功的传教经验, 加之澳门优越的地理位置, 使利玛窦对进入中国内地传教充满憧憬。但在澳门的一次骚乱中, 他开始思索这样一个问题: 应该用何种方式传教? “在一次骚乱中, 利玛窦神父几

〔6〕 龙思泰 Anders LJUNGSTEDT, 《早期澳门史》Zaoqi Aomenshi [Early History of Macau], 吴义雄 WU Yixiong 等译, 章文钦 ZHANG Wenqin 校注, (北京 Beijing: 东方出版社 Dongfang chubanshe [The oriental Press], 1997), 57.

〔7〕 同上 *Ibid.*, 第 91 页。

〔8〕 吴志良 WU Zhiliang, 《东西交汇看澳门》Dongxi jiaohui kan Aomen [Convergence of the East and West in Macau], (澳门 Macau: 澳门基金会出版 Aomen jijinhui chuban [The Press of Macau Foundation], 1996), 166.

〔9〕 同上 *Ibid.*, 第 1 页。

〔10〕 转引自吴志良 WU Zhiliang, “从澳门看中西方文明的碰撞和交融 Cong Aomen kan zhongxifang wenming de pengzhuang he jiaorong” [Collision and convergence of the Chinese and Western civilization in Macau], in 吴志良 WU Zhiliang, 章文钦 ZHANG Wenqin 等著, 《澳门—东西交汇第一门》Aomen—dongxi jiaohui diyimen [Macau the First Gate of Convergence of the East and West] (北京 Beijing: 中国友谊版公司 Zhongguo youyi chubanshe [Chinese Friendship Publishing Company], 1998), 1.

〔11〕 吴志良 WU Zhiliang, 《东西交汇看澳门》Dongxi Jiaohui Kan Aomen [Convergence of the East and West in Macau], 168.

〔12〕 利玛窦 Matteo RICCI, 金尼阁 Nicolas TRIGAULT, 《利玛窦中国札记》Limadou zhongguo zhaji [Matteo Ricci's China Journal], 何高济 HE Gaoji 等译, 何兆武 HE Zhaowu 校, (北京 Beijing: 中华书局 Zhonghua shuju [Zhonghua Book Company], 2010), 141.

受其害;他从中深受启发:要从事劝化工作,必须先熟悉这个国家的文化与民情。不久,他深知传教之要诀,先在取得华人之尊敬,而最佳方法,无如以传介学术入门。(1580,1581年发自科钦和果阿之信;1583年2月13日发自澳门之信。)”^[13]由此可知,利玛窦的“学术传教”思想是在澳门学习汉语时萌发的。至于对利玛窦进入内地后的传教方式、路线,已经有较多学术成果,兹不赘述。利玛窦进入内地传教的第一站为肇庆,他的同伴为钟巴相修士,是一名出生于澳门的华人,跟随利玛窦做一些翻译和汉语辅导的工作。1594年,郭居静神父(Lfizaro Catfino 1560—1640)由澳门来到肇庆,使利玛窦筹划已久的进京计划得以实施,利氏在两名愿入耶稣会的年轻澳门人的陪同下,一同北上。^[14]由此可见在利玛窦进入内地传教的早期,澳门华人起了汉语翻译和与当地人沟通的作用,一定程度上对传教事务的顺利进行做出了贡献。

利玛窦在澳门学习汉语,“自此以后,凡东来的教士,大多集中在澳门先学汉语,认识中国。这成了习惯,后来还形成制度。”^[15]利玛窦进入内地不久,受其传教经验的影响,“以后凡准备进入中国、日本、越南传教的,必须先到澳门学汉语”,耶稣会远东教务视察员范礼安敏锐地觉察到澳门的重要性,要让澳门成为“精通汉语,熟悉中国礼仪的培训基地,使澳门成为天主教的传播中心”^[16],于是向耶稣会总会长建议,在澳门建立一所培养东方传教士的高等学校。1594年12月1日,澳门成立了远东第一所大学—圣保禄修院,致力于培训赴华传教的神职人员,在修院内,汉语为必修课,人人都要学习,所以“随着大批受过严格职业培训、尤其是语言能力培训的传教士,从澳门这个大本营输入中国,实地考察获取第一手准确情报,葡萄牙的中国观有了质的飞越。”^[17]以至于在清代,“顺治、康熙朝索性做出了规定,要求凡准备入华的传教士,必须先‘赴广东澳门天主堂住二年余……学习中国语言’。这一来,在圣保禄书院学习汉语,已不单单是语言能力的培训,同时是进入中国大陆的入境的许可条件了。”^[18]由此可知,单从传教士学习汉语角度来看,澳门为传教士进入内地、减少传教阻力起到了积极的作用。有学者认为,随着传教士把在中国传教过程中的所见所闻,所思所作通过澳门传回欧洲,促进了欧洲汉学的兴起。随之而来的是18世纪欧洲的“中国热”的兴起,它直接影响了欧洲的启蒙运动,西方一些著名人物,如莱布尼茨、亚当·斯密、歌德、伏尔泰等均受到儒学和中国人思维模式的深刻影响,在这些人的作品中均可以找到东方的文化因子。^[19]

[13] 费赖之 Louis PFISTER,《明清间在华耶稣会士列传(1552—1773)》*MingQing zaihua yesuishi liezhuan* [Biographies of Jesuits in China during the Ming and Qing Dynasties], 梅乘骐 Mei Chengqi, 梅乘骏 Mei Chengjun 译, (上海 Shanghai: 天主教上海教区光启社 Tianzhujiao shanghai jiaogu guangqishe [the Press of Guangqi in Catholic Shanghai Diocese], 1997), 31.

[14] 此处内容请参见上 *Ibid.*, 第 33 页。

[15] 刘羨冰 LIU Xianbing, “澳门历史上双语人才的培养与中外文化教育交流 Aomen lishishang shuangyu rencai de peiyang yu zhongwai wenhuajiaoyu jiaoliu” [Cultivation of Bilingual Talents and Sino-western Cultural and Educational Exchanges in Macau History], 吴志良 Wu Zhiliang, 章文钦 Zhang Wenqin 等著:《澳门—东西交汇第一门》*Aomen—Dongxi Jiaohui Diyimen* [Macau—the First Gate of Convergence of the East and West], 99.

[16] 同上 *Ibid.*, 第 108 页。

[17] 吴志良 WU Zhiliang, 《东西交汇看澳门》*Dongxi Jiaohui Kan Aomen* [Convergence of the East and West in Macau], 168.

[18] 刘羨冰 LIU Xianbing, “澳门历史上双语人才的培养与中外文化教育交流 Aomen lishishang shuangyu rencai de peiyang yu zhongwai wenhuajiaoyu jiaoliu” [Cultivation of Bilingual Talents and Sino-western Cultural and Educational Exchanges in Macau History], 吴志良 Wu Zhiliang, 章文钦 ZHANG Wenqin 等著:《澳门—东西交汇第一门》*Aomen—Dongxi Jiaohui Diyimen* [Macau—the First Gate of Convergence of the East and West], 99.

[19] 同上 *Ibid.*, 第 119 页。亦参 SUN Shangyang “the Eastward Flow of Western Learning and the Spread of Chinese Civilization,” Chapter 7, in YUAN Xingpei & YAN Wenming & Zhang Chuanxi & Lou Yulie eds., *The History of Chinese Civilization*, Vol. IV, (Cambridge University Press, 2012), 338-347.

二、中西文化冲突的缓冲地

早期全球化时期的中国天主教传教事业,并非总是像利玛窦时期那样较为平顺,而是伴随着各种危机。有学者认为基督教在中国所遭受的教难,有四次。第一次即为明神宗万历四十四年(1616年),由南京礼部侍郎沈淮所发动的南京教案。^[20]关于南京教案的研究,成果颇丰,此处不再赘述。但值得注意的是南京教案中受到官府羁押的传教士王丰肃(Alfonso Aagnoni 1566—164,后改名高一志)和谢务禄(Alvaro Semedo 1585—1658,后改名为曾德昭)均被押解放逐至澳门。但数年后二人均改名潜回内地,对当时的传教事业与西方文化的在中国的传播都做出不小的贡献。

王丰肃在澳门逗留数年后,于1624年“始重入中国内地传教。在此之前,他在澳门撰写中文著作,均在以后刊印;并在此教授神学2年,任公学顾问一年,因为在南京识之者众,乃派他去了山西,并改名高一志。”^[21]高一志的主要传教区域在绛州,在信教文人韩云、韩霖和段袞、段袞等兄弟的协助下,天主教在绛州的传播甚为成功。费赖之曾记载:

“高一志神父在山西绛州传教,因得著名文人韩云(洗名斯德望)和韩霖(洗名多默)两兄弟之助,曾为成人授洗200人,其中学者60人,及宗室成员多人。1626年,授洗者有成人500人,次年又有500人,此后逐年有增。……高一志神父初来时。仅有教友25人,及高神父去世时,已有8000人之谱,其中200人为有功名之士人,有的已入仕途。”^[22]”

从中可见,高一志在山西绛州的传教成果可谓不凡。同时,据耶稣会现存零星统计资料所载,山西省在崇祯九年(1636年)共约有8000名教徒,至于大小教堂,在崇祯十三年即有102座。绛州在当时不仅是山西全省最为活跃的教区,天启七年(1627),还筹建了全中国第一座由教徒捐建的天主堂;崇祯四年左右,绛州已有各式教堂30座。^[23]在谈及教徒筹资建造天主堂的事情时,艾儒略曾提及地方士绅段袞在绛州自己筹资建堂,并给与高度评价,藉此来教导自己的门人,

“段君尝立一圣堂,比邻不戒,偶燬于火。段君仰而叹曰:‘是堂湫隘,吾主弃而去之矣。’请更诸爽垲者,复捐金、庀材另创一所,比前加丽焉。夫人当缔创之后,忽遭焚毁。即有道力者,能自克于怨尤,斯已多矣。其不灰心而弛力者,几人哉?段君不惟无怨尤,更加毅然之力,其不可及者此已。”^[24]”

从1634年起,山西适逢百年不遇的大灾荒,连续长达八个月干旱无雨,庄稼颗粒无收,灾民流离失所,“饿殍数以千计”,饥民为求生,“至有杀生人、掘尸体以为食者,也有母食其婴者;令人忆及耶路

[20] 王治心 Wang Zhixin,《中国基督教史纲》*Zhongguo jidujiao shigang* [Outline of Chinese Christianity History],(上海 Shanghai:上海世纪出版集团 Shanghai shiji chuban jituan [Shanghai Century Publishing Company],2007),71.

[21] 费赖之 Louis PFISTER,《明清间在华耶稣会士列传(1552—1773)》*MingQing Zaihua Yesuishi Liezhuan* [Biographies of Jesuits in China during the Ming and Qing Dynasties],梅乘骐 MEI Chengqi,梅乘骏 MEI Chengjun 译,103.

[22] 同上 *Ibid.*,第103页.

[23] 黄一农 HUANG Yinong,《两头蛇》*Liangtoushe* [Two-headed Snake] (上海 Shanghai:上海古籍出版社 Shanghai guji chubanshe [Shanghai Classics Publishing House],2006),288.

[24] 李九标编 LI Jiubiao,〔意〕艾儒略等口铎 Giulio Aleni,《口铎日抄》卷八 *Kouduo richao* Vol. 8 [Oral Notes],钟鸣旦 Nicolas Standaert,杜鼎克 Adrian Dudink 编:《罗马耶稣会档案馆明清天主教文献》第七册 *Luoma Yesuhui Dangangan mingqing tianzhujiao wenxian* Book 7 [Catholic Documents during Ming and Qing Dynasties in Roman Jesuit Archives],(台北 Taipei:利氏学社 Lishi xueshe [Taipei Ricci Institute],2002),583-584.

撒冷城被围时的惨状。”^[25]鉴于这种惨象,高一志等神父救贫济困,并出于爱心,购置了一处住宅,专门用于收养弃儿,此项慈善事业,刚开始仅仅有神父们运营维持,“逐渐得到教外人的赞助,无论富者、贫者皆善愿乐助。城中的官员对神父们的善举,也表示感谢,并给予种种方便。那些夫人们见此善举……有捐助首饰者,有捐助珠宝者,以资助此项事业不断增长的开支。”^[26]在传教士这一慈善行为的感召下,很多信教地方士绅把这些悲悯他人的慈善心理付诸于实践中。例如段衮曾协助高一志神父,负责“诸天神之后善会”,在神父们的影响下,“不仅把住房施给贫民们居住,且供应膳食,从而导之入教。他不时去城乡收集弃儿,还给予关怀照顾。一次,有人告诉他有一弃儿被活埋,他立即赶去将其救出。”^[27]面对崇祯年间的大饥荒,地方乡绅纷纷输财举赈:

岁有凶歉,何代无之?明崇祯六七年,频年荒旱至十四年,而极真所谓野无青草,市绝米粒,亘古无有之大厄也。若非仁人君子矜恤于其间,周余黎明靡有孑遗,不堪再咏矣。其时好义乡绅士民踴输数千金,分坊置首簿著贫民名数,每五日点名散给计口授米。又立东生院煮粥哺饥穷民,赖以全活甚众。举其首倡劝赈者则有韩乡宦云兄弟,閩州众乡绅咸有输助,独雨公先生霖捐五百金券,贫三百會借二百……盖天时告变,人宜警救,若乃拥高夏厌腥肥,而坐视乡邻亲友瘠,漠然不动念,甚非所以答上天厚我之意也。出其宴会歌舞之余,便可为膏枯肉殍之用一时,称为高义。数十年以后,相传荣名,子孙扬其前徽而袭为余……^[28]

天主教徒韩云曾出面募款煮粥以供深冬守城的乡兵御寒:

长夜不寐有关心之大事二,一御流寇,一御流寇者饥寒也,……所以不能寐者,时则三冬,遥夜如年,霜寒风冷,雪厚冰坚,纵宿饱裘袞挨至交更未有不饥生粟,腹为馁者。哀我閩里乡党同舟之人,几不饥寒者乎?且我等稍可支持雇人应役,即此雇役之人亦人,人子也,我等温饱彼独饥寒……若令有余之家,少设一席酒,少作一不急之事,随心喜施,城上人便可过此寒夜。如每夜每人得米粥一碗,即可御寒,估至冬终费银百两,每夜每人二碗即可充饥,估至年终倍之,不肖除自先捐助,外亲与同志乞求酌钱米之多寡,为临时煮粥之便,宜自思不难于募助,而难于煮散……^[29]

从以上材料可以得知,在高一志等传教士感召和带领下,当时山西绛州的慈善事业得到一定的发展。

曾德昭,1613年来华,由于南京教案,被放逐澳门,但在1620年重回内地,浙江杭州为其主要的传教区域。在杭州得到“三柱石”之一的杨廷筠的帮助,开辟了多处新教区。后来去西安传教。有学者

[25] 费赖之 Louis PFISTER,《明清间在华耶稣会士列传(1552—1773)》*MingQing Zaihua Yesuishi Liezhuan* [Biographies of Jesuits in China during the Ming and Qing Dynasties],梅乘骐 MEI Chengqi,梅乘骏 MEI Chengjun 译,103.

[26] 同上 *Ibid.*,第104页.

[27] 同上 *Ibid.*,第104页.

[28] [清]张焕扬 ZHANG Huanyang,张于铸 ZHANG Yuzhu 修纂:《光绪直隶绛州志》卷十七 *Guangxu zhili jiangzhou zhi* Vol. 17 [Zhili Local Gazetteers in period of Guangxu],《孙锡龄救荒协议传》*Sun Xiling jiuhuang xieyi zhuan* [Biography of Sun Xiling's Famine Relief] (光绪五年刻本 *Guangxu wunian keben*, i. e., 1879).

[29] [清]张焕扬 ZHANG Huanyang,张于铸 Zhang Yuzhu 修纂:《光绪直隶绛州志》卷十七 *Guangxu zhili jiangzhou zhi* Vol. 17 [Zhili Local Gazetteers in period of Guangxu],《韩云募煮粥引》*Han Yun muzhuzhou yin* [The story of Han Yun Raising money to cooking porridge] (光绪五年刻本 *Guangxu wunian keben*, i. e., 1879).

认为“曾德昭到西安不久(1625),就成为目睹景教碑的第一个欧洲人。”^[30]并“将《大秦景教流行中国碑》首次译成西方文字,轰动一时。”^[31]通过对碑文的翻译介绍,让西方人知道早在唐代基督教就已经传入中国。但在欧洲更让其名声大噪的是他的著作《大中华帝国志》,“1637年完成的《大中华帝国志》,五年后以西班牙文出版,陆续被译成意大利语(1643年)、法语(1645年)、英语(1665年)和荷兰语(1670年)”^[32]《大中华帝国志》内容分为两部分。第一部分系统介绍了中国概况,诸如,政治、经济、文化、人民、教育、科技、宗教和衣食住行、红白喜事等风俗习惯;第二部分主要描绘了圣方济各教会的在华传教活动,并全面记录了从罗明坚、利玛窦开始的在华传教事业。^[33]其中也有一些对当时澳门情况的记述。他的著作丰富了当时欧洲人对中国的了解,促使欧洲较为正面的中国观的进一步确立,为中西文化的交流做出了贡献。

三、禁教时期教民的避难所

在乾隆四十九年(1784)至乾隆五十年(1785),曾发生过一起席卷全国的教案,在这次教案中,乾隆曾数次发布旨令严查此案,缉拿此案“元凶”,而各省督抚也为此事绞尽脑汁,并撒下“天罗地网”,缉捕“真凶”。在此时期的清实录和清宫档案中,一个人的名字频繁出现,在《清中前期西洋天主教在华活动档案》中涉及此人的档案也有 80 余件,他就是整个教案的关键人物蔡伯多禄。^[34]蔡伯多禄,又名蔡如祥、蔡鸣皋,福建龙溪县人。

关于蔡伯多禄案也可以称之为由“一封信引发的血案”,此案肇始于乾隆四十九年八月初九日,湖广总督特成额奏报查获携带天主教经像的西洋人,以及蔡伯多禄书信等:

湖北襄阳郟(阳)一带界近陕甘,抵任后即严飭文武选派员弁兵役设卡巡防。据郟阳镇右营守备舒万年禀称,七月十二日巡查水汛至白家湾,见对河小船内有人吵闹,随带弁员保甲渡河,见船内四人面貌异样。据水手云称係西洋人往陕西传教等语……查点船上箱物,内箱一口俱装西洋经卷,并纸画神像等物……守备等见小木箱内有蔡伯多禄寄与李姓书一封。查书信内大略,该西洋人四名係广东罗马当家所发往陕传教,令蔡伯多禄送至

[30] 费赖之 Louis PFISTER,《明清间在华耶稣会士列传(1552—1773)》*MingQing Zaihua Yesuishi Liezhuan* [Biographies of Jesuits in China during the Ming and Qing Dynasties], 梅乘骐 MEI Chengqi, 梅乘骏 MEI Chengjun 译, 166-167。但是费赖之又在括号内注解到“(一说金尼阁是欧人中首先目睹此碑者,时在 1625 年 10 月。见《1550 年前中国的基督教史》1550 *nian qian Zhongguo jidujiao shi* [History of Christianity in China before 1550] 第 38 页。译者注。)”

[31] 吴志良 WU Zhiliang,《东西交汇看澳门》*Dongxi Jiaohui Kan Aomen* [Convergence of the East and West in Macau], 147。

[32] 同上 *Ibid.*, 第 147 页。

[33] 同上 *Ibid.*, 第 147 页。

[34] 关于蔡伯多禄的研究请参见:方豪 FANG Hao,《中国天主教史人物传》*Zhongguo tianzhujiaoshi renwuzhuan* [Biographies of Chinese Catholics' History], (北京 Beijing: 宗教文化出版社 Zongjiao wenhua chubanshe [Religion and Culture Press], 2007), 617; 吴伯娅 WU Boya,《蔡伯多禄事考》*Caiboduolu shikao* [the Research of Peter Cai], 肖清和 XIAO Qinghe 编,《宗教与历史》(第五辑) *Zongjiao yu lishi* Vol. 5 [religion and History], (上海 Shanghai: 上海大学出版社 Shanghai daxue chubanshe [the Press of Shanghai University]), 2016, 141-152; 王宁 WANG Ning,《蔡伯多禄案研究》*Caiboduolu an yanjiu* [the study of Peter Cai's case], (上海 Shanghai: 上海大学硕士论文 Shanghai daxue shuoshi lunwen [MA thesis in Shanghai University]), 2014 年 4 月; Eugenio MENEGON; Asian Native Voices in Southern European Archives; The Case of Pietro Zai (Cai Ruoxiang, 1739—1806), Pupil of the Chinese College of Naples. Paper prepared for the meeting Documentation on Asia in Southern European Archives. Panel: 'Documentation and History; Archives and the Writing of History' Med Asia-Casa Asia. Barcelona, September 14-15, 2006.

湖南湘潭暂住,另着人送樊城,直走西安,礼托李姓送往之语。^[35]

从奏报得知,官府抓到了准备去陕西传教的传教士,他们携带天主教经卷圣像等,而此案的“主角”蔡伯多禄也浮出水面。由于时值清廷禁教时期,朝廷禁止天主教的一切传教行为,不许洋人私自进入内地传教,乾隆申明:“西洋人进京行艺,原所不禁,即如近据舒常奏德天赐等情愿来京,已有旨令其遇便送至京城,但必须报明地方官代为具奏,始行允准。”^[36]同时想到当时陕甘的回民起义,乾隆帝龙颜大怒,下令务必把蔡伯多禄缉拿归案,所有帮助传教士潜回内地的中国教民,一律逮捕查办。蔡伯多禄在信中写道:

罗马当家现发四位铎德往陕传教,委晚在广东办人送至湘潭暂住,另酌人再办前往樊城,直走西安,但念走旱路比走水路更难,非得一二江湖练达之士难以承办。左右思维,惟台台府上晚爷,最为合式,敢恳为天主分上,暂令抛离家务,信到日,即便束装就道,建立圣功,免致四铎悬望,不胜厚幸,所有领受隆情,容晚再来贵地日面谢。恭候闾府宠福金安,嵩此上李大爷、二爷二位文几。铎末蔡伯多禄字拜。^[37]

所有信中涉及的传教士以及教民被缉拿审查,涉事的区域内,湖南、湖北、广东、福建等地督抚均掀起大规模的搜捕活动,但历经几月蔡氏依旧没有抓捕归案,乾隆甚为不悦。在审问被捕的教民时,曾有教民招供在山西、山东、湖广、直隶等省都有习教和传教之人,且“罗马当家”派十人分往山陕、湖广、山东、直隶等省传教^[38]。乾隆得知后,斥责地方官的无能和失察,各地纷纷掀起抓捕教民的活动,致使形成席卷十几个省的全国性教案。

在数月抓捕蔡伯多禄无果的情况下,广东巡抚认为蔡氏与澳门夷人向来熟悉,所以可能潜逃至澳门,他派人去澳门严密查访,令按察使觉罗明善前往查办,并晓谕澳门夷人“尔等住居澳门,每年贸易获利,仰受大皇帝复育深仁,至优极渥。即有夷人犯法尚应送出,听候天朝按律惩治。况蔡伯多禄系

[35] 《湖广总督特成额奏报盘获西洋人及随带天主教经像现提审查办折》*Huguang zongdu Techenge zoubao panhuo xiyangren ji suidai tianzhujiao jingxiang xiantishen chabanzhe*, 中国第一历史档案馆 *Zhongguo diyi lishi danganguan* 编:《清中前期西洋天主教在华活动档案史料》第一册 *Qing zhongqianqi xiyang tianzhujiao zaihua huodong dangan shiliao Book1* [Historical Files of Western Catholic Activities in China in the Early Qing Dynasty], (北京 Beijing: 中华书局 *Zhonghua shuju* [Zhonghua Book Company], 2003), 344-345。《湖广总督特成额奏报盘获西洋人欲往陕西私行传教缘由折》*Huguang zongdu Te Cheng zoubao panhuo xiyangren yuwang shanxi sixing chuanjiao yuanyou zhe*, 中国第一历史档案馆 *Zhongguo diyi lishi danganguan*, 澳门基金会 *Aomen jijinhui*, 暨南大学古籍研究所 *Jinan daxue guji yanjiusuo* 合编:《明清时期澳门问题档案文献汇编》(一) *Mingqing shiqi aomen wenti dangan wenxian huibian* [Compilation of archives of Macau issues in the Ming and Qing Dynasties], (北京 Beijing: 人民出版社 *Renming chubanshe* [People's Publishing House], 1999), 421-422。

[36] 《寄谕湖广总督特成额等着查究西洋人前往西安传教案犯严拿务获》*Jiyu huguang zongdu Te Cheng deng zhao chajiu xiyangren qianwang xi'an chuanjiao anfan yanna wuhuo*, 中国第一历史档案馆 *Zhongguo diyi lishi danganguan*, 澳门基金会 *Aomen jijinhui*, 暨南大学古籍研究所 *Jinan daxue guji yanjiusuo* 合编:《明清时期澳门问题档案文献汇编》(一) *Mingqing shiqi aomen wenti dangan wenxian huibian* [Compilation of archives of Macau issues in the Ming and Qing Dynasties], 423。

[37] 《湖广总督特成额奏呈盘获蔡伯多禄书信》*Huguang zongdu Te Cheng zoucheng panhuo Cai boduolu shuxin*, 中国第一历史档案馆 *Zhongguo diyi lishi danganguan* 编:《清中前期西洋天主教在华活动档案史料》第一册 *Qing zhongqianqi xiyang tianzhujiao zaihua huodong dangan shiliao Book1* [Historical Files of Western Catholic Activities in China in the Early Qing Dynasty], 346。

[38] 参见吴伯娅 *WU Boya*, 《蔡伯多禄事考》*Caiboduolu shikao* [the Research of Peter Cai], 肖清和 *XIAO Qinghe* 编:《宗教与历史》(第五辑) *Zongjiao yu lishi Vol. 5* [religion and History], 144。

内地民人,岂容尔等包庇藏匿?倘敢抗违,定即封澳严查,从重办理该夷人等。”^[39]经过官方的数次交涉,澳门方面均以并无藏匿蔡伯多禄作为答复。官府对澳门西洋人容留内地人民的场所一一遍查,均无果。最后孙士毅雇佣几个基督徒去澳门诱捕,但均以失败告终。蔡伯多禄好像人间蒸发了。据一些外国学者推测,蔡氏经由澳门,乘船去了果阿。龙思泰写道:“秘密接引神甫的主要支持者蔡伯多禄逃跑了,他离开广州来到澳门,并乘船前往果阿。他的犯罪的同伴中几乎没有人能自夸有这样九死一生的经历。他们中的一些人,被捕时一见到刑具,便失去了刚毅,以殉道者的花冠换取屈辱凄凉的生活。”^[40]有学者认为:

乾隆四十九年教案爆发后,广东巡抚孙士毅在各地捕蔡伯多禄。蔡伯多禄摆脱了追捕,躲避在一位天主教徒药商的家中。并于 1784 年 9 月 26 日安全到达了方济各会女修道院。在孙士毅对澳门进行大搜索时,葡萄牙人并没有向孙士毅说实话,而是采纳了新任葡萄牙主教 Alexandre de Gouren 的建议护送蔡上船,并准备把他送往果阿。蔡伯多禄于 1784 年 11 月 30 日晚离开了中国。如此便知为何东南数省几轮搜捕都未将蔡伯多禄抓获。^[41]

历时一年,席卷十几个省,共有 18 名外国传教士和数百名中国教民被捕的全国性教案—蔡伯多禄案,随着“元凶”的脱逃,乾隆帝慢慢对蔡案失去兴趣,最终被迫放弃搜捕活动。

结语

通过对上述四个人物的研究可知,他们均与澳门结下了不解之缘。无论是“容教”时期的利玛窦,还是教难时期的高一志、曾德昭、蔡伯多禄等,他们都以澳门为事业的起点或困难时期的避难所。澳门都在他们的生涯中,进而在中西文化交流中,起到了“桥头堡”作用。“容教”时期的利玛窦,先是在澳门学习汉语,了解中国文化,进而在一次使其深受其害的骚乱中,意识到若想顺利传教,先需取得华人尊重,而这一关键在于“学术传教”,这为其后来的传教策略,乃至被称为“利玛窦规矩”的传教方式奠定基础。同时,受其传教经验的影响,耶稣会士在澳门积极筹办学校,推广汉语学习,不仅培养了一批精通汉语的东方传教士,而且促进了澳门当地的教育发展。至于利玛窦在中西文化交流中的重要作用,有学者曾提出如下观点:“明代出现的中西文化教育双向交流的过程中,利玛窦是一个辛勤的垦荒者,播种者,他做出了开拓性的贡献。”^[42]而在教难时期,高一志和曾德昭被遣送回澳门,在澳门进行休整后,潜回内地。在高一志的感召下,面对灾荒,地方士绅纷纷募捐救助,促进了当时绛州慈善事业的发展,将一种颇具近代性的公益实践引入到中国社会生活之中。曾德昭重回内地后,在西安目睹

[39] 《广东巡抚孙士毅奏报拿获蔡伯多禄并严查蔡伯多禄等事折》Guangdong xunfu Sun Shiyi zoubao nahuo xiebodoulu bing yanna caiboduolu deng shizhe,中国第一历史档案馆 Zhongguo diyi lishi dangangan 编:《清中前期西洋天主教在华活动档案史料》第一册 Qing zhongqianqi xiyang tianzhujiao zaihua huodong dangan shiliao Book1 [Historical Files of Western Catholic Activities in China in the Early Qing Dynasty], 382-383.

[40] 龙思泰 Anders LJUGSTEDT,《早期澳门史》Zaoqi Aomenshi [Early History of Macau],吴义雄 WU Yixiong 等译,章文钦 Zhang Wenqin 校注,209.

[41] 王宁 WANG Ning,《蔡伯多禄案研究》Caiboduolu an yanjiu [the study of Peter Cai's case], 2014, 80.

[42] 刘羨冰 LIU Xianbing,《澳门历史上双语人才的培养与中外文化教育交流》Aomen lishishang shuangyu rencai de peiyang yu zhongwai wenhuajiaoyu jiaoliu [Cultivation of Bilingual Talents and Sino-western Cultural and Educational Exchanges in Macau History],吴志良 WU Zhiliang,章文钦 ZHANG Wenqin 等著:《澳门—东西交汇第一门》Aomen—Dongxi Jiaohui Diyimen [Macau—the First Gate of Convergence of the East and West], 106.

景教碑后,译成西文。他的《大中华帝国志》也为欧洲人了解中国提供了新视角。蔡伯多禄案中,虽牵连甚众,但当事人蔡伯多禄能顺利逃过围追堵截,受益于澳门当时传教士的庇护。因此,在“禁教”时期,澳门为部分传教士和教民提供了一个避难所,为中西文化的正面冲突提供了一个缓冲地,从而也避免的大规模的中西冲突。试想,如果在“禁教”时期,当时官府以“大肆屠杀”的手段对待传教士和教民,或因此而封锁澳门,那么,中西文化交流的纽带可能随之被切断,中西间的沟通也许会因此受到阻塞。

在全球化早期阶段,澳门不仅是商人谋利、传教士入华传教的桥头堡,还是西方其他文化得以输入中土的中介。西方的热兵器、地理学、天文学、数学、绘画艺术、音乐,等等,大多是经由澳门传入中国内地的,而传教士介绍、翻译中国文化的作品也大多是经由澳门传入欧洲的。历史选择了澳门这个独特的弹丸之地,充当中西文化交流与早期现代性输入中国的津梁。而澳门的独特地位的获得与维系,可以说既充满了谋略、智慧,也伴随着骚乱、恐吓乃至勒索、贿赂等丑恶现象。但无论如何,澳门在全球化早期阶段充当的中西文化交流的桥头堡角色是不容否认的,也是值得珍视的。

English Title:

Globalization and Modernity: On the Bridgehead Status of Macao in the Early Cultural Exchange Between China and Europe

Shangyang SUN

Ph. D. , Peking University; Professor, Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies, Peking University, No. 5 Yiheyuan Road, Haidian District, Beijing, P. R. China 100871; Tel. +8613693058965; Email: sunsy1965@qq. com.

Jianbin GUO

Ph. D. Candidate, Peking University; Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies, Peking University, No. 5 Yiheyuan Road, Haidian District, Beijing, P. R. China 100871; Tel. +8618811580178; Email: guojianbin@pku. edu. cn.

Abstract: Late Ming dynasty is the early period of globalization, during which Macao became a significant bridge of cultural communication between China and Europe. Most Jesuit missionaries, such as Matteo Ricci (1552-1610) etc. , began to study Chinese language and culture upon their arrival in Macao, and then got into the mainland of China, where they made great contribution to the exchange between China and Europe. When the situation became harsh, Macao became a haven for some missionaries and Chinese Christians, which resulted in the minimization of conflict between both sides. With the case studies of Matteo Ricci, Alfonso Vagnone (1568-1640), Alvaro Semedo (1585-1658) and Pietro Zai (Cai Ruoxiang, 1739-1806), this article aims at demonstrating the role that Macao played as a bridgehead in the early period of cultural communication between China and Europe.

Key Words: Globalization; Modernity; Macao; Missionaries; Early Cultural Communication between China and Europe

教育人类学视角下的民族教育史一例

刘诗伯

(大理大学民族文化研究院, 671003, 大理 中国)

摘要:本文尝试以教育人类学的研究视角和理论方法,分析西方传教士在中国边疆民族地区的办学实践的一个案例,即英国传教士塞缪尔·柏格理(Samuel Pollard, 1864—1915)在贵州苗族地区石门坎办学的历史,探讨这些教育实践对我国民族教育从前现代教育阶段向现代教育阶段转变过程中所作的贡献,从中总结其教育思想与理念的历史价值。

关键词:教育人类学、基督教、民族教育、传教士

作者:刘诗伯,法学博士(人类学),大理大学民族文化研究院。地址:云南省大理市大理古城弘圣路2号,671003,大理市,云南省,中国。电话:13128622141。电子邮箱:nature_self@163.com

一、教育人类学的学术关怀

教育人类学是人类学的分支学科,也有学者将其视为为人类学与教育学的交叉学科。它运用人类学的原理和方法去研究人类社会的教育实践活动,通过对不同地域、不同文化、不同历史时期的人类群体的教育活动进行深入考察,探索和总结人类社会的教育规律和特点,其目的是为人类社会实现更理想、更优质、更有效的教育提供科学依据和理论方法。

人类学的一个重要学科特色,就是既认同作为一个生物种群的人类具有广泛的共性,同时也承认并尊重人类不同群体的文化差异性,因此而成为近一个世纪以来学术界、知识界、文化界反对种族主义和文化霸权主义的重要理论依据之一。中国大陆的一位民族地区高校负责人曾总结道:“人类学的理论对多元文化的理解和尊重不无裨益。虽然人类学的不同学派各有短长与不足,但从人类学学科发展的过程来看,对多元文化及其价值的倡导始终是学科的一个重要趋向。”^[1]

具体到人类学在教育领域的应用,我国教育学专家在分析教育人类学诞生的历史及其原因时指出:“教育人类学在西方的崛起,有两个最重要的因素,一是经过文艺复兴运动、新教改革运动和工业革命运动,人的主体性日益确立,人的发展日益重要,教育如何适合新社会发展、培养新型人才、以解决社会发展的重大问题备受社会的广泛关注;二是多元社会的崛起,需要教育人类学这种具有更综合、更深刻功能的跨学科研究,以全新的视角来研究和审视教育,提供新的教育认识,参与多元化教育

[1] 索端智 SUO Duanzhi, “论多元文化与互相尊重——从人类学的多元文化观谈起 Lun duoyuan wenhua yu huxiang zunzhong; cong renleixue de duoyuan wenhuaguan tanqi” [On Multiculturalism and Mutual Respect], in《青海民族研究》Qinghai minzu yanjiu [Qinghai Journal of Ethnology], No. 7(西宁 Xining, 2003), 49.

实践, 致力于创建本民族特色的现代教育体系。”〔2〕以人类学研究及应用较为普及的美国为例, “人类学家的参与是美国教育人类学学科发展的重要推动力量。关注少数族裔和弱势群体的教育问题, 以此捍卫社会公正, 是美国教育人类学研究的重要特色。”〔3〕

对照英国内地会传教士柏格理(Samuel Pollard)在贵州苗族地区石门坎兴教办学的诸多举措和实践, 我们可以看到, 他创办的教育事业正好体现了教育人类学所关注和倡导的多项重要内容。〔4〕

下文将从西方传教士所代表的外来文化如何与中国民族地区的本土文化交汇融和、新教改革和工业革命所产生的现代科学知识体系如何在低生产力水平的农业社会普及与应用、人类学者所说的“地方性知识”(local knowledge)如何更新并最终实现民族地区教育水平的显著提高等几个方面加以讨论。

二、对民族历史及文化传统的尊重

人类学的历史研究发现, 两个或多个异质文化相遇触碰时, 可能出现的局面主要有这样几种类型的状况: 文化张力产生文化冲突、文化采借促成文化整合、文化融合导致文化变迁, 但这些过程却经常与令人遗憾和痛心的紧张、对抗、暴力、征服相伴随。一位美国人类学家在其研究中提出, 历史上的政治强势集团“通常有五种自上而下针对异质性文化的管理模式”, 其中四种分别是“屠杀、同化、区域隔离、整合”, 其导致的后果不言而喻。她认为“现代社会所努力寻求的”较为理想和可行的模式是第五种, 即“实行文化多元主义”。〔5〕

作为一个学科的存在价值的体现, 如何避免历史上的族群对立、撕裂、动乱等悲剧重演, 让社会各群体在不同文化的接触交汇过程中保持开放、和谐, 相互取长补短, 实现共同发展和进步, 一直是文化人类学与教育人类学特别关注的课题。

作为传教士的柏格理清楚知道基督教最早的传教历史, 因为圣经详细记载了初期基督教会处理外族传统文化问题的经过。公元第一世纪当基督教从犹太地区传到亚欧其他区域时, 传教使者即面对如何看待非犹太民族原有的历史文化的问题, 归入基督教的外族信徒应否遵守犹太民族的宗教律法、是否要放弃本民族的文化传统? 这些问题在基督教内部曾一度产生争议, 结果教会通过第一次耶路撒冷会议作出决议, 并向外族的基督徒致函表示: “因为圣灵和我们定意不将别重担放在你们身上, 唯有几件事是不可少的, 就是禁戒祭偶像的物和血, 并勒死的牲畜和奸淫。这几件你们若能自己禁戒不犯就好了。”〔6〕这说明, 除了关乎基督教核心教义的几项基本行为准则以外, 非犹太裔的基督徒无需刻意改变自己原有的民族文化和历史传统, 更不必改变自己的民族身份认同。这成为后来基

〔2〕 冯增俊 FENG Zengjun, “论中国教育人类学的学科主题 Lun zhongguo jiaoyu renleixue de xueke zhuti” [On the Subject Theme of Educational Anthropology in China], in《民族教育研究》*Minzu jiaoyu yanjiu* [Journal of Research on Education for Ethnic Minorities], No. 1(北京 Beijing, 2008), 29.

