

**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 the Theory of
Intellectual History
“思想史理论” 专辑**

No. 25, 2023

国学与西学: 国际学刊 (半年刊)

第二十五期: 二零二三年 十二月

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: 北京大学哲学系系聘副教授), **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

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

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、荣休教授)

陆地 (北京大学视听传播研究中心主任、教授暨华侨大学周边研究院院长)

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)

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 (兰州大学哲学学院教授、院长)

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 (武汉大学欧美宗教学文化研究所教授、所长)

朱东华 (清华大学哲学系教授)

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)、汤姆森路透新资料引用索引 (ESCI, Thomson Reuters) 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 / OCC), ELSEVIER and DOAJ (<http://bit.ly/1IPWhtD>), European Reference Index for the Humanities and Social Sciences (ERIH).

International Journal of Sino-Western Studies (IJS)

(Semi-annual)

No. 25: Dec. 2023

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 Philosophy, Peking 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

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

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

Editorial Advisory Board (in alphabetical order)

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

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)

LU, Di (Prof. & Director, V & A Communication Research Center, Peking University. Dean of Institute for Surrounding Communication at Huaqiao University)

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 (emeritus 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 Xiping (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 (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), Thomson Reuters 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 / OCCC), ELSEVIER and DOAJ (<http://bit.ly/11PWhtD>), and European Reference Index for the Humanities and Social Sciences (ERIH).

目录

Contents

卷首语 From the Editor's Desk*

黄保罗著 杨莹译	丁光训将“信”作为动词的单方面诠释	7
Paulos HUANG	K. H. Ting's One-Sided Interpretation of <i>Xin</i> (信) as a verb	17
Tr. by YANG YIng		

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

王孝强	陆时雍对《九歌》性质及其艺术性的阐释	23
WANG Xiaoqiang	Lu Shiyong's Interpretation of the Nature and Artistry of <i>A Verse in "Nine Songs"</i>	31
LIANG Wanjing	The Exotic Country in the Quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns: Images of China in the Battle of the Books	32
梁婉婧	古今之争中的异国	44

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

Church and Society

乔飞	晚清兖州教案之法律文化解析	47
QIAO Fei	On the Legal Culture Analysis of Yanzhou Anti-Church Case in Late Qing Dynasty	63
BAI Junxiao	St. Augustine's Cosmological Arguments on Transcendent Beauty	64
柏峻霄	圣奥古斯丁关于超验美的宇宙观论证	77

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

Jacob Chengwei Feng	The China Aspiration in Light of Jacob's Narrative (Genesis 25:19-36:43): Toward a Chinese Public Theology for Human Flourishing in the Third Millennium	81
冯成伟	从雅各叙事(创25:19-36:43)的视角分析中国抱负: 构建为着第三个千年、基于人类繁荣之中国公共神学	98
MO Zengyi	Women and Aged Disability: A Study of Naomi's Gender identity and its Transformation in <i>the Book of Ruth</i>	99
莫铮宜	女性与年老失能: 《路得记》中拿俄米性别身份及其转换研究	112

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

韩星	殷商的神权和王权观念	115
HAN Xing	The concept of religious authority and power of the monarch in Shang Dynasty	131
吴倩	基于实践智慧的本体论说: 牟宗三“道德的形上学”建构得失试探	132
WU Qian	Ontological Theory Based on Practical Wisdom —An Exploration of the Gains and Losses of Mou Zongsan's “Metaphysics of Morality” Construction	142

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

谢文郁	《天主实义》与中西思维的问题意识	145
XIE Wenyu	The True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven and the Differences in Concerns between Chinese and Western Thinking	155
肖清和	利玛窦与晚明思想世界的新视域: 对谢文郁教授《〈天主实义〉 与中西思维的问题意识》一文的回应	156
XIAO Qinghe	Matteo Ricci and the New Horizon of the Intellectual World in late Ming: A Response to Prof. XIE Wenyu's Article “The True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven and the Differences in Concerns between Chinese and Western Thinking”	167

书评与通讯 **Reviews and Academic Reports**

杨莹	思想史的定义和方法及其他相关问题: 兼谈马丁·路德思想在中国的被接受史.....	171
YANG Ying	The Definition, Methods and Other Related Issues of Intellectual History: Also on the History of Martin Luther's Thoughts in China.....	186
何丹春	论思想史的内涵与研究方式:以解放神学的起源为例.....	187
HE Danchun	On the Definition and Research Methods of Intellectual History: Taking the Origin of Liberation Theology for example.....	196
李瑞翔	论思想史视域下的神学与哲学研究: 以马丁·路德对海德格尔的影响为例.....	197
LI Ruixiang	Discussion on the Study of Philosophy and Theology in the Perspective of the Intellectual History: Taking Martin Luther's Influence on Heidegger as an Example.....	206
投稿须知	Notes for Contributors.....	209
注释体例及要求	Footnote Format and Requirements.....	211

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

丁光训将“信”作为动词的单方面诠释¹

黄保罗/撰 杨莹/译

(上海大学 文学院, 上海 宝山 200244)

提要: 丁光训借由“信”挑战传统宗教改革家们的神学, 提出了淡化“因信称义”的主张, 这是因为他对汉字“信”的诠释极其不同于宗教改革家们, 如马丁·路德, 对新约希腊文概念 πιστεῦω、πιστός 和 πίστις 的理解。在此, 笔者欲以“中国的”传统宗教和道德观念为框架, 探讨丁光训作出异于传统宗教改革家们的神学之解读的不同及其原因。此外, 新约希腊文和宗教改革拉丁文传统亦被纳入讨论之中, 如同它们在阐明宗教改革家的立场中充当辅助性角色一样。本文并不运用政治神学方法, 而是从系统神学和语义分析的, 尤其是概念分析的视角出发, 因为关于前者的研究已经相当充分, 而对后者的讨论还远远不够。πίστις 和“信”分别在新约希腊文和中国经典、文学甚至通用语中都具有多层意义, 但丁仅将关注点落脚在作为动词的“信”的含义上。当丁谈论“因信称义”这一教义时, 他没有足够清楚地辨析 πιστεῦω、πιστός 和 πίστις, 以及 *credo*、*fideliū* 和 *fides* 的诸多相异之处。其实, 除动词外, “信”也被用作形容词、动名词、形容词性名词以及名词。然而, 丁光训的单方面诠释致使其对“信”的解读有别于马丁·路德及其他西方前人。

关键词: πιστεῦω/*credo*/believe; πιστός/*fideliū*/*faithful*; πίστις/*fides*/*faith*/信; 动名词 *fides*/believing/信; 淡化

作者: 黄保罗, 上海大学文学院历史系伟长学者特聘教授, 中欧人文研究与交流中心主任, 博士生导师, 芬兰赫尔辛基大学东亚学及西方思想史双博士, 日本东京大学东洋文化研究所博士后, 研究领域包括大国学、汉语学术神学、芬兰学、中西文化对话、马丁·路德著作翻译及研究等。通讯地址: 上海市宝山区南陈路333号。

译者: 杨莹, 上海大学文学院世界史博士在读。电子邮件: yinying17853321152@163.com。通讯地址: 上海市宝山区南陈路333号。

一、丁光训主教对传统宗教改革神学的挑战

丁光训主教通过淡化“因信称义”(“Watering Down / Diluting Justification by Faith”)理论质疑传统宗教改革之神学。他主张淡化“信”之作用的原因在于, “信”对其而言是动词“去相信”(“to believe”), 即“信”是一个不如人的善功有价值的人本主义行为。² 丁的诠释背离了

1 原文来源: Paulos Huang, “K. H. Ting’s One-Sided Interpretation of *Xin* (信) as a verb,” in Alister Au ed., *To See a Theological World in a Grain of Sand: Festschrift for Pilgrim W. K. LO on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, (Hong Kong: Gratia Christian College, 2023), 245-264.

2 淡化“因信称义”也被英译为“the dilution of justification by faith”, 此思想最初被表述在丁的文章和著作中, 可见: 丁光训 K. H. Ting, 《淡化因信称义》*Danhua yinxinchengyi* [Watering Down the Doctrine of Justification by Faith], 刘华俊 Liu Huajun 编: 《天风甘雨: 中国基督教领袖丁光训》*Tianfeng ganyu: Zhongguo jidujiao lingxiu Ding Guangxun* [The Heavenly Wind and Sweet Rain], (南京 Nanjing: 南京大出版社 Nanjing daxue chubanshe [Nanjing University Press], 2000); 丁光训 K. H. Ting, 《谈基督徒一个思想深处的问题》*Tan jidutu yige sixiang shenchu de wenti* [On a question in the deep depth of Christian thinking], 丁光训 K. H. Ting: 《丁光训文集》*Ding Guangxun wenji* [The Works of Ting], (南京 Nanjing: 译林出版社 Yinlin chubanshe [Yilin Press], 1998); 丁光训 K. H. Ting, 《调整宗教观念的呼唤》*Tiaozheng zongjiao guannian de huhuan* [A Call to Change Religious Thinking], 《人民政办报》*Renmin zhengban bao* [Newspaper of People’s Political Consultative Conference], (1998年9月4日); 丁光训 K. H. Ting, 《老的神学思想要有

改革家们。笔者欲以“中国的”(“Chinese”)³ 传统宗教和道德观念框架,并参阅参考文献⁴中列出的研究文章,探讨丁光训背离传统宗教改革之神学的解读的不同和及其原因。同时,笔者亦对一些有关“信”的希腊文和拉丁语术语(作为动词、形容词和名词)进行分析,如同它们在阐明圣经原意和宗教改革家们立场中充当辅助性角色一样。

二、本文的研究目的和方法

就研究方法而言,笔者对丁光训淡化“因信称义”主张的探讨不是政治神学视角的,而是从系统神学的视角进行切入,正如来自 JSCS 的一名学者所论⁵,丁的政治性意图似乎已表明

所谓调整有所更新》Lao de shenxue sixiang yao yousuo tiaozheng yousuo gengxin [The old theological thinking should be adjusted and updated],《人民政办报》Renmin zhengban bao [Newspaper of People's Political Consultative Conference], (1999年9月4日)。

3 中国文化包含有多元的宗教和伦理,每一种都可能对基督教神学有所丰富,但笔者主要分析丁光训的儒家式个人修养和政治神学动机。“信”的字面意思是诚信(trustworthiness)、诚实(integrity)或诚心(sincerity),即一个人言行一致。参见《说文解字》中关于“信”的解释和《论语·为政篇》。“信”是五常(亦称五德,即仁义礼智信)之一。2012年,中国共产党第十八次全国代表大会提出并推动建设社会主义核心价值观(诚信是其中准则之一);富强、民主、文明、和谐是国家层面的价值目标,自由、平等、公正、法治是社会层面的价值取向,爱国、敬业、诚信、友善是公民个人层面的价值准则。

4 关于丁这一主张,许多学者持有不同看法。中立态度:Marketta Antola, *Kosminen Kristus tienä harmoniaan K. H. Tingin kontekstuaalisessa teologiassa*, (Department of Systematic Theology, University of Helsinki & The Library of University of Helsinki, 2017); Li Jieren, *In Search of the Via Meclia Between Christ and Marx: A Study of Bishop Ding Guangxun's Contextual Theology*, Lund: Center for Theology and Religious Studies, Lund University, 2008)。展开消极批判:赵天恩 Zhao Tianen、庄婉芳 Zhuang Wanfang,《当代中国基督教发展史:1949-1997》*Dangdai Zhongguo jidujiao fazhanshi: 1949-1997* [The Developing History of Contemporary Chinese Church: 1949-1997] (台北 Taipei: 中国福音会 Zhongguo fuyin hui [China Ministries International], 1997); 李信源 Li Xinyuan,《一个“不信派”的标本——丁光训近作评析(附丁光训近期文章三篇)(上下)》*Yige “buxinpai” de biaoben ---- Ding Guangxun jinzuopingxi(fu Ding Guangxun jinqi wenzhang sanpian)(shang and xia)* [A Specimen of the School of “Unbelief”: A Review on Ding Guangxun's Recent Works(Appendix: Three Recent Articles of Ding Guangxun)]·《生命季刊》Shengming jikan [Quarterly of Life], No. 2, (1999); 陈韵珊 Chen Yunshan,《三自神学论评》*Sanzi shenxue lunping* [Review on the Three-Self Theology] (台北 Taipei: 基督教与中国研究中心 Jidujiao yu Zhongguo yanjiu zhongxin [Center for the Study of Christianity and China], 2003)。以同情立场进行研究:罗明嘉 Miikka Ruokanen,《关于因信称义的通信》*Guanyu yinxinchengyi de tongxin* [A letter on Justification by Faith]·《金陵神学志》*Jinglin shenxuenzhi* [Nanjing Theological Review]·No. 4·(南京Nanjing: 南京神学院 Nanjing shenxue yuan [Nanjing Theological Seminary]·2004)·68-71; Mikka Ruokanen, “K. H. Ting's Contribution to the Contextualization of Theology in China,” *Modern Theology*, (2008), 104-122; Mikka Ruokanen, “Remarks on Tuomo Mannermaa's Interpretation of Martin Luther's Lectures on Galatians,” *International Journal of Sino-Western Studies*, vol. 18, (2020), 39-63. 表达支持观点:李维真 Li Weizhen,《寻迹“因信称义”》*Xunzhao yinxinchengyi* [Tracking Justification by Faith]·《金陵神学志》*Jinglin shenxuenzhi* [Nanjing Theological Review]·No. 1·(南京Nanjing: 南京神学院 Nanjing shenxue yuan [Nanjing Theological Seminary]·2003)·122-127; 欧阳文丰 Ouyang Wenfeng,《对淡化“因信称义”的神学思考》*Dui danhua yinxinchengyi de shenxue sikao* [A Theological Reflection on the Dilution of Justification by Faith]·《金陵神学志》*Jinglin shenxuenzhi* [Nanjing Theological Review]·No. 1·(南京Nanjing: 南京神学院 Nanjing shenxue yuan [Nanjing Theological Seminary]·2003)·128-132; 王光辉 Wang Guanghui,《从淡化“因信称义”看神学思想的调整》*Cong danhua yinxinchengyi kan shenxue sixiang de tiaozheng* [The Adjustment of Theological Thoughts in the Light of Watering Down the Doctrine of Justification by Faith]·《金陵神学志》*Jinglin shenxuenzhi* [Nanjing Theological Review]·No. 1·(南京Nanjing: 南京神学院 Nanjing shenxue yuan [Nanjing Theological Seminary]·2003)·133-140。

5 一名来自JSCS的匿名学者评论了笔者的文章并有言道:“丁的做法是以神学建设为幌子,直接反对一种倾向于仅将‘信’(‘faith’)作为认同之意而无民族和道德要求的特定诠释。因此,丁的表述在程序上具有误导性:他故

朗且得到了充分的研究⁶。或许许多神学家认为丁的观点中并未显示出过多的神哲学要素，但从系统神学的视角进行分析依旧是非常有意义的，因为中国人思维方式的一个重要特征就是趋同而非求异。⁷为了说服中国基督教徒追随其主张，丁策略性地不会直接排斥马丁·路德等宗教改革家以及他们与中国基督教徒之间的同一性，因为这些改革家们受到中国基督教徒的广泛欢迎。他不得不掩盖自己的政治动机并与中国化神学方法展开争辩。为了剖析丁光训神学的实质，笔者希望能够从探究丁对改革宗立场的轻率驳斥（这意味着对改革宗观点的讽刺）延伸到更全面、更平衡地重新定义信仰及称义。虽然谈及“基督教中国化”（“Sinicized Christianity”）问题时应当关注到中国语境，但我们仍然需要把握圣公会教徒丁光训到底背离了路德等改革家多少。由于丁的政治动机及对所谓“基督教中国化”的建构，所以他的独特之处或许能够证明其正确性，因为从定义上讲，“基督教中国化”与西方神学相分离。然而，丁从未公开否认过路德关于新约中 *πίστις* 的解释。相反，丁通过抨击那些相信“因信称义”教义的基督教徒的方式，试图隐藏自己的政治目的并对外宣称这是对路德的理解作出的重新诠释。

为了详细说明丁及其西方先辈思想上的结构性原则，本文在使用系统神学和语义分析的方法时，将神学概念的分析作为一个主要工具。此外，丁对中文译自希腊文术语 *πιστεύω* 的“信”的基本诠释极大地背离了路德对拉丁语翻译 *credo* 的理解，而文章的任务便是描述和展现这种背离⁸，由此或许可以发现他们之间的同异。然而，笔者目的并非是呈现异同，而是要探究丁以淡化“因信称义”来挑战其西方先辈们的可能性原因，因此将不可避免地辨析“*πιστός/fidelium/faithful*”和“*πίστις/fides/faith*”这两组概念。⁹

意将‘信’看作是一个意识形态标签和一个没有道德含义的部族誓言，部分原因在于他力求将道德重塑为‘基督教中国化’（‘Sinicized Christianity’）。基督徒（尤其是新教徒）对教义和赞许的追随与中国人（熟知儒家思想）对美德和道德的强调之间的长期紧张关系，几个世纪以来一直困扰着利玛窦（Matteo Ricci，1552-1610）、理雅各（James Legge，1815-1897）、吴雷川、赵紫宸等学者。现在，支持后者的丁光训终于解决了这一问题。然而，与其前辈们不同的是，丁的主张表现出了明显的亲政府立场。丁所谓的‘道德’（‘morality’）是在中国共产党制度的框架内设立的。虽然如丁所描述的那样，信仰作为一种智力上的认同是隐藏的和不可测量的，但行为是可观察的、可量化的，因此能够通过立法加以调节。道德的标准不是建立在神圣启示（犹太和基督教伦理—神教）、个人良知（传统天主教道德神学）、天生良知（孟子道德形而上学）之上，而是由一个全能的‘极权主义’（‘totalistic’）政府进行制定，这个政府不仅掌握着治理的权力，甚至承担着道德上的权威。丁‘淡化因信称义’的提议是一个明显的政治声明，而将此提议看作是其他任何东西都会误解其潜在动机。”

6 关于此方面的研究，可见：李信源 Li Xinyuan，〈一个“不信派”的标本——丁光训近作评析（附丁光训近期文章三篇）（上下）〉 Yige “buxinpai” de biaoben ---- Ding Guangxun jinzu pingxi(fu Ding Guangxun jinqi wenzhang sanpian) (shang and xia) [A specimen of the school of ‘unbelief’: A review on Ding Guangxun’s recent works(Appendix: Three recent articles of Ding Guangxun)]，〈《生命季刊》 Shengming jikan [Quarterly of Life], No. 2, (1999)；陈韵珊 Chen Yunshan，〈《三自神学论评》 Sanzi shenxue lunping [Review on the Three-Self Theology]〉（台北Taipei: 基督教与中国研究中心 Jidujiao yu Zhongguo yanjiu zhongxin [Center for the Study of Christianity and China], 2003)。

7 万君仁在 Ruokanen 和黄共同主编的 *Christianity and Chinese Culture* 一书中第85-101页讨论过此话题，详见：Mikka Ruokanen & Paulos Huang eds., *Christianity and Chinese Culture*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan / Cambridge, U. K. : William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2010), 85-101.

8 尽管本文的关注点是丁和宗教改革家，并将圣经预言作为一种辅助角色，如同它在阐明宗教改革观点时发挥的作用一样，但同时也会引用关键性的希腊文术语。

9 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), 18-19.

通过一系列对丁光训关于“信”和宗教改革家们关于动词 πιστεύω/*credo*/*believe*、形容词 πιστός/*fidelium*/*faithful* 及名词 πίστις/*fides*/*faith* 的理解的比较, 本文期望得出以下观点: (1)路德等改革家早已用拉丁文术语, 如 *credo*、*fidelium* 或 *fides*, 表达和诠释相关的新约希腊文术语了, 这是一种不同于丁的路径; (2)“信”和 πίστις 都具有多层含义, 但丁主要仅谈论了动词属性的“信”, 而“信”在中国经典、文学甚至通用语中都是包含诸多意义的。由于未对 πιστεύω、πιστός 和 πίστις, 以及 *credo*、*fidelium* 和 *fides* 之间的区别进行清楚辨析, 丁极大地背离了其西方先辈的观点。

三、丁将“信”主要诠释为动词“相信”(“Believe”)和人的行为

丁的诠释看似与新约希腊文中的 πιστεύω 和拉丁语 *credo* 相近似, 但实则不同。

他单方面将“信”解释为动词“相信”(“believe”), 即来源于人的主观决定并与任何实际行动相分离。他批评“因信称义”说:

上帝不问你有没有仁义的行为, 不问你是自私了一生还是为了大众服务牺牲, 只问你生前信了还是没有信。如果生前信, 那么不管你多么自私害人, 卖国卖友, 死后还是进天堂享受永福, 而如果生前不信, 不管你为别人为社会作过多大的贡献, 死后必送入地狱, 那儿有永远不灭的火。¹⁰

在此, 丁把“信”诠释为动词“相信”(“believe”), 即“信”是人的言语、精神、才智或情绪、心理的行为, 它不包含现实的伦理道德行动。丁忽略了“信”在其他层面上的诸多意义。通过与某些优秀英雄事迹的比照, 丁得出淡化“因信称义”的结论, 这是因为在他看来动词“信”的价值无法和实际、具体的善功相提并论。在中国语境中, 丁的上述批评不是一个特例, 大多数中国人也都将“信”作为一个动词来理解。于是, 在这种理解之下, 不仅人自身成为对象及动因, 而且所有由人造成的结果也将是人本主义行为。然而, 任何产生于人自身力量的结果都不可能是完美无瑕的, 因此, 无法在绝对意义上证明人的正当性。

除“相信”(“believe”)之外, 动词“信”的含义还有其他层面。¹¹ 从根本上讲, 探讨丁将动词“信”仅诠释为人的行为这一做法正确与否, 是至关重要的; 且这种诠释把“信”的地位置于伦理或道德行动之后。首先, 丁忽略了唐朝景教¹² 和元代也里可温教义中“信”的“敬畏”(“fear”)之内涵。¹³ 其次, 就哲学层面而言, “信仰/相信”(“belief/believe”)主要在

10 丁光训 K. H. Ting, 《谈基督徒一个思想深处的问题》Tan jidutu yige sixiang shenchi de wenti [On a Question in the Deep Depth of Christian Thinking], 丁光训 K. H. Ting: 《丁光训文集》Ding Guangxun wenji [The Works of Ting], (南京 Nanjing: 译林出版社 Yinlin chubanshe [Yilin Press], 1998), 286.

11 其他相关词汇为 trust、have confidence in、rely on、confess、will、obey、belief、accept as true、be confident with、credit with veracity; follow a credo、have a faith、be a believer、submit. 如果爱涉及义, 那么这个爱就是上帝之爱, 即基督之爱, 而非人之爱。

12 用汉语记录景教的唐代十个文献请参见: <http://www.orthodox.cn/localchurch/jingjiao/nest1.htm>.

13 陈垣 Chen Yuan, 《元也里可温教考》Yuan yelikewenjiao kao [A Study on the Yelikewen of Yuan Dunasty], (上海 Shanghai: 商务印书馆 Shangwu yinshuguan [The Commercial Press], 1917); 李金强 Li Jinqiang, 《中国基督教史研

智力上被理解为“确信……为真” (“assure. ° ° as true”), 并没有情感上的依赖、伦理或道德上的服从、以及遵循上帝的意志, 因此“信”被误解为“相信” (“believe”), 成为只是口头上承认有关上帝的智识而与善功相分离。第三, 丁还漏掉了“信”作为“信实” (“faithfulness”) 的含义, 而这个含义对儒家和基督徒而言都是非常重要的, 前者视“信实”为人的一种品德, 后者认为“信实”是上帝的及其赋予人的主要特征之一。

四、丁忽略了新约中与“信”相对应的原始术语“πιστεύω/*credo/believe*”

πιστεύω ——汉译为“信”——应当被理解为一种由上帝施行的而非人发出的行为。事实上, “信”的确译自最初新约希腊文中的积极性动词“πιστεύω”, 该词源自“πίστις/*faith*”, 而“πίστις/*faith*”又来源于“πειθω / to persuade or be persuaded”。它可以被表达为“believe”(肯定、有信心), 常常用作说服自己 (=human believing), 并带有受上帝说服的神圣意义 (=faith-believing)。只有将“πιστεύω” (“believe”) 置于具体文本中, 才能把握它指的是自私的信(没有神圣含义), 还是导致/源自上帝之信仰 (faith)产生的信 (believing)。¹⁴ 因此, 当丁淡化“因信称义”时, 他显然忽视了受到上帝召唤的神圣内涵, 从而误释了“信”仅是人的而非上帝的行为。

五、通过将“信”作为动词展开批评, 丁不同于了那些强调 πιστεύω 作用的西方先辈

“信”与 πιστεύω 之间的区别可以在六个拉丁词汇中得到明显展现, 而这些词汇被丁完全忽略了, 但它们对于改革家们理解原始希腊文术语来说非常重要¹⁵。

对16世纪的许多宗教改革家而言, 《哥林多前书》13章中的三个拉丁词汇——*fides*、*caritas* 和 *spes* 实际上代表了“πιστεύω”的过去、现在和未来时:

究之兴起及发展》Zhongguo jidujiaoshi yanjiu zhi xingqi yu fazhan [The Starting and Development of the Study on the History of Chinese Christian Church] · 《近代中基督教会研究集刊》*Jindai Zhongguo jidujiaoshi yanjiu jikan* (chuangan hao) [Collections of Late Modern History of Chinese Christian Church(First Issue)] · No. 1 · (香港Hong Kong: 香港浸会大历史系及教学发展中心Xianggang jinhui daxue lishixi ji jiaoxue fazhan zhongxin [Department of History and Teaching Development Centre, Hong Kong Baptist University] · 1998) · 5-8; 陈昭吟 Chen Zhaoyin · 《元朝也里可温教和世界历史发展的关系》*Yuanchao Yelikewenjiao he shijie lishi fazhan de guanxi* [The Relationship Between Yelikewen of Yuan Dyantys and the Development of World History] · 《成大宗教与文化学报》*Chengda zongjiao yu wenhua xuebao* [Chengda Journal of Religions and Cutures] · No. 6 · (2006) · 59-91; Richard Foltz, *Religions of the Silk Road*, 2nd ed, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010)。

14 “信”也是译自被动动词“πιστεύω”, 此词可被表达为“使可信、由此建立” (“to make trustworthy · hence to establish”) · 参见: <http://biblehub.com/greek/4100.htm>; <https://biblehub.com/greek/4104.htm>。

15 Lowell C. Green, *How Melancthon helped Luther discover the gospel: the doctrine of justification in the Reformation*, (Greenwood & SC: Attic Press, 1980), 144.

1. *fides* (信仰 · faith) 近似于“相信预言” (“the preterist”) 的过去时 · 表示“对以往得到教会权威学说声明的真理的知性认同”¹⁶。正如 Smith 所指出的 · faith 与 belief/believe 交织在一起 · 并且可以从三个方面进行解释: (a) 一个人报告说另一个人承认了某个特定的事实; (b) 一种观点是认为某个特定的事实就是如此; (c) 一种观点是将某个特定事实想象成真的。¹⁷
2. *caritas* (仁爱 · love, charity) 等同于动词 πιστεύω 的现在时 · 使信仰 (faith) 得以确立 (*fides caritate formata*), 由此对“义”产生有效的影响。¹⁸ 它指涉的是直到希望实现时 · 爱对塑造信仰 (faith) 所具有的功能。¹⁹
3. *spes* (希望 · hope) 是相信 (*fiducia*) 如同公义的审判人一样的上帝会在未来赐予“义”和“救赎”以作对其信众的奖赏。²⁰

动词“πιστεύω”得到强调。是对基督教神学之宗教改革家们最重要的影响之一。基于此 · 改革家们引介了一种以人为中心的信仰观。这种新路径导向了两种充满矛盾的意义: (1) 以人为中心的观点为“因信称义”之教义增添了新视角; (2) 它打开了把信仰 (faith or believing) 误解为人本主义主观行为的可能性。²¹ 很明显 · 丁接受了将“信”仅理解为人本主义主观行为的影响 · 而没有意识到“信”在本质上也是上帝在人的心灵和行为中的作为。

丁忽略了路德使用的与动词“信”相关的另外三个拉丁词汇: 意为“接受” (“accept/acceptance”) 的 *credulitas* 和 *credere*, 意为“跟随/依附” (“adhere/adherence”) 的 *adhaesio*, 以及意为“对未来充满信心” (“trust in future”) 的 *fiducia*。²²

4. *credulitas* 或 *credere* 指的是“接受” (“accept”) 和“承认” (“acknowledge”) 早已存在于教会并得到教会声明的教义。在拉丁语中 · *credulitas* 是“信” (“believe”) 的现在时 · 意为他/她接受被告知要去相信的东西是真的且承认预定真理的正确性。它涉及“主观的信” (“the subjective faith”, *fides qua creditur*), 与“客观的信” (“the objective faith”, *fides quae creditur*) 相反。²³ 由于对教会和上帝虔诚 ·

16 Lowell C. Green, *How Melancthon helped Luther discover the gospel: the doctrine of justification in the Reformation*, (Greenwood & SC: Attic Press, 1980), 144.

17 Wilfred Cantwell Smith, *Faith and Belief: The difference between them*, (Princeton & NJ: Princeton University Press, 1979), <https://layreadersbookreviews.wordpress.com/2016/05/21/faith-and-belief-the-difference-between-them-wilfred-cantwell-smith/>, 2016-05-21.

18 Lowell C. Green, *How Melancthon helped Luther discover the gospel: the doctrine of justification in the Reformation*, (Greenwood & SC: Attic Press, 1980), 144-145.

19 *Ibid.*, p. 145.

20 *Ibid.*

21 名词性的“信” (“faith”) 指的是上帝的恩赐 · 动词性的“信” (“believe”) 是圣灵借助耶稣基督在人心中的新创造。

22 Lowell C. Green, *How Melancthon helped Luther discover the gospel: the doctrine of justification in the Reformation*, (Greenwood & SC: Attic Press, 1980), 140.

23 本文将在后面探究“客观的信”和“主观的信”的区别。参见: Seeberg, Reinhold. *Dogmengeschichte*. 3rd ed. of Vol I, II, 376& 4th ed. of Vol. III, 348. 许多英文词汇都是源自拉丁词汇 *credulitas* · 例如: *credulity* (easy to believe), *incredulity* (not easy to believe), *gullibility* (easy to believe), *ingullibility* (not easy to believe)。

路德在很长一段时间里接受了罗马天主教会关于“信”(faith, believe)的学说。24 人自身想要成为上帝或审判者是人的本性，并且这个本性充满了“credulitas”(不轻信、怀疑)。25 对于路德而言，credulitas让人“赞同”(“admit”)和“接受”(“accept”)上帝至高无上的权威，“摧毁”罪人的自大(se esse deum)，以及使主的荣耀归于主(deum esse deum)，因为只有面对上帝时感到谦卑(humalitas)和害怕是人应当做的事情。26 路德的《海德堡论纲》(Heidberg Disputation)第8条讨论了谦卑这一问题。27 路德也将“信”(“believe”)解释为“顺从”(“submission”)和“知性的同意”(“intellectual consent”)，而且以人在 humalitas²⁸的基础上得称的义取代内在的义，后者是一个人通过自身善功获得的。29 就罪人而言，信仰(believing)是一种行为，即他在上帝审判自己有罪之前便完全投降，但同时也相信上帝的仁慈并祈求上帝的宽恕。信仰(believing)是超越“隐藏的上帝”(“hidden God”, Deus Absconditus)而进入“显露的上帝”(“revealed God”, Deus Revelatus)中寻找宽恕。30

5. adhaesio (跟随/依附·adhere/adherence)· adhaesio 在路德那里指的是基督徒与耶稣基督，基督徒与上帝的话语，以及遵从上帝意志和旨意的信徒间的联合。经由联合，信徒由外至内再生为基督的模样，³¹ 而信仰(belief)至此成

24 关于《罗马书》(the Romans)1章17节·路德说：“ex fide non nisi ex credulitate in Deum” (WA 56: 10, 9)·关于《罗马书》4章5节·他说：“fides tails credulitas” (WA 56: 41, 12); “... fides seu credulitas...”。关于《希伯来书》(the Hebrews)11章1节·路德有言道：“Sic enim fides aliud nihi quam credulitas” (WA 57/III: 227, 4, 234, 9. et passim); “Credere enim in Christum est in ipsum toto corde intendere et omnia in ipsum ordinare” (WA 56: 252, 5)。

25 Martin Luther, D. · Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe, (Weimar: Verlag Herman Böhlhaus, 1883-1993), 1: 225; 57/III: 90, 21; Lowell C. · Green, How Melancthon helped Luther discover the gospel: the doctrine of justification in the Reformation, (Greenwod & SC: Attic Press, 1980), 141.

26 Martin Luther, D. · Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe, (Weimar: Verlag Herman Böhlhaus, 1883-1993), 1: 357, 17.

27 [德]马丁·路德 Martin Luther · 《路德文集1》Lude wenji (1) [The Works of Martin Luther(Volume 1)] · 路德文集中文版编辑委员会编 Lude wenji zhongwenban bianji weiyuanhui bian · (上海 Shanghai: 上海三联书店 Shanghai sanlian shudian [Shanghai Sanlian Bookstore Co., Ltd.], 2005) · 1: 33-34; Martin Luther, D. · Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe, (Weimar: Verlag Herman Böhlhaus, 1883-1993), 1: 358, 28.

28 承认上帝的全能和入自身的罪/有限·接受并相信上帝·以及完全顺服上帝的意志·尤其是爱上帝和他人的意志。

29 Martin Luther, D. · Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe, (Weimar: Verlag Herman Böhlhaus, 1883-1993), 40/III: 154, 30; 40/I: 23, 9; Lowell C. · Green, How Melancthon helped Luther discover the gospel: the doctrine of justification in the Reformation, (Greenwod & SC: Attic Press, 1980), 186-188.

30 Lowell C. · Green, How Melancthon helped Luther discover the gospel: the doctrine of justification in the Reformation, (Greenwod & SC: Attic Press, 1980), 218-219.另: 受到圣奥古斯丁影响的路德使用中世纪罗马天主教有关信仰(belief/faith)的定义·因此路德在1518年前的理解不同于使徒保罗的学说·奥古斯丁: De Soiritus et Litera IX, 15, in CSEL · VIII/1: 167, 13-18; xxxii, 55, in CSELL VIII/1: 212, 24-7; xxxii, 56, in csel viii/1: 214, 13-19; XXXIII, 58, in CSEL VIII/1: 216, 16. WA 54: 186. WA 56: 7, 36, 11, 37. 111; 57/III: 208-9. TR V, No. 5247. 路德对信仰(belief/faith)的理解具有真正的宗教改革性质·他于1518年10月在《奥格斯堡记录》(Acta Augustana)上的首次发表中将信仰(belief/faith)解释为活跃在当下的信仰(fide ad praesentem effectum destinata)· WA 40/III: 25f. 173, 30.

31 Martin Luther, D. · Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe, (Weimar: Verlag Herman Böhlhaus, 1883-1993), 57/III: 143, 3; 157, 1; 159, 15; 178, 10; 228, 17.

为物质身体的一部分，这种内在的转换发生在与耶稣基督的联合之中。³² “跟随/依附” (“*adhere*”) 和“联合” (“*unite*”) 的意义与上帝之义和罪人之罪之间发生的不可思议的互换 (*admirabile commercium* = *fröhlicher Wechsel*) 相一致，但是需要指出的是人与上帝间的联合是义的结果而非原因。³³ 老年路德对信仰 (*believing*) 的理解相较于其青年时期发生了很大变化。在墨兰顿 (*Philipp Melancthon*, 1497-1560) 的帮助下³⁴，路德于 1518 至 1519 年间开始从现时救赎性 (*the present-tense soteriological*) 视角进行切入，放弃以往相信和期盼义和恩典将会在未来到来的 (*non in re sed in spe*) 未来主义末世论 (*futuristic eschatological*) 视角³⁵。信仰 (*faith*) 不只是关涉“一种未来的希望” (“*a future hope*”)，而且是当下“一个现存的所有物” (“*an existing possession*”) ³⁶；信仰 (*believing*) 是 *fide ad praesentem effectum destinata* (信仰活跃于当下)³⁷。路德的新解为之后神学在被动的义，“*justitia aliena*” 以及律法和福音不同方面的发展奠定了重要基础。³⁸ 此外，路德认为 *fidelitas* (虔诚) 也指向信徒对上帝的信实/忠诚以及对上帝律法的践行。*Fidelitas* 的反义词是 *infidelitas* (不信实)。³⁹ 尽管 *adhaesio* 和 *fidelitas* 体现出一种现时状态，但它们也包含着对产生于过去的真理的认同之意。

6. *fiducia* (对未来的相信，*trust in future*)。在墨兰顿的帮助下，老年路德也对 *fiducia* 进行了说明。在拉丁语中，*fiducia* 表示“believe”的未来时，既与将知识作为前提的“*trust*” 又与处于次等地位且同 *spes* (希望) 有密切关系的“*assent*” 相近似。这是中世纪罗马天主教学说的典型解释，也就是说“义” 只会在未来发生，生活在当今

32 Lowell C. Green, *How Melancthon helped Luther discover the gospel: the doctrine of justification in the Reformation*, (Greenwood & SC: Attic Press, 1980), 143.

33 Martin Luther, *D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, (Weimar: Verlag Herman Böhlhaus, 1883-1993), 57/III: 124, 9; Hebrews, 2: 10; Lowell C. Green, *How Melancthon helped Luther discover the gospel: the doctrine of justification in the Reformation*, (Greenwood & SC: Attic Press, 1980), 143.

34 Lowell C. Green, *How Melancthon helped Luther discover the gospel: the doctrine of justification in the Reformation*, (Greenwood & SC: Attic Press, 1980), 146-147, 149 & 153 endnote 77.

35 Martin Luther, *D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, (Weimar: Verlag Herman Böhlhaus, 1883-1993), 56: 269, 30; 272, 19.

36 Lowell C. Green, *How Melancthon helped Luther discover the gospel: the doctrine of justification in the Reformation*, (Greenwood & SC: Attic Press, 1980), 145.

37 Martin Luther, *D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, (Weimar: Verlag Herman Böhlhaus, 1883-1993), 40/III: 25f; 173, 30.

38 Lowell C. Green, *How Melancthon helped Luther discover the gospel: the doctrine of justification in the Reformation*, (Greenwood & SC: Attic Press, 1980), 149.

39 Martin Luther, *D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, (Weimar: Verlag Herman Böhlhaus, 1883-1993), 57/II: 105, 2; 56: 223, 13; 56: 30, 11.

世界的人们不确定他们是否会获得上帝的救赎。⁴⁰ 1517至1518年⁴¹, 路德继承了哲罗姆 (St. Jerome, 约340-420)将“ὑπόστασις”、“*enie gewisse Hoffnung*”分别解读为“实质”(“substance”)、“稳定的希望”(“a steadfast hope”)的思想。⁴² 1518年, 墨兰顿到达维滕堡后, 路德开始对这个有关信仰 (faith) 的诗节进行全新诠释,⁴³ 并意识到*substantia*的意思是“物质”(“goods”), 它在希腊语中的相关词是 οὐσι 或 ὑπαχιν 而非 ὑπόστασις。因此, 路德改变了之前将 ὑπόστασις 与*substantia*对等起来的想法, 而把 ὑπόστασις 诠释为上帝赞许和宽恕的“保证、信心、信任”(“assurance, confidence, trust”)。⁴⁴ 因此, πιστις 意为“自信”(“assurance”), 而且信徒在当下就已经被上帝仁慈地称为义了,⁴⁵ 他/她完全地拥有了得到内在救赎的确信。⁴⁶

丁没有表述与“πιστις”相关联的三种时态词汇*fides*、*caritas*和*spes*, 以及*credulitas*或*credere*、*adhaesio*、*fiducia*的任何知识性内容,⁴⁷ 而这在宗教改革者们那里是至关重要的。

六、对“信”作为动词进行诠释的总结

40 圣奥古斯丁以过去时将信仰与耶稣基督之死联系起来, 以现在时将信仰与“坐在右手边”(sessio ad dextram)联系起来, 而且通过将来时将信仰与即将到来的审判联系起来。参见Augustine's *Enchiridion*, II (8): “*Est etiam fides et praeteritarum rerum et praesentium et futurarum*”。但是, 与基督教福音派教徒不同的是, 奥古斯丁并未将未来的完满引入当下。关于他对《罗马书》(Romans)3: 21 节的评论, 路德在《〈诗篇〉讲解》(Lecture on the Psalms)中说道: “*Nova autem lex proprie de futuro Iudicio et Iustitia prophetat*” (CI V: 156, 32)。

41 Martin Luther, *D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, (Weimar: Verlag Herman Böhlhaus, 1883-1993), 50/III: 187, 11.