〔3〕 陈学金 CHEN Xuejin, “美国文化人类学与教育的融合及其发展 Meiguowenhua renleixue yu jiaoyu de ronghe jiqi fazhan” [The Integration and Development of American Cultural Anthropology and Education], in《贵州民族研究》*Guizhou minzu yanjiu* [Guizhou Ethnic Studies], No. 2(贵阳 Guiyang, 2014), 165.

〔4〕 柏格理 Samuel Pollard、邵慕廉 F. J. Dymond 等, 《在未知的中国》*Zai weizhi de zhongguo* [In Unknown China], 东人达 Dong Renda、东旻 Dong Wen 译(昆明 Kunming, 云南民族出版社 Yunnan minzu chubanshe [Nationalities Publishing House of Yunnan], 2002).

〔5〕 赛诺妮-隆 E. L. CERRONI-LONG, “多元文化教育中的人类学作用”*Duoyuan wenhua jiaoyu zhong de renleixue zuoyong* [The Anthropological Role in Multicultural Education], 李乔杨 LI Qiaoyang、张培青 ZHANG Peiqing 译, in《民族论坛》*Minzuluntan* [Minzu Tribune], No. 4(北京 Beijing, 2015), 29-33.

〔6〕 新约圣经《使徒行传》*Xinyueshengjing shituxingchuan* [Bible: Acts], 15: 28-29.

督教向各地宣教时遵循的一项重要原则,近代来华的天主教、新教以及东正教大都如此。^[7]

显然,柏格理也将圣经的上述原则应用于他创办的石门坎地区民族教育之中。例如,民族语言是最重要的民族特征,也是传承民族文化最重要的载体,这已是公认的客观事实和基本常识。因此,柏格理为苗族创造苗文,其意义和作用不仅仅是为扫盲和阅读圣经之便,同时也是让苗族文化从口传变成文字记录,从而获得更好的保存并发扬光大。在苗文推广的过程中,柏格理根据本土文化而编写的《苗族原始读本》,包括了苗族的历史传说、歌谣、民间故事,以及本地民众的日常生活等内容。

继柏格理之后,其他传教士和本土知识分子根据不同苗语方言继续完善和编创苗文,他们的苗文创作给整个苗族地区带来了被后来一位语言学家称为“久远而深刻的影响”,被形容为“苗族社会发展进程与我国近代社会历史巨变发生碰撞闪烁出来的火花。”这位专家研究黔东南山区传唱至今的用澳大利亚传教士创造的苗文所编写的福音诗歌,发现“唱经诗中融入了苗族信众自己的生活,本土化、民族化在文化传播过程中的作用是不言而喻的。”“这不禁让我们感叹,民间的草根文化远比我们想象的顽强,它们以其特有的生命力潜滋漫长,绵延着那一息尚存的文化薪火。”^[8]

除了扫盲教育和创办学校外,传教士在被视为其“主要工作”的传教过程中,也遵从同样的原则。对于希望受洗加入基督教会的应用者,柏格理只提出五项要求:

1. 戒除鸦片;
2. 戒酒、戒赌;
3. 每逢礼拜日停止做生意;
4. 不再畜养奴隶。

5. 所有申请接受洗礼的人必须接受为期六个月的考验,观察其行为是否因信仰而发生根本改变,以此检验他们是否可以真正实践基督教信仰。^[9]

从上述条件可知,传教士关注的主要是道德方面的改善,而不是要改变本地民族的传统文化和民族特性。相反,他们在尽力寻求中国传统文化与基督教信仰可能的契合点。^[10]

三、基督教的科学教育观

在过往讨论石门坎以及其他地区教会学校的教育实践时,国内一些论者基于“科学与宗教必然对立”的习惯观念,强调传教士办学只是作为其传教的辅助手段,认为在华教会学校取得的教育成就,只是“无心插柳”的“意外”间接效果。这样的分析和结论忽略了对基督教教育理念及其历史的深入考察和认识。

首先,从其个人的教育背景可知,出身普通工人家庭的柏格理从小接受英国的公学教育,并以优异的成绩毕业,17岁即考取政府机关的公务员职位。当时的英国公学实行的是基督教教育,圣经和神

[7] Alexander V. LOMANOV, "Issues of Chinese Culture and Religion in Periodicals of the Russian Ecclesiastical Mission in Peking (1904-1917)", in *International Journal of Sino-Western Studies*, vol. 14 (Helsinki, 2018), 143-161.

[8] 王贵生 WANG Guisheng, "黔东南老苗文的历史及现状的调查和研究 Qian dongnan laomiaowen de lishi ji xianzhuang de diaocha he yanjiu" [Investigation and Research on the History and Present Situation of Old Miao Language in Southeast Guizhou], in 《凯里学院学报》*Kaili xueyuan xuebao* [Journal of Kaili University], No. 5 (贵州 Guizhou, 2010), 57.

[9] 格里斯特 W. A. SIEGRIST, 《塞缪尔·柏格理——在华传教士的开拓者》*Saimiuer Bogeli: zai hua chuanjiaoshi de kaituoze* [Samuel Pollard, Pioneer Missionary in China], 东人达 Dong renda、东旻 Dong Wen 译, (北京 Beijing, 中国文史出版社 zhongguo wenshi chubanshe [China Culture and History Press], 2018).

[10] 孟广林 MENG Guanglin, "中西文化传统中的‘神(天)’人关系观" [Relations between "God/Heaven" and Man in the Chinese and Western Cultural Traditions], in 《国学与西学国际学刊》*Guoxue yu xixue guoji xuekan* [International Journal of Sino-Western Studies], Vol. 10 (赫尔辛基 Helsinki, 2016), 85-94.

学是必修课, 研读圣经所用的希腊文和拉丁文也是必学的语言, 但学生同时学习天文、地理、数学、物理、化学、生物等自然科学, 以及文学、戏剧、历史等人文科学, 还有逻辑学、古典哲学等, 严谨和高质量的公学教育为英国社会培养了大量精英人才, 也使英国成为当时世界上文化、教育、科技水平最先进的国家之一。事实上, 基督教教育不等同于人们所知道的神学教育或经院教育, 后者专为培养教会神职人员而设, 前者则是以基督教信仰为办学理念的、面向社会大众的普通教育, 而柏格理本人就是这一教育的受惠者。不难理解, 由于他对基督教教育有切身体会和感受, 自然也认定这种教育不但适合而且可以造福不同地区和不同文化的人群。

细看柏格理时代的英国基督教教育, 我们需要了解和认识的是, 经过近两千年曲折坎坷发展历程的基督教, 在西方社会已经进入到世界历史上科学技术文明和教育水平最高的时期, 而现代科学正是从基督教中孕育诞生的。^[11] 正如清华大学的科学史专家所指出: 基督教的“创世观念、自然定律(自然法)的原则、《圣经》关于统治自然界的命令等等, 都为科学活动提供了关键动机和辩护,” “没有基督教就不可能产生西方近现代科学。” “如果没有基督教和自然神学这个母体, 科学是不可能获得今天这样的权威认知地位的。”^[12]

到了柏格理接受教育的年代, 以英国物理学家、数学家牛顿、莱布尼兹等人为代表的自然科学家所奠基的现代科学体系已经发展到相当成熟的阶段, 并且广泛普及到欧洲和北美的基础教育之中。这些国家和地区的基础教育仍然属于基督教教育, 是一种植根于基督教信仰、以基督教理念为指导原则的现代普及教育, 它与现代工业文明社会的发展和需求相适应。当时并未出现后来的“宗教与公立教育分离”的情况, 更未到“后现代主义”思潮在西方大行其道的时候。

因此, 作为一直接受基督教教育的传教士柏格理, 其思想意识中并不存在“科学与基督教信仰必然冲突”的观念, 相反, 他相信两者是完全可以而且必须互相结合的。倡导、传授、普及现代科学知识, 消除愚昧和巫术迷信, 既是传播基督教的必然需要, 也是苗族地区从封闭落后的前现代社会迈向现代文明的需要。因此, 在他创办的石门坎教育事业中, 将现代科学作为学习的必要内容, 是理所当然的。这既不是偶然或巧合, 也不是作为权宜之计暂且借用的传教辅助手段。培养有信仰、有现代科学知识技能及文明意识的新一代苗族人才, 本来就是柏格理的办学目标。

基于这样的目标, 柏格理办学所设置的课程体系是以基督教教育理念为原则、以现代科学体系为知识框架、以当地社会实际需求为优先考虑的。这样的设置符合教育发展的自身规律。有研究者将柏格理的课程内容总结为五个方面——以人为本的课程价值取向、扫盲教育与精英教育相结合的课程目标、“自下而上”的课程思路、“农业-科学-教育”相结合的课程实践、以人与社会协调发展为标准的课程评价。^[13]

实践证明, 柏格理推行的这一教育模式, 切实有效地回应了当地民族的真实需求, 因而在短短几

[11] 爱德华·格兰特 Edward GGRANT, 《近代科学在中世纪的基础》*Jindai kexue zai zhongshiji de jichu* [The Foundations of Modern Science in the Middle Ages Their Religious, Institutional and Intellectual Contexts], 张卜天 Zhang Butian 译(长沙 Changsha, 湖南科学技术出版社 Hunan kexue jishu chubanshe [Hunan Science and Technology Press], 2010); 玛格丽特·奥斯勒 Margaret J. OSLER, 《重构世界: 从中世纪到近代欧洲的自然、上帝与人类认识》*Chonggou shijie: cong zhongshiji dao jindai ouzhou de ziran shangdi yu renlei renshi* [Reconfiguring the World: Nature, God and Human Understanding from the Middle Ages to Early Modern Europe], 张卜天 ZHANG Butian 译(长沙 Changsha, 湖南科学技术出版社 Hunan kexuejishu chubanshe [Hunan Science and Technology Press], 2012).

[12] 张卜天 ZHANG Butian, “‘科学’与‘宗教’概念的演变 *Kexue yu zongjiao gainian de yanbian*” [The Evolvement of the Concepts of Science and Religion], in《自然辩证法通讯》*Ziran bianzhengfa tongxun* [Journal of Dialectics of Nature], No. 3(北京 Beijing, 2017), 152.

[13] 苑青松 YUAN Qingsong, 《柏格理先前教育中课程经验研究》*Bogeli xianqian jiaoyu zhong kecheng jingyan yanjiu* [A Study of Course Experience in Samuel Pollard's Previous Education](贵阳 Guiyang: 贵州师范大学硕士论文 Guizhou Shifandaxue shuoshi lunwen [Master's thesis of Guizhou Normal University], 2008).

十年的时间内就大幅度提高了当地民众的文化教育水平,令偏远的石门坎山寨成为举世瞩目的“教育奇迹”之地。^[14]

四、植根本土的教育创举

过去人们习惯性地传教士在华兴办的教育称为“西式教育”(与“中式教育”相对),而不是“现代教育”(与“传统教育”相对),因此不少论者更多着眼于其“外来性”,以凸显其来源的地域差异,却忽略了它本身兼具的“国际性”和“本土性”。其实,只要对现代教育在中国(包括民族地区)落地生根、蓬勃发展的历史过程、生长机理以及内在规律进行细致分析和深入研究,就不难想象:若果仅仅是简单地贩运和移植一种水土不服的“文化舶来品”,是不可能在中国大地上开花结果的。

正如北京师范大学一位裕固族的教育人类学专家所言:“学校教育文化选择研究是教育人类学的核心研究主题,其根本论题是如何看待和处理现代性与多样性的关系问题。”^[15]若以教育人类学的这一视角去考察柏格理实施的教学方法和设立的课程体系,即可发现:他虽然引进了基督教的现代教育及其学科框架,但他并没有完全照搬西方教会学校的模式。^[16]前述的使用本土语言进行教学、教材编写结合本地文化和生活等做法,其目的何在?实际上,传教士们是在努力探索一种具有现代性的本土教育,这无疑苗族教育史上的一项创举。所有考察和研究过石门坎地区学校发展历史的学者,都不会得出这些学校是英国学校而不是本土苗族学校的判断。^[17]

其实,柏格理只是将前辈传教士的首创应用于石门坎地区而已。这种国际化与本土化结合的教育模式,其源头应追溯至新教第一位来华传教士、柏格理的英国同胞马礼逊(Robert Morrison),以及由他所开创的近代华人教育事业。

马礼逊于1818年在南洋马六甲创办了面向华人的英华书院(The Anglo-Chinese College),此后数十年间,英华书院一直是新教传教士开办的规模和影响力最大的华人文教机构。该院从办学宗旨、

[14] 东人达 DONG Renda,“近代民族教育的一项创举——滇黔川边石门坎教育体系述评 Jindai minzu jiaoyu de yixiang chuanguju;dianqianchuanbian shimenkan jiaoyu tixi shuping”[An Initiative of Modern Ethnic Education: A Review of Shimenkan Education System on the Border of Yunnan, Guizhou and Sichuan], in《贵州民族研究》Guizhou minzu yanjiu [Guizhou Ethnic Studies], No. 4(贵阳 Guiyang, 2004), 133-140; 何嵩昱 HE Songxu,“石门坎‘教育神话’对当代西部民族地区农村基础教育的启示 Shimenkan jiaoyu shenhua dui dangdai xibu minzu diqu nongcun jichu jiaoyu de qishi”[The Enlightenment of Shimenkan’s “Educational Myth” to the Rural Basic Education in Contemporary Western Ethnic Areas in China], in《教育文化论坛》Jiaoyu wenhua luntan [Tribune of Education Culture], No. 3(北京 Beijing, 2012), 122-127; 李世平 LI Shiping,“试论西方宗教对西南少数民族教育的影响 Shilun xifang zongjiao dui xinan shaoshuminzu jiaoyu de yingxiang”[On the Influence of Western Religion on the Education of Minority in Southwest China], in《西南师范大学学报》(哲学社会科学版) Xinan shi fan daxue xuebao [Journal of Southwest Normal University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)], No. 2 (Chengdu: 1995), 42-47.

[15] 巴战龙 BA Zhanlong,“学校教育文化选择研究的根本论题和基本视角 Xuexiao jiaoyu wenhua xuanze yanjiu de genben lunti he jiben shijiao”[Fundamental Theme and Basic Perspective of School Educational Culture Choice Research], in《全球教育展望》Quanqiu jiaoyu zhanwang [Global Education], No. 1(北京 Beijing: 2018), 106.

[16] 陈学金 CHEN Xuejin,“文化多样性与学校教育: 西方国家的实践及中国的历程 Wenhua duoyangxing yu xuexiao jiaoyu: xifang guojia de shijian ji zhongguo de lichen”[Cultural Diversity and School Education: Practices in the West and China], in《广西民族研究》Guangxi minzu yanjiu [Guangxi Ethnic Studies] No. 1(南宁 Nanning, 2018), 99-107.

[17] 张坦 ZHANG Tan,《“窄门”前的石门坎: 基督教文化与川黔边苗族社会》Zhaimenqian de shimenkan: jidujiao wenhua yu chuanqianbian miaozu shehui [Shimenkan in front of Narrow Gate: Christian Culture and Miao Society in Sichuan-Guizhou Border] (昆明 Kunming, 云南教育出版社 Yunnan jiaoyu chubanshe [Yunnan Educational Publishing House], 1992; 贵阳 Guiyang, 贵州大学出版社 Guizhou daxue chubanshe [Guizhou University Press], 2009); 何幼兰 HE Youlan,“从近代石门坎民族教育得到的启示 Cong jindai shimenkan minzu jiaoyu dedao de qishi”[Enlightenment from Modern Shimenkan Ethnic Education], in《云南民族大学学报》(哲学社会科学版) Yunnan minzu daxue xuebao [Journal of Yunnan University for Nationalities (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)], No. 2 (昆明 Kunming: 2007), 48-50.

招生条件、师资要求,到教学制度、教学内容及形式等各个方面,为中国的现代教育体系确立了最初的基础。正如中山大学一位近代史研究专家所总结:马礼逊及其助手米怜(William Milne)“将中西方语言、历史文化和科学的交流,与促进基督教在中国的传播,作为书院的两个目标,可以说奠定了近代基督教新教在华开展教育活动的思想。”^[18]此后,包括柏格理在内的传教士们,承继马礼逊开拓之先河,在中国的学前教育、初等教育、中等教育、高等教育、职业教育、特殊教育、妇女教育、成人教育、民族教育等各个领域着力耕耘,促进了现代教育体系在中国的逐步形成和持续发展。

一位知名的文化历史学家将 1895-1920 年称为我国历史的“转型时期”,是“从传统过渡到现代、承先启后的关键时代。”他提到这个时代转型的重要标志之一,就是国内“新式学校”和“现代教育制度”的兴起,具体表现在“新式学堂的普遍建立,以建立新学制与吸收新知识为主要目的。”以高等教育为例,截至 1949 年全国共有约 110 所大专院校,其中占五分之四的 87 所都是创立于这个“转型时期”,当中的 21 所公私私立大学“几乎包括了二十世纪中国著名的大学及学术思想重镇,”^[19]而这里面又有将近一半是闻名于世的中国教会大学。毋庸置疑,以现代教育为特色的各级新式学校,对中国的社会发展和进步做出了重要贡献。

“前人栽树,后人乘凉。”今天,我们应该重新认识中国社会发展和教育发展的历史。现代教育虽然是由西方传教士引进、倡导并在中国土地上初创、实施,但它从一开始就是中国教育而不是外国教育,是中国教育从前现代形态向现代形态的转变,是中国教育从旧的历史阶段向新的历史阶段的演变和发展。^[20]它可以视为全球教育发展和进步的一个构成部分,但它并不是中国教育和中华文明的异质化,更不意味着中华各族文化将因此而断绝和消亡。

五、立足于差异性发展的人才培养

毫无疑问,教育的根本目的是培育人才。而民族地区的教育,当然就是培养本民族的人才。但是,人才的定义究竟是什么?回顾中国历史可知,延续千年的科举制深刻影响了中国的教育制度与实践,并成为国人文化深层意识的一部分,至今仍有很多人认为教育的最终目的,就是通过层层考试去“选拔优才”。我国有教育专家对此评论道:“科举考试严重脱离社会实际,造成教育与人的发展的背离,教育成了少数人剥夺多数人发展的工具,”它“排斥和扼杀了教育的文化创新功能,”“只是一代代地复制着旧的社会制度,无力对新社会发展挑战做出创新性策应。”^[21]他同时指出,这种教育制度导致人们习惯思维的后果就是:“不重视文化问题的教育研究,把所有的教育都看成一模一样,简单的读

[18] 吴义雄 WU Yixiong,《在宗教与世俗之间——基督教新教传教士在华南沿海地区的早期活动研究》*Zai zongjiao yu shisu zhijian:jidujiao xinjiao chunjiaoshi zai huanan yanhai diqu de zaoqi huodong yanjiu* [Between Religion and Secularity: Early Activities of Protestant Christian Missionaries in the Coastal Areas of South China](广州 Guangzhou:广东教育出版社 Guangdong jiaoyu chubanshe [Guangdong Education Press], 2000), 333.

[19] 张灏 ZHANG Hao,“中国近代思想史的转型时代 Zhongguo jindai sixianshi de zhuanxing shidai” [The Transitional Era of Modern Chinese Ideological History], in《二十一世纪》双月刊 *Ershiyi shiji* [Twenty-first Century] Bimonthly, (香港 HongKong: April 1999), 29-39.

[20] 沈红 SHEN Hong,《石门坎文化百年兴衰:中国西南一个山村的现代性经历》*Shimenkan wenhua bainian xingshuai: zhongguo xinan yige shancun de xiandaixing jingli* [Modernity Through Grassroots Lens: The Cultural Transformation of Ethnic Community in Southwestern China](北京 Beijing, 万卷出版公司 Wanjuan chubanshe [Volumes Publishing Company], 2006).

[21] 冯增俊 FENG Zengjun,“论中国教育人类学的学科主题 Lun zhongguo jiaoyu renleixue de xueke zhuti” [On the Subject Theme of Educational Anthropology in China], in《民族教育研究》*Minzu jiaoyu yanjiu* [Journal of Research on Education for Ethnic Minorities], No. 1 (北京 Beijing: 2008), 33.

书考试,忽视了教育的文化性和差异性。”“偏重分数的教育观使教育难以摆脱小农经济的功名教育体系。”^[22]

具体到石门坎教育的发展,人们谈论其历史成就时通常举出的例子就是:“从这里走出了世界第一个苗族博士。”但是,若仔细分析产生“第一个苗族博士”的石门坎民族教育的具体实践经验,就可发现:虽然柏格理本人就读的英国公学后来逐渐发展成当地少数人的精英教育,但他在石门坎地区推行的并不是我们所熟悉的那种传统精英主义教育以及体现这种教育思维的应试教育,而是适合各个层次和不同人群的、重视人的差异性的现代全人教育(又称素质教育)。

柏格理显然借鉴了英国著名教育家爱德华·思林(Edward Thring)在“厄平汉(Uppinghmn)公学改革”中提出的两条重要教学原则:一是“意识到每位学生,无论聪颖还是愚笨,都必须得到个别关照”;二是“为了有效地关照每位学生,学校必须具备足够的校舍和设施以确保广泛活动的开展。”思林在其主导的公学改革过程中,坚持将基督教信仰教育与对学生的人文关怀相结合,注重学生的个体差异性和学习的自主性,并积极推进体育运动等非考试科目的开展,强调综合素质教育的重要性。他明确提出:“在我们学校里,每个学生都有自己感兴趣的事可做,我们不让任何学生掉队。无论聪明还是笨拙,必须尽最大努力去教育和培训每一个孩子,这是我校制度的重要组成部分。”^[23]这个理念的推行,令他主持的厄平汉公学从一间籍籍无名的乡村学校变成声誉鹊起的英格兰“名校”,许多优秀的毕业生还获得牛津大学的奖学金。我们从“第一代苗族博士”朱焕章的成长经历、产生这位苗族青年才俊的石门坎学校的办学理念、教学管理及其最终取得的成就、以及朱焕章学有所成后拒绝在城市为官而返回家乡从事山村教育的事迹之中,可以看到厄平汉公学改革的影子以及思林教育思想的成果体现。

与此相反,无论在西方还是在中国,“为国家选拔上层统治精英分子”都是传统精英主义应试教育的最重要特征,其方式是大量重复性的练习和层层加码的考试,而且往往还冠以“注重教学质量”之名,但实际上却是一轮又一轮持久漫长的“淘汰赛”,不断将考试的“失败者”淘汰出局,却不注重学生在非应试方面的其他能力和优势。

十九世纪从托马斯·阿诺德(Thomas Arnold)到爱德华·思林的英国公学改革,恰恰是对他们本国这种传统教育模式的变革乃至颠覆,以适应当时英国社会的变化发展。而受益于这一改革的柏格理,则将他们的教育思想应用到石门坎苗族山村的办学之中。

换言之,“教育产出精英”与“精英主义教育”不是一回事。“第一个苗族博士”在石门坎的出现与成长,只是柏格理推行全人教育的顺理成章、水到渠成的结果之一,而不是他最初的刻意设计和竭力追求的主要目标。我们在分析这段历史及其成就时不应倒果为因,误以为柏格理实行的是一种精英主义的应试教育,不同之处仅仅是在教学内容上将中国传统的四书五经和八股文改成圣经和新科学知识而已,却忽略了新旧两种教育模式在基本理念和目标上的重要差别。

六、结语

综上所述,以教育人类学视角分析柏格理在石门坎的办学实践,我们可以看到:体现在民族教育领域中的“柏格理教育思想”,除了其忠实虔诚的基督教信仰和令人钦佩的奉献精神之外,至少还包含

[22] 冯增俊 FENG Zengjun、周红莉 Zhou Hongli,“论中国教育人类学的学科意义 Lun zhongguo jiaoyu renleixue de xueke yiyi” [Disciplinary Significance of Educational Anthropology in China], in《当代教育与文化》*Dangdai jiaoyu yu wenhua* [Contemporary Education and Culture], No. 2 (北京 Beijing: 2011), 6.

[23] J. ROACH, *A History of Secondary Education in England 1800—1870*. (UK: Longman, 1986), 252.

了“尊重民族历史文化”、“注重全人教育”、“倡导科学文明”、“国际性与本土化结合”等多个方面。正是这些教育思想和实践塑造了当年石门坎地方的教育形态,造就了西南苗族地区一枝独秀的“教育神话”。

今天,世界经济发达国家和地区已经进入所谓“后工业社会”,与现代科技日新月异迅猛发展相伴的,是“文化多元主义”旗号之下的“后现代主义”“解构主义”“道德相对主义”“进步主义”“技术主义”等各种充满争议的思潮和理论在西方社会的流行和泛滥。这一系列思潮以及由此而来的各类所谓“政治正确”的主张,深刻影响了西方的当代教育,使之与马礼逊、柏格理等人所处的年代早已不可同日而语。

自明末利玛窦来华后,基督教与近代科学同时传入中国,并在中国的思想学术界和文化教育界内引发了中西文明交汇与碰撞的话题,置身其中的传教士们大都努力尝试“超越差异,探索文化的共通之处”,^[24]但这种尝试并非总能取得理想的效果。著名历史学家、教育家章开沅先生在总结国内过去百多年来的争论时感叹道:“近代以来,我们已经为周而复始的‘体’‘用’之争、西化论与本位论之争耗费了太多的时间。”^[25]跨入新世纪之后,继续重复这类争论确实未必能有效解决眼前的现实问题。“教育要面向现代化、面向世界、面向未来”^[26]不仅仅是一个口号,而应该是中国教育发展始终坚持的方向。教育是民族复兴的希望所在。回顾柏格理在石门坎办学的历史,那曾经的辉煌里蕴含着丰富的价值和宝藏,足以引发我们的思考和反省,使我们在全球不断变化的形势以及各种教育理念和思潮的冲击面前,能够做出审慎而正确的分辨、应对与选择。

[24] 世光 SHI Guang 2016:“超越差异探索文化的共通之处——〈利玛窦:紫禁城里的耶稣会士〉评介 Chaoyue chayi tansuo wenhua de gongtong zhi chu——Li Madou:Zijincheng li de Yesuhui shi” [Beyond Difference:Exploring the Intersection of Cultures. A Review of R. Po-Chia Hsia's Matteo Ricci: The Jesuits in the Forbidden City], in《国学与西学国际学刊》*International Journal of Sino-Western Studies*, vol. 10 (赫尔辛基 Helsinki:2016), 119-122.

[25] 章开沅 ZHANG Kaiyuan、陈才俊 CHEN Caijun,“价值体系的重建与人类文明的重构 Jiazhi tixi de chongjian yu renlei wenming de chongguo” [Reconstruction of Value System and Reconstruction of Human Civilization], in《南国学术》*Nanguo xueshu* [South China Quarterly], No. 2 (澳门 Macao:2014), 19.

[26] 1983 年 10 月 1 日邓小平 Deng Xiaoping 为北京景山学校的题词。

English Title:

An Example of Ethnic Education History from the Perspective of Educational Anthropology

LIU Shibo

Ph. D. (Anthropology), Professor, Institute of National Culture Research, Dali University. Address: No. 2, Hongsheng Road, Dali Old City, 671003, Dali, Yunnan, China. E-mail: nature_self@163.com

Abstract: Using the perspective and theoretical methods of educational anthropology, this paper attempts to analyze a case of Western missionary practice of schooling in China's minority areas, namely, the history of Rev. Samuel Pollard (1864-1915), a British missionary, in Shimenkan, Guizhou Province, and to discuss his contribution to ethnic education in its transformation from pre-modern education stage to modern education stage, thereby summarizing the historical value of his educational ideas and concepts.

Key Words: Educational anthropology, Christian, Ethnic education, Missionary

比较宗教文化研究

Comparative Religious and Cultural Studies

“窥视诸神的诞生”对偶像崇拜的形成的一个哲学诠释

戴永富^[1]

(新加坡神学院副教授)

摘要:根据本文诠释,偶像崇拜是出于人的自欺性自我防卫机制,而这机制是在人面对自身脆弱和外在现实的威胁时被启动的。人在此通过使其自我价值绝对化而冲淡客观因素所带来的威胁。但要达到这目的,人需要借用世上的某种寄托(如:财富)来构造出一个他自己能倚靠的自我形象(如:我是富人)。但这种自我形象还受到无常现实的威胁,所以人选择以加深自己对其寄托的依赖而压制那寄托的不稳定性,因而进一步加强其自我形象。如此,被神化的既是人的自我,也是人用于神化自己的寄托,而所谓偶像大体上是由虚假的自我形象及其支撑组成的。照此,偶像的生产逻辑是人以加强其迷恋这主观条件来压制客观条件的威胁。那么,偶像耐人寻思地集这些自相矛盾的特性于一身:受制于人却控制人、为人所造却塑造人。这种现象与马克思所说的拜物教和异化相似,即偶像变成一个几乎独立于人而损耗人性的异己。之所以如此,根因是人硬逼偶像承担它无法履行的任务,而这最后给人带来了他们自己无法承受的代价。

关键词:偶像崇拜;自我防卫机制;自我形象;现实;异化

作者:戴永富,新加坡神学院副教授, Singapore Bible College(新加坡神学院), 9-15 Adam Road, Singapore 289886. Phone:(+65)-655-91555;email:yongfu.meiling@gmail.com

一、导论

偶像崇拜这概念是圣经对西方思想的一个重要贡献。基督教继承了犹太教的偶像批判,并赋予偶像崇拜以更具哲理性的内涵。从此,偶像所指的不仅是虚构而受拜的神明,更是世上一切为了服务人的需要而被人神化的事物。因此,人总是离不开宗教生活:古人若崇拜巴力和宙斯,今人则敬拜功名利禄。那么,本文的写作目的是通过以基督教致善主义(perfectionism)^[2]为视角的哲学诠释而开掘偶像崇拜的更深层内涵。基督教致善主义把幸福定义为人性自我的完善,^[3]而人通过与神联合方能实现之。照此,基督教偶像崇拜观与费尔巴哈的宗教批判都视假神崇拜为一种去人性化机制。^[4]

[1] 美国普度大学哲学博士(宗教分析哲学),美国加尔文大学文学士(哲学);Ph. D.,Purdue University,USA;B. A. (Hons), Calvin College, USA.

[2] 奥古斯丁、阿奎那,和加尔文在不同程度上都提倡基督教致善主义。Thomas HURKA,Perfectionism,(NY:Oxford Univ. Press,1996)是西方致善主义哲学传统的一个好介绍。

[3] 人性和自我虽是不同概念,但基督教哲学传统强调,正确的自我认识是完善人性的必要条件。

[4] 费尔巴哈,马克思,及弗洛伊德等怀疑大师认为,人为了逃避苦难和脆弱而屈服于自己的思想产物,因此无法认清自己及自身的痛苦而不能充分实现人性。他们在一定程度上用了基督教的偶像批判工具来批判宗教(参阅 Merold WESTPHAL 1998: *Suspicion and Faith*, Grand Rapids; Eerdmans).

本文是以偶像的形成过程为论述框架。人心若好比制造偶像的工厂,^[5]那么,自我防卫是其运作机制的性质,而自我欺骗为其生产工具。进言之,偶像崇拜是出于人在面对威胁自己的客观现实时所采取的一个自我防卫策略,而这策略是关于人如何通过极度强化其主观因素或渴望而压制客观因素的不稳定性所带来的忧惧。由于渴望不能无对象,故所谓极度强化渴望等于是把现实里最能令人感到安全的事物绝对化,而这行动本是一种畸形的敬拜。被绝对化的事物是人的自我本身和人用以推崇自我的寄托,因最能令人安心面对现实的就是被理想化的自我,但自我形象之所以起保护作用,因它是依赖其它被绝对化的寄托。换言之,现实的威胁令人神化其自我形象,但该形象的脆弱使人逐渐神化人用以神化自我的寄托。比如,人以‘我是富人’这自我形象为其在优胜劣败的社会里的避风港,但由于现实的反复不定,人不断夸大这形象所依赖的财富的价值。总之,偶像崇拜实质上事关人如何构造并维持其虚假的自我形象,但这过程包含着至少两个偶像即自我及其寄托的核心作用。人靠神化其形象及寄托这过程可好比偶像工厂的制造流程。偶像制造的最后阶段便是失控的产品:偶像变成榨取人性之“人工智能”。人的自我防卫工程最终适得其反:“凡要救自己生命的必丢掉生命”。

二、偶像崇拜的滥觞:自我防卫

根据阿奎那所代表的基督教致善主义,受造物之所以存在,因神通过其能力和恩典与他们同在。但神与受造物的联合性质与程度因受造物的种类而异,故神与人的联合强于神与动物的同在,而神与动物的同在强于神与植物的同在。^[6]诸如天使和人等有理性受造物所需要的不仅是神的能力的同在,更是神与他们在心灵上的亲密联合。此外,神创造万物,旨在使神以外的存在能与神同在而反射出神的荣耀。因此,对受造物,尤其对于人,日臻完善意味着他们与创造者的联合越来越强而他们变得愈来愈像造物主。总之,受造物只能在自己与造物主的关系中生存,而这关系的性质,尤其对于人,是联合而效法的关系。

那么,根据圣经,人的始祖堕落后,人便开始与神隔绝、而这带来了一个对人不太友善的现实,因为堕落是人远离神这位生命的源泉(反联合)而损坏了神在自己身上的样式(反效法)的作为。面对脆弱、死亡,和痛苦的威胁,人所感受的是残酷现实与自己的求生或自我实现的渴望的矛盾。这矛盾引起了焦虑,^[7]但在缺乏对神的信靠的情况下,焦虑使人急于保护自己的利益而采用一些以自我为中心的防卫措施。自我中心主义令人的所作所为都受限於圣经所谴责的“肉体”或“单单是人”(merely human)^[8]的维度里。囿于此维度者在防卫自身生存时不将神算进去,而忽略神之人则轻易视自己为实践意义之神。是故,自我中心主义会导致自我崇拜。

属肉体之人在面对现实与渴望的关键冲突时所选择的并非倚靠神,乃是启动以自我为中心的防卫机制,而自我防卫的运作大体上离不开自我肯定和自我膨胀。^[9]详言之,为了能够在残酷的现实中幸存,人致力于肯定自身的价值,但人发现其自我肯定未能提供可靠的保护,因人的本性实质上是脆弱而有限的。故人在无法战胜现实的情况下将其自身价值绝对化了。由是可知,属肉体的自我防卫本是一种产生虚假的自我形象的机制。^[10]由于该形象的形成和维持蕴含着人对其心目中的自我的尽

[5] CALVIN, *Institutes*, I. xi. 8.

[6] 参阅 AQUINAS, *Summa Theologiae* 1, Q. 43, A. 3.

[7] 这是来自 R. NIEBUHR, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, vol. 1. (NY: Scribner, 1964) 里的观点。

[8] John BARCLAY, *Obeying the Truth* (London: T & T Clark, 1988), 206-7.

[9] 这是 David Bakan 的用语,引于 Walter Wink, *Engaging the Powers* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1992), 57.

[10] Peter LEITHART, *Delivered from the Elements of the World* (Downers Grove: IVP, 2016), 91; 参阅 E. BECKER, *The Denial of Death* (NY: Free Press, 1997) .

心投入,这膨胀的自我形象与自我崇拜无异。从这角度看,偶像崇拜事关自我崇拜,而受崇拜的自我本来是虚假的自我形象。

三、“制造工具”:自欺

由于防卫机制已成为了人心理的默认配置,人心可好比一种制造偶像的工厂。若自我防卫机制是偶像工厂的生产方式的性质,那么自欺是该工厂的制造工具。偶像崇拜的自欺出于人在面对威胁中的不信。不信和忧惧相随,而它们使不愿依靠神之人急于防卫自己。但拒绝信靠神只能被迫发明神的替代品,因为人明白,自己无法充分保护自己。人其实隐约晓得他的这种作为是出于自欺,但人压抑自己的察觉,因为人的不信所引起的忧惧叫人不惜理性的代价地寻求自慰。因此,偶像崇拜出于自欺但也导致更严重的自欺。^[11]本部分要讨论的是这种自欺的种类及过程。

偶像制造过程所依赖的第一种自欺是人为了逃避自身的有限性神化了世上不能受敬拜的东西。这是犹太人称偶像崇拜为反常的敬拜(*avodah zarah*)的原因。^[12]敬拜真神才是理性,因为真神是完全超越人却又充满慈爱的完美存在。但超越人而毫无慈爱的存在只能令人惧怕而不能引起真诚的敬拜,故面临可怕的现实之人神化了那些能帮助他增强自爱,即粉饰其形象的事物。换言之,为了对付人生中的可怕且有主宰作用的事物(现实、命运,等等),人制造了一个能给自己撑腰的新主宰。比如:当一个人发现世上许多残酷的现象挑战了他的“自我中心说”后,他就利用财富来支撑他的自我崇拜,但人也知晓,财富其实是不稳定的现实的一部分。所以,随着人的不安与自我崇拜倾向之间的张力之日益加深,人以各种措施(如:吝啬、贪污)把财富这支撑绝对化了,而借此把自我膨胀推到更高的程度上(“我比他人棒,因我更富有”)。总之,偶像崇拜不仅事关自我崇拜,也事关‘寄托崇拜’,因人不得不要崇拜一切可用于神化其自我形象的身外之物。照此,自我中心主义和偶像崇拜是相互解释的:人独立于神之日是人服从偶像之时。^[13]

偶像制造过程所依赖的第二种自欺是双重人生。在偶像崇拜中,人的上层信仰与言行都受制于底层的自我防卫欲望及与之相关的忧惧,但人选择只在上层上生活而不愿直视底层上的东西。双重生活也构成着基督教对律法主义式宗教的批判:律法主义者所崇拜的是自己及自己所依赖的清规戒律,神只是充当肯定他们以圣洁生活为资本的自我膨胀的橡皮图章罢了。^[14]律法主义者在上层上的虔诚遮掩着底层上的忧惧及骄傲。^[15]这种双重人生之所以是自欺而不仅是欺人的手段,因人不断压制自己不太光彩的真心态,使得底层上的事物最后很少露出人的意识水面了。

偶像制造过程所依赖的第三种自欺是自相抵牾的倚靠。圣经说,假神“必须要人抬着走,因为它们不能走路”(耶 10:5)。这意味着人一方面叫假神支撑自己的自我,另一方面,为了使偶像起到神明

[11] 人用于造偶像的自欺也包含着价值观的错判,即人将相对的绝对化、视有限为无限、叫有条件之善做无条件之好。

[12] HALBERTAL & MARGALIT 1998: *Idolatry*, trans. by N. Goldblum (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press), 4.

[13] 偶像崇拜也是一种赔偿性策略,因人要靠偶像来弥补自身的恐惧与不足。为了压抑自己的忧惧或淡化残酷现实的威胁,人给自己制造麻醉性寄托。马克思说宗教是鸦片,但每个人的心其实是生产属灵鸦片的工厂。马氏觉得宗教使无产者逃避现实而对资本家的剥削逆来顺受,但实际的问题比他所想的更深刻。不管人的阶级是什么,人总受现实的支配,而这支配比经济上的剥削更难避免。所以,无论人有没有信教,人总要借着把世上事物偶像化而躲避或压制自己的恐惧。故问题也更难根治。

[14] 以宗教行为当偶像是路德因信称义和十字架神学的重要神学背景,关于如何在中国的文化处境内理解路德的因信称义及路德的精神,参阅 LAI Pan-chiu, “Justification by Faith and Protestant Christianity in China”, *International Journal of Sino-Western Studies* 16 (June 2019), 21-33 和游斌 YOU Bin 与黄保罗 Paulos HUANG, “基督教中国化视角下的路德新诠释 Jidujiao zhongguohua shijiao xia de Lude xin quanshi” [The New Interpretation of Martin Luther in the Light of Christian Sincization], in *International Journal of Sino-Western Studies*, vol. 16 (Helsinki, June 2019), 1-17.

[15] Dan VIA, *Self-Deception and Wholeness in Paul and Matthew* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 29-32.

的作用, 人要通过夸大偶像的重要性或加强自己对偶像的迷恋来不断支撑其偶像。人本知道其寄托是靠不住的, 故为了确保自身安全感, 人宁可把包装寄托的牛皮吹大, 也不愿从他的偶像泡沫里走出去。由于被神化的很多事物都是低于人, 人信靠偶像是等于依靠那本质上只能依靠人的事物。比如: 一个爱名如命者知道, 名誉是需要自己出力方能稳固。名誉一方面高举脆弱的自我, 另一方面要依赖人的各样举措(如: 炫富、自夸)才能稳坐神明的宝座。简言之, 人自欺地借着加强主观的反应来弥补客观状态的不足, 即透过加深自己对自身寄托的迷恋而压制那寄托的不稳定性。照此, 偶像及其敬拜者相互倚靠, 而由于自我防卫机制离不开自我肯定和膨胀, 那么, 人所肯定的是人借以肯定自己的寄托, 所高举的也是人赖以贬低他人的偶像。

路德说: “惟有信心和依靠给我们带来神与偶像。当你的信心和依靠正确, 你的神也是真正[之神]……当你的信心和依靠不对, 那么你就没有真正之神”。^[16] 人一般想: 所信之神若被证明为假, 自己的敬拜也不对。路德在此用相反的逻辑: 自己的敬拜行动若不对, 所信之神也是假的。偶像崇拜事关反常的敬拜方式, 而不仅有关反常的敬拜对象。^[17] 是以, 信徒的敬拜若反常, 其神学观再正确也不会给他带来真神。敬拜变得反常, 当它沦为人的自我防卫的工具; 在这种被歪曲的敬拜中, 人知道自己需要寄托但又拼力把守这寄托, 因为人要确保偶像带给自己的益处。

人自相抵牾的倚靠也出于其它原因, 即人的英雄主义。英雄主义令人陷入矛盾: 人一方面寻求一个能支撑他脆弱的自我的偶像, 另一方面又不甘示弱而想支撑他的支撑。着力于自我防卫之人想独立自主而拒绝信靠神, 但这种人自相矛盾地需要偶像来支撑自己, 之后自相抵牾地想借着支撑他的寄托而露出锋芒, 以后又想再倚靠他的寄托而重新开始了这无休的循环。由此可见, 拜偶像者身陷反常的宗教生活: 既不能做真正的自救, 又无法做名副其实的倚靠。由于偶像崇拜是由两种互相抵消的倾向(既要寄托, 又想自立)组成, 依赖它的人生则如一座纸牌屋那样不稳定。

四、“制造流程”: 自我、现实, 与世上寄托之神化

我们现在要理解偶像的其制造流程。这流程是由三重神化过程(即神化自我、现实, 和世上的寄托)组成的。照此说, 人所崇拜的偶像大体有三种: 自己、令自己畏服的可怕存在(如: 命运、自然), 及那些可用于神化自己的寄托。

堕落后, 每人都以自我为中心, 因此在遇到重大挑战时, 人自动聚焦于自己的需要或看自己为最大的关心对象, 从而就难免神化自己。但在不依靠超越自己之神时, 人只能以被膨胀的自我当避难所。这意味着自我崇拜本有两种相连的含义: 一是指其运作性内涵(operational meaning), 即人视自己为至高的管理者和决定者; 二是其实质内容(substantial content), 即人所神化的并非脆弱的自己, 而是经过粉饰的自我形象。总之, 现实对人的威胁启动了堕落后之人所固有的自我崇拜倾向, 而这倾向既可见于人的自我防卫, 也体现于这防卫的结果, 即人被神化的自我形象。

讲究科学的当代人好像已不信命运也不拜神明了, 但实际的情况并非这么简单。自古迄今, 人人都面对“主宰问题”(the lordship problem)^[18], 即如何对付操控人的力量这问题。只要人觉得自己的人生被更大的力量辖制, 人不难发现, 成为人是等于做一个处于诸多力量的主宰下的活物。主宰问题实质上是一种宗教问题, 因为每个人“都不可避免地受到……[某种]神的束缚。”^[19] 宗教基本上是关

[16] LUTHER, *Luther's Large Catechism*, trans. by S. Janzow (St. Louis: Concordia), “The Ten Commandments”, (1988).

[17] 参阅 HALBERTAL & MARGALIT, *Idolatry*, 3-4.

[18] 这是 David POWLISONS, “Idols of the Heart and ‘Vanity Fair’”, in *The Journal of Biblical Counseling* 13, no. 2 (Winter 1995): 35-50 里的专用词, 但我改变了其内涵。

[19] *Ibid.*, “Idols of the Heart and ‘Vanity Fair’”, 39.

于人如何认同或对付生命中对人最有主宰作用的事物，因而所有人都有不同程度的信仰生活。^[20]能扮演主宰角色的事物因人而异，但主宰这概念是指一切能引起人最根本的忧惧的支配力量。宗教和哲学里面的所谓神明、命运、自然等概念很多时候也是指这种意义的主宰。对主宰性事物的意识程度也因人而异，但每人在其心坎上都有这种难以根除的忧惧，即自己最深的渴望会被自己无法控制的事物挫败。只要人看不到日光之上有爱人之神或虽已知之却不予重视，人会不自觉地把日光之下的命运、自然等威胁人的事物拜作神。人未必向这些主宰烧香，但它们对人的威慑使人聚焦于自己而不愿靠神这事实足以表明它们的神明般角色。

面对可怕的主宰，人一般会采用这些策略：一是奉其主宰若神明而使之变成自己的后盾。若古人神化了自然的可怕力量而用献祭、祈祷等仪式驯服它们，今人则通过信奉社会的价值观和遵守其诸如随大流、麻木等游戏规则来保证自身平安。二是借着崇奉一个主宰来脱离另一个主宰的威胁。若古人以善待自己的神祇来对付威胁自己的神明，今人则用金钱、权利等偶像与威胁自己的穷困、软弱抗衡。面对金刚怒目式大上帝，人需要得到菩萨低眉般小上帝的保护。小上帝带来的满足感能在主观上抵消现实这大上帝的客观威胁。

乍看之下，以上两种策略有所不同，但它们其实都是人为了确保自我崇拜而与更强的现实讲价的表现。这是说那两种策略皆是人用以消除、减轻，或推延更强的现实的危害之手段。如此，第一种策略能涵盖第二种策略，即人顺服主宰他的事物的表现之一是崇拜其它更小的主宰。譬如：一个牧师看似很有理想又不辞辛苦为教会做工，但其本来动机为积累成绩，因他觉得，现实会用荣誉和安全感奖赏成功人士。这牧师仿佛用小上帝（成绩）来对付大上帝（残酷竞争），但他敬拜小上帝的作为是他服从大上帝所定的生存逻辑的表现。再者，人崇奉这两种神，因为他要确保自己的自我崇拜。换言之，人之所以惧怕现实而找偶像的支撑，因为他们把自己的命看得比什么还重要。

人力图崇拜自己时必然要崇拜其它假神，因偶像崇拜是出于内在渴望和外在现实的张力。在最理想的情况下，一人最深的渴望与世上最终极的事物相应，而这种相应性将带来和谐且理性的人生。为了享受有意义的人生，人期望自己所关心的是世上最有价值的事物，故主观的关心程度与客观的关心对象的价值要成正比。但人发现自己所珍爱的事物并非世上最重大的，而诸如命运、自然，或上帝自己等最终极的现实对人不友善或漠不关心。当人最深的渴望找不到相应的对象，人尽量寻求一个能满足自己渴望的准终极（quasi ultimate）事物。我用准终极这词是为了说明，人本来知道自己的渴望对象并非世上最终极之事（大上帝），但人觉得，至少在更小的范围内或于自身的人生中，自己的渴望对象还可以扮演着终极事物（小上帝）的角色。然而，人追求的任何事物的准终极性或重要性本是出自人的主观评价而已。

要言之，偶像崇拜本为多层。人对功名利禄（小上帝）的推崇是外层上的崇拜，而更深一层的是人对可怕现实或大上帝的崇拜，因为这崇拜催生了人敬拜小上帝的动机，但最深层的是人的自我崇拜，因它提供了人敬拜其它所有偶像的最基本动机。^[21]自我这偶像引进了支撑性偶像这小上帝，而之所以如此，因为人已屈服于可怕的现实这大上帝。如上述，自我崇拜包含着人对其用以遮蔽自身脆弱的自我形象的崇拜。为了在残酷的现实肯定自己，人视小上帝为他重塑自我形象的核心材料。如此，所谓自我形象是以自我加小上帝为其内容的（如：以“我很理性”为其形象之人将以理性这偶像粉饰其自我）。

[20] Walter WINKL, *Naming the Powers* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 76.

[21] 由此可见，偶像崇拜自然导致多神论式的人生取向。人的自我神化叫人在拒绝与独一真神联合时只能受众多假神的控制而不能自拔。

五、“最终产品”：以反常的“联合而效法”为特征的人生

这部分要讨论的是偶像工厂的产品,即围绕着虚假的自我形象的偶像崇拜生活。

正如敬拜真神的人生是以人与真神的“联合而效法”为表现,拜偶像的人生的内涵是人与假神的联合及人对假神的效法。从基督教的角度,与神紧密联合而全面效法神事关人性的完善。说人是社会性动物是等于说人像三一神一样是关系性存在。若最理想的关系是灵魂之间的关系,那么灵魂之间的关系的最好表现是灵魂与灵魂的联合或相爱,而对于人,灵魂之间的联合的最高表现是神与人的联合,但这联合也包含着人与人的联合。由于神是爱,故与神联合等于被爱本身充满,而唯有如此人方能爱人如己。人都有自己与他者联合的倾向及需要,而这也是人效法神而成全人性的倾向及需要。与神联合意味着人在爱中不断完善本性,但这联合离不开信靠顺服(即以神之心为心)。

当人拒绝透过信靠顺服与神联合,人与他者联合的倾向会很反常地转向自己,令人迷恋而倚靠自己。不怪乎路德把罪人称为向内弯曲之人(*homo incurvatus in se*)。向内弯曲只能歪曲本性,因惟有把爱充分释放出去才能成全人性,而自恋的生存是靠着阻碍那本质上只能向外扩展而与他者联合之爱的成长。但人无法摒弃其自然倾向及需要,人因此靠着自恋或自我防卫寻求与他者联合。人在脆弱中需求倚靠与接纳,却又受自我崇拜渴望的驱策,所以人只能实现畸形的联合。畸形联合的表现至少有二:一是人把世上事物上帝化而使之满足自己对神的需求,而这‘听话’的神也能促进人的自我崇拜大业。二是人用偶像美化自身形象,使人能一石二鸟地用那形象争取他人的接纳而满足自己与他人联合这需要,又利用人的接纳来进一步推进自己的自我膨胀。这样一来,人的自我依靠和自恋与人对偶像的依靠和迷恋分不开。人和支撑自己的假神因此就“同甘共苦”了:偶像的盛衰荣辱也是人的盛衰荣辱。这是缘何人为自己的信仰、民族等事物容易有狂热的维护与传扬。

根据圣经,敬拜总带来效法,故敬拜偶像则使人越像假神。^[22]如上述,偶像也是人用以重塑自我形象的材料。但用偶像造面子是等于以夸张人生的一个方面来遮蔽其它很多方面的不足,而这是等于虚有其表的自欺。故拜偶像者的人生会像偶像一样变得更虚空。“他们所铸的偶像都是风,都是虚空……随从虚无的偶像,自己也成了虚妄”(赛 41:29;耶 2:5)。这几处经文的“虚空”和“虚幻”的希伯来词(*tohu*)一开始出现于创 1:2(“地是空虚混沌[*tohu wa bohu*];深渊上一片黑暗”)。空虚可以说是一种缺乏或没有神的同在的状态,所以它能描述创造前的无秩序和创造后的濒临灭亡等状态。据此理解,偶像崇拜是虚妄的,因为它使人逐渐回到创造前的“空虚混沌和深渊之中”而灭亡。偶像崇拜叫有尊严的活人服从幻想,而这是如同人把自己视为虚构的存在似的。由此足见人脆弱程度之深及其防卫欲望之烈。以下若干段落会探讨偶像使人奔向空虚混沌的方式。

拜偶像虚化人生,因为偶像崇拜导致自我否定。何以然?其一,偶像使人否定自己最需要之爱。爱的性质很特殊,因为没有自足之爱。爱者无法说自己已不需要爱被爱者了,而被爱者也不能说自己已不需要接受爱者之爱了。爱无止境,故唯有永恒之神方能维持并满足这永无止息的动态。偶像崇拜是基于自爱,而自恋者寻求自足,其最不敢做的是真正之爱所必有的自我倒空,所以他最根本的需要之一,即爱他者与得到他者之爱的需要,无法得到满足。其次,偶像令人贬低自己,因为拜偶像者为了抬高身价而屈从低于自己的事物。康德认为,不可仅以人之市价待人,因人人皆有无价之尊严。^[23]市价是对人的有条件评价,如:以才华或美貌取人。人的市价基于人相对于他以外之事的用处,故仅以市价待自己是等于将自身的尊严与低于自己的事物的市价混淆起来。

再者,偶像之所以阻碍人性的完善,其主因是偶像和人在位置上的交换:原是工具的偶像变成人

[22] 参阅 G. BEALE, *We Become What We Worship* (Downers Grove: IVP, 2008).

[23] KANT, *Groundwork*, translated by H. Paton (NY: Harper, 1964), 4:434-435.

的存在目的,而本是目的之人却沦为偶像的工具。康德认为,有尊严的理性存在才有资格当目的,^[24]因无价的是要被有市价的服务,非反之。但这说法似乎有问题,因为有些偶像并非低于人,如:自己和其他人,故拜自己和他人为偶像似乎没有把低于人的东西绝对化。其实不然。先说自我崇拜:如上述,崇拜自我者是崇拜其自我形象(如:“我是有权有势的人”),而这形象及其所依赖的寄托(如:权势)这两个偶像已几乎融为一体;人觉得推崇其寄托等于高举自己而贬低寄托无异于轻蔑自己,但这等于视自己与低于自己的寄托为一体而贬低人性了。再说他人崇拜:当人把他人推到神坛上,人对他的爱会沦为溺爱或过度依赖。不健康的爱本有双重目的:一是硬逼他人给自己做可靠的安慰或寄托,二是人遇到不稳定因素时为了增强安全感而强化对他人的依赖感。故敬拜他人并非真正爱人而视人为超级工具:人所珍爱的是他人的使用价值,哪怕这价值有多高。

拜偶像使人虚空,因为被神化的事物会失控而变成支配人的暴君。世上的一切好事都是神的恩典,但人的神化机制如辐射污染一般使好事突变了:原是成全本性的恩典被神化后则变为损害人性的属灵癌瘤。更有甚者,这些突变体还变成人的统治者。巴特说,“人的反叛释放了更多的反叛:这反叛是人的能力高举自己、背叛了人、成为无主人且抵挡人的能力”。^[25]偶像崇拜是人想自立为神的表现,故其自然后果是人所发明的偶像也背叛而主宰了人。总之,偶像无非是神的恩典突变为奴役人并日渐损害人性的暴君的表现。因此,若人所惧怕的现实可被理解为一切实害人的事物的总和,那么人用于对付现实的偶像就是现实更高明地加害于人的手段。

以上解释与马克思的拜物教(Fetischismus)理论相似。^[26]对马氏,拜物教是指“人创造的东西……逃避了人的控制,获取了独立的表面而开始奴役[创造它的人]”。^[27]马氏认为,金钱在资产阶级社会的作用凸显了拜物教的问题。钱是人所发明的交换手段,但以利润为导向的社会把钱当作自足而衡量一切的最高价值。钱因此变成了支配人的偶像,也令劳动者把自己的价值交给了他生产的产品,因产品已变为金钱的载体了。如此,产品便越加兴旺,而劳动者的人性却被自己制造的产品掠夺了。^[28]但资产者也受害,因其自我认同、人际关系,与意识形态都遭到金钱崇拜的操控。“[这曾]用魔术创造了如此庞大的生产资料和交换手段的现代资产阶级社会,现在像一个魔法师一样不能再支配自己用魔术呼唤出来的魔鬼了”。^[29]

与拜物教密切相关的是异化(Entfremdung),^[30]即一种不自然而损害人性的分裂状态。已登上神坛的金钱利用了诸若劳动、天赋、人际关系等本是发挥人性的事物来摧残人性。这些事物沦为金钱苦役人、把金钱转化成产品的工具。再说,崇拜金钱是等于受到身为金钱的载体的产品的操控。产品本要令人自豪,因人通过它能看到自身潜力的具体表现,但由于人被迫将自己产品化而把产品偶像化,产品和其它完善人性的事物竟然都成为了人所厌恶也想逃避的异己。这样,异化是由两种分裂构成的:人与完善人性的事物的分裂,及其所导致的人与自己的分裂。由此可见,拜物教与异化其实是解释一个现象的两种视角而已:前者从偶像的加害方式这角度看,而后者从人的受害状态之角度看。

[24] 参阅 KANT, *Critique of Judgment*, translated by W. Pluhar (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1987), 5; 431, 435, 444. 说人是目的是说人性的完善是人生的目的。

[25] BARTH, *Church Dogmatics* IV. 4, Lecture Fragments (The Christian Life), translated by G. Bromiley (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 215.

[26] 参阅马克思 Karl MARX,《资本论第一册》Zibenlun Diyice [The Capital, vol. 1], 郭大力、王亚楠 Guo Dali, Wang Yanan 译(上海 Shanghai: 三联书店 Sanlian Shudian, 2009)第一章, (4)。

[27] David LEOPOLD, “Alineation”, *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2018 edition, accessed on December 12, 2018).

[28] HALBERTAL & MARGALIT, *Idolatry*, 243-44.

[29] 马克思与恩格斯 K. MARX & F. ENGELS:《共产党宣言》Gongchandang Xuanyan [Communist Manifesto], 任卫东 Ren Weidong 译(<https://www.marxists.org/chinese/marx/01.htm>)

[30] 参阅马克思 MARX,《1844 年经济学哲学手稿》1844 Nian Jingjixue Zhexue Shougao [Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844], 刘丕坤 LIU Pikun 译(北京 Beijing: 人民出版社 Renmin Chubanshe, 1979)。

拜物教和异化适于解释诸如财富、权力、美貌等偶像,但未必能解释虚假的自我形象这更根本的偶像。问题是,自我形象看似事关人的自我本身,而其它偶像则源于自我之外,所以,正如拜物教与异化是出于人以外的金钱及产品,偶像崇拜的奴役是来自低于人且外乎人的事物。但无论是自我形象或其所倚靠的偶像均是“身外之物”,故它们都能给人带来异化般的悲剧。何故?如上述,自我形象及其寄托是合而为一的,即后者是前者的有机成分。更甚者,在构造虚假的自我形象时,人其实在把自己的焦点与目标转移到“人以外之事”了。这里的人以外之事是指人真实的自我之外的东西或是指人的自我完善之外的目标。哲学家称直接完善自我或人性的目标为内在目标,而叫一切与内在目标无直接关系的目标做外在目标。许多问题和痛苦是出于人为了追求外在目标而牺牲内在目标或把内在目标外在化这错误。完善自我这内在目标的过程若可被称为自我实现,那么,以远离真正的自我的‘形象工程’则可被称为自我证明。之所以如此称谓,因在无常现实中存在之人几乎本能地要向自己和他者证明自身的价值,而此乃偶像崇拜的主要功能之一。

进言之,自我证明是人用自己的本性为外在目标服务的过程,即人把精力和潜能花在虚假的自我形象的建造上。自我实现和自我证明容易被混淆,因为人常觉得他所推崇的自我形象等于他自己。然而,有些把聪明、天赋等人的先天能力当偶像的形象看起来还是成全本性和自我的,这是如何解释?偶像崇拜的微妙则可见于此:当人把自己所固有的好事,包括出于自己本性之事,用于自我推崇这目标上,人便开始矮化并远离本性了。按照基督教致善主义,人的自我和本性及其所有优点的目标大致有三:一是使人认识超越人的真理与美善及身为它们的载体之神,二是让人通过事奉与神及他人联合,三是借着这一切认识到自己的尊严或无价,因为其存在是基于神的爱。偶像崇拜拦阻人达到这些目标,结果是人对自我的认识被歪曲了。进言之,在缺乏对美善和爱等绝对价值的体悟上,人会觉得一切,包括其自身价值,都是相对的,因而在残酷且充满竞争的现实中要证明自己。

那么,拜偶像者的自我证明由两个阶段组成:一是人在心中构造出一个能证明其价值的自我形象;二是在现实中证明其自我形象的价值。自我证明的这两个阶段也是异化的两个步骤:自我形象在人心中的形成已是人远离真正的自我和本性的表现。在自我证明的第二阶段中,人努力将其自我形象付诸现实,而这过程所得的表面成就给人自我崇拜提供凭据。例如:一个以‘我善于赚钱’为形象之人视高收入和大企业等成就为他自我崇拜的合法性凭据。成就之所以为凭据,因人觉得它能证明其心目中的自我形象为真。这让人想起巴别塔故事:高耸入云的巴别塔是人用以确立自己的伟大形象的凭据。创 11:4 说,人要借此塔“为自己立名”,而“名”在此是有纪念碑的含义。^[31]同样的,自我形象这偶像的功能是要在现实上成为人肯定自己的丰碑。对拜偶像者,获取成就是等于把先前仅在内心存在的自我形象在现实中实现出来。但努力实现自我形象之人并不是在完善自己,乃在建造身外之“丰碑”。偶像崇拜本是一种形象工程,因为对人来说,人生的无常或命途的多舛好像是现实或神对自己的存在及价值的拒绝。因此,人要靠自身成就取得自己、他人,和他所服从的东西(道德、神明,等等)的肯定。那么,由于自我形象本质上事关人在自己和他者面前的演出,它给人的既非无价之尊严亦非无条件之爱,乃是依赖他者的态度之市价,亦即取决于表演的精彩程度这条件之接受。

形象未必代表本质,自我形象这种精神构造也不例外。致力于实现自我形象之人将其形象误判为真实的自我,也把自己挣得的市价,哪怕它有多高,误解为他最需要的爱。但市价总是不稳定而有条件的,因为偶像世界是靠属灵的市场经济经营人的。为了维持自我形象所需要的自欺,人只能费力把本是无常的市价恒常化,将本是幻想的形象实质化。这是等于证明欺骗为真的尝试,或从圣经的巴力先知这故事(王上 18:20-40)这角度看,是一种激活偶像的努力。在把虚假的自我形象改成固定的现实时,当代人像巴力先知一样竭尽全力地要唤醒一个本无气息的偶像。但古往今来,偶像如吸血鬼

[31] Nahum SARNA, *Genesis*, (Philadelphia: The JPS, 2001), 83.

般吮尽人的精力,因为人的需要无限、人的能力有限,而欺骗永远无法变成现实。总之,说偶像能成为独立于人的暴君是说维持自我形象的高昂代价会榨取人的一切。

我们可以从其它视角探讨这问题。偶像起源于人在面对现实与渴望的冲突时维持自己的渴望而逃避现实这选择。但人不能自绝于现实而生存,所以人力图从现实中划出并粉饰一小块可利用的现实,使之更契合自身的渴望。这一小块伪现实由两种偶像(即所谓自我形象及其依赖的寄托)组成。但要维护这些偶像,人既要确保伪现实与现实的共存,也要不断扩展其伪现实。所谓共存在此是指人的偶像崇拜小天地不遭更大的现实的侵害这状态,而所谓扩展是指人从更大的现实里再划出再矫饰更多块的现实,即人借着挣得更多的认同或更大的成就而扩大其自我形象的实现范围。后来,人的形象在多人面前显得更美好,但人真正的自我却精疲力竭。自我形象已变成与人的自我相对立的鬼魂般的“另我”(alter ego)了。总之,偶像是一种构造人为现实的工程,但人承担不起这工程的费用,因现实的复杂性及其力量远超越人的预测和控制力。

六、结束语

根据圣经,由于人人皆有原罪,所以人的脆弱只能启动人的自我防卫机制,而唯有在耶稣这位无原罪之人身上,脆弱与不信的密切关系终于被切断了,而借此彰显出人的正确形象。人想否定脆弱而肯定自己,基督却接受痛苦而成全他人。按照基督教神学,惟其如此,脱离偶像崇拜是以信心接受基督的灵而在世上体现出耶稣的生活方式。这是“联合而效法”的表现,因人如此则以基督的样式为其自我形象。圣灵所激起的信靠顺服机制逐步取代信徒的自我防卫机制,使基督的心态和思维在信徒的心灵上成形。相爱所需要的就是这种不防卫自己的信靠顺服,而唯有如此,人的所有潜力方能得到真正的实现与归宿。总之,所有崇拜都使人与其敬拜对象联合而效法之,即让敬拜者要么像神一样越加真实,要么如偶像一般益发虚空。

由此可知,偶像崇拜使人逃避现实,但逃避现实的反义词不是讲现实,乃是超越现实。渴望与现实的张力是神叫人以信心超越残酷的现实而与充满慈爱之神相遇的邀请。这说明张力所引起的忧惧本身是一种考验:人可视之为自我防卫的起点或顺服神的开端。那么,信靠神让人敢于超越现实而证明残酷现实的终极性为假,因最终极的现实是神自己。

English Title:

“Looking Into the Birth of Gods”: A Philosophical Interpretation of the Origin of Idolatry

Leonard Sidharta

Associate Professor, Singapore Bible College, 9-15 Adam Road Singapore 289886, Phone: (+ 65)-655-91555; Email: yongfu.meiling@gmail.com

Abstract: this paper philosophically interprets idolatry as a product of a self-deceptive self-defense mechanism, which operates when a person perceives threats from reality. Here, one tries to diminish the perceived threat by maximizing the value of one's own self. To achieve this goal, one uses a sustaining prop (e. g. , wealth) to construct the edifice of one's self-image (e. g. , “I am wealthy”). However, since one's self-image is constantly threatened by the capriciousness of reality, one chooses to counter the caused instability by deepening one's attachments to one's image and its sustaining prop. It is clear then that idolatry largely consists of the worship of two interrelated idols: a fictive self-image and its support, and the self-deceptive logic of idolatry consists of repressing objective threats by reinforcing one's subjective attachments. Also, every idol intriguingly has certain contradictory attributes: it is controlled by humans and yet controls its masters, it is constructed by people but also changes its worshippers. This is reminiscent of Marx's notions of fetishism and alienation, which explains how idols ironically become quasi-independent entities that exhaust human potential and bring forth self-estrangement. This irony happens because in forcing idols to play a role that they cannot perform, humans inflict upon themselves the “maintenance cost” of idolatry that they cannot bear.

Key Words: idolatry; self-defense mechanism; self-image; reality; alienation.

中希传统的两种诠释

——以《诗经》和《雅歌》为例

刘君君

摘要:民国学者常将《雅歌》与《诗经》类比,《雅歌》现代化诠释某种程度上成为民国时期对《诗经》“去经学化”的理论依据。周作人、顾颉刚、胡适、林语堂、许地山等人认为《诗经》中恋爱诗与《雅歌》同为男女情歌,其“后妃之德”如同西方神学家视《雅歌》为“人神之恋”类似,二者均为载道之言,纯属附会之词。现代化诠释影响了新文化人整理国故。对待传统,陈梦家、朱维之、沈从文、苏雪林在他们的翻译、评论、创作、文论中提出另一种看法,他们坚持“人神之恋”及文本蕴含的宗教意义。我们今天回望民国学者对传统的不同诠释,似乎发现传统诠释更具重要价值。

关键词:诗经;雅歌;诠释

作者:刘君君,清华大学人文学院,博士研究生,100084,15011187743。Email:liu-jj15@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn

—

《雅歌》原名为“歌中之歌”,英文翻译为“Song of Songs”,《雅歌》是《希伯来圣经》的五卷诗歌(《路得记》、《雅歌》、《传道书》、《耶利米哀歌》和《以斯帖记》)之一,归为智慧书。智慧文学是古代近东地区的一种文学类别。历史上围绕《雅歌》的成书日期、作者以及对《雅歌》的诠释一直有诸多争论。雅歌曾被解释为:寓言;引申为预表;戏剧;叙利亚婚礼诗歌集(勒南[E. Renan]、韦茨施泰因[J. Wetzstein]、翁贝托·卡苏托[Umberto Cassuto]等人观点),异教生殖崇拜礼仪的文集(泰奥菲勒·米克[Theophile Meek]观点);以及爱情的诗歌散集(罗伯特·戈迪斯[Robert Gordis]的观点)。

《诗经》原本称《诗》,战国之时已列名六经,但尚未称《诗经》,南宋初年正式使用《诗经》一名,屈万里考证可能起于南宋初年廖刚《诗经讲义》,元代时,《诗经》为书名风气盛之,明代以后,《诗经》成了定名,故而谓之。今人阅读为汉代四家诗之一的“毛诗”,其余齐鲁韩三家皆有亡佚、缺失。《诗经》总目311篇,《南陔》、《白华》、《华黍》、《由仪》、《崇丘》、《由庚》6篇存篇名亡其辞,文辞完整有305篇,其中风诗160篇,雅诗105篇,颂诗40篇。雅诗分为大小雅,小雅74篇,大雅31篇。“雅”字释义,历来有分歧。《毛诗序》认为正政,朱熹认为正声,郑樵以为朝廷之音。“雅”本为乐器,也指曲调,实指西周王畿乐歌,此为朝廷正乐。《左传·昭公二十年》“天子之乐曰雅”,毛诗引申“雅”之“正”义。

《雅歌》传入中国后,传教士用《诗经》“大小雅”来翻译《歌中之歌》。传统上,人们认为《歌中之歌》为所罗门王所作,故命名为“雅歌”,既取“雅正”之义,也取“王乐”之意。至此,《雅歌》就不可避免与《诗经》发生关联。民国时期,经周作人提倡,《雅歌》成为希伯来圣经中接受度最高,流传度最广的经卷,因其与《诗经》中“恋爱诗”相似,二者常被拿来类比。《雅歌》的现代化诠释在某种程度上成为民国时期《诗经》“去经学化”的参照资源和学理依据。

游斌认为应把基督教理解为一种悠久而深远的文化系统,与上下五千年的中华文化来对话。^{〔1〕}面对中希不同传统,现代学者李炽昌曾提出“跨文本阅读”(cross-textual reading),他将中国在内的亚洲经典称为文本 A(Asian text),《圣经》称为“文本 B”(Biblical text)。他认为在汉语语境下的《圣经》解释,就是在这两个文本之间的互读。即“人们能够按另一文本的方式来阅读某一文本,从一个跨越到另一个,以把握两个文本的精义。……通过这样的努力,就可以达到两者之间的创造性整合或丰富彼此内涵的转化。”^{〔2〕}游斌则提出“比较经学”(Comparative Scriptural Studies)的概念。游斌认为“比较经学并不仅仅是把某个经学传统与另一个进行比较,而是在研究某一个经学传统时,比较经学能够提供扩大研究者视野的方法——使他能够超越单一宗教的经学传统的界限,去考察不同宗教经学传统的潮流和运动,并认识经学与人类活动其他领域之间的种种关系。简而言之,比较经学可以解释为通过一个以上的经学视野来进行经典研究,并研究经学与其他知识间的关系。”^{〔3〕}面对现代学者对待中希经典所提出的不同框架和设想,我们不妨回到民国学者中看历史上由《雅歌》诠释所引发的争议,从中汲取他们对待传统的不同态度。

二

周作人在《〈旧约〉与恋爱诗》(1921年1月1日刊《新青年》8卷5号,署名仲密)中引用了美国神学博士谟尔(George F. Moore)《旧约之文学》^{〔4〕}第二十四章内容:“这书(指《雅歌》中反复申说的一个题旨,是男女间的热烈的官能的恋爱。……在一世纪时,这书虽然题着所罗门的名字,在严正的宗派看来不是圣经;后来等到他们发见——或者不如说加上——了一个譬喻的意义,说他是借了夫妇的爱情在那里咏叹神与以色列的关系,这才将他收到经文里去。”^{〔5〕}周作人在阅读《旧约之文学》后,受其启发,多次在《〈旧约〉与恋爱诗》以及《圣书与中国文学》(1921年1月10日《小说月报》12卷1号,署名周作人)等文章中提到《旧约》与《诗经》,周作人以西方为借镜,看到《圣经》历史批判法可为“整理国故”的参考方法,因此接着说:“但欧洲对于圣书,不仅是神学的,还有史学与文学的研究,成了实证的有统系的批评,不像是中国的经学不大能够离开了微言大义的。”^{〔6〕}“我们从《雅歌》问题上,便可以看出欧洲关于圣书研究的历史批评如何发达与完成。中国的经学却是怎样?我们单以《诗经》为例;《雅》《颂》的性质约略与《哀歌》及《诗篇》相似,现在也暂且不论,只就《国风》里的恋爱诗拿来比较,觉得这一方面的研究没有什么满足的结果。这个最大的原因大抵便由于遵守古训,没有独立实证的批

〔1〕 参黄保罗 Paulos HUANG,“精神人文主义:马丁·路德与儒家”工作坊报告 Jingshen renwenzhuyi; Mading lude yu Rujia gongzuofang baogao” [A Report on the workshop “Spiritual Humanism: Martin Luther and Confucianism”], in《国学与西学国际学刊》Guoxue yu Xixue guoji xuekan [International Journal of Sino-Western Studies], (Helsinki: Nordic Forum for Sino-Western Studies 2019, No. 16), 183.

〔2〕 李炽昌 LI Chichang,“跨文本阅读策略:明末中国基督徒著作研究 Kuanwenben yuedu celue: Mingmo Zhongguo jidutu zhuzuo yanjiu” [The Strategy of Readings in Chinese Christian Writings], in《基督教文化学刊》Jidujiao wenhua xuekan [Journal of Christian Culture], (No. 10, 北京 Beijing: 中国人民大学出版社 Zhongguo renmin daxue chubanshe [The Press of Renmin University of China], 2003), 168.

〔3〕 游斌 YOU Bin,“论比较经学作为汉语基督教经学的展开途径 Lun bijiaojingxue zuowei hanyu jidujiao jingxue de zhankai tujin” [Comparative Scriptural Studies], in《国学与西学国际学刊》Guoxue yu Xixue guoji xuekan [International Journal of Sino-Western Studies], No. 1, (Helsinki: Nordic Forum for Sino-Western Studies, 2011), 81.

〔4〕 George Foot MOORE, The literature of the old testament. (Cambridge: The University Press, 1903).

〔5〕 周作人 ZHOU Zuoren,“《旧约》与恋爱诗 Jiuyue yu lianaishi” [The Old Testament and Love Poem], in《新青年》Xinqinmian [New Youth], Vol. 8, No. 5 (Beijing: 1921).

〔6〕 Ibid.

判。”〔7〕他又说：“‘《关雎》，思得淑女配君子也’；《郑风》里‘女曰鸡鸣》，淫女思有家也’。实际上这两篇诗的性质相差不很远，大约只是一种恋爱诗，分不出什么‘美刺’。”〔8〕

经周作人提倡后，胡适、顾颉刚等人受其启发，拿来作为整理国故及整理民间歌谣的依据。顾颉刚在《论〈诗经〉的厄运与幸运》一文附加周作人所引用的谟尔的言论“那些歌是民间歌谣的好例，带着传统的题材，形式即想象。这歌自然不是一个人的著作，我们相信当是一部恋爱歌集，不必都是为嫁娶的宴会而作，但都使用于这样的情景。”〔9〕胡适在《谈谈〈诗经〉》中也论述：“像那本《旧约全书》的里面，也含有许多的诗歌和男女恋爱的故事，但在欧洲中古时代也曾被教会的学者加上许多迂腐穿凿的解说，也变成了一部宗教经典。”〔10〕

除胡适、顾颉刚、陈槃等人极力将《圣经》高等批判法作为去经学化的依据外，林语堂也对周作人的观点表示赞同。林语堂在民国十二年十二月一日以林玉堂之名发表《科学与经书》认为“科学的知识与方法都能帮助我们旧有的学问整理起来做有系统的研究。”〔11〕后晚年林语堂在台湾撰文《〈关雎〉正义》、《论赤足之美》，仍坚持早年周作人的观点：“本来诗歌发于男女相悦思慕之情。无男女思慕之情，便无诗歌。《关雎》乐而不淫，歌文王后妃夫妇琴瑟和鸣之乐，以表示周公之化行于南国，原也相宜。只不应该把这篇及周南之什整个解作歌颂后妃‘不妒忌’之美的。”〔12〕“大凡古典时代的人，遇着诗歌言男女爱情，都不肯就诗言诗，必加上道德教训，然后言情不妨讲道，讲道不妨言情。中外都是一样，……耶教圣言的言情诗，也遭到和尚院的神学家曲解。最有名的是所罗门王的情歌……其牵强附会程度不亚于毛公。”〔13〕可见，林语堂与周作人观点相同，都认为《关雎》和《雅歌》为男女情歌。

许地山曾根据摩尔顿(Richard. G. Moulton)的 The Modern Reader's Bible〔14〕翻译了《雅歌》，取名《雅歌新译》，发表在1921《生命》2卷5期上。许地山在《雅歌新译绪言》中说：“雅歌是一卷抒情的牧歌”，〔15〕“与其说歌为应灵性上的要求而作，毋宁说他是一篇描写纯粹夫妇爱情的歌。”〔16〕许地山认为“‘所罗门所造最优美的歌’这个名目自然是后人加上去的。学者从文体和歌内所用字眼上头研究，就知道这书稿的编成，远在所罗门以后；也许是所罗门原作，后人修改的。总之这书的作者不一定是所罗门，而是编成的年代当在西历纪元前一百年至二百年之间。”〔17〕许地山同样接受了高等批判法，对《雅歌》也极力主张从文学角度进行阅读。

综上所述，五四时期，诸多新文化人如周作人、胡适、顾颉刚等都认为《诗经》中道家之言属于穿

〔7〕 周作人 ZHOU Zuoren, “圣书与中国文学 Shenshu yu Zhongguo wenxue” [Holy Bible and Chinese Literature], in《小说月报》Xiaoshuo yuebao [Novel monthly], No. 12. (Beijing 1921).