42 《希伯来书》(Hebrews)11章1节在简体中文和合本中被表述为“信是所望之事的实底, 是未见之事的的确据。”更早的英文本将它表达为: “Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.” 在NIV版本圣经中是: “Now faith is the assurance of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen.”

43 Lowell C. Green, *How Melancthon helped Luther discover the gospel: the doctrine of justification in the Reformation*, (Greenwood & SC: Attic Press, 1980), 138, 150 endnote 12.

Martin Luther, *D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, (Weimar: Verlag Herman Böhlhaus, 1883-1993), 56: 269, 30; 272, 19.

44 Martin Luther, *D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, (Weimar: Verlag Herman Böhlhaus, 1883-1993), 2: 595, 15; Lowell C. Green, *How Melancthon helped Luther discover the gospel: the doctrine of justification in the Reformation*, (Greenwood & SC: Attic Press, 1980), 146-147.

45 Martin Luther, *D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, (Weimar: Verlag Herman Böhlhaus, 1883-1993), 40/III: 46, 23. 在此, 路德放弃了未来时的信仰, 并且强调对上帝的可见之力的确信与信赖。参见: Martin Luther, *D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, (Weimar: Verlag Herman Böhlhaus, 1883-1993), 40/I: 240; Philip Melancthon, *Corpus Reformatorum. Philippi Melancthonis opera quae supersunt omnia*, 28 vols., Karl Bretschneider & Heinrich Bindseil eds., (Halle: A. Schwetschke & Sons, 1554), CR 21: 788.

46 约翰·马尔巴赫与路德和梅兰希顿的论纲的第九及第十论点。可见: Martin Luther, *D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, (Weimar: Verlag Herman Böhlhaus, 1883-1993), 39/II: 207.

47 Martin Luther, *D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, (Weimar: Verlag Herman Böhlhaus, 1883-1993), 40/III: 154; Lowell C. Green, *How Melancthon helped Luther discover the gospel: the doctrine of justification in the Reformation*, (Greenwood & SC: Attic Press, 1980), 186.

“信” (believe in) 耶稣基督不仅仅是人自身的主观决定，因为在某人说服另一人信服耶稣基督之前，首先需要他/她已经因上帝的话语⁴⁸、受圣灵的指引⁴⁹ 而顺服于上帝，否则，一个人无法自主做出信仰耶稣基督的决定。必须只有当名词神圣的“πίστις (faith)” 存在于动词“πιστεύω (believe)” 之前时，动词“believe” 才能在一个人的内心、心理、思想、理性、情感和言语中发挥效用。只有通过这种方式，我们才能理解为什么亚伯拉罕 (Abraham) 相信上帝的举动能够使他称义，⁵⁰ 因为这样一种相信上帝的行为必定不仅仅是人本主义主观性行为，尽管看起来好像是亚伯拉罕作为人的一个行动。实际上，亚伯拉罕的这种相信是一种具有神圣性的表现，即他成为了被拣选、免罪和称义的上帝之儿女，这其中必然需要来自上帝的恩典、恩赐和奥秘，上帝赐予亚伯拉罕以名词性客观的“信” (“faith”)。此名词之信并非来自人本主义主观性方面，而是来自上帝的恩典、恩赐⁵¹ 和奥秘，圣灵的新创造，以及上帝之子耶稣基督的显现。只有以此为根据为源泉，动词“相信” (“believe”) 才能在一个人的心中诞生。因此，它绝非如丁所认为的次于人之善功那么简单或无意义，因为信 (faith)、恩典和恩赐将会一起导向救赎，而且它并不源于一个人的善功。

实际上，“信” 在新约希腊文中有三个相关词汇，而且亦有诸多近似词汇存在于拉丁语和英语中，有动词、形容词、动名词、形容性名词和名词。其中，作为一个积极动词，“信” 是“πιστεύω/credo/believe”，源于“πίστις/faith”。作为一个被动动词，“信” 为“πιστώ / to make trustworthy / hence to establish”。作为一个形容词和形容词性名词，“信” 等同于“πιστός/faithful”。作为一个名词，“信” 在新约希腊文中是“πίστις/faith”，指的是三位一体上帝的奥秘恩典，即天父经由圣灵在圣子耶稣基督 (*Christo [filius]*, in *Christ [the son]*) 中降下的恩赐。

然而，丁主要将“信” 作为动词进行了单方面诠释，因此他极大地背离了其西方宗教改革家先辈们，如马丁·路德关于希腊文 πιστεύω 和拉丁文 *credo* 的理解。比较有意思的是，马丁·路德曾经在诠释诗篇110: 4而谈到基督的祭司职分时说：“现在，我们被告知，上帝亲自按立 (ordain) 这位基督为大祭司——事实上，正如我们先前所说，他用崇高的誓言证实了这一点——坐在天父的右边，特别是为了防止我们落入任何形式的忿怒或耻辱，但前提是，我们必须继续相信他。我们要向他寻求安慰、帮助，以及天父的未曾被淡化的永恒恩典 (We are to look to Him for comfort, help, and the undiluted, everlasting grace of the Father)。”⁵² 特别使用了“天父的未曾被淡化的永恒的恩典”。路德的“未曾被淡化” 与丁的“淡化”，体现出丁与路德为代表的新教之间的差异。

48 *Romans*, 10: 17.

49 *Galatians*, 3: 5.

50 *Ibid.*, 3: 6.

51 Martin Luther, *D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, (Weimar: Verlag Herman Böhlau, 1883-1993), 40, 1, 366, 7-367, 6.

52 LW 13: 322.

English Title:

K. H. Ting's One-Sided Interpretation of *Xin* (信) as a verb

Paulos HUANG

Author, professor, College of Liberal Arts, Shanghai University, Nanchen road 333, 200444 Baoshan District, Shanghai, P. R. China.

YANG Ying

Translator, Department of History, Shanghai University. Email: yingy17853321152@163.com. Nanchen road 333, 200444 Baoshan District, Shanghai, P. R. China.

Abstract: K. H. Ting has challenged traditional Reformed theology with *xin* (信), since he understood the Chinese word *xin* so differently from the Religious Reformers, e.g., Martin Luther, understanding the NT Greek concepts πιστεύω, πιστός and πίστις to the point that Ting proposed to dilute its role in justification (*danhua yinxin chengyi*; 淡化因信称义). I hereby aim to explore the distinction of and reason for Ting's understanding which departs from traditional Reformed theology from within the framework of traditional "Chinese" conception of religion and ethics; in the meanwhile the NT Greek and Reformation Latin traditions have also been studied as a subsidiary role insofar as they illumine the Reformers' positions. This study is not conducted through political theology, but in the light of systematic and semantical, especially conceptual analysis, because the former has been well studied but the latter approach has not been explored well enough. Both πίστις and *xin* have many layers of meaning in NT Greek and Chinese classics, literature, or even common parlance, but Ting paid attention only to the connotation of *xin* as a verb. When Ting discussed the doctrine of justification by faith, he had neither distinguished clearly enough the differences among πιστεύω, πιστός and πίστις, nor among *credo*, *fidelium* and *fides*. In addition to a verb, *xin* is used also as an adjective, a verb-noun, an adjective-noun and a noun, but because of his one-sided interpretation Ting has understood *xin* differently from Martin Luther and other Western predecessors.

Keywords: πιστεύω/*credo*/believe; πιστός/*fidelium*/faithful; πίστις/*fides*/faith/*xin*; the verb-noun *fides*/believing/*xin*; watering down

对黄保罗之“丁光训将‘信’作为动词的单方面诠释”一文的简单回应

黄保罗通过社交软件向我发来他的一篇近期文章,于是我撰写了这篇回应。文章使用了系统神学和概念分析的研究方法,认为丁光训主张淡化“因信称义”的原因在于他对“信”的单方面诠释,尤其是他主观性地将“信”仅作为一个动词进行理解。我的回应较为简洁,这是因为此篇论文实在无需再讨论什么了。

我很赞同黄不从政治神学的角度探讨丁的立场的决定,这一点很明确,尽管事实并非他在脚注4中(注:即译文脚注5)所描述的那样。但是,黄应当记住丁的身份是一位教会领袖,而不是系统神学家。黄在此文中如此详细地引用了希腊文和拉丁语材料,这表明他误解了丁的意图,或者说其手头时间很充裕。的确,丁立足于国家权威,但我想补充一点,政教分离从来都不是中国宗教生活的常态,也不是许多基督教传统生活的常态。

首先,丁关心政治,但同时也心系教牧:他不想加剧基层信徒和非信徒之间的紧张关系,因为在农村地区的许多基督徒都是原教旨主义者。他们蓄意攻击非信徒,其领导者并不认可黄教授所拥护的宗教改革派关于称义的观点,而是坚持一种将反对之人妖魔化的原教旨主义神学。因此,因信称义在中国被误用了,而这正是丁所反对的。

其次,丁从来都不是一位改革宗神学家。他在英国圣公会传统中成长起来并接受了神学训练,而因信称义从来都不是这一传统的关键教义。相反,黄把路德宗和改革宗关于“因信称义”的观点提升到对所有基督徒而言都至关重要的地步。对此,英国圣公会教徒、门诺派教徒和其他派别不会同意,罗马天主教徒和东正教教徒也不会同意。

最后,黄如果对这种处境化回应有任何关切,那么就会看到丁并不是一直都在主张淡化“因信称义”。在20世纪80年代,他曾通过因信称义来展示新教徒在中国宣扬三自的努力。因此,丁显然意识到了这一教义对新教徒的重要性,但的确力求淡化它,就像圣公会信徒通常所做的那样。

简而言之,黄的系统神学是非历史性的。因此,他的文章极易被斥责为“是对丁光训立场的讽刺”(此处改编自黄的文章第247页的最后一行)。诚然,丁的观点与黄的不同,但那又如何?

魏克利 (John Wickeri)⁵³

2023年6月30日 香港

53 《丁光训文集》英语版译者和丁光训研究专家。

A Brief Response to Paulos Huang, “K. H. Ting’s One-Sided Interpretation of Xin (信) as a Verb” (2023.06)

Paulos Huang kindly sent me a copy of his recent essay on social media, and I offer this response. His argument is that Ting was proposing to dilute the role of *xin*/belief in the Reformation doctrine of justification (淡化因信稱義) and so his interpretation is one-sided, especially his understanding of *xin* subjectively as a verb. Huang’s method is that of systematic theology and concept analysis. My response is brief, for Huang’s paper does not deserve anything more.

I can appreciate Huang’s decision not to explore Ting’s position from a political theological position, which is clear, although not in the way he describes it in Footnote 4. But he should remember that Ting was speaking as a church leader, not a systematic theologian. For Huang to go into such detail citing Greek and Latin sources shows that he misunderstands Ting’s purpose, or that he has too much time on his hands. Yes, Ting accepts the authority of the state, and I would add that the separation of church and state has never been the norm in Chinese religious life, nor in the life of many Christian traditions.

Ting’s concern was political, but also pastoral: he did not want to exacerbate tensions between Christians at the grassroots and non-Christians, in a situation where many Christians in rural areas were Fundamentalists bent on attacking non-believers unreasonably. Their leaders did not uphold Huang’s beloved Reformation position on justification but stuck to a Fundamentalist theology that demonized those opposed to them. And so, justification by faith was being misused in China. This was what Ting opposed.

Second, Ting is not and has never been a Reformed theologian. He grew up in and was trained theologically in the Anglican-Episcopal tradition, in which justification by faith has never been a key doctrine. In contrast, Huang elevates the Lutheran and Reformed position, to the point that it becomes essential for all Christians. Anglicans, Mennonites and others would disagree, as would Roman Catholics and Orthodox.

Third, if Huang had any sympathy to contextualized responses, he would see that Ting was not speaking for all time on diluting the doctrine of justification by Faith. In the 1980s, he had drawn on justification by faith to show what Protestants were trying to do in China in their advocacy of Three-Self. Ting realized the importance of this doctrine for Protestants, but he did want to de-emphasize it, as Anglicans more generally have done.

In short, Huang is ahistorical in his systematic theology. His essay, therefore, is easy to dismiss as “what amounts to a caricature of Ting’s position” (adapted here from the last line on page 247 of Huang’s paper) ° True, Ting’s position differs from Huang’s own position, but so what?

Phsilip L ° Wickeri
30 June, 2023 Hosng Kong

This number is a special volume on the theory of intellectual history.

In the column of **Humanities, Theology, and Chinese National Studies** we have published Dr. WANG Xiaoqiang's "Lu Shiyong's Interpretation of the Nature and Artistry of *A Verse in "Nine Songs"*" and Ms. **LIANG Wanjing**'s "The Exotic Country in the Quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns: Images of China in the Battle of the Books" °

In the column of **Practical Theology and Sino-Western Views on Church and Society**, we have published professor **QIAO Fei**'s "On the Legal Culture Analysis of Yanzhou Anti-Church Case in Late Qing Dynasty" and Dr. BAI Junxiao's "St. Augustine's Cosmological Arguments on Transcendent Beauty" °

In the column of **Chinese and Western Classics and the Bible**, we have published **Jacob Chengwei Feng**'s "The China Aspiration in Light of Jacob's Narrative (Genesis 25: 19-36: 43) : Toward a Chinese Public Theology for Human Flourishing in the Third Millennium" and Dr. **MO Zhengyi**'s "Women and Aged Disability: A Study of Naomi's

Gender identity and its Transformation in *the Book of Ruth*" °

In the column of **Church History in the West and in China**, we have published professor **HAN Xing**'s "The concept of religious authority and power of the monarch in Shang Dynasty" and professor WU Qian's "Ontological Theory Based on Practical Wisdom—An Exploration of the Gains and Losses of Mou Zongsan's "Metaphysics of Morality" Construction" °

In the column of **Comparative Religious and Cultural Studies**, we have published professor **XIE Wenyu**'s "The True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven and the Differences in Concerns between Chinese and Western Thinking" and professor XIAO Qinghe's "The True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven and the Differences in Concerns between Chinese and Western Thinking" °

In the column of **Reviews and Academic Reports**, we have published a series on the theoretic study of intellectual history. **YANG Ying**'s "The Definition, Methods and Other Related Issues of Intellectual History: Also on the History of Martin Luther's Thoughts in China" ° **HE Danchun**'s "On the Definition and Research Methods of Intellectual History: Taking the Origin of Liberation Theology for example" ° And **Li Ruixiang**'s "Discussion on the Study of Philosophy and Theology in the Perspective of the Intellectual History: Taking Martin Luther's Influence on Heidegger as an Example" °

人学、神学与国学

**Humanities, Theology, and
Chinese National Studies**

陆时雍对《九歌》性质及其艺术性的阐释¹

北京语言大学首都国际文化研究基地 王孝强

【提要】陆时雍提出《九歌》“非祭词”的论断，认为《九歌》是见物生情而吟咏抒怀的作品，并从创作宗旨、神人关系、创作背景等方面进行了论证。陆时雍提出《九歌》具有“婉变悱恻”的特征，体现在“语短韵长”和“情境雅合”两个方面。他认为《九歌》语言的总体特征是简洁，语意浑然天成，自然真朴，并从兴合情韵、情景交融、善托言情三个方面揭示了“情境雅合”的内涵，进一步丰富了其诗歌理论。

【关键词】陆时雍 《九歌》 性质 艺术特色 情境

【作者信息】王孝强，北京语言大学首都国际文化研究基地讲师，文学博士。北京市海淀区学院路15号北京语言大学中华文化研究院，邮编100083。电子邮箱: hy82868@163.com

陆时雍，字仲昭，浙江桐乡人，明末重要文学理论家，以《诗镜》和《楚辞疏》等著作名世。陆时雍强调诗歌要以神韵为宗、情境为主，他将“以情论诗”的诗学观贯通于《楚辞》注疏实践，尤其集中体现在对《九歌》的疏解中。陆时雍对《九歌》的性质及其艺术特色提出了不同于前人的独到见解，本文对此作一提炼概括。

一、陆时雍的《九歌》“非祭词说”

有关《九歌》的性质可谓众说纷纭，而以王逸、朱熹的“祭词说”影响最广、最深远，在有明一代被大多数人所接受。

王逸说：“楚国南郢之邑，沅湘之间，其俗信鬼而好祠，其祠必作歌乐鼓舞以乐诸神。屈原窜伏其域，怀忧苦毒，愁思怫郁，出见其俗，祭祀之礼，歌舞之乐，其词鄙，因为作九歌之曲。上陈事神之敬，下见之冤结，托之以讽谏。故其文意不同，章句杂错，而广异意焉。”²王逸认为屈原见楚地娱神乐舞而作《九歌》，抒发自身冤苦之情，并蕴含讽谏之意。这一观点对后世产生了广泛而深远的影响，形成了《九歌》“祭词说”的性质判断。

朱熹继承王逸说法，《楚辞集注·九歌》解题言：“九歌者，屈原之所作也。昔楚南郢之邑，沅、湘之间，其俗信鬼而好祀，其祀必使巫覡作乐，歌舞以娱神。蛮荆陋俗，词既鄙俚，而其阴阳人鬼之间，又或不能无褻慢淫荒之杂。原既放逐，见而感之，故颇为更定其词，去其泰甚，而又因彼事神之心，以寄吾忠君爱国眷恋不忘之意。”³在《楚辞辩证》中朱熹对《集注》的判断继续补充道：“楚俗祠祭之歌，今不可得而闻矣。然计其间，或以阴巫下阳神，或以阳主接阴鬼，则其辞之褻慢淫荒，当有不可道者。故屈原

1 本文为国家社科基金重点项目“中国文学史书写体系的西化与化西问题研究”(19AZW015)、北京语言大学院级项目(中央高校基本科研业务费专项资金)“陆时雍楚辞学研究”(22YJ180003)的阶段性成果。

2 [宋]洪兴祖Hong Xingzu [of the Song Dynasty],《楚辞补注》Chuci buzhu [Supplementary Annotations to Chuci], (北京Beijing:中华书局Zhonghua shuju [Zhonghua Book Company],1983), 55.

3 [宋]朱熹Zhu Xi [of the Song Dynasty],《楚辞集注》Chuci jizhu [Variorum Annotations to Chuci], (上海Shanghai:上海古籍出版社Shanghai guji chubanshe [Shanghai Classic Publishing House], 2001), 31.

因而文之，以寄吾区区忠君爱国之意，比其类，则宜为三颂之属；而论其辞，则反为国风再变之郑卫矣。”⁴

朱熹与王逸一样，认为《九歌》作于屈原放逐之间，同样是受到了楚地巫卜之事的启发而创作的祭词。但同时基于以诗解骚的基本精神，朱熹又有一些新见：第一，在《九歌》创作性质来说，王逸认为《九歌》完全是屈原的创作，朱熹认为《九歌》是屈原在楚地本有的祭词基础上“更定其词，去其泰甚”修改加工而成的。第二，王逸认为《九歌》的情感主要是怨愤、讽谏，朱熹认为“虽不得于君，而爱慕无已之心，于此为尤切”，强调《九歌》展现的屈原即便委屈哀怨仍旧怀抱“忠君爱国眷恋不忘之意”，将《九歌》的主题纳入到朱熹解骚一贯的忠君爱国的主题下。第三，朱熹以《诗经》“六义”分析《九歌》，试图将其纳入到经学体系中，认为《九歌》表达的爱国之意有《颂》的精神，而“褻慢淫荒”之词、“阴阳人鬼”之事，又像郑卫之声、变风变雅之词，各篇内又都存在赋、比、兴的表现手法。

自汉至明，王逸、朱熹共同提倡的“祭词说”成为《九歌》研究中的主流意见。明代汪瑗则对这一问题提出了与前人不同的新见解，他在《楚辞集解》中说：“屈子《九歌》之词，亦惟借此题目，漫写己之意兴，如汉魏《乐章》《乐府》之类，固无暇论其潜与不潜也。后世诗人作《乐府》者，莫盛于李白，说者讥其漫写己意，多不合本题之旨。今观屈子《九歌》之作，盖亦有然者。”⁵汪瑗提出了屈原借古题写己之意兴的观点，这里的意兴就是情感的迸发。汤炳正在《楚辞类稿》中说：“建安以来，中国诗人有袭用乐府古题之风，即用古题写新辞。其实远自屈宋，即开其先例……《天问》‘巨棘宾商，九辩九歌’，知《九歌》与《九辩》皆远古遗传之歌曲名。至于屈原之《九歌》，宋玉之《九辩》，皆为沿用古题而写新辞。”⁶汪瑗虽然认为《九歌》是楚国祭典乐歌之名，但屈原仅借古题来抒发自身的情感。这样的研究思路，体现了明代楚辞研究者摆脱了“意”的羁绊，开始从“情”的角度分析《九歌》性质的问题，发展到陆时雍的研究中，出现了《九歌》“非祭词”的判断。

陆时雍在《读楚辞语》中说：“《九歌》非祭词也，因物咏之，随意致情。唐人尝有感怀之什矣，又有漫兴之咏矣。心不同兮媒劳，恩不甚兮轻绝；交不忠兮怨长，期不信兮告余以不闲。此非降神之语亦明矣。若《山鬼》则托为鬼言矣，岂有反致祝于人者，而奈何为此要语也。即楚俗多鬼，原何自而媚之？彼怀沙之不遑，而暇为南夷更定此词也？王逸曰：‘楚国南郢之邑，沅湘之间，其俗信鬼而好祠，其祠必作歌乐鼓舞以乐诸神。屈原窜伏其域，怀忧苦毒，愁思怫郁，出见其俗，祭祀之礼，歌舞之乐，其词鄙，因为作九歌之曲。上陈事神之敬，下见之冤结，托之以讽谏。’朱晦翁因仍其说，至谓《湘君》等篇，男主事阴神，故其情意曲折尤多，何敢信其然也。”⁷

4 同上Ibid, 180.

5 [明]汪瑗Wang Yuan [of the Ming Dynasty], 《楚辞集解》Chuci jijie [Collective Annotations to Chuci], 董洪利Dong Hongli点校, (北京Beijing:北京古籍出版社 Beijing guji chubanshe [Beijing Classic Publishing House], 1994), 108.)

6 汤炳正Tang Bingzheng, 《楚辞类稿》Chuci leigao [Manuscripts of Studies of the Chuci], (成都Chengdu: 巴蜀书社 Bashu shushe [Sichuan Bashu Publishing House Co., Ltd.], 1988), 237.

7 [明]陆时雍Lu Shiyong [of the Ming Dynasty]撰, 张学城Zhang Xuecheng 薄迎迎Bao Yingying点校, 《楚辞疏》Chucishu [Annotations to Chuci], (南京Nanjing:南京大学出版社Nanjing daxue chubanshe [Nanjing University Press], 2019), 8.

陆时雍以“何敢信其然”态度鲜明地表达了对王逸、朱熹“祭词说”的否定，陆时雍认为《九歌》与唐人感怀之作类似，都是见物生情而吟咏抒怀，他从《九歌》创作宗旨、神人关系、创作背景等方面具体论证了“非祭词说”。

第一·从创作宗旨来说，陆时雍认为《九歌》并非祭神之作。陆时雍在注疏中虽然也认同《九歌》具有楚地祭神祀鬼的创作环境背景，但他并不认为就能据此将屈原创作的《九歌》与祭神祀鬼之歌等同，诸篇作品并不为祭神，而是用来抒发屈原自身情感的。

持《九歌》“祭词说”的注家对《九歌》中众神的神格都会加以辨析，因为《九歌》中的众神——如最高天神东皇太一、云神云中君、日神东君等——代表着不同的崇拜形象，相应的礼神目的、神人关系对祭词风格及其措辞都有影响。朱熹也试图将众神作为“君”的艺术形象进行阐释，通过人对神的情感连结申发屈原“忠君爱国”的思想。

但陆时雍在《楚辞疏》中对神格全然不提，对神明都以情论之，陆时雍抒写神鬼不过是借以寄托，《九歌》所表现的也只是众神具有的人的情感，而非面对不可捉摸的神性的崇拜。

第二·从神人关系来说，陆时雍认为祭祀之礼应神圣郑重，而在祭祀之礼活动中祭词理应庄重肃穆，但《九歌》之词却常与之抵牾。

《九歌》中有哀情愁绪，甚至有责备怨怼之词。如《云中君》“心不同兮媒劳，恩不甚兮轻绝”“交不忠兮怨长，期不信兮告余以不闲”之类并非与神交接时应该有的情感和言辞。陆时雍在《云中君》注疏言：“‘君不行兮夷犹，蹇谁留兮中州？’似望见之而怪叹之词也。‘令沅湘兮无波，使江水兮安流。’恐惊其神也。‘望夫君兮未来，吹参差兮谁思。’则自怨其旁徨之极，而神终不可见矣。”⁸在《少司命》注疏言：“‘夫人兮自有美子，荪何以兮愁苦？’其怨望之词耶。”⁹这类言辞组成的“祭词”并无敬神之意，反有责备，更达不到降神祈求神明庇佑的作用。

《九歌》中有亲昵儿女语，不似人神之间的情感。陆时雍疏《礼魂》“长无绝兮终古”云：“《九歌》婉变已甚，昵昵儿女语，何褻也！”¹⁰认为《九歌》之词情感过于外泄，而有失中正，《读楚辞语》云：“《山鬼》骚兴拍人，无限招摇挑荡之况。‘既含睇兮又宜笑，子慕予兮善窈窕’，谓之而未敢必其然也，然而撩人则欲狂也。‘留灵修兮憺忘归，岁既晏兮孰华予’，此老狐深衷谜语也。‘怨公子兮怅忘归，君思我兮不得闲’，是代为知己也。”¹¹所列诗句已突破了人神之间应有的界限，而是过于直白的狎昵之词，并不是祭词应有的郑重之关系。

《九歌》展现的神人关系时常有儿女情态之句，爱之则招摇挑荡，恨之则怨望怪叹，这类情感都达不到祭祀神明所应该有的庄重谨慎的态度，《九歌》中众神的形象自然也非高高在上不可触碰，而是具有人的情感。

8 [明]陆时雍Lu Shiyong [of the Ming Dynasty]撰·张学城Zhang Xuecheng 薄迎迎Bao Yingying点校·《楚辞疏》Chucishu [Annotations to Chuci], (南京Nanjing:南京大学出版社Nanjing daxue chubanshe [Nanjing University Press], 2019), 94.

9 同上Ibid, 104.

10 同上Ibid, 112.

11 同上Ibid, 9.

第三·从创作背景来说·屈原不具备创作祭词的条件。陆时雍认同王逸对《九歌》作时的判断·认为《九歌》作于屈原放逐沅湘之际·但他不认为屈原此时有创作祭神之辞的闲适心态·他说：“彼怀沙之不遑·而暇为南夷更定此词也？”¹²在放逐的最后阶段·屈原作《怀沙》·陆时雍称：“《怀沙》情穷语迫·太史公独载此篇以卒原志也。”¹³认为《怀沙》的情感已达到爆发前的临界点而语句急迫·可以想见屈原在人生最后阶段·内心伤楚·神智忧郁·自身情感的郁结尚无法遣怀·且愈演愈烈·何来空暇为南夷更定祭词呢？但这样的推导就屈原作品来说没有十分明确的内证·陆时雍对屈原“无暇更定祭词”的论述也没有再展开详论·仅凭体察其情而推测·未免略显武断。

另外·陆时雍认为《山鬼》一篇并非祭神的诗歌。“若《山鬼》则托为鬼言矣·岂有反致祝于人者·而奈何为此要语也。即楚俗多鬼·原何自而媚之？”¹⁴《山鬼》一篇托于鬼言·为何要以鬼的口吻来致祝于人？鬼无法降福于人·也没有必要为鬼来作祭词·即使受到楚地巫鬼风俗的影响·屈原又为何要自作祭鬼之词来取悦鬼呢？作为《九歌》重要组成部分的《山鬼》一篇·并不符合祭神的目的和规制·这可以说是《九歌》“非祭词”的内证。

二、陆时雍对《九歌》艺术性的阐释

与《九歌》性质之论题相承接·既然是被创作出来的诗歌作品·那么对其艺术特色进行发掘阐释自是题中应有之义。陆时雍以诗话风格的语言对此作了鞭辟入里的分析。诗话这一诗歌评论形式经过宋、元、明三代的发展·至晚明时期已形成了相对稳定的风格·形式上采取漫谈随笔的样式·内容上以鉴赏诗句·分析艺术性为主·语言上追求诗化的韵味·给读者留下深刻印象。陆时雍在《读楚辞语》中说：“温柔敦厚·《诗》之教也。婉变悱恻·《离骚》之旨也。‘君不行兮夷犹·蹇谁留兮中洲’·此情语也。‘扬灵兮未极·女嬃媛兮为余太息’·此情境也。‘捐余袂兮江中·遗余佩兮澧浦。采芳洲兮杜若·将以遗兮下女’·此情事也。知其不然·而未敢绝望者·厚道也。思之不得·但流涕以从之·而未尝有一言怨及之者·爱之至也。”¹⁵他概括提炼出《九歌》写情语、写情景、写情事“婉变悱恻”的特征·这具体体现在“语短韵长”和“情境雅合”两个方面。

(一) 语短韵长

陆时雍认为诗歌以有韵为要·他在《诗镜总论》说：“有韵则生·无韵则死；有韵则雅·无韵则俗；有韵则响·无韵则沉；有韵则远·无韵则局。”¹⁶与诗歌韵味直接相关的是诗

12 同上Ibid, 8.

13 同上Ibid, 39.

14 [明]陆时雍Lu Shiyong [of the Ming Dynasty]撰·张学城Zhang Xuecheng 薄迎迎Bao Yingying点校·《楚辞疏》Chucishu [Annotations to Chuci], (南京Nanjing:南京大学出版社Nanjing daxue chubanshe [Nanjing University Press], 2019), 7.

15 同上Ibid · 8.

16 [明]陆时雍Lu Shiyong [of the Ming Dynasty]选评·任文京Ren Wenjing赵东岚Zhao Donglan点校·《诗镜》Shijing [On the Context of Verses], (石家庄Shijiazhuang: 河北大学出版社Hebei daxue chubanshe [Hebei University Press], 2010), 13.

歌的语言，陆时雍推崇语短味长，重视语言天然去雕饰，对晋人“巧言”“华言”直接称为诗歌之病：“诗莫弊于晋，色暗而不韶，韵沉而不发，气塞而不畅，词重而不流。”¹⁷

首先，陆时雍品评《九歌》的语言总体特征是简洁。在《读楚辞语》中说：“‘灵偃蹇兮姣服’，灵，灵巫也。‘灵连蜷兮既留’，亦灵巫也。朱晦翁谓巫不患其不留，何言既留而不知。既留者，语词也。谓之巫服则可，谓之神服不可。既谓神既留矣，而又谓‘謇将儵兮寿宫’，复何所指耶？《九歌》语极简洁，不应如是之复。”¹⁸认为已经说了神既留而后文又说“儵兮寿宫”则是重复了，《九歌》语言简洁，应不会作此枝蔓语，他评《礼魂》“春兰兮秋菊，长无绝兮终古”句云“语何简会”¹⁹，也表达了对《九歌》语言简洁但余味深长的总体认识。在《东皇太一》眉批中，陆时雍引用孙矿“《九歌》句法稍碎，而特奇峭，在《楚辞》中最为精洁”²⁰的评点进一步补充说明了自己的观点。

其次，陆时雍品评《九歌》语意浑然天成，自然真朴。他认为语言不必华美雕刻，而是要能生动鲜活地对物象进行描摹，营造情景想象的空间，语词流转自然，得真朴之意。陆时雍评《湘君》《湘夫人》“搴薜荔兮水中，采芙蓉兮木末”“鸟何萃兮苹中，罾何为兮木上”说：“其语意之来，如云逐风流，水随渠注，乃至此君信手生春之妙。且兰若翠羽，抑何色秀之天成也。”²¹他认为两句语意如风如水，自然之景观随手拈入诗中，经过再造重组，虽无炫目辞藻，却呈现出流动天然之姿、水到渠成之色，是在朴实中见真情景。

楚辞中也有色泽鲜明、语言精丽之词，陆时雍认为其亦不失真朴：“如卫之《硕人》，骚之《招魂》，艳极矣，而亦真极矣。”²²他在《诗镜总论》中说：“傅玄得古之神。汉人朴而古，傅玄精而古。朴之至，妙若天成；精之至，粲如鬼画。二者俱妙于思虑之先矣。”²³陆时雍认为《招魂》虽艳、傅诗虽精，但文辞都在思虑之先而写就，虽描绘艳丽，却仍然符合妙若天成的真朴之意。

最后，陆时雍十分重视《九歌》诸篇语言风格的辨析。他认为《九歌》诸篇因为神主的不同，其整体语言风格也各异，“《湘君》娟秀韶令，《国殇》威武蹈扬，《山鬼》不俚不雅，种种神色飞动，命物之妙，真可下诸天而役万灵者。”²⁴“‘青云衣兮白霓裳，举长矢兮射天狼；操余弧兮反沦降，援北斗兮酌桂浆；撰余轡兮高驰翔，杳冥冥兮以东行。’是高步天衢语气。”²⁵“《国殇》气语饱决，字字干戈，语语剑戟，左旋右

17 同上Ibid, 63.

18 [明] 陆时雍Lu Shiyong [of the Ming Dynasty]撰，张学城Zhang Xuecheng 薄迎迎Bao Yingying点校，《楚辞疏》Chucishu [Annotations to Chuci], (南京Nanjing:南京大学出版社Nanjing daxue chubanshe [Nanjing University Press], 019), 8.

19 同上Ibid, 9.

20 同上Ibid, 93.

21 同上Ibid · 8.

22 [明] 陆时雍Lu Shiyong [of the Ming Dynasty]选评，任文京Ren Wenjing赵东岚Zhao Donglan点校，《诗镜》Shijing [On the Context of Verses], (石家庄Shijiazhuang: 河北大学出版社Hebei daxue chubanshe [Hebei University Press], 2010), 5.

23 同上Ibid, 4.

24 [明] 陆时雍Lu Shiyong [of the Ming Dynasty]撰，张学城Zhang Xuecheng 薄迎迎Bao Yingying点校，《楚辞疏》Chucishu [Annotations to Chuci], (南京Nanjing:南京大学出版社Nanjing daxue chubanshe [Nanjing University Press], 2019), 8.

25 同上Ibid, 8.

转·真有步伐止齐之象。风折云旋·星流雹击·不足拟其步骤之奇也。‘带长剑兮挟秦弓·首身离兮心不惩’·鬼何其雄。观贾雍腹语·亦足为此词之传奇矣。”²⁶《湘君》语言清秀美丽·《山鬼》在雅俗之间；《东君》语言壮丽·有如红日高升之宏伟；《国殇》语言杀伐·呈现出军阵的雄武之气。能在组诗中呈现不同的语言风格·陆时雍感叹屈原笔力有如“下诸天而役万灵者”。

(二) 情境雅合

在《古诗镜》中陆时雍言：“诗以得境为难·得境则得情矣。心有成象·目有成形。斯口有成句·可以神遇·不可以言求。”²⁷陆时雍认为造情取境为难·境由心造·唯心中有真情·口有不思而成句·才能创作出使读者身临其境·感同身受的诗篇。《四库全书总目》评价陆时雍《诗镜总论》言“大旨以神韵为宗·情境为主”·是看到了陆时雍品评诗歌以“情境雅合”为主要标准的诗歌理论特征。

陆时雍在《九歌》的疏解中明确提出了“情境雅合”的诗歌理论。他说：“《东皇太一》《云中君》似疏星滴雨·寥落希微·正其情境雅合·著一丽语不得·著一秣语不得。”²⁸认为《东皇太一》《云中君》虽然语言并不秣丽·但营造出寥落幽微·深邃空远的诗境·与诗篇所要表现的情感雅合。

首先·陆时雍强调了《九歌》的兴合情韵。他在《诗镜总论》中对诗歌之“兴”提出了情韵的要求：“诗之可以兴者·以其情也·以其言之韵也。夫献笑而悦·献涕而悲者·情也；闻金鼓而壮·闻丝竹而幽者·声之韵也。是故情欲其真·其韵欲其长也。二言足以尽诗道矣。”²⁹这一诗歌创作观也带入到《九歌》的疏解中·他在《读楚辞语》中说：“兴起于诗·诗之失兴者多矣。兴者·感物生情·悠然起兴。若物不称情·何当于兴矣？‘沅有芷兮澧有兰·思公子兮未敢言’才说芷兰·便觉公子·芬馥扑人眉睫。‘石濂兮浅浅·飞龙兮翩翩；交不忠兮怨长·期不信兮告余以不闲’亦自俯仰具足。”³⁰陆时雍认为起兴之物要与诗歌表达的情感契合·沅芷澧兰之芳香营造了公子令人喜爱的气息·视线在石濂·飞龙上游移·一俯一仰·正是人感叹之情状。

26 [明] 陆时雍Lu Shiyong [of the Ming Dynasty]撰·张学城Zhang Xuecheng 薄迎迎Bao Yingying点校·《楚辞疏》Chucishu [Annotations to Chuci]·(南京Nanjing:南京大学出版社Nanjing daxue chubanshe [Nanjing University Press]·2019)·9.

27 [明] 陆时雍Lu Shiyong [of the Ming Dynasty]选评·任文京Ren Wenjing赵东岚Zhao Donglan点校·《诗镜》Shijing [On the Context of Verses]·(石家庄Shijiazhuang:河北大学出版社Hebei daxue chubanshe [Hebei University Press]·2010)·291.

28 [明] 陆时雍Lu Shiyong [of the Ming Dynasty]撰·张学城Zhang Xuecheng 薄迎迎Bao Yingying点校·《楚辞疏》Chucishu [Annotations to Chuci]·(南京Nanjing:南京大学出版社Nanjing daxue chubanshe [Nanjing University Press]·2019)·7.

29 [明] 陆时雍Lu Shiyong [of the Ming Dynasty]选评·任文京Ren Wenjing赵东岚Zhao Donglan点校·《诗镜》Shijing [On the Context of Verses]·(石家庄Shijiazhuang:河北大学出版社Hebei daxue chubanshe [Hebei University Press]·2010)·9.

30 [明] 陆时雍Lu Shiyong [of the Ming Dynasty]撰·张学城Zhang Xuecheng 薄迎迎Bao Yingying点校·《楚辞疏》Chucishu [Annotations to Chuci]·(南京Nanjing:南京大学出版社Nanjing daxue chubanshe [Nanjing University Press]·2019)·8.

其次，陆时雍强调了《九歌》的情景交融。在《古诗镜》中，陆时雍说：“少陵七言律，蕴藉最深。有余地，有余情。情中有景，景外含情。一咏三讽，味之不尽。”³¹认为诗歌的蕴藉表现在“余地”“余情”，而非全都写尽，在创作上达到情景浑融，才会产生味之不尽的审美效果。他又说：“善道景者，绝去形容，略加点缀，即真相显然，生韵亦流动矣。”³²对于写景，陆时雍主张“绝去形容，略加点缀”，即不要太刻意、太复杂，只要适当点缀，以少总多，才能“真相显然，生韵流动”，即以最简练的语言传递出最丰富的景物之神，激发读者的想象。

在《读楚辞语》中，陆时雍言：“《河伯》崎岖，劳心无功，劳力无庸，求亲而不得者，不知其可已也。波滔滔，鱼邻邻，举目萧萧，将谁与号？”³³波滔滔，鱼邻邻，写尽了的盛大场面，但举目望去，心上人却不在，热闹之景反增了凄凉之感。

在对《湘夫人》“袅袅兮秋风，洞庭波兮木叶下”一句的疏解中，陆时雍就引用了张焕如、孙矿的评语作为眉批来传达自己的观点，张焕如评曰：“风流萧瑟，袅袅秋风，水波木下，愁绪当与湖水相量耳。”孙矿评曰：“袅袅二句，《月赋》得此一篇遂增色，可见楚骚写景之妙。”³⁴袅袅秋风吹起，水面泛起了波纹，树叶纷纷落下，秋之萧瑟、波风之微寒，周遭之景与诗人愁绪相合，给人以身临其境之感。谢庄《月赋》有“洞庭始波，木叶微脱”“凉夜自凄，风篁成韵”之句，当从袅袅二句化出，孙矿认为“《月赋》得此一篇遂增色”，可见其景与情雅合，成为人们共通的艺术体验而传至后世。

最后，陆时雍强调了《九歌》的善“托”言情。陆时雍考察《九歌》的艺术特色，意识到情感与“托物”手法的直接关系。他十分重视诗歌托物言情，《诗镜》云：“诗之妙在托，托则情性流而道不穷矣。……夫所谓托者，正之不足而旁行之，直之不能而曲致之。情动于中，郁勃莫已，而势又不能自达，故托为一意，托为一物，托为一境以出之，故其言直而不迂，曲而不滂也。”³⁵他认为寄托而情长，诗歌具有韵味之处就是含蓄、深婉，过于直陈其情则意短韵少缺乏回味之处。所谓“托”，就是情到深处却无法自达、自解，转而托之于意、物、境，因此善“托”的诗歌其语言直白但情感不直露、语言婉曲但情感不滞迟。

对《湘君》“扬灵兮未极，女婵媛兮为余太息”一句疏曰：“女婵媛兮太息，一似恍惚，一似梦寐。甚矣，骚人之善托也。女，湘君之侍女也。”³⁶思慕之人未到湘君之侧，

31 [明] 陆时雍Lu Shiyong [of the Ming Dynasty]选评·任文京Ren Wenjing赵东岚Zhao Donglan点校·《诗镜》*Shijing [On the Context of Verses]*, (石家庄Shijiazhuang: 河北大学出版社Hebei daxue chubanshe [Hebei University Press], 2010), 10.

32 同上Ibid, 10.

33 [明] 陆时雍Lu Shiyong [of the Ming Dynasty]撰·张学城Zhang Xuecheng 薄迎迎Bao Yingying点校·《楚辞疏》*Chucishu [Annotations to Chuci]*, (南京Nanjing: 南京大学出版社Nanjing daxue chubanshe [Nanjing University Press], 2019), 9.

34 同上Ibid·98.

35 [明] 陆时雍Lu Shiyong [of the Ming Dynasty]选评·任文京Ren Wenjing赵东岚Zhao Donglan点校·《诗镜》*Shijing [On the Context of Verses]*, (石家庄Shijiazhuang: 河北大学出版社Hebei daxue chubanshe [Hebei University Press], 2010), 18.

36 [明] 陆时雍Lu Shiyong [of the Ming Dynasty]撰·张学城Zhang Xuecheng 薄迎迎Bao Yingying点校·《楚辞疏》*Chucishu [Annotations to Chuci]*, (南京Nanjing: 南京大学出版社Nanjing daxue chubanshe [Nanjing University Press],

其遗憾失落之情已达顶点，陆时雍称之为“恍惚、梦寐”的失神状态。这种状态如何呈现，湘君自述已不可能，便托于侍女旁观者，见湘君失魂落魄也为其叹息。

陆时雍除了发明《湘君》之托，还认为“《离骚》蹇修，盖托也”³⁷，“《思美人》思何苦也，思夫不育，思妇不孕，思美人而不得，故思良媒。思良媒而无从，故托怨于归鸟也”³⁸。在陆时雍看来，屈原之所以多次运用“寄托”的手法，除了因为直陈手段难尽其情外，还有一个重要原因，即“寄托”本来就是屈原自身情感宣泄的主要手段。他在《读楚辞语》说：“其为远游求女也奈何？曰：此托也。意有所不可，则托而逃之以自解也。愠托而喜，忧托而豫，知其不可而无奈，故托之以自解也。‘陟彼崔嵬，我马虺隤。我姑酌彼金罍，维以不永怀。’此有若狂痴然，疗狂靡药，故曰‘道思作颂，聊以自救兮’，不救则病甚矣。”³⁹陆时雍认为屈原多次运用寄托自解，因情无可抒发，则借寄托与自身精神矛盾和解，虽知这种寄托是暂时的，但愠忧的心情需要释放，恰如疗狂之药，“寄托”便是屈原在不平之情十分激烈的时候所选择的宣泄手段。从营造情境的角度看，《九歌》诸篇所构成的思慕而不得、爱恋而难耦的人间普遍情感，恰恰是屈原情感、情绪所托之诗境，是寄怀之笔。屈原在《九歌》中托神人、人鬼之离合关系，托有情无情之连结，其实是抒发现实政治中抱负难伸的苦闷，平复因钟情于楚而楚王“不查余之中情”导致的伤感。陆时雍以“善托”评《九歌》，可谓精审独到，所论虽简，却直击肯綮。

三、小结

陆时雍提出的《九歌》“非祭词说”，着眼于《九歌》整体所反映出来的诗人情感，认为各篇作品体现的不是对神明庄重谨敬之情，而是“随意致情”的个人情感，所祭祀之神、鬼都是诗人情感兴发的触媒。在这里，陆氏并没有否定《九歌》体现的楚地祀神的文化传统，而只是将这种巫鬼特色作为屈原创作《九歌》的背景，认为《九歌》是屈原效仿祭词形式、描画伸张“离合”的个人情感体验而创作的一组“非祭词”作品。这是对王逸、朱熹“祭词说”的重大突破，在楚辞学史上具有重要学术价值。

与此相承，陆时雍提炼出《九歌》“婉变隄恻”之艺术品格，而具体又呈现出“语短韵长”和“情境雅合”的特征。在《九歌》的疏解中，陆时雍十分注重其诗歌语言理论的贯彻，尤其关注《九歌》中简洁、有韵的语言，关注语意的浑然天成、自然真朴，进而辨析各篇所具有的语言风格。同时，陆时雍从兴合情韵、情景交融、善托言情三个方面揭示了“情境雅合”的内涵，进一步丰富了其诗歌理论。也正是基于对“语”“韵”“情”“境”的执着追求，才有了陆时雍对屈原作品的极高评价。“千古以来人皆梦梦于中而不寤。惟山有木，匠则采之，凡人有情，圣人道之。能知人之情、能言人之情、能尽人之情者，

2019), 96.

37 同上Ibid, 3.

38 同上Ibid, 4.

39 同上Ibid, 2.

圣人也。原其圣于骚者。”⁴⁰认为只有屈原能够把“梦梦于中而不寤”的“情”和“境”感知到、道透彻，只有屈原能够称得上“骚中之圣”。陆时雍的这一论断深得挚友周拱辰推重，其在《楚辞疏叙》中说：“世之得是书而读之者，宜何如？亦庶几乎善读灵均者斯善读昭仲者乎？”⁴¹认为陆时雍注出了《离骚》之古义，疏出了屈原之本心，换句话说，陆时雍读懂了屈原。

The English Title:

Lu Shiyong's Interpretation of the Nature and Artistry of *A Verse in "Nine Songs"*

WANG Xiaoqiang, Doctor of Letters, Lecturer of Beijing Philosophy and Social Science Research Center for Intercultural Studies, Beijing Language and Culture University. 15 Xueyuan Road, Haidian District, 100083 Beijing, P. R. China. Email: hy82868@163.com.

Abstract: Lu Shiyong (1591?—1642?) put forward the claim that *A Verse in "Nine Songs"* is “not a piece of a funeral oration”. Lu proposed that it is a lyrical verse and elaborated on it in terms of the theme, the relationship between humans and the gods, and the background of the work. He held that *A Verse in "Nine Songs"* has the characteristics of “being elegant and pathetic”, reflected in it has “short sentences and long rhymes” and “an elegant context”. The general characteristics of *A Verse in "Nine Songs"* is that its language is concise and its semantics natural and simple. Lu explained his view of *A Verse in "Nine Songs"* having “an elegant context”, in terms of the emotional charm, the mingling of the emotions and the scenery, and the mastery of expressing feelings via verse, and thus expanded the area of research of his poetry theory.

Key words: Lu Shiyong, *A Verse in "Nine Songs"*, nature, artistry, the emotions and the scenery

40 [明] 陆时雍Lu Shiyong [of the Ming Dynasty]撰·张学城Zhang Xuecheng 薄迎迎Bao Yingying点校·《楚辞疏》*Chucishu [Annotations to Chuçi]*, (南京Nanjing:南京大学出版社Nanjing daxue chubanshe [Nanjing University Press], 2019), 8.

41 同上Ibid, 2.

The Exotic Country in the Quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns: Images of China in the Battle of the Books

LIANG Wanjing

(Beijing Language and Culture University, Haidian District, Beijing 100083)

Abstract: Preceded by Renaissance, followed by Enlightenment, the Quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns, as an important cultural and intellectual event in European minds, has not received the attention it deserves. The Quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns which happened in 1690s England, also known as the Battle of the Books. In the battle about the superiority of ancient culture or modern culture in the West, China as an exotic country of the East was repeatedly mentioned, and in the polemical writings between Sir William Temple and William Wotton, China was given two entirely different faces: “Politically Prominent China” and “Pagan China”. By analyzing the state of Chinese knowledge and the mechanism of image production in the polemical writings of British intellectuals, this paper discusses the role and ideological function played by the image of China in Enlightenment Britain, and then deliberates the construction of the British state, religious consciousness, and reflexive subject in the Early Modern period.

Key words: the Quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns, the Battle of the Books, Images of China, Sir William Temple, William Wotton

Author: LIANG Wanjing, Beijing Language and Culture University, Haidian District, Beijing 100083.

Tel: 13051399800, Email: liangwanjing1998@126.com

The term “the Quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns” was first used to refer specifically to the literary and aesthetic controversy within European intellectual community that lasted for more than half a century between the end of the 17th and the beginning of the 18th centuries. And this term was later expanded to include from the Italian humanists of the 15th century to the present day.¹ Narrowly speaking, the Quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns erupted almost simultaneously in Paris and London, and was known in France as *La Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes* and in England as the Battle of the Books. In European cultural history, the Quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns, which preceded the Renaissance and followed by the Enlightenment, is an important cultural and intellectual event in European minds. As Leo Strauss puts it, “The Battle of the Ancients and the Moderns was not just a mere literary debate, it was fundamentally a debate between modern philosophy or science and ancient philosophy or science.”²

1 刘小枫Liu Xiaofeng,《古典学与古今之争》Gudianxue yu gujinzhiheng [Classical studies and the Quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns], 北京Beijing 华夏出版社Huaxia chubanshe [Huaxia Press], 2016), 67.

2 列奥·斯特劳斯Leo Strauss,《苏格拉底问题与现代性》Sugeladi wenti yu xiandaixing [Essays & Lectures on the Problem of Socrates and Modernity by Leo Strauss], 北京Beijing: 华夏出版社Huaxia chubanshe [Huaxia Press], 2016), 2.

Literally, the Battle of the Books was a great discussion about the superiority or inferiority of the ancients over the moderns. ³The Battle of the Books, which took place in London, was spearheaded by Sir William Temple (1628-1699), who responded to the Frenchman Bernard Le Bovier de Fontenelle (1657-1757) and the Englishman Thomas Burnet (1635-1757) with his essay “an essay upon the Ancient and Modern Learning” (1689). The former proposed a theory of ancient history from the point of view of new natural scientists, and the latter used new philosophical principles to explain European history. In his essay, Temple highly appreciated the Chinese political system and moral minds, thus implying the irrationality of the existing western system. Temple’s well-targeted counterpunch led to the war of words that stretched elsewhere. They were met by the English scholars William Wotton (1666-1727) and Richard Bentley (1662-1742), who, keenly grasping the implications of Temple’s essays, regard Temple’s quotations of the Chinese prominent political system as a provocation to the authority of Christianity. Drive the battle between the ancient and the modern from the political system to religion.

Some scholars believe that it was the emergence of “China” in the Quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns that triggered the quarrels of English intellectuals during the Enlightenment period, and then the war intensified and evolved into the Battle of the Books. ⁴This is an inaccurate statement. It was not so much China that triggered the quarrel as it was knowledge from China that shaped and shook the imagination of European intellectuals. In this debate about the superiority or inferiority of Western civilisations, China, as a foreign country in the East, was given two distinct faces: “Politically Prominent China” and “pagan China”. By analyzing the state of Chinese knowledge and the mechanism of image production in the polemical writings of British intellectuals, this paper will discuss the role and ideological function played by the image of China in Enlightenment Britain, and then deliberates the construction of the British state, religious consciousness, and reflexive subject in the Early Modern period.

I. Temple’s Eastern Horizon: a Scholarly Political System that Impacts the Christian Narrative

Temple was an outstanding diplomat and politician who signed several alliances with the Netherlands on behalf of England and endeavoured to avoid several British-Dutch wars. In 1680 Temple resigned from his position as Privy Counsellor and returned to Moore Hall to concentrate on his writing, and in 1688 he hired Johnathan Swift as his private secretary to help compile an anthology of his writings. Their relationship lasted until Temple’s death in 1699, when Swift was responsible for organising and publishing his posthumous manuscripts.

3 Joseph M. Levine, *Humanism and History: Origins of English Historiography*, (Ithaca and London: Cornell University, 1987), 155-156.

4 Min, Eun Kyung, “China between the Ancients and the Moderns.” *The Eighteenth Century*, vol. 45, no. 2, (2004) , 117.

As a diplomat who travelled extensively in Europe, Temple's knowledge of faraway China was significant, and even more valuable was his attention to the Chinese political system, which his biographer described as "the first English political commentator to hold the Chinese system of government in high regard"⁵. As early as 1672, Temple's "An Essay on the original and nature of government" contained assertions similar to those of Confucius. He linked the policy of ruling a family with the way of ruling a kingdom, arguing that "a family seems to be a small kingdom, and a kingdom is only a large family."⁶From there, he suggested that the rule of the king depended on the opinions and sentiments of the people, and that "monarchy is the safest and most secure of all forms of rule."⁷In 1689, in "an essay upon the Ancient and Modern Learning", he even compared the moral thoughts of the East and the West: "The end of the Greeks seems to lie in the happiness of the individual and of the family, while the Chinese attach importance to the good state and happiness of the kingdom, or of the politics",⁸ also summarized Chinese politics as "the politics of the scholars", and even further suggested the relationship between learning and governing: "I know of nothing that advances knowledge and learning more than strict moderation, a pure air, an atmosphere of equality, and a state or politics that is stable over a long period of time. We may justly give these advantages to those Eastern regions."⁹

Temple's affection for the East is even more evident in his 1690 essay "An Essay of Heroic Virtue". Although this treatise is devoted solely to the virtues of the worshipped heroes of antiquity, it covers heroes not only from Europe, but also from the "less frequented peripheries": China, Peru, the Tartar Empire, and the Arabian Empire. Temple "knew the great old Chinese empire" by heart: the Great Wall, the Imperial City, Fuxi and Confucius, the Four Books, the Five Elements, the Chinese characters and traditional Chinese medicine Most important to him was the Chinese government and its officials, and how learning enabled the officials to run the country. Temple realised that Confucius was "the most learned, the wisest, and the most upright of the Chinese", and that his influence on later generations was so profound that, after the Qin dynasty, Chinese learning was limited by his works. He believed that the teachings of Confucius were intended to guide and regulate the moral character of man in life, family, and government work.¹⁰

Temple also alludes to his microaggressions about British politics at the time in this introduction to the politics of Chinese scholars. Speaking about Chinese politics, he elaborated on the source of the emperor's orders in China, where there was a monarchical and hereditary system,

5 Woodbridge, Homer E., *Sir William Temple: The Man and His Work*. (New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1940), 276.

6 William Temple, "An Essay on the original and nature of government", in *The Works of Sir William Temple, vol.1*. (printed by S. Hamilton, Weybridge, 1814), 1-30.

7 *Ibid.*, pp. 1-30.

8 William Temple, "an essay upon the Ancient and Modern Learning", in J. E. Spingarn eds, *Sir William Temple's Essays on Ancient & Modern Learning and On Poetry*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909), 1-50.

9 *Ibid.*, pp. 1-50.

10 William Temple, "An Essay of Heroic Virtue", in *The Works of Sir William Temple, Bar. In Two Volumes, vol. 1*, (London, 1814), 191-232.

“but all the emperor’s orders came from his advisers, from the advice and requests of specially constituted councils of counsellors. All the important offices of the state were likewise appointed by the emperor on the advice of different committees, so that candidates could not count on the preferences of the monarch, the favouritism of his ministers, flattery, or corruption to come to power, but relied on their own merits, learning, and virtues.”¹¹

Those familiar with Chinese history will recognize the discrepancy between Temple’s account and the political realities of the Ming and Qing dynasties, and Temple’s concern with the role and selection of members of the emperor’s council of counsellors is reminiscent of his own unhappy experiences as a privy councillor under King Charles II. as recorded in a short biography of Temple by a contemporary, “Some account of life and writing” (1728) recorded all this. ¹²Charles II set up the Privy Council on Temple’s advice, but nepotism and arbitrariness sapped Temple’s enthusiasm for politics, and he soon gave up his position as Privy Councillor. American scholar Boyle suggests that it was Temple’s lack of success that stimulated his quest for a better system of government. ¹³Perhaps Temple, in a sense, held his utopian political ideals in the scholarly political China he envisioned.

This leads to the next question, how was Temple able to boldly use Chinese knowledge as argumentative material in the ancient and modern controversy that swept Europe? It is important to realise that in the Quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns in Paris, the main focus of both sides of the argument was European knowledge of the past and present. In the battle of books in London, why did the eastern civilisation represented by China become an important and indispensable material for both sides of the argument? To answer this question, it may be necessary to begin with Temple’s sources of Chinese knowledge.

Temple never visited China in his life, and much of his understanding of China came from Jesuit travelogues and translations. According to Li Chunchang, the Chinese translator of Temple’s collected works, Temple seems to have derived most of his knowledge of China from two Jesuit missionaries: Alvaro Semedo (曾德昭) and Gabriel de Magalhaens (安文思), the authors of *The History of the Chinese Empire* and *The New History of China* respectively. ¹⁴In addition to this, “An Essay of Heroic Virtue” mentions the Latin edition of *the Works of Confucius* published in France by Jesuit missionaries. Some scholar speculates, based on Temple’s words describing China, that he also read Joan Nieuhof’s *An embassy from the East-India Company* (《荷使初访中国记》),¹⁵ Numerous scholars have examined the etymology of the Sharawadgi-style Chinese

11 *Ibid.*, pp.191-232.

12 *Ibid.*, preface.

13 Boyle, Frank. “China in the Radical Enlightenment Context of the English Battle of the Books.” *The Eighteenth Century*, vol. 59 no. 1, (2018), 7.

14 威廉·坦普尔William Temple, 《论古今学问》Lun gujin xuewen [an essay upon the Ancient and Modern Learning], 李春长Li Chunchang译, (北京Beijing: 华夏出版社Huaxia chubanshe [Huaxia press]), 2021, 59.

15 Stone, Donald, “Swift, Temple, Defoe, and the Jesuits.” *Taiwan Journal of East Asian Civilisation Studies*, 8.2 (2011), 316.

gardens proposed by Temple. Temple's line of knowledge has been combed in detail.¹⁶ Generally speaking, Temple travelled with several Dutch Jesuit missionaries who visited China during his stay in the Netherlands and gained vivid insights into China from them, such as Martinus Martini (卫匡国). One figure who may have had a major influence on Temple that has been overlooked in this informative index is the Dutch scholar Isaac Vossius (1618-1689). If the Jesuits brought original insights about China, Vossius brought Temple a way of thinking that broke with established Christian intellectual views.

Vossius came from a classical family and his father was a religious scholar fluent in Hebrew. Equally adept at classical languages, Vossius did not submit to established interpretations and became sceptical of the traditional narrative of the biblical calendar. Both Vossius and Temple shared an ineffable passion for China, particularly for its history and utopian political organization. In *Dissertatio de Vera aetate Mundi* (1659), by Vossius, he attacked the narrative body of the *Vulgate* translation of the Bible, and, with his knowledge of China, Vossius used the highly unusual argument that the Chinese were the most civilized people who ever lived, and that they preserved their own memorials, almanacs, and unbroken 4,500 years history, and that they were more ancient than Moses.¹⁷ This viewpoint, which seems to be a commonplace one today, was clearly out of place in the 17th century, when kings and religious powers were in dispute. From the 13th century onwards, Europe had had uninterrupted access to information about China, and Vossius recognized the elephant in the room - 4,500 years of Chinese history proved that the chronological narrative constructed by the Bible was wrong, and that there was something older than the Bible's history, a distant, far-flung empire that was within our reach. The far eastern empires are within our reach. The title of the book alludes to Vossius's aim - *A Treatise on the True Age of the World* - as he seeks to shatter the illusion of the Christian chronological narrative and expose the "true" age, challenging the unquestioned authority of the Christian sacred narrative.

Some scholars have pointed out that Temple's "dangerous idea" of questioning the orthodoxy of the biblical narrative may well have been derived from Vossius.¹⁸ In his *Response*, Wotton refers to the passion for China shared by Temple and Vossius as partners in perspective.¹⁹ Johnathan Swift, on the other hand, in *The Battle of the Books*, visualises Vossius and Temple as the two warlords of the Ancients, and "in the end it was Vossius and Temple who led the Allies", and

16 Cf. Murray, Ciaran, "Sharawadgi resolved." *Garden History*, 26.2 (1998), 208-213. 张旭春 Zhang Xuchun, 《"Sharawadgi"词源考证与浪漫主义东方起源探微》sharawadgi ciyuan kaozheng yu langmanzhuyi dongfang qiuyan tanwei 【"Sharawadgi" etymological research and the oriental origin of romanticism】 , 《文艺研究》wenyi yanjiu 【Literary and art Studies】 , (2017), 31-39.

17 Boyle, Frank, "China in the Radical Enlightenment Context of the English Battle of the Books." *The Eighteenth Century*, vol. 59 no. 1, (2018), 8.

18 Jonathan I. Israel, *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity, 1650-1750*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 606.

19 Wotton, William, *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning, to Which Is Now Added a Defence Thereof, in Answer to the Objections of Sir W. Temple, and Others. With Observations upon the Tale of a Tub, 3rd ed. corrected* (London, 1705), p.137. Subsequent references to this work will be abbreviated "Defence."

Swift's placement of Vossius ahead of Temple may suggest an ideological link between the two men, which is certainly evidenced. According to Boyle's disclosure, in 1679 Vossius published his most deviant work, *De Sibyllinis*, and Temple copied the manuscript to Swift in 1697.²⁰ Boyle frankly states that Vossius's writings, which expressed the meaning of the ancient Scriptures in the present day, were beyond the scope of Temple's comprehension of the judgement. However, Temple's article shows that not only did he understand the nature and meaning of the debate, he was in favour of embracing the unorthodox position.

Indeed, apart from the Biblical record of the origins and course of the Jewish people, the events in the rest of our world prior to the Trojan War are either extremely vague and ambiguous due to a lack of evidence and unknown authorship, making it impossible for us to make a judgement. The accounts of China, the remnants of Manetho on ancient Egypt, the narrative of Eustace on the Scythian Empire, and the descriptions of Herodotus and Diodorus on numerous other places are so far outside the period of time which the Bible gives us that we are not permitted to discuss them. After the Christianisation of a large part of the world, this inconsistency may have led to the oblivion of many ancient writers.²¹

Temple does not shy away from referring to ancient pre-Christian civilizations and suggests that there are incompletenesses in the time period covered by biblical interpretation. A basic tenet of his argument is then revealed: that the acquisition of knowledge is cyclical and not dependent on divine providence, and that there is an older existence beyond the Christian biblical calendar. These seemingly mundane factual statements, made in Enlightenment England at a time when old and new ideas were colliding, had the added force of shaking traditional Christian intellectual beliefs.

II. Wotton's turn of mind: defending the Christian intellectual-faith relationship

Based on this analysis, it is easy to understand why Wotton, a clergyman, appears in the Battle of the Books. While the point of Temple's *On Ancient and Modern Learning* was not to attack the traditional view of Christian narrative head-on, he was writing to counter the presentist rhetoric of the Frenchman Fontenelle and the Englishman Burnet.²² Nevertheless, Wotton and his allies were keenly aware of the unorthodox implications. Fan Cunzhong compared the Chinese

20 Boyle, Frank, "China in the Radical Enlightenment Context of the English Battle of the Books." *The Eighteenth Century*, vol. 59 no. 1, (2018), 4.

21 William Temple, "an essay upon the Ancient and Modern Learning", in J. E. Spingarn eds, *Sir William Temple's Essays on Ancient & Modern Learning and On Poetry*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909), 1-50.

22 Burnet here refers to Thomas Burnet, who published the book *The Sacred Theory of the Earth* in 1684. Not to be confused with Gilbert Burnet, who would be mentioned later.

material of Jesuit priests of the time with Temple's statements and found that Temple's discourse contained little insight. But Temple's light-hearted and polemical writings were undoubtedly more popular with the general public than the cumbersome and dull clerical books, and they did serve to introduce Chinese culture to the general public.²³ Temple's good character and concern for his country, as well as his diplomatic achievements in easing the British-Dutch wars, made his writings popular among the English public; in November 1690, Temple published a collection of essays, *Miscellanea, the second part*, which included "an essay upon the Ancient and Modern Learning". Only two years later, in 1692, a third edition was published, in which Temple revised the text of "an essay upon the Ancient and Modern Learning", which was reprinted the following year and translated into French. This shows the great influence of the spread of this article. It also explains why Wotton and his party pointed the finger at Temple rather than at Vossius, who was even more radical in his views and behaviour.

To meet this highly respected opponent, the young man Wotton published his 29 chapters, nearly 400 pages work *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning* in 1694. Wotton's book appears to be a response to Temple's "an essay upon the Ancient and Modern Learning", but in fact it covers a wide range of articles and refutes them in every way. Wotton devotes Chapter 7, "With an Account of Sir William Temple's Hypothesis of the History of Learning", to responding to the learning issue, from which we can get a glimpse of Wotton's idea of argument. First, we need to understand Temple's view of the history of learning.

Temple begins by distinguishing between knowledge and learning: knowledge is that which is recognised as true and reliable, and learning is the understanding of the widely differing and conflicting views of those who have gone before. In this sense, modern man proclaims nothing more than learning that has not been honed and evaluated over time, thus defeating the modernist view that "the present man certainly knows more than the ancients". Temple also used "the ancients could make use of their knowledge of the ancients and have recourse to living guides, while the moderns can only have recourse to the dead guides of books" to refute the learning path of the modernists. The living guide of which Temple speaks is the ancient and modern East. While the Greeks could trace their learning back to Egypt or Phoenicia, and perhaps to their prosperous dealings with the Ethiopians, Chaldeans, Arabs, and Indians of the East, China, with its traditional priestly system and historiographical records, is a living guide within reach of the modern Westerner. Temple thus turns to a discourse on Eastern character and politics.

Wotton did not continue Temple's idea of argumentation about Eastern knowledge, but rather adopted the usual tactic of the modernists in the ancient and modern controversies - "Drain from the bottom", by ignoring the discussion of the merits of the content and directly questioning the legitimacy of the argument's premise.

23 范存志Fan Cunzhong,《中国文化在启蒙时期的英国》Zhongguo wenhua zai qimeng shiqi de yingguo[Chinese Culture in Enlightenment England],(南京Nanjing:译林出版社Yilin chubanshe[Yilin press],2010),18.

Before I examine Sir William Temple's Scheme, Step by Step, I shall offer, as the Geometers do, some few Things as Postulata, which are so very plain, that they will be assented to as soon as they are proposed.

(1.) That all Men who make a Mystery of Matters of Learning, and industriously oblige their Scholars to conceal their Dictates, give the World great Reason to suspect, that their Knowledge is all Juggling and Trick.

(2.) That he that has only a Moral Persuasion of the Truth of any Proposition, which is capable of Natural Evidence, cannot so properly be esteemed the Inventor, or the Discoverer rather, of that Proposition, as another Man, who, tho' he lived many Ages after, brings such Evidences of its Certainty, as are sufficient to convince all competent Judges; especially when his Reasonings are founded upon Observations and Experiments drawn from, and made upon the Things themselves.

(3.) That no Pretences to greater Measures of Knowledge, grounded upon Account of Long Successions of Learned Men in any Country, ought to gain Belief, when set against the Learning of other Nations, who make no such Pretences, unless Inventions and Discoveries answerable to those Advantages, be produced by their Advocates.

(4.) That we cannot judge of Characters of Things and Persons at a great Distance, when given at Second-hand, unless we knew exactly how capable those Persons, from whom such Characters were first taken, were to pass a right Judgment upon such subjects; and also the particular Motives that biassed them to pass such Censures. If Archimedes should, upon his own Knowledge, speak with Admiration of the Egyptian Geometry, his Judgment would be very considerable: But if he should speak respectfully of it, only because Pythagoras did so before him, it might, perhaps, signifie but very little.

(5.) That excessive Commendations of any Art or Science whatsoever; as also of the Learning of any particular Men or Nations, only prove that the Persons who give such Characters never heard of any

*Thing or Person that was more excellent in that Way; and therefore that Admiration may be as well supposed to proceed from their own Ignorance, as from the real Excellency of the Persons or Things;*²⁴

In Wotton's view, Temple's thesis has only a moral, empirical basis and no rational credentials based on experimentation or observation. Temple's reference to "learning" and "knowledge" is nothing more than the creation of a mystery. After refuting the notion that Temple's views lacked rational basis and created an illusion, Wotton moved on to a critique of Temple himself and the materials he used: Temple was not a scholar in the universal sense, but a retired politician, and

24 Wotton, William, "Defence." pp. 90-91. <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/ebo/A67135.0001.001/1:7?rgn=div1;view=fulltext>, 2023-8-9.

the Oriental politics he praised so much was second-hand material whose authenticity remained to be seen. Wotton also sarcastically depresses the fact that Temple's Oriental fervour was born out of ignorance, and that if Temple really possessed knowledge, then he should have worshipped the true God. Wotton's final stroke actually conveys what he sees as a legitimate knowledge-belief relationship: true knowledge is knowledge of a true person or god, and true belief arises from true worship. In his view, Temple's view is already outside the orthodox type of intellectual belief. It is also along these lines that Wotton directs the focus of his argument from the ancient politics of virtue to the question of the legitimacy of religious knowledge.

In fact, Wotton's rebuttal of Temple is not without merit; Temple's talents in classics are more limited, or he would not have been cowed on the question of the authenticity of the *Phalaris Papyrus*. As for the use of Chinese knowledge, some scholars have also pointed out that it was an anachronism for either Vossius or Temple to make such startling claims, and that they were as gullible about the history and figures of ancient China as they were about China's superiority to Europe in terms of its system of government, political philosophy, and medicine.²⁵ This can also be seen in Temple's idealisation of the role of the Chinese Emperor's Council of Advisors. The empirical versus scientific knowledge debate is not unlike the ancient versus modern debate that took place in Paris, and the core of Wotton's rebuttal to Temple should still fall on the defence of the traditional Christian relationship of intellectual belief.

Commenting on this argument between Temple and Wotton, the poet of the time, Thomas Rymer (1641-1713), was keenly aware of Wotton's intentions, "To subdue this popular antagonist, he [Wotton] well examined every word that seemed to be inconsistent with his own notions But Mr Wotton lost his end, and it was his task to attack Sir William Temple."²⁶ Raymer was clearly on Temple's side. It also indirectly presents the problem Wotton faced at the time: how to defeat a popular foe, one of the most gentlemanly writers of the age? This clearly went beyond the doctrinal question of ancient and modern disputes and evolved from an intellectual battle to a personal attack on a conceptual battle.

The dramatic shift in the focus of the argument clearly did not depend on Wotton alone. Rather than Temple sparking a backlash from the clergy represented by Wotton, it was the Royal Society that controlled the key direction of the battle of the books. Wotton was 28 the year he published *Reflections*, and Bentley was 31 when he wrote *On the Brief of Phalaris*. Although one of them was a Fellow of the Royal Society and the other a Royal Librarian, both were more long on learning and short on politics. In Raymer's opinion, "Mr Wotton was employed by some friend or patron." Boyle, on examination, believes that the signatory behind them was Gilbert Burnet.

25 Jonathan I. Israel, *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity, 1650-1750*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 604.

26 Rymer, Thomas, "An Essay, Concerning Critical and Curious Learning in Which Are Contained Some Short Reflections on the Controversie Betwixt Sir William Temple and Mr. Wotton, and That Betwixt Dr. Bentley and Mr. Boyle", *U-M Library Digital Collections*, pp.48-49. <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/ebo/A58018.0001.001/1:2?rgn=div1;view=fulltext>, 2023-8-9.

This Bishop of Salisbury, seemingly far removed from the battle of the books, chose Wotton and Bentley as his spokesmen in religion and in public. ²⁷We can notice that some of Bishop Burnet's comments about Temple also magically appear in Wotton's criticisms, and these kinds of religious attacks provide Wotton with ideas.

III. Shifting the focus of the debate: the retreat of "China"

Wotton's essay actually needs to address this issue: reconciling the impact of Chinese history on an otherwise Christian belief system. Temple's introduction of Chinese history was intended to emphasise the politics of learning, but he inevitably brought with him the difficulty of clergy apologetics. This problem is obviously difficult to solve on its own. And so, once again, back to the question that confronted Wotton: how to defeat a popular foe? With the benefit of his experience in religious polemics and ancient and modern controversies, Wotton chose to "pull the rug out from under him": to attack his opponent's arguments and his opponent's own legitimacy.

In the year following the publication of "an essay upon the Ancient and Modern Learning", Temple published another essay, "An Essay of Heroic Virtue", in which he went into detail about China, devoting a paragraph to a brief description of Chinese astrology, pharmacy, and alchemy, relegating them to the category of other learning that had been discarded or despised. However, Temple appreciates the Chinese doctor's expertise in taking a pulse and employing simple medicines. ²⁸This is all Temple has to say about Chinese medicine. Such idleness has become the focus of Wotton's attack on China.

Wotton uses Chapter 12, "Of the Learning of the Chineses", to demystify the superiority of constitutional China, focusing his argument on China's backwardness in medicine and mechanics. Perhaps he saw no need to argue, as the facts were plain to see, or perhaps it was a lack of understanding that led Wotton to compile six paragraphs on the five elements and the body from Andrew Cleyer's *The Chinese Physick*, and then to argue, self-refutingly, that Chinese medicine was absurd. He concludes that the Chinese may be the best of labourers, but it is hard to believe that they can be inclusive philosophers. ²⁹Wotton's attack was feeble, and attracted much ridicule, with the aforementioned Reimer suggesting that Wotton was 'quarrelling with him [Temple] over trifles of no consequence'. So in the second edition of *Reflections* in 1697, Wotton expanded the chapter to 'Learning about India and China', suggesting that his earlier scribbling about China had been refuted.³⁰

27 Boyle, Frank, "China in the Radical Enlightenment Context of the English Battle of the Books." *The Eighteenth Century*, vol. 59 no. 1, (2018), 8.

28 William Temple, "an essay upon the Ancient and Modern Learning", in J. E. Spingarn eds, *Sir William Temple's Essays on Ancient & Modern Learning and On Poetry*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909), 1-50.

29 Wotton, William, "Defence." pp. 145-153.

30 Min, Eun Kyung, "China between the Ancients and the Moderns." *The Eighteenth Century*, vol. 45, no. 2, (2004), 123.

The attack on Temple's own beliefs proceeded more smoothly, with Wotton pointing to two major "proofs" of Temple's insults to Christianity: first, that Temple had allowed a "Sergian monk" to play a major role in Muhammad's education, thus tainting Christianity. The second is that Temple neglects to discuss Moses and Jesus in his praise of Confucius and other legislators. Wotton views Temple in the preface as "one of those who believe that Christianity should be nothing more than an empty form of words," intending to accuse Temple of questioning and undermining the biblical narrative of Christianity. Nonetheless, Temple's greatest harm came from Bishop Burnett, who claimed that Temple was "an admirer of Confucius, an atheist, and a corrupter of the Christian faith," misinterpreting Temple's advocacy of "natural reason" and associating him with naturalistic deists. The misinterpretation of Temple's advocacy of "natural reason" and his association with natural deists is truly sinister. Although in the long run the growing Church of God reinforced the power to subvert the Christian theocracy, it was not necessarily a good thing to be called a deist in England, where the regime and the theocracy were at loggerheads at the time. Thomas Burnett, who wrote *The Scared Theory of the Earth* in an attempt to reconcile the contradictions between the new philosophy and the Biblical calendar, was judged to have gained the endorsement of the naturalists, and lost his national priesthood. Forced to bear the name of "deists", Temple attracted the attention of true naturalists, who began to constantly interpret the implication of nature in Temple's writings, especially the "Garden of Epicurus", and they absorbed Temple's conception of nature, which was derived from Chinese politics, into their own system of exposition, and posthumously named Temple. They incorporated Temple's conception of nature as derived from Chinese politics into their own discourse and posthumously named Temple as the spokesman of deists. Temple, who had been extolling the virtues of the Chinese political system, was now dressed up as a pagan.

The shift in the centre of gravity of the discourse may have forced Temple to abandon his previous line of argument. In his last work, "A Defence of Ancient and Modern Learning", he retained his admiration for the ancient system of government, but no longer explicitly referred to China or other Eastern countries. In spite of Wotton's attack, Temple did not change the subject of his argument, but continued his dialogue with the French Fontenelle and Perrault. Wearing the hat of "natural theist", Temple did not give up questioning the Christian discourse system, and by combing through the intellectual history of Christianity, he secretly left an indictment: "Christianity came to the earth without relying at all on the knowledge of learning to attach itself to elegance. The first fathers who made use of learning Using the learning that preceded them to defend the Christian faith against the heathen with the powerful weapons of the heathen themselves This learning was too powerful, and it was used in abundance every time Christendom split."³¹

31 William Temple, "an essay upon the Ancient and Modern Learning", in J. E. Spingarn eds, *Sir William Temple's Essays on Ancient & Modern Learning and On Poetry*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909), 1-50.

Temple and Wotton's ostensible controversy over ancient and modern learning, but actually a hidden struggle over beliefs, ended with the death of one of the parties, and the dispute between Charles Boyle and Bentley over the authenticity of the Phalaris' *Epistles* became a new centre of gravity, while China gradually withdrew from the ancient and modern controversy.

IV. China as “substitution”

The European imagination of the East, of China, has a long history and has not ceased to exist. In the long history and vast literature associated with it. Argumentative essays like Temple's and Wotton's are unique. Unlike the travelogues, geographies, and missionary accounts that were popular at the time, the intellectuals of the English Enlightenment manipulated a variety of images of China to reveal more directly and explicitly the impact of the newest knowledge on the traditional knowledge of their own country. In these texts, which either tinkered with or countered, the latest exotic knowledge was strangely integrated with the most traditional Christian material. And for the readers of these polemical texts at the time, the presence of this exotic information did not just add to their accumulation of knowledge systems, but also touched upon a transformation of intellectual structures in a shadowy way. Thus, the significance of the Chinese image in this debate between Temple and Wotton lies not in its specific utility or authenticity, but in how the intellectuals of the British Enlightenment metaphorically articulated the cognitive paradigms of the era.

The space of the exotic, starting from and delineated by Western Christian perspectives and scales, is de-realised and conceptualised, and the notion of the exotic within the framework of such narratives has been withdrawn from the vein of its specific meaning. The space of the exotic, as a manipulable content for Western Christian narrators, has been incorporated into the process of Europe's own subjectivisation even before Europe carried out a real political and economic colonial exploitation of the East. In this sense, the exotic as “being” is absent, present only in the way it appears and is appeared. In terms of the frequent appearance of China in the Battle of the Books, the content of the Battle of the Books debates is about China, but the identity preferences of the debaters and the sources of their Chinese materials are not at the centre of the critical intellectual stance. That is to say, the images of China that emerge and are portrayed in these debates are created according to the intellectual needs of Enlightenment British intellectuals at the moment, independent of the authenticity of their content.

What role does China/exoticism play in the Battle of the Books debate? Derrida's notion of “substitution” may be instructive.

In Derrida's view, the “substitute” has no essence and is ontologically unthinkable, but it can disturb the illusion of wholeness of the “origin”, because without the “substitute” there is no “origin”. “origin”. At the same time, the “replacement” factor can not only disturb and dissolve the unity of “origin”, but also make the self-consistency and stability of the “replacement” factor face the dilemma of self-structure. The “substitution” factor itself faces the dilemma of self-structuring

and stability.³²The European reflective subject embodied in the polemics of Temple and Wotton (mainly embodied in the relationship of faith in Christian knowledge), in fact, also relies on its own “substitute” factor, that is, China, which has been invented as an exotic space. China as an exotic space played a role in the conflict of intellectual beliefs in Enlightenment England, and this exotic image was brought to the European readership by English intellectuals, who pruned, purified, and shaped it to force it into their own defended intellectual traditions.

However, China’s otherness did disturb the subjective consciousness of European thought in the ancient-modern controversy, because China, as a “substitute” factor, could not be regarded as a presence (a complete and authentic embodiment), but at least it could not be regarded as a complete absence. This dilemma is reflected in the gap between description and discourse, that is to say, no matter how the British intellectuals of the time used the polemical material of “China”, they could not ignore the existence of “China” as an anomaly. In order to make the discourse on China more reasonable, users had to resort to various means, such as blurring the focus, shifting the topic, making the most of what was small, and avoiding the focus, in order to undermine the integrity of the foreign world that had already arrived.