〔8〕 Ibid.

〔9〕 参顾颉刚 GU Jiegang, “诗经的厄运与幸运 Shijing de eyun yu xingyun” [The Misfortune and Lucky of the Book of Songs], in《小说月报》Xiaoshuo yuebao [The Novel Monthly], Vol. 14, Issues 3-5. (Beijing 1923)

〔10〕 胡适 HU Shi, “谈谈诗经 Tantan shijing” [Talking about the Book of Songs], in《市适》Shishi [Shishi], Vol. 1, No. 2, (1937), 65.

〔11〕 林玉堂 LIN Yutang, “科学与经书 Kexue yu jingshu” [Science and Scriptures], in《晨报五周年纪念增刊》Chenbao wuzhounian jinian zengkan [Morning News 5th Anniversary Supplement], No. 12, (1923), 21-24.

〔12〕 林语堂 LIN Yutang, “《关雎》正义 Guanju Zhengyi” [“Guan Ju” Justice], in《无所不谈合集》Wusuobutan heji [Everything talks about collection], (长春 Changchun: 东北师范大学出版社 Dongbei shifan daxue chubanshe [Northeast Normal University Press], 1994), 11.

〔13〕 林语堂 LIN Yutang, “论赤足之美 Lun chizuzhimei” [On the Beauty of Barefoot], in《无所不谈合集》Wusuobutan heji [Everything talks about collection], (长春 Changchun: 东北师范大学出版社 Dongbei shifan daxue chubanshe [Northeast Normal University Press], 1994), 14-15.

〔14〕 Richard Green MOULTON, *The Modern Reader's Bible* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1912).

〔15〕 许地山 XU Dishan, “雅歌新译 Yage xinyi” [The Song of Song's New Translation], 《生命》Shengming [Life] (1921), No. 2.

〔16〕 Ibid.

〔17〕 Ibid.

凿附会,如同《雅歌》本应只是男女情爱恋歌。基督徒作家中,林语堂、许地山亦主张将《诗经》、《雅歌》当做文学文本,他们认为《雅歌》所主张的“人神之恋”“神与以色列的爱”为后人附加,与《诗经》的“后妃之德”都为道学家之言。

三

无独有偶,陈梦家也依据摩尔顿(Richard. G. Moulton)的圣经 The Modern Reader's Bible^[18] 翻译雅歌。针对摩尔顿的结构,陈梦家做了创造性改动,他将全诗由摩尔顿分的七大段改为十七阕,每节单独设立小标题。陈梦家说“在我的血里,我还承袭着父亲所遗传下来的宗教情绪……这一篇二千多年古以色列人的抒情诗,是又朴素又浓密的。”^[19]“旧约时代”的人物完全具有现代人的浪漫色彩,赞美爱如像赞美上帝:上帝是他们灵魂上的爱,他们肉体上的上帝是女人。”^[20]“但是这属于‘上帝的选民’的爱仍然主张灵的,苏拉女在所罗门的怀抱中赞美爱的伟大。”^[21]陈梦家虽然认为是否是所罗门所著值得商榷,但他仍主张《雅歌》是“人神之爱”的书写。

沈从文有不少模仿《雅歌》的文本,在《龙朱》《神巫之爱》等小说中,沈从文赋予其多重意义。《神巫之爱》既是男女之恋,又是人神之恋,带有巫楚文化色彩,沈从文创造性将“人神之恋”与傩神祭祀联系在一起。傩戏中“请神”“娱神”(人神恋爱)“送神”,既与《九歌》结构类似,也与《雅歌》结构类似,其所构建的“湘西世界”上溯到远古神话,并没割裂人神联系,赋予“苗”民历史以神圣性和合法性,让“苗”民拥有与汉文化相以抗衡的悠久历史和传统。

朱维之在《歌中的雅歌》^[22]提到《雅歌》在历史上的几种诠释:作为戏剧的雅歌,作为结婚的牧歌,以及情歌。后,朱维之又在《雅歌与九歌——宗教文艺中的性爱错综》中说到:“当我开始用文学的观点来读《圣经》时,便惊异《雅歌》一卷底优美。当我少时鉴赏中国历代文艺作品时,早为《楚辞》中《九歌》底伟奇所吸引。后来我对于这两者渐渐看为一类东西。因为两者都是宗教文艺作品,里面都有性爱错综在里面;两者底体裁又都成了讨论的问题:是戏剧呢?或是牧歌;是一篇整篇呢?或者是几首独立的诗放在一起?”^[23]朱维之说:“至于雅歌底内容方面,从头到尾全是恋歌,没有半个字提到上帝,圣殿,神灵等等宗教方面的名词。从头到尾没有一点宗教的思想和感觉。近代的圣经学家像顾斯比(E. J. Goodspeed),等便断定他没有宗教意识,只是于希伯来人民生活底描写方面,却很详尽,不失为一部好的恋爱歌集而已(参阅马鸿纲译《圣经的研究》139页)。可是话又要说回来了,这本纯粹的恋歌集又为什么要编在圣经里面呢?为什么犹太人到现在还是当这逾越节时公开宣读雅歌呢?为什么在中世纪那样禁欲主义的时代里,非但没有从圣经中删去雅歌,反而天才的说教者伯尔那(Bernard de Clairvaux)专用雅歌作经题讲了十八年的道呢?”^[24]由此可见,朱维之既把《雅歌》当做文学文本,也承

[18] Richard Green MOULTON, *The Modern Reader's Bible* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1912).

[19] 陈梦家 CHEN Mengjia, 《“歌中之歌”译序》*Gezhongzhige yixu* [The Song of Song's Translation Preface], 《南开大学周刊》*Nankai daxue zhouban* [Nankai University Weekly] (1932).

[20] 陈梦家 CHEN Mengjia, 《歌中之歌》*Gezhongzhige* [The Song of the Songs], (上海良友图书馆印刷公司 Shanghai liangyou tushuguan yinshua gongsi [Shanghai Liangyou Library Printing Company], 1932), 1-11.

[21] *Ibid.*

[22] 朱维之 ZHU Weizhi, “歌中的雅歌 *Gezhong de yage*” [The Song of Songs], in 《协大学术》*Xieda xueshu* [Xie University Academic], No. 1, (1930), 127-142.

[23] 朱维之 ZHU Weizhi, “雅歌与九歌——宗教文艺中的性爱错综 *Yage yu jiuge—zongjiao wenyi zhong de xingai cuozong*” [The Song of Songs and the Nine Songs -The Intricacies of Sex in Religious Literature and Art], in《基督教丛刊》*Jidujiao congkan* [Christianity Series], No. 15, (1946), 76-79.

[24] *Ibid.*

认其中的宗教意味。

天主教作家苏雪林虽然没有直接发表对希伯来传统《雅歌》的看法，但她对于五四时期，新文化人用现代学术眼光去整理中国传统诸如《诗经》《楚辞》等表示不满。对于《诗经》，苏雪林认为“诗至汉代研究诗经者有大小毛公，有齐、韩、鲁诸家，闹出无数花样，什么六义四始，正变美刺，诗序、诗谱等等，把原来匹夫匹妇采兰赠药，桑间濮上的情歌都变作文王之化，后妃之德，反而把诗的原意弄得晦涩不堪，遂有‘诗无达诂’之叹。”^[25]《诗经》中的“颂”，苏雪林认为：“又如清末阮元说诗之周商鲁三颂，乃音乐歌唱跳舞之全动作，为容。容，用。兼，一音之转，变为颂。颂者由来容，即‘样子’之意。极为博学如梁任公亦从其说，不惜曲搜各种证据以证实之。我谓颂有‘赞颂’‘颂敬’‘颂扬’诸义，惟祭天祭祖时用之，等于西洋宗教之赞美诗，极其庄严与隆重，岂可轻轻以‘样子’二字名之？”^[26]由此可见，苏雪林虽赞成将古代经典从经学家载道之言中解放，但又不认同将其中与宗教意义割裂开的诠释。他对梁启超等人对“颂”的解释尤为不满，认为“颂”为宗教用语，表示颂赞，赞美。绝不是梁启超所说的“样子”。

苏雪林对民国学者用治《诗经》的方法整理《楚辞》，也持异议。在《九歌中人神恋爱问题》中，她说：“但我对于现代楚辞注家的见解，也不满意。现代整理国故的学者，将诗经十五国风，从迂腐不勘的空气里解放出来，归还它们平民文学的真面目。……诗经过这一刮垢磨光的工作，而后清光大来，我们读诗的人，才可以玩味诗的真正神韵。至于其他古书，他们也用同一方法整理，成绩大都可观。不过天下事不可一概而论，他们将整理诗经的标准，应用到楚辞九歌上去，结果便不大妥当了。”^[27]苏雪林接着说：“我以为九歌完全是宗教舞歌，完全是祭祀的歌辞。东皇太一等为之祭歌，固不待说，湘君湘夫人河伯之言情也不出宗教的范围。他们也歌咏恋爱，但他们所歌咏的是人与神的恋爱，不是像游国恩、陆侃如所说的人与人的恋爱，这一点最为重要，须划分一个鸿沟的界限。”^[28]

陈梦家、沈从文、苏雪林、朱维之等无论在翻译创作，或在阐释中，一方面虽认同将中国与希伯来传统可视为为文学文本，但又坚持不能将其仅视为文学文本，以现代阐释完全消解文本的宗教意味。对此，我们不由追问，究竟是什么原因造成他们对待传统的方式不同？我们今天，又该站在何种立场上反思传统？

游斌在《论比较经学作为汉语基督教经学的展开途径》说：“启蒙运动和理性主义使人们不再将《圣经》理解为‘神启文本’，而是记载古代以色列和早期基督教信仰群体的宗教经验的作品，因此，可以用历史学或宗教的方法对《圣经》展开研究。”^[29]除了历史学、宗教的方法研究《圣经》外，还有文学的方法。启蒙运动后，作为文学的《圣经》兴起，并在一定程度上影响了民国学者，他们不仅用文学方法诠释希伯来传统，也用此来整理中国古代文本，在“经学文学化”的同时，我们从历史中看到民国保守派学者另一种态度，他们对完全用现代学术眼光去整理传统产生异议。

四

回到这个问题，我们必须从文本出发。

[25] 苏雪林 SU Xuelin,《诗经杂俎》*Shijing zazu* [The Book of Poetry] (台北 Taipei: 台湾商务印书馆 Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan [Taiwan Commercial Press], 1995), 1-2.

[26] *Ibid.*

[27] 苏雪林 SU Xuelin,《九歌中人神恋爱问题》*Jiuge zhong renshen lianai wenti* [The Problem of Love between Humans and Gods in Nine Songs] (台北 Taipei: 文星书店股份有限公司 Wenxin shudian gufen youxian gongsi [Wenxing Bookstore Co., Ltd.], 1967), 4.

[28] *Ibid.*, 10.

[29] 游斌 YOU Bin, “论比较经学作为汉语基督教经学的展开途径 Lun bijiaojingxue zuwei hanyu jidujiao jingxue de zhankai tujin” [Comparative Scriptural Studies], in *International Journal of Sino-Western Studies*, No. 1, (2011), 81.

《诗经》,周作人和林语堂等人均认为“后妃之德”属经学家附加之言,郑振铎直接说“穿凿附会”。如果仅从文辞角度看诗经,很多问题都解释不清。一切真是如他们所说的么?部分学者认为毛诗首序是用于某一种仪式、场合,是一种功能的提示,后期才是一种文辞。先是礼仪、乐章的用途,后面才有义理的用途。如果放在礼乐制度背景下,更有助于理解。因此,“后妃之德”要从音乐角度去看,“南”是一种乐器,据郭沫若《甲骨文研究·释南》考证,以为南为青铜乐器,后变为曲调名称。本为地方民间音乐,郑玄《周南召南谱》“后妃夫人侍御于其君子,女史歌之。”周公,召公采集来,对其地位做了提升,西周末、东周初成了王室的正乐。马银琴认为“二南”曾为房中之乐,后用于王室正乐,所以说是后妃之德,后妃之本。但这层还原只还原到礼乐制度来理解《诗经》和“后妃之德”可能的关系。

《诗经》仍需要上溯到宗教意义上进行再次还原,《诗经》中不少诗歌以“鸟”、“树”“植物”等起兴,后人“兴”理解莫衷一是,《周礼·春官·大师职》“曰兴”,郑玄引郑司龙注,曰“兴者,托事于物”,朱熹在《周南·关雎》中认为“兴者,先言他物,以引起所咏之词也。”这种说法一直被视为定论。实际上,“兴”并非随意起兴,古人生活的是巫文化世界,兴词极有可能是咒语,日本学者家井真即持这种观点。“鸟”、“植物”在古人的生活世界都具有它自身的神秘意义。闻一多、赵沛霖解释其为“图腾说”,鸟占是原始习俗,鸟类兴象是从鸟占卜过渡而来。雎鸟是一种捕鱼的鸟,李时珍《本草纲目》中记载:“鄂,〔释名〕鱼鹰,雕鸡,雎鸠,王雎”。江表人呼为食鱼鹰。《诗》云:“关关雎鸠,在河之洲”就是说的雎鸟。远古以鸟为图腾,如舜以凤鸟(一说鸠)为图腾,丹朱氏以鹤为图腾。饶宗颐考证了上古具有普遍的鸟崇拜现象,雎鸠鸟也是一种被先民崇拜作图腾并保护获得好运的神鸟。《关雎》是保障求爱成功的吉祥鸟。鱼鹰捕食,象征男女求爱。仰韶文化出土的鸟衔鱼形珮以及汉画关雎求鱼图可以为证。“关关”声象征小伙子求爱顺利,所以承接“窈窕淑女,君子好逑”。最后一章是对首章的呼应,由于神鸟保护成功,所以有琴瑟友之,钟鼓乐之的贺婚迎娶的场面。《毛诗故训传》作:“雎鸠,王雎也。鸟挚而有别”,并说“后妃乐君子之德,无不和谐。又不淫其色。”

《雅歌》为“歌中之歌”,根据现代释经学者,多认为公元前4-3世纪编订,因为文中出现波斯和希腊的外来语,未必为所罗门所做,是民间男女情歌。人神之恋为后人附加。犹太传统(密什拿[Mishnah]、塔木德[Talmud]、他尔根[Targum])认为,本书以寓言形式描绘了神对以色列的爱。教会领袖如希坡律陀(Hyppolytus)、奥利金(Origen)、哲罗姆(Jerome)、亚他拿修(Athanasius)、奥古斯丁(Augustine)和明谷的贝纳尔(Bernard of Clairvaux)等均认为本书的寓言描述了基督对新妇——教会的爱。

如果对《雅歌》进行适当历史情境还原,或许可以帮助我们了解恋爱婚庆歌为何象征人神之恋。《雅歌》是犹太人在逾越节安息日读的书卷,纪念神带以色列人出埃及,是神对以色列选民的爱。逾越节是犹太人最为重要的节日。犹太人是在上帝启示摩西带领以色列人出埃及后,才开始过逾越节,这是神与人立约。《雅歌》为婚庆之歌,“婚约”犹太人极为重视,称之为盟约,只有死亡才能解除。故《雅歌》8:6-7节说:“求你将我放在心上如印记,带在你臂上如戳记;因为爱情如死之坚强,嫉恨如阴间之残忍。”因此,圣经常用婚约比喻神人之约。《旧约》为犹太人成文律法,犹太仍有口传律法,如果我们离开口传律法,只谈成文律法很难明白真正的含义。

如果再往前溯源,我们可以在《圣经》与近东文化的关系得到一些启示,虽然对《雅歌》的生殖崇拜释义,部分学者提出异议。但我个人认为,这是较为接近源初语境的一种诠释。奥尔布赖特(W. F. Albright)认为希伯来文化《雅歌》中“书拉密”的原型是“书玛妮图”。“书玛妮图”是迦南神,主爱情与战争,同时也与冥界有着千丝万缕的关系。巴比伦文化中称“伊斯塔”,如果从巴比伦-亚述文化再往前追溯到苏美尔-阿卡德文化,苏美尔将婚庆歌女神称为“伊南娜”。伊南娜主观性爱、繁殖和战争,是中东地区的宇宙女神。

因此,最早的女神原型由苏美尔文化中的“伊南娜”,演变成巴比伦的“伊斯塔”和迦南的“书玛妮

图”或“阿斯塔特”；希腊神话中，演变为“阿芙洛狄蒂”；罗马神话中变成“维纳斯”，希伯来文化中成“书拉密”。希伯来族长亚伯拉罕漫游于美索不达米亚的乌尔城、哈兰以及迦南、埃及地，不排除受到当地文化的影响。正如奥尔布赖特所说：“一些异教神的名字已经成为世俗的希伯来词语而失去了异教的含义；神话表达被视为诗意的象征主义，却不显明与原始的异教神有丝毫关联。”^[30]

诚然，《诗经》和《雅歌》文本历来颇多争议，我们在这里并非是要认定某种诠释为合正统诠释，亦非要裁定哪些释义是对的，哪些是错的，而是将其作为一个“问题意识”提出来，旨在恢复其历史语境。

五

由此可见，当我们在发生学意义上重新返回文本的源初语境时，会对文本产生更为深入的理解，而文本在历史语境中不断附加的含义也能有更为确切的认知。如果从发生学的背景看，文学、历史、神话等均从宗教分化出来。苏雪林在《浮生九四》中说：“不幸一般青年一味抛弃旧的时，是连婴儿和浴盆的水都泼了出去。我倒幸运，虽服膺理性主义，还知选择应走的道路，不过这是后来的话。”^[31]“我以为不了解民间祭典及其流传的故事、神话，也决不能解决中国整个历史文化问题。”^[32]五四新文化人曾受“高等批判法”启发，故而以“现代的，科学的方法”进行“国故整理”。今天我们回望民国学者的做法，仍有许多值得反思的地方。

如果我们将传统仅视为文学文本，做文学解读，不放回历史语境，割裂文本与宗教、文本与音乐、文本与历史的关系时，仅用现代新知去理解传统，文本中的很多东西则变得模糊不清。传统被现代学术分科化约后，越来越陷入学科本位主义，传统被历史、哲学、文学等学科切割和剪裁，成为被选择的传统。

中国传统中，“经史子集”是一体的，中希经学都提倡“以经解经”，我们过去曾质疑这种方法。自现代化以来，传统中一些部分被称为“神话”“上古史”，“迷信”，视为“虚构的”“想象的”“非科学的”。它被现代科学和理性主义所排斥，当我们站在今人的世界去体认传统时，实际上不自觉用现代世界的知识去驱逐古代世界的知识，用现代的世界观去驱逐古代的世界观，离传统越来越远。

保罗写信给帖撒罗尼迦人说“你们要站立得稳，凡所领受的传统，都要坚守。”传统 *traditio*，希腊文是 *paradosis*，意指从一个阵营转到另一个阵营。在保罗看来，传统是活的历史。我们今天阅读古代经典，正如伽达默尔在《真理与方法》中所说“为权威和传统正名”，尽管每一个阐释者都有自己的前理解，但并不意味着每一种阐释都是有效阐释。对于经典，“我们的理解来自于这个事件或作品以往曾经得到以被理解的方式，这种理解根植于历史和阐释传统的发展过程之中。”^[33]正是通过与古人的不断对话，传统不断成为活的传统。

[30] W. F. ALBRIGHT, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan. A Historical Analysis of Two Contrasting Faiths.* (London: Athlone Press, 1968), 163-164.

[31] 苏雪林 SU Xuelin, 《浮生九四：苏雪林回忆录》 *Fushen jiushi: Su Hsüeh-lin huiyilu* [Lifetime Jiuzi: Su Hsüeh-lin 's Memoirs] (台北 Taipei: 三民书局 Sanmin shuju [Sanmin Book Company], 1993), 40.

[32] 苏雪林 SU Xuelin, “我幼小时的宗教环境 *Wo youxiaoshi de zongjiao huanjing*” [The Religious Environment of My Childhood], 《苏雪林文集》(第2卷) *SU Xuelin de wenji (di er juan)* [Su Hsüeh-lin 's Anthology] Vol. 2, (安徽文艺出版社, Anhui wenyi chubanshe [Anhui Literature and Art Publishing House], 1996), 44.

[33] 伽达默尔 Gadamer [Gadamer], 《真理与方法》 *Zhenli yu fangfa* [Truth and Method] (Beijing: 商务印书馆 Shangwu yinshuguan [The Commercial Press], 2007), 377.

English Title:

Two interpretations of Chinese and Hebrew traditions——Taking the Book of Songs and Song of Songs as example

LIU Junjun

Ph. D. candidate, Department of Literature, Faculty of Humanities, Tsinghua University, Beijing, P. R. China, Tel: +86 15011187743, Emai: liu-jj15@mail. tsinghua. edu. cn

Abstract: Scholars of the Republic of China (1912–1949) often compared the Song of Songs with the Book of Songs. The modern interpretation of the Song of Songs has become the theoretical basis for the ‘de-traditionalization’ (去经学化) of the Book of Songs in the period of the Republic of China. Chou Tso-jen, Ku Chieh-kang, Hu Shih, Lin Yutang, Xu Dishan and others advocated that the love songs in the Book of Songs and the Song of Songs are both love poems between man and woman. At the same time, many of them argued that both “the virtue of the queen and maids of honor” (后妃之德) in the Book of Songs and western theologians’ claim that the Song of Songs concerns love (between God as the groom and the people as the bride) are farfetched, and that they merely appeared to embody Tao (Truth). New Culture Scholars used this modern method to re-organize the nation’s cultural heritage. However, Chen Mengjia, Zhu Weizhi, Shen Congwen, and Su Hsüeh-lin raised objections in their translations, creative writings, and literary theories. They insisted on reading “God’s love for the people” and the text’s religious significance. Examining the history of interpretation, we conclude that a more traditional interpretation is of greater value.

Key Words: Book of Songs; Song of Songs; Interpretation

书评与通讯

Reviews and Academic Reports

ACAEMIC NEWS

PART ONE

A Review on the Joint International Conference of Nordic Forum of Sino-Western Studies and 20th International Symposium on Bicosmology

LIU Jing

(Macau University of Science and Technology)

From 6th to 7th August 2019, the “2019 International Conference of Nordic Forum of Sino-Western Studies”, sponsored by the Nordic Forum of Sino-Western Studies and 20th International Symposium on Bicosmology, was held at the University of Helsinki, Finland.

More than 20 professors, scholars and doctoral students from Beijing Normal University, China University of Political Science and Law, Macau University of Science and Technology, University of Edinburgh, University of Helsinki, University of Nizhni Novgorod, Whitehead Institute and Nepal Sanskrit University attended the conference. The participants conducted in-depth and productive discussions on topics of biological cosmology, natural philosophy, natural history, natural history education, Dunhuang Studies, philosophy of religion, applied philosophy, comparative philosophy and other related philosophical issues, and tried to provide a practical path with global cultural characteristics for solving the problems of global natural history and natural history education by integrating the ideas and wisdom of participants from Europe and Asian countries. The following is a brief overview of the main issues.

1. Natural History, Nature and Education

Professor Liu Xiaoting of Beijing Normal University focuses on the paradigm of natural philosophy, Chinese traditional studies on natural history. It is pointed out in the topic that Greek natural science contains two traditional tensions of natural history and natural philosophy in its origin. Due to the prominent direction of contemplation in the evolution of Greek thought, it led to the emergence of natural philosophy. On the other hand, natural philosophy was evolved into metaphysics and introduced the concept of natural science in modern times through medieval efforts. The popular education in the world introduced in this paper is the industrialization education with this natural science as the paradigm. During the traditional evolution process of the natural history, it is mainly based on the natural environment, using various methods to integrate people into nature, establish an organic connection between man and nature, and promote the healthy growth and

development of human education. In particular, the education related to nature, including the education carried out in nature, the education of understanding and experiencing nature, and the use of nature education have the great theoretical significance to embodied cognition, emotional realm, natural feelings, social environmental protection, self-healing, etc. Professor Liu has stressed the analysis on the paradigm of anecdotes that collected all the knowledge by Chinese traditional studies on natural history.

Professor Liu Xiaoting highlighted the concept of image-related knowledge in the dominant form of natural Chinese studies. The image can be divided into object image (image of nature) and hexagram image of Yi. The object image is the appearance of the thing, and the hexagram image is the arrangement form of the hexagram, which is the skill of holding the image. The former indicates abstraction and contemplation, while the latter embodies practicality and skill. This determines that Chinese natural history and Western natural history also differ greatly in the way of education. The main reason is that natural history education not only adheres to the overall concept, skills concept, socialization concept, survival education concept, wisdom education concept and multicultural concept, but also include a wide range of social and educational content, especially the contents which are called art education and physique education in the West. In this regard, the commonly called Education for Qualities, General Education and Liberal Arts Education can be classified or included in the scope of natural history education. The return of the tradition of natural history and the re-establishment of the paradigm of natural history make the promotion of natural history education not very urgent. To this end, Professor Liu pointed out that it is necessary to advocate the sentiment or spirit of natural history, and actively explore the natural resources of human tradition, especially the historical, humanistic, physical, intrinsic and classical experience of China. In particular, it is of far-reaching significance to popularize natural history and set up a paradigm of natural history education as soon as possible to realize universal education in the new era.

Ding Hongwei, a researcher at Whitehead Institute, focuses on the analysis of the “embodied” characteristics of natural history education in his paper, and makes an in-depth discussion on several core concepts of embodied cognition, phenomenology of education, embodied philosophy and natural history education at different levels. In a broad sense, the study of different levels of natural history education is based on the instinctive way of living with nature. Through observing the experiential activities of plants, animals, insects and minerals in nature, it promotes the multidimensional development of human knowledge, emotion and values. In a narrow sense, natural history education is to guide and encourage children to fully develop their instinct to be close to nature, so that children can acquire knowledge, emotion and values in the process of dialogue with nature, and finally form a harmonious state of mind and life concept. Thus, researcher Ding put forward the specific concept of embodied philosophy. The embodied philosophy is the cognitive basis of the similarity of linguistic signs, the three basic principles of embodied philosophy are the embodied mind, the cognitive unconscious, and metaphorical thought, which are the philosophical theoretical basis for the research of embodied cognition in natural history education. It makes a detailed analysis on the three dimensions of natural history education: the dimension of nature education, the dimension of natural history education and practice-oriented natural history education.

Professor Paul Huang of the University of Helsinki put forward valuable suggestions on the

contemporary transformation of knowledge innovation education mechanism, i. e. Education in Finland and General Education in Chinese. Since the Education in Finland has been ranked first in the world by the United Nations for many years, especially the recent announcement that Finland will gradually abolish the establishment of professional disciplines has attracted worldwide attention. Based on his experience in Finland for more than 20 years, Professor Huang has analyzed that several main features of kindergartens, primary schools and secondary schools in Finland (superficially) are short class hours, less homework and fewer examinations. Teaching is mainly carried out in a relaxed form which seems to be “play”. Students do not advocate competition with each other, but emphasize cooperation. At the same time, relevant international organizations have come to the conclusion that the quality of education in Finland is among the best through testing and evaluation. Finland, as one of the world-famous Nordic welfare states, its far ahead competitiveness, integrity, livability, human happiness index is an indirect proof of the quality of its education. As per Professor Huang’s experience, it can lead to far-reaching conclusion. As a Chinese scholar who promotes general education in universities, I was inspired by the empirical phenomena listed by Professor Huang, as well as the academic qualifications and their implications for contemporary human beings, especially for Chinese education.

2. Biological Cosmology

The structure of biological cosmology by Professor Konstantin of University of Nizhni Novgorod in Russia reflects a cornerstone moment. The scope of the biological world (related to life processes) is unlimited; it contains all possible life phenomena and processes; biology, ecology, anthropology and individualism (psychology), social culture, cosmology (i. e. globalization) evolution, including the process of cultural life on earth. (The only exception is the field of political research, taking into account its complexity and the difficulties in achieving realistic scientific methods). Professor Konstantin pointed out in his paper that any natural science, social science or humanitarian science (except political science) will match the research issues and exchange of views in the mainstream of biological cosmology, but only in the case of explorers using (or critically testing) Aristotle’s (organism, functionalism) methods in carrying out their activities. So it’s used to study and understand the Aristotle’s four causes of cosmological and drive the forces of reality. However, another important point is to acknowledge (or at least consider) the final outcome and the dominant value of enTelecheia, that is, to consider (including key aspects) intrinsic (goal and overall organizational) factors, their main value life in the life of theme. Obviously, in principle, it is impossible to create a scope that can understand this kind of (all-inclusive) research. Professor Konstantin believes that, taking into account the basic principles of the intrinsic teleological biological cosmology (functionalism), our own functionalism approach has been proposed for the construction and operation of such structures. This is the choice of self-contained research direction to achieve the point of view of biological cosmology, therefore, it provides a sufficient number of different research areas, which have their own research objectives and scope, it will be used for the accumulation and structuration of given (available) information in biological cosmology to make a prospect.

3. Dunhuang Studies and Dunhuang Art Philosophy

Dr. Liu Jing of Macao University of Science and Technology generally discussed all the philosophical issues involved in Dunhuang art, against the background of the artistic view, the trend of modern philosophy and the new visual threshold of the study of artistic philosophy from the perspective of metaphysical philosophy. Started from the perspective of “ontology”, it analyzed and narrated the living conditions of the people behind the Dunhuang art form, and comprehensively introduced the direct and explicit blueprint of Dunhuang art—the content of religious Buddhist scriptures, and further analyzed the artistic interpretation of the content of Dunhuang art to the Buddhist scriptures. Dr. Liu Jing herself is a practitioner of art painting, she showed her paintings of “Illustration of Bodhisattvas Sermon” (taking Cave 290 of Mogao Grottoes as an example) about Dunhuang murals arts on the spot as the central category and logical starting point, launched a discussion on other important aspects of Dunhuang art and put forward some quite new viewpoints.

Among the rich and colorful topics, she believed that Dunhuang art painted the Bodhisattva in a rich and colorful way, it expressed the connotation that Buddha itself as a symbol is Nirvana, which is the result of a special survival practice; Bodhisattva as a symbol is the loader of the practice process of the result of Nirvana. Because of special characteristic of Bodhisattva, Dunhuang artists devote much more passion to Bodhisattva than Buddha. Through the depiction of Manjushri, Vimaiakirti, Avalokitesvara and other Bodhisattva, the profound significance of Dunhuang art can be seen from the indirect or direct depiction of prajna, meditation, thought and outlook of Dunhuang art. As an artistic symbol, Dunhuang flying asparas, which is the most free form and the most expressive of artistic spirit in Chinese Buddhist art, is not identical with the religious archetypes of Gandharva, the God in charge of holy songs and dances, and Kimnara, the God in charge of entertainment in Indian Buddhism, but takes the rich myths and legends about “flying” in ancient China as one of the important cultural origins. At the same time, inspired by the ancient Chinese literati’s persistent pursuit of the spiritual realm of “flying”, and influenced by the atmosphere of “advocating peace and quiet” and “worshipping contemplation” in the philosophy of the Southern Dynasty of China, the connotation of flying has been abstracted from the concrete images of Buddhist Gandharva and Kimnara, and has become a cultural and philosophical symbol that focuses on expressing “spiritual freedom”.

Dunhuang art is extensive and profound, involving many disciplines, which needs to be unremitting exploration from different perspectives and different ways of thinking. Dr. Liu Yun made a useful exploration of Dunhuang art from a philosophical point of view, in which the subject content and art form of Dunhuang art with inspiring feature will play a positive role in promoting the study of Dunhuang art.

4. Research on Chinese Philosophy and Comparative Philosophy, Natural Philosophy and Applied Philosophy

Liu Yuanyuan, a doctoral student at the University of Edinburgh, pointed out that all forms of

reality are regarded as the result of continuous and dynamic changes and developments in nature in Chinese philosophy. As she mentioned in her thesis that organic naturalism is an important feature of Chinese philosophy, and demonstrated it from two aspects: first, from the perspective of ontology, based on the relationship between subject and object in Taoism; secondly, from the relationship between man and society. Through the study of these two aspects, it tried to prove that the potential of change lies in the essence of things, and everything is in an organic dynamic process of change.

Zhai Yujia, a doctoral student at China University of Political Science and Law, makes a brief overview through the comparison of the community thoughts of Marx and Whitehead. It is discussed that Marx and Whitehead did not have a clear definition of the concept of “community”, but in their theory, they contained the idea of community. In the context of the commonality of many dimensions, and when they analyzed civil society and the state and explained political liberation and human liberation, Marx used the word “community” to describe the concept of “community”. As he pointed out, the current capitalist society is an illusory community, and the future communist society is a “real community”. Both Marx and Whitehead emphasized the understanding of all things with a process, connection, dynamic and whole epistemology, and this kind of common theoretical character is also reflected in their community thought. Dr. Zhai explored the community thoughts of Marx and Whitehead, in which he took the harmony between man and nature, man and man, man and himself as the value orientation, providing philosophical basis for the construction of ecological civilization, and manifesting the value appeal of common well-being with the purpose of highlighting the value of subjectivity.

Based on the most basic physical principles and concepts, Chen Yunpeng, a graduate student of Inner Mongolia University, solved the Schrodinger equation of quantum mechanics for material system. As mentioned in the paper, Aristotle put forward the point of view of the first motivation, Newton put forward the view that God is the first driving force in order to solve the singularity problem, but at the same time, it also needs the induction of empirical data as a supplement. The first principle has hierarchical distinction and relativity. The first principle is the static part of the system, which shows simplicity. The auxiliary hypothesis is the dynamic part of the system, which shows complexity. Finally, it concluded the substantive concept that the use of first principle can help people to better understand and solve problem in the world.

For a long time, the relationship between man and nature has always been an issue of concern to human beings. We can see works that reflect the relationship between man and nature in many literary works. Trees are not only ordinary non-human natural creatures in daily life, but also play an important role in the development of our species and culture.

Xu Mengru, a graduate student at Nepal Sanskrit University, raised the deep question of “Can we be naturalistic” as the background to discuss the topic of the thesis. She believes that human beings live with nature, but they are never useful to nature. We are intervening in nature because we can use fire. Each living entity works together for nature, not for human beings. The paper analyzed the environmental consciousness of Indian epic “Mahābhārata” and pointed out that it is the essence of “Mahābhārata” to maintain the naturalness of nature by respecting the existence of every phenomenon in nature. We should also get inspiration from literary works, respect nature and protect nature.

During the rich topic discussion, from the perspective of religious values, researcher Baoyan has given a brief review on funerals of the Hui nationality, which always followed the principle of “simple and quick burial”. The paper points out that funerals are simple, solemn and strictly abide by Islamic rules. To a certain extent, from the notes of Muslim festival ceremonies that participated by the author can see the reality of Islamic death rituals in the contemporary mixed areas of Hui nationality. The different manifestations of different Hui people in the death memorial ceremony, or the “daily” differences caused by the “non-daily” ritual norms, record the multi-orientation of the contemporary Hui nationality in the construction of cultural identity. Through the description of the death ceremony, the paper discusses the ethnic and religious identity, and further reflects on the cultural identity scene of the contemporary Hui nationality.

Conclusion: the theme of this conference is very open and also shows great philosophical significance. Scholars attending the meeting held rigorous and enthusiastic discussions around topics as natural history, nature, natural history education, cosmobiology, Dunhuang philosophy of art, Chinese philosophy, natural philosophy, applied philosophy, comparative philosophy, etc. which fully reflected the international perspective of this academic seminar. In particular, the participation of young scholars and artists shows that the researchers of philosophy education in the new era should possess the problem consciousness, the contemporary era consciousness as well as the sense of responsibility and mission. The organizers of the University of Helsinki in Finland have highly appraised the conference and thanked the participants for their strong support, hoping to strengthen international exchanges among scholars in the future.

PART TWO

A Report on the International Research Project Regarding the Topic of the Impact of Religious Values on Chinese Social Life

JIANG Miao

(China Academy of Social Sciences)

During the period 20 to 21 August, 2019, a two day workshop titled “The Impact of Religious Values on Chinese Social Life” was held at the Culture Center Sofia, Helsinki, Finland. The workshop was most successful from its commencement, throughout all presentations and session proceedings, and in achievement of its overall goals and objectives.

This important workshop was just one of a planned series of related international research activities over the next four years. As founded by the Academy of Finland and the University of Helsinki. The meeting was comprised of twelve scholars invited from China, and twelve scholars invited from western countries.

The entire workshop program was spread over four sessions, with several topics being discussed. Including, the core values contained within each of the three Chinese traditional teachings

(Confucian, Daoism and Buddhism). Also, Christianity, both Protestant and Catholicism. And Islam. With the specific impact on Chinese society of each of these three principal religious beliefs being the main focus of this workshop. The two related topics being religious values and related ethics, together with Scriptural Reasoning in China.

The first session thus covered the core values of traditional religions in China. The related discussions well illustrated the common and shared values of humanity in Confucian and Buddhism. For example, how Confucian classics are in fact humanistic writings, in the context and light of the particular Confucian language used. While the Bible often being treated as a humanistic classic, rather than as a divinely revealed canon, in the Chinese context. Another example is that of Humanistic Buddhism, having the aim of bringing back Buddhism into today's modern humankind lifestyle. That is, being closely linked with social life, rather than instead being isolated from society.

The harmonious and environmental values of Daoism were also presented. With the belief that the three teachings contained within Daoism are actually different branches of the same tree. With all of them teaching the same truth, and that worship is the only goodness.