中文题目：

古今之争中的异国：英国书籍之战中的中国形象

梁婉婧

北京语言大学文学院·北京 海淀 100083·手机号：13051399800·电邮：liangwanjing1998@126.com

提要：前承文艺复兴·后接启蒙运动·古今之争作为欧洲思想界重要的文化思想史事件·却并未受到应有的关注。1690年代发生在英国的古今之争又被称为书籍之战。在这场有关西方古今文明孰优孰劣的论战中·作为东方异国的中国被反复提及·并在坦普尔和沃顿的论战中·被赋予了“政制中国”和“异教中国”这两个截然不同的面相。本文通过分析英国知识分子论战文章中的中国知识状况及形象生产机制·讨论中国形象在启蒙时期的英国所扮演的角色和发挥的意识形态作用·进而研究英国的国家、宗教意识和反思性主体在现代早期的建构。

关键词：古今之争 书籍之战 中国形象 坦普尔 沃顿

32 雅克·德里达Jacques Derrida,《论文字学》Lun wenzixue [Of Grammatology], 汪堂家Wang Tangjia译,(上海Shanghai: 上海译文出版社Shanghai Yiwén chubanshe[Shanghai yiwén press]), 2005, 456-459.

实践神学 与中西教会和社会

**Practical Theology and
Sino-Western Views on
Church and Society**

晚清兖州教案之法律文化解析¹

乔飞*

提要: 晚清发生在山东的兖州教案,蕴涵着复杂丰富的法律文化内容。从起因层面来看,中国传统“华夷之防”的民族心理、“共同体本位”的观念以及绅民依情感逻辑而订立的民间排教规范,是兖州教案得以发生的法律文化因素。从教案的处理过程来看,“一元独尊”与“多元共存”文化观之不同,“舆情人心”与“法律权利”价值取向之不同,“明法主张”与“暗法应对”之解纷风格之不同,体现了中西法律文化之差异。教案是“传统”与“现代”在晚清中国碰撞的产物,传教与教案处理也推动着传统中国向现代转型。时至今日,传统与现代的冲突并未成为历史,我们的文化现代化、社会心理现代化依然任重道远。

关键词: 教案; 法律文化; 传统; 现代

作者: 乔飞, 河南大学法学院教授, 法学博士。研究领域: 宗教与法律。

通讯地址: 河南省开封市明伦街85号, 475001。电子邮件: wordofancient@126.com。电话: +8613938526122。

教案,或曰“民教纠纷”,是晚清时期中西碰撞、中西交会的特殊历史产物。关于教案的研究,在历史学领域已有丰硕成果,但法学界对此却关注甚少。^[2]作为一种纠纷或案件,教案应当纳入法学视域进行考察,尤其是作为以研究历史中法律或案件发生、发展、演变及其规律为主要内容的法律史学,对教案更应当优先阐释。“兖州教案”是中国近代史上的著名案例,蕴含着丰富的法律文化内涵。本文即尝试采用法学理论工具,解析兖州教案的发生及其纠纷处理,挖掘这一著名案件背后的“法律文化”因素,以求为现代法治建设提供借鉴。

一、兖州教案的案情

光绪十二年(1886年),德国圣言会天主教主教安治泰计划在兖州建立教堂,“即行价买郡城东街吕锡光宅房一所”,预备传教。兖州地近孔子故乡,士民受儒家思想影响,深疾洋教。绅士汤诰、范宝真等得知安治泰来兖的消息后,“纠众不许其买宅建堂,并不准传教士在城居住”。绅士张贴匿名揭帖,宣称天主教“其教义弃伦灭理,禽兽不如”,数说天主教种种劣迹和荒谬,安治泰只好作罢。^[3]众绅士推翻了安治泰原来的购房协议,强行收买吕锡光宅房,并于此盖起考场楼,^[4]兖州教案由此发生。其后,安治泰又

1 本文是2022年国家社科基金一般项目“儒家‘自然法’思想研究”(项目编号:22BFX019)的阶段性成果。

2 关于清代教案的研究综述,参见乔飞Qiao Fei,“清代教案研究的回顾与反思”Qingdai jiaohan yanjiu de huigu yu fansi [Analysis on the Research of Anti Church Cases in Qing Dynasty of China],载([韩国Hanguo]《中国史研究》2010年第67卷Zhongguoshi Yanjiu [Korea:The Journal of Chinese Historical Researches, 2010, Vol. 67), 305-324。

3 廉立之Lian Lizhi、王守中Wang Shouzhong,《山东教案史料》Shandong Jiaohan Shiliao [Shandong Anti-Church Historical Materials],(济南Jinan:齐鲁书社Qilu Shushe [Qilu Press], 1980), 221, 223-224。

4 同上书Ibid,第285页。

在城里“价买张宝干宅房一所”，又有“教徒单春堂奉献城宅一区”，都办有买卖契约。正当安治泰派人修屋，以便去住时，又被当地绅民知晓。1887年8月，汤诰、范宝真等“白昼纠众封锁城门”，修屋人、卖主及中保人被迫出逃。绅民们将单春堂房宅拆毁一空，“复将张宝干宅门窗拉去”，张母谎称此房并未价卖，才使“民忿稍息，而未遭毁坏”，张母旋即逃至济宁教堂，当面告知安治泰发生的一切。安治泰认识到事态严重，“亲往省城禀请巡抚查办”，巡抚则饬令济东道王作孚办理。同年9月，安治泰派遣教徒王燕吉携带函件赶赴兖沂道署时，被汤诰、范宝真等绅士“搜翻抢去衣物信件，私押数日”。事态越来越严重，安治泰只好前往北京，面见法国公使李梅，陈明兖州发生的一切。^[5]由此，兖州教案引起总理衙门与法国及其后德国公使之间的频繁交涉，前后达10年之久，未能有效解决。1897年德国强占胶州湾后，安治泰才将主教驻地迁至兖州，建起了兖州教堂。

二、兖州教案发生之法律文化解析

除晚清遭受西方殖民这一政治因素外，兖州教案的发生有复杂的法律文化原因。法律文化具有“深层结构”与“表层结构”，前者包括法律心理、法律意识、法律思想等层面，后者包括法律规范、法律制度、法律组织机构、法律设施等层面。^[6]这种理论架构，不仅适用于国家法领域，对于民间法的分析也极具解释功能。中国官绅民众的“夷夏之防”心理、“共同体本位”的观念、为排教而进行的“情感性立法”，就是兖州教案得以发生的深层因素。

(一) “华夷之防”：兖州教案发生的心理因素

法律心理是法律文化结构中较深的一层，“是一个民族千百年来民族文化传统积淀的产物”，尽管它是特定族群对法律现象直观的感性认识，是法律意识形态的初级阶段，但却是该族群一种“超稳定形态”的一种心理。^[7]“华夷之防”就是华夏民族看待华夏与其他族群、国家、文化之间高低贵贱关系的一种法律心理；“华夷之防”或曰“夷夏之辨”，是古人用来区分“华夏”与“夷狄”族群的。华、夷之别，是文明与野蛮的区分。“裔不谋夏，夷不乱华”，^[8]孔颖达的疏解是“中国有礼仪之大，故称夏；有服章之美，故谓之华。”“华夏”即“大而美”之意，如此自称，显示自己为文明教化的代表。华夏拥有“郁郁乎文哉”^[9]的礼乐文明，对未经礼乐教化的“夷狄”，视之为“若禽兽然”。^[10] 礼乐文明特别重视父子之亲、君臣之义以及男女之别，而这也是夷夏之辨的主要

5 同上书 Ibid, 第221-222页。

6 参见刘作翔Liu Zuoxiang, 《法律文化理论》Falv Wenhua Lilun [Legal Culture Theory], (北京Beijing: 商务印书馆 Shangwu Yinshuguan [Commercial Press] 2004), 118、136。

7 同上书 Ibid, 第119-120页。

8 《左传·定公十年》Zuozhuan-Dingong shinian.

9 《论语·八佾》Lunyu·bayi.

10 《国语·周语中》Guoyu·Zhouyu.

内容和标准。^[11]孟子曾说，“吾闻用夏变夷者，未闻变于夷者”，^[12]即只能由华夏民族同化其他民族，而不容许其他民族同化华夏民族，其逻辑是“内中华外夷狄、贵中华贱夷狄”，此为文化原则，也是政治原则，华夏作为共同体的意识于是被不断强化。基于此，历史进程中华夏民族较为强盛时，往往会有“万方来朝，四夷宾服”的优越心态；但当华夏民族受到外族入侵时，“夷夏之辨”的思想常激起强烈的民族情感，激发人们抵御外来者，以捍卫华夏文明。蒙、满入华，莫不如此。

晚清时期，进入中国的西方传教士，被国人视为“逆夷”。^[13]兖州教案就是因为传教士在孔子故里山东兖州建盖教堂而引发；当地绅民认为“教堂立，则洋教行；洋教行，则淫祸起。”^[14]当时人们对天主教的认知是男女淫乱，“其传教者谓之牧士，愚民被其利诱人教时，引入暗室，不论男女，脱其衣裳，亲为洗濯。继令服药一丸，即昏迷不知人事，任其淫污”；或者认为天主教残害人命，“男则取其肾子，女则割其子肠”，^[15]甚至“迷拐童男童女，剖心挖眼，以为配药点银之用。”^[16]特别是天主教“不扫墟墓，不祀木主，无祖宗也；称父老兄，称母老姊，无父子也”，^[17]这些严重违背中国传统礼法核心的教义与行为，绅民无法接受。“盖中国礼法自持，首重男女之别。而教士开堂传教，男女并受，嫌疑所在，重情难堪。”^[18]面对夷狄如此“野蛮”之教，当地绅民同仇敌忾：“东鲁义士为驱逐洋教，斩杀汉奸，以保乡闾。”^[19]天主教的传播，在当时兖州人看来，已使华夏文明面临危机：“其祸为生民以来所未有，其事为凡有血气所痛恨，而其

11 参见孙键飞Sun Jianfei, “夷夏之辨与中国古代礼法文化：以法社会学和法人类学为视角” Yixia zhibian yu zhongguo gudai lifa weihua: Yi fashexuixue he farenleixue wei shijiao [Distinction of Han and Minority Ethnic Groups and the Culture of Rites and Law in Ancient China], 载谢晖Xiehui、陈金钊Chen Jinzhao、蒋传光Jiang Chuanguang主编：《民间法》（第十七卷）Mingjianfa [Civil law] Vol. 17, (厦门Xiamen: 厦门大学出版社Xiamen daxue chubanshe [Xiamen University Press] 2016), 51-62页。

12 《孟子·滕文公上》Mengzi-tengwengong shang.

13 中国第一历史档案馆Zhongguo diyi lishi danganguan [China's First Historical Archive]、福建师范大学历史系Fujian shifan daxue lishixi [Fujian Normal University History Department] 合编，《清末教案》（第一册）Qingmo jiaoran [Anti Church Cases in Late Qing Dynasty] (Book 1), (北京Beijing: 中华书局Zhonghua shuju [Chung Hwa Book Co. ·] 1996), 223.

14 王明伦Wang minglun, 《反洋教书文揭帖选》Fan yangjiao shuwen jietie xuan [Anti-church Texts Anthology], (济南Jinan: 齐鲁书社Qilu Shushe [Qilu Press] 1984), 161; 台湾Taiwan “中央研究院近代史研究所” Zhongyang yanjiuyuan jindaishi yanjiusuo [Modern History Institute of Academia Sinica]: 《教务教案档》第五辑Jiaowu jiaoandang [Religion Affairs and Anti Church Cases Archives] Series V, 1977, 441.

15 同上书·Ibid, 第158页。

16 台湾Taiwan “中央研究院近代史研究所” Zhongyang yanjiuyuan jindaishi yanjiusuo [Modern History Institute of Academia Sinica]: 《教务教案档》第五辑Jiaowu jiaoandang [Religion Affairs and Anti Church Cases Archives] Series V, 1977, 414.

17 中国第一历史档案馆Zhongguo diyi lishi danganguan [China's First Historical Archive]、福建师范大学历史系Fujian shifan daxue lishixi [Fujian Normal University History Department] 合编，《清末教案》（第一册）Qingmo jiaoran [Anti Church Cases in Late Qing Dynasty] (Book 1), (北京Beijing: 中华书局Zhonghua shuju [Chung Hwa Book Co. ·] 1996), 220.

18 “兖州府滋阳县士民公呈” Yanzhoufu ziyangxian shimin gongcheng [The Gentlemen's Notification of Ziyang County, Yanzhou City]; 见台湾Taiwan “中央研究院近代史研究所” Zhongyang yanjiuyuan jindaishi yanjiusuo [Modern History Institute of Academia Sinica]: 《教务教案档》第五辑Jiaowu jiaoandang [Religion Affairs and Anti Church Cases Archives] Series V, 1977, 488.

19 同上书Ibid, 第414页。

耻尤非五胡乱华辽金弱宋所可比也。”^[20]然而，晚清儒生们对天主教的认识，是从明末儒生编撰的《破邪集》及反教人士编写的各种揭帖而来，这些内容大多荒诞不经，在今天看来是编撰者以极不健康的猥亵心理对天主教的刻意扭曲、抹黑，与天主教的真实情形相去万里。就连清总理衙门也承认：“至该处匿名揭帖，措辞失当，实非情理。已由本衙门行知山东巡抚，严飭遍行销毁，并妥为弹压矣。”^[21]

“夷夏之防”的心理代代相传，成为一种“集体无意识”，深深铭刻于华夏民族的心灵中。这种心理本能地主张自己文化的绝对性及普遍性，即绝对认为华夏文化是天下最先进的文化，同时也“意味着在它之外的文化模式是不可接受的”。^[22]到了清代，“朝野上下，益傲然自大”，^[23]甚至认为“出乎尧舜禹汤文武周公孔子之教之外，即入乎禽与兽之中”。^[24]过度地绝对化自己，不可避免地形成自我膨胀、鄙视他者心理，造成的后果是文化反思能力的丧失，既不能客观地认识自身，也不能理性地了解异域文化，也就不可能平等地与其他文化进行交流、对话乃至合作。时至清代，这种心理“对中国近代化产生了巨大的滞阻效应”，^[25]使得中国的发展大大落后于世界历史的进程。

(二) 共同体本位: 兖州教案发生的观念因素

在法律文化的层次结构中，法律意识居于法律心理和法律思想之间的过渡地带，其主要表现内容是法律观念。^[26]“共同体本位”的观念，是兖州教案发生的又一因素。“共同体”是“自我意识和共同利益方面具有同感的社会群体”，^[27]“本位”系指重心、基点、或立足点。在一特定的法律文化中，“法的本位”是指一定历史条件下“法律制度或法律文化的重点、基点、出发点或着眼点”。^[28]相对于西方法律文化注重个人权利

20 同上书 Ibid, 第414页。

21 廉立之Lian Lizhi、王守中Wang Shouzhong, 《山东教案史料》Shandong Jiaoran Shiliao [Shandong Anti-Church Historical Materials], (济南Jinan: 齐鲁书社Qilu Shushe [Qilu Press], 1980), 225.

22 张双志Zhang Shuangzhi, “文化的自身认同: 传统华夷之辨的文化解读” Wenhua de zisheng renting: chuantong huayi zhibian de wenhuajiedu [The Self-Identity of the Culture: Cultural Interpretation of Traditional Huayi Distinction], 载《天府新论》Tianfu xinlun [New Horizons from Tianfu] 2007年第2期。

23 萧一山Xiao Yishan, 《清代通史》(第二卷) Qingdai tongshi [General History of the Qing Dynasty] Vol.2, (上海Shanghai: 华东师范大学出版社Huadong shifan daxue chubanshe [East China Normal University Press], 2000), 788.

24 (清Qing) 蒋敦复Jiang Fudun, “论传教” Lun chuanjiao [On missionary]; 转引自王明伦Wang minglun, 《反洋教书文揭帖选》Fan yangjiao shuwen jietie xuan [Anti-church Texts Anthology], (济南Jinan: 齐鲁书社Qilu Shushe [Qilu Press] 1984), 32.

25 赵文静Zhao wenjing, “传统华夷观对中国近代化的滞阻” Chuantong huayiguan dui Zhongguo jindaihua de zhizu [The Traditional Huayi View is a Stagnant Hindrance to China's Modernization], 载《粤海风》Yuehaifeng [Guangdong Sea Breeze] 2002年第6期。

26 刘作翔Liu Zuoxiang, 《法律文化理论》Falv Wenhua Lilun [Legal Culture Theory], (北京Beijing: 商务印书馆Shangwu Yinshuguan [Commercial Press] 2004), 128.

27 [美]杰克·普拉诺 Jack Plano, 《政治学分析词典》Zhengzhixue fenxi cidian [Political Science Analysis Dictionary], 胡杰Hu Jie译·(北京Beijing: 中国社会科学出版社Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe [China Social Sciences Press], 1986), 24.

28 付子堂Fu Zitang、文正邦Wen Zhengbang, 《法理学高阶》Falixue gaojie [High-Level Jurisprudence], (北京Beijing: 高等教育出版社Gongdeng jiaoyu chubanshe [Higher Education Press], 2008), 244.

的“个体本位”，传统中国法律文化具有“群体本位”或“共同体本位”的价值趋向。在法律文化的“法律意识”层面，占核心地位的就是法律价值观，“法律价值观决定和支配着人们行为的趋向和选择”。^[29]“共同体本位”的价值取向，是兖州教案发生的观念因素。

首先，当地民人“契约自由”权受到限制。传教士安治泰购买“城东街吕锡光宅房一所”，双方就此买卖“已经说合”，也无“违背例禁”之情形。绅士汤诰、范宝真等人得知这桩交易后，“纠众拦阻”，^[30]并到处张贴照官版刊印的匿名揭帖，号召更多民众阻挠这一买卖行为。购买房屋属于民事行为，在民法中遵循“意思自治”等基本原则。无论是买方安治泰还是街民吕锡光，都是民法学原理中的“适格主体”，有权根据自己的意志设立、变更、消灭民事关系。“意思自治”原则强调主体的独立人格与理性能力，赋予民事主体决策与行动自由，自主地追求并实现利益的最大化，从而带动实现社会整体利益的最大化。“契约自由”是“意思自治”的重要体现，其具体形式包括双方行为自由、作为或不作为的自由、选择行为方式的自由、选择行为对象的自由、确定具体权利自由的自由等。当事人之外的其他人，对当事人的上述自由与权利都只能予以尊重和保护，而不能干涉和妨碍。兖州地方绅士“纠众不许”行为，损害、乃至剥夺了街民吕锡光和传教士安治泰的“契约自由权”，构成民事“侵权行为”。

其次，“物权的所有权”受到限制，所有权人不能行使所有权。传教士在兖州城里购买张宝干的一所房屋，并得到教民单春堂“奉献城宅一区”。正当主教派人前去修理准备入住，又被绅民发现。1887年8月21日，汤诰、范宝真等人“白昼纠众，封锁城门”，导致“所派修理教堂之人、卖主、中人等逃避”。绅民拆毁了单春堂的全部房宅，并将张宝干家门窗拉去，因张母声明此房“未许价卖”，才使房屋没有受到更多毁坏。^[31]

单春堂基于信仰“奉献”其房屋行为，在民法中属于“赠与合同”行为。赠与合同是赠与人将自己的财产无偿地给予受赠人，受赠人表示接受赠与的合同。赠与合同自当事人双方意思表示一致时成立，赠与人交付赠与物时起生效，传教士安治泰（实际是天主教会）显然获得了“奉献”房屋的所有权。^[32]即使兖州绅民认为“奉献”行为无效，房屋的所有权仍归教徒单春堂所有；无论如何，绅民将单春堂房宅“全部拆毁”，是损害物权的“侵权行为”。物权在民法原理中为“绝对权”，这种权利的义务主体是不特定的，又称“对世权”，即权利主体之外的任何人，都有义务尊重该权利的存在和行使；并且，该权利也无需通过义务人实施一定的行为即可实现。房屋所有权是典型的“物权”“绝

29 刘作翔Liu Zuoxiang,《法律文化理论》Falv Wenhua Lilun [Legal Culture Theory], (北京Beijing: 商务印书馆Shangwu Yinshuguan [Commercial Press]2004), 129.

30 廉立之Lian Lizhi、王守中Wang Shouzhong,《山东教案史料》Shandong Jiaoran Shiliao [Shandong Anti-Church Historical Materials], (济南Jinan: 齐鲁书社Qilu Shushe [Qilu Press], 1980),226.

31 同上书Ibid, 第221-222页。

32 在天主教中，信徒将部分财产捐赠给教会，是蒙天主祝福的行为（参加《圣经·申命记》14章·《玛拉基书》3章7~12节）。根据天主教法典，教会有权接受信徒捐赠的财物；参见[美]哈罗德·J·伯尔曼Harold J.Berman,《法律与革命：西方法律传统的形成》Falv yu geming:Xifang falv chuantong de xingcheng [Law and Revolution:the Formation of the Western Legal Tradition], 贺卫方He Weifang等译·(北京Beijing: 中国大百科全书出版社Zhongguo dabaikē quanshu chubanshe [Encyclopedia Publishing House] 1993), 293.

对权”“对世权”，权利人可以按照自己的意思对其进行占有、使用、收益与处分。但在兖州教案中，这种权利被当地绅民损害、剥夺了。同样，因为传教士购买张宝干的一所房屋，汤诰、范宝真等当地绅民“白昼纠众，封锁城门”，甚至去张宝干家“将门窗拉去”，是出于对权利人卖房行为的不满，实质既是对权利人“物权”这一“绝对权”的侵害，也是对权利人“契约权”这一“相对权”的妨碍。

19世纪的西方，普遍奉行“契约自由”原则，法国1804年就颁布了《法国民法典》，“契约自由”“财产权不可侵犯”是该法典及西方法的重要原则。但这些观念、原则在西风东渐中受到了晚清中国社会的抵制，这与当时中国社会“共同体本位”的价值取向有关，这从揭帖内容可以发现。《揭帖》公约：“以后境内房屋田地不准私卖，须由绅董查明，方准立约。”^[33]即当事人并不能自由地进行意思表示，其意思表示只有得到绅董检查、准许，契约合意过程才能继续进行。“绅董查明”的权力来自于“揭帖”的授权，揭帖是兖州绅民的“公意”，是兖州绅民“共同体”意志的体现。在卢梭的“社会契约”理论中，“众意”是众人个别意志的总和，总是相互冲突，而“公意”是众意中去掉了相抵触的部分，这个“公意”就是“法律”。^[34]兖州绅民没有学习过卢梭的契约理论，但他们行动的逻辑与卢梭理论高度契合。强调公意可以避免个人或少数人专制，但过分高扬公意往往忽略了少数人的权利，甚至会产生“集体暴政”的危险。^[35]在共同体的社会实践中，“既有以民间法、习惯法出现的原则、规范，又包含着以维护权益、解决纠纷为目的的行为模式、行动逻辑”；^[36]“揭帖”属于“乡规民约”型的民间法，其原则不是保障“意思自治”与“权利自由”，“共同体”整体的利益才是当地民众要维护的内容。这里的“共同体利益”并非是物质性的，而是“文化认同”“心理感受”等精神层面的。对于违背规约者，绅民用非常严厉、残酷的手段进行制裁，通过极端野蛮的“治理机制”，防范地方共同体面临的文化风险，维护共同体既往的文化格局。

(三) 公议排教：兖州教案发生的规范因素

法律规范是法律意识形态的集中体现。^[37]当一个社会占主导地位的法律意识，用明确的规则形式表现时，法律规范就产生出来；法律规范规定和制约着社会成员的行为方向，是社会成员必须遵守的行为模式和行为准则。兖州教案中，当地绅民为抵制天主教传播，

33 台湾Taiwan“中央研究院近代史研究所”Zhongyang yanjiuyuan jindaishi yanjiusuo [Modern History Institute of Academia Sinica]:《教务教案档》第五辑Jiaowu jiaoadang [Religion Affairs and Anti Church Cases Archives] Series V, 1977, 414.

34 [法]卢梭Jean-Jacques Rousseau,《社会契约论》Shehui qiyue lun [Social Contract Theory], 何兆武He Zhaowu译, (北京Beijing: 商务印书馆Shangwu yinshuguan [Commercial Press], 2005), 35、47.

35 参见魏胜强Wei Shengqiang,《西方法律思想史》Xifang falv sixiangshi [History of Western Legal Thought], (北京Beijing: 北京大学出版社Beijing daxue chubanshe [Peking University Press], 2014), 116.

36 易江波Yi Jiangbo,“共同体：中国传统法律文化的一个重要属性”Gongtongti:Zhongguo chuantong falvwenhua de yige zhongyao shuxing [Community: An Important Attribute of Chinese Traditional Legal Culture], 载《湖北警官学院学报》Hubei jingguan xueyuan xuebao [Journal of Hubei University of Police] 2009年第4期。

37 刘作翔Liu Zuoxiang,《法律文化理论》Falv Wenhua Lilun [Legal Culture Theory], (北京Beijing: 商务印书馆Shangwu Yinshuguan [Commercial Press] 2004), 138.

经过“众人合议”，制定、颁布“揭帖”的行为，实为“民间立法”。以法律文化理论观之，就是将“华夷之防”“共同体本位”等心理、意识，上升为法规范的过程。“揭帖”规范在兖州具有权威性和约束力，当地社会成员必须遵守，否则就给予制裁：

一、愚民有卖给洋鬼暨汉奸房屋田地者，我绅民即率众将该民寸磔，继将房屋烧毁，田地抉成数十丈深坑。

一、愚民有卖给洋鬼食物者，即割耳示众。

一、愚民有容留洋鬼住宿者，即割耳示众，并将房屋烧坏。

一、跟随洋鬼之中国人，明系汉奸，为洋鬼耳目。即将此等汉奸拴住挖眼割耳，再为议处。

一、洋鬼入境，除拿其跟随汉奸外，即率众将洋鬼逐出境外。如该鬼抗拒，即将该鬼毆死，同深(伸)义愤。^[38]

特定的立法、执法思维方式，体现出特定的法律文化特征；思维方式的差异，是造成法律文化差异的一个重要原因。相对于“理性”“逻辑”我们今天所熟知的法律思维而言，兖州绅民公议立法的思维，呈现出鲜明的“情感”特征。^[39]

首先，兖州绅民揭帖立法是出于强烈的情感动机。从揭帖的内容来看，“查天主教起自欧罗巴洲，蔓延中国”为绅民对天主教之“担忧”；“其教义弃伦灭理，禽兽不如”为绅民对天主教之“厌恶”；“又有孽术能配蒙汗药，迷拐童男童女，剖心挖眼，以为配药点银之用”，为绅民对天主教之“恐惧”；“尤复好行强横，唯利是图，以夺人之国为奇功，占人之土为豪举，淫人妻女为智略”，为绅民对天主教之“忿怒”；“嗟乎！愚民无知受其蛊惑，只知有利，不知有害。岂知其教以利为饵，迨入其牢笼，奸淫斩杀，任其所为，欲自拔而不能”，^[40]由于有人而皈依天主教，绅民因而产生“伤悲”。在这种号召民众“绝”天主教在兖州传播的“立法说明”中，所用词语几乎都极富感情色彩。传教士是“洋鬼”，其教义“禽兽不如”，传教士传教动机则是怀叵测之“淫人妻女”“剖心挖眼”，绅民立约是“以伸义愤”。揭帖多以口号式、标签式话语表达，通篇都浸透着浓烈的主观情感，极少有理性的论证分析。这些内容，对兖州百姓产生巨大影响；众多平民正是在这些反教言论的熏陶下产生了反教打教的动机。可见，兖州民间的打教“立法”，正是出于强烈的主观情感而产生。

其次，兖州绅民对教士教民的处置方式，使揭帖规范呈现明显的情感性。纠纷解决中诉诸直觉的正义观念和朴素的公正意识，依靠自力救济、情感的大众司法，是法的情

38 台湾Taiwan“中央研究院近代史研究所”Zhongyang yanjiuyuan jindaishi yanjiusuo [Modern History Institute of Academia Sinica]:《教务教案档》第五辑Jiaowu jiaolandang [Religion Affairs and Anti Church Cases Archives] Series V, 1977, 414.

39 相对于理性思维，情感思维具有“情思融合”“情为主导”“情与象联”等特点，其根本思维方法是“自我调节情感的情感性想象”；参见肖君和Xiao Junhe,“情感思维逻辑论纲”Qinggan siwei luoji lungang [On Emotional Thinking Logic],载《佛山科学技术学院学报》(社会科学版)Foshan kexue jishu xueyuan xuebao [Journal of Foshan University (Social Science Edition)] 2015年第4期。

40 台湾Taiwan“中央研究院近代史研究所”Zhongyang yanjiuyuan jindaishi yanjiusuo [Modern History Institute of Academia Sinica]:《教务教案档》第五辑Jiaowu jiaolandang [Religion Affairs and Anti Church Cases Archives] Series V, 1977, 414.

感性的通常表现形式。^[41]传教士、教民的言论和行为在违背民间法的同时，也伤害了中国绅民的感情，引起中国绅民的反感、愤怒，于是绅民主动出击进行排教、打教；清代的绝大多数教案，均由中国绅民主动挑起。^[42]兖州教案也不例外；案发伊始，绅民得知传教士置买房宅，不是去寻求正式的“公力救济”，而是在激愤中立即对洋人进行了判决并且迅速进入了“判决执行程序”，纠众毁坏房屋。至于自身是否适格的审判主体和执行主体，判决执行的时间、场合、方式等是否合适，这些法律程序问题，民众根本意识不到。刑罚残酷是法的情感性的极端表现形式之一。^[43]《揭帖》中的制裁措施，如卖给洋人房屋田地者，将面临“率众将该民寸磔，继将房屋烧毁，田地抉成数十丈深坑”等惩罚；有卖给洋人食物者，即“割耳示众”；对于容留洋人住宿者，“即割耳示众，并将房屋烧坏”；对于“跟随洋鬼之中国人”，将面临“挖眼割耳”。其制裁方式，不乏夏商时代的野蛮“肉刑”，即便在中国本土传统法律文化中，也绝非文明之举。情感脱离理性的指导和约束，会使人走向偏激；极端的爱恨情仇会产生巨大的驱动力，使人的意志作出极端化的决定。兖州民间的这些刑罚措施，缺乏起码的罪责刑相适应的理性因素，皆是出于对天主教的极端厌恶情感而设立。

必须指出，兖州绅民“公议”立法中的情感，属于“负面情感”。在“心理类型理论”中属于“内倾情感型”，^[44]是“消极的文化心理”之展现。“消极的文化心理具有狭隘自闭性特点，对于外来文化，一概予以排斥，缺乏放之四海的眼光，不愿接纳本民族文化以外的任何文化成果”；^[45]因此，不利于与外来文化的互动、交流。

三、兖州教案处理过程之法律文化解析

教案是发生在晚清涉及中外的“民教纠纷”，教案的处理属于“纠纷解决”的法学范畴，其解纷机制同样包括解纷主体、解纷依据、解纷方式等诸多法理要素。^[46]兖州教案的解决主体，前期为总理衙门与法国公使，后期为总理衙门与德国公使，其纠纷解决模

41 高鸿钧Gao Hongjun,《现代法治的出路》Xiandai fazhi de chulu [The way out of modern rule of law], (北京Beijing: 清华大学出版社Qinghua daxue chubanshe [Tsinghua University Press], 2003),44、50.

42 陈银崑Chen Yinkun,《清季民教冲突的量化分析(1860—1899)》Qingji minjiao chongtu de lianghua fenxi [Quantitative Analysis of Civil and Religious Conflicts in the Qing Dynasty (1860—1899)], (台北Taipei: 台湾商务印书馆 Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan [Taiwan Commercial Press], 1985), 13.

43 高鸿钧Gao Hongjun,《现代法治的出路》Xiandai fazhi de chulu [The Way Out of Modern Rule of Law], (北京Beijing: 清华大学出版社Qinghua daxue chubanshe [Tsinghua University Press], 2003), 46.

44 在荣格的“心理类型理论”中，人的心理活动有感觉、思维、情感和直觉四种基本机能。感觉（感官知觉）告诉你存在着某种东西；思维告诉你它是什么；情感告诉你它是否令人满意；而直觉则告诉你它来自何方和向何处去。按照两种态度类型与四种机能的组合，荣格描述了性格的八种机能类型。其中，“内倾情感型”（the introverted feeling type）这种类型的人，既是内倾的，又是偏向于情感功能的，其情感由内在的主观因素所激发，思维压抑，情感深藏在内心，沉默，力图保持隐蔽状态，其气质常常是忧郁的。

45 李晓峰Li Xiaofeng,“论文化心理的类型及其情感表现”Lun Wenhua xinli de leixing jiqi qinggan biao xian [On the Types of Cultural Mentality and Their Affective States], 载《渭南师范学院学报》Weinan shifan xueyuan xuebao [Journal of Weinan Teachers College]2002年第4期。

46 范愉Fan Yu,《纠纷解决的理论与实践》Jiufeng jie jue de lilun yu shijian [Theory and Practice of Dispute Resolution], (北京Beijing: 清华大学出版社Qinghua daxue chubanshe [Tsinghua University Press], 2007), 81.

式不是严格的司法审判，而是通过双方“协商谈判”的方式进行。值得关注的是，兖州教案的处理，在解纷理念、解纷依据、解纷风格等方面，彰显出中西法律文化之不同。

(一) “一元独尊”与“多元共存”：教案处理的理念不同

理念是社会集体观念系统中最深层次的、关于某种行为价值标准或终极目的的信念，韦伯形容“理念所创造的‘世界观’常常以扳道工的身份规定着轨道，在这些轨道上，利益的动力驱动着行动。”^[47]“解纷理念”，就是“社会中大多数人对解纷标准、解纷目的等问题的根本看法或信念，它支配或决定着解纷行为或解纷机制的样式，在纠纷解决中的适用往往优先于实在规范的适用。”^[48]兖州教案的协商处理中，中方认为，“孔教所在之处，洋教绝对不能进来”，秉持“一元独尊”的文化理念。法方秉持“文化多元”主张，认为“天主教进入孔教所在之地，不会伤害孔教，多种宗教文化可以在一地并存”，因此传教士具有在孔教之地的传教自由权。

不同文化之间的冲突，如“世界文化与民族文化、文化同质与文化异质、一元文化与多元文化等，都是文化普遍主义与文化相对主义矛盾的不同表现形式”。^[49]兖州教案中，中方绅民持“一元文化”观，是文化普遍主义乃至“自我文化绝对主义”的体现。

乃现有洋鬼窜入东鲁，引诱愚民，欲买地建堂，肆其淫凶，荼毒我民，独不思我鲁为圣人之地，秉礼之邦，家读孔孟之书，人多英雄之选，岂肯任从愚民受其蛊惑，害我桑梓，将何颜立天地间，见天下士哉！为此沥血布告阖郡乡谊，同伸大义，门户绸缪，斩杀奸，以靖内乱，驱逐洋教，以靖外忧。^[50]

兖州为“圣人之地，秉礼之邦”，是绝对高级、绝对圣洁、绝对正确、绝对先进文化的所在地，洋教的进入，会玷污、破坏这一绝对文化的完整和美好，因此绅民坚决抵制。兖州所辖亚圣府孟氏与邹邑绅民也“公议”：“道统所关亦大矣，唐虞开之，孔孟承之，春秋战国之时，若无孔孟，则道统不存。今洋教蜂起之日，亦道统存亡之际也。”^[51]“道统”对儒家士人而言是神圣不可侵犯的。任何文化，如果对“道统”有妨碍，就要坚决排拒。总理衙门照会法国公使，也持同样观点：

47 [德] 马克斯·韦伯Max Weber,《儒教与道教》Rujiao yu daojiao [Konfuzianismus and Taoismus], (北京Beijing: 商务印书馆Shangwu yinshuguan [Commercial Press], 1995), 19-20.

48 陈会林Chen Huilin,《地缘社会解纷机制研究》Diyuan shehui jiefeng jizhi yanjiu [Research on the Mechanism of Geo-Social Conflict Resolution], (北京Beijing: 中国政法大学出版社Zhongguo zhengfa daxue chubanshe [China University of Political Science and Law Press], 2009), 311.

49 张谨Zhang Jin,“文化普遍主义与文化相对主义及其现实张力” Wenhua pubian zhuyi yu wenhua xiangdui zhuyi jiqi xianshi zhangli [Cultural Universalism and Cultural Relativism and Their Realistic Tensions], 载《湖南社会科学》Hunan shehui kexue [Hunan Social Sciences] 2013年第4期。

50 台湾Taiwan“中央研究院近代史研究所” Zhongyang yanjiuyuan jindaishi yanjiusuo [Modern History Institute of Academia Sinica]:《教务教案档》第五辑Jiaowu jiaodang [Religion Affairs and Anti Church Cases Archives] Series V, 1977, 414.

51 “邹县绅民揭帖告白” Zouxian shenmin jietie gaobai [The Gentlemen's Confessions of Zou County]; 参见王明伦 Wang minglun,《反洋教文书揭帖选》Fan yangjiao shuwen jietie xuan [Anti-church Texts Anthology], (济南Jinan: 齐鲁书社Qilu Shushe [Qilu Press] 1984), 160.

缘中国从孔圣之教，备极尊崇。兖州系属孔圣故里，为儒教根本之地。若欲在该处建立教堂，非但本地人忿忿不平，即天下之人亦必闻而惊骇。……贵大臣素悉中国风俗，崇奉孔圣，万众同心。兖州建堂系属大拂人情之举，势不能行。务望转嘱安教士，不必再作此议，徒费口舌。^[52]

兖州为“孔圣故里”“儒教根本之地”，异质文化是不能进入的。“儒教”已经深深浸染当地人的心灵神经，一旦被触碰，就会使他们“闻而惊骇”乃至“忿忿不平”。在他们心目中，儒家与天主教是截然对立、有我无你、非此即彼的。如果“耶稣之说流行”，则“孔圣之道不作”。^[53]这种一元文化观是“文化绝对主义所标榜的同质化、理想化的文化存在，是以普遍主义为思想基础的文化观。”^[54]而在文化人类学中，“普遍主义(universalism)是指这样一种思想方式和行为方式，它主张最有价值的东西可以作为命题而得到直接表达，而且这种价值总可以、并且总应该被普遍地推广，或者说被普遍化，形成一种对所有有关现象都无差别地有效的‘标准’”。^[55]儒家文化的确具有“普遍主义”因素，尤其是“孔子仁学的确立，把中国文化与历史带进了对普遍性原则和普遍主义理念的自觉与承担”。^[56]但过分沉溺于自身文化的“普遍有效性”，会形成“夜郎自大”心理，甚至因此排斥甚至敌视其他族群的文化，从而会走向文化封闭主义，阻碍文化间的正常交流。兖州绅民以及总理衙门面对天主教传播捍卫儒教“一元独尊”的反应，正是这种文化心理的表现。

欧洲自经历文艺复兴、宗教改革、启蒙运动后，文化样态已经从中世纪的“神学一元”走向“文化多元”。“一元独尊”的文化观对西方人而言已经不能接受。法国公使李梅照会总理衙门：

在贵国崇奉孔圣，上自儒家，下至民人，万众同心，本大臣早已知之。且泰西各国亦以孔教为贵重。而我传教士在中国广置学堂，教学生四书五经，即崇奉孔圣所由来也。惟中国百姓匪独奉习儒教，即另有他教，已由国家一体准行。譬如就兖州而论，释道二教各有庙宇，为数已多。而回回一教亦可建有礼拜寺一二。是乃贵王大臣及本大臣素所深知也。查释回二教亦属肇自西方。如在兖城三教寺庙外，另建一天主堂，贵王

52 廉立之Lian Lizhi、王守中Wang Shouzhong,《山东教案史料》Shandong Jiaoran Shiliao [Shandong Anti-Church Historical Materials], (济南Jinan: 齐鲁书社Qilu Shushe [Qilu Press], 1980), 225.

53 中国第一历史档案馆Zhongguo diyi lishi dangangan [China's First Historical Archive]、福建师范大学历史系Fujian shifan daxue lishixi [Fujian Normal University History Department]合编，《清末教案》(第一册) Qingmo jiaoran [Anti Church Cases in Late Qing Dynasty] (Book 1), (北京Beijing: 中华书局Zhonghua shuju [Chung Hwa Book Co. .] 1996), 223.

54 张欢Zhang Huan,“多元文化主义的概念辨析” Duoyuan wenhua zhuyi de gainian bianxi [An Analysis of The Concept of Multiculturalism], 载《理论与现代化》Lilun yu xiandaihua [THEORY AND MODERNIZATION] 2018年第6期。

55 张祥龙Zhang Xianglong,“儒家哲理特征与文化间对话:普遍主义还是非普遍主义” Ruxue zheli tezheng yu wenhua jian duihua:Pubian zhuyi haishi fei pubian zhuyi [The Philosophical Feature of Confucianism and Its Position in the Inter- Cultural Dialogue: Universalism or Non- Universalism], 载《求是学刊》Qiushi xuekan [SEEKING TRUTH] 2008年第1期。

56 徐治道Xu Zhidao,“中国文化的普遍主义精神与普遍主义使命:专访黄裕生教授” Zhongguo wenhua de pubian zhuyi jingshen yu pubian zhuyi shiming [Universal Spirit and Universal Mission of Chinese Culture Interview with Professor Huang Yusheng], 载《江苏行政学院学报》Jiangsu xingzheng xueyuan xuebao [Journal of Jiangsu Administration Institute] 2016年第2期。

大臣想兖郡居民以及天下之人何至而惊骇？倘系愚民全不知天下之事，无从见闻面作此论，本大臣则能原谅。然贵衙门公文亦有此论，是本大臣万难逆料者也。^[57]

法使知晓中国普遍奉行儒家文化，并表示西方各国对儒家文化也非常尊重。不但如此，传教士在中国传教时，也“广置学堂，教学生四书五经”；也就是说，“儒”和“耶”并不截然对立，彼此相容是能够实现的。“文化多元”不仅可以存在于儒耶之间，也能存在于儒家与其他宗教文化之间。就在兖州，不仅“释道”二教的庙宇“为数已多”，而且“回回一教”的清真寺也存在一二，事实证明多元的文化形态多年来在兖州和平共处、相安无事，如果天主教进入兖州，不可能引起民众“惊骇”。在“多元文化主义者看来，按照普遍主义原则建立起来的一元文化，只不过是虚假的、纯粹统一性的文化幻相。”^[58]“文化多元”体现的是“文化相对主义”，认为不同文化没有高低优劣之分，主张不同文化间应相互尊重，不能用一种文化的是非标准去衡量另一种文化。而普遍主义的文化观，尽管可以保证多数人权利的实现，但容易忽视群体中的少数人或少数人群体差别性的权利诉求。法国公使处理教案的理念是“文化多元”，不同意清政府“文化一元独尊”的纠纷处理理念。

(二) “舆情人心”与“条约权利”：教案处理的依据不同

纠纷解决的依据，既包括法律规则和原则，也包括所谓“软法”，以及传统习惯、自治规范等民间社会规范。^[59]在兖州教案的协商处理中，西方公使立足于条约、大清律典等正式法律，为传教士主张诉求。而总理衙门立足于“人心”“人情”“舆情”等“社会规范”，抵制西方的传教诉求。

1860年《中法北京条约》的签订，标志着清政府禁教政策的结束，开始实现“宽容”的天主教政策；该条约是清代天主教政策的重大转折点，其第6款规定：

应如道光二十六年正月二十五日上谕，即颁示天下黎民，任各处军民人等传习天主教，会合讲道、建堂、礼拜，且将滥行查拿者予以应得处分，又将前谋害奉天主教者之时所充天主堂、学堂、莹坟、田土、房廊等件应赔还，交法国驻扎京师之钦差大臣，转交该处奉教之人，并任法国传教士在各省租买田地，建造自便。^[60]

按照这一条款，中国人信仰天主教的权利主体范围为“各处军民人等”，非常广泛，信仰权利范围为“传习天主教，会合讲道、建堂、礼拜”，不仅有“信教”的权利，而且有“传教”“建堂”的权利。条约“任法国传教士在各省租买田地，建造自

57 廉立之Lian Lizhi、王守中Wang Shouzhong,《山东教案史料》Shandong Jiaonan Shiliao [Shandong Anti-Church Historical Materials], (济南Jinan: 齐鲁书社Qilu Shushe [Qilu Press],1980), 227-228.

58 张欢Zhang Huan,“多元文化主义的概念辨析”Duoyuan wenhua zhuyi de gainian bianxi [An Analysis of The Concept of Multiculturalism],载《理论与现代化》Lilun yu xiandaihua [THEORY AND MODERNIZATION] 2018年第6期。

59 范愉Fan Yu,《纠纷解决的理论与实践》Jiufeng jie jue de lilun yu shijian [Theory and Practice of Dispute Resolution], (北京Beijing:清华大学出版社Qinghua daxue chubanshe [Tsinghua University Press], 2007), 91.

60 王铁崖Wang Tieya,《中外旧约章汇编》(第一册) Zhongwai jiu yue zhang huibian [old treaties Collection between China and foreign country (Book I)], (北京Beijing:生活·读书·新知三联书店Sanlian shudian [Life, Reading, New Knowledge Triple Bookstore], 1957), 147.

便”这一内容只在中文文本中出现，法文文本中没有；但咸丰帝对条约中文文本的批示是：“所有和约内所定各条，均著逐款允准，。。。。。。其各约内应行各事宜，即著通行各督抚大吏，一体按照办理。”^[61]所以清政府对这一条款明确予以承认，意味着从此传教士获得了在中国内地租买田地房产、建盖教堂等与传教有关的所有权利。

1886年9月，安治泰在兖州预备传教，遭到了当地绅士民众的抵制。1888年1月，法国公使李梅就此提出交涉，陈明“外国人之来中国，系彼此互订条约所明载者也”，兖州传教“应由该处官吏先行设法保护，以符条约，而遵照谕旨所明言，准天主教遍传各省者也”，请求总理衙门“飭令华人照约办理”。^[62]对此，总理衙门予以拒绝，理由是兖州为“孔圣故里”，是“儒教根本之地”，在兖州建教堂“系属大拂人情之举”，因此“势不能行。”^[63]法国公使重申其诉求的依据：“本大臣查天主教流行中国，通准奉习，无所查禁一节，系遵照我两国叠立和约，及所奉贵国上谕载明而行。”^[64]即根据两国订立的条约和大清皇帝上谕，传教士有在兖州传教的权利。总理衙门承认“传教之无所查禁，刊布条约也已通行”，并不否认条约及上谕这些“法律”存在的事实，但提出西方传教士来华“为时未久”，如果要让天主教顺利传播，“总宜默体人情，逐渐推施，不可加以强迫”。^[65]也就是中方不是不履行义务，而是因为民众“人情”这一“特殊国情”，不能立刻履行，需要“逐渐推施”；否则，就是对中方民众进行了“强迫”。

1888年3月，针对总理衙门的照会，法使李梅进行了反驳：“查条约，各省地方官早已通行晓谕，...前者通行之示，未见成效，百姓似乎未悉，致遭近变”，认为百姓排教，是因为中方官员没有对民众履行条约及上谕内容的告知义务。“查贵国遇有法则例禁，某某条某某处百姓未能遵照，则地方官因之出示申明，往往有之。条约及上谕亦应如此为妥。前者每有如此复行出示，不无成效”，如果百姓知道条约权利义务内容，“人情”就会改变；因此法国公使敦促总理衙门，“亟应在该处复行出示晓谕，俾咸周知”，否则，“咎由所应归矣”。针对总理衙门认为传教士没有考虑民情、强行传教，李梅不予认可：“至司铎传教，果系先体人情”，对“不愿入教者”，没有“加以强迫”，传教士“谨遵上谕及条约流行，遇有违者滋事，即亦查照请办”，是正常行使法律权利的行为，“其请照约办理，非所谓强迫他人也。”而且“民人不止万万，传教士祇以数百计”，怎么可能“以力强人”？传教士“所盼望者，勿被他人强迫而已”。^[66]

总理衙门坚持“民情特殊”论，认为“民情”是不可改变的。“查兖济两属人民既不信西教，非口舌所能开导。教士虽有劝善之心，譬尤盲人而语以黑白，聋者而语以音律，亦属徒劳”，坚持不允许传教士在兖州传教。并且提出“安教士等于该处绅民屡相齟齬”，要求法国公使“转飭该教士等，未可再往兖济两处传教，免致别生事端，以敦

61 《筹办夷务始末》(咸丰朝)，卷六十七。Chouban yiwu shimo [Preparation for foreign-related affairs] (Xianfeng Dynasty), Vol. 67.

62 廉立之Lian Lizhi、王守中Wang Shouzhong, 《山东教案史料》Shandong Jiaoran Shiliao [Shandong Anti-Church Historical Materials], (济南Jinan: 齐鲁书社Qilu Shushe [Qilu Press], 1980), 222.

63 同上书 Ibid, 第225页。

64 同上书 Ibid, 第225页。

65 同上书 Ibid, 第229页。

66 同上书 Ibid, 第231页。

睦谊，而固邦交”，即民教纠纷的责任在于传教士。传教士不去兖州，一切太平；传教士一去兖州，不仅“别生事端”，而且中法之间的“睦谊”“邦交”都受影响。总理衙门同意“行知山东巡抚，飭令该处地方官，申明定约，再行出示晓谕”，但同时“相应照会贵大臣，转饬该主教等，暂勿前往该两处传教可也。”^[67]说到底，总理衙门承认条约的存在，但拒绝履行条约义务，坚持不允许传教士前往兖州传教。

1890年11月，德国取得了在华天主教的保教权。兖州教案这一纠纷的处理，于是改由中德双方协商处理。1890年12月，德国公使巴兰德照会总理衙门，“山东南界德国天主教堂被人欺凌”，要求清政府“望照条约保护”。^[68]总理衙门故调重弹：“中国崇奉儒教，兖州系属孔圣故里，为儒教根本之地”，如果在兖州建教堂，就会“人情惊骇”，兖州传教一事“势必难行”。^[69]认为传教士意在“广行西教”，“亦须因地而施，不别强人所不愿”，对传教士的呆板、固执、不会变通表示不满，“望转饬安教士不必再作此议”，^[70]拒绝德方根据条约提出的要求。不但如此，总理衙门还反守为攻，规劝德使巴兰德遵从中方的“人情逻辑”：“贵大臣久住中华，于风俗人情，又所深悉，谅必能开导教士，遇事和平商办，可免多少周折，庶昭睦谊。”^[71]巴兰德认为，总理衙门自身就对天主教缺乏尊重，“地方居民见贵署如此，必以为中国轻视天主教，民间即可欺凌”，作为处理中西事务最高机关的总理衙门，如果对传教士“如分以待”，中国民间对传教士自然“一律相看”，并且坚持认为“山东南界教堂之事，实能按约所开”，要求中方履行条约义务，“凡在中国者或崇奉或传习天主教之人，皆全获保佑身家，其会同礼拜诵经等事，概听其便。”^[72]

为了迟迟不能落实的教士权利得以实现，1891年1月，德国领事司良德“坚执己见”，抱着“非得地不去”^[73]的决心亲赴兖州，但刚到兖州城外就吃了闭门羹，当地绅民很快聚集，喊打叫杀，司良德只得无功而返。德国公使为此提出交涉，总理衙门的解释是，“连日绅民聚议，四散流言，...惟人心固结，众怒难犯，实属防不胜防”，“民情”如此，“人心”如此，“官法已穷，保护即无把握”，^[74]对德方提出的条约请求表示爱莫能助。

1893年，在搁置一年多之后，德国公使再次提出兖州教案之解决，要求中方遵守自己的法令：“不遵国家之使令，即与煌煌谕旨不符”，即使根据中国最高法律“上谕”，“岂有任意煽惑人心，攻逐洋教之理？”^[75]要求清政府切实履行法律义务。总理衙门继续以“人心”“舆情”为由加以拒绝：“诚以兖州府所属皆遵奉孔圣人之教，已历千百

67 同上书 Ibid, 第232页。

68 同上书 Ibid, 第235页。

69 同上书 Ibid, 第235页。

70 同上书 Ibid, 第236页。

71 同上书 Ibid, 第237页。

72 同上书 Ibid, 第238页。

73 同上书 Ibid, 第238页。

74 同上书 Ibid, 第238页。

75 同上书 Ibid, 第252页。

年之久，地近曲阜，并不愿崇奉他教，人心固执，地方官亦不能强拂輿情。”^[76]在德国强占胶州湾之前，兖州教案的处理始终是各说各话，没有进展。

(三) “明法”主张与“暗法”应对: 教案处理的风格不同

如前文所述，西方国家公使、领事在解决兖州教案之纠纷时，依据的是与清政府正式签署的条约；条约有正式的文本，权利义务内容非常明确。如德国公使认为，“在教士入境时交验的护照上写着，他们无论在哪里传教和兴建教堂，都是受到保护的”；^[77]而清政府一直坚持传教士不能前往兖州传教，因为兖州是孔子故里，“情况特殊”，应作例外处理。德方认为“在早先订立的协定（条约）上没有写着这样例外的情况”，^[78]法无禁止则自由，“若谓兖州府城可不以条约为例，按实在情形，绝无此理”。^[79]西方公使为传教士主张权利诉求的依据就是条约，其解决纠纷的模式是“明法主张”，纠纷的解决在于切实履行条约的权利义务，是“法律化处理”纠纷的风格体现。

晚清官员清楚地知道“天主、耶稣两教久为外国所宗，其意主于劝善，自与邪说不同。条约准其流传，并为保护”，^[80]但他们并不想履行条约义务。在1895年保护教堂上谕颁布之前，清政府对天主教实际采取的是“不禁之禁”政策。早在1867年，面临即将到来的十年修约，总理衙门针对西方各国可能提出的修约内容，拟定谈判计划并上奏同治皇帝。同治帝命令各地督抚对谈判计划进行共同商议，传教问题是谈判的内容之一。奕訢等总理衙门大臣先后提出数种限制传教的办法，但均觉不妥。最后，总理衙门总结说：

天主教之入中国，与佛道二家相等，若照僧道设官以治之，未始非权变之策，而究竟不无流弊，且令天下以引入天主教为口实，更属非宜。抱人心风俗之忧，而存补偏救弊之念，惟有平日联络绅民，阳为抚循而阴为化导。或启其误，或破其奸，是亦不禁之禁也。^[81]

这种法律文本与实际行动截然相反的“二元化”主张，得到了地方大员的普遍赞同；如闽浙总督吴棠就限制传教一事上奏皇帝，“诚如专指，惟有联络绅民，阳为抚循，阴为化导，不禁之禁之一法也。”^[82]隔日不久，湖广总督李鸿章也上奏：

76 同上书 Ibid, 第253页。

77 同上书 Ibid, 第285页。

78 同上书 Ibid, 第285页。

79 同上书 Ibid, 第247页。

80 中国第一历史档案馆Zhongguo diyi lishi dangangan [China's First Historical Archive]、福建师范大学历史系Fujian shifan daxue lishixi [Fujian Normal University History Department]合编，《清末教案》（第二册）Qingmo jiaoran [Anti Church Cases in Late Qing Dynasty] (Book 2), (北京Beijing: 中华书局Zhonghua shuju [Chung Hwa Book Co. ·] 1998), 471.

81 《筹办夷务始末》（同治朝），卷五十。Chouban yiwu shimo [Preparation for foreign-related affairs] (Tongzhi Dynasty), Vol. 50.

82 Ibid.

各省多毁堂阻教之案，足见民心士气之可恃，而邪教不能以惹众也。……因习教而纵奸徒，固为地方之隐患。因传教而召党类，尤藏异日之祸根。惟法人以传教为业，久立专条。只有明为保护，密为防闲。督抚大吏慎选牧令，以教养为亟，实行保甲以别淑慝，崇礼明德以资劝化，多设善堂以赈困乏也，此治本之说也。^[83]

显然，晚清朝廷对天主教在中国传播，从内心并不认可，之所以以条约形式同意，实为无奈之举，是清政府应对西方国家的“权变之策”。如果天主教真的传行中国，会有“人心风俗之忧”。解决这种忧患的途径，就是“平日联络绅民”，形成广泛的反教主体。众意难违，众怒难犯，用“民心士气”抵制洋教传播是行之有效的办法。同时，通过绅士民众“唇”天主教之“误”，“破”天主教之“奸”，于是就有了各地绅民的反教揭帖，其间充满了鞭挞天主教的各种“误”“奸”的内容。清政府对天主教的具体政策是表面保护，实质抵制。具体的反教模式是：“官方暗示→绅士策划→民众实施→官方默许”。

这样，条约“文本上的法”是“传教信教自由”，实际“行动中的法”却是“抵制传教信教”，形成“明法”与“暗法”、“明规则”与“潜规则”实际并存的“双轨制”或“二元化”法制状况。“暗法”或“潜规则”体现着高层权力者的真实意志，地方官对此心领神会，实际的执法就是“悖条约”而“顺上意”。兖州教案，典型地体现了这种法律文化特征。“山东兖郡绅民均愿传教，惟地方官支吾不允”，^[84]无论是法国公使还是德国公使，都发现大清官员才是教案的根本起因。安治泰去兖州与地方官协商谈判时，“居住客店有人粘贴揭帖，地方官所派护勇毫不查禁”，以致当地士绅“煽惑人心，借端滋事”。^[85]在约定的谈判地点，地方官员有意拖延时间，“直拖到群众在外面集合起来”，任凭群体性排教骚乱发生。在整个“官僚的闹剧”中，“满清官员的角色都扮得很好”，他们吃惊地面面相觑，好像对骚动“根本没有料到”；然而诸多细节表明，知府“是这整个事件货真价实的主谋”，^[86]归根到底，排教骚乱“责在该道，毫无疑义”。^[87]如果说“政治”在“本质上是权力通过任何的手段，达到所期望的结果的能力”，^[88]晚清官员对于教案的处理，采取的是“政治斗争”的策略，是通过“制造纠纷”来“解决纠纷”，^[89]其解纷模式是“政治化处理”，迥异于西方法德官员的“法律化处理”。

83 Ibid.

84 廉立之Lian Lizhi、王守中Wang Shouzhong,《山东教案史料》Shandong Jiaoran Shiliao [Shandong Anti-Church Historical Materials], (济南Jinan: 齐鲁书社Qilu Shushe [Qilu Press], 1980), 258.

85 同上书Ibid, 第261页。

86 同上书Ibid, 第288-289页。

87 同上书Ibid, 第261页。

88 [英]安德鲁·海伍德Andrew Heywood,《政治学》Zhengzhixue [Politics], 张立鹏Zhang Lipeng译, (北京Beijing: 中国人民大学出版社Zhongguo Renmin daxue chubanshe [China Renmin University Press], 2006), 13.

89 其他西方国家人士也发现，诸多教案是由清朝官绅人为策划而起。1882年，处理济南教案的美署使何天爵直言不讳地指出：“中国无论何处之民，若无人耸动，无不与洋人相安，待之以情理。”这位美署使在中国生活了十三年之久，对民教纠纷的前因后果非常了解，在照会恭亲王奕訢时，非常肯定地认为：“所有教士交涉民人滋事案

四、余论

从传统走向现代，是历史发展的必然。中国近代史，就一段由传统宗法社会走向现代社会的历史。通过对兖州教案的法律文化解析，不难发现，传统的“华夷”秩序观，有悖于民族、国家间“平等”的现代国际法原则；传统的“共同体本位”观念，不符合“权利保障”“契约自由”等现代法律价值；为排教、基于“情感思维”而订立的“民间法”规范，未能遏制、消除“不良情感”，未能实现“情感理性化”，^[90]违背了“理性”这一法律的现代本质要求。教案的缘起，实为“传统”面对“现代”而产生的本能性“排异反应”。中西在处理教案时所展现的解纷理念、解纷依据、解纷风格等不同，也体现出传统与现代在“文化观”“契约观”“法律观”等方面的冲突。教案，既让人看到“传统”与“现代”在晚清中国的碰撞；同时又让人发现，传教及教案处理，悄然推动着传统中国向现代方向发展。^[91]诚然，“传统”与“现代”的冲撞，直至今日并未结束。2010年起发生的“曲阜建教堂”事件，再次折射出传统心理、观念之顽强。部分钟情于儒学的知识分子念兹在兹的“圣地”观、“圣城”观以及耶教“亡天下”观，与晚清绅士惊人相似。晚清至今一百六十年，我们的经济现代化已经硕果累累，但我们的文化现代化、社会心理现代化依旧任重道远。

件，直可谓均由绅士与微员有以耸之”；参见中国第一历史档案馆、福建师范大学历史系合编：《清末教案》（第二册），中华书局1998年版，第355页。法国传教士在《传教年鉴》中，也记录了清政府官员违背条约主动抵制传教而酿成教案的情形；参见中国第一历史档案馆Zhongguo diyi lishi danganguan [China's First Historical Archive]、福建师范大学历史系Fujian shifan daxue lishixi [Fujian Normal University History Department]合编：《清末教案》（第四册）Qingmo jiaoran [Anti Church Cases in Late Qing Dynasty] (Book 4), (北京Beijing: 中华书局Zhonghua shuju [Chung Hwa Book Co.] 2000), 236、240.

90 莫江平Mo Jiangping, “法律的情感与理性” Falv de qinggan yu lixing [The Emotion and Reason of the Law], 载《西南政法大学学报》Xinan Zhengfa daxue xuebao [Journal of SUPSL], 2000年第2期。

91 参见姚西伊Yao Xiyi, “传教士与中国现代化关系的嬗变” Chuanjiaoshi yu Zhongguo xiandaihua guanxi de shanbian [The Missionary and Relations of Transmutation with China's Modernization], 载卓新平Zhuo Xinping、许志伟Xu Zhiwei主编：《基督宗教研究》（第七辑）Jidu zongjiao yanjiu [Christian Studies] Series VII, (北京Beijing: 宗教文化出版社Zongjiao wenhua chubanshe [Religious Culture Publishing House], 2004), 484-500; 黄建刚Huang Jianggang, “晚清西方传教士对中国现代化进程的贡献” Wanqing xifang chuanjiaoshi dui Zhongguo xiandaihua Jincheng de gongxian [The Western Missionaries' Contribution to China's Modernization Process in Late Qing Dynasty], 载《社科纵横》Sheke zongheng [Social Science Review], 2015年第8期。

English Title:

On the Legal Culture Analysis of Yanzhou Anti-Church Case in Late Qing Dynasty

QIAO Fei

Law Professor of Henan University Law School. Doctor Juris. Research area: Christianity and Law. Mail address: Law School, Henan University, Kaifeng City, Henan Province, P.R.China. Email: wordofancient@126.com, Tel. +86-13938526122.

Abstract: Yanzhou Anti-Church Case, which happened in the late Qing Dynasty in Shandong Province, contains complex legal culture besides political factors. For the causes of happening, the national psychology of Chinese tradition “prevention of Hua-Yi”, “the idea of” community standard “and the civil regulation making by Yanzhou people according to the emotion logic are the legal cultural factors that why Yanzhou Case taking place. During the dispute settlement processing, the cultural view of “one culture only” conflicted with the “multiple coexistence”, the value orientation of “public opinion” conflicted with the “legal rights”, and the style of “legal rights appeal “ conflicted with “ hidden rules response”, These reflect the difference between Chinese and Western legal culture. Anti-Church Case was the result of the collision between “tradition” and “modern” in late Qing Dynasty, missionary and anti-church case processing also promoted the transformation from traditional China to modern. Today, the conflict between tradition and modern has not been stopped, our cultural modernization, psychological modernization still have a long way to go.

Key Words: Anti-church Case; Legal Culture; Tradition; Modern

St. Augustine's Cosmological Arguments on Transcendent Beauty

BAI Junxiao

(assistant professor at the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Hong Kong)

Junxiao Bai received her Ph.D. degree from Tilburg University in 2017. Her doctoral dissertation is *The Beauty of God in the Numerical Order: St. Augustine's Musical Cosmology*. She obtained a master's degree in music aesthetics at Xi'an Conservatory of Music in 2009 and a M.A. in theology at the Lutheran Theological Seminary in Hong Kong in 2012. She is an assistant professor at the Lutheran Theological Seminary. Her research interests focus on musicology, Augustinian studies, church history, and Greek philosophy. **Email:** Jenny.bai@lts.edu

Abstract: Based on the Christian doctrine of *creatio ex nihilo*, Augustine argues that God created all forms from nothing, and the physical-temporal world simultaneously sprang into existence when corporeal forms were created and motions occurred; thus, time and space are creatures. In order to argue for the intelligent design of the world, Augustine investigates the attributes of formless matter, corporeal form, and intelligent form in the order of creation, which is logical order rather than temporal order. All forms, which are good and beautiful in different degrees, contain the triad (beauty, measurement, and order) as the common good and constitute universal harmony, manifesting the transcendent beauty of God. The human form is superior to all other corporeal forms because it is a combination of the corporeal and intelligent forms; thus, not only can it reason the unchangeable principles (metaphysical forms) underlying physical phenomena, but it also can receive the ethical beauty existing in the commandments of the Creator.

Key words: transcendent beauty, order, form, *creatio ex nihilo*, gradation, universal harmony

1. Transcendent Beauty is not an Aesthetical Object

Augustine's concept of beauty investigates how universal harmony manifests transcendent beauty in the order of creation. For Augustine, transcendent beauty is an attribute of God rather than an aesthetical object. Modern philosophers generally relate the study of beauty to the concept of aesthetics, a new philosophical field pioneered by Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten (1714-1762), who envisioned a philosophical study of sensual feeling, which relates to art theory. Immanuel Kant is considered one of the founders of this modern aesthetic system, laid out in his *Critique of the Power of Judgment*, and his aesthetics deals with sensibility, feeling, and gratification of human beings in the activities of the aesthetically subjective judgment of an object, which does not require logical reasoning.¹ Contrastingly, in the ancient philosophical and theological tradition, the topic of beauty is about the investigation of the attribute of God, which is based on logical reasoning. Without discriminating between different concepts of beauty in varying contexts, the

1 Immanuel Kant, *Critique of the Power of Judgment*, trans. Paul Guyer and Eric Matthews (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 89.

notions of the essence of God on one hand and art theory on the other can be mixed up, causing confusion and misunderstanding. In response to the confusion surrounding the concept of beauty in contemporary work on aesthetics, E. R. Curtius outlines the ancient philosophical understanding of beauty:

When Scholasticism speaks of beauty, the word is used to indicate an attribute of God. The metaphysics of beauty (e.g., in Plotinus) and theories of art have nothing whatever to do with each other. "Modern" man immeasurably overvalues art because he has lost the sense of intelligible beauty that Neo-Platonism and the Middle Ages possessed. "*Sero te amavi, pulchritudo tam antiqua et tam nova, sero te amavi,*" says Augustine to God (Conf., X.27.38). Here, beauty is meant of which [modern] aesthetics knows nothing.²

Other scholars also recognize the difference between beauty and aesthetics in the ancient world. Umberto Eco points out a significant characteristic of the theory of beauty prior to and during the Middle Ages: "The medievals did, in fact, conceive of a beauty that was purely intelligible, the beauty of moral harmony and metaphysical splendor."³ Frank Hentschel, in his "The Sensuous Music Aesthetics of the Middle Ages," also notices the obvious contrast between aesthetics and beauty, stating that "[i]n the Middle Ages, most discussions about beauty (*pulchritude*) were placed in metaphysical contexts that cannot be interpreted with regard to art, either in the modern sense or in the medieval sense of *ars*."⁴ Matthias Smalbrugge distinguishes between Augustinian beauty and aesthetics, drawing a concise and profoundly convincing conclusion about the relationship between the two:

Augustinian beauty is not an element of what will become Western aesthetics or Western art, although Western art is unthinkable without the subjectivism of which Augustine traced the first contours. His beauty is essentially pre-modern, a classical element that can be used at best as an aspect of a traditional theodicy.⁵

Reading the topic of beauty in the context of ancient philosophical and theological tradition from a metaphysical perspective gives an accurate account of Augustinian beauty. This present article argues that according to Augustine's cosmology, the creation order manifests transcendent beauty, which can only be perceived by human reason.

2 E. R. Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, trans. Willard R. Trask (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013), 224, no. 20.

3 Umberto Eco, *Art and Beauty in the Middle Ages*, trans. Hugh Bredin (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), 1.

4 Frank Hentschel, "The Sensuous Music Aesthetics of the Middle Ages: The Cases of Augustine, Jacques de Liège and Guido of Arezzo," *Plainsong and Medieval Music* 20, no.1 (2011): 1.

5 Matthias Smalbrugge, "Beauty and Grace in Augustine," in *Studia Patristica*, vol. 49, ed. J. Baun, A. Cameron, M. Edwards and M. Vinzent (Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 11.

Before his conversion, Augustine wrote a book *De pulchro et apto* (*On Beauty and Fitness*). Almost two decades later, he feels no regret for the loss of this book, which is about the corporeal forms of the physical world, as he retrospectively confesses: “At that time [before his conversion in AD 386], I knew nothing about these things [transcendent beauty], and I loved those lower beauties, and I was in a deep pit.”⁶ After conversion, corporeal beauties are neither the object of Augustine’s love nor his focus of negation; instead, he properly evaluates them so as to investigate the eternal beauty of God in the order of creation. Therefore, Augustine’s arguments for transcendent beauty also cover the topic of corporeal beauty when premises are supplied by the latter to make deductions about the former. The transcendent beauty not only surpasses the realm of the senses but also is far beyond human cognition by reasoning. However, in the realm of logic, human intelligence can taste metaphysical splendor in the creation order by reasoning about the cause and purpose of beauty.

Augustine’s investigation of transcendent beauty has never undergone a process of evolution during his career as a Christian philosopher since he constantly refers to numbers as the unchangeable truth to support his arguments for the unchangeable attributes of God. Similar to the Pythagoreans, Augustine believes that the world is harmonically arranged in numeric order and all the forms of creatures are measured by numbers.⁷ In his two early apologetical writings, *De Ordine* and *De Musica*, Augustine searches transcendent beauty in unchangeable harmonic order with the guidance of *quadrivium* (music, arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy), as he states in *De Ordine*: “Now in music, in geometry, in the movements of the stars and in the fixed ratios of numbers, order reigns in such a manner that if one desires to see its source and its very shrine, so to speak, he either finds it in these, or he is unerringly led to it through them.”⁸ In his later years, when reviewing *De Musica* in *Retractations*, Augustine reiterates the concept that music, as the science of numbers, is the basis for him to search for the unchangeable and invisible attributes of God.⁹ Evidently, after Augustine’s conversion, his focus turns to the life-long pursuit of the transcendent beauty by constantly referring to the unchangeable numerical principles underneath the phenomena of the corporeal world.

2. *Formosissima and creatio ex nihilo*

According to the gradations of beauty, Augustine argues that no corporeal form would exist unless God, the Creator, is the incomparable supreme Form in the degree of perfection. In *De*

6 Augustine, *Confessions*, 4.13.20. Note: In this article, quotations from Augustine’s works translated from the original texts in J.P. Migne edition to English are my own, unless otherwise indicated.

7 Augustine, *De Musica*, 6.17.57.

8 Augustine, *De Ordine*, 2.5.14.

9 Augustine, *Retractations*, 1.11.1. *quorum ipse sextus maxime innotuit, quoniam res in eo cognitione digna versatur, quomodo a corporalibus et spiritalibus, sed mutabilibus numeris, perveniatur ad immutabiles numeros, qui iam in ipsa sunt immutabili veritate, et sic invisibilia Dei per ea quae facta sunt intellecta conspiciantur.*

Vera Religione, Augustine uses *Formosissima* (the superlative degree of *formosus*, which means fine appearance or well-formed beauty relating to order, form, measurement, numbers, and movement) synonymously together with *speciosissimus* (the superlative degree of *speciosus*, which means splendid beauty in appearance and attractive to the mind) to indicate the beauty of God, stating:

Therefore, He is the Creator of substance, from whom all peace comes, and who is uncreated and the Most Beautiful Form (*formosissima*). The corporeal object has a certain form, without which the corporeal cannot be formed. If you ask who made corporeal forms, that is to ask who is the perfect Beauty (*speciosissimus*). All forms come from the Beauty. However, besides the only God, the only Truth, the only Salvation of all, and the first and highest Essence (from which all things derive their existence, for all existence as such is good), who can be the Form?¹⁰

For Augustine, the most beautiful transcendent Form is the Essence, which caused all forms, both spiritual and physical. Based on the Christian cosmology—*creatio ex nihilo*,¹¹ Augustine draws a clear ontological distinction between the Form as Creator and created forms in both his early and later works. In *De Musica*, Augustine declares: “If you take these things from the earth, it will be nothing. Almighty God made the earth out of nothing.”¹² He reiterates this doctrine in *Confessions* XII, “Surely the formed is better than the unformed and is preceded by the eternity of the Creator, so that it was from nothing, from which something was made.”¹³ Repeatedly, in *De Civitate Dei*, Augustine states that “if God is always master, he always has creatures serving his dominion; nevertheless, not begotten of him, but made by him out of nothing, nor coeternal with him.”¹⁴ Since all corporeal forms were created from nothing, they have mutable nature subjecting to corruption. According to the law of causation, all mutable matters are effects that depend on the cause of another being and cannot have its own being by itself. Therefore, if there were no ultimate cause, which is immutable, nothing would exist. Although immutability surpasses the cognitive limitation of human beings, logical necessity compels human reason to admit that there must be a necessary, unchangeable Being to cause other changeable beings with measurement and order, as Augustine states:

He indeed is the Truth Himself because He is unchangeable. For every mutable form, which He made, has no its own being. Truth, therefore, is that which is

10 Augustine, *De Vera Religione*, 11.21.

11 This term *creatio ex nihilo* first appears in an apologetical work *To Autolytus*, written by Theophilus of Antioch, the sixth bishop of Antioch in the second century. Theophilus argues that this notion is a biblical truth, stating, “And first, they [the biblical prophets] taught us with one consent that God made all things out of nothing; for nothing was coeval with God.” (Theophilus of Antioch, *To Autolytus*, 2.10)

12 Augustine, *De Musica*, 6.17.57.

13 Augustine, *Confessions*, 12.29.40.

14 Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, 12,15,3.

immutable. All things made by the Truth received their existence because of the *modo* (measure) of the Truth. Therefore, the Truth, which is the Supreme, cannot be contrary to existence except that which is not. Hence, as everything that is good comes from the Truth, so all that are from the Truth are nature; for all that exist in nature are good.¹⁵

The eternal necessary Being must be the unchangeable Truth, which cannot be non-existent and mutable. Since all corporeal forms were created from nothing as effects by the necessary Being, they are mutable and corruptible—coming into existence and subjecting to perishing in the sequence of time. However, they are good because corruptibility is their nature.¹⁶

In *De Civitate Dei* VIII, Augustine compares Christ with Roman religions and philosophers and states that some principles that Platonists discovered from the physical world agree with Christian truth, including that God is the incomparable first Form.

They [philosophers] conclude that the first Form is not to be found in those things whose forms are changeable. They discover that the corporeal and the soul are more or less beautiful in forms and that they could have no existence if they are deprived of forms. They understand that there is a certain Being in which the first Form is unchangeable and incomparable, and they most rightly believed that the Being is the first Principle of things which was not made and by which all things were made. ‘For what can be known about God is manifested to them; for His invisible attributes, namely, His eternal power and divine nature, have been clearly perceived from all visible and temporal created things.’ (Romans 1:19-20) They call things that the part of theology has been discussed physics or nature.¹⁷

Regarding natural principles discovered by Platonic philosophers, he refers to Apostle Paul’s statement that the knowledge of God has been clearly revealed by the temporal-physical forms. For Augustine, natural science is essential to knowing the eternal truth of God and temporal creatures, mainly to know what God is not.

Augustine also differentiates his concept of forms from Platonic forms or worlds in his review of *De Ordine*.¹⁸ He claims that his concept is not a carbon copy of Plato or Platonic philosophers but a revelation received from God:

I proposed two worlds, the one sensible, the other intelligible—not on the authority of Plato or the Platonists, but on my own in such a way as though the Lord also meant

15 Augustine, *De Natura Boni*, 19.

16 Augustine, *De Natura Boni*, 10.

17 Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, 8.6.

18 See Plato, *Phaedo*, 79a-b, trans. G.M.A. Grube, in *The Complete Works of Plato*, ed. John M. Cooper (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Co, 1997), 69.

to indicate this, on the ground that He does not say, 'My kingdom is not of the world,' but 'My kingdom is not of this world (John 18.36).'¹⁹

Augustine understands "the kingdom of the Lord" as the spiritual realm in which human beings submit to God, while "this world" indicates the human society that is rebellious against God rather than "the world", namely, the physical world that God created. He endorses the Platonic concept of the intelligible world, namely, the metaphysical form as "the unchangeable plan according to which God made the world."²⁰ Since to create is to form and to arrange, Augustine believes that the archetypes of creatures exist in the design of God in the a-temporal realm because "God makes things new and different neither without predetermined order and plan, nor foreseeing them from upcoming time, but by eternal foreknowledge."²¹ The substance of corporeal forms is made from nothing, but the design of corporeal forms, which is metaphysical form of measured numbers, is in the eternal foreknowledge that is infinite and incomprehensible to humans but not to God.

Augustine says that two kinds of people would inevitably err—people whose souls have been enslaved by the physical world and people who escape from it for the sake of the spiritual realm but are ignorant of the reality of the world, as Augustine says in his early work *De Ordine*:

If he does not know what nothing is, what is formless matter, what is formed inanimate, what a body is, what is the lifeless in body, what is in place and what is in time, what is local motion, what is non-local motion, what is steady motion, what a-temporality is, what is to be neither in a place nor nowhere, what is beyond time and forever, what it is nowhere to be and nowhere not to be, what it is never to be and never not to be, whoever does not know these matters, but chose to seek and debate about his own soul (let alone investigating about the Highest God, who is better known by knowing what He is not), will fall into every possible error.²²

In this passage, Augustine raises ontological issues in respect of the nature of nothingness, forms, substance, time, space, and motion. And he emphasizes the importance of knowing the nature of these things relating to what can be known about God. If a person does not correctly know the ontological truth of the physical world, he would not properly know his own soul, let alone God. In an argument with Faust, the Manichee, in order to refute the dualistic concept of two gods, logic compels Augustine to raise a question: "Who is the author of all things which I mentioned, if not the One by whose *modus* all things are united, in whose wisdom all beautiful things are formed, according to whose law all things are arranged?"²³ Augustine argues that when the evidence of reality compels human reason to admit that the power of order operates as the unchangeable

19 Augustine, *Retractions*, 1.3.2.

20 Augustine, *Retractions*, 1.3.2.

21 Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, 12.18.

22 Augustine, *De Ordine*, 2.16.44.

23 Augustine, *Contra Faustum Manichaeum*, 21.6.

law dominating the whole universe, there must be a Lawgiver who is consistent, omnipotent, omniscient, and omnibenevolent; otherwise, there would be no order and form, and nothing would exist. The Form of God is the first Principle by which all things were created and measured, but not the substance that all things share with God. The difference between God and creatures is the ontological order of beauty, which establishes the position of creatures as presentable forms showing the beauty designed by the *Formosissima*.

3. Formless Matter and Formed Creatures

In order to investigate the reality of the physical world, Augustine analyzes the nature of formless matter, corporeal form, and intelligible form according to the order of creation, which is the order of logic rather than temporal order. He assumes that God created the formless matter from nothing, and the clue is in Genesis 1:24: “Did you not, Lord, teach me that, before you formed and distinguished this formless matter, there was nothing, no color, no shape, no body, no spirit? It was not, however, absolutely nothing: it was a kind of formlessness without any form.”²⁵ Augustine also argues that the formless matter was created in the a-temporal realm, explaining that “the formlessness, from which heaven and earth were made, were made not in time because the formed materials give rise to time, but that the formlessness was made first.”²⁶ Based on the fundamentals of physical motions, Augustine argues for an intrinsic connection between time, space, and corporeal forms “because without the change of motions, there is no time, and where there is no form, there is no change”²⁷ The nature of physical forms contains the measurement of both spatial and temporal numbers that are conditioned by space and time. Thus, physical forms, space, and time are preconditions for motions to happen, “[f]or where there is no shape, nor order, nothing comes or passes away, and where this does not take place, there are certainly no days or alternation of temporal spaces.”²⁸ The nature of formless matter is mutable, so it has potential to be formed and moved. However, it was not moved until it was shaped and measured by God according to metaphysical forms; at that point, motions and time simultaneously took place.²⁹ However, the formless matter and forms do not relate in the sequence of time in the way that flowers precede fruits, nor the formless matter likes raw materials such as wood or silver, from which things are made; instead, their simultaneous union brought time into existence. Augustine illustrates how metaphysical forms changed formlessness simultaneously with the

24 Genesis 1.1-2 *In principio fecit deus caelum et terram, terra autem erat invisibilis incomposita (informis) et tenebrae erant super abyssum et spiritus dei superferebatur super aquas.* (Vetus Latina)

25 Augustine, *Confessions*, 12.3.3.

26 Augustine, *Confessions*, 12.29.40. *materiam rerum primo factam et appellatam caelum et terram, quia inde facta sunt caelum et terra, nec tempore primo factam, quia formae rerum exserunt tempora.*

27 Augustine, *Confessions*, 12.11.14.

28 Augustine, *Confessions*, 12.9.9.

29 Augustine, *De Genesi Contra Manichaeos*, 1.2.4.

example of the relationship between a formless sound and a tune, which relate in logical order rather than in temporal sequence:

Materials [such as wood] by time also precede the forms of the things which are made from them, but in singing, this is not so. For when it is sung, its sound is heard at the same time; there is not first a formless sound, which is afterwards formed into a song, for as soon as it sounded, it passed away. You could not find any skill that can arrange tunes from a sound. However, it is first in origin. A tune is not formed in the sequence of time but in the soul.³⁰

According to the theory of physics, a musical tune is produced by the vocal body's controllable, regular vibrations, and the frequency of vibrations can be manifested by harmonic ratio; in other words, harmonic ratio is the metaphysical form of a musical tune, while noise, namely, a formless voice, is produced by irregular vibrations, and no harmonic ratio can be found in it. Noise occurs, then disappears immediately; by no means could it be a material for making a tune in the sequence of time. Thus, they have a relationship by logic rather than by time. Among all creatures, only humans, as rational animals, are able to have a harmonic ratio in their soul, and by their mouths, controllably operate a musical tune, which is formed by the union of a voice and harmonic ratio simultaneously. Again, in *De Genesis ad Litteram*, with a similar illustration of the relationship between a voice and a word, Augustine explains that God made both the formless matter and forms simultaneously.³¹ In this regard, Augustine understands God as the unmoved Mover and His creation as the first Motion, (though in which no temporal intervals can be found), giving existence to both space and time as conditions for the corporeal forms to move.³² It seems that Augustine borrowed some elements from Aristotle; however, they are fundamentally different. In *Physics*, Aristotle concludes his investigation on motion and time, stating that "the first mover causes a motion that is eternal and causes it during an infinite time."³³ Thus, according to Aristotle, the first mover, time, and motions are all eternal. Unlike Aristotle, based on *Creatio ex nihilo*, Augustine understands time and space as finite creatures in order to distinguish the ontological differences between the Creator's eternity and creatures' temporality. Thus, he interprets Genesis 1:1a 'in the beginning' (*in principio*) not as in the beginning of time but 'in wisdom/logos/principle of God' since there was no time before God created the world.³⁴ The word (*Logos*), by which God commanded the creation, must be the eternal Logos and ontologically different from vocal utterance, which is essentially conditioned by time and space.³⁵

30 Augustine, *Confessions*, 12.29.40.

31 Augustine, *De Genesis ad Litteram*, 1.15.29.

32 Augustine, *De Musica*, 6.17.58

33 Aristotle, *Physics*, Book VIII, 267b20-25, trans. R.P. Hardie and R.K. Gaye, in *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, ed. Jonathan Barnes (Princeton University Press, 1995), 446.