The second workshop session focused on such topics as the successes and failures of Protestant Christianity in Chinese society. Also, how Christian Ultimate belief systems help defend modern Chinese society from life's anxieties and nihilism. Together with consideration of the beneficial impacts of the normal charity practices within Catholic Christianity on Chinese society.

The relationship between Christianity's core value systems and their effects on the current modern transformation of Chinese society was the main question topic of the related discussions.

The principal topic of the third workshop session was about how Islam is being integrated into both western society, and secondly, within modern Chinese communities. Several examples of influential Islamic social thoughts were introduced and discussed to show this movement. In addition, selected Chinese scholars of Islam, including famous authors and their relative impacts, were reviewed and discussed.

Additional topics of the third workshop session covered religious values and global ethics. Including the presentation of two specific cases related to the reconstruction of Confucian religious belief in recent Chinese history.

In the fourth and final session of the workshop, there was much discussion surrounding the Scriptural Reasoning in China. Certain experiential practices of Scriptural Reasoning in China and related methodological and theological functions within interfaith dialog were presented. Including expressions of hope, suggestions and in addition, questions to be addressed regarding the future of Scripture Reasoning were raised and discussed.

At the closing of the workshop, Professor Mikka Ruokanen summed up the results of the various session discussions, and provided a number of helpful suggestions for continuation of the success of the research project. Among others Professor David Ford from Cambridge University, Professor Steve Bevas from USA, Professor Jaakko Hämeen-Anttila from Edinburg University, Professor Tuula Sakaranaho and Adjunct Professor Paulos Huang from University of Helsinki have been present in the workshop.

论耶可比小说《沃尔德玛》中的爱的哲学^{〔1〕}

刘伟冬

(黑龙江大学哲学学院)

摘要:康德曾在他的道德哲学中探讨了人的自律何以可能的问题,他的论证虽然深刻,但不得不面对如下诘难:道德自律容易导致孤立的自我。德国浪漫主义哲学家耶可比(Friedrich Heinrich Jacobi)在他的小说《沃尔德玛》中批判了两种自律的人格,即单向的自律人格和双边性的自律人格,在此基础上耶可比提出非自利性的爱来克服自律性人格的缺陷,以实现人与人的真正的统一。在他看来,爱是一种超自律的存在;是一种非感性的神性之爱。

关键词:爱;自律;上帝;自由

作者:刘伟冬,男,黑龙江大学哲学学院讲师,武汉大学欧美宗教研究所研究员,通信地址:黑龙江省哈尔滨市黑龙江大学家属区四十栋一单元 503 室,邮编:150080;电话:+8613476864147;邮箱:lwd4194@163.com

一、两种自律性人格的不足

自律是康德道德哲学的主题,它的含义简单地来说就是自我立法,同时自我守法。但是守法为何?康德通过严密的推演得出三个定言命令,例如“只依据那些你同时认为它能成为普遍规律的准则去行动”以及“每一个理性存在者的意志,都可作为制定普遍法则的意志”。康德的论证虽然严谨,但在耶可比眼里道德自律并非完美无暇。他在其小说《沃尔德玛》的第二部分对康德自律性人格展开了批判,然而他没有指责自律的根基——理性,更没有直接诘难定言命令本身,而是将自律性人格进一步地划分为单边性的自律人格和双边性的自律人格,^{〔2〕}并在小说的情境中指出其不足。

若是试图进入到小说主要人物的矛盾冲突,进而体会耶可比所要阐述的思想,那么我们不得不从《沃尔德玛》第一部分和第二部分的结合部开始,因为这里为小说的情境和人物之间矛盾进展埋下了伏笔。

沃尔德玛(Woldma)与海因希特(Heinriette)通过多次真诚的、充满爱意的交流从陌生人变成了一对情侣。在沃尔德玛的灵魂深处,海因希特是真正的新娘,他在精神上是爱着海因希特的,^{〔3〕}当然海因希特在内心深处也是深爱着沃尔德玛的。两人本可以顺利地走进婚姻殿堂,过上幸福的生活,但不幸地是,沃尔德玛突然拒绝了海因希特的爱,要和艾尔文娜(Allwina)订婚了。沃尔德玛给出的理

〔1〕 参阅 LAI Pan-chiu, “Justification by Faith and Protestant Christianity in China”, *International Journal of Sino-Western Studies* 16 (June 2019), 21-33 和游斌 YOU Bin 与黄保罗 Paulos HUANG, “基督教中国化视角下的路德新诠释 Jidujiao zhongguohua shijiao xia de Lude xin quanshi” [The New Interpretation of Martin Luther in the Light of Christian Sincization], in *International Journal of Sino-Western Studies*, vol. 16 (Helsinki, June 2019), 1-17.

〔2〕 参见 Dirk FETZER, *Jacobis Philosophie des Unbedingten* (München: Ferdinand Schoeningh Verlag, 2007), 185.

〔3〕 参见 Friedrich Heinrich JACOBI, *Woldemar* (Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 2000), 339.

由是,他希望能够体验到一种充满激情的爱,而这是在海因希特那里体验不到的,尽管他们常常在精神上保持着一致。海因希特看到恋人即将离去,做了痛苦的辩解,“您曾经不下百次地确定您不会根据激情决定婚姻,不会要求女士的激情……您曾经说在女人与我们男人一样在似乎感受到了爱的激情的地方,在那里几乎总有一些不纯粹的、错误的东西作为基础存在着。”〔4〕但是,沃尔德玛还是无情地拒绝了海因希特的挽留,他说道:“艾尔文娜(Allwina Clarenau)在我的眼里是一个非常具有吸引力的造物物。”〔5〕带着两人的分离,以及沃尔德玛的移情别恋,小说进入了第二部。

在小说第二部的开端,耶可比写道:彼得特尔(Bidertal,沃尔德玛的兄弟)得知沃尔德玛和艾尔文娜订婚的消息感到吃惊,无法相信这是真的。他相信沃尔德玛和海因希特才是真心相爱的,但是他惊讶地发现海因希特的姐妹们并不回避,竟然有些开心地讨论有关沃尔德玛订婚的事情。彼得特尔在她们的神情里隐约地感到些隐情——姐妹们的表现可能是为避免海因希特尴尬。其实,海因希特也意识到了这一点,但是因为自己事先得知沃尔德玛已经爱上艾尔文娜,所以没有显得不满,焦躁、愤恨,反而表现得平静;她也没有因为沃尔德玛的背离而发誓不愿做他的妻子,她还保留着挽回的希望。〔6〕悲剧的发生往往伴随着激烈的矛盾冲突,现在一切都显得过于平静,在他人看来海因希特(Heinriette)仿佛想让失恋的事实不了了之;但是,事情没有这么简单,平静的水面之下是激流涌动。

接下来我们看一下沃尔德玛在宣告分手之后是如何单方面地处理与海因希特的关系的。〔7〕沃尔德玛抛弃了与海因希特的爱情,要去找寻激情之爱,但是他发现越是远离海因希特(一种主体之间的状态),越是退回到一种个体自我之孤立的境地之中(移情别恋没有让沃尔德玛幸福,激情是不能持久的)。〔8〕“个体的自我”可能导致两种状态:自律和他律,他律意味着受他者奴隶,而自律排除了两个主体或者多个主体之间的联系,进入到一种空洞的、孤立的自我的境地。显然这两种状态都不是沃尔德玛所欲求的。但是,自律不是完全没有意义的,因为自律意味着自由,尽管这种自由的实现条件单纯地依靠自我就可以实现,因此还是限于自我之内的、孤立的自由。小说的主人公不想抛弃自律,自律对他来说不仅高于他律,而且高于任意的自由。由此沃尔德玛在离开海因希特之后最初的日子里并没有多少悔恨的意思,“我自由地享受着一切,安静地飘荡在无限权力的海洋中。”〔9〕沃尔德玛沉浸在自己的世界里,支配着自己所创造的一切,这种自律式的自由就是主体与自身的同一性,我是我,我与自身保持一致,在这里沃尔德玛不受更高的东西所限制,产生了享有无限权力的幻觉。

如果世界只有一个人存在,我们没必要为主体之间的关系担忧,但造物者创造了难以计数的主体,那么我们不得不面对这样一个合理的问题:“主体间的关系如何能够实现,在个体的自由或者自律没有因为这种关系而受到破坏的情况下?”〔10〕主体间的关系一方面要超越于个体的自由,另一方面又要以之为条件。当然,耶可比所寻求的主体间的关系不是充满冲突的,而是和谐的、主体之间达成真正统一的关系。过了不久,沃尔德玛发现海因希特有些秘密不再与他分享了,沃尔德玛感到非常痛苦——向他人保守自己的秘密意味着两人之间信任的关系终结了。他对海因希特不满、愤怒,他甚至承认“一种邪恶的精神再次盘旋在他的头上。”〔11〕这可以说是沃尔德玛在发觉海因希特不再信任他之后的情绪表现。

沃尔德玛的不良情绪表明他并不想中断两人和谐、统一的关系,但是他没有停留在不满愤怒的情

〔4〕 *Ibid.*, 330.

〔5〕 *Ibid.*, 330.

〔6〕 参见 Friedrich Heinrich JACOBI, *Woldemar* (Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 2000), 341.

〔7〕 单边性的自律人格及其缺陷通过 Woldemar 的行为得到了表现。

〔8〕 参见 Dirk FETZER, *Jacobis Philosophie des Unbedingten* (München: Ferdinand Schoeningh Verlag, 2007), 186.

〔9〕 Friedrich Heinrich JACOBI, *Woldemar* (Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 2000), 347.

〔10〕 Dirk FETZER, *Jacobis Philosophie des Unbedingten* (München: Ferdinand Schoeningh Verlag, 2007), 168.

〔11〕 Friedrich Heinrich JACOBI, *Woldemar* (Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 2000), 368.

绪中太久，他“很高兴地感受到了精神的自由在没有受到攻击的情况下，他的内心为所有美的事物所刺激，为兴趣所敞开。”^[12]沃尔德玛是乐观的，他相信人的自律，人性的纯粹性和无罪，相信一切美的事物。他沉浸在自己理解的人性理论之中，期待着海因希特的谅解，这可以说是沃尔德玛对两人关系的一种行动上的回应。但是，这种尝试是不成功的，他还是“在她那里、尤其是她针对他的行为中感受到了一些改变了的东西。”^[13]沃尔德玛克制了自己的恶意，对人性展开了美好的想象，但这是不可能获得海因希特的理解的，一方面因为沃尔德玛的表现仅仅停留在内心的世界里，没有具体的行动；另一方面单方面行为的封闭性，没能建立起与海因希特的直接关系，她对沃尔德玛所思所想一无所知。

沃尔德玛对自己的处境感到伤心，越是这样他越是感到对海因希特的爱。沃尔德玛想过寻找激情之爱，当激情褪去他发现最爱的还是原来那个精神上契合的伴侣。他找准机会直接地对海因希特倾诉道：“你还会陪伴在我身边吗，海因希特？我绝对不会失去你？——不是真的吗，我绝对不会失去你？”^[14]沃尔德玛从上述的那种片面的行动中走出来，尝试通过直接的倾诉来获得对方的回应，从而建立“主体间的关系”。遗憾的是，海因希特没有愉快地恢复与沃尔德玛的关系，她有些“疑惑”，甚至感到痛苦。沃尔德玛再次感受到了一种陌生感，他发现他们曾经相互的信任、精神的契合都消失殆尽了——尽管在之后两个人彼此面对的时候，为了避免尴尬，两个人嘘寒问暖，表演得像好友一样，但还是掩藏不住两人冰冷的陌生感。^[15]可以说，两位主体之间具体的、内在的关系瓦解了，所剩下的只是一些虚假的、外在的关系。沃尔德玛试图通过单方面的行动弥合两者之间的裂痕，但对方没有给出积极的回应，显然他的尝试失败了。

但是沃尔德玛没有放弃，他又有了新的主意：“我应该站在她的立场想一想，毕竟她是个女孩；斟酌一下，是什么导致了我们的两人品格的差异；这样我就可以就一切事情为她辩护了。”^[16]但是，这种设身处地的尝试很快被沃尔德玛否决了，“我一定要站在她的立场上吗？海因希特对我来说是一个他者；海因希特背离了我。”^[17]沃尔德玛已经意识到恢复与海因希特旧有的情感状态已经不可能了：“为了与她好好相处，我必须忘记自己曾如何全心地把她视为我的女朋友——我是她的男朋友。”^[18]沃尔德玛必须面对他与海因希特旧有的恋爱关系已经成为过去的事实，他还是爱着海因希特的，为了挽回海因希特，沃尔德玛不得不尝试建立一种新的关系。但是，这种新的关系还只局限在对过去的遗忘和扬弃；沃尔德玛应该选择忘记，在他看来海因希特也不是完全无过错的，“因此一切都应该被扬弃掉，一切都应该被遗忘。”^[19]但是忘记之后又怎样呢？遗忘属于是一种消极的行为方式，它在两人之间并没有建立什么积极的东西。^[20]两人的关系没有因为选择对过去的遗忘而得到扭转，沃尔德玛原本期待陌生感会转化为快乐，但是陌生的、让人不习惯的东西还在那里。沃尔德玛屡屡碰壁已经无计可施了，他渴望对方主动对他进行批评，甚至把责任推卸给他，这也可能为两人关系的恢复博得一些生机。遗憾的是，海因希特没能理解沃尔德玛的心意，“她让他（沃尔德玛）清楚地意识到：她所有的快乐在今晚被毁掉了。”^[21]

沃尔德玛尝试了多种可能，他愤怒过，希望引起海因希特的注意，他对自己严格自律，甚至把错误

[12] *Ibid.*, 371.

[13] *Ibid.*, 371.

[14] *Ibid.*, 372

[15] 参见 Dirk FETZER, *Jacobis Philosophie des Unbedingten* (München: Ferdinand Schoeningh Verlag, 2007), 188.

[16] Friedrich Heinrich Jacobi, *Woldemar* (Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 2000), 385.

[17] *Ibid.*, 385.

[18] *Ibid.*, 385.

[19] *Ibid.*, 388.

[20] 参见 Dirk FETZER, *Jacobis Philosophie des Unbedingten* (München: Ferdinand Schoeningh Verlag, 2007), 188.

[21] Friedrich Heinrich Jacobi, *Woldemar* (Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 2000), 392.

归于自身等等,但是这些尝试都是单方面的,其结果也是失败。沃尔德玛感到两人完全漠视对方,关系断了,可以说两者关系再次统一在一定程度上来说是不可能了,“沃尔德玛一夜未睡,在自身之内把一切都翻转过来,以致于改变的每一种前景也被毁掉了,每一种希望变成了蠢行。”^[22]

沃尔德玛单方面的努力失败了;但这并不意味着海因希特不想与之和好如初,其实她也在做着单方面的努力,^[23]只是耶可比所做的描述不多罢了,“我不知道发生了什么;是的,我不知道。我有过错,它们会落在我头上的。”^[24]与沃尔德玛一样,海因希特也希望通过对自身过错的认可来建立与沃尔德玛的关系。^[25]可惜的是,海因希特是在与沃尔德玛的兄弟彼得特尔的交谈过程中、而不是在与沃尔德玛的直接交流中揭示这些内容的。海因希特单方面的努力失败了,她有着属于她自己的希望,但这希望不为沃尔德玛所知,那么这希望就是片面的。

沃尔德玛与海因希特是两个成熟的、有理性的人,他们有向善的心,有改正自己错误的意愿,可以说他们有着自律的人格,但是他们为什么不能敞开自身,直接地对话以实现两者的“再次统一呢”?这是因为两位主人公的表现实际象征着康德所言的自律的人格,这种人格虽然具有把道德作为目的、具有反思自身、纠正错误的能力,但这种人格是有缺陷的,它其实是一个沉浸在自我之中的封闭的自我。一旦自我出了问题,破坏与其他主体统一的关系,这种自我就显得束手无策。他返回自身,可以反省自己的错误,但对他来说“我思”、“自我反省”就是一切,单纯地在自我之内就可以把一切问题解决,从而认识不到向他者敞开自己的必要,那么主体间的“再次统一”就变得不可能。但是,康德显然不会满意这个结论,在他看来理性存在者因为理性所实现的道德自律(并且因为理性预设了上帝)能够实现一个目的王国,或者说一个道德的共同体。康德的共同体是一个美好的理想,但是我们必须指出在这个共同体之中主体与主体之间是因为自我树立的抽象的法则和目的而联系在一起;我们可以进一步推论说主体遵循自我建立的抽象的法则和目的是实现康德所谓的道德共同体的充分条件;可以说,在没有爱、情感、沟通、对他者敞开自身的情况下,康德的道德世界仍然可以实现。康德的设想是一种理论上的可能,但是沃尔德玛和海因希特两个自律人格在处理双方矛盾时所暴露的弊病已经表明:封闭的自律人格在处理不同主体之间的沟通和统一的问题时是无能为力的,它在一定程度上展现的是一种傲慢的、空洞的自我。尽管封闭的人格也表现出对善的目的主动追求的能力,但是它仍然是自我同一性。这种封闭的人格很难公开、直接地承认错误,反而却焦虑地等待着他人主动地谅解。在两个主体之间,如果恰有一个自律的人格,主体间的关系还有复合的余地,如果是两个自律的人格,他们的行为多会酿成悲剧:两人要么退回到自身,维护自己的傲慢:要么两人的傲慢被击得粉碎。

海因希特隐隐约约意识到了症结所在,她决定“向沃尔德玛敞开自己”,她要向他倾诉她的感受、她的灵魂整个的状态。^[26]尽管海因希特知道她的单方面的表白很可能被沃尔德玛直接拒绝,但她还是要抓住这个机会:“感谢上帝,现在到了澄清我们之间问题的时候了……我们的友谊对我来说是神圣的……我们友谊之建立是如此地深刻,并且能得到衷心保证的是,我不会对这样一种评论感到羞愧:我们的友谊不会恐惧那些最为渺小的裂痕。”^[27]对海因希特来说,过往的友谊是那么美好、坚固,绝不能轻易抛弃,如果她和沃尔德玛打算建立裂痕之后新的关系,这个关系一定要与过去的关系联结

[22] *Ibid.*, 394.

[23] 当 Heinerichette 做出努力的时候,双方关系就不是单向度的,即 Woldemar 的单方面的努力,而是双向度的,即双方的共同努力。但因为他们的人格性仍然是自律性的,因此可以称之为双边的自律人格。

[24] Friedrich Heinrich JACOBI, *Woldemar* (Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 2000), 377.

[25] 参见 Dirk FETZER, *Jacobis Philosophie des Unbedingten* (München: Ferdinand Schoeningh Verlag, 2007), 189.

[26] 参见 Friedrich Heinrich JACOBI, *Woldemar* (Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 2000), 381.

[27] *Ibid.*, 382.

起来。海因希特是勇敢的，但她的尝试成功了吗？沃尔德玛对海因希特的倾诉感到疑惑，不确定他们之间的友谊真的如此坚固；他做过的努力都没起到什么效果，海因希特的突然表白让他感到混乱和窘迫，他不知道该说些什么，以致于他想马上离开。海因希特如此炽烈而又直接的倾诉为何会让沃尔德玛感到窘迫呢？他不是期待着两人重归于好吗？如果海因希特认为自己的友谊和爱是由于无条件的信任，沃尔德玛则不能完全认同。^[28]这样的后果是由他曾试图弥合两人裂痕却被海因希特视而不见造成的，可见误解一直折磨着彼此相爱的沃尔德玛和海因希特。

海因希特倾情的告白失败了，他们都在努力恢复甚至重建两人的关系，但都因为二者的傲慢与封闭没能找到共同点。海因希特对沃尔德玛的无动于衷感到伤心，但是没有彻底气馁，最后她采取了另一种近乎绝望的做法。海因希特所希望的那种对两者关系的重塑不是基于对两人过错的抵消，而是一种期待，海因希特说道：“很明显他是不公正的，人们应该劝告他睁开自己的眼睛。”^[29]沃尔德玛认为两人都有过错，过错相抵消，两人感情自然可以恢复，海因希特对这种和稀泥的处理方法感到不满，她选择了期待，期待沃尔德玛改正自己，有所升华。海因希特从“敞开自身”转入到对沃尔德玛的期待之中，这表明她在积极的尝试碰壁之后退回到消极的不作为之中，毕竟期待是一种单方面的、非主动的恢复主体关系的尝试。海因希特以期待的方式与沃尔德玛交往，两人有过交流但始终没有解开心结。海因希特感到心绪的混乱与绝望，她百般地说服自己“对他的爱不是一种蠢行”，才获得了灵魂的安宁。最终期待还是失败了，“沃尔德玛与海因希特因其行为而被带入的境况是一种相互的漠不关心的安静。”^[30]这个结果不难预料，因为期待仍然是封闭性的，它消极的表现类似于漠不关心，没有两个主体间的灵魂的默契与行动的配合是不可能获得想要的结果的。

因为两者相互之间的冷漠，主体间的关系消亡了，这也意味着两个自律的主体所做的尝试，即通过最初沃尔德玛最初单边的、而后海因希特加入进来的双边的行动以恢复他们之间的统一关系的尝试彻底失败了。封闭的自律人格无法建立主体间的关系，然而两个主人公的努力就还没有结束，在下面我们看看两个主体是如何通过爱来克服自律人格的缺陷的。

二、爱的哲学

每一个主体都试图通过单独的行动来恢复主体间的关系，这种尝试已经表明主体是积极的、能动的了，但是从上文的描述来看不管是主体选择积极的尝试抑或消极的尝试，主体间的关系始终没有建立起来，相反联系中断了，成了虚无。这样的悲剧显然不是我们愿意看到的。那么，沃尔德玛与海因希特的关系如何进一步地发展呢？耶可比没有让两人的关系就此中断，他不仅要否定自律的人格，他还要让两人的关系在更高的阶段得到统一。由此，沃尔德玛与海因希特尝试恢复统一关系的第二阶段开始了。与上述单方面的尝试不同，耶可比对两人关系的处理要做一个转变。其实在之前海因希特的父亲痛恨沃尔德玛的背离，他在死前要求海因希特许下愿望绝对不能嫁给沃尔德玛，面对临死的父亲海因希特痛苦地答应了这一请求。海因希特将父亲的遗命告知了她的诸位好友，并要求他们务必向沃尔德玛保密，她害怕一旦沃尔德玛知道了她对亡父的诺言，就会坚定地断绝与她的关系。然而，沃尔德玛还是从海因希特的好友那里得知了这一令人痛苦的事实，但是他始终没有向她透露一二，反而努力恢复两人的关系。之后，海因希特偶然地知道沃尔德玛已然知晓她的诺言，海因希特为沃尔德玛的勇敢与坚持所打动，沃尔德玛的扭捏、含蓄都是有原因的啊，他得知海因希特对父亲的临

[28] 参见 Friedrich Heinrich JACOBI, *Woldemar* (Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 2000), 383.

[29] 参见 Friedrich Heinrich JACOBI, *Woldemar* (Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 2000), 386.

[30] 参见 Dirk FETZER, *Jacobis Philosophie des Unbedingten* (München: Ferdinand Schoeningh Verlag, 2007), 191.

终诺言一定非常痛苦,他在绝望的时候一定抱着希望在努力。她是那么激动,那么为沃尔德玛优美的灵魂所感动。由此,两人之间的关系在绝望之际迎来了转机,海因希特希望能够获得沃尔德玛的宽恕,一旦得到宽恕他们之间的困扰就被取消了,两人就可以和好如初。

但是,宽恕是一件容易的事吗,抑或它只是一个可以轻易放过的不值得探讨的概念?在耶可比的小说里,宽恕显然不是一个可有可无的概念,因为宽恕一方面意味着对自律性人格导致的后果,即双方关系的毁灭的扬弃,另一方面则是向更高的层次即无条件的爱过渡的媒介。宽恕的前提是双方找到共同点,即对某个普遍真理的共同的认可,没有这个共同点双方无法达成一致,同时共同点一定要胜过基本矛盾,否则也无法达成宽恕。但是,仅仅有思想的一致宽恕仍然未必达成,因为一方需要主动承认错误,而另一方则需要宽宏大量甚至自我反省,如果两人展现出一种胜利与失败的关系,生成的傲慢与屈辱就会阻碍着宽恕的达成。由此可见,真正的宽恕应该建立在平等的关系之上,而平等的关系应该以双方共同承认自己的过错、共同的忏悔为前提。关系是两个人的,不是一个人的,它的破坏、修复与升华不是一个人的事情,而是两人共同作用的结果,因此可以说一方承认错误,一方予以宽恕还不是真正的宽恕。应该指出,真正的宽恕应该是双方对自身错误的检讨以及对对方的包容,在这里两者的关系既是互动的,同时又是平等的。其实,海因希特与沃尔德玛也是这样做的,海因希特:“我来了,放下那些书本上的知识,来寻求确凿的宽恕。”^[31]沃尔德玛也做了积极的回应:“你原谅我,我会接受你的宽恕。”^[32]沃尔德玛与海因希特之间的宽恕达成了,两人和好如初,既然两人共同经历这么多的磨难,不妨说两人之间的感情升华了。

到目前为止,我们还有一个重要的问题没有谈,即什么是爱的问题。其实,没有爱的存在宽恕是不可能的,海因希特在了解真相后是带着完全的信任和深刻的爱面对沃尔德玛的,而沃尔德玛面对海因希特则说道:“爱在不需要任何好处的情况下被寄予了我,同样我也能够如此纯粹地、不可理解地再次给予爱。”^[33]二人之间的宽恕不是因为需要宽恕而宽恕,而是因为有了更高的东西而宽恕。宽恕这个概念本身还是有条件的、不完善的,它依靠其自身是不可能解决问题的,例如我不能因为说我宽恕了你,我就宽恕了你,我还要问我为什么宽恕了你,这就是说宽恕需要一个原因和根据才可能成立。宽恕的有限性还需要更高的范畴来克服,这个更高的范畴绝不能是物质的东西,因为这意味着买卖,也不能是空洞的规则来克服,因为它造成了傲慢与封闭,而只能是爱来克服。耶可比曾经写道:如果人们没有对道德的爱,那么道德就是虚无,^[34]引申一下,我们可以说来自于爱的宽恕才是真正的宽恕,宽恕在没有爱的情况下就是虚无。爱是纯粹的、无私的,同时又是不能通过概念所把握的,它克服了自律的封闭性、有限性,把两个分裂的主体再次统一了起来。由此看来,耶可比所说的爱显然不是建立在有限之物之上的爱,爱在他那里具有超越性,是不可进一步追溯的;它包容了一切缺憾、污秽,同时又给予了纯洁、光明的东西,这正如耶可比在小说的结尾所总结的那样:“请相信爱,它接受一切,但也给予一切。”^[35]

宽恕与和解因为爱而实现,而不是有了宽恕与和解爱才生成。可见爱是比自律与宽恕更高的范畴。爱是超自律的,那么爱就不是通过自由主体的单方或者双方的努力建立起来的。虽然爱不以主体的自律以及实践为前提,但是我们不能认为自律以及主体间的关系可以脱离爱而存在。上面所展现的沃尔德玛与海因希特经历已经表明:如果没有爱的存在,人与人不得不相互地分裂。那么我们不免有个疑问,爱来自哪里?是我们后天学来的呢,还是来自于一个更高的存在者——神?如果是后天

[31] Friedrich Heinrich JACOBI, *Woldemar* (Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 2000), 454.

[32] *Ibid.*, 456.

[33] *Ibid.*, 461.

[34] *Ibid.*, 441.

[35] *Ibid.*, 467.

学来的，爱就具有经验的成分，因此缺少必然的、神圣的力量。人作为有限的存在者，只有信仰，爱的能力才会从灵魂中生成出来，换言之如果一个人没有信仰，是没有爱的能力的，因为爱作为人的潜能不能施展出来。正如沃尔德玛在感受到内心的爱时所感慨的那样：“我必然要崇拜神；必然仰望神。”^[36]爱是神的本质，神的爱是无私的、绝对的和永恒的，神因为爱而创造了世界并按照其自身的形象创造了人，由此人有了爱的能力，但这种能力还是一种潜能，是信仰把它激发出来。耶可比所理解的神显然与犹太教中的神是不同的，犹太教把神理解为人之外的绝对的异己的力量，这种力量具有绝对的权威，他通过摩西用冰冷的律法统治着犹太人，而人所做的只是对他的绝对的服从。犹太人的神是没有爱的，他嫉妒、苛刻，这造成了犹太人的偏狭与狂妄，以致于他们认为只有自己的神才是真神，只有犹太教的信徒死后才能升入天堂。因为平等与爱在犹太人的民族观念中是不存在的，不同民族之间的和解和联合也是不可能的，显然犹太人对神的理解造成了与其他民族的隔膜与仇恨。但是，如果我们以为犹太人之间存在着平等和自由那就错了，如果说希腊人的平等是建立在自由的心灵之上，那么犹太人的平等则是建立在普遍地对神的依赖和人的无能之上。人是神的奴隶，人要绝对地服从于神，我们可以讲奴隶与奴隶是平等的，但是这种平等并没有改变不平等、不自由的现实，因此是没有意义的。耶可比对神以及爱的理解显然受《新约》的影响，在这部圣典中所探讨的主题就是神对人的纯粹的、绝对的爱：人因为在诱惑之下偷食禁果而犯下原罪，这种罪依靠人的努力是无法洗清的，神出于对人的爱而把独子耶稣派往人间，神的独子向人宣扬爱与善的价值，在经历诸种苦难之后以其生命的代价替人洗清了罪，此后每个人都获得了升入天堂的可能。其实，洗罪只是为人进入天堂提供了消极的可能，而积极的可能性就在于每个人都有爱的能力。

既然神按照其形象创造了人并把具有神性的爱的种子放置在人的灵魂之中，那么人的爱与神的爱一样都是完满、绝对的，人有能力实现纯粹的道德，耶可比甚至写道：谁无私地、必然地、绝对地爱着，谁就可以成为具有神性的存在。^[37]人的爱可以与神的爱相媲美，但是人之爱的实现过程必然充满着艰辛，毕竟人是有限的存在者，受着感性欲求的限制。虽然爱一旦掺杂了感性的因素就不再纯粹，但不管怎样原罪毕竟不是不可克服的。爱排除了感性的欲求，排除了对外在对象的依赖，爱是爱本身，它在人的精神内就是完善的。但是爱如何让自身开端呢？一旦爱被感性的欲求压制，爱的种子岂不是不能成长吗？爱绝不是因为有限事物的刺激而生成，但是爱的能力也绝不是通过逻辑演绎而产生的结果。在耶可比看来人有一种预感的能力，这种能力让人感知到人自身对爱的倾慕，对神的敬畏、对丑恶的厌恶。这种能力比信仰更加根本，不是有了信仰才有了预感，而是有了预感才有了信仰。人们常常问，为什么人有信仰，其根源就在于人有预感的能力。预感的能力是无法压制的，它犹如人心中一点光明，万古不灭。爱因为预感而成为一种力，爱之力是原初的、创造性的力。人们常以为自己因为理念、理想等完善的目的而有了更高的追求，进而才表现出了爱的能力，在这里爱成了理想的产物。其实这个顺序是倒置了的，按照耶可比的观点爱才是第一位的，因为爱是与神本质相关的。既然爱是一种力，爱就要将自身释放出来，实现要有其规则，否则爱就是一种盲目的力量，甚至有可能转向罪恶。例如有人以爱的名义、但却使用恶的手段行事。这种人比起那些以恶的名义行事的人往往会造成更大的恶，因为“爱的名义”比起“以恶之名”更容易让人丧失警惕性。那么，爱的原则是什么呢？对此耶可比首先讨论了智性的品格。纯粹之爱是在真理范围内的欲求，因为这样一种欲求，人们仅仅按照其智性的品格行动。但是，耶可比所说的智性品格不同于康德的智性品格。在康德那里更多的表现为树立绝对命令以及遵守绝对命令的能力。而耶可比则将智性的品格理解为表述并且遵守神性原则的能力。神性原则作为纯粹之爱遵守的对象是超验的、甚至是超人性的。可见，爱的原则实

[36] *Ibid.*, 461.

[37] 参见 Friedrich Heinrich JACOBI, *Goettlichen Dingen und ihrer Offenbarung* (Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 2000), 52.

实际上就是指这种神性原则。但是什么又是神性原则呢? 在耶可比的文本里没有看到直接的表述。但是从其行文中仍可发现他所说的神性原则正是《圣经》所言说的: 上帝因为爱的力量创世并且赋予每一个人无条件的爱, 由此人也要无条件地爱自己的邻人甚至敌人。这样一种神性原则是不能通过知性的间接性证明的; 相反, 它是在人的灵魂中被直接意识到的。爱是力量, 是情感, 它为人与人、人与物、人与神提供了真正的统一性, 是爱克服了一切分离与对立, 把万事万物联结在一起。

绝对的爱是要付诸行动的, 没有行动的爱是有缺陷的。神因为爱创造了整个世界, 正如耶可比所写的那样: “如果神不创造, 在他之内就不会有爱让自身被思考。”^[38]可以说, 神对世界的创造是对完满的爱之力量的释放。人是按照神的形象创造的, 与神一样也有着爱, 人不能把爱及其原则仅仅局限在思想和情感中, 因此要有所作为。但人是有限的存在者, 人在行动的过程中必然会遇到异己的力量, 在实践中感受到了来自自然的或者人为的阻力, 由此人感受到一种与他者的对立, 而非统一。有限的人对这种分裂感到痛苦, 但在有限之物中找不到解决的办法, 因为有限之物只会提供有限的东西; 爱的实现也不能诉诸理性, 因为理性是把有限的事物联结起来的能力, 如果把爱当作一个部分连接起来, 爱就会受其它部分的限制, 因此降低为有限的存在。人的使命就是要把完满的爱, 统一的爱带入驳杂、分裂的人间中来。人作为人, 总会限于异己之物的包围之中^[39], 时常感到恐惧和颤栗, 为了克服这些感受, 人们可以选择用暴力统治他人, 实现统一, 但这种方式是不正义的。耶可比已经指出人与人有着共同的东西: 爱。爱是人的本质, 是统一和不分裂, 它包容一切恶的东西、善的东西。耶稣曾经说过: 爱你的敌人, 当他要打你的左脸, 你把右脸也给他打。这是爱超越一切异己之物的最好的表达。人要带着爱而不是恨去行动, 要勇敢、坚持, 这样一个被爱统一、联结的世界才能建立起来。这既是神要人做的, 也是人自己要做的。

三、结论

主体与客体是作为相互对立的的存在者而存在的。沃尔德玛与海因希特之间的感情一直存在罅隙的原因就是他们把彼此一直视为外在的对象。在没有爱在场的情况下, 两个主体之间的统一是不可能的, 哪怕这两个主体是自律的或者自由的主体, 对此耶可比写道: “没有爱的自由只是盲目的估计。”^[40]可见, 单纯的自由不能达成统一, 而是造成了主体的封闭性与虚无。自由依据爱才获得了积极的意义, 但这不是说爱不需要自由(这里的自由不是康德的自由, 主要指一种能动性), 爱也要把自由纳入到自身中来, 只有自由的人才会爱。但是, 爱一定是高于自由的, 爱超越于自由主体的对立之上。爱是绝对的存在、无条件的存在, 在爱的情感中只有统一、完满而没有对立与差异。沃尔德玛与海因希特之间的情感矛盾依靠单纯的自由是没有用的, 有限的东西始终是有限的东西, 他们的矛盾只有在直觉得到爱的时候才得到解决。爱更是神的本质, 神是在爱中并通过爱创造了整个世界, 如果我们抛开了这个绝对的存在者, 我们是体会不到一个完满的爱, 由此我们必须选择回归到一个绝对者之下。有人会说一个抛开了神的人也是有爱的, 例如他爱着他的家人、他的朋友, 但这种爱是相对的、有限的, 因为他的心中没有神, 他只会爱自己的熟人, 但对陌生人却极为冷漠。有限的爱造就了温暖, 也造就了敌意, 这是我们要注意的。^[41]

[38] Friedrich Heinrich JACOBI, *Kleine Schriften* II (Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 2007), 245.

[39] 主体与客体, 我与他是互为条件的, 没有客体的存在主体是意识不到自己的, 没有主体的存在客体如同一个虚无。主客对立对人而言是一种常态, 让我感受到他者的力量, 但这并不意味着这种对立无法取消。

[40] Friedrich Heinrich JACOBI, *Goettlichen Dingen und ihrer Offenbarung* (Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 2000), 40.

[41] 有人说即便没有信仰, 我们也可以对陌生的人有无条件的爱, 例如我们因为乌托邦的理想对陌生的民族给予完全无私的援助。但是这种爱往往表现为一种激情, 是短暂的, 因此不能称之为无条件的。造成“无信仰者, 不会无条件爱”的原因在于乌托邦理想的有限性、有条件性, 有条件的东西还不是绝对的存在, 在某个条件下必然造成人与人的分歧、甚至仇恨。

English Title:

The View on the Philosophy of Love in Jacobi's Novel *Woldmar*

LIU Weidong

Lecturer, School of Philosophy, Heilongjiang University, Room 503, Unit 1, Building 40, Teachers Dormitory, Haerbin City, 150080, Heilongjiang Province, P. R. China. Tel: +8613476864147. Email: lwd4194@163.com

Abstract: Kant once discussed the issue of how the self-discipline of man comes into being in his moral philosophy. Though profound, his argument has faced the following observation: Self-discipline in morality easily leads to self-isolation. Friedrich Heinrich Jacobi, a German romantic philosopher, criticized two self-disciplined personality types in his novel *Woldmar*, namely, the personality with one-dimensional self-discipline and the personality with bilateral self-discipline. Based upon this criticism, Jacobi proposes a non-self-interested love to overcome the defects of the self-disciplined personality and aims to realize the true unity of man. In his view, love is a kind of existence that transcends self-discipline, and a kind of non-perceptual divine love.