34 Augustine, *Confessions*, 11.9.11.

35 Augustine, *Confessions*, 11.6.8.

Regarding the gradation of beauty in the creation order, the human form is superior to all other corporeal forms by the rational soul, which contains individual uniqueness concerning intelligence, affection, and free will. Regarding the uniqueness of individual human form and the universality of mankind's form, Nebridius raised a question in his letter to Augustine: "Whether the highest Truth, the Wisdom and the supreme Form (or Archetype), by whom all things were made and whom our creeds confess to be the only-begotten Son of God, contains the ratio (reason) of mankind in general, or also of each individual of our race?"³⁶ In responding to this question, Augustine posits that an individual human form as a part of the created world belongs to one general ratio of humankind, namely, a ratio of many humans together, while every individual human form is created according to a specific ratio that suits that human, and the uniqueness of human form is distinguished by diversities in the circulation of time.³⁷ Further, Augustine analyzes the nature of the human form: it is similar to the form of the inert matter regarding its physical material, similar to the form of plants regarding seed-bearing, and similar to animals concerning the senses; however, only human form consists of an animal body and a rational soul, which human has in common with angels.³⁸ Thus, Augustine states that "man is a great creature, made after the image and similitude of God, not as respects the mortal body in which he is clothed, but as respects the rational soul by which he is exalted in honor above the beasts."³⁹ In order to match the rational form of the human soul, the human body was created as a harmonic instrument of the soul, as Augustine explains:

Don't you know parts connect to each other by numbers? This interrelation is called harmony, a word derived from music where we see the strings stretched upon the lyre. If all the strings were to give forth the same sound, there would be no song; it is variation in degrees of tension that produces different sounds. These different sounds, however, connected by ratios, produce sweetness of sound, which is not visible beauty. Whoever recognizes that it is the same ratio that connects the limbs of the human body will marvel and be greatly delighted to know that the same ratio intelligibly presents all visible beauty.⁴⁰

The human body has a harmonic power to present beauty from both within and outside because it was created according to harmonic principles in order to serve the reasoning function of the rational soul. Thus, the human form has a combined harmonic power that enables human to react to the outside world and to know what they should know by both bodily senses and rational reasoning. Regarding the reason of the rational soul, Laurence raised two questions in his letter to

³⁶ Augustine, *Epistola 14*, 4.

³⁷ Augustine, *Epistola 14*, 4.

³⁸ Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, 5.11.

³⁹ Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana*, 1.22.20.

⁴⁰ Augustine, *Sermon 243* "De Resurrectione Domini Secundum Ioannem," 4.4.

Augustine: "How far does reason contend for religion? What should not come into reason when faith is required alone?"⁴¹ Augustine replies:

Things that either originate from the sensory experience of the body or that are discovered by the intelligence of the mind may be demonstrated by human reason. However, regarding things that we are neither able to experience with the bodily senses nor achieve with the mind, we shall unhesitatingly believe the witnesses of those divine people who accomplished the Scripture and saw and even foresaw the things about which they testified with divine aids in their senses and minds.

For Augustine, human reason and the bodily senses are taking charge of knowing the world at different levels, respectively. Reason takes the dominant role because it is not only responsible for investigating things that cannot be perceived by the senses but also judges the data collected by sense perception. Still, it has limitations in knowing the infinite knowledge of God. Thus, miracles or prophecies from God, which are not contrary to reason and facts but divinely surpass the dominion of human senses and reason, should be believed with faith.

Because of the harmonious combination of bodily form and rational soul, human form is also superior to other creatures by free will and affection. All corporeal forms contain measurement of both temporal and spatial numbers; animal forms additionally have memory, senses, and appetite, which human beings have in common with other animals, except for having the form of the mind with free will for the endorsement of ethical beauty, which is about happy life.⁴² Augustine holds that having a good will is essential to happy life, stating:

Definitely, not evils, but good things, make people happy when they do them: of which there is already something of the good that should not be esteemed lightly, that is, the good will itself, which desires to rejoice in the good things of which human nature is capable, not in the perpetration or acquisition of any evil.⁴³

Human's free will is led by the force of love. Beauty has the power to delight the soul; thus, it is the object of love and enjoyment. Therefore, Augustine is apt to use *pulchritude*, which means the inner quality of being pleasing, beautiful, and attractive, to indicate that in the ethical order, God is the object of love and satisfaction for humans, who cannot be beautiful unless they wholeheartedly love God, the highest Beauty. In the passage below, Augustine uses *pulchritudo* synonymously together with *formosus* to indicate human beauty:

'Confession and beauty (*pulchritudo*) are before Him.'⁴⁴ Do you love beauty (*pulchritudinem*)? Do you wish to be beautiful (*pulchre*)? Confess! He did not say

41 Augustine, *Enchiridion*, 1.4.

42 Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, 5.11. *rationali autem insuper mentem, intelligentiam, voluntatem.*

43 Augustine, *De Trinitate*, 13.6.9.

44 *Confessio et pulchritudo in conspectu ejus.* (Psalm 95.6 in Vulgata Latina)

beauty and confession, but confession and beauty. If you are ugly, confess that you may be fair (*pulcher*). If you are a sinner, confess that you may become righteous. You can deform yourself, but you cannot make yourself beautiful (*formosum*)... We love beauty (*pulchritudinem*); however, let us first choose confession so that beauty (*pulchritudo*) might follow.⁴⁵

In this passage, Augustine relates sin to ugliness and righteousness to beauty; thus, there is an ethical beauty of the inward related to love and choice. Man can deform his inward beauty by the choice of free will “for he who loves iniquity hates his own soul.”⁴⁶ However, he cannot reverse the consequence of deforming unless he confesses his disorder or sin and loves God, the Designer, who would restore him to the right order or righteousness because ethical beauty ontologically exists in the commandment/righteousness of God. The beauty of righteousness and wisdom has no shape, size, weight, or color; however, it has incomprehensible measure, number, order, and quality in the will of God, “whose unity is the standard of all measure, whose wisdom is the mode of all beauty, and whose law is the rule of all orders.”⁴⁷ By the free will of the rational soul, the human form is able to receive righteousness from God because “righteousness is the beauty of the soul, by which men are beautiful,”⁴⁸ Augustine states. Thus, humans, as rational forms, not only have a rational function to understand the unchangeable principles but also have free will to make choices based on the knowledge and affection of the rational soul.

4. Common Good and Universal Harmony

Augustine claims that “the triad: measure, beauty, and order are the common good in all things created by God, either in the spiritual or in the corporeal.”⁴⁹ As to create is to form/beautify, to measure, and to order, the triad—measure, beauty, and order must be simultaneously accomplished as the common good in both the physical and metaphysical realms. This concept differentiates Augustine from other ancient philosophers, particularly Plato and Aristotle—one focuses on the metaphysical realm, and the other focuses on the physical realm. Raphael’s famous painting “School of Athens” captures the major difference between these two philosophers’ interests—Plato, holding his *Timaeus*, vertically points to heaven with his right hand, while Aristotle horizontally stretches his right hand to indicate the temporal, physical world, and his left hand holds *Ethics*, in which he disagrees with the Platonic doctrine of Idea and holds that in ethics, the term ‘good’ should be applied to the categories of substance, quality, quantity, relation, or time and

45 Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, “Psalm 96” (Lat. 95), 7.

46 Augustine, *De Trinitate*, 8.6.9.

47 Augustine, *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 21.6.

48 Augustine, *De Trinitate*, 8.6.9. *Est enim quaedam pulchritudo animi iustitia, qua pulchri sunt homines.*

49 Augustine, *Enchiridion*, 3.10.

space; however, the Platonic Idea does not include all numbers existing in these categories.⁵⁰ Thus, Aristotle prefers to seek goodness in the physical world, which is attainable for humans.⁵¹ Unlike these two philosophers, the major concern of Augustine is to investigate the transcendent beauty in the harmonic order of both physical and metaphysical realms.

In his *De Natura Boni*, Augustine states that “from God, all things have a measurement (*modus*), all things are beautiful, and all things are in the order.”⁵² The triad (beauty, measurement, and order) intrinsically unites every form to contribute to the tout ensemble of the universal harmony, which is better than any individual beauty, as Augustine states: “Particularly, all things united together are very good because their ensemble constitutes the wonderful order and beauty of the universe.”⁵³ All creatures have been measured and arranged in different degrees of beauty: the celestial is superior to the terrestrial, the incorporeal to the corporeal, the rational to the irrational, the unchangeable to the changeable, and the eternal to the temporal—the lowest and the highest are harmonically connected in the creation order, as Augustine writes, “It is as though the divine power were more closely present in the transcendent beauty while having arrayed the lesser beauty at the greatest distance and the lowest level.”⁵⁴

However, the lesser beauty of the lowest level has nothing to do with the ontological evil assumed by Manichaeism. In order to refute Manichaeism's error, at the beginning of *De Natura Boni*, Augustine declares: “God is supremely good and unchangeable; all things made by God, both the spiritual and corporeal are good.”⁵⁵ If God is transcendentally true, good, and beautiful, the elements of goodness, truth and beauty are identical in God's creation and the nature of all creatures. Therefore, Augustine further states, “If we say that He is the supreme *Modus*, we should understand that the supreme *Modus* is the supreme Good. Everything exists because of the *Modus*.”⁵⁶ *Modus* is the measurement standard. All creatures are measured and ordered as good works to demonstrate the degrees of beauty and goodness designed by God, the *formosissima*.

The common good, namely, the triad (beauty, measurement, and order) is manifested by the universal harmony in the vicissitude of time. The mutability of the corporeal forms in the cycles of time does not disrupt the beauty of the divine order; instead, it contributes to the consummation of the universal harmony in the same way that every musical note first appears then instantly

50 Aristotle, *The Nicomachean Ethics*, 1096b 25-30, trans. W. D. Ross in *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, ed. Jonathan Barnes (Princeton University Press, 1995), 1733.

51 Aristotle, *The Nicomachean Ethics*, 1097a.

52 Augustine, *De Natura Boni* 3. *a quo omnis modus, omnis species, omnis ordo*.

53 Augustine, *Enchiridion*, 3.10. *simul vero universa valde bona, quia ex omnibus consistit universitatis admirabilis pulchritudo*.

54 Augustine, *Commentary on the Lord's Sermon on the Mount*, 1.17.53, trans. Denis J. Kavanagh, in *The Fathers of the Church*, vol. 11 (Washington D.C: Catholic University of America Press, 1968), PDF edition.

55 Augustine, *De Natura Boni*, 1.

56 Augustine, *De Natura Boni*, 22.

vanishes in musical motion, all the while contributing to the harmonic sequence of the whole song. The appearance and decay of corporeal forms are well arranged in the entire beauty of the universe, “as a speech well composed is assuredly beautiful, although its syllables and sounds are ephemeral, fleeting as the death of something that has only just been born.”⁵⁷ The phenomena of generating and disappearing of notes in temporal sequence is the only way that music harmony shows up by temporal motions. The physical world moves as a *cosmos/universitas* in the same temporal sequence. Therefore, Augustine regards God as the Musician who conducts the harmonic symphony of all parts of the universe, stating:

Whether He bestows or adds, removes or curtails, increases or diminishes, the unchangeable Creator, as the Director of mutable things, orders all events in His providence until the beauty of the universal course of time of which individual parts are adapted to each successive time, just as a grand melody unutterably flows from the wise Composer, and passes into the vision of those who eternally contemplate on God and properly worship Him and have faith in God even though in the temporal realm.⁵⁸

This analogical narrative gives an accurate and exhaustive account of cosmic harmony from a macroscopic perspective. Audible human music illustrates harmonic ratios by melodic and rhythmic motions, while the motions of the whole universe—the motions of heavenly bodies, the rise and decline of every individual corporeal form, and the historical vicissitude of the human community, all constitute grand cosmic harmony. Human beings are created not only as rational audiences to perceive the harmony of the universal motion but also as ethical beings to receive the principles of harmony; thereby, they are able to perform both audible music and ethical harmony through their bodily forms. Accordingly, the process of human life is similar to a piece of musical motion— At the finale, when all notes pass away with time, only the human soul can perceive the effect of its whole life and judge whether it lived in harmony with the eternal harmonic order.

In summary, all forms have the common good, namely, the triad—measure, beauty, and order; nevertheless, they are good and beautiful in different degrees of the creation order, which constitutes universal harmony. The human form is superior to other physical forms due to its mind and free will equipped for understanding unchangeable truth and receiving the ethical beauty of the commandments of God. The end, therefore, of ethical beauty, which is received by the human mind and free will, is to fulfil the ultimate harmony of the universe according to the harmonic law of God.

57 Augustine, *De Natura Boni Contra Manichæos*, 8.

58 Augustine, *Epistola 138*, 1.5.

5. Conclusion

Augustine investigates creatures' measured nature to make rational scientific argumentation for the transcendent beauty manifested in the tout ensemble of all forms in the creation order. The transcendent beauty cannot be perceived by the senses, but the rational soul can metaphysically reason it by the clue of the universal harmony manifested in the physical world. Human reason is compelled by logic necessity to posit that nothing would exist unless there is a Creator who serves as the transcendent uncaused Cause, the unchangeable Truth, the most beautiful Form, and the perfect Modus to arrange all forms with the common good (beauty, measurement, and order). The human form, a combination of the corporeal body and the rational soul, is superior to other physical forms because it is not only able to reason the transcendent beauty in universal harmony but also can choose with free will to conform to harmony, in which all creatures manifest the beautiful works of the Creator either ineffably or aloud.⁵⁹

中文题目：

圣奥古斯丁关于超验美的宇宙观论证

柏峻霄，于2017年获得蒂尔堡大学（荷兰）哲学博士学位。博士论文是《数理秩序中的上帝之美：圣奥古斯丁的音乐宇宙论》。她于2012年在香港信义宗神学院获得神学硕士学位，2009年在西安音乐学院获得音乐美学硕士学位，现任信义宗神学院助理教授，研究兴趣是音乐学、教父学、奥古斯丁研究、教会历史、希腊哲学。Email: Jenny.bai@lts.edu

提要： 基于“从无创造”的基督教教义，奥古斯丁论证上帝从无中创造了所有形态，当物质形态被创造、物理运动发生时，时间-物质世界同时出现；因此，时间和空间皆受造之物。为了论证万物的存在基于智慧的设计，奥古斯丁根据创造秩序（是逻辑的而非时间的秩序）考察了无形存在、有形形态，以及智能形态的属性。一切形态在不同程度上是美善的，因它们都以美、量、序构成的三元为普遍的善，所有形态的综合构成了普遍的和谐，彰显上帝的超验之美。人类形态优于所有其他有形的形态，因其是物体形态和智能形态的结合；因此，人类形态不仅可以认知和推理物理现象背后的不变原则（形而上的形式），而且有能力领受存於造物主之诫命中的伦理之美。

关键词： 超验美，秩序，形态，从无创造，等级，普遍和谐

⁵⁹ Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, Psalm 145.9.

中西经典与圣经

**Chinese and Western Classics
and the Bible**

The China Aspiration in Light of Jacob's Narrative (Genesis 25:19-36:43): Toward a Chinese Public Theology for Human Flourishing in the Third Millennium

Jacob Chengwei Feng

(Fuller Theological Seminary, School of Mission and Theology)

Abstract: Compared to the five centuries of global colonial history, China's (semi-)colonial history lasted only a little over one hundred years (1840-1949). However, since 1949, coloniality, anti-colonialization, anti-imperialism, and decolonization have continued to lurk in ideology, philosophy, politics, and most importantly in Chinese theology. This paper argues by engaging with Jacob's narrative (Genesis 25:19-36:43), Chinese public theology can adequately engage in meaningful dialogue with the Aspiration, including the China Dream (*Zhongguo meng* 中国梦) and a Community of Shared Future for Mankind (*renlei mingyun gongtongti* 人类命运共同体), by articulating a Chinese public theology of human flourishing on domestic and international levels. The paper first analyzes China's (semi-)colonial/anti-colonial history in four stages with its various influences on Chinese theology. Then the paper adopts a three-layered "sandwich" approach to expose the profound epistemic crisis that is deeply embedded in Chinese theology. Finally, the paper attempts at a constructive Chinese public theology for human flourishing in the Third Millennium.

Key words: epistemic crisis, China Dream, a Community of Shared Future for Mankind, human flourishing, Chinese public theology

Authors: FENG, Chengwei, PhD candidate, Fuller Theological Seminary, Email: chengweifeng@fuller.edu

I. Introduction

China began to officially advocate the vision of the China Dream (*Zhongguo meng* 中国梦)¹ in November 2012 in order to achieve "the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation."² With the short-term goal of reaching a "moderately well-off society" around 2021 and the long-term goal of becoming a fully developed nation by about 2050, the China Dream is an all-encompassing vision on national, personal, historical, global, and antithetical levels, ranging from physical and mental

1 Also translated as the "Chinese Dream" in other academic journals and media coverages. This paper will use the China Dream. See Tianyong Zhou, *The China Dream and the China Path* (Singapore: World Scientific, 2014).

2 The China Dream was proposed by President Jinping Xi in November 2013 and later elaborated and repeatedly stressed at the parliamentary session which elected Xi to the presidency. See Uking Sun, "'Chinese Dream' Is a World Dream," *China Daily*, updated Mar. 26, 2013, 2013, accessed June 4, 2021, https://www.chinadaily.com.cn/china/2013chinastudies/2013-03/26/content_16347214.htm. For a comparison between the American Dream and China dream, see Fengxiang Lin and Kui Zhu, "On the Cultural Differences between American Dream and China Dream," *World Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities* 3, no. 1 (2017). For an analysis of the China Dream and its projection to the African Dream, see Anny Boc, "The Power of Language: Globalizing 'The Chinese Dream'," *Fudan Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences* 8, no. 4 (2015), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40647-015-0102-y>.

well-being of each citizen to ecological, technological, economic, and military improvement.³ If, at the risk of simplification, China Dream may be considered to be primarily focused on domestic prosperity, then a Community of Shared Future for Mankind (*renlei mingyun gongtongti* 人类命运共同体, CSFM)⁴ as a global vision was initially proposed in March 2013.⁵ Its concept and mechanism for realization can only be understood when the paths to its construction are considered not only for the entire global world but also for each individual country and each specific human individual.⁶ Amid the mounting global public health crisis caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, China has been actively advocating the vision of a Community of Common Health for Mankind as an extension of CSFM.⁷ For the sake of simplicity, this paper coins an “umbrella” term the *China Aspiration* to refer to both the China Dream and CSFM.

Since its inception for more than ten years, interdisciplinary engagements with the China Aspiration (at least partially) have been carried out in the areas of international politics,⁸ economics,⁹ international law,¹⁰ religious freedom,¹¹ semiotics,¹² culture,¹³ and politics,¹⁴ just to

3 The five dimensions include building a strong China, stable China, generous China, harmonious China, civilized China, beautiful China, and creative China on the national level; physical well-being including better education, more stable employment, higher income, a greater degree of social security, better medical and health care, improved housing condition and a better environment, and mental well-being including improving resilience and the sense of fulfillment on the personal level; the implementation of China’s yearning for the stability and transformation of new China on the historical level; making contribution to the development of the world under globalization, and setting a good example for the Third-world countries on the global level; focusing on the primary tradeoff between economic development and its unintended byproducts such as income disparities and environmental degradation on the antithetical level. See Lin and Zhu, “Cultural Differences.”

4 This term is also translated similarly as a Human Community with Shared Future, or Community of Common destiny.

5 Liza Tobin, “Xi’s Vision for Transforming Global Governance: A Strategic Challenge for Washington and Its Allies,” *The Strategist* 2, no. 1 (November 2018) (2018), <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.26153/tsw/863>.

6 M. Bondarenko Valentina, “A New Scientific Paradigm as a Key to Building a Community with a Common Future for Humanity,” *Cadmus* 4, no. 3 (2020).

7 Zhong Weixin and Liang Jun, eds, “Belarus receives new batch of Chinese COVID-19 vaccines,” People’s Daily Online (November 12, 2021) para. 1-6 at para. 4, <<http://en.people.cn/n3/2021/1112/c90000-9918872.html>> [accessed December 16, 2021].

8 Fabio Massimo Parenti, *The Chinese Way: Overcoming Challenges for a Shared Future* (Singapore: World Scientific, 2023); David Arase, *The Geopolitics of Xi Jinping’s Chinese Dream: Problems and Prospects* (Singapore: ISEAS, 2016).

9 Zhou, *China Dream and the China Path*.

10 Ian Yuying Liu, “The Chinese Dream, Neoliberalism, and International Legal Ideology,” *The Chinese Journal of Global Governance* 4, no. 2 (2018), <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1163/23525207-12340033>; M. Francesca Staiano, *Chinese Law and Its International Projection: Building a Community with a Shared Future for Mankind* (Singapore: Springer, 2023).

11 Kin Sheung Charetto Yan, “When the Gospel Meets the China Dream: Religious Freedom and the Golden Rule,” *International Bulletin of Mission Research* 42, no. 3 (2017), <https://doi.org/10.1177/2396939317747149>.

12 Junchen Zhang, “The “Chinese Dream” as a Discursive Symbol: A Corpus-assisted Discourse Study on Political Discursive Construction and Global Media Representations of the “Chinese Dream”,” *Chinese Semiotic Studies* 18, no. 4 (2022), <https://doi.org/doi:10.1515/css-2022-2082>; Zhide Hou, “Using Semantic Tagging to Examine the American Dream and the Chinese Dream,” *Semiotica* 2019, no. 227 (2019).

13 Lin and Zhu, “Cultural Differences.”

14 Liu, “Chinese Dream.”

name a few.¹⁵ However, Christian theology in general, and Chinese public theology in particular, have by and large failed to engage with this grandiose and ambitious project. Lai Pan-chiu and Xie Zhibin dedicate a special issue in the interesting topic of public theology in Chinese context.¹⁶ Unfortunately the China Aspiration does not receive any treatment. Alexander Chow develops a Chinese public theology that describes the emergence of growth of public Christian voices in China and their relation to what he calls the “Confucian imagination.”¹⁷ But Chow does not interact with the China Aspiration. This oversight by the Chinese public theology obviously has many reasons. First, the China Dream or the CSFM has been wrongly dismissed “as vague or empty propaganda”¹⁸ or downplayed as being “not the intellectually coherent, robust and wide-ranging philosophy needed to stand up to Western ideas.”¹⁹ Second, according to Harari, Christianity, Islam, and Hinduism have become “backward-looking” religions, or perceived as such, with their theology staying more and more irrelevant.²⁰ Third, Xie observes that some Chinese fundamental theologies tend to be against the public and that there exists an “anti-public public theology.”²¹ Therefore, it is the author’s deep conviction that theology ought to respond to the pressing challenges of secular and humanistic development, particularly the China Aspiration with normative ideas related to human flourishing. Thus, there is an urgent need to fill this present theological gap. This paper intends to do so by proposing human flourishing as a Christian project in China to engage with the China Aspiration as its dialogue partner.

The paper argues that by engaging with Jacob’s narrative (Gen 25:19-36:43), Chinese public theology can adequately carry out meaningful dialogue with the China Aspiration in terms of human flourishing on domestic and international levels. The paper is organized into the following structure. First, it will first present the methodology employed for the analysis. Then the paper will provide the social, philosophical, and ideological analysis of the China Aspiration and analyze its challenges to Christianity in China. After identifying the theological and ethical challenges posed to theology, the paper will present Jacob’s narrative (Gen. 25:19-36:43) in the Old Testament and use it as a point of anchor to construct a Chinese public theology of human flourishing. Based

15 For a most recent edited volume on CSFM, the Belt and Road Initiative, etc., by Linggui Wang and Malcolm Thompson, see Linggui Wang and Malcolm Thompson, eds., *China’s Development and the Construction of the Community with a Shared Future for Mankind* (Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore, 2023).

16 For a special issue on public theology in China, see Pan-chiu Lai and Zhibin Xie, “Special Issue: “Public Theology in the Chinese Context,”” *International Journal of Public Theology* 11, no. 4 (2017).

17 Alexander Chow, *Chinese Public Theology: Generation Shifts and Confucian Imagination in Chinese Christianity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018).

18 Tobin, “Xi’s Vision for Transforming Global Governance,” 155.

19 Javier C. Hernandez, “In China’s State News Media, What Is Said May Not Be What’s Printed,” *New York Times*, 2015, accessed June 6, 2021, <https://cn.nytimes.com/china/20151015/c15sino-news/en-us/>.

20 Harari argues that instead of Christianity and other religions, what humanity needs is “small groups of forward-looking innovators.” See Yuval Noah Harari, *Homo Deus: A Brief History of Tomorrow* (New York: HarperCollins, 2017), 271.

21 Zhibin Xie, “Why Public and Theological?: The Problem of Public Theology in the Chinese Context,” *International Journal of Public Theology* 11, no. 4 (2017), 399-400.

on this vision, the paper will conclude by offering its theological and ethical implications in the contemporary Chinese context.

II. Methodology

The paper analyzes the China Aspiration from four perspectives. First, an interdisciplinary—historical, socio-political, philosophical, and theological—approach is adopted. Max Stackhouse argues that “it is impossible today to do good work in theological ethics without drawing on the research and experience of these fields, such as history and social science.”²² Sebastian Kim and Katie Day identify interdisciplinarity as a distinguishing mark of public theology.²³ Due to the need to deal with China’s economic, social, and political issues, the paper realizes the need to incorporate informants outside of academic bibliographies,²⁴ which is especially true when doing Chinese public theology due to limited information in Chinese scholarly publications. To Miroslav Volf, this kind of interdisciplinary approach is not an option for those who do theology. He argues that the failure to take this approach reduces theology to science.²⁵ Consequently, theology is unable to address normative questions.²⁶ Volf and Croasmun believe that these contribute to the theology’s internal crisis (and consequently external crisis), which is manifested in the fact that “the big questions of life are now more or less absent from the academy entirely.”²⁷

The second aspect of the methodology is social analysis. To respond effectively to the social injustice in China, this paper strives to understand the social reality in all its complexity.²⁸ Joe Holland and Peter Henriot define social analysis as an “effort to obtain a more complete picture of a social situation by exploring its historical and structural relationships.”²⁹ While fully aware of the limits of social analysis,³⁰ this paper recognizes that “theological reflection [grows] out of the analysis.”³¹ Thus, social analysis is a helpful tool that “permits us to grasp the reality with

22 Max L. Stackhouse, “General Introduction,” in *God and Globalization*, ed. Max L. Stackhouse and Peter J. Paris, Religion and the Powers of the Common Life (New York: T&T Clark, 2000), 1-33, in particular, p. 10.

23 Kim and Day identify six marks of public theology in that it is inherently incarnational, engaging with public sphere(s), interdisciplinary, dialogical, global, and is performed. See Sebastian C. H. Kim and Katie Day, *A Companion to Public Theology* (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 10-17.

24 Kim and Day, *A Companion to Public Theology*, 13.

25 Miroslav Volf and Matthew Croasmun, *For the Life of the World: Theology that Makes A Difference*, Theology for the Life of the world, (Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2019), 46-51.

26 Volf and Croasmun, *For the Life of the World*, 45-49.

27 Volf and Croasmun, *For the Life of the World*, 49.

28 Joe Holland and Peter J. Henriot, *Social Analysis: Linking Faith and Justice*, revised and enlarged ed. (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1983), 89.

29 Holland and Henriot, *Social Analysis*, 14.

30 Holland and Henriot speak of the limits of social analysis in that first, it is not designed to provide an immediate answer to the question “what do we do?” Second, social analysis is not an esoteric activity for intellectuals. Third, social analysis is not value-free. Moreover, social analysis is only a negative instrument, moves only in the scientific thought model, and uses elite language. See Holland and Henriot, *Social Analysis*, 15-16, 89-92.

31 Holland and Henriot, *Social Analysis*, 93.

which we are dealing-‘*la realidad*’ so often referred to in Latin America”,³² and correspondingly “*xianshi*” (现实, reality) as used in the Chinese context. In particular, social analysis’s historical and structural approaches are employed while maintaining the distinctions between the objective and subjective dimensions of reality in analysis.³³

In addressing the complex constituents in China’s social system, this paper also adopts spherical analysis, a conceptual framework elaborated by Michael Walzer.³⁴ By drawing the entire world of goods within reach of philosophical reflection, Walzer proposes the concept of “distributive spheres” and subsequently a system of complex equality to realize distributive justice.³⁵ While aware of the criticisms towards his theory³⁶ and his position of communitarianism,³⁷ the author finds Walzer’s spherical thinking a useful conceptual framework to tackle issues such as dominance and tyranny by protecting the minimum autonomy of each sphere.

The third aspect is an ethological approach proposed by Stackhouse. For Stackhouse, theological ethics not only discern the “ethos,” namely, the subtle web of “values” and “norms,” the obligations, virtues, convictions, mores, purposes, expectations and legitimations that constitute the operating norms of a culture in relation to a social entity or set of social practices, but also engage in “ethology” studies which “seek, with the more profound social analysts and historians, for example, to articulate the vision of ultimate reality thought to stand behind the ethos.”³⁸ By highlighting the vision of “ultimate reality” (*zhongji xianshi* 终极现实), this paper delves into the explicit or implicit view of what is holy, sacred, or inviolable about values or norms in the ethos of the China Aspiration and assesses whether what is going on ought to go on.³⁹

32 Holland and Henriot, *Social Analysis*, 14.

33 To Holland and Henriot, the social system needs to be analyzed both in terms of time-historical analysis-and space-structural analysis. More specially, historical analysis is a study of the changes of a social system through time. The structural analysis provides a cross-section of a system’s framework in a given moment of time. Moreover, the objective dimension includes the various organizations, behavior patterns, and institutions that take on external structural expressions, while the subjective dimension includes consciousness, values, and ideologies. See Holland and Henriot, *Social Analysis*, 14-15.

34 Michael Walzer, *Spheres of Justice: A Defense of Pluralism and Equality* (New York: Basic Books, 1983).

35 Walzer, *Spheres*, 3, 17-20.

36 Rustin argues that it is “difficult to find grounds within Walzer’s relativist position for intervention to end or mitigate gross social injustices (for example, the oppression of women) where these injustices have not already become the subject of contention within a society.” See Michael Rustin, “Equality in Post-Modern Times,” in *Pluralism, Justice, and Equality*, ed. David Miller and Michael Walzer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 17-44, in particular at p. 31. Ripstein opines that if distributive justice is determined by the meaning of the goods as “socially conceived” in the presence of naïve ignorance of one party or the overwhelming power of force in another, such notion of justice can all too easily be co-opted by the more powerful, who determines the shape of “social consensus,” in the absence of a limiting framework of a basic set of rights endowed to individual persons themselves apart from the goods with which they interact. See Ripstein Arthur, “Universal and General Wills: Hegel and Rousseau,” *Political Theory* 22, no. 3 (1994), <https://doi.org/10.1177/0090591794022003004>, <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0090591794022003004>: 444-67.

37 Hak Joon Lee provides a helpful criticism of communitarianism in pointing out that “in general communitarians tend to take a sectarian, parochial posture.” Instead, Lee advocates covenantalism as an alternative. See Hak Joon Lee, *God and Community Organizing: A Covenantal Approach* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2020), 215-16.

38 Stackhouse, “General Introduction,” in Max L. Stackhouse and Peter J. Paris, eds, *God and Globalization*, 10-11.

39 Stackhouse, “General Introduction,” 11.

The fourth aspect is its global approach.⁴⁰ While it is true that “globalization has different meanings for different groups,”⁴¹ this paper adopts what Manfred Steger defines as global imaginary, or the consciousness of the world as a single whole.⁴² In dealing with the China Aspiration, this paper also refers to globalization as a specific process “by which capitalism expands across the globe as powerful economic actors seek profit in global markets and impose their rules everywhere, a process often labeled ‘neoliberalism.’”⁴³ This paper intends to establish vital connections between the China Aspiration with these imaginary and economic aspects of globalization.

In sum, this paper adopts an eclectic and hybrid methodology that employs interdisciplinary, spherical, ethological, and global approaches. Next, the paper analyzes the China Aspiration and presents its theological implications and challenges.

III. The China Aspiration and Its Fourfold Analysis

(1) Interdisciplinary Analysis

First, the China Aspiration is analyzed through the lens of modernity. Miroslav Volf is right in following Charles Taylor, who speaks of “multiple modernities.”⁴⁴ As a relatively new and active partner in globalization, China experiences modernity in a unique, non-Western way. China’s previous encounter with globalization in the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century left on the country an indelible mark of humiliation due to military and economic invasions by the western powers and Japan;⁴⁵ hence the buzzword “the Century of Humiliation.”⁴⁶

40 Voluminous literatures exist in the academic field regarding globalization. For a comprehensive elucidation of leading theoretical approaches to understanding globalization, see Barrie Axford, *Theories of Globalization* (Oxford: Wiley, 2014). For a comprehensive treatment from the perspective of public theologians, see Max L. Stackhouse, Peter J. Paris, Don S. Browning, and Diane Obenchain, *God and Globalization: Theological Ethics and the Spheres of Life*, ed. Max L. Stackhouse, Peter J. Paris, Don S. Browning, and Diane Obenchain, 4 vols. (New York: T&T Clark, 2000).

41 Frank J. Lechner and John Boli, *The Globalization Reader*, fifth ed. (Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell, 2015), 5.

42 Steger defines globalization in its general sense by dissecting the highly complex system into three layers, namely, globality as social conditions, global imaginary as consciousness of the world as a single whole, and globalization as a spatial concept signifying a matrix of social processes that are transforming our present social condition of conventional nationality into one of globality. See Manfred B. Steger, *Globalization: A Very Short Introduction*, Very Short Introductions, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 2-3.

43 Lechner and Boli, *The Globalization Reader*, 5.

44 Volf follows Charles Taylor, who speaks of “multiple modernities,” See Miroslav Volf, *Public Faith: How Followers of Christ Should Serve the Common Good* (Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2014), 120.

45 For a detailed historical analysis related to the ethos of national humiliation, see Zheng Wang, *Never Forget National Humiliation: Historical Memory in Chinese Politics and Foreign Relations* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012). Also see Michael Yahuda, “China’s Win-Win Globalization,” YaleGlobal Online, Yale University, updated February 19, 2003, accessed June 5, 2021, <https://archive-yaleglobal.yale.edu/content/chinas-win-win-globalization>.

46 Alison Adcock Kaufman, “The ‘Century of Humiliation,’ Then and Now: Chinese Perceptions of the International Order,” *Pacific Focus* 25, no. 1 (2010), <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1976-5118.2010.01039.x>.

Following (perhaps along with) the military invasion, the western missionaries brought Protestantism to China.⁴⁷ One of the disruptive effects of globalization at that time was the breaking down of traditional Confucian system under the pressures of globalization as these were forcibly brought to bear upon China. The communist takeover in 1949 and the character of the Maoist regime that lasted until the mid-1970s were shaped by a nationalist reaction to this experience.⁴⁸ External influences were seen as polluting, which resulted in the expulsion of all foreign missionaries and culminated in the confiscation and even the burning of Bibles and other religious artifacts. The self-reliance and minimum toleration of external influences, an approach that was fundamentally antagonistic to globalization, culminated in the self-destructive, internally generated chaos of the Cultural Revolution (1966-1976), which led the country to the brink of economic bankruptcy.

Deng Xiaoping's economic reform in late 1978 was a sign of embracing modernity and globalization in earnest. China quickly absorbed itself into the international or global building blocks of neoliberalism, such as the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF) system, and became a member of the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 2001. Indeed, China rapidly became a World Bank poster child for successful globalization and the most favorite customer.⁴⁹ To implement CSFM, China launched the Belt and Road Initiative (B&R) in 2013 together with the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) and the New Development Bank (NDB) to strengthen infrastructure both on westward land route from China through Central Asia and on the southerly maritime routes from China through Southeast Asia and on to South Asia, Africa, and Europe.⁵⁰

In sum, China is a beneficiary of the current phase of neoliberalism and the economic aspect of globalization and intends to gradually change its role from passive participation to active engagement as a global leader. Moreover, the unfortunate association between Western imperialism and Christianity contributes to the exclusion of Christianity from the China Aspiration toward a full scale of national and personal prosperity.

(2) Ethological Analysis

As part of the China Dream, China advocates “the core socialist values,” namely, prosperity, democracy, civilization, harmony, liberty, equality, fairness, rule by law, patriotism, dedication, integrity, and amicability. These ethos can be traced to Confucianism, the legitimate and mainstream

47 Ryan Dunch, *Fuzhou Protestants and the Making of a Modern China, 1857-1927*, Yale Historical Publications, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001).

48 Yahuda, “China’s Win-Win Globalization.”

49 Yahuda, “China’s Win-Win Globalization.”

50 David Dollar, “*The AIIB and the ‘One Belt, One Road’*,” Brookings, updated Summer 2015, accessed June 5, 2021, <https://www.brookings.edu/opinions/the-aiib-and-the-one-belt-one-road/>.

ideology of Chinese traditional culture since 134 BC.⁵¹ Thus, the norms associated with the China Dream are a product of the ideologies such as collectivism, benevolence, and integrity that are brought in through Confucianism, mingled with the individualism established wherever secular modernity arose. The former contributes to the national dimension of the China Dream,⁵² and the latter contributes to the personal dimension of the China Dream.⁵³

The ethos behind CSFM is China's global value to develop a new path to peace, prosperity, and modernity. These values are multi-dimensional, including mutual interdependence and cooperation in global power, a joint stakeholder in the common interest, sustainable development in ecology, reduction of poverty, promotion of worldwide mechanism, and win-win cooperation in global governance.⁵⁴ For Tobin, these dimensions "reflect the extraordinarily wide range of arenas in which Beijing believes it must restructure global governance to enable China to integrate with the world while at the same time achieving global leadership."⁵⁵

The deeper levels of motivation and commitment of the China Aspiration can be summarized with twofold significance. First, it is a deep-seated ethos of decoloniality, which has been either neglected or (falsely) reduced to nationalism by Western social science and politics.⁵⁶ Hidden behind the core socialist values lies a deep sense of liberation from the "Century of Humiliation" brought in by Western imperialism and colonialism. Tobin observes correctly that in global governance as proposed in CSFM, "Chinese leaders advocate 'consultative' democracy not only in state-to-state relations but also within states, arguing that it is a valid and even superior model. Chinese official media disparage western democratic regimes as chaotic, confrontational, competitive, inefficient and oligarchic."⁵⁷ But she fails to notice that this is a typical decolonizing view of interculturality which "calls for radical change in the dominant order and in its foundational base of capitalism, Western modernity, and ongoing colonial power."⁵⁸ For Walter Mignolo and Catherine Walsh, decoloniality means "thinking, doing, sharing, and collaborating with people in different parts

51 Shijie Wei, "Harmony in Confucian Thought and Building a Community of Shared Future for Mankind," *SHS Web of Conferences* 153, no. 01006 (2023), <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202315301006>; Lin and Zhu, "Cultural Differences," 10.

52 The national dimension of the China dream aims to build a strong China, stable China, generous China, harmonious China, civilized China, beautiful China, and creative China. See Lin and Zhu, "Cultural Differences," 12.

53 The personal dimension is composed of two parts: physical and mental well-being. Physically, every individual can enjoy safe food, decent housing, personal security, quality education, modern healthcare and secure retirement. Mentally, each individual can be more resilient, rewarded and fulfilled, thus making a more stable and thriving society. See Lin and Zhu, "Cultural Differences," 12.

54 Xing Qu, "人类命运共同体的价值观基础," *People Daily*, updated Feb 16, 2013, accessed June 5, 2021, <http://theory.people.com.cn/n/2013/0216/c40531-20496626-2.html>.

55 Tobin, "Xi's Vision for Transforming Global Governance," 157.

56 Pál Nyíri and Joana Breidenbach, *China inside out: Contemporary Chinese Nationalism and Transnationalism* (Budapest, Hungary: Central European University Press, 2005); Chris Buckley, "China's Combative Nationalists See a World Turning Their Way," *The New York Times*, updated Dec 14, 2020, accessed June 8, 2021, <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/12/14/world/asia/china-nationalists-covid.html>.

57 Tobin, "Xi's Vision for Transforming Global Governance," 157.

58 Walter Mignolo and Catherine E. Walsh, *On Decoloniality: Concepts, Analytics, Praxis* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2018), 58.

of the globe engaged in similar paths, people striving ... in their own local histories confronting global designs.”⁵⁹ Such a deeper and more profound motivation is deeply embedded in the China Aspiration.

The second aspect is related to the Confucian philosophical and political concept of “all-under-heaven” (*tianxia* 天下), which originated three thousand years ago but is still largely unknown in Western countries.⁶⁰ “All-under-heaven” is the Chinese philosophy of world politics that focuses more on “worldness” than “internationality.”⁶¹ For Zhao, a world theory is “impossible until universal well-being takes priority over that of the nation-state.”⁶² Those who penned the China Aspiration would whole-heartedly agree with Zhao in his observation that “[t]he key problem today is that of a failed world as opposed to that of so-called failed states. No country could possibly be successful in a failed world.”⁶³ The ancient Chinese concept of “all-under-heaven” is an institutional system of the world that is “of and for the world, or by the world” to promote universal well-being, and not just the interests of some dominating nations in the current world system. The contemporary world system is “essentially imperialistic in terms of dominance, having evolved from the concept of empire in terms of rule by power.”⁶⁴ The system of “all-under-heaven” is characterized by its global perspective and the principle of harmony amongst all nations. Zhou dissects the dense concepts as a “semantic trinity,” in that it captures three meanings: the earth or all lands under the sky, a common choice made by all peoples in the world, or a universal agreement in the “hearts” of all peoples, and a political system for the world within a global institution to ensure universal order. With the all-under-heaven concept, the world is understood as consisting of the physical world (land), the psychological world (the general sentiment of peoples), and the institutional world (a world institution). The heart of the Chinese political concept “consists of a hierarchy between all-under-heaven, states and then families, as opposed to nation-states, communities and individuals in the West.”⁶⁵

Consequently, from the Chinese viewpoint, the Western political system would seem incomplete and is inherently dangerous in that there is no one to take care of the world.⁶⁶ The spirit of “all-under-heaven” has greatly influenced Chinese politics that even today, without some knowledge of the former, one could not correctly understand the latter.⁶⁷ This philosophy thus plays a vital role as the global consciousness⁶⁸ embedded in CSFM.

59 Mignolo and Walsh, *On Decoloniality*, 245.

60 Tingyang Zhao, “A Political World Philosophy in terms of All-under-heaven (Tian-xia),” *Diogenes* 56, no. 1 (2009), <https://doi.org/10.1177/0392192109102149>: 5-18, p. 7.

61 Zhao, “A Political World Philosophy,” 6.

62 Zhao, “A Political World Philosophy,” 5-6.

63 Zhao, “A Political World Philosophy,” 5.

64 Zhao, “A Political World Philosophy,” 6.

65 Zhao, “A Political World Philosophy,” 11.

66 Zhao, “A Political World Philosophy,” 11.

67 Zhao, “A Political World Philosophy,” 9.

68 Lechner and Boli, *The Globalization Reader*, 2.

(3) Spherical Analysis

In present-day China, undoubtedly, the political sphere is the dominating one over all others.⁶⁹ Xie observes that “in the Chinese tradition, despite the emergence of a non-governmental public sphere and its struggle with governmental intervention, the meaning of the public is primarily dominated by the government. There remains a lack of any strong sense of diverse social spheres.”⁷⁰ From this perspective, the China Dream is this dominant political sphere permeating and controlling almost all other spheres, including the religious sphere, thereby breaking the principle of complex equality and creating social injustices.⁷¹ Such a dominance marginalizes and excludes Christianity *de facto* from China’s most ambitious project of human flourishing.

The dominance of the political sphere is true not only domestically but also internationally. In a continual effort to expand China’s cultural influences, China has established hundreds of Confucius Institutes in dozens of countries, driven by a strong political motive. However, Ren argues that due to the insufficiency of cultural content and key concepts which can typify contemporary China, it is hard to see Confucius Institutes as China’s soft power.⁷² Once again, in its consideration of expanding cultural influences, the China Aspiration ignores the Chinese Christians’ contributions to the global church.⁷³

(4) Social Analysis with Globalization in View

It is worth pointing out that the China Aspiration does not remain merely as an ideology. On the contrary, China has been implementing this strategy both on the domestic and international levels with perseverance. Aided by China’s hall-mark capability of “concentrating resources to accomplish large undertaking” (*jizhong lilianqiang bandashi* 集中力量办大事), China has achieved enormous social accomplishments in many areas, including doubling the life expectancy in the

69 Xie argues that in the Chinese tradition, despite the emergence of a non-governmental public sphere and its struggle with governmental intervention, the meaning of the public is primarily dominated by the government. There remains a lack of any strong sense of diverse social spheres. Xie, “Why Public and Theological?,” 397, 402; Zhibin Xie, “Human Nature, Justice, and Society: Reinhold Niebuhr in the Chinese Context,” *Theology Today* 77, no. 3 (2020), <https://doi.org/10.1177/0040573620926243>, 237.

70 Xie, “Why Public and Theological?,” 402.

71 Walzer, *Spheres of Justice*, 17-20. For a special issue of bringing Reinhold Niebuhr’s theological methodology into a contextual experiment with the “reality of human experience” in the Chinese context (including mainland China, Hong Kong and Taiwan), and dealing with issues of human nature, justice and democracy, see Xie, “Human Nature, Justice, and Society.”

72 Ren Zhe, “The Confucius Institutes and China’s Soft Power,” *IDE discussion papers* 330 (2012).

73 For example, Chinese Christian Watchman Nee was honored by Christianity Today to be one of the 100 most influential Christians in the 20th century. Both Nee and his disciple Witness Lee were recognized by the American Congress. See Representative Smith, In Recognition of Watchman Nee, (U.S. Congress, 2009); Rep. Pitts, Watchman Nee and Witness Lee, (Congressional Record, 2014). For the Local Churches’ contribution to the global church, see Jacob Chengwei Feng, “Against the Tide: The Ecclesiology of the Local Churches and Its Contribution to a Global Church,” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 65, no. 2 (2022).

past seventy years,⁷⁴ lifting one hundred million people out of poverty in a decade,⁷⁵ winning its battle against air pollution,⁷⁶ just to name a few.

However, as the beneficiary of neoliberalism, China has also experienced its unavoidable mishaps. The Chinese youths, to whom the former President Mao Zedong paid a well-known tribute and said, “you young people ... are like the sun at eight or nine in the morning ... We put our hopes in you,” have recently demonstrated their increasing control over the narrative on Chinese social media with the growing popularity of buzzwords such as “lying flat” (*tangping* 躺平) and “involution” (*neijuan* 内卷). The former shows Gen Z’s alternative way of thinking to stop striving for mainstream goals such as buying a house whose price has constantly been rising, getting married, and having a child, as a “silent and blameless protest” of living like wage slaves consumed by consumerism, while the latter expresses their resentment towards “[a] highly dynamic trap which consumes a lot of energy” while running in place and constantly having to motivate themselves day in and day out.⁷⁷ Mishra captures this sense of resentment “of people who feel left behind by the globalized economy or contemptuously ignored by its slick overlords and cheerleaders in politics, business, and the media.”⁷⁸ Other domestic problems include widening the gap between the rich and the poor,⁷⁹ the aging problem⁸⁰ reflected by its recent major policy shift of allowing more than one child per family,⁸¹ violation of basic human rights in the preference of “Survival Rights,”⁸² and freedom of religion.⁸³ Internationally, China’s signature Belt and Road

74 Anonymous, “How did life expectancy double in China in 70 years?,” PR Newswire, updated Oct 10, 2019, accessed June 6, 2021, <https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/how-did-life-expectancy-double-in-china-in-70-years-300936234.html>.

75 William N. Brown, *Chasing the Chinese Dream: Four Decades of Following China’s War on Poverty* (Singapore: Springer Singapore, 2021 Jun 02, 2021); Jack Goodman, “Has China Lifted 100 Million People out of Poverty?,” BBC News, updated Feb. 28, 2021, 2021, accessed June 7th, 2021, <https://www.bbc.com/news/56213271>.

76 Felix Leung, “How China is Winning Its Battle Against Air Pollution,” Earth.org, 2019, accessed June 7, 2021, <https://earth.org/how-china-is-winning-its-battle-against-air-pollution/>.

77 Heather Mowbray, “Trending in China: Young Chinese Reject Rat Race, Embrace ‘Lying Flat’,” Caixin, updated March 31, 2021, 2021, accessed June 7, 2021.

78 Pankaj Mishra, *Age of Anger: A History of the Present*, First American ed. (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2017), 274.

79 Huifang He, “China’s ‘Two Sessions’: Wealth Inequality Poses Threat to Beijing’s Post-pandemic Economic Plan,” SCMP, updated March 4, 2021, 2021, accessed May 16, 2021, <https://www.scmp.com/economy/global-economy/article/3123891/chinas-two-sessions-wealth-inequality-poses-threat-beijings>.

80 Ryan Woo and Kevin Yao, “China Demographic Crisis Looms as Population Growth Slips to Slowest Ever,” Reuters, 2021, accessed June 7, 2021, <https://www.reuters.com/world/china/china-2020-census-shows-slowest-population-growth-since-1-child-policy-2021-05-11/>.

81 Stephen McDonell, “China Allows Three Children in Major Policy Shift,” BBC News, 2021, accessed June 7, 2021, <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-china-57303592>.

82 Baijie An, “Survival, Development Are Basic Human Rights: Xi,” China Daily, 2016, accessed June 8, 2021, http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/china/2016-12/04/content_27563699.htm.

83 Hua Shen, “China Conducts Two Trials in Crackdown on Audio Bibles,” (Dec. 14, 2020), Voice of America, 2020, accessed June 7, 2021, <https://www.voanews.com/east-asia-pacific/china-conducts-two-trials-crackdown-audio-bibles>.

Initiative (B&R), as the most visible means by which China implements CSFM, receives harsh criticisms.⁸⁴

The China Aspiration is thus the globalization “with the Chinese characteristics.” As a beneficiary of neoliberalism in the narrow sense of globalization, China intends to continue to harness the economic gains from the same globalization process and yet exert its economic and political influences worldwide by its Belt and Road Initiative (B&R). Therefore, the China Aspiration faces insurmountable domestic problems and deep-seated concerns and criticisms from the international community. Such aspiration is yet another implementation of modern humanism in that it “rejected God and the command to love God” but still “retained the moral obligation to love neighbor.”⁸⁵ Harari argues that “[f]or 300 years the world has been dominated by humanism, which sanctifies the life, happiness and power of Homo sapiens.” After investigating who Homo sapiens really is and how humanism became the dominant world religion, Harari concludes that “attempting to fulfill the humanist dream is like to cause its disintegration.”⁸⁶

In sum, the China Aspiration can be analyzed with the following features. First, the China Aspiration is deeply rooted in Confucianism and its ancient philosophy of “all-under-heaven,” undergirded by the ethos of the “Century of humiliation” and the sense of decoloniality. The aspiration is coupled with dissatisfaction or competition with the current Western political system and equipped with a universal touch of caring for the worldness (*tianxia*). Second, led by this aspiration and executed with a strong will, China has achieved significant accomplishments towards human prosperity. However, this grandiose aspiration as another form of humanism has been inevitably repeating the ills of neoliberalism and humanism, inclined to future disintegration with the possibility of turning a dream into an illusion and even a nightmare. Third, of the uttermost concern to Christian theologians, ethicists, and church leaders is that Christianity has been utterly excluded from this all-encompassing design that affects every Chinese citizen.

IV. Jacob’s Narrative: Chinese Public Theology of Human Flourishing for the Third Millennium

The Chinese public theology of human flourishing under construction has two goals. First, it will resist disintegration and interact with the ultimate reality intimately related to heaven. To that end, the article turns to Jacob’s narrative as a sketch of a project of human flourishing in China as a “God-based framework for discernment, evaluation, and transformation.”⁸⁷ Second, Christians are not indifferent to, and therefore, should not be left out of the project of human flourishing in China.

84 Anthony Kleven, “*Belt and Road: Colonialism with Chinese Characteristics*,” (May 6, 2019), The Lowy Institute, 2019, accessed June 7, 2021, <https://www.loyyinstitute.org/the-interpreter/belt-and-road-colonialism-chinese-characteristics>.

85 Volf, *Public Faith*, 59.

86 Harari, *Homo Deus*, 66.

87 Stackhouse, “General Introduction,” 18.

It is imperative that public theologians engage with the public actively by putting forth their vision of human flourishing, which is “the main thing the Christian faith brings into the public debate.”⁸⁸

Volf is correct that the way Christians work toward human flourishing is not by imposing on others their vision of human flourishing and the common good but by bearing witness to Christ, who embodies the good life.⁸⁹ However, Volf’s proposal of human flourishing mainly interacts with Western societies.

To develop a contextualized Chinese public theology, this paper resorts to the Scriptures for inspiration. One of the earliest prominent figures exhibiting human flourishing is Jacob, as illustrated in the Jacob narrative (Gen. 25:19-36:43). The final section in Gen. 32-35 culminates in the nocturnal struggle and concomitant name change from “Jacob” the “supplanter/deceiver” (cf. 25:26; 27:36) to “Israel” the “God-wrestler” (32:29; cf. 35:10). Victor Matthews and Frances Mims argue that with his new name, Jacob at last reaches a level of maturation that allows him to become the rightful heir to the covenant.⁹⁰ Gerhard von Rad labels Jacob’s new name “a name of honor” that will now ensure God’s recognition and acceptance of him.⁹¹ Walter Brueggemann argues for a transference of power between God and humanity whereby Jacob assumes a new identity as both a man and a community in relationship with God.⁹² Therefore, human flourishing is not only exemplified in Jacob as an individual, but also in Israel as a nation.

Brueggemann observes that the Jacob narrative “portrays Israel in its earthiest and most scandalous appearance in Genesis,” and is thus offensive to one who seeks edification in any conventional religious or moral sense:

But for that very reason, the Jacob narrative is most lifelike. It presents Jacob in his crude mixture of motives. This grandson of the promise is a rascal compared to his faithful grandfather Abraham or his successful father Isaac.... The narrator knows that the purposes of God are tangled in a web of self-interest and self-seeking.⁹³

To Brueggemann, God’s initial and inscrutable designation of Jacob (25:23) “brings Jacob to well-being and prosperity,”⁹⁴ namely, a flourishing life. But this affirmation needs to be held in tension with another, namely, the fact that this designation begins the trouble (25:29-34; 27:1-45) that is to mark Jacob’s entire life which “has conflicts with all those around him.”⁹⁵ As the mainspring

88 Volf, *Public Faith*, xv.

89 Volf, *Public Faith*, 99-117.

90 Victor H. Matthews and Frances Mims, “Jacob the Trickster and Heir of the Covenant: A Literary Interpretation”, *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 12 (1985): 185-96, pp. 186-87.

91 Gerhard von Rad, *Genesis*, trans. J. H. Marks (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1973), 321.

92 Walter Brueggemann, *Genesis, Interpretation, a Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching*, (Atlanta: John Knox, 1982), 268-69.

93 Brueggemann, *Genesis*, 204.

94 Brueggemann, *Genesis*, 204.

95 Brueggemann, *Genesis*, 204-5.

of the narrative, the juxtaposition of “special designation” for flourishing and “a life of conflict” identifies with Volf’s assertion that:

Flourishing requires the transformative presence of the true life in the midst of the false, which requires that the true world come to be in the midst of the false world, that the world recall, recover, and for the first time fully embody its goodness as the gift of the God who is love.⁹⁶

The four-fold analysis presented in the first part of the paper excavates the China Aspiration and identifies the deeply embedded human conflict. However, as illustrated in Jacob, “the two kinds of narratives, of human conflict and of divine confrontation, cannot be separated from each other.”⁹⁷ Brueggemann argues that, on the one hand, we cannot simply focus on the “religious” encounters; on the other hand, Jacob does not live in a history that is flat and one-dimensional. The same can be said of China. The China Aspiration with a noble and universal goal of human flourishing cannot be accomplished without divine intervention: “The two dimensions of reality is of one peace.”⁹⁸

These two dimensions of reality are manifested first in the vision of Bethel, which comes in Jacob’s flight from his brother, who wants to kill him. Second, the crippling encounter at Penu’el (32:22-32) comes in the midst of great anxiety about reconciliation with that same brother. Similarly, the success or failure of the China Aspiration “will depend in large part on how its proposals are received in other countries.”⁹⁹ While China is engaged in reconciliation with the international community, such as the United States in the trade war,¹⁰⁰ and European Union on the investment deal suspension,¹⁰¹ its leaders need to take heed to Brueggemann’s conclusion that “[t] here are no troubled dimensions of human interaction which are removed from the coming of the Holy God. And there are no meetings with the Holy God apart from the realities of troubled human life.”¹⁰² For Jacob to live in the reality of flourishing life as a gift of God, he, or the narrator, is deeply aware that this juxtaposition in Jacob’s narrative is a statement about “the God who comes and the human life into which he comes.” In the opportunities and struggles of the globalization whose transformative powers of interdependence “reach deeply into all aspects of contemporary

96 Volf and Croasmun, *For the Life of the World*, 150.

97 Brueggemann, *Genesis*, 210.

98 Brueggemann, *Genesis*, 210.

99 Tobin, “Xi’s Vision for Transforming Global Governance,” 156.

100 Sara Hsu, “*The US-China Trade War Is Still Happening: Four Years and A New President later, U.S. tariffs on Chinese Products Remain.*,” *The Diplomat*, 2021, accessed June 8, 2021, <https://thediplomat.com/2021/03/the-us-china-trade-war-is-still-happening/>.

101 Su-Lin Tan, “*China-EU Investment Deal Suspension Seen as More Politically Symbolic than Economic, but Risks to Trade Exist.*,” *South China Morning Post*, updated May 21, 2021, accessed June 8, 2021, <https://www.scmp.com/news/china/diplomacy/article/3134258/eu-china-investment-deal-hold-meps-vote-halt-talks>.

102 Brueggemann, *Genesis*, 210.

social life,”¹⁰³ China, as well as the others, may “learn how it is that the Holy God impinges upon power struggles and how it is that human realities are transformed by these assaults from God.”¹⁰⁴

Genesis chapter 28 records Jacob’s encounter with God, who appeared to him in a dream and declared that “I am the LORD, the God of Abraham your father and the God of Isaac” (v. 13, NRSV).¹⁰⁵ Elsewhere in Genesis, God is called “the maker of heaven and earth” (14:19, 22) and “the God of heaven and earth” (24:3). Therefore, in Hebrew scriptures, the concept of heaven is closely associated with God as the ultimate reality. The transformative power of Jacob’s encounter with God as the ultimate reality has a two-fold manifestation in his fleeing journey. First, as an exiled and threatened “non-person” who had to stop and rest in an insignificant “non-place,” Jacob is transformed by the coming of God to a person crucial for the promise of human flourishing. Second, the “non-place” is transformed into a crucial place, Bethel.¹⁰⁶

Jacob’s meeting with the ultimate reality happens in a dream. The wakeful world of Jacob was a world of fear, terror, loneliness, and unresolved guilt.¹⁰⁷ However, the dream permits the entry of an alternative into his life. The dream is “not a morbid review of a shameful past,” but “rather the presentation of an alternative future with God.”¹⁰⁸ This future, in the form of promise, “affirms the promise of land for Israel and the promise of well-being for others by Israel.”¹⁰⁹ The promise for the well-being of others protects the narrative from self-interests.¹¹⁰ Gospel moves to Jacob in a time when his guard is down. Likewise, in China, no matter how dominant its political sphere is, the China Dream will be used by God as “a means by which the purpose of God has its say in the life of this family.”¹¹¹

The news brought in by the dream is “that there is traffic between heaven and earth.”¹¹² In the dream, Jacob saw a “ramp,” rather than the conventional “ladder,” which has become “a visual vehicle for a gospel assertion.”¹¹³ For Brueggemann, the earth is not left to its own resources, and heaven is not a remote, self-contained realm for the gods. Heaven has to do with earth, and earth finally may count on the resources of heaven. That is the substance of the vision that shatters the presumed world of Jacob. He had assumed he traveled alone, with his only purpose being survival. It was not hard then to conclude that divine and ultimate reality was not irrelevant. Brueggemann

103 Lechner and Boli, *The Globalization Reader*, xxvi.

104 Brueggemann, *Genesis*, 210.

105 Unless otherwise stated, all verse references are from NRSV.

106 Brueggemann, *Genesis*, 242.

107 Brueggemann, *Genesis*, 243.

108 Brueggemann, *Genesis*, 243.

109 Brueggemann, *Genesis*, 244.

110 Brueggemann, *Genesis*, 244.

111 Brueggemann, *Genesis*, 243.

112 Brueggemann, *Genesis*, 243.

113 Brueggemann, *Genesis*, 243.

alludes to incarnational faith of the power of God being embodied in a historical man, an image Jesus referred to in John 1:51.¹¹⁴

The heaven motif in Jacob's dream has two-fold implications for Chinese public theology. First, heaven is not merely a philosophical abstraction, as in the case of "all-under-heaven" (*tianxia*), above states and families to take care of the world. The concept of *tianxia* is employed to promote the vision of CSFM and seeking wide recognition from the international community with a Confucian phrase: "we are not alone on the Great Way, and the whole *tianxia* is one family."¹¹⁵ While relying on the Human Exhortation of Common Destiny (another translation of CSFM) to persuade the international community, the China Aspiration as a human vision ultimately depends on the conditional acceptance of other states.

In Jacob's narrative, heaven "refers to the reality of promise related to the purpose of God." The earth can only become "a place of possibility because it has not been and will not be cut off from the sustaining role of God."¹¹⁶ Any human aspiration needs the sustaining role of God to become an aspiration of possibility.

Second, while China has been using the concept of "Survival Rights" to shy away from its responsibility to protect basic human rights,¹¹⁷ God as the divine and ultimate reality cannot be deemed as irrelevant, just like in Jacob's case. This God is a just God who proclaims justice (Matt. 11:18, 20; 23:23). To achieve human flourishing, social justice as a social condition is necessary because justice "forms the basic architecture of a common life," and "there are certain norms and values, such as dignity, freedom, equality, and human rights, that are universal in nature and authority."¹¹⁸ In China, this entails the cessation of religious persecution.¹¹⁹ Instead of repressing Christianity, China will do well if it adopts a policy of religious flourishing because human flourishing necessarily means religious flourishing. The reason is straightforward: "[t]he world has always been a very religious place,"¹²⁰ and may I add that humanity has always been a very religious being. The once-popular motto $\frac{3}{4}$ "all religions will wither away" $\frac{3}{4}$ has been proven false.¹²¹ On the contrary, "the fastest-growing worldviews today are religious $\frac{3}{4}$ Islam and Christianity."¹²² Therefore, human flourishing is a holistic framework in which religious flourishing is an indispensable constituent. If China continues its policy to allow the

114 Brueggemann, *Genesis*, 243.

115 In the English version, *tianxia* is translated to "world." See Jinping Xi, "President Xi Jinping's 2021 New Year Address," *xinhuanet.com*, 2020, accessed June 8, 2021, http://www.xinhuanet.com/politics/leaders/2020-12/31/c_1126934359.htm.

116 Brueggemann, *Genesis*, 243.

117 Xigen Wang, "生存权发展权是首要的基本人权," *People Daily*, updated Feb 19, 2021, accessed June 8, 2021, <http://theory.people.com.cn/n1/2021/0219/c40531-32031360.html>.

118 Lee, *God and Community Organizing: A Covenantal Approach*, 163.

119 Christians have been prosecuted and sentenced to prison for possessing certain religious publication, whether in print or in multimedia format. See Shen, "China Conducts Two Trials in Crackdown on Audio Bibles."

120 Volf, *Public Faith*, 119.

121 Volf, *Public Faith*, 120.

122 Volf, *Public Faith*, 120.

political sphere to dominate the religious sphere and tighten its control of Christianity, the state-sanctioned churches will continually lose their members to underground churches.¹²³ Therefore, it is imperative that public theologians engage with politics in proposing that given the religious diversity in China, they “affirm freedom of religion” as a basic human right and “reject any form of religious totalitarianism and to embrace pluralism as a political project.”¹²⁴

In sum, the paper has constructed a Chinese public theology of human flourishing based on Jacob’s narrative. As a prominent patriarch featuring human flourishing not only on an individual level but also as a precursor to Israel on a national level, Jacob experienced the transforming power from an exiled and threatened “non-person” to a person crucial for God’s promise. Amid conflicts and striving for survival, Jacob encountered the ultimate reality in his dream. With a ramp connecting heaven and earth, and with God of heaven and earth standing above the ramp, this dream shatters Jacob’s presumed world and makes the earth a place of possibility for genuine human flourishing through the sustaining role of the real ultimate reality, which makes it possible to resist any form of disintegration. To Jacob, God’s promise of human flourishing reaches beyond his own strife for survival but holistic well-being and prosperity for himself and others. Therefore, public theology’s engagement in theory and praxis in China ought to adopt religious pluralism as a political project and advocate religious flourishing as part of holistic human flourishing.

V. Conclusion

In this paper, I have argued for a Christian proposal of human flourishing in China in dialogue with the China Aspiration, a collective term including the China Dream and the Community of Shared Future for Mankind (CSFM). However, there has been a gap in theological treatment from the perspective of Chinese public theology. The paper proposed a detailed, multi-tiered analysis of the China Aspiration by using an eclectic and hybrid methodology that combines interdisciplinary, social, spherical, ethological, and global approaches. The paper then analyzed the history of China’s modernity and highlighted the “Century of humiliation” as an ethos underlying the China Aspiration. Moreover, the ethos of decoloniality and the ancient philosophical and political concept of “all-under-heaven” (*tianxia*) capture the China Aspiration’s deep-seated ethology that resorts to heaven as the ultimate reality. Moreover, what governs the China Aspiration is the dominant political sphere both at home and abroad.

123 In 2017 and 2018, Harris Doshay, a doctoral student at Princeton University, attended and analyzed the sermons delivered by ministers of the Three-Self Patriotic Movement, the state-controlled Protestant church. Mr. Doshay found that congregants showed their preference by “voting with their eyelids”: if the oration stayed within party lines, many, consistently and sometimes rather demonstratively, decided to nap. Anonymous, “*Protestant Christianity is booming in China*,” *The Economist*, 2020, accessed May 16, 2021, <https://www.economist.com/graphic-detail/2020/09/15/protestant-christianity-is-booming-in-china>.

124 Volf, *Public Faith*, 144.

The China Aspiration has achieved a certain degree of success. However, as a beneficiary of neoliberalism, China also experienced its unavoidable pitfalls. As globalization with Chinese characteristics, the China Aspiration in actuality is another implementation of humanism heading to likely disintegration. Based on such detailed and extensive analysis, the paper presented a Chinese public theology of human flourishing. By exploring Jacob's narrative in Genesis, the paper presented Jacob as a pioneer and model of individual and national human flourishing. With the help of the juxtaposition between human conflict and divine confrontation, the paper engaged the China Aspiration on the level of heaven as the ultimate reality. Jacob's dream invites God into his life which overcomes his shameful past. Through the traffic between heaven and earth on the ramp, true human flourishing is made possible and holistic by the rich resources of heaven where God dwells.

If there is anything constructive-or perhaps novel-element in this paper, it is the fourfold analysis of the China Aspiration (China Dream and the Community of Shared Future of Mankind), the identification of its deeper motivation of decoloniality and connection with the ancient Chinese philosophy of all-under-heaven, and a constructive Chinese public theology of human flourishing in the Third Millennium. However, due to the paper's limited scope, more in-depth theory and praxis in the field of public theology are needed to respond to the China Aspiration comprehensively.

汉语题目：

从雅各叙事（创二五19-三六43）的视角分析中国抱负：构建为着第三个千年、基于人类繁荣之中国公共神学

作者：冯成伟·富勒神学院·博士候选人·chengweifeng@fuller.edu

提要：与长达5个世纪的全球殖民历史相比，中国的半殖民历史只有一百多年。但是，自从1949年直到现在，殖民、反殖民、反帝、去殖民主义的思想仍然深深地潜伏在意识形态、哲学、政治，特别是中国神学里。本论文认为，借助创世纪中雅各之叙事（创二五19-三六43），中国公共神学能够在国内及国际层面的人类繁荣上，与统称为“中国抱负”（包括中国梦和人类命运共同体）进行有效的对话。本文首先从四个阶段来分析中国半殖民/反殖民的历史，以及每个阶段对中国神学的影响。然后，本文从三个层次（“三明治”）来剖析中国神学在认识论上的危机。最后，本文尝试构建为着第三个千年、基于人类繁荣的中国公共神学。

关键词：认识论危机·中国梦·人类命运共同体·人类繁荣·中国公共神学

Women and Aged Disability: A Study of Naomi's Gender identity and its Transformation in *the Book of Ruth*

Zhengyi MO

(Associated professor of Zhejiang Yuexiu University)

Author: Mo Zhengyi, associate professor at the School of English of Zhejiang Yuexiu University, Tel: +13957851492, Email: mozy11@163.com

Abstract: This paper attempts to investigate Naomi's gender identity and its transformation based on the integration of feminist and aged disability perspectives. Focusing on dismantling and restoration of Naomi's gender identity in the story of Ruth, the investigation exposes how such a transformation is related to the norm of womanhood set in the patriarchal society of biblical Israel. Naomi's case reflects how the patriarchal values of ancient Israel obscured and shaped identities of the post-menopausal women, some of the most vulnerable members of the society. This investigation offers contemporary readers an opportunity to contemplate similar instances within their own communities and to reflect on what different individuals and communities can do to protect the dignity and well-being of the oppressed.

Key words: gender identity, aged disability, transformation, womanhood, biblical Israel

1. Introduction

Increasing frailty is a common identifier for an aging person in the Hebrew Bible. There are several mentions regarding the failing, blind eyes of the old man in the case of Issac (Gen 27.21) and Jacob (Gen 48.10), and the waning vitality in in case of Barzillai (2 Sam 19.35). In 1King1.1-4, David loses his reproductive vigor and is deemed insufficiently masculine. On the other hand, it is uncommon that Hebrew Bible has biases in favour of senior aged men. For example, Abraham (Gen25.8), Gideon (Judg 8.32) and David (1Chron 29.28) are three "gray headed" individuals and whose age is described as the "good old age" (*sēbâ tōbâ*) at their late life stage. In addition, the biblical texts also highlights examples of aged able-bodied men, such as Caleb and Moses. For example, Moses was a hundred and twenty years when he died, his eyes were undimmed and his vigor unabated (Deut 34.27). By comparing of physical conditions regarding the old age of Moses and David as example, it shows that old age could be a source of disability for men, but not always so. In contrast, the biblical text provides no direct information about the physical state relating to senior age of women.

It is widely recognized that a male-centric perspective is adopted in the Hebrew Bible.¹ If a favourable description of the relation between man and his old age is made based on this

1 E.g. Ilona Rashkow, "Ruth: The Discourse of Power and the Power of Discourse," in *The Feminist Companion to the Bible*, ed. Althalya Brenner (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 26; Carol Meyers, *Discovering Eve: Ancient Israelite Women in Context* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 23-24.

male-centric perspective, what is the perspective toward woman of old age in biblical Israel society? By examining the life of Naomi from the book of Ruth as an example, this paper investigates her gender identity and its transformation with a focus on the dismantling and restoration of her femininity.² It is expected that through the investigation, the relation between the transformation of Naomi's gender identity and the norm of womanhood set in biblical Israel, as well as the self perception of her female identity, can be disclosed. Based on this, a conclusion is to be reached that the post-menopausal women of the biblical Israel, represented by *'almānā* Naomi, suffer from being denied recognition as women under their final incapacity to bear children, and gender practices of a patriarchal structure pose a fluid, complicated and more significant impact on their gender identities than biological sex.

2. Research Perspectives and Background Information

Gender, which refers to the social roles ascribed to femininity and masculinity, is applied as a means to describe its distinction from the biological sex.³ While biological sex is fundamentally determined by chromosomal makeup and physiological structure, gender is a social and cultural construct, an outcome of various arrangements, and as a means of legitimizing one of the most fundamental divisions of society.⁴ Gender intersects with race, sexuality, ethnicity, social class, and nation in variegated and situationally contingent ways, and can be understood as external to the individual, and is perceived and expressed via a series of ongoing judgments and evaluations by others, as well as of others.⁵ Moreover, gender is a primary way of signifying relationships of power.

2 Hans Wolff provides a typical example of traditional interpretation of the biblical data on the understanding of three distinguished life stages of the human lifespan, which is on the measuring stick of physical maturity: children, young but fully-grown men and women, and the mature or elderly.

children (*yōnēq*, the sucking child, Deut 32.25; *nāar*, the boy, Ps148.12; *tap*, toddling but not capable of walking, Ezek 9.6); young but fully-grown men and grown-up girls (*bāhūr* and *bētūlā*, Deut 32.25; Ezek 9.6 and Ps148.12); and mature, elderly, men and women (*zāqēn*, who wear a beard, Ezek 9.6; Ps.148.12; *iššēbā*, the grey-haired man, Deut 32.25; *iššā* Ezek 9.6).

See Hans Wolf, *Anthropology of the old Testament* (Columbia MD.SCM Press, 2012), 120. In addition, we may find similar expression to Wolff's phases of lifespan in Lev 27.1-7. In general, Wolff's perspectives of phases of the life basically focus on visible physical characteristics. However, his interpretation meets problems in that it offers no clue as to the social meaning behind these physical characteristics. For instance, it fails to touch the gendered cultural issues of old age for women. On the whole, Wolff's interpretation reinforces the male lens encoded in the biblical text based on the scholarly presuppositions he brings to his work. It is especially impressive when he parallels "fully grown men" with "grown-up girls" in his interpretation, implicating his male-centric position.

3 Jeanne Marecek, Mary Crawford, Danielle Popp, "On the Construction of Gender, Sex and Sexualities," in *The Psychology of Gender* (Eagly, Alice H.; Beall, Anne E.; Stenberg, Robert J. eds 2nd., New York. Guilford press, 2004), 190-261.

4 Candace West, Don H. Zimmerman, "Doing Gender," in *Doing gender, doing difference. inequality, power, and institutional change*, eds., S. Fenstermaker; W.Candace (New York. Routledge, 2013), 3-25.

5 Ibid.,

This is especially true in ancient world where women were dominated by men in terms of power and privilege, and women's gender was defined through a hierarchical power structure, typically manifested and exercised by a system referred to as "patriarchy".⁶ Overall, one's gender is somewhat ambiguous and has certain room for fluidity due to the ongoing influence of many complicated social aspects. ⁷In view of it, variability or transformation of gender deserves our attention and is worth following.

Like gender, disability is also a cultural production. It refers to a physical or mental conditions or state, negatively affecting categories of persons especially on account of social meaning and has contributed significantly to the generation and maintenance of inequality in societies.⁸ Disability relies on cultural perceptions of the nature of embodiment.⁹ Disability, which intersects with different aspects of a person's identity such as gender, race or social class, creates a unique experience of discrimination or oppression. Indeed, disability and gender intersect to create a unique experience that is not simply the coincidence of being a woman and having a disability separately, but the combined experience of being a woman with a disability. Women with disabilities, even more intensely than women in general, have been cast in the collective cultural imaginations as inferior, lacking, excessive, incapable, unfit, and useless.¹⁰ For instance, a barren woman was perceived to be deficient and denigrated in ancient Israel since she was unable to meet the norms of the reproductive function of female set in a man's world.¹¹ Therefore, feminist understandings of disability—the gendering of disability aids the modern interpreters of the Bible to understand how gender frame social relations and how these arrangements play out in the family and in work and into the later years of an Israelite woman's life.¹²

Prior to the discussion of Naomi's case, a brief background introduction to the status of the Israelite's women will be made. The studies of women's status in biblical law indicate that the biblical legislation, like ancient Near Eastern social policy in general, assumes women's subordinating roles to the dominant male in her life, either as daughter, wives, or mothers.¹³ An unmarried woman of biblical Israel is under the ownership and control of her father. She does not inherit from her father unless she has no brothers, in such cases, she must subsequently marry

6 Manohar D. Berkowitz & J.Tinkle, "Walk Like a Man, Talk Like a Woman. Teaching the Social Construction of Gender," *Teaching Sociology* 38 (2010), 132-143.

7 Kate Bornstein, *Gender Outlaw. On Men, Women and the Rest of Us* (Vintage,1995),51-52.

8 Saul M. Olyan, *Disability in the Hebrew Bible. Interpreting Mental and Physical Differences* (Cambridge. Cambridge University Press, 2008),2-3.

9 Claire McKinney, "Crippling the Classroom: Disability as a Teaching Method in the Humanities" in *Transformations: the Journal of Inclusive Scholarship and Pedagogy*, vol 25, No.4(Fall 2014/Winter 2016):114.

10 Garland-Thomson Rosemarie, "Feminist Disability Studies," in *Signs* 30 (2005) :1557-1558.

11 Candida R. Moss and Jeremy Schipper, *Disability and Isaiah's Suffering Servant* (Oxford. Oxford University Press, 2011),16-17.

12 Martha Holstein, *Women in Late Life. Critical Perspectives on Gender and Age* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield,2015), 9.

13 Tikva. Frymer-Kensky, *In the Wake of the Goddess. Women Culture and the Biblical Transformation of Pagan Myth* (New York, 1992), 121.

with her father's clan to prevent the dispersal of tribal property among outsiders (Num 36.2-12).¹⁴When getting married, she was bought by her husband from the house of her father by paying a certain amount of bride's price or *machor*.¹⁵ This man *bayal* owns and controls her, as a rule, wife, slaves as well as castles are listed altogether as belonging to the husband's house (Exod 20.14). Besides, a vow made by a married woman could be annulled if her husband persuaded her against it immediately, and she was forgiven by God (Num 30.8,12).

In a patriarchal society of ancient Israel, in which women were dominated by men in terms of power and privilege, it is not surprising that women's gender roles are prescribed and established by men. Having applied insights gleaned from sociology, anthropology, and archaeology to reconstruct modes of Israelite social life and the ordinary of biblical history, Carol Meyers argues that women are prescribed roles in the areas of textiles, food production, childbearing and-raising, and household education.¹⁶Meyer's view finds support among other scholars.¹⁷

Compared with other factors, childbearing is the most essential function in conforming to the norms of womanhood defined by the ancient Israel society. Like other ancient societies, women of biblical Israel married for the purpose of bearing children, particularly sons. The reproduction of further generations not only offers sustainable labour forces for the family, but is also the way to maintain the continuity of the line of the male dominated house.¹⁸ This is especially true in agrarian societies of the biblical period (1200-600BCE) with the high rate of infant mortality and maternal death during childbirth. Thus, giving birth to the next generation constituted a woman most important contribution to the house of her husband.¹⁹ Accordingly, it is assumed in

14 This is typically known as regulation of Zelophehad's daughter and will be discussed in part IV.

15 In the account of the quest for a bride for Issac in Gen 24, Abraham's servant on several occasions bestowed jewelry and other gifts on Rebekah and her family. In responding to Jacob's demand of returning to his native land, Leah and Rachel said that their father regarded them as foreign women. This could refer to the fact once married, they are no longer considered his responsibility, but part of Jacob's family. The use of the verb *mākar* "sell" (Gen 31.15) indicates that Leah and Rachel understood their marriage to have involved a purchase. Exod 22.16 and Deut 22.28 also provide hints of marrying a violated girl by paying the bride's price. In addition, in Gen34.2, Shechem's infatuation with Dinah led him to say to her father and brothers, "ask of me ever so much a bridewealth (*machor*) and gift (*mattan*) and I will give as you say to me."