Key Words: love; self-discipline; God; freedom

文学作品、人文经典、神的话语、还是神人交碰的记录？

关于希伯来《圣经》研究的对话

黄保罗、李炽昌

摘要:本对话于 2018 年 8 月 2 日在赫尔辛基大学举行,主要包括如下内容:一、您个人的生活经历和学历中有哪些事件对你今天的学术道路,包括你所从事的这个事业和你的思想的形成产生一些重要的影响?你怎么会产生宗教情怀?背诵《圣经》经文的经历,戴智民博士(Dr. Richard Deutsch)的影响,著名的学者 Professor David Flusser 的影响,爱丁堡大学的希伯来《圣经》研究。二、学术研究中的核心问题:神学与宗教之间的问题,跨语境和跨文本阅读与前见,您的信仰对学术研究的影响,“经”与“教”的关系,以中国的经典来读希伯来《圣经》的原文。三、你的研究是否会被你自己的过分人文主义“前见”所控制?把“教”放下来去读“经”的时候,你如何处理你自己的“前见”?你是否会在传一个不同于使徒保罗所传的福音?你会否导致相对主义或虚无主义?先解构,再建构,您不担心离经背道吗?四、汉语学界的希伯来《圣经》研究及人才培养:人才培养计划,中国大陆本土培养的希伯来《圣经》研究学者。五、大国学视野中的汉语学术圣经学:我所构建的《大国学视野中的汉语学术圣经学》为了解构狭隘国学,并为在汉语学界进行基督教研究获得合法性。《圣经》不仅是神的话语、文学艺术作品和人文经典,而且是神人交碰的记载,无论你信它是上帝,还是不信它是上帝,它有上帝的话。如果你真的去研究这个话,它就会成为一个对你生命有意义的话。六、你的学术研究与基督教传统教义之间的关系是什么?你的颠覆了传统教义的研究成果是什么? Cross textual reading(跨文本阅读、跨文本诠释)与 inter-religious(宗教间对话)或 comparative religions(比较宗教学),您自己如何在多元亚洲经典处境中进行《圣经》阅读?三位一体、原罪等教义有《圣经》根据吗?如何关注《圣经》的模糊性和超越性?旧约里有“上帝是全知全能”这方面的经文吗?七、你自己的学说也就是“教”,得以站立的根据是什么?你以你自己的理解来代替“教”而解经,如何理解路德的“唯独《圣经》”?你的“权威”是什么?除去人文理性之外,你相信上帝对你有启示吗?八、汉语学界《圣经》学今后发展的展望。九、“经”的绝对性与否的问题。

关键词:《圣经》、跨文本阅读、经与教、前见、大国学视野中的汉语学术圣经学

作者:黄保罗(Paulos Huang),上海大学特聘教授, *International Journal of Sino-Western Studies* (www. SinoWesternStudies. com)和 *Brill Yearbook of Chinese Theology* (www. brill. com/yct)主编。芬兰赫尔辛基大学哲学与神学双博士,日本东京大学博士后。主要研究大国学、汉语学术神学、马丁·路德、汉语学术对话神学、汉语学术圣经学、全球第一的芬兰教育之奥秘等。最新著作(译)《芬兰学派之父曼多马著作集》(2018 上海三联)及《马丁·路德研究丛书》七本(证道集、书信集、论婚姻、论洗礼、论两个国度、论教会秩序、论信心的确据和爱里的接纳)(山东省两会)引起学界广泛关注。

李炽昌(Archie Lee),英国爱丁堡大学哲学博士(希伯来圣经研究),现为山东大学人文社科一级教授,博士生导师,中国文化研究所名誉高级研究员。曾任香港中文大学文化及宗教研究系资深教授,历任香港中文大学宗教系主任,文学院副院长、院长等职务。2013 年 12 月正式加盟山东大学。亚洲圣经研究协会(SABS)创会主席、圣经研究协会(SBL)董事。此外,李炽昌教授于 1998-2001 年度,受英国剑桥大学宗教学与神学高级研究中心邀请,出任“亚洲基督教”研究计划主任,他还担任 *Global Bible Commentary*, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, *Biblical Interpretation* 以及 *Journal of World Christianity* 等多项国际性学术出版计划的编辑和评审工作。主要研究希伯来《圣经》,代表作品很多,如李炽昌、游斌著:《生命言说与社群认同:希伯来圣经五小卷研究》,北京:中国社会科学出版社,2006 年。

黄保罗(以下简称“黄”):今天是 2018 年 8 月 2 号,在赫尔辛基大学,现在我们在一个中心,我非

常高兴和李教授来做这样一个对话。李教授,非常地欢迎你。

李炽昌(以下简称“李”):谢谢,谢谢。这是一个难得的机会。

黄:是,到芬兰来相见。

李:在异地。

黄:对,在异地。所以,你现在参加 Society of Biblical Literature(SBL)会议,我想你可不可以简单地和我们谈一下三个问题?

一、您个人的生活经历和学历中有哪些事件对你今天的学术道路,包括你所从事的这个事业和你的思想的形成产生一些重要的影响?

黄:第一个问题,您个人的生活经历和学历中有哪些事件对你今天的学术道路,包括你所从事的这个事业和你的思想的形成产生一些重要的影响?

李:好的。我就从我在芬兰的这次开会开始讲,因为这个是圣经文学研究学会(Society of Biblical Literature)的国际年会。该学会在 1880 年成立,是圣经研究最老及最大的一个圣经研究学会,已经有 138 年了,会员有 8 千多人。它出了一个很重要的学术权威期刊,叫《圣经文学学刊》(Journal of Biblical Literature)。这是一个世界性的组织。每年在美国开一次会,在欧洲开一次国际会议,约两三年也会去亚洲、非洲或其他不同的地方开国际会议。

我参加这个会,主要因为我的兴趣是《圣经》研究。我是做希伯来《圣经》(基督教旧约)的。可是希伯来《圣经》里面就有很多有趣的问题要处理,它是一个跨学科研究的科目。我先交代一下我的背景。

黄:你是哪一年出生?你的学历、生活经历,这个简单说一下。

李:我是 1949 年出生的,在中国。

黄:你是中国大陆出生的吗?

李:是,我是广东佛山的。

黄:我以为你是香港的。

李:我是南方人,讲广东口音的普通话,口音是难改了。我大概 7 岁才到香港。在香港接受的教育,从小学到大学,到研究院都在香港。我在香港中文大学读书的时候是宗教与哲学系。

1.1 你怎么会产生宗教情怀?背诵《圣经》经文的经历

黄:你的童年生活对你研究《圣经》有影响吗?

李:所以,我觉得《圣经》研究,我钻研这么多年,这是一个历史的偶然,还是神的安排。我从小就对宗教叛逆。

黄:对,你怎么会产生宗教情怀?你的宗教情怀和经历是怎么样的?你什么时候信耶稣的?我能用这个词吗?

李:其实,我说是偶然的,还是神的安排。我小的时候在广州上学,我住在一个佛寺里边。

黄:住在庙旁边。

李:不是住在旁边,是我们住在里面。因为他们租出来一些房间,我们就住进去。后来,我去佛山,我很小,我就问我的父母跟祖父母,我说:“我们为什么住在教会里面?我们没有住的地方吗?”

黄:住的什么?

李:租,租的。所以,我住在教会里面。

黄:是教会里面,不是庙里面?

李:我在广州是庙,在佛山是教会。而且,这些教会现在还在,叫“生平堂”。

黄:生平堂在哪儿?在佛山?

李:佛山。

黄:你小的时候,你几岁?

李:我1到7岁。

黄:你1到7岁在广州?

李:不是,我1岁就在佛山出生,之后好象两三岁去了广州。

黄:住在佛教的庙里面。

李:对。

黄:然后,四五岁又回到佛山,住在基督教教会里面?也是租的?

李:租的。

黄:在广州的庙里面也是租的?

李:对。

黄:那你就是有缘。

李:我当时住在教会里面,住在生平堂,他们有幼儿园,到圣诞节的时候,就说:我们要小朋友去念圣诞故事。

黄:耶稣诞生的故事。

李:我当时其实是7岁,一个字都不懂。可是,我将所有的《马太福音》第一章18节开始的都能背下来:

“耶稣基督降生的事记在下面:他母亲马利亚已经许配了约瑟,还没有迎娶,马利亚就从圣灵怀了孕。她丈夫约瑟是个义人,不愿意明明地羞辱她,想要暗暗地把她休了。正思念这事的时候,有主的使者向他梦中显现,说:‘大卫的子孙约瑟,不要怕,只管娶过你的妻子马利亚来,因她所怀的孕是从圣灵来的。她将要生一个儿子,你要给他起名叫耶稣,因他要将自己的百姓从罪恶里救出来。’这一切的事成就,是要应验主藉先知所说的话,说:‘必有童女怀孕生子,人要称他的名为以马内利。’约瑟醒了,起来,就遵着主使者的吩咐,把妻子娶过来,只是没有和她同房,等她生了儿子,就给他起名叫耶稣。”

我是用广东话。

黄:背下来了?

李:全背下来了。当时,我还不是基督徒。

黄:7岁就背下来了这个故事了?

李:所以,我到现在很多经文,故事的经文[还记得];所以,我现在觉得,背《圣经》很重要。所以,很多我的学生问我:你每一章每一节都能记住啊?我以前背的,我背了很多。而且,我一个字都不懂的时候,我就已经背下来了。

黄:有点像中国传统的背四书五经,你就背《圣经》。

李:可是,后来我妈妈,这个也是个很奇怪的问题,她因为是做一个家庭里面的师傅。

黄:每天起来做饭?

李:不是,我们说叫拜拜。

黄:烧香,祭祖先。

李:烧香,她就有很多规矩。她后来说:有一个教会的人跟她说,以前派福音单张,说你信什么?我拜祖先。他说:很麻烦,天天拜,你成为基督徒不用这样做。她说:好好好。就这样[她就信了]。

黄:就这么简单?

李:就这么简单。人家说不需要天天拜。

黄: 就愿意信了, 你妈妈?

李: 对。

黄: 那是在中国大陆时候吗? 还是在香港?

李: 在大陆, 是神召会。所以, 我说我这个关系, 跟基督教就很早了。

黄: 后来到了香港, 上大学之前, 宗教与你有什么关系吗?

李: 我是这样, 我从小, 我妈妈她很简单的, 信仰只有一点, 每个星期都要去教会。

黄: 就这一条, 其他都不要。

李: 她什么时候去, 我都要去, 我很听话的, 所以, 我就去教会。去教会里面, 小朋友就参加主日学。这个主日很奇怪, 也是背经。

黄: 也是背《圣经》?

李: 每个《圣经》都背下来。

黄: 这造就了你将来成为《圣经》学者的根基。

李: 所以说, 我是从背, 慢慢过来的。这个经文对我来说是生命里的一部分。所以, 你做一个人文的研究也好, 我也不需要相信还是不相信, 它是上帝的话, 我可能比较开放地说, 它对一些有非常强信心的人, 他信上帝的话, 对一些比较觉得还有自由的人来说, 它[《圣经》里]有上帝的话, it contains(包含)上帝的话。

黄: 这里的差别是, is(是)还是 contains(包含)?

1.2 戴智民博士(Dr. Richard Deutsch)的影响

黄: 香港中文大学, 宗教与哲学系。

李: 对。这个系里面也有很强的基督教神学。其中一个对我有很大影响的老师是一个犹太裔的基督徒。根据我的了解, 我的这位老师(戴智民博士, Dr. Richard Deutsch)的家庭是在第二次世界大战中犹太人被大屠杀里面的受害者。

黄: 大屠杀的幸存者!

李: 他为什么会幸存呢? 就是因为教会帮了他。听说, 是一个牧师保护了他。他在基督教的背景里面长大。他后来在瑞士巴塞尔(Basel)读神学, 研究希伯来《圣经》。我在上学时, 他就鼓励我, 他说, 旧约经典对理解犹太教及基督教非常重要, 他教我希伯来文, 也帮我申请去以色列进修, 在耶路撒冷的希伯来大学上课, 住在 Tantur Ecumenical Institute(坛图尔普世运动研究所), 这是一个很重要的有关普世运动历史与发展的地点, 风景优美, 就在耶路撒冷与伯利恒中间的一个小山上。

黄: 叫普世运动研究所。跟基督教合一运动有关?

李: 对。它有个历史渊源。首先, 1962-65 年间的梵蒂冈第二次大会中, 天主教会请一些东正教会(Eastern Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox)及基督新教的非天主教的教会领袖及神学家以观察员身份(Observers)参加, 总数是 63 人。开了会之后, 他们中的一部分人就跟教宗说, 希望他们之间的对话可以继续。所以, 东正教、基督新教跟天主教在多年各方的努力下, 在 1972 年在耶路撒冷合作开设了 Tantur Ecumenical Institute for Advanced Theological Studies。我通过这个机会在希伯来大学学习希伯来语言、圣地考古和《圣经》研究。

黄: 这是哪一年?

李: 1976 年到 1977 年。我在 1977 年初被接纳修读博士课程。

黄: 博士课程。

李: 对。

1.3 著名学者 Professor David Flusser 的影响

李: 有一个非常著名的学者, Professor David Flusser, 他是一个正统犹太教信徒, 可是, 他的学术

研究范围是早期基督教及新约《圣经》,也研究死海古卷及第二圣殿的犹太-基督教。他写了好几本重要的书,翻译成多种语言。其中一本颇为人知的是用一个很简单的书名:《耶稣》。

黄:就叫这个名字?

李:对。

黄:简单一个词做个书名。

李:他在希伯来大学比较宗教学系,他认为,真正要了解基督教不能不从犹太教的《圣经》开始,他建议我从希伯来《圣经》及犹太拉比传统研究耶稣在新约《圣经》的登山宝训。

黄:犹太教只有旧约,他们的《圣经》叫 Tanak。

李:Flusser 教授帮助我成功申请到以色列国家奖学金,可是,后来因我在中文大学两位老师的意见,希望我能在一间有神学传统及背景的大学作研究,我决定放弃希伯来大学,进苏格兰爱丁堡大学读博。

黄:苏格兰的爱丁堡大学。

李:对。其实在之前一年我已经被爱丁堡大学接受了,可是 Deutsch(戴智民)教授希望我考虑,耶路撒冷的经验对我的学术发展的影响。他在香港中文大学授课与研究《圣经》的时候,就对他自己的基督教身份及犹太人的根进行了重新思考。

黄:他的犹太的根、血缘?

李:他当时是在过渡当中:犹太教、基督教、基督徒、传教士、犹太裔这个根。读《圣经》,旧约《圣经》也好,新约《圣经》也好,都需要知道耶稣、门徒及早期基督徒都是犹太人。迦南圣地是很重要的,就是基督教、犹太教都产生在这个地方,基督教也是犹太教的一个分流,早期基督教与犹太教密不可分,也不是想作为一个新的独立宗教,历史的背景我们都清楚。到底我在以色列读还是在英国读博士?当时有这个背景在,我应该受多一些犹太的传统训练,还是多一些基督教的观点与神学?这两者的轻重,对我的《圣经》研究到现在都影响很大。

黄:你是在 1977 年开始到爱丁堡大学的。

1.4 爱丁堡大学的希伯来《圣经》研究

李:是 1977 年 10 月。爱丁堡大学的希伯来《圣经》研究的教授资源很强,我跟 Professor G. W. Anderson, Professor G. Auld, Professor John Gibson 及 Professor Hayman 等研读旧约及早期犹太教,基本上做《圣经》文本的研究。

黄:文本学者。

李:可是文本研究,涉及的范围包括文献学、文字学、考古学、历史学,之后就是经典的观念、它的世界、它的思想史等,但是,基本上我是《圣经》文本学者。

黄:您后来在香港中文大学崇基学院以文本为切入点,以跨学科的、学科间的方法进行研究。你做完博士就回香港了?

李:从 1980 年到 2014 年退休,我在香港中文大学服务了 34 年。

黄:你的身体也挺好。

李:还好。

黄:在这 34 年中,有哪个重大的问题?

李:香港回归中国的问题。对很多人而言,一九九七年中国收回香港主权的问题出现之后,大家要考虑到到底在香港留下来还是到海外发展?当时,我其实没有太大的挣扎,虽然有一些海外大学的邀请,最后,我还是留在中大。

黄:一直是中大人。

李:对。

二、学术研究中的核心问题

2.1 神学与宗教之间的问题

黄: 还有其他影响你学术路向的事件吗?

李: 其中一个就是神学与宗教之间的问题, 因为中大有宗教学研究, 也有崇基神学院。我最先是在神学院的, 后来, 就转到宗教学研究了, 我在宗教研究方面一直重视发展其他的宗教。第一个影响我的学术思考的, 是从一个以基督教为中心的 religious studies (宗教研究) 扩大到包括其他宗教传统及以宗教学理论为基础的宗教研究学系。

黄: 多元宗教研究。

李: 这里涉及一个学术路向的转移, 从一个神学和哲学的视角切入, 转到历史、社会、政治的视角。原因就是, 我认为, 要真的理解一个宗教, 不能单从一个思想体统去认识; 宗教也有生活, 也有社会, 有人群, 也有世界。所以, context (语境) 对我来说是很重要的一个观点。

2.2 跨语境和跨文本阅读与前见

黄: 影响你的学术研究, 就是语境, 语境是非常重要的概念。

李: 对。首先, 我这么多年都是在做一个 contextual interpretation of Bible (《圣经》的处境化诠释), 这是一个范围, 而且我还组织这个 section (分会、部分)。

黄: 中文怎么说?

李: 就是圣经的处境研究。

黄: 英文再说一下。

李: Contextual biblical interpretation。

黄: “处境化的圣经诠释”或者“解释”。

李: 这个以前不重要, 在现在的世界学术里面, 有很重要的发展, 不能不理处境。这个处境包括: 经文的历史的处境, 以色列人跟早期基督徒的社会的处境, 不能只是 abstract (抽象), 就是不能抽象地去处理经文, 因为这个经文里面有一些思想, 有一些神学, 我就是从经文里面寻找观念。我说这个是立体的, 立体的意思就是…

黄: 多角度的。

李: 对, 所以, 这个对我影响最大。我现在读的经, 不会单读一个表面经文里面讲什么, 我说它后面到底发生什么事情, 它的作者到底面对什么问题, 它在经文里面所表达的, 就是回应的问题。

黄: 我这里穿插一点。像我在赫尔辛基大学的《圣经》学, 传统上我们讲 exegetics 就相当于解经学, 是解释希伯来《圣经》或者希腊语的《圣经》在原文本中表示的是什么意思。而 hermeneutics, 就是诠释学, 是说这段经文对于今天的 context 里的我这个读者有什么意义, 因为在你的解释中, 你是把这两个概念 exegetics 和 hermeneutics 结合在一起的吗?

李: 它们不能分。原因就是你这个 exegesis, 就是从经文里面读出什么来。

黄: 对, 从里面拽出来它的意思之原意。

李: exegesis 好像是客观的, 可是你怎么抽出来都不是客观的。谁在抽?

黄: 谁在抽, 怎么抽, 从哪里抽?

李: 这个谁受什么影响, 这个谁身份怎么样, 你是一个犹太信徒和基督徒信徒、非信徒? 其实是有影响的。

黄: 真正客观, 我们一般所说的 objective 是不够客观的。

李:我们以为它一定是客观,一定是科学的,其实,界线很难分。而且,我都觉得,读者是有很大的影响力的。我们这个读者是现在的读者,可是历来这些读者都受其他元素的影响。可是,现在今天回到经文里面读经文,你通过这个历史的隧道看进去,这一段历史你需要处理吗?这是第一点。第二点,你能否跳过这些历史而不理它?

黄:不要前人的解经,只要自己的。

李:如果是可以跳过去的话,你还是带着你自己的……

黄:自己的 presupposition,个人的前见。

李:你放不下,你放不下,就不是你,你放下,你就不能读。

黄:对,每个人都有有色眼镜,自己的眼镜。

李:对。所以,我觉得这个是很重要的(fundamental)。

2.3 您的信仰对学术研究的影响

黄:好的,犹太和基督教,这两个元素对你有很大的影响。再一个就是 presupposition 对你的影响,合在一起。与这个相关我还想问,接着你这个话题,就是有哪些因素影响了你的学术?你作为一个基督徒的信仰,你怎么成为基督徒的?你是从父母那里来的?还是自己年轻的时候接触到基督教信仰的?你是怎么信基督的?这个信仰怎么影响了你的学术研究?

李:这一点,我现在就到一个地步,我看《圣经》,以前的信仰跟现在的信仰到底有没有影响到我?我说一定的。可是,我现在就有一个观念:基督教的思想是怎么来的?它不是从经文里抽出来的;我现在发现,我们先有了教义,才去定那个经文。举个例子,教会的第一次尼西亚公会议(公元 325)。

黄:《尼西亚信经》、尼西亚大公会议。

李:尼西亚会议的时候,他们定基督论人神二性的教义。

黄:就是基督教信仰的核心内容。

李:他们不就定了嘛。

黄:对,尼西亚会议。

李:当时,《圣经》还没有定稿。

黄:那时候圣经还没有定稿?!

李:《圣经》于 381 年的第二次大公会议即第一次君士坦丁堡会议上才被确定为旧约 46 卷和新约 27 卷了,正典才形成。教义于 325 年被确定,而《圣经》于 381 年才被确定嘛;它们都是康斯坦丁的时代。康斯坦丁对基督教有好感,^[1]因为他的经历,之后他要统一罗马帝国,他要统一王国,他觉得基督教很有帮助,而且他觉得基督教应该有统一的信仰,^[2]因为当时不太统一,所以,才有了教会的这些会议。最后,他们觉得应该有一些经,因为当时有很多经,信徒读不同的经,而且,每个群体都对它自己的经典的重要、不重要与次要进行区分……^[3]

黄:就是说,哪些书有资格被列入《圣经》?是当时面临的问题。

李:有些经,今天都不会被列入《圣经》进去的。你看这段历史,你就能看到……

黄:就是《圣经》的正典化是如何完成的?

李:可是,不同的群体还有其他的书,他们的图书馆不单只有正典型《圣经》。

黄:不只是有新教《圣经》的 66 卷书。

李:新教跟天主教又不是一样的。

[1] 约于主后 312 年。

[2] 主后 313 年罗马皇帝颁发《米兰敕令》使基督教在帝国合法化。380 年基督教成为罗马国教,对非基督教产生了排他性。

[3] 《圣经》于 381 年的第二次大公会议即第一次君士坦丁堡会议上才被确定为旧约 46 卷和新约 27 卷了,正典才形成。

黄: 东正教跟天主教、新教今天还是不一样的。

李: 东正教也不一样, 他们有 82 本书嘛。

黄: 对, 东正教 77 卷, 罗马天主教有 73 卷, 而新教则有 66 卷。

李: 所以, 你看到这个就是不同的经典。不同的经典以外还有其他经典, 不是说你订了这些书, 所有其他书就不能进到图书馆, 其他人就不能够读; 不是, 而且还不断地扩大。

黄: 就是说, 在今天的世界上, 图书馆里非基督教的文献也还是收集很多。

李: 对, 基督教也有, 非基督教也有。所以, 你看到, 这个阅读是很广的, 而且影响每一个团体的信仰。唯独一个问题就是, 我现在再看读经, 你通过教义, 通过信仰去读经, 还是希望, 去读经典本身? 我刚才说了, 很难绝对客观地去定义……

黄: 《圣经》的本意很难被挖掘出来。

李: 挖掘《圣经》的本意也不是这么容易。我们是希望越靠近[本意]越好。可是, 我们要知道, 有一些教义就是有一些在[《圣经》确立]前面, 有一些在[《圣经》确立]后面成立的, ……

黄: 所以, 你这里讲的核心问题, 是不是涉及经典和信仰的关系? 我讲的经典就是《圣经》了, 经典和信仰哪个在前? 哪个在后? 信仰不一定是从经典来的, 因为有很多信仰教义是在《圣经》正典没有定下来之前就诞生了, 特别是信仰的教义, 如基督论的被确定就是如此。历史上是以这个作为标准再来筛选《圣经》, 哪些是正典, 哪些是次经, 哪些是旁经。

李: 而且, 他们筛选的时候也有一个情况, 他们选某本书, 不是整本书里面所有的意义都觉得重要。

黄: 而是只节选其中的一部分?!

李: 因为某一点还是能够解释教义的, 它就用这个经典。其实, 里面还有一些跟这个教义……

黄: 甚至相冲突和不吻合的?!

2.4 “经”与“教”的关系

李: 现在回过头来, 你现在读经需要教义, 还是你读经希望看到经文里面的其他不同的层次? 如果是后者, 很多跟基督教的教义就不一样了。如果你说要跟从前面的路线, 我就分“经”跟“教”的问题。经就是经文, 就是现在传下来我们看到的经文, 所以, 这个经文也不是统一的。

黄: 但《圣经》还是有一个版本, 权威的。

李: 是一个版本, 两个版本, 还是几个版本?

黄: “经”的权威版本和内涵到底是什么? 是个产生争议的问题。

李: “教”就是教义, “教”就是教会。教跟经之间的关系很重要。你从教去读经, 你永远都不会读到经的本意。经里面有关教以外的东西, [就读不出来了]。

黄: 拿教看经, 只看了符合教的这一部分, 其他的部分就被忽略掉了, 甚至排斥掉了。

李: 最清楚的是我们读旧约, 旧约的许多内容都没有被读出来, 因为有新约嘛。宗教改革的时候, 其中一个当时说法是到底要不要叫“旧约”这个名称, 有人说不要, 我们叫 Hebrew Bible(希伯来《圣经》), 后来就这样有了“旧约”与“希伯来《圣经》”两种叫法。所以, 很多信徒就觉得, 我们的经里面有“旧约”和“新约”。可是, 你看, 马丁·路德讲要从新约到旧约来读《圣经》。可是, 这是个教义。因为你从新约去说旧约的话, 你就觉得旧约没有独立的地位, 它的存在就是为了……

黄: 见证耶稣基督。

李: 所以, 你就只有读到这部分。这个部分旧约是一个预表也好, 预言也好, 后面的只是前面的应验。这个说法不是反对, 可是, 我不能够接受。因为如果接受, 你读一生, 读 100 年, 读 1000 年, 读 2000 年, 以后读的[希伯来《圣经》的]经文都是服务新约的; 可是, 旧约经文本身有很多宗教的教义、其他教义的内容和宗教的经验, 不是说犹太人跟神人的关系, 后面这个没有被读出来。

黄:对,读不出来那份意思了。

李:永远都读不出来了。

黄:怎么办?

李:你是读前面的经文,可是,你永远在后面的经文里面去解释前面的经文,这个我说就不是真正的阅读。

2.5 以中国的经典来读希伯来《圣经》的原文

所以,你第三个问题是将来怎么发展?中国的基督教如果要发展,我觉得,你就不能够只是跟随整个西方传统的基督教对旧约的看法,因为这样你走来走去,都是西方基督教这样发展传到中国,中国的文化作为整个传统是没有影响的。所以,我们现在如果接受了,我们能够做的,我们接受的,用中国语言跟文本、观念去表达,你看到这个,核心的问题是定了。中国化的问题是什么?它将这个观念以中国的文字和能够被理解的方式来表达。可是,如果你真的要想这个经典能够中国化的话,你就要解释。当然,后面的[新约]放不下了。[如果]我们用中国的经典、中国本土的资料、观念来读[希伯来《圣经》的]原文,里面开放了很多…

黄:可能性。

李:以前,我们没看到这些。

黄:很多的维度。

李:对。而且有一点,中国的文化传统在这里就有贡献。如果不是,你还是一个,在后面永远是工具。

黄:就是个工具。

李:可你是个工具的话,你就只有能够附属嘛。

黄:重复,复述,重复,repeat,repeat 西方的教。

李:还有一个词是,我说是“附属”。

黄:附属,是个附产品、附属品,不是独立的。

李:不是主体。对吗?

黄:对。

李:所以,我现在就觉得这个路不容易走。

黄:我们现在已经谈到你主要研究的核心内容的问题。

李:对。我就不将它分得那么清楚,我放在我的思想当中来谈。如果我们要对中国的经学,圣经学,进行研究的话,如果中国要有一个贡献的话,我们要从我们的经学的方法,西方经学的方法,作为进入,把基督教跟信仰,即“教”的部分先放下来。

黄:把教的部分先下来?!

李:今后我们读出什么维度,跟中国的传统有什么对话,我们如果说处理“教”的问题的话,在这里才能出来。

黄:就是先读了之后得出一些结论。

李:先经后教。

黄:这是你的主要思想?

李:对,这个是我的思想。

三、你的研究是否会被你自己的过分人文主义“前见”所控制？

3.1 把“教”放下来去读“经”的时候,你如何处理你自己的“前见”？

黄:但是这里我的感觉,你也遇到一个挑战。就像你讲的那样,你讲先把“教”放下来,先来读希伯来的或者希腊的《圣经》原文,再加上中国的视野,跟中国的结合在一起。但是,这里就存在一个前见(presupposition)的挑战:你从里面怎么能够找到客观的经义?你把“教”放下来了,你拿的是“经”,你的这个“前见”是什么东西?在你头脑中指挥你的 presupposition 是什么?那是不是就不是 divine revelation(神圣的启示),还是 humanistic(人文学性质的东西)?如果都不是的话,那就是你自己独特的个人性的“教”,就是你自己的人文学性质(humanistic)的东西?

李:不是,这个是两个层次。第一个,我们谈到“authority”(权威)的话,你就会帮自己画一个圈。

黄:圈给它画出来?!

李:这个圈是“教”,你就会觉得,西方的“教”是有“authority”,不是西方的“经”有“authority”。对吧?

黄:对。

李:所以,你放下“authority” of 这个教,不是放下“authority” of 经。

黄:经。

李:你放下 revelation,而且启示神性部分,有关“教”,你不放弃“经”这个部分,所以,它也是 divine revelation。

黄:对。但是,这里我理解这个意思……

李:你看到,这个经,我刚才好像说,先有教义,再有教团,然后慢慢有教史,最后慢慢到教的传统。经与教是互动的(interactive)。

黄:互相影响的。

李:可是,经也是有它的,如果你信 revelation(启示),问题就是 the divine revelation(神圣的启示)是组[成]的教,还是组[成]的经?

黄:不错,你要这样想的话,我们经常都是从一个“教”,作为一个 theoretic basis(理论根基)。

李:而且是作为 authority(权威)。

黄:对。比如说,三位一体、耶稣基督的人神二性、童贞女马利亚生子,就是《使徒信经》的核心嘛。

李:都是这个教的 authority(权威)。

黄:对,所以,你读经就是要符合这个,不然这个解读的经,就觉得有弊端(heresy)。

李:这样就很奇怪了,我们觉得 the divine revelation is not in the text(神圣的启示是不存在于经里面的)。

黄:是 in the Creed(在信经里的)。

李:所以,我现在讲的不是反教,很多人觉得我是反教。我真的是将信仰跟那个,我说这个不容易做,可是我真的要这样做。

黄:你的目标不是要反教。

李:我是放下这个“教”。

黄:你有点像 phenomenology(现象学),要继承,先把这个前见,把这个“教”先搁置一下。

李:其实有一点,我相信 text(经文)不是简单的,意思就是 revelation(启示)不是简单的。第二, The Word of God is not simple,意思就是……

黄:上帝的话语不是那么简单的。

李:如果教已经包含了 word,我就不相信。

黄:教已经包含了 word,就是这个教义已经把上帝的经包含在里面了。

李:所以,我的意思就是这个信仰,就是 The word of God is much beyond the doctrine。

黄:“经”要比“教”更丰富、更广阔。

李:而且,上帝一定比这两个更丰富。

黄:这是不错的,对。

李:理论上是这样的。

黄:对,应该是这样。还有,另外,我刚才讲的教和经谁在前,谁在后的问题,这也是一个问题。

李:现在,我们从教还有从神学去 limit the word of God(限制神的经)。

3.2 你是否会在传另一个不同于使徒保罗所传的福音?

黄:这样的话,你这里会不会出现一种,像保罗说的,如果有人传的和我不一样,你就不要接待他,因为在新约里是这样说嘛,我们就传同一个福音,就是耶稣基督的福音。

李:这个问题就是保罗、彼得、约翰他们传的不一样。你现在这句话就是,保罗说:“你们要不听他们、其他的人,听我的”。

黄:对。

李:理论上也可以这样说。

黄:对,也可以这么说。

李:彼得的书信跟彼得的福音没讲到这个点。

黄:谁决定的?

李:但我现在的,我知道,这个是很多人不能接受。我现在不是说基督教不是基督教问题,信徒不是信徒的问题。我的经虽然经过正典化了,但是我作为一个学者,我知道这个正典化的过程,知道经典的限制,可是我不能够受它限制。

黄:被它控制死了。

李:因为我知道,《出埃及记》这本书也好,耶稣的福音也好,还有其他的 text(经文)可以帮我深入去了解这个经。你说,因为你要信仰,你有上帝;所以,早期这些经跟这些点就不再重要,这个写作就没用了吗?它没有帮助你吗?我们的信心太少了,我们开放的话……

黄:更开放。

李:谁可以告诉你,你在你的研究当中,这个信徒的话,没有 revelation(启示)呢?谁说的?

黄:对,这有可能每个人都会得到上帝的启示嘛。但你这里有个问题。

李:你知道 we have a lot of time(我们有很多时候),we have limited the freedom of God。

黄:我们把上帝的自由限制住了对吧?对,这是不错的。

3.3 你会否导致相对主义或虚无主义?

黄:但是你这个是探索的过程而已。现在,你的这个作法有一种危险,就是会形成一种状况,我称之为相对主义,或者是虚无主义。

比如说,到底基督教的信仰是什么?上面所说的人有原罪,信主得救,死而复活,这些难道都值得怀疑吗?那我信什么呢?你在建构,我还没建好呢,这个经一抓,你这个经一抓又有问题了。我们讲新旧约全书共有 66 卷,旧约 39 卷,新约 27,新教的《圣经》总共是 66 卷,这基本上是固定的。如果你把现在这个经的 close(封闭固定的)正典数目改变成为 open(开放性数目)的话,你要把《彼得福音》,什么《多玛福音》也都加进来,这样一搞,那这就多了;到最后就没有“教”了,或者这个教我需要重新界定,而不再是我们所相信的新教了。这个问题你将怎么解决?

而且,我还要问你的挑战是,你自己的 authority(权威)是什么?你相信 God also reveals to you,

Archie Lee(上帝也向你李启示)吗? 就像路德当年读经一样, 上帝对你有独特的启示吗? 你这样读, 这也是可以的。但另一种可能就是说, 你把传统的教, 我们说的“正统的教义”(orthodox doctrine), 都放置下了, 放置一下, 你不可能是 empty(空的)。把那个放置了之后, 是什么进来了? 你进来的是 God's special revelation to Archie Lee(上帝给你李的特殊启示), 或者你的这些 your reasonable ability(你的理性能力)? 就这两个问题, 你怎么来解决这个问题?

李: 首先, 就是说, 我做这些研究, 不会说, 我现在只是做新教的《圣经》研究。

黄: 好的, 你不这样讲。

李: 如果你这样讲, 就是 66 卷了, 可是, 如果说我是做天主教的《圣经》研究, 那就是 47 了。如果我说是东正教的, 那就到 82。所以, 你现在做哪一个?

黄: 我自己有点 ecumenical(普世运动性的), 我认为天主教、东正教、新教这三个都是广义的可以接受的基督教(Christianity), 我是这样认为的。

李: 但是, “经”就已经开放了, 看到了吗?

黄: 是, 我是也有一点开放。但是, 我是坚持两点, 这个有点是我的“教”了, 就是“三位一体”和“基督的人神二性”这两点。

李: 再回到这个问题。《圣经》学, 不是教义学。《圣经》学, 如果你按照这个教义去宽泛地理解它的话, 比如说, 教义里面对每一本书都有一个观念, 有一个想法, 有一个传递的传统; 可是, 如果我做一个《圣经》研究, 如《约伯记》, 我一定要有三位一体呢?

黄: 就是怎么都把它们一起放到这里来?

李: 这个不要。教会里面说这本书是有关 sufferings of the innocent 呢?

黄: 无辜者的受苦。

李: 不能够, 在教会里面, 根据教义说, 约伯是一个非常忍耐的人。

黄: 有忍耐性的人。

李: 你读第三章开始, 就不一样了。第三到四十二章, 上帝讲话, 中间一段, 约伯是一个反抗的约伯。你说他不能够接受他, from chapter 1 to chapter 42。

黄: 是, 中间那个都没有了。

李: 这样的话, 你就以为 authority(权威)就在“教”里面。可是经里面, 我说“经”有很多层面的, “教”是读其中一个, 就成为“教”的东西。我现在作为一个《圣经》学者, 我读了这些经, 你说一定要跟这个部分, 我觉得, 就没有《圣经》学了。比如说, 我读, 举例来说, 现在不理宗教部分, 比如说, 中国的四书, 从汉学也好, 从宋学也好, 到清里面的, authority(权威)是什么? 你今天真的有跟其中一个去 define(界定)这个 text(经)吗? 考古里面出现一些经文, 经的注解, 你看不看?

黄: 那当然应该看了。基督教也应该如此, 《圣经》也应该如此。

李: 所以, 我说, 如果你做研究的时候, 咱们说这些经, 这些其他的不能看的话, 它有没有帮助我们, 我们就不能够成为一个学术的……

黄: 对, 就把它封闭了, 自我限制了。

3.4 先解构, 再建构, 不担心离经背道

李: 所以, 回到一个问题, “authority”(权威)不是我的很重要的关心, 如果你常常用 authority 的话, 这个西方的 authority 就一定 over(超过)中国的 authority; 所以, 中国的神学就不能够发展了, 这是第一点。第二点就是冒险的问题。没冒险就没有新发现。没冒险, 你就是 traditionalist(传统主义者)。所以, 现在我就说, 作为一个学者, 作为一个希望在中国《圣经》研究作为学问里面能够慢慢建立起来的, 就一定要将所有这些都要拆了, 才可以建。

黄: 先拆了, 再建。

李:如果你不拆的话,你其实不能够建。

黄:先解构(deconstruction),再来一个建构(construction)。

李:所以,我也不担心离经背道这个 orthodoxy(正统教义)的问题,我也不担心 swim in the wider and open sea(在更广阔的大海里游泳)。

黄:在开放的海里游泳。

李:我就需要这个,你才可以,你可能死掉。

黄:需要 take the risk(冒险)。

李:Archie 死了。

黄:会有另一个学者站起来。

李:在中国就是这样。

黄:我知道,我理解你,也尊重你这个做法。你是在这个的背后,你有这样一个愿望,而且也这样做。这个做,你的理性,你的 passion(激情),你的 desire(欲望),你的 reason(理性),你的 wish(期望),除了这些之外,你是不是也相信,有个高的 reveal(启示),还有 revelation(启示)给你。

李:我能够说的是这样。

黄:应该上帝是给你有启示的,能找到。

李:如果你信上帝是宇宙的主宰,你信所有生命是从上帝而来,你也信我们的 intellect is connected with God。

黄:我们的智力也是跟上帝相关的,智力是上帝给的。

李:对。如果这个前提都觉得是有可能性的话,所以,你就会觉得就不担心了,我不担心。

黄:假如它是真理,不担心会被解构掉,是吧?

李:而且,我看到在基督教传统来说,每一代的人都有一些要挣脱的。

黄:有改革家要诞生。

李:其实我不是改革家。

黄:你不想做改革家。

四、汉语学界的希伯来《圣经》研究及人才培养

4.1 人才培养计划

黄:你说你自己并不是想做一个宗教改革家?

李:可是我 lay the ground for others。

黄:为其他人打基础。

李:所以,又回到一个问题了,就是从 2003 年开始,我就看到中国《圣经》研究这一块需要训练人才。所以我就开始去 design the program,就是设计。

黄:设计培训计划是吧?

李:也跟大学说你都给我几个……

黄:scholarship 名额。

李:对,每年三个,因为在中大,你一定要学校给你这个名额。

黄:才能招生是吧?

李:有钱也不能招。可是学校也说,OK,都给你名额,可是也需要有钱去承担这个多的名额,所以,我又去找钱。

黄:从 2003 年开始。

李:对,10 年。10 年 12 个博士生,大陆的。

黄:今天与您一起来开会的他们三个,都是你的学生吧?

李:对,今天是他们三个。

黄:姜宗强、田海华、林艳、姜森。姜森是拿你的博士吗?

李:对。

黄:我还不知道呢。

李:她是这样,本来她是北大的,北大跟香港中文大学合作,合作之后,所以,她就来香港读书,也是同时间读两个博士,联合培养。她有几个途径,第一,拿中大的学位。第二,拿中大跟北大的学位两个。第三,拿北大的学位。

黄:拿三个?

李:三个可能性。所以,比如说,我有一个学生他就拿两个,姜森是拿一个,她是拿北大的,是这样。所以,她也是我的学生,她读了三年。

黄:所以,你为大陆总共培养了 12 个博士。他们现在都在中国大学找到教职了是吧?

李:除了一个,她嫁给……

黄:嫁给老外了?

李:不是,一个中国人,可是这个人 computer scientist(电脑科学家),她现在就移民了,得到一个非常好的工作在 State University of Florida。

黄:佛罗里达。

李:所以,她就在这个地方工作了,她就去那里了。

黄:是谁?

李:李哲,哲学的哲。

黄:是个女生是吧?

李:女生,读得很好的,而且她的语言现在不错,可是她现在在佛罗里达。所以,除了她一个以外,其他 11 个都在中国,其中有一位不在《圣经》研究里面,所以还有 10 个。

黄:都有哪几个?姜宗强(西北师范大学,兰州)、田海华(四川大学,成都)、林艳(深圳大学,深圳)、孟振华(南京大学,南京)、张颖(华东师范大学,上海)、黄薇(上海大学,上海)。

李:还有叶落夫,之后有个张什么,跟张颖一级的,叫张晓林。

黄:八个了,还有姜森(中国社会科学院世界宗教研究所,北京)。

李:对。

黄:9 个了,还有一个。李哲在美国。

李:李哲。在北京做什么工作我都不太清楚,还有一个赵若云。之后还有宁波大学的徐雪梅。

黄:徐雪梅我知道的,徐雪梅在我们的《国学与西学国际学刊》发过文章的。你们的这个经费是国际圣经工会资助你们,还是从哪里?

李:亚联董(United Bible Society in Asia),这个是 1922 年成立的。它本来是成立管理在中国的 13 家基督教大学,后来 1979 年以后就没了,就离开了。所以,北大的校园、燕大……

黄:都归北大了。

李:可是后来中国给了一部分钱。

黄:给了他们一笔钱?

李:所以,它就有一点钱。

黄:这是培训现状。

李:对。

4.2 中国大陆本土培养的希伯来《圣经》研究学者

黄:那中国大陆本土培养希伯来的《圣经》研究学者有吗?除了你的学生之外,中国大陆还有其他的吗?大学里面。

李:有的。比如,中国人民大学。

黄:雷立柏(Leopold Leeb,1967年一,奥地利学者)在那里教希伯来语。

李:还有浙江大学的,叫什么名字?

黄:梁慧。

李:对,她也是《圣经》研究,希伯来语。

黄:对,她和杨克勤(美国西北大学,芝加哥)他们合作。

李:她也是读的一些希伯来语。像天津南开大学的王立新。

黄:然后,就是河南大学梁工。

李:对。他们很多人是读希伯来语,就是在神学院里面。

黄:还有金陵神学院(南京)。

李:华东神学院(上海)。

五、大国学视野中的汉语学术圣经学

5.1 《大国学视野中的汉语学术圣经学》

黄:我原来在2012年写了一本书,叫《大国学视野中的汉语学术圣经学》。我基本上就是罗列这样一个体系。我就讲《圣经》是可以被当成三种类型的东西来研究,一个就是把它当成一个“上帝的话语”(the word of God),二是当成一个“文学作品”(literature),从南开的朱维之、梁工等等下来;就是一个文学作品,艺术品。三是当成“人文经典”(humanistic document),里面有历史,有文化,也有政治,有社会学。

我觉得在中国大陆的学术界里面研究《圣经》,好像最多的是把它当成一个文学作品,比如,以梁工他们为代表。然后,其他的则是把它当成一个社会学、政治学、经济学、文化学的人文经典的文本来进行研究。

李:思想史。

黄:思想史方面的,就是人文经典。

李:Philosophical ideas(哲学的思想)。

黄:是这样一个状况。我想,《圣经》的这两类研究都对,也有必要,也很重要。但是,我认为,这只是一部分而已,不是《圣经》的全部。《圣经》之所以为《圣经》,最主要的是有一部分人认为它是“神的话语”。所以,我把这几个合在一起,我想,这样来看,《圣经》才是比较全面的。但是,您的研究属于……

5.2 《圣经》不仅是神的话语、文学艺术作品和人文经典,而且是神人交碰的记载

李:在这三个之外。你知道为什么吗?

黄:为什么呢?搞清楚这一点很重要。我想知道,你怎么在这三个之外,我想把你包括进“人文经典”的范围之中,结果你在这三个之外,你跑出去了。

李:首先,我觉得,你是探索 the word of God(上帝的话语)还是不是 the word of God,都没问题。可是,它是一个 human articulation of the defined human experience in the historical situation of

context, 它不是一个简单的人文、人文学思考, 是一般人在一个历史的状况当中, 有一个对神、上帝, 还是一个信仰的投入; 可是, 经过一个非常艰难的历史的处境, 在神人交碰的观念当中, 见证一个非常深的宗教的情操, 而且, 这个情操被记载在现在的文字当中。所以, 这个文字不但是 literature(文学), 不但是人文的, 也不但是从上帝来的上帝的话语, 是人回应“神人交碰”的宗教的情操的表现, 所以, 它的宗教性很强。我觉得, 你读《圣经》, 比如说, 我是旧约《圣经》, 我读这个经, 它是 a literature, yes, but it is not only literature(文学, 是的, 但它不仅是文学), 它是 a humanistic document, yes, but it is not only a humanistic document (人文经典, 是的, 但它不仅是人文经典)。

黄: It is not only that(它不仅是那个)。

李: 它是一个信仰里面承认上帝的话 not accepted(不被接受), 用了很多“人”的话, 你不能够说“骂上帝的话”是“上帝的话”。可是, 你骂上帝, 能够骂上帝, 是用人的话, 可是骂上帝的话有一个 interactive God, 你骂这个神。

黄: 互动的神。

李: 所以, 你心里明白, 你都骂上帝骂得很厉害的。

黄: 是的, 不高兴嘛, 遇到困难抱怨上帝。

李: 对。可是, 你骂上帝不单是一个“骂”, 而是在“人神交碰”当中。

黄: Communication, interaction(交通、互动)。

李: 我说 religious sentiment, dimension of text(经的宗教意义、维度), 不能够不理, 所以, 我是做这个。

黄: 要来看这种互动中的宗教情操。这是你对《圣经》的定位。我大部分很认可, 你接着说。

李: 我是这样看, 如果这样的话, 你就不能够说, 我们说极端化(polarize), 两极。

黄: 两极化。

李: 神就是神, 人就是人。它一定在神人之间。所以, 从这个角度来说, 我说《圣经》, 你不能够将它放在神这边, 单是这边; 也不能够放在人这边。我们通常都喜欢, 尤其是我们中国学术界里面, 我们的训练是这样, 一定要 polarize 这些东西。

黄: 两极化, 黑的, 白的。

李: 对。你所说的三个部分(神的话、人文经典、文学艺术作品)在《圣经》里面都有。可是, 它还有一个突出的部分, 我希望用 Rudolf Otto (奥托)的 idea of the Holy(神圣)the Mysteria。

黄: 神秘性。

李: 你如果说, 我们每个人都明白什么是神秘性。

黄: 那就不神秘了。

李: 是的, 那样的话, 你就没明白。

黄: 对。

李: 它还是神秘。可是, 你没有明白。

黄: You can feel something, but you cannot get it。

李: Trancedence。

黄: 超越性。

李: 你知道, 它一定在我外面, 你永远都不能够超越它。

黄: 形而上, 或者是精神彼岸。

李: 对。第三, 很重要, facinating, 你觉得……

黄: 让你惊叹。

李: 惊讶。facinating。你如果没有的话, 其实没有信仰, 也没有投入。你做一些事情可有可无。

它一定要影响你的生命,经典都要这样做。我说,我非常投入的,我读经文,每次读经文我都觉得你不能够没有感觉,可是,你又不能够单是感觉也不行。你以为你的感觉,你就抓住了它,它还是很远。所以,我就是这样。

5.3 无论你信它是上帝,还是不信它是上帝,它有上帝的话。如果你真的去研究这个话,它就会成为一个对你生命有意义的话。

李:可是,无论你信它是上帝,还是不信它是上帝,它有上帝的话。如果你真的去研究这个话,它就会成为一个对你生命有意义的话。

黄:是上帝的话,有上帝的话,对于你生命有影响,有意义的。

李:因为它如果跟你生命没有关系,他信上帝的话有什么用?这个教义。

黄:对,那个教义,是真的钱,放在银行里,跟我一点关系都没有,没有这个关系。

李:可是,你说,我不知道他信上帝的话还是不信上帝的话,我知道它对我生命有意义,我觉得,这个更重要。所以,这个教义问题,教义是一个好像 verbal formulation,就是用语言去表达一个 statement(声明)。

黄:一个表述,语言的表述,言语的表述。

李:这个表述没用的。

黄:就像生命, touch your life(触动你的生命)。

李:渐渐地投入,而且,经文进到你生命里面,这个 symbol(比喻)就很清楚了。比如说,《以西结书》中上帝说:“这个是我的话,你吃掉它”。^[4]这个是 symbolic(比喻性的),意思是说非常地甘甜啊,这个你要懂得它,他要将上帝的话融入到他的生命当中,而且在生命里面要活出来。我的意思是说,这个活出上帝的话,不是信它是上帝的话或不是上帝的话。

黄:对,耶稣说:听而行的,这才叫真的信。这里我觉得很有意思。

六、你的学术研究与基督教传统教义之间的关系是什么?

6.1 你的颠覆了传统教义的研究成果是什么?

黄:还有几点我想讨教。一个就是说,你到现在,我理解了你做的这个思路,你的主要研究、你的思路和你的目标了。到现在为止,你是以文本做基础的,一个一个,以《赛亚书》,什么《耶利米书》或者《约伯记》或者什么。那你到现在为止,你觉得,你发现了你的研究成果是什么东西?哪一些成果与传统的“教”, doctrine(教义),你颠覆了它,或者你修补了它?我不是指 historical or humanistic(历史的或人文的),我是指有点像 theological(神学性)方面的。你有哪些重要观点?比如,你把三位一体颠覆了吗?把耶稣基督人神二性颠覆了吗?原罪问题颠覆了吗?人有没有永恒的灵魂?就这些方面,你觉得你有哪些比较重要的成果,请举一些例子。

6.2 Cross textual reading(跨文本阅读、跨文本诠释)与, inter-religious(宗教间对话)或 comparative religions(比较宗教学)

李:两方面。第一方面,我这么多年研究一个重要的问题,就是《圣经》从西方教会,经过殖民时代,来到中国一个新的地方,而且,这个新的地方本来有很多“经”的。

黄:四书五经,十三经。

李:所以,就出现一个问题,“经”与“经”的相遇的问题。“经”与“经”的相遇,首先一个问题是翻

[4] 《以西结书》3:1 他对我说:“人子啊,要吃你所得的,要吃这书卷,好去对以色列家讲说。”² 于是我开口,他就使我吃这书卷。³ 又对我说:“人子啊,要吃我所赐给你的这书卷,充满你的肚腹。”我就吃了,口中觉得其甜如蜜。

译。可是翻译也不是当时的翻译, 翻译就是 interpretation(诠释)。所以, 首先, 我提出了在中国跟整个大的亚洲的环境, 一个很难发展的对读经的方法, 我叫跨文本研究、跨文本阅读。

黄: 你“跨”是用“cross”是吧?

李: cross textual interpretation.

黄: cross textual reading(跨文本阅读), cross textual interpretation(跨文本诠释)。

李: 现在, 我觉得, 在中国常常有一些传统的词, 因为我 1993 年就提了, 写了一些文章。我看到一点, 首先, 它不是 comparative(比较性的), 你常常做两个经典比较的话没用, 它一定是这两个字, 它们相遇的时候, 首先这个是 A, 这个是 B, 这个是现在的经典, 我通过这个经典去了解它, 就是它里面有一些东西, 我读它的时候, 我不能够直接读它, 因为我都有我自己的文化背景, 没有通过这个, 可能它通过……

黄: 它通过 C。

李: 对。

黄: 这两个不一样是吧? 你从那边来读它, 我从这边来读它。

李: 所以, 这是一个。另外一个, 我可能要跳到 B 看 A。

黄: 反过来看自己。

李: 而且, 这个是来来回回的。之后, 得到一个互动的……

黄: 你这个我懂了, 我来讲, 就是一个 methodologic(方法论)上的一个重要的点。这个就是我们现在搞的被 David Ford 叫做“经文辨读”(scripture reasoning)的东西, 它是最近几年搞起来的。先是讲伊斯兰。

李: 它是 1998 年最先提的, David Ford 和 Peter Oak。我当时在剑桥, 他非常有兴趣, scripture reasoning, 1998 年、1999 年、2000 年我都跟他聊了很多, 所以, 我知道他。

黄: 他的 scripture reasoning 和你的这个有什么不一样吗?

李: 有很多不一样。他的 scripture reasoning 主要处理三个一神教的经典: 犹太、基督和伊斯兰。就是同一个观念里面, 他们三个之间怎么有一个 scripture reasoning 的过程, 达到现在的犹太教、基督教跟伊斯兰教。因为这三个经典都有渊源的, 都互相有影响的。虽然, 犹太经典早, 基督教经典是第二, 伊斯兰经典是第三, 可是, 这三个都是 religion books(宗教经典)。

黄: 对, 这是一个文本本身的不一样, 和追求这个方法。但是, 方法论上呢? 就是你讲的也是我通过这个来阅读那个, 这样, 有什么不一样吗?

李: 它不会改变, 它不会改变的。伊斯兰教怎么看, 他们就没有来回。它是 trace(推), 从后面“推”怎么发展的, 从上面 up, 所以, 不一样。

黄: 但是, 你这个方法与我们称为 comparative theology(比较神学), 也叫 intra-religious dialogue(宗教内对话)好像也不同, 当然, 与 comparative religions(比较宗教学)或 inter-religious dialogue(宗教间对话)更不同了。我强调的不是宗教间, 是而是宗教内, 赖品超搞很多, 我也搞这些东西, 这个与你有什么不一样吗?

我简单先跟你讲一下。我说的 comparative theology 是“比较神学”, inter-religious dialogue(宗教间对话), 类似于 comparative religions(比较宗教学)。我是指, 我作为一个基督教, 对于儒家或其他所遇到的宗教, 我先不来批评它, 我先来理解它, 理解它之后我不立即下判断, 我不说“你对或错”, 理解了之后, 我也聆听它对我的理解。儒家说: 你们基督教什么什么。我会认真听一下: 你讲的基督教, 是不是我所信的基督教? 然后, 我来给它回应。假如他们说: 你们基督教就说“人干什么无所谓, 只要信就行了”。我就说: “啊? 基督教是这样吗?” 我这样来慢慢地与他对话, 辨别清楚, 他所听说和理解的基督教是什么? 其他的基督徒所介绍的基督教是什么? 基督教的正统教导是什么? 我所理

解的基督教是什么?最后的一个目的,我就不是那个排他主义,也不是包容主义,也不是多元主义,而是一个(particularism),是“个殊论者”:我是基督教,我是这样的。所以,我跟你对话的目的,是想理解你是谁,然后,我也想理解你眼中的我是谁。当你眼中的我不是真正的我的时候,我就在反思有哪些原因引起这些差异?其中最重要的两个原因是:第一,我没有把我自己的身份认同表述清楚,或者我在生活中没有行出来真正的我来。第二,也有可能是你误解了我。所以,我想这样达到的目的,是要来介绍我是谁。我这种个殊论,就是要用你的思维和语言来理解你是怎么理解我的,然后,我再看看我怎么更好地表达自我来帮助理解我。

这样,我的这种“个殊论”与你这个 Cross textual reading/interpretation(跨文本阅读/诠释),你说这里面有相似吗?我觉得有点相似,有没有相似?

李:有可能是有相似。可是,我关心的问题不一样。

6.3 自己多元亚洲经典处境中的《圣经》阅读

李:我关心的问题,首先,我自己的处境是 multi textual(多元的经典)、亚洲的经典。

黄:对,多元的经典。

李:我们有儒家经典,有道教的经典,也有佛教的经典。

黄:伊斯兰,等等的。

李:有很多不同的经典。这些经典,我们现在读经,读《圣经》的时候,这些经典有意义吗?怎么将其他的经典跟宇宙上帝的话这个经典进行怎样的对话。这个是第一点。第二点,有的这个 textual 经文的细节、textual 经典的细节,你就发现,我读这么多经典,其实,《圣经》里面的很多经典……

黄:就是你讲的多层次,《圣经》里的多层次。

李:经典背后还有很多经典的。

黄:藏在下面的,一层一层的。

6.4 三位一体、原罪等教义有《圣经》根据吗?

李:所以,现在读的时候,因为我没关心基督教啊、基督徒啊、信仰啊,这个问题我没有研究。所以,我只有关心一个,首先这个经典的《圣经》我现在怎么研究它?怎么建立一个《圣经》学?所以,这一个就是现在我从它后面读,都是为了这个。所以,最后,如果你说要建立中国神学、亚洲神学,一定不能少了这个。可是,如果现在放下最后这个部分,我现在读这个经,这个经文它没来中国之前,它是西方的神学:原罪啊、三位一体啊,现在来了;这个路我现在这样走,怎么样?所以,就将你关心的问题放在里面了。

比如说,举个例子,这个经文如果从这个角度去走的话,它是《创世记》第二、第三章,是人的堕落犯罪,而且,后来的原罪,原罪从这个里面进去,然后,很多神学就过来了,如耶稣啊等都是跟《创世记》第二、第三章相关的。可是,我看第二、第三章写书的时候,它是关心这些问题吗?我真的有读《圣经》,所以,第一个问题,上帝对亚当、夏娃说:你要被赶出伊甸园。原因在什么地方?当然是犯罪、堕落,不听上帝的话。可是,上帝没有这样说啊,经文你知道上帝以什么原因将他们赶出去?经文写得很清楚啊。可是,我们现在无论谁读这个经文,都不会注意这个。

黄: ignore(忽略)那段。

李:对。刚才你问为什么三章二十二到二十四它讲什么?^[5]回到经文,他说上帝 among himself,你说三位一体也好还是什么的,虽然当时没有“三位一体”,在这些神学的会议当中,上帝说:“他们已经吃了善恶树的果子,他们的眼开了,他们跟我们相似”,这句话很重要。上帝说“这两个人跟我们相似”。这句话就没有说他们犯罪,可是谁说这句话?蛇说了:“神说,你吃了以后你就跟上帝相似”。

黄:神说的吗?

李:对。

黄:现在还真的这样。

李:真的这样。

黄:所以,神要把他赶走。

李:第二句话:“现在恐怕他们吃生命树的果子,就永远活着”。所以,上帝要赶他们出去。为什么赶他们呢?再加一句话,“为了他们出去耕种他们所自出的土地”,这里有很多重要的话。首先,我们现在很多时候假定,我们都要住在伊甸园里面,如果不犯罪的话。所以,上帝做这个世界是白做的。这个世界存在不存在,没关系;你就在这个小的伊甸园里面。到现在……

黄:也不需要耕种那个土地了。

李:不需要。而且,都说这些年都在里面,很多时候,我们就觉得,永远的在里面,我就不喜欢在里面了 too crowded(太拥挤了)。芬兰多好啊,中国这么大,13 亿、14 亿人口在伊甸园里面。这都是笑话。其实,里面有很多重要的东西。

第一,他们要选择两棵树,选哪棵?哪一棵是禁果?我们的传统都不理,可是,无论怎么样,首先他们真的吃了一棵,而且,吃了这一棵他们就有智慧了,他们就知道有 knowledge(知识),懂得有智慧,懂得反抗上帝。上帝希望我们不反抗他吗?我觉得,上帝没这么胆小啊!你反抗我,我就要压你吗?所以,还有一点就是,他们没吃另外一棵生命树,到底 all these features,每一句 sentence,作者是没有意义吗?还是上帝的话没有意义吗?如果是每一个字,每一个词都有意义的话,这些我们要懂。所以,你要懂它的话,你就发现了,原来这个世界,它后面有多么大的经文的世界。你发现了一个问题,就是联系谁的问题。人跟上帝的关系关联在哪里?人跟上帝相似跟不相同在什么地方?这个是很重要的,所有 religious texts(宗教文本)都要处理一个问题,我是谁?我为什么会跟上帝沟通?因为跟他相似。我为什么不能够成为上帝?因为我们就是人,人神有一个区别。

黄:有相似,又有区别。

李:对。

黄: similarity and distinction(相似性和区别)。

李:所以,这一点,在神学里面,你不能够不提。

黄:这个是最关注的问题,我研究路德的 anthropology(人学),我就关注这些问题,现在,特别感兴趣。

李:可是你用“Original Sin”(原罪)这个[概念],你就[把它们]都去掉了。这个故事如果是“Original Sin”,你看到你在读后面古代希腊的文献,四个五个,现在不是我发现的,学者他们都已经讲

[5] Genesis 3:22-24(New International Version, NIV);²² And the Lord God said, “The man has now become like one of us, knowing good and evil. He must not be allowed to reach out his hand and take also from the tree of life and eat, and live forever.”²³ So the Lord God banished him from the Garden of Eden to work the ground from which he had been taken.²⁴ After he drove the man out, he placed on the east side of the Garden of Eden cherubim and a flaming sword flashing back and forth to guard the way to the tree of life.《创世记》3:22 耶和華神說:“那人已經與我們相似,能知道善惡。現在恐怕他伸手又摘生命樹的果子吃,就永遠活着。”²³ 耶和華神便打發他出伊甸園去,耕種他所自出之土。²⁴ 于是把他赶出去了,又在伊甸园的东边安设基路伯和四面转动发火焰的剑,要把守生命树的道路。

了,他们都是关心同一个问题,都是关心人一定不能成为人,如果他没有 knowledge(知识)。

黄: Without knowledge, human beings cannot become real human beings(没有知识,人就不能成为真正的人)?

李: 柏拉图说:“The unexamined life is not worth living”〔6〕。你没有反思,没有去考察的生命…

黄:不知道生活。

李:所以,人一定要思考,一定要吃这个树。

黄:不吃这个树,就不是人了。

李:对。所以, it is a must essence(那是个必须的本质),所以,上帝就帮我们做了这个事。可是,我们永远都不能够作为人,永远不能够吃另外一棵树,因为你吃了就不是人了,你就是神了。

黄:不吃,你就不是人;那个你吃了,你也就不是人。

李:很重要的故事。你看到,我们神学的教育里面,都没有处理。因为经文已经帮我们决定了,它是个原罪的故事,一个犯罪的故事,原来里面更多的东西,来到中国的文献,人神的分别在哪里? 人追求长生的问题,不死的问题。

黄:永恒。

李:都是有关这个问题。

黄:中国的经典里面很关注永恒的问题。

李:所以,你看到中国经典,《圣经》经典,《圣经》背后的古代都处理这个问题。不是说原罪的问题不重要,你有了原罪的问题,所有经文就不要了? 我说不对,我要经文里面还有其他很重要的问题。

黄:你这个解说我很认同,但是,里面有一句话,你刚才引这么多经文,还有一句话说,“什么树人都可以吃,只是分别善恶树的果子你不可吃,因为你吃的日子必死”。你没有解释这段话。你刚才解释的是那个。我为什么问这个问题呢? 是想确认一点,你说好的 knowledge(知识)是一个 essence of human beings(人的本质),生命、永生是神和人之间的一个 distinction(区别),好,我也认可。

但是,比如说,我作为一个,从你来讲你可以把“教”暂时放在一边,作为我来讲,我常常会从“教”来解释这段“经文”。我的解释是什么? 当人吃的这个果子获得了知识的时候,他这个知识不是真的知识。就是人和神之间有个差异,所以,永恒和不永恒之间,这是个差异之外。还有一点,人是获得不了那种绝对的知识,因为我们讲假如说 Logos(罗各斯),神就是真理本身,人可以获得 reflection, epistemology, stages(反思、认识、阶段)都可以,但是,他获得不了绝对。所以,所谓的与神相……

李:你说绝对?

黄:绝对, absoluteness。

李:对,没问题。这个没有说是 absoluteness。

黄:对。所以,就是说,可能人的罪,为什么解释成是一个罪? 就是在于,人必须得承认:我是一个被造的,我没有可能超越上帝。

李:没问题啊。

黄:没问题? 但是,他吃了这个果子之后,我们讲智慧果,它带来的灾难是在于:如果人要全部的相信上帝,你想,可能就没有这个 human being(人类的),没有这个我了,只有伊甸园了。没错。但就是因为人有了智慧,就像老子说的,智慧太多了,世界就开始打仗了,你有智慧,我有智慧,我们俩就打了。

〔6〕 (Ancient Greek: ὁ... ἀνεξέταστος βίος οὐ βιωτὸς ἀνθρώπου) is a famous dictum apparently uttered by Socrates at his trial for impiety and corrupting youth, for which he was subsequently sentenced to death, as described in Plato's Apology (38a5-6).

李: 可是, 你没有智慧, 我没有智慧, 没打仗, 可能我们不成人。

黄: 这也是不错。所以, 这个故事, 整个这个故事就在这里嘛。

李: 整个故事就是说, 没有绝对, 而且, 你刚才说分别善恶树的果子不可吃。

黄: 吃了必死。

李: 不是。是“园中那棵树的果子你不能吃”。

黄: 你的意思是说: “园中那棵树”并不一定是指智慧树吗?

李: 所以, 不知道……

黄: 这两棵树是哪棵树是吗?

李: 对。所以, 里面很多重要的地方。这是 ironic(讽刺性)的。

黄: “只是分别善恶树的果子”, 好像是有这个吧?

李: 有。

黄: 我们基本上都是这样解读。

李: 像我讲的, 我们不能吃善恶树的果子。

黄: 对, 一般这么讲。

6.5 《圣经》的模糊性和超越性

李: 我可以帮你坐下来读两三个小时这个经文。首先第一点, 我们常常将这些本来是一个 narrative。

黄: 叙述性的。

李: 改成了 philosophical(哲学性)和 theological(神学性)的 text(经文)。

黄: Our imagination(我们的想象)。

李: 另外一点, characteristics of the Hebrew Bible writing(希伯来《圣经》的书写特点)是 ironic。

黄: 讽刺性的或幽默性的。

李: “ironic”的意思就是讲的话是很有趣的, interactive(互动性的), 有时候想说的话是对上帝说假话。

黄: 开玩笑的。

李: 很重要的一个。第二, ambiguity(模糊性)。

黄: 模糊性, 随意性。

李: 它一定要模糊的。模糊性的空间很大。所以, 经文, 最麻烦的读经文就是这个地方。因为常常其他是绝对清晰的, 可是它就绝对不清晰。而且, 它一定有很多可能性。所以, 这么多人研究, 就是因为这个原因了。而且, 很多人有不同的意见。而且, 又产生了不同的流派, 因为经文就是不太清楚。这是第二。第三, 就是它是从事实开始去追源。

黄: 一个事实, 一个现象。

李: 最简单的就是, 我们为什么穿衣服? 为什么有男跟女? 为什么男女要结婚? 为什么生孩子? 为什么男的要这么辛苦的在田间工作? 为什么生孩子这么痛苦?

黄: 为什么要有情感?

李: 为什么人要死? 不是因为这个故事之前人就不死, 人真的我们经验到过死, 我们现在有各种故事的解释。人为什么跟上帝相似? 不是绝对相似。可是, 我们跟上帝相似, 因为我们能够有 knowledge and wisdom(知识和智慧)。虽然我觉得这个不是绝对的, 不但是绝对, 而且它的 knowledge 的范围很广, 性交、男女的性都是 knowledge。所以, 你看到后一章很清楚, 我们中文《圣经》[创 4:1] 是这样翻的: “亚当跟夏娃同房, 就生了孩子。”原文是什么? “Adam knows his wife Eve”, [and she became pregnant and gave birth to Cain.] 他“知道”夏娃这个 knows 就是很重要的观点, 所以, 这个 knows 跟第二章、第三章里面这个分别善恶树, 这个不是善跟恶的问题, knowledge of good

and evil(善恶的知识)合在一起就是惊醒的意思,东西啊、南北啊、善恶啊、好坏啊。

黄:对的,就是我讲的 epistemology 或者叫认识论,或者叫认识真理。

李:所以,它有这个观念,人跟上帝相似。可是,真的不能够跟上帝相似,我们觉得,上帝是不死的,人是会死的。这个是生命树的解释。这些我觉得很重要。就是关乎人自我的了解、神人的关系、人与人之间的关系、男女的关系,这些故事很重要啊。你说,我在读了这么多,有什么跟这个教义不一样?我说很多,这就要举例子了。

黄:我指的是这种根本性的,大的问题上。

李:原罪的问题。

黄:原罪就非常重要了。

李:原罪非常重要,三位一体都有,经文很多。上帝改变不改变这个观念呢?我们一定说上帝不能够改变吗?永远不改变吗?

6.6 旧约里有“上帝是全知全能”这方面的经文吗?

李:还有,而且,我们觉得上帝是全知全能的吗?他不能够全知,全知就不行。

黄:不是全知的?

李:他知道我下一步会将你杀掉,这个就不行。因为他这样知道的意思,就是他决定你每一个行为都在他手的当中,没有 ethic(伦理),我杀你,因为他已经决定了,他好像走的每一步都在上帝手中,旧约里面说上帝不断在改变。

黄:上帝“后悔”。旧约用过这个词,那是另一个概念。

李:有。可是,最重要的就是,上帝在旧约里面如果他是一个 personal God(人格化的上帝),好像我们的 father(父亲)一样,他会为你好,希望你好,希望你听话。可是,你最后听不听他话,他没有掌控,这个父亲最担心这一点。所以,旧约里面说,上帝的心常常在担心,上帝好像父亲一样,生了孩子,培养他,像先知何西阿说的那样“抱他”,希望他好;可是,孩子离开了,犯罪了,他不对。我现在要放弃他吗?你看经文里面,心里很疼啊,我都不知道怎么办。上帝就是上帝,因为他有这个感受,他跟我们一样有感受。这就是跟传统的神学,跟教义……

黄:解释不一样,我知道,你讲这一点……

李:所以,我对经文不能够抽象去说它有一些教义教给我们,我读的时候,这个真的是我的感受,也是上帝的受苦,他更为受苦。

黄:不错。但是,这里,旧约里,我现在一直想不起经文,你对旧约很熟,应该旧约里也有说“上帝是全知全能”这方面的经文吧?

李:没有。他知道,但是没有“全”这个字。

黄:他知道,但是没有说“全”。

李:对。

黄:这与我们所想象的至高神,我们讲至高有差异啊?那新约里有吗?他是今在、昔在、永在全能的神。这是新约里面有这些经文了。而且,我们这个解释一般把新约和旧约联合在一起来看的。这是一个状况。

李:所以,你就又重新读旧约。

七、你自己的学说也就是“教”得以站立的根据是什么？

7.1 你以你自己的理解来代替“教”而解经

黄:我理解你这个,我觉得你这个非常有意义,但是,你要遇到很大的挑战,别人要挑战你的就在于什么呢?你现在把这个“教”放下了,你现在有一套“你自己的理论”来代替“教”。这个“教”就是“你的教”。

李:对。

黄:你这个“教”是从哪里来的?比如说,刚才讲的经文总结出来的,但是,你总结的时候,你拽出来的,那个 exegesis,你拽出来的是客观吗?你也没说你客观。

李:我没有说客观。Contextual 就不是客观的。如果你要客观的话,你就不能够做中国神学。

黄:不错,我也理解。

李:这是个很大的问题。

黄:不错。

李:中国神学就不能够客观。

黄:对,这是从中国的视角来做的,Chinese perspective, Chinese contextual(中国的视觉、中国的语境的)。从这个角度看的,在这个圈子里看。

李:不但不能够客观,也不能够普世。因为你普世,就不能够作为中国的了,如果你普世的话,你就在做中国的神学往外推广,所以有的就说,你中国神学了不起。这是一个 particular theology(个殊的神学)。

黄:这个我认可。这一点我认可。但是,你这里,除了这个以外,我以为你还存在挑战,别人挑战你的问题,他会问你 authority(权威),你这个解释,你说好……

李:没关系。

黄:对,没关系,不错。你说我就喜欢喝这个咖啡,那就喝,这个不错。但是,你作为学者,我们要讨论,因为你要把那个“教”放下来嘛,那么,别人就要问你,你搞的这一套是从哪里来的?是来自于你的主观的(subjective)前见还是哪里?所以,这里的话……

李:可以说,你这个阅读不对。

黄:你不能说别人的阅读不对。只能说你这个阅读的角度不一样,你的 context(语境)不一样。

李:可是你不能用一个 authority, universal doctrine(权威、普世的教义)去评我这个阅读,对吧?

黄:对。他是从那个角度来评论你的。

李:那也是 external(外在的)。

黄:还有,你刚才解读的,比如说,你总结出,吃生命树永恒的不相似性和吃善恶树的人要分别/获得知识的人的独特性,这就是“你的理论”,这就是你的“教”,这就是你的 doctrine,是你的教义。

李:这个是中国神学的起点。

黄:对。但你这个教义就跟原罪论一样。

李:不一样。

黄:我知道,我说的“一样”是指,从定义上来说,你就是拥有另一套的“教义”。所以,别人从另一个角度也就会怀疑你并与你吵架……

李:不需要怀疑的,你可以跟,你可以不跟,等于我不跟你的教义。

黄:不错。

李:我为什么要跟教?如果你回答的好,你也可以不跟我。可是,我这个就是研究《圣经》、读经的

一个方向,一个角度。

黄:但是,比如,你讲的“知”和上帝的“全能全知”的问题。如果说上帝不是全能的,这当然就颠覆了西方神学的传统观念了。你这套做法一步一步在迎合中国的传统,这个会引出一个什么结果?我又要回到我的关注,就是关注人的,能不能 union with God(与神联合),这个过程。

李:所以,我觉得,我读经里面发现一点:神人的关系在历史的长河当中是互动的。但是,那个互动的神不会 in full control。

黄:他不会完全地控制人?

李:他虽然有力量,但是,他不控制。

黄:我认为,你这个结论,对于我来说,不中国的传统来说,就从欧洲的传统来说,我认为,可以解释你这个问题。什么意思呢?就是因为上帝爱人,他给了人自由,所以,我不完全控制你,就像你讲的旧约的《耶利米书》一样:上帝或他的先知一遍又一遍地哭求,我真伤心啊,但人就是不听话啊。但是,上帝不去把人造成机器人,就是因为上帝出于爱而给了人自由意志(free will),所以,我讲的这套欧洲神学的传统理论完全能解释你刚才的那个问题,而不必然需要你发明自己新的教义。

李:如果他真地给我自由的话,他就不知道我要怎么做决定。如果他给你自由,他又知道你怎么做的话,这个不是自由,对吗?

黄:但是,我们讲的“全知”是一种 transcendence(超越)。比如说,我知道,作为我来说,我说:“李老师,上帝知道你,知道你一生将来干什么。”这是我的一种信念。但是,我不知道,上帝知道你怎么做。你怎么做还是个 mystery(神秘的)。比如,我们两个谈完之后,分手之后你干什么,你说你去开会怎么样的,具体的,我不知道;但是,上帝知道,你有可能走到半路,你说我太累了,我回宾馆休息,不去开会了,这个变化有可能发生。但是,这个“知”就是作为一个信念。

李:所以,我就这样看,有一个词,unexpectedness。

黄:不可预期性。

李:我不会预测上帝怎么做,上帝应该也是不能够预测人怎么做。

黄:这个弹性(flexibility),不可预测性。

李:如果能够预测就不是 mystery(神秘的)。

黄:我也是这么认为,这是人和机器区别的差异。我专门与搞 AI(人工智能)的专家对谈过,就是机器能不能代替人,unexpectedness 是机器没有的。^[7]

李:所以,连上帝都不能够有 unexpectedness。如果人的行为上帝可以预测的话……

黄:很好,我们俩谈的很好这个问题。

7.2 如何理解路德的“唯独《圣经》”? 你的“权威”是什么? 除去人文理性之外,你相信上帝对你有启示吗?

再问一个,差不多快要结尾了。

再问一个问题,你是《圣经》学者,路德也是《圣经》学者,路德是 Biblical professor(《圣经》学的教授),路德不是一个 Systematic theologian(系统神学家),他就说:唯独《圣经》,几个唯独嘛,唯独恩典、唯独信仰、唯独《圣经》。

李:都是 contradicting(互相矛盾的)。

黄:对,都是 contradicting。这个唯独《圣经》Sola scriptura,从你刚才的梳理,比如说,在《尼西亚信经》的时代,甚至以前《圣经》什么时候正典版本才确定下来的,这个教义(doctrine)的形成,也前有

[7] 黄保罗对谈蔡恒进(上):“进化论和神学分别怎样理解人工智能?”黄保罗对谈蔡恒进(下):“必须改变教育方式来面对人工智能的挑战”。《探索与争鸣杂志》2018年5月22日,微信版。<https://mp.weixin.qq.com/s/21Be4fU8dQHVoNbxiYEgaA>

后之分嘛。然后,路德说这个唯独经典,那你是怎么来理解这个问题的?

李:他不能够独立来说。第一,他要唯独经典的话, sola scriptura, 他要反抗罗马天主教会的教义, 在这个方面来……

黄:他就去反对很多 traditions(传统), 很多人搞的会议, 等等。

李:对, 也是我说这个“教”的问题。

黄:他其实也是反对当时的罗马天主教的“教”。

李:对。

黄:所以, 要回到经嘛, 路德和你一样, 你和路德做一样的工作。再回到经。

李:第二, 他回到“经”不是我们今天讲的“经”, 他回到经, 回到他喜欢的“经”。他不喜欢的他不要。

黄:不错, 他讲《雅各书》《希伯来书》是否应该列入正典, 都是有问题的。

李:天主教会有的七本书是支持赎罪券, 他就不要这些《次经》了。所以, 他的回到是有选择性的回到。我们今天是 absolute time(绝对的时间), 他的回到《圣经》是为了 against the authority of the tradition(反对那个传统的权威)。

黄:他是用一部分的经典来反对传统的权威。

李:另外一点, 它也是好像你刚才问我的问题, 你的“权威”在哪里?

黄:他说是 revelation(启示), 就是“上帝给他说话”。

李:所以, 他这样是将自己读出来的东西当作 revelation(启示)。

黄:对, 我就考虑, 你读书也是这样, 所以, 我问你的就是, 你是不是将你自己的“reason”(理性)当作“revelation”(启示)?

李:所以, 我不要跟他……

黄:你还没有达到他那样。

李:我知道, 他做的是这样。所以, 你看到, 我读他的 Commentary on Psalms(《诗篇评论》), 我觉得全是自己的。

黄: Subjective interpretation(主观诠释)。

李:这是第一。第二, 他的时代跟我们的时代不同。他的时代, 我们叫做 pre-critical studies(批判性研究之前)时代, 就是对经……

黄:还没有批判的时代。

李:没有批判的认识, 没有考古, 没有很多我们现在知道的东西, 没有 manuscripts(手稿), 很多 manuscripts(手稿)都没有。

黄:没有手稿是吧?

李:所以, 现在我们比他幸福得多。可是, 我们现在的幸福就是有这么多的资源, 我们很多时候就说:不理睬这些, 我要回到经。他回到经, 我是认为, 他不喜欢看其他的, 可是, 这些其他的还没存在, 而且, 他回到经, 是要反抗传统。所以, 现在叫 authority(权威), 问题就是他建立他的 authority, 我是不关心我的 authority。

黄:你不关心你的, 他建立他的。你凭着感觉走。

李:我读了, 它对我有意义; 我觉得, 它跟我的生命连在一起。我就说了: 对你没意义, 对全世界没有意义, 对 Archie Lee 有意义就行, 以我为中心。

黄:惟我独尊?

李:不是。生命就是这样, 我关心所有人的生命, 可是, 我不能够没有我自己的生命。

黄:对。

李:如果这个经文对我有意义,我伤心,也是对一些人有意义。

黄:等一下,再回到下面一个很重要的问题。《圣经》(林后 3:6)里面说的,我们读圣经不要读字面,要读精义,字面叫人死,经义使人活。不好意思,我读的是新约的经文,有简略句。所以你刚才讲的这些,比如说我们找字面等等,这是一个问题。

第一,“字面”和“精义”之间的关系问题。我们从字面 exegesis,我通过希腊语,通过希伯来语,通过版本,通过形式、用词等等形式的方法我来找这个意义,这就存在一个“字面”和“精义”之间的关系问题。

第二,“教义”和“经文”之间的关系问题,再一个是主观的 reason(理性)和 revelation(启示)。路德我看他是很相信上帝给他的启示的,这几个方面都是有矛盾的。

你这个读法我觉得对,我认为作为一个学者这样做是有意义的。但是,我们毕竟做神学,我还是受一点局限,我是把《圣经》当作“the word of God”:是上帝的话,有上帝的话,和对生命有意义的话;所以,the Bible 不仅仅是 the word about God(关于上帝的话),而是 the word of God(上帝的[话])。如果你这样的话,你的这个解构就使经典的权威没有了,没有也没有关系,不要经典。那基督教的信仰根基是什么?就是大公会议吗?我们几个人开个会,我们三个人开个会搞一个?

李:我知道你说这个,我说我没关心这个,我关心学术的问题。

黄:没错,但你的这个学术对基督教的根本信仰冲击很大啊?!

李:没问题。

黄:你这样说的话,我就讲达到了相对主义和虚无主义嘛。就是宗教信仰的根据在哪里?你就没有根据了嘛!你看经文,东正教、天主教、新教,书的数目都不一样,即使数目不一样,我讲我是 general(广义)的都包括在内,我说的这些都在,或者还有一个,经典前,经典后,教义的经典前。再一个,你“字面的”和“精义的”,然后你自己主观的“interpretation”(诠释)和那个“revelation”(启示),你读路德看 Commentaries on Psalms(《诗篇评注》)都是他的 subjective interpretation(主观诠释),还是说 revelation(启示),这些东西怎么办?

如果这些东西我们都摆出来之后,请注意:当我们讲这一切的时候,都是在大前提下的,我们俩到现在为止的谈话都是主要 rely on our reasons(依靠我们的理性),根据学术的规则,我们俩都是在根据这个;但是,这个“reason”(理性),我们知道这个本身只是人身上的一个“gift”(礼物、恩赐)而已,上帝比我们的理性要高出许多的。

李:我们所以不能够掌握它,我们只能从经文开始。首先一点,如果说,不要只存在于字面的话,我觉得是对的;可是,这句话不是说:因此,你就不要读这个文字了。

黄:那当然了,we should not be limited by the literal text(不要被字面所限制)。

李:所以你要 beyond it(超越字面)。

黄:一定要超越它,从它开始进入它中间。

李:你从“文字字面”再到“精义”。对吗?

黄:对。

李:你就不能够说我只有“经”。

黄:若只要圣灵感动,不要经文了,那也不行。

李:所以,这个不是矛盾的问题,不是你需要这个还是那个的问题,因为这两个都要。

黄:两个 balance(平衡)。

李:对。所以,我觉得这个“精义”的问题就这样。

第二点我要讲的,我知道你关心的基督教,我现在说“放下来”,有一个原因,我现在觉得我还是做学问的。所以,我们两条线是不一样的天线。首先我要做的,我现在研究的是旧约《圣经》。旧约《圣

经》我们有另外一个名字叫 Hebrew Bible(希伯来《圣经》), 为什么叫 Hebrew Bible(希伯来《圣经》)呢? 就是因为它不应该从“旧约”与“新约”的这个关系当中去梳理了。你如果读这个经文, 我们常常从基督教来说, 你就觉得一点, 不是基督教的人, 而是其他宗教的人, 比如说犹太教, 就不能够研究旧约了。

黄: 对, 理解。

李: 因为我们现在这个会一般是犹太人, 他每次都要来到基督教这个场合。

黄: 进基督教会场来听?

李: 他不会啊。可是他还在研究啊, 他研究犹太教。所以, 现在出现了[的情况是], 不但基督教分门分派, 还有另外一个教也是读同一个经文。你说, 你一定要跟基督教徒说为什么, 你说只有基督教徒[的]读[法才]是对[的], 犹太人读就不对, 所以, 我们很难这样说。

还有一点, 我现在研究的经文, 就在犹太教还没有成立之前与基督教还没成立之前, 没有成为经典之前他们就[被]写下了。后来, 这两个教就说, 这些经文我们要让它成为我们经典的[正典]那部分。所以, 这些文化传下来的时候, 你说, 他已经知道有犹太教、基督教吗? 不会。我现在研究, 能不能将基督教放下, 将犹太教放下, 回到一个我们说 Hebrew religion(希伯来宗教)。所以, 我现在其实研究的是这个, 叫 Hebrew Bible(希伯来《圣经》)。

黄: 不错, 我觉得, 你这样做很有意义的。但是, 我觉得与我刚才讲的也不是完全两条天线。你讲你是做学术, 在我的理解来说, 学术和这个信仰, 这两个是可以合在一起的。

李: 对。可是你和犹太教、基督教还是你自己的信仰?

黄: 我也是 contextualization(处境化的), 我是从基督教的 context(处境), 我不否认犹太教说他的 context(处境)。

李: 所以, 我就不从基督教的 context(处境)。

黄: 但你有另一个, 你是独特的 context(处境), 你也有你自己的一个。

李: 对。

黄: 是不是在这些研究中, 其实, 你的背后还是有一个 context of Archie Lee(李的处境)? 对于你的研究, 它是成为你的 revelation(启示)的一个重要的 background element(背景元素), 是不是?

李: 我不是用 revelation(启示)这个词的, 我现在喜欢用的一个词是……

黄: inspiration(默示)?

李: 也不用。我是用 enlightenment(启蒙、觉悟)。

黄: 启蒙。

李: 不是。是佛教里的“觉悟”。

黄: 我知道, 佛教里的觉悟。

李: 觉悟。

黄: 对, 彻悟。这个也是对的, 启蒙运动也是 enlightenment(觉悟)。你要这样讲, 我讲你还是有点 humanistic(人文学性质的)。

李: 有, 一定有。我不会反对, 而且我有“人”的部分, 不能够放弃“人”; 可是, 我不能够停在“人”, 因为停在“人”的话, 这个经典就没有宗教的部分了。所以, 我不会停, 可是我又不能反对是“人”。

黄: 很好, 我今天更清晰地理解你的思想。我发现, 你做的很有价值。但是, 我们中间还是有不少的差异。

李: 对, 一定有差异。

黄: 但是, 我觉得, 比如说, 我讲我谈信仰, 我并不是说: “我信, 所以, 才是正确的”。我还是要用理性、感性来这样分析的, 但是, 我在分析的时候, 我意识到理性的重要和必须, 可也意识到理性的有限

嘛,因为这是方法。

李:所以,我是这样讲,比如说,我跟游斌也是,游斌也是非常重视信仰的。我说,我不是不重视信仰,可是,我觉得我在研究文本的时候,我不能够从信仰的角度,因为,比如说,我没有问我的学生是不是基督徒?我觉得,他们不是。我说,如果他们研究,他们从哪个角度?我不能够让他们从犹太教、基督教还是其他传统的,所以,我是现在从在大学里面以后《圣经》学的发展……

八、汉语学界《圣经》学今后发展的展望

黄:请你展望一下汉语学界今后的《圣经》研究发展。

李:你觉得应该怎么样?

黄:我是请问你的观点。

李:就是这样啊,我就问这个问题。所以,你问我的时候,首先就是教义的方向,无论犹太教,基督教,还是天主教,还是什么教……

黄:用教义来解释经文,这是一个路径了。

李:对。所以,不是说我反对,只是我不从这个路径。第二,从一个以色列人将经文写下来的时候,在他们整个国家受苦;又探索人的存在,神人关系,宗教形象,要处理这些问题。如果他们处理的还有意义的话,它有一个对后来我们现在再重回看它的时候,应该对我们有意义。如果这对我们有意义,我也不能够相信上帝不在那个意义的里面,他不能够在外面。所以,这样的话,我就说,这个是人类的一个宗教传统。这个宗教传统我们现在读的时候,我们要投入,我们要经验,我们要从存在生存的角度去处理,就不从系统去处理。

黄:我这样理解,大家有多种路径,不要互相排斥。

李:对,我不会。

黄:但是,我可以选择我走这条路,你走那条路,他走那条路,这几个是互相可以并存的,百花齐放。

李:对。回到这个问题了。在中国学术界里面,大学高等教育里面,《圣经》研究有没有地位?将来应该怎么发展?这个是我的关心。我的关心就是,走出另外一条来到中国,对中国的国情也好,处境也好,有意义的话,我们就 take on Chinese classics(借鉴中国文本)。

黄:对,学习借鉴。

李:所以,就跨文本。跨文本是这样过来的。我们从中国的经典跟圣经的经典互读,跨文本阅读,我觉得,这个是将来应该走的路。怎么走呢?所以,很多人叫我写下来 in details(详细地),我都不想写。

黄:是个 open system(开放的体系)?

李:以后有人在做。我现在看到,在中国,还没有对整个西方发展出来的那个《圣经》的诠释的传统有深厚的介绍。

黄:中国还没有对《圣经》研究传统做系统的介绍。

李:建立作为一个我们说 foundation(根基),这个是我现在在做的。做这个,我要训练一些人,跟他们的下一代学者,所以我跟他们每年都开 Biblical seminars(《圣经》研讨班、研讨会),让他们带他们的学生过来,就是慢慢那个团体在扩大,他们可以有新的方法。

黄:不要被局限得那么死。

李:什么进路,我觉得都可以。你不能够说哪个对,哪个不对,所以,我就开放。所以,我就没有

authority(权威)。

黄:时间差不多了,我们俩聊了两个小时了。但是,最后一个问题,就讲“经”。

九、“经”的绝对性与否的问题

黄:我们讲经学,那么,犹太、东正、罗马、新教这几个传统对经的数目,希伯来《圣经》或者新旧约数量不一样。我们中国有四书五经、十三经,等等。这里这个“经”,我还想问的一个问题在于:从新教的角度来说,这个“经”好像就是一个绝对的标准,那希伯来里面是什么? 犹太教……

李:这涉及《圣经》观。

黄:那希伯来人是不是把《圣经》当成他们信仰的一个绝对的标准?

李:也是分派,包括正统派、改革派等。

黄:也存在这个问题,也是一样。那如果这样讲的话,绝对性还是它的根源,Orthodoxical School 认为希伯来《圣经》是绝对性的。

李:他们的 Orthodoxical School(正统学派)是最绝对的,比我们[新教]更厉害。

黄:《古兰经》也是这样。天主教和东正教里面,他们对经文是不是看得那么绝对? 好像稍微弱一些吧?

李:其实,对情况看得最绝对的,其实就是近代在美国 revival evangelical movement(复兴的福音派运动)中出现的。其实,路德不会这样看,可是,现在,我们觉得路德就强调“sola scriptura”(唯独《圣经》);可实际上他不是这样封闭的。

黄:我在四川大学宗教学研究所田海华他们刊物《宗教学研究》上发过一篇文章,就是研究路德的 inspiration(默示)这个概念。

在中国的“经”里面,比如,佛教里面讲的经是太开放的,那么,儒家里面也是。我觉得,儒家里面的“经”是不是就缺少一点“绝对性”? 它虽然也讲天道,但是,它这个“经”的位置……

李:你说“天道”?

黄:天道(Dao of Heaven, Heavenly Dao)。我觉得,在儒家里的经典,它的绝对性好像不像基督教、犹太教这么强。

李:因为没有“成为经的过程”这么普遍化。

黄:对,它的经,它不是启示来的嘛,它是哪个皇帝开会决定的,皇帝定的。而基督教无论怎么讲,无论大公会议解决的,但是它相信的是上帝的 Revelation(启示)。

李:[但教会历史中的大公会议]背后还是皇帝。

黄:对,背后还是人,如康士坦丁等。但是,最起码……

李:他们 commission(委身)。

黄:对,但是这个理论上,theoretically,它不是皇帝,是上帝嘛。我想,这点差异也是很有意思的。

李:其实,现在中国儒家的经典,一定是没有这个 dimension(维度),没有这么清楚的 dimension,我们叫 transcendence(超越)也好,religion(宗教)也好,divine(神圣)也好,真的没有。不代表中国没有这一个感情。这个感情就跟民间,跟生活有关。可是,经典常常成为考试的 textbook(教材)也好,而且它有一套解释的理论。

黄:所以,一定要按朱熹那个解释嘛,那就是他们的 orthodoxy(正统),就按那个来进行嘛。

李:还有这个解释就好像跟《礼记》里面说的“修身、齐家、治国、平天下”,但是缺少“爱苍生”,没有对整个造化的这个关怀,所以,这个是没有的。

黄:缺少这个 dimension,这个维度它没有。

李:还有,中间也有一个维度,我觉得很重要。

黄:什么维度?

李:你说“修身”、“齐家”、“治国”,中间有“社会”吗?

黄:没有“社会”。

李:没有“社会”,没有“人群”,没有邻舍。因为没有这个就没有 civil society(公民社会),就是社会感受,这个共同体。

黄:“共同体”(共同体),应该存在于“家”和“国”之间。

李:从“家”到“国”应该有一个“社群”。

黄:这是中国大陆的敏感词,“公民社会”(civil society)。

李:可是,在中国,这个很重要的,对任何社会都很重要。可是,最反动、最推动社会发展的是这个。

黄:civil society。

李:可是它也是最危险的。后面的天道也好。

黄:天道太高了,太远了。

李:中间没有一个维度,可是这两个,基督教都有。

黄:非常感谢李老师。我回去之后会整理一下,到时候我先来看一下,修改一下。然后到时候发给你,也麻烦你辛苦一下帮我弄一下。

李:我很高兴跟你谈话。

黄:很有意思。总共谈了两个小时。

(对话稿由黄保罗负责整理,包括所有标题、小标题和分段等;然后由李教授校对;最后由黄保罗统稿件。2018年12月22日于西班牙属大加内利亚岛度假中心 [Monte Feliz, Gran Canaria, Spain], 2020年受难节定稿)

English Title:

Is it a literature, humanistic document, the Word of God, or a record of God-man interaction? A Dialogue on the Hebrew Biblical Studies between Paulos Huang and Archie Lee

Authors: Paulos HUANG, Ph. D. (1996, Univ. of Helsinki) & Th. D. (2006, Univ. of Helsinki), Post-Doctor (2000, Univ. of Tokyo), is Distinguished Professor at Shanghai University, and Chief editor of International Journal of Sino-Western Studies ([www. SinoWesternStudies. com](http://www.SinoWesternStudies.com)) and Brill Yearbook of Chinese Theology (www. brill. com/yct), and Guest Professor in over ten universities in China. He is the author of *Confronting Confucian Understandings of the Christian Doctrine of Salvation* (Brill, 2009), and Chinese academic monographs on Sino-Christian Academic Theology, Biblical Theology, Dialogical Theology between Christianity and Chinese Culture, and *Daguoxue* (National Studies). Presently Paulos is concentrating on the study of Martin Luther and translating his ten works into Chinese.

Archie Lee, Ph. D. in Hebrew Biblical Studies from Edinburgh University, emeritus Professor, Director of the Department of Religions and Cultures, Dean of the School of Humanities at Chinese University of Hong Kong. Since December 2013, he worked as the First Level Professor in Shandong University and supervisor of Ph. D. in Hebrew Biblical Studies. He is the founding chairman of SABS (Society of Asian Biblical Studies) and Board member of SBL (Society of Biblical Literature). From 1998 to 2001, Archie worked as the director for Asian Christianity Research Plan at the invitation of Cambridge University (UK), and he has also worked as editor and reviewer for *Global Bible Commentary*, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, *Biblical Interpretation* and *Journal of World Christianity*, etc. . He has many publication in Hebrew Biblical Studies, for example, Archie Lee and Bin You, *Life Talk and Community Identification: A Study on the Hebrew Five Small Prophetic Books* (Beijing: China Social Sciences Press, 2006). As a teacher Lee has supervised over ten Ph. D. young scholars in Hebrew Biblical Studies at the Chinese University of Hong Kong, and most of them are now working as important scholars in Chinese academia.

Abstract: This dialogue took place on August 2nd, 2018 at University of Helsinki, and has focused on the following issues. 1) What kind of events in your personal life and study experience have influenced you to pursue your present academic career and to construct your own theology? How did you start your religious life? Your experience of reciting Biblical texts and the influence of Dr. Richard Deutsch and Professor David Flusserto on your academic career, and your experience of Biblical studies at Edinburg University. 2) Core questions in your academic research; the relationship between theology and religions, cross-contextual and textual reading and presuppositions, the influence of your faith on your academic research, the relationship between the Canon and doctrines, to read the original Hebrew Biblical texts in Classic Chinese. 3) Has an over-optimistic humanistic presupposition controlled your research? If you put aside the doctrines of Christianity while reading the Hebrew Bible, how do you deal with your own presuppositions? Is it possible that you are proclaiming a different Gospel from the Apostle Paul? Are you going to fall into relativism or nihilism? If your strategy is to deconstruct first and to reconstruct later, are you worried that you will stray from Christian Orthodox doctrine? 4) The plan of Hebrew Biblical scholars' training in Chinese academia; You have strategically trained over ten Hebrew Biblical scholars for Chinese academia, and you have deeply influenced the present state of Hebrew Biblical studies in Chinese language. 5) Sino-Christian Academic Biblical Studies in the Light of the Great Guoxue; In order to deconstruct the narrow-minded guoxue (Chinese national studies) and to include Biblical studies in Chinese academia officially, I have invented this concept and have published two monographs and several articles related to it. The Bible is usually accepted as literary fiction, a humanistic document, or the Word of God, but you consider the Bible as a record of God-Man interaction. 6) What is the relationship between your academic research and Christian orthodox doctrines? Do

any of your research results subvert the traditional teachings of Christianity? You have invented and developed cross-textual reading & hermeneutics. Facing inter-religious dialogue, or comparative religions, how do you read the Hebrew Bible in your own context of pluralistic classics. Can you find biblical evidence to support the doctrines of the Trinity and Original Sin? A scholar should pay attention to the ambiguity and transcendence of the Bible-do you find any Hebrew Biblical text to prove that God is omniscient and has omnipotentiality? 7) What is the basis for your own theories? This is to say, what allows them to withstand scrutiny? You have done Hebrew Biblical hermeneutical research with your own understanding / teaching / interpretation as the presupposition, how do you interpret Martin Luther's Sola Scriptura? What is the authority for you? In addition to humanistic reason, do you believe that God has a revelation for you especially? 8) The outlook of the development of Biblical studies in Chinese academia. 9) The problem of the Canon's absoluteness.

Key Words: The Bible, Cross-Textual reading, the relationship between canons and doctrines, presupposition, Sino-Christian Academic Biblical Studies in the Light of the Great Guoxue

《国学与西学：国际学刊》 (中英文双语半年刊)

投稿须知

《国学与西学国际学刊》(GUOXUE YU XIXUE Guoji Xuekan)创刊于 2011 年 12 月,由国学与西学北欧论坛(Nordic Forum of Sino-Western Studies)主办、赫尔辛基大学世界文化系宗教学中心、北京大学高等人文研究院世界宗教与普世伦理中心、与吉林大学文学院国学与西学比较研究中心协办之中英文双语学术期刊,整合北欧四国(芬兰、瑞典、挪威、丹麦)学者之力,每年于芬兰出版两期(六月及十二月出版)。栏目有:

“人学、神学与国学”(人学乃启蒙运动以来强调理性的学术,神学乃关于上帝及研究基督教的学术,而国学则指中国精神体系之研究);

“实践神学与中西教会和社会”(实践神学乃现实中基督教实践之研究,中西教会/社会乃指中国与欧美等传统上以基督教为信仰和精神体系的基督教会与社会);

“中西经典与圣经”(中西经典乃中国及西方的宗教、人文经典,而圣经则指基督教的圣典);

“教会历史与中西文明变迁”(教会历史乃基督教会之历史,中西乃中国与欧美等传统上以基督教为信仰和精神体系的社会);

“比较宗教文化研究”(比较宗教文化研究乃中国、欧美等西方国家的宗教与文化之比较研究);

“书评与通讯”(书评乃对主题为国学与西学的新书之述评,而通讯则指同样主题的学术动态与新闻)。

1. 本刊欢迎下列类型的稿件:(1)研究性论文(Research Articles):国学、西学研究、及国学和西学比较的原创性学术论文。(2)书评(Book Reviews):对近来出版的相关学术专著的评介。(3)会议综述和报道(Conference Reports):对相关学术会议的深入报道。

2. 本刊全年公开征稿,凡与本刊内容相关的学术论文均欢迎各界人士投稿,但内容必须是首次(特例另加说明)发表的原创性学术研究成果。

3. 中英文文稿均被接受。以中文投稿的研究论文需附英文摘要和关键词;以英文投稿的稿件需附中文的摘要和关键词。原则上,论文含注释中文稿件为 8000 至 12000 字为宜,论文含注释英文稿件以不超过 12000 字为宜,书评及会议报道每篇一般以 3000 字为限,特殊情况另论。

4. 研究论文的撰写格式及顺序如下:

(1)首页:中英文题目、作者联系方式(中英文姓名、职务及职称、通讯地址、电话、电子邮件等联系方式)。

(2)中英文摘要(各以 200-700 字为宜)、关键词(以 5 个词为限)。

(3)正文含注释(正文及注释撰写请勿透露作者的相关信息,引用作者本人的文献时请不要使用第一人称,中文稿件的注释请遵照《国学与西学：国际学刊》的《注释体例及要求》撰写)。

5. 来稿请寄打印清晰的稿件两份,并以电子邮件或其他方式寄交原稿件的 Word 文档的电子版一份。

6. 本刊在收到寄交的论文后,本刊编辑委员会先进行匿名初审,初审后再请两位同领域的学

者专家复审,复审者意见不同时将邀请第三位学者评审;并于稿件收到后三个月内回复作者。逾期未接到通知者,可自行处理稿件。本刊概不退稿,作者请自留底稿。稿件随收随审,一经审稿通过即寄发同意刊出函告知作者。经决定采用的文稿,须依本刊体例修改论文格式,编辑部有权对稿件酌情删改(不愿者请投稿时说明),且需作者亲校最后文稿,修改过后始由本刊编辑委员会另行决定与何期刊出。

7. 著作人投稿本刊,经收录刊登后,同意授权本刊再授权其他本刊接受之资料库进行重制,通过网络提供服务,授权用户下载、打印等行为,并可酌情修改格式。

8. 本刊所刊登的文稿,作者文责自负,一切立论不代表本刊观点,版权则归本刊所有。

9. 稿件已经刊登,本刊将于出版后赠送该期刊物两本作为酬谢,不另付稿酬。

10. 本刊的征稿、评审、编辑与发行等事宜,皆依照《国学与西学:国际学刊》的“刊行及编审办法”办理。

11. 来稿或意见,请寄:

《国学与西学:国际学刊》编辑部 收

Vellikellontie 3 A 4,00410 Helsinki,Finland.

电子文档请寄至:ijofsws@gmail.fi

Tel. + 358-40-836-0793

www.SinoWesternStudies.com

International Journal of Sino-Western Studies *Notes for Contributors*

1. *International Journal of Sino-Western Studies* (IJS) is published semi-annually every June and December by the Nordic Forum of Sino-Western Studies (members from Finland, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark) and sponsored by the University of Helsinki, Peking University, and Jilin University. It covers areas in Humanities, Theology, and Chinese *guoxue* (National Studies), Practical Theology and Sino-Western Views on Church and Society, Chinese and Western Classics and the Bible, History of the Church and State in the West and in China, Comparative Religious and Cultural Studies, Reviews and Reports on Academic Conferences.

2. The types of work we prefer to publish:

a. Research Articles: Original articles related to the topics mentioned above.

b. Book Reviews: Reviews on books or articles that are related to our themes.

c. Academic News: In-depth reports on conferences or other academic news related to our themes.

3. IJS welcomes the submission of texts throughout the year; it is required that the text is original and has not been previously published.

4. The text can be written in Chinese or in English. An English article should have a Chinese abstract, and vice versa. The length of a Chinese article should be between 8,000 and 12,000 Chinese characters, including footnotes. An English article should have no more than 12,000 words, including footnotes. A book review or a report on academic news is usually limited to 3,000 words. Exceptions will be decided separately.

5. Articles should follow the following format:

a. Both a Chinese and an English title, the author's occupation, position, and contact information; see the Article Submission Cover Page.

b. A 200-700-word abstract and the maximum of 5 keywords in English and Chinese should be included.

c. Full information on publications should be included in the footnotes.

Footnotes must follow the style stated in our Footnote Format and Requirements. For the purpose of an anonymous review, please refrain from revealing the author's identity in the article; when citing the author's own work, please refrain from using the first person pronoun.

6. Please submit two paper copies of the article by mail and one in an electronic form through email. The electronic file should take the Microsoft Word format.

7. Article submitted to IJS will be peer-reviewed first by the editorial committee, then by two scholars of a relevant field, and if necessary a third scholar will be invited to review. The author will receive the decision within three months after submitting the article. The editorial committee has the

right to ask for a revision of an article and will thereafter decide whether the article will be published.

8. The author shall agree to authorize IJS the right to the reproduction of the article either electronically or in print.

9. The author is solely responsible for the content of the article, and any viewpoint expressed therein does not necessarily reflect the opinion of IJS. After publication, IJS reserves the copyright of the article.

10. The author will receive two copies of the IJS in which the article is published, no fees or royalties are paid to the author.

Please send your article or suggestion to:

Editorial Committee
International Journal of Sino-Western Studies,
Vellikellontie 3 A 4, 00410 Helsinki, Finland
Email with attachment to: ijofsws@gmail.fi
Tel. + 358-40-836-0793
www.SinoWesternStudies.com

注释体例及要求

Footnote Format and Requirements

一、总则 General Principles

1、采用页下注(脚注),从文首至尾依次加注。

Use continuous footnotes from the start to the end of your article.

2、一般情况下,引用外文文献的注释仍从原文,无须另行译出。

Use original literature when the reference is in a language other than the article, a translation of the citation is not required.

3、文章正文后不另开列“参考文献”。

Independent bibliography is not required.

4、所引资料及其注释务求真实、准确、规范。

Please use authentic, accurate, and standard literature references.

5、非汉语语言以英文为例。

We use English as an example of all the non-Chinese languages.

二、分则 Detailed Rules

1、专著 Monograph:

黄保罗 Huang Baoluo,《汉语学术神学》Hanyu xueshu shenxue [Sino-Christian Academic Theology],(北京 Beijing:宗教文化出版社 Zongjiao wenhua chubanshe [Religion and Culture Press],2008),155—159。

Paulos Huang, *Confronting Confucian Understandings of the Christian Doctrine of Salvation: A Systematic Theological Analysis of the Basic Problems in the Confucian-Christian Dialogue*, (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2009), 88-89.

2、编著 Compiled works:

罗明嘉 Luo Mingjia、黄保罗 Huang Baoluo 主编,《基督宗教与中国文化》Jiduzongjiao yu zhongguo wenhua [Christianity and Chinese Culture],(北京 Beijing: 中国社会科学出版社 Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe [Chinese Social Sciences Press],2004),155。

Miikka Ruokanen & Paulos Huang, eds., *Christianity and Chinese Culture*, (Grand Rapids & Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2010), 3.

3、译著 Translated literature:

麦克·阿盖尔 Maiké Agaier,《宗教心理学》Zongjiao xinlixue [Religious Psychology],陈彪 Chen Biao 译,(北京 Beijing: 中国人民大学出版社 Zhongguo renmin daxue chubanshe [The Press of Renmin University of China]),2005,30。

Fung Yulan, *A History of Chinese Philosophy*, tr. by Derk Bodde, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952), 150.

4、外文稿件引用中文资料 Chinese literature in non-Chinese articles:

Liang Qichao, *Gushu zhenwei jiqi niandai* [The Genuinity of Chinese Ancient Books and their Dates], (Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan [The Commercial Press], 1923), 20.

5、文集中的文章 Articles in collections:

张敏 Zhang Min, “基督徒身份认同——浙江温州案例” *Jidutu shenfen rentong——Zhejiang Wenzhou anli* [The Personal Identity of Christians], 张静 Zhang Jing 主编:《身份认同研究:观念、态度、理据》*Shenfen rentong yanjiu: guannian, taidu, liju* [A Study on Personal Identity], (上海 Shanghai: 上海人民出版社 Shanghai renmin chubanshe [Shanghai People's Publishing House], 2006), 101-105.

Zhuo Xinping, “Comprehensive Theology: An Attempt to Combine Christianity with Chinese Culture,” in Miikka Ruokanen & Paulos Huang, eds., *Christianity and Chinese Culture*, (Grand Rapids & Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2010), 185-192.

6、报纸中的文章 Articles in newspapers:

曹曙红 Cao Shuhong, 《信仰之旅 慈善之行——上海玉佛寺禅寺觉群慈爱功德会参访团西藏行纪实》*Xinyang zhi lu, Cishan zhi xing——Shanghai Fochansi Juequn ciai gongdehui canfangtuan Xizang xing jishi* [The Trip of Faith and the Travel of Charity], 《中国民族报》*Zhongguo minzubao* [The Newspaper of Chinese Ethnic Minorities] (2011年8月23日), 第5版。

David E. Sanger, “U. S. and Seoul Try to Ease Rift on Talks with the North,” *New York Times*, (11 June, 2005).

7、期刊中的文章 Articles in journals:

李炽昌 Li Chichang, “跨文本阅读策略: 明末中国基督徒著作研究” *Kuawenben yuedu celue: Mingmo Zhongguo jidutu zhuzuo yanjiu* [The Strategy of Readings in Chinese Christian Writings], 《基督教文化学刊》*Jidujiao wenhua xuekan* [Journal of Christian Culture], No. 10, (北京 Beijing: 中国人民大学出版社 *Zhongguo renmin daxue chubanshe* [The Press of Renmin University of China], 2003), 168.

J. R. Carrette, “Religion and Mestrovic's Postemotional Society: The Manufacturing of Religious Emotion,” *Religion*, vol. 34, (2004), 271.

8、会议论文 Conference papers:

田海华 Tian Haihua, “汉语语境中的‘十诫’: 以十九世纪基督新教的诠释为例” *Hanyu yujing zhong de ‘Shijie’: Yi shijiu shiji jiduxinjiao de quanshi wei li* [The Ten Commandments in the Chinese Context], “第四届‘基督教与中国社会文化’国际年青学者研讨会” *Disijie ‘Jidujiao yu Zhongguo shehui wenhua’ guoji qingnian xuezhe yantaohui* [The Fourth International Young Scholar Conference on Christianity and Chinese Social Culture], (香港 Xianggang, 香港中文大学 *Xianggang zhongwen daxue* [Chinese University of Hong Kong], 2008年12月5-9日), 3.

John Barwick, “Liu Tingfang, Chinese Protestant Elites, and the Quest for Modernity in Repu Xinping Republican China”, presented in “The 4th International Young Scholars' Symposium on ‘Christianity and Chinese Society and Culture’,” (Hong Kong: The Chinese University of Hong Kong, 5-9 December, 2008).

9、学位论文 Dissertations:

刘家峰 Liu Jiafeng,《中国基督教乡村建设运动研究(1907—1950)》Zhongguo jidujiao xiangcun jianshe yundong yanjiu [A Study on the Movement of Chinese Christian Countryside Construction], (武汉 Wuhan:华中师范大学博士论文 Huazhong shifan daxue boshi lunwen [Ph. D. dissertation in Central China Normal University],2001),55。

Nathan C. Faries, The Narratives of Contemporary Chinese Christianity, (The Pennsylvania State University, PhD dissertation, 2005), 22.

10、互联网资料 Internet source:

<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/polis/englishschool/wilson03.doc>, 2005-03-27.

11、重复引用 Consecutively repeated citations:

同上书,第19页。

Ibid., pp. 73-75.

12、转引 Quotation from a secondary source:

新疆档案馆档案政 Xinjiang dang‘anguan dang’ an zheng 2 —5 —140 [Xinjiang Archives, Politics], 转引自木拉提·黑尼亚提 Mulati Heiniyati:《喀什噶尔瑞典传教团建堂历史考》Kashigeer Ruidian chuanjiaotuan jiantang lishikao [A Study on the History of Church Establishment in Kashgar by Sweden Missionaries],《新疆社会科学》Xinjiang shehui kexue [Social Sciences in Xinjiang],(乌鲁木齐 wulumuqi:2002年第3期),64-65。

Stanley A. Erickson,“Economic and Technological Trend Affecting Nuclear Nonproliferation,” The Nonproliferation Review, vol. 8, no. 2, 2001, p. 43, quoted from Michael Wesley,“It’s Time to Scrap the NPT,” Australian Journal of International Affairs, vol. 59, no. 3, (September 2005), 292.

13、华人姓名写法 Writing of Chinese personal names:

如果华人拥有外文名字,则按西文方式名前姓后,如:Paulos Huang;若只有中文名字,则按中国方式姓前名后,如:Zhuo Xinp ing 等。If a Chinese person uses the Westernized first name, his name can be written in this way:Paulos Huang;but if he ONLY uses the Chinese name, it must be written in the Chinese way, for instance:Zhuo Xinp ing, etc.

14、其他 Others:

河北省地方志编纂委员会 Hebei sheng difangzhi bianzhu an wei yuanhui [The Editorial Committee of Hebei Provincial Chorography] 编:《河北省志·宗教志》Hebei sheng zhi·Zongjiaozhi [Hebei Provincial Chorography·Religions],(北京 Beijing:中国书籍出版社 Zhongguo shuji chubanshe [Chinese Books Publishing House],1995),224。

U. S. Agency for International Development, Foreign Aid in the National Interest, (Washington, D. C., 2002), 1.

International Journal of Sino-Western Studies 国学与西学 国际学刊

Sanovan Press, Vellikellontie 3 A 4, 00410 Helsinki, Finland.
Email: ijofsws@gmail.com, www.SinoWesternStudies.com/

Order Form 订购单 (From Issue No. ____ to No. ____, 由第 ____ 期至第 ____ 期)
(Please tick your choice 请勾选) (Tax and postage included 含税及邮费)

Printed Version 纸质版

Region 地区	Asia (euro € or RMB ¥) 亚洲 (欧元 € 或人民币 ¥)		Europe 欧洲		Other Area 其他地区	
	Surface 水陆	Airmail 航空	Surface 水陆	Airmail 航空	Surface 水陆	Airmail 航空
Price for individuals (per year/2 issues) 个人(每年 2 期)	35 € (350 ¥)	40 € (400 ¥)	50 €	60 €	40 €	50 €
Price for individuals (2 year/4 issues) 个人(两年四期)	60 € (600 ¥)	70 € (700 ¥)	90 €	100 €	90 €	100 €
Price for institutions (per year/2 issues) 团体/机构(每年 2 期)	80 € (800 ¥)	90 € (900 ¥)	90 €	100 €	80 €	90 €
Price for institutions (2 year/4 issues) 团体/机构(两年四期)	150 € (1500 ¥)	170 € (1700 ¥)	150 €	170 €	110 €	130 €

PDF electronic version 电子版订购单

Please pay the fee (in US dollars) to the Account below. Then please fill in this form and the webmaster will send you the full texts soon.

One Paper: 1 US \$

Five Papers: 3 US \$

All Papers of One Issue: 8 US \$

Method of Payment 付款方法

网上付款 www.SinoWesternStudies.com/ 全文购买 full-texts/

人民币账户: 中国建设银行长春市分行吉新支行 6227 0009 4256 0079 382 (账户名: Huang Paulos Zhan Zhu). International payment outside China: Bank Account: Nordea Bank, Helsinki, Finland, Account number FI44 1378 5000 1315 41. Paulos Huang, Sanovan Press Company.

Please send my journal to 期刊请寄至

Name 姓名 _____

Tel. 电话 _____ Fax. 传真 _____

Email 电子邮件: _____

Address 地址: _____