16 Carol Meyer, "Everyday Life of Women in the Period of the Hebrew Bible," in *The Women's Bible Commentary*, eds. Carol A. Newsom and Sharon H. Ringe (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998), 252-259. Although domestic units may be different, women's influence and even dominating multifarious facets of economic life, social and parenting activities in household are not to be ignored. The "worthy woman" poem of Prov 31.10-31 reflects such a case. Nevertheless, women's sphere of influence is conceived of as limited to private, domestic-centered activities, not to public sectors of men's world, see Carol Meyers, "Returning Home: Ruth 1.8 and the Gendering of the Book of Ruth," in *The Feminist Companion to the Bible*, ed. Althalya Brenner (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 26; C. Meyers, *Discovering Eve: Ancient Israelite Women in Context* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 98-99,107,111.

17 E.g. Block argued that childbearing and doing housework were involved as main tasks of married women of ancient Israel, see Daniel I. Block, "Marriage and Family in Ancient Israel," in *Marriage and Family in the Biblical World* ed. Ken M. Campbell (Intervarsity Press, 2003), 72-76; Carolyn S. Leeb, "The Widow: Homeless and Post-Menopausal," in *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 32 (2002) :161.

18 Carol Meyers, "The Family in Early Israel," in *Families in Ancient Israel*, ed. Leo G. Perdue (Louisville. Westminster John Knox Press,1997), 27; Daniel I. Block, "Marriage and Family in Ancient Israel", 73.

19 Daniel I. Block, "Marriage and Family in Ancient Israel," 73.

the Hebrew Bible that a woman with a childbearing body is to be able bodied.²⁰ Infertility would indicate ultimate female disability because she does not conform to ancient Israel's expectations of womanhood.

In addition, motherhood also has a religious significance. In his monograph on the social meaning and the qualities of the gendered life cycle as it pertains to the religious life of an Israelite or Babylonian woman, van der Toorn argues that it was fixed that beginning from her nursing period, a girl would be expected to bear and raise children. He maintains that the experience of motherhood "formed the high point of the religious life of the average woman. Motherhood was her destiny... It was a climax in her religious life. The kindness of gods was tangibly present in the fruit of the womb."²¹ In biblical Israel, fertility was considered a blessing from the deity, and children were believed to be a reward to the family from YHWH.²² The loss of reproductive capabilities of a woman was often attributed to some hidden wrong, sin or flaw which was consequently related to being unblest or even curse by God, referring to her shameful religious identity.²³ Therefore, in consideration of social and religious consequences, a woman's infertility indicated her female disability and ultimately resulted in the deprivation of her femininity .

3. Dismantling of Naomi's femininity

According to chapter one of the book of Ruth, Naomi lost her husband and her two sons, thus, she became '*almānā*'. The Hebrew term *almānā* like the Akkadian *almattu* and the Sumerian NU.MU.SU or NU. MA.SU, is a legal-technical term that is more restricted than the English "widow".²⁴ It refers to a married woman, whose husband and her father-in-law are deceased, and she has no

20 In contrast, barrenness is mentioned in close context with illness, Exod 23.25-26: "I will remove sickness from you midst. No woman in you land shall miscarry or barren." In Dent 7.14-15, barrenness and sickness are aligned, see Candida R. Moss and Jeremy Schipper, *Disability Studies and Biblical literature* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 19.

21 Karel Van der Toor, *From Her Cradle to Her Grave. The Role of Religion in the life of the Israelite and the Babylonian Woman* (trans. Sara J. Denning-Bolle; The Biblical seminar 23; Sheffield. JSOT Press, 1994), 23. Likewise, young women who are barren in the the Hebrew Bible are often attributed to the cause that YHWH closed their wombs (Gen 30.22; 1Sam 1.5), and they were unable to bear a child until YHWH opened their wombs, emphasizing the divine role in conception and birth, also see Ps 113.9.

22 YHWH blessed men by saying "be fertile and increase, fill the earth..." (Gen 1.28) and this idea is to be found throughout the Hebrew Bible, such as Gen 15.1-6; 17.6; 22.17; 26.3-5, 24; 28.13-15; 24.60; 48.16; Rut 4.11; Ps 127.3-5; 128.3-4.

23 For example, Michal, daughter of Saul, had no children to her dying clay because she despised David for his leaping and whirling before God (2 Sam 6.12-23). Other typical cases of treating communal barrenness as a curse or punishment are found in Gen 20.17-18, Exod 23.25-26, Deny 7.14-15, Hos 9.11, etc. However, infertility related to unblest or curse from YHWH should not be perceived to be universal. Sometimes there is no indication of reason of infertility in the biblical text, to name a few, the cases of Rebekah or Rachel. It is not that they are barren because of divine curse or punishment for their wrongdoing. Rather, they are simply barren, see Candida R. Moss and Jeremy Schipper, *Disability studies and Biblical Literature*, 19-20.

24 In contrast, widow in English simply means a woman whose husband is dead, and who has not remarried, see Martha T. Roth, "The Neo-Babylonian Widow," in *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*, 43/45 (1991-1993):2-3.

son to provide her with financial support. In this respect, Naomi was left alone and in need of legal protection.²⁵

In a patriarchal society such as ancient Israel, Naomi became a member of her husband's family when she married. With the death of her husband Elimelech, she was still considered to be part of his family, and was subject to the authority of a male of his kin. In other words, even though death had ended the physical relationship that existed between Elimelech and Naomi, it had not terminated the relationship between Naomi and her husband's family, with the mutual rights and obligations incumbent upon both parties.²⁶

Nevertheless, with the end of the Elimelech's line, Naomi, as *'almānā*, had to turn to the kinsman of her husband's house to fulfill the law obligation to Elimelech by conducting a levirate marriage. Such a marriage might have also provided her legal protection which she desperately needed. Naomi could have had a chance to contract a levirate marriage with kinsman such as Boaz or the unnamed sandal off drawer (Rut 4.1-4), had she not been too old. Nevertheless, as Naomi was past childbearing age, she was not able to fulfill the law obligation any more, and thus no longer conformed to the view of womanhood of biblical Israel.²⁷ In this case, Naomi was understood to be deficient. It was not the physical changes themselves in a woman's body that happened when she was post-menopausal that led to her being marked as disabled, but rather the meaning that ancient Israel assigned to these changes.²⁸ In short, menopause represented the ultimate irreversible physical change in Naomi's body that stamped her as no longer being a woman. In other words, Naomi's body with disability makes her vulnerable to being denied recognition as women. In light of this, we find a dismantling of Naomi's femininity, meaning that her female identity was deprived by the Israelite's patriarchal society. Consequently, Naomi

25 The etymology of the Hebrew word *'almānā* is uncertain and the word is very old, it has cognates in the other Semitic languages. Akadian *almattu*, Ugaritic *'lmt*, Phoenician *'lmt*, Aramaic *'armaltā* and Arabic *'armalat*. See S. Moscati, *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Language*, Porta Linguarum Orientalium, cited by Paula S. Hiebert, "Whence Shall Help Come to me?". The Biblical Widow " in *Gender and Difference in Ancient Israel*, ed. Peggy L. Day (Minneapolis, Fortress, 1989), 127-128.

26 E.g. Ruth was still called in the name of the wife of her dead husband Mahlon (Rut 4.10). The case of Tamar, the daughter-in-law of Judah (Gen 38), also illustrates this point. When Tamar's husband's death left her a childless widow, Judah was obliged by the levirate law to provide another son for her. When this procedure proved futile with his second son and since his third son was under age, Judah told Tamar to return to her own kin. Yet even after Tamar had resumed living with her paternal kin, it was still Judah who claimed control over her. When told she was pregnant, it was Judah who ordered her to be burned. Nothing from any member of Tamar's family could be heard.

27 According to the socioeconomic settings of real life in ancient Israel, the poor, who constituted the vast majority of the people, had to endure a labor-intensive existence all their years, experiencing hardships, exploitation, demands from the powerful, diseases and accidents, little food, etc. Material evidences indicate that life expectancy must have hovered around age 40, which means persons in their 40s were considered to be old, see Douglas A. Knight, "Perspective on aging and the elderly in the Hebrew Bible", in *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology* 68 (2014): 138, 144. Accordingly, when Naomi decided to return from Moab to Judah, she was probably about age 45, which suggests that she has past the age of childbearing.

28 Naomi Steinberg, "Women Who Used to Be Women but Aren't Anymore. Gender and Aging as Disability in the Hebrew Bible", in *International Conference on Cross-Textual Interpretation of Chinese and Hebrew Classical Writings* (at center for Judaica and Inter-religions studies of Shan Dong University, Jinan, June 14-17, 2019), 51.

obtains no social-cultural validation in the Israelite system of family life and is in a defenceless, isolation and bereavement situation, living on the fringes of society.²⁹

The ideology that a menopausal woman is no longer a woman reflected by Naomi's example finds support in the Hebrew biblical text. In persuading her two daughters-in-law to return to their mothers' house, Naomi states in Ruth 1.12 that she is *zāqān*, "too old to have a husband". *Zāqān* is derivative of the noun *zāqān*, "beard".³⁰ It is a stative verb which in the Qal denotes the state of being which follows being young (Ps 37.25). Of the 178 occurrences of the root *zqn*, approximately one third of the references relate to the meaning "old", e.g. we meet the phrase "old and advanced in years" (Gen 24.1, Josh 13.1; cf. 1 Sam 17.12) or "old and full of days" (1 Chr 23.1). On the one hand, *zqn* relates to the physical state of man of being old.³¹ During this period of life, grey hair appears (1 Sam 12.2). There is failing of sight (Gen 27.1; cf. 1 Sam 3.2;4.15), etabolism and mobility (1 Kgs 1.1, 15), and a danger of falling (1 Sam 4.18). A description of the onset of age in poetic symbols is found in Eccl 12.1-5. Death is an imminent prospect (Gen 19.31; 24.1; 27.1-2; Josh 23.1-2), and leadership is due to be relinquished (Josh 13;1; 1 Sam 8;1,5; 1 Chr 23.1). On the other hand, one in the period of advanced age is closely attached with tradition and cultural meaning. e.g. one is to be respected (Lev19.32) and not despised (Prov23.22). The ageing man wants to proclaim power and righteousness, which YHWH himself has taught him from his youth up to a future generation (Ps.71.17-19).³² Indeed, *zāqān* as a substantive, usually plural, is used as a technical term referring to the social group of official community leaders as "elders", matured aged men with beards, who form the juridical assembly, and has to pronounce judgment at the city gates (Deut 21.2-6;22.15-18; 25.7-9; Ruth 4.2,4,9,11; Jer 26.17). In fact, of the 178 occurrences of the root *zqn* in the Hebrew Bible, almost all of them refer to males. In contrast, in only six cases does the word group deriving from *zāqān* apply specifically to females (Gen 18.12-13; 24.36; Zech 8.4; Prov 23.22; Ruth 1.12).³³ For example, In Prov 23.22b "do not disdain your mother when she is old (*zāqān*)" where *zāqān* still implies us a disrespect to an old woman, who is taken as to be deficient since she has irreversibly lost her vigor. While *ziqēnot* (old women) and *zāqānim* (old men) appear

29 This also finds textual support where her indignation and desperate feeling is reflected through her cry. "call me the bitter one" (Rut 1.20). Moreover, the shifting of the reference of *šnaim* reflects the course of events that sets the story in motion. At the beginning of Ruth, the two sons of Elimelech and Naomi are the principal pair who five times are mentioned with the word *šnaim*. However, even those five instances reveal the family's changing fortune, since in 1:1-2 they are "his [Elimelech's] two sons" (*šney-bānāyv*), after Elimelech's death in v.3 it leaves Naomi a single parent, they are called "her two sons" (*šnēy bāneyhā*). When the two sons die inv.5 they do so together, and their coupling is reiterated by the description of Naomi's bereavement: she was left without her husband and her two sons (*mišnēy ylādeyhā*). In 1.8-9 Naomi's bitter and despondent characterization begins with her habit of addressing Ruth and Orpah with irregular masculine plural suffixes *lēhēm, yimāhēm*, which may be the narrator's first hint of the emotional turmoil and are the sings Naomi's preoccupation with the sons she has lost, see Andrew R. Davis, "The Literary Effect of Gender Discord in the Book of Ruth," in *Journal of Biblical Literature* 132 (2013) :501,504-505.

30 R.Laird Harris; Gleason L. Archer, Jr; Bruce Waltker, *TWOT*, II (Moody publishers, 2008), 249.

31 Ibid.

32 Hans Wolf, *Anthropology of the old Testament*, 124.

33 *TDOT*, IV, 123.

side by side in Zech 8.4, the identities of the former derived from the basic form of *zqn*, originally applied to the latter, thus indicating a subordinating status of the females.

Among these six cases four instances connect the senior age of women directly with childbearing (Gen 18.12-13; 24.36; Ruth 1.12). The verb *zāqēnti* in Qal stative in Ruth 1.12 is specifically applied to Naomi where she is referred to as a woman past age of reproduction. Here, the literate translation of “being too old to have a husband” (Ruth 1.12) certainly does not mean she is too old to remarry, but rather implies that she is beyond age to have a sexual relation that would result in pregnancy.³⁴ By using *zqn*, it indicates that Naomi has no expectation of bearing children due to her advanced age.

In fact, there are other common words for advanced age in the biblical texts, such as *yāšēš/yāšiš* (old) (Job 12.12; 15.10; 29.8; 32.6) and *sēbâ* (gray head) (1 Sam 12.2; Job 15.10).³⁵ In some cases, *yāšēš/yāšiš*, *sēbâ* and *zāqēn* are in mixed use in the biblical texts for the description of one’s senior age. In 1 Sam 12.2, *zāqēn* and *sēbâ* are put side by side to indicate that Samuel was at an advanced age. The word *sēbâ* may or may not be appropriate for Naomi, since a post-menopausal woman is not necessarily gray headed. In this situation, the word *yāšēš/yāšiš* could have been well applied to Naomi. Nevertheless, using *zāqēn* in Ruth 1.12 is to stress that she no longer fits the norm for able bodied women and is thus labeled literally as “someone with a beard”. It is mindful that the expression of *zāqēn* is not a biography of Naomi, an actual ancient post-menopausal woman, but rather a textual representation which is delivered through a kind of rhetorical construction of the male author/s.³⁶ Naomi’s case finds echos in the life of Sarah in Gen 18.12-13 and 24.36, where the root *zqn* is used to imply her status of being post-menopausal with no children. This should not be understood to mean that both Naomi and Sarah are the beneficiaries of the power status of men. Instead, when a woman no longer menstruates, she does not appear to assume new roles of importance, rather her biology limits her access to opportunities through other institutions besides motherhood. In ancient Israel with a binary gendered society, women lost their gender identities when their bodies were no longer childbearing ones. Thus, to be a woman with a beard was a category of identity quite distinct in its meaning from being a man with a beard since men were always assumed to be fertile.

Focusing on the Hebrew root *zqn* and cultural norms about women’s gender reflects how ancient Israelite women viewed by men. Aged women whose bodies were no longer able to bear children are labeled to the class of “bearded individuals”. They suffer from oppression and have

34 Jeremy Schipper, *Ruth: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2016), 95.

35 Daniel I. Block, “Marriage and Family in Ancient Israel”, 95.

36 Such a textual representation is further identified through textual evidence of *stēyhem* (1.19) and *hēmnhāh* (1.22), which referred to Naomi and Ruth with masculine forms. It is anticipated that Naomi and Ruth, without husbands and sons to support them, must become husband and sons to the other, highlighting their newly emerged male responsibilities to be assumed in Bethlehem, see Andrew R. Davis, “The Literary Effect of Gender Discord in the Book of Ruth,” 506. On the other hand, the case of Ruth is different from Naomi because of different ages, which will be discussed in the later part of III.

none of the power, status, honor, or other benefits of being a woman.³⁷ As for Naomi, she becomes a disabled one since her body falls short of the norms assumed by ancient Israel for an able bodied woman. Furthermore, in the male author's narrative, the use of *zqn* by Naomi in the first person in describing her body as "disabled" and stigmatized suggests that she herself has already internalized the construction of ideology of women's disability by ancient Israel. She sees herself as empty, without social value, and with little self-worth and names herself "bitter one" (Rut 1.20). Such an internalized notions could also be identified with Sarah when she acknowledged that she was *zāqēn* (Gen 18.12), too old to have enjoyment with her husband. From the context where YHWH responds to Abraham "Why did Sarah laugh saying, 'Shall I in truth bear a child, *zāqēnti* as I am? ", we may infer that "enjoyment" refers to sexual intercourse that leads to conception (Gen.18.13).

While *zāqēn* is used to link women's advanced age with their sexual infertility, another Hebrew word '*aqar* (meaning "one deprived of a root") is applied to those young women who are barren---whether for a short time or a long time.³⁸For example, when Sarah is barren from her early age, she was described as '*aqar* (Gen 11.30). The same word is used for Rebekah (Gen 25.21) and Rachel (Gen 29.31) for their early infertility. In addition, the cases of Abigail, Bathsheba and Hannah implicate the distinction between the cultural meaning of ages of the women, as opposed to barrenness in the Hebrew Bible. Abigail is nowhere referred to as '*almānā* after the death of her husband Nabal. She simply transfers her residence, sexuality, and possessions to the household of David by becoming his wife (1 Sam 25.39-42). That Abigail still retained childbearing potential is made clear by the report that she bore to David his second son Chileab (2 Sam 3.3).³⁹ In case of Bathseba, the transfer of her fertility to the king's household is accomplished prior to her husband's death, but she likewise is never called '*almānā* (2 Sam 11, 2-2b).⁴⁰ As for Hannah, who is unable to bear a child until YHWH intervenes and reverses her infertility, she is according to the biblical text still on womanhood, "YHWH had closed her womb" (1 Sam 1.5).

Compared with *zāqēn*, the word '*aqar* has no direct negative link to the gender status of a woman. Instead, using this word may hint that young women who are infertile still have potential to give birth to children in the future. This is especially significant for young widow of the ancient Near East. Data of Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian shows that women had first married between the age of fourteen and twenty and men between the age of twenty-six and thirty-two.

37 Juliana M. Claassens, "Resisting Dehumanization: Ruth, Tamar, and the Quest for Human Dignity," in *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 74 (2012) :662.

38 This term in the biblical text explicitly addresses human barrenness and applies only to females (Gen 11.30, 25.21, 29.31; Exod 23.26; Judg 13.2-3; 1 Sam 2.5; Job 29.21; Ps 113.9) and the personification of Zion as a woman (Isa 54.1). It describes a woman whose womb is closed so that male seed could not enter, see Baruch A. Levine, "'seed' versus 'womb': Expressions of Male Dominance in Biblical Israel," in *Sex and Gender in the Ancient Near East*, ed.S.Parpola, S. and R.M. Whiting (Proceedings of the XL VIIe Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Comptes Rendus. v. 47/1-2; Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2002), 2:337-343.

39 Carolyn S. Leeb, "The Widow: Homeless and Post-Menopausal," 161.

40 Ibid.

This decade or more of age difference between spouses suggests that many women would outlive their husbands, producing a relatively young widowed female populations, still fertile and capable of reproduction.⁴¹ Relating to the story of Ruth, it is not inappropriate to label Orpah and Ruth as ‘*aqar* since these two young women were barren given that they were married to their husbands for quite some time but failed to bear children. In contrast, Naomi’s sorrowful response with “my lot is far more bitter than yours [Ruth and Orpah]” (Rut 1.13) is worth noting since it reveals the hidden distinction between the fate of the aged widow and the young one.

In consideration of the distinctive applications of *zqn* and ‘*aqar* to childless women with regard to their ages in biblical texts, it indicates that the perception of post-menopausal women were influenced by a social and traditional construction, rather a medical one.⁴²

4. Restoration of Naomi’s femininity

In contrast to her irreversible menopausal physical state, Naomi’s deprived gender identity, which is implicated with a bearded image, can possibly be restored. Although Naomi identifies herself as someone who is devalued, she attempts to make her efforts to seek a solution to the problem. Nonetheless, Naomi is to display her ingenuity within the bounds of the patriarchal structure of the society. The regulation of Zelophehad’s daughter, to which two regulations of the kinsman redeemer and levirate marriage are subjugated, is not unknown in the story of Ruth (Rut 3.20;4.2).⁴³ The regulation of Zelophehad’s which daughter is first and foremost, concerned with the perpetuation of Zelophehad’s name, indicating an example of norm of male dominated society (Num 27.1-4;36.5-9).⁴⁴In the case of Ruth, she has the inheritance of the land of Elimelech as a daughter along the lines sanctioned by Zelophehad’s regulation, in light of the fact that no male heirs remain. In this mean, Ruth is no longer treated as a daughter-in-law, but a daughter, a

41 Martha T. Roth, 4.

42 Related studies see. Candida R. Moss and Joel S. Baden, *Reconceiving Infertility. Biblical Perspectives on Procreation and Childlessness* (Princeton. Princeton University Press, 2015),2-4; Candida R. Moss and Jeremy Schipper, *Disability and Isaiah’s Suffering Servant*,2; Hector Avalos, Sarah J. Melcher, and Jeremy Schipper (eds.), *This Abled Body. Rethinking Disabilities in Biblical Studies* (Atlanta. Society of Biblical Literature, 2007).

43 Embry convincingly argued that the kinsman redeemer and levirate marriage are concrete measures of Zelophehad’s regulation. In addition, as the historical settings for the story of the kinsman redeemer and levirate marriage daughters was the post-exilic period, the purpose of which was to stabilize a rather insecure period as it pertained to inheritance matters. Since Ruth is most likely post-exilic, it may be that the author of Ruth shared the sense of marriage as a transaction in the case of females who had inherited the land with Number 36, see Bard Embry, “Legalities in the Book of Ruth: A Renewed Look” in *the Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 41(2016): 31-44.

44 Critical to the regulation of Zelophehad is the preservation of their father’s name. This may be the principle behind why the child produced from Boaz and Ruth ends up accounted as Naomi’s and, by default, Elimelech’s. Obed thus preserves Elimelech’s name and secures it to the land for Elimelech in a way that marriage of Zelophehad’s daughters were to have done for Zelophehad, *Ibid*, 39.

full-fledged family member.⁴⁵ It is identified at the beginning of chapter three when Naomi called Ruth “ my daughter ”, a reflection of essential relationship on the level of mother-daughter. This can be compared to when Naomi addressed to Ruth and Orpah as “my daughters” (11b,12a,13c) in persuading them to go back to their “ mother’s house”, which implies the end of mother’s and daughters-in-law’s relationship.⁴⁶ In the beginning of chapter three, Naomi’s statement providing Ruth with a sense of security:“ My daughter, must I not seek a home (*mānoāh*) for you (3.1) ” resumed, and upgraded the status of Ruth from daughter-in-law to be daughter. Thus, it implies that Ruth resumed her status of being an unmarried woman within the household and under the authority of Naomi.

According to the Zelophehad’s regulation, Ruth has to marry a man from within the tribe of Elimelech, through whom the restoration of Naomi’s gender is to be possible. As Boaz showed a willingness to act as a kindred redeemer when allowing Ruth to glean in the portion of the field that he held, Naomi understood that he would probably continue to serve in this capacity not only through the provision of food, but through marriage as well. In consideration of this, Naomi arranged a marriage between Ruth and Boaz. By taking the responsibility for the welfare of her daughter-in-law, she ultimately ensures the continuity of Elimelech’s line.

Even when Naomi outlines her scheme to Ruth, she does so within the set of man’s world.⁴⁷ Above all, she gives Ruth explicit instructions to wash, anoint herself, dress, and go down to the threshing floor, and not to disclose/uncover herself to Boaz until he has finished eating and drinking (3.3).⁴⁸ Then, Naomi limits the role that Ruth is to take: “He will tell you what you are to do” (3.4). Not only does Naomi know that Boaz would be a man of action (3.18),⁴⁹ she also knows how her proposal would function best in a patriarchal society. Ruth is to make her availability for marriage known, but then the initiative is passes to the male, who knows best how to manipulate the androcentric system in which he lives. As for Ruth, even when she displays her own initiative in providing extra incentive for his acceptance (3.9), she is only strengthening the plan already set

45 Peter H.W. Lau, *Indentity and Ethics in the Book of Ruth: A Social Ibentiy Approach* (Berlin/New York, Walter debGruyter, 2011),134.

46 Matthew Michael, “The Art of Persuasion and the Book of Ruth: literary Devices in the Persuasive Speeches of Ruth 1:6-18” in *Hebrew Studies* 56 (2015) :155.

47 Peter H.W. Lau, *Indentity and Ethics in the Book of Ruth*, 139.

48 According to Naomi’s instruction, Ruth shall uncover her dress and lie down at Boaz’s feet when he finished eating and drinking. Uncovering the body is used with various forms of the root *šākāb*(to lie down) may imply a euphemism for sexual activity (Lev 20; 11,18,20; Deutsch27:20), see Jeremy Schipper, *Ruth: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, 143.

49 For Naomi’s advice to Ruth “ uncover his feet ” (*vgilliyt mārglotāyv*), two points are at issue: Firstly, the verb---used in this form often means ‘to uncover nakedness’ for sexual purpose (Deut 23.1; 27.20); Secondly, the use of---which Ruth was to uncover is ambiguous. The term ‘ foot’ is a common enough biblical euphemism for ‘penis’ and difference in Hebrew between ‘uncover his feet’ and ‘uncover his foot/penis’ is subtle. In this context, and with an appropriate hesitation after ‘uncover’, could Ruth miss the sexual intent implicit in Naomi’s instruction? Naomi quickly assures Ruth that any further ‘action’ in the relationship would be up to Boaz. Apparently, Boaz is to respond to Ruth’s gesture with some instructions of his own, see Ilona Rashkow, “Ruth: The Discourse of Power and the Power of Discourse”, 37-38.

by Naomi, not deviating from it. In general, Naomi guides Ruth and the both function as examples to encourage Israelite women *qua* women in similar situations of defencelessness, isolation, or bereavement.⁵⁰ Nevertheless, they utilize the men's system to their advantage, and do not subvert it.

Finally, the utilization becomes successful when Boaz married Ruth. With the born of Obed, Naomi took the child and held him to her bosom and she became its foster mother (Ruth 4.16-17). It is unlikely that she has become the child's wet-nurse or adoptive parents.⁵¹ The child symbolizes continuation of Elimelech's family, the complete reversal of Naomi's ill-fortune, and restoration of her to fullness. It does make a more important implication of restoration of Naomi's gender identity, indicating she has regained her lost femininity by becoming the mother of Obed. Indeed, the recovery of her lost gender identity finds textual support in the book of Ruth. The women neighbors' celebration of a son born to Naomi, and their naming action (4.17) represent a restoration of the affirmative notion toward Naomi by the ancient male-dominated Israelite society. Ruth's cooperation to fulfillment to the norm of the Zelophehad's regulations contributed to such a restoration. In this mean, Ruth's social and personal value is highly acknowledged through the crowd's acclamation of being more valuable to her mother-in-law than seven sons.

The son will *lāk Imēšiyb nepēš* (renew your life), *ulkalkel' et sēybātēk* (sustain your old age) in 4.15 certainly conveys a stronger social-cultural meaning than a physical one. The son will "renew or restore your life" implies that Naomi is once again full by regaining her mother status and can rejoice. More strikingly, *sēybā* instead of *ziqnā* being used to refer to Naomi's old age suggests that she has now been set free from being labeled as a bearded individual.

Naomi and Sarah share a similar life course in that both post-menopausal women experienced a transformation from dismantling to restoration of their female identities, namely from the gendered stigma of bearded to becoming a mother. While Sarah's infertility was ultimately removed and she became a mother through the intervention of YHWH, Naomi as *'almānā* restored her gender by becoming mother of Obed whose birth was as an outcome of a fulfillment of Zelophehad's regulation. Hence, the prescription and transformation of woman's gender is based on the fulfillment of the norms of womanhood set in male dominated biblical Israel. Yet, Naomi's case indicates that such a fulfillment is not always necessarily preconditioned through a natural and biological process of childbearing by oneself. Instead, we can see that gender practices of a patriarchal world pose a fluid, complicated and more significant impact on women's identities compared to biological sex.⁵²

50 Athalya Brenner, "Naomi and Ruth: Further Reflections," in *A Feminist Companion to Ruth* ed. Athalya Brenner (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993), 144.

51 *The Jewish Study Bible*, eds., Adele Berlin and Mare Zvi Brettler (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 1585.

52 Indeed, we find that even not aged women in the Hebrew Bible cope with their infertility with an alternative similar to Naomi's in order to meet the social norm of being a woman. It is not infrequent to see that a barren woman initiates, though unwillingly, to share her husband with a handmaid in order to bear children for her in a kind of proto-surrogacy, to name a few,

5. Conclusion

The investigation of Naomi's gender and its transformation is conducted based on the integration of feminist and aged disability perspectives. Through the investigation, it helps us deepen our understanding of the dismantling and restoration of Naomi's femininity in respect to the norm of womanhood in the biblical text. The transformation of Naomi's gender reflects how aged women's identities, dignity, basic rights, and needs are not respected by male power hierarchies in ancient Israel. To a great extent, biblical Israel with its patriarchal structure not only shaped women's world, but also shaped women's views toward their own identities.

Naomi's case creates a space for moral reflection since the dignity of women and men who are created in the image of God deserves respect. As John Barton claims that the authors of ancient Israel's narratives "realized that human ethical enquiry needs to be anchored in specific cases, and it is only through the richness of storytelling that we come to understand what it is to be human and to make informed choices in a world that is only partly predictable."⁵³ The moral reflection is with great significance since Israelite cultural values that devalued the bodies and identities of women who did not conform to the norm of womanhood are very popular in many cultures. For instance, in China, Japan and Korea, an infertile woman is often stigmatized as "a woman made of stone." This is still true today. In such a context, this paper makes proposals that to be human, we should firstly be able to see or recognize the plight of some of the most vulnerable members of society, that is, be bearing witness to the stereotypes of post-menopausal women, and secondly to protest and resist those forces that seek to assault violence, or obscure one's human dignity, whether physically, emotionally or spiritually. As for a woman, only in her fully humanity will it be possible to fully understand what it means to be a woman.

Rachel and Leah share their husband Jacob with Bilhah (30.3-8) and Zilpah (30.10-13). By doing so, the barren woman hopes to meet the norm of what it meant to be a woman and thus can restore her femininity.

53 John Barton, *Understanding Old Testament Ethics. Approaches and Explorations* (Louisville. Westminster John Knox, 2003), 11.

中文题目：

女性与年老失能：《路得记》中拿俄米性别身份及其转换研究

提要：本文在融合女性和年老失能视角的基础上，探讨了《路得记》中拿俄米性别身份的丧失与恢复过程。拿俄米的案例反映出古代以色列的父权制生育观如何模糊和塑造作为社会最边缘群体的绝经后妇女的身份，揭示出对古代以色列女性身份的规范如何深受父权制的影响。本文的研究提醒当代读者，应关注并维护社会受压迫群体的尊严与福祉。

关键词：性别身份、老年失能、转换、女性、古代以色列

作者：莫铮宜，浙江越秀外国语学院英语学院副教授 从事于圣经文学研究与比较文学研究 电子邮件：mozy11@163.com 电话：+13957851492

教会历史 与中西社会

**Church History
in the West and in China**

殷商的神权和王权观念

韩星

(中国人民大学国学院教授)

提要: 殷人崇祀尚鬼，奉行神本主义，一切都要通过占卜预决吉凶。殷人的神灵很多，基本包括天神、地示、人鬼三大系统。上帝的权威最大，是自然的主宰，有超凡脱俗、不食人间烟火、不为人的意志所左右的特点，是殷人信仰世界中的至上神，它与殷人的祖先神合一。“帝”的初意即为宇宙万物的始祖，是宇宙万物的生殖之神，与西方把“God”视为造物主的意思很接近。在殷人的宗教信仰系统中，人并不直接向天神行祭，每有所求，必须通过祖神这个中介来实现。商王死后都尊称为帝，这就导致了商王朝后期“巫王合一”和“政教合一”体制的形成。商代晚期，形成了上帝—祖灵—时王三位一体的结构。他们共同主宰着天上人间，完成了神权与王权的一体化，至上神与极端专制的结合，形成了神道设教的政治思想体系，对后来中国历史有重要影响，值得我们深入研究。

关键词: 殷商。神权。王权。政教合一

作者: 韩星，思想史专业。中国人民大学国学院教授，北京市房山区长阳镇阜盛大街59号院。邮编102488。Email: lthanxing@163.com

一、殷商的神本主义

在“国之大事，在祀与戎”的社会里，宗教世界观占据着支配地位。《礼记·表记》说：“殷人尊神，率民以事神，先鬼而后礼”。什么是“先鬼而后礼”？郑玄解释这句话说“内宗庙，外朝廷”。“内宗庙”就是重在鬼治；“外朝廷”就是重在人治。夏与周都是内朝廷而外宗庙的，只有殷人是内宗庙而外朝廷。可见，殷人的政治是依据鬼神做标准的。¹马明衡《尚书疑义》说：“商俗尚鬼”²。商汤时曾经因为葛伯主张无神论，不祭祀祖先而发兵征讨，《尚书·汤征》：“汤征诸侯，葛伯不祀，汤始征之，作《汤征》。”《孟子·滕文公下》：“汤居亳，与葛为邻。葛伯放而不祀，汤使人问之曰：‘何为不祀？’曰：‘无以供牺牲也。’汤使遗之牛羊，葛伯食之，又不以祀。汤又使人问之曰：‘何为不祀？’曰：‘无以供粢盛也。’汤使亳众往为之耕，老弱馈食。葛伯率其民，要其有酒食黍稻者夺之，不授者杀之。有童子予以黍肉饷，杀而夺之。……为其杀是童子而征之。”葛伯不祭祀祖先，还侵夺民众，所以汤发兵征讨，以儆效尤。这样，“汤行仁义，敬鬼神，天下皆一心归之”³。

1 王治心 Wang Zhixin: 《中国宗教思想史大纲》Zhongguo zongjiao sixiangshi dagang[Outline of the History of Chinese Religious Thought](北京Beijing: 东方出版社Dongfang chubanshe, [Orient Press], 1996), 38.

2 马明衡 Ma Mingheng: 《尚书疑义》卷三 Shangshu yiyi Juanshan[Doubts about Shangshu(Volume 3)], 钦定四库全书 Qinding sikuquanshu[The Si Ku Quan Shu].

3 《越绝书》卷三 Yuejueshu Juanshan[Yue Jue Shu(Volume 3)].

《诗经》中《商颂》五篇都是关于祭祀方面的诗。如《那》：

猗与那与，置我鞀鼓。奏鼓简简，衍我烈祖。汤孙奏假，绥我思成。鞀鼓渊渊，嘒嘒管声。既和且平，依我磬声。于赫汤孙，穆穆厥声。庸鼓有数，《万舞》有奕。我有嘉客，亦不夷怍。自古在昔，先民有作。温恭朝夕，执事有恪。顾予烝尝，汤孙之将。

该诗是为祭祀殷汤所作的乐歌，陈述了音乐舞蹈之盛，以纪念其先祖。还有《烈祖》：

嗟嗟烈祖，有秩斯祜。申锡无疆，及尔斯所。既载清酤，赉我思成。亦有和羹，既戒既平。饗假无言，时靡有争。绥我眉寿，黄耇无疆。约軹错衡，八鸾鸛鸣。以假以享，我受命溥将。自天降康，丰年穰穰。来假来飧，降福无疆。顾予烝尝，汤孙之将。

与《那》同为祭祀成汤的乐歌。《毛诗序》：“《烈祖》，祀中宗也。”朱熹《诗序辨说》云：“详此诗，未见其为祀中宗，而末言汤孙，则亦祭成汤之诗耳。”

《尚书·商书》也有许多关于祭祀鬼神的内容，如《盘庚上》：“兹予大享于先王，尔祖其从与享之，作福作灾。”《盘庚中》：“我先后绥乃祖乃父。乃祖乃父，乃断弃汝，不救乃死。……乃祖先父，丕乃告我高后曰：‘作丕刑于朕孙！’迪高后丕乃崇降弗祥。”《高宗彤日》：“典祀无丰于昵”，《微子》：“今殷民乃攘窃神祇之牺牲，用以容，将食无灾。”

周人征伐殷人，也是以不祭祀作为罪状之一，《尚书·牧誓》：“昏弃厥肆祀弗答”。“盖殷以崇祀而兴，以不祀而亡，此尤殷商一朝之特点也。”⁴

殷人崇祀尚鬼与考古所呈现的商代文化的总貌也相符合。从殷虚卜辞中可以看出，殷人尊神先鬼的说法确属事实。比如杀牲祭神的数目相当惊人，有多至一次“羊百”、“羊三百”、“百牛”、“千牛”、“五十豚”、“百豕”、“犬百”、“三百犬”等。并大量用人为牺牲，其中包括有不同的邦族：羌、大、亘、奚、印等族，一次可杀多至“百羌”、“三百羌”、“千人”等。杀祭的方法有：俎、伐、戕、沈、卯等。可以看出殷人尊神先鬼达到何等程度。如今所见著录齐备的10万余片甲骨资料，不可能代表当时社会生活的全部，但它已经反映出商代物质文明的一面，也反映出精神生活的一面，尤其是在宗教占卜活动中所反映的商代贵族世俗生活的一些宗教信仰。从甲骨文中就可以看出殷商时人的思想意识形态是“卜以决疑”。商王在处理“国之大事”或个人行止时，往往通过占卜来指导一切活动。占卜时，把整治好的甲骨拿来，施灼呈兆，判断吉凶，然后把所问之事契刻（或书写）在甲骨上，这就完成了占卜的过程。所卜的事，大概说来，总不外对付天然，及对付同类的事件。罗振玉《殷虚书契考释》先把卜辞分为：卜祭、卜告、卜享、卜出入、卜田渔、卜征伐、卜年、卜雨及杂卜九类。

4 柳诒徵Liu Yizheng:《中国文化史》(上卷) Zhongguo wenhuashi(shangjuan)[The History of Chinese Culture (Volume 1)]·(上海Shanghai: 东方出版中心Dongfang chubanshan zhongxin[Orient Publishing Center],1988), 101.

后来董作宾《商代龟卜的推测》在罗氏基础上又增加了卜彙、卜瘳、卜旬三类，共十二类。占卜完毕，将所问事项刻记在甲骨上（即卜辞），有时过了若干天以后，所问之事在现实生活中幸而言中，或与所希冀的结果大相径庭，也要刻记在甲骨的有关卜辞之后，这就是所谓的“验辞”。

殷人几乎所有的事务，比如年成的丰歉，战争的胜败，城邑的兴建，官吏的任免，刑罚的施用，法律的制定，以及奴隶是否逃亡等等，甚至发展到无日不占，无事不卜的程度。主卜的是王，所贞的是天，一切禀命与卜，一切禀命于天。“卜以决疑”都是通过占卜向祖先神和“上帝”祈祷和请示，说明在殷人宗教里自然神和祖先神的职责集中于上帝一身。正如郭沫若曾说，商代“宗教颇有可观，因卜辞本身即是宗教之资料。凡言原始宗教或宗教之起源者不可不读卜辞。”⁵占卜作为一种巫术，主要是以兽胛骨和龟甲为媒介，求得“神明”对于人们所询问问题的回答。这种巫术的存在，表明当时的人相信有特殊的“神明”存在，足以影响人们的生活、决定人们行止的吉凶。卜辞中，殷人的上帝对殷王求卜的事项发布各种指示，作出或吉或凶、或可或否的回答。从字面上看，这些命令或指示既没有什么理性根据，也没有什么道德根据。殷人的上帝基本上是个恣情任性的专制君主，人们必须绝对服从，否则就会受到上帝惩罚，导致凶祸灾难。但是，如果我们透过卜辞的字面分析内在的实质，就可以认识到：必须绝对服从上帝的“没有理性根据”的指令这个事实本身，就是一种“理论”，但这不是“理论的理性”，而是一种“政治的理论”；必须绝对服从上帝的“没有道德根据”的指令这个事实本身，就是一种“伦理”，但这不是“纯社会性的伦理”，而是一种“政治的伦理”。上帝本质上是殷王的投影，上帝的神性本质上是殷代统治者的阶级特性，上帝的绝对神权本质上无非是殷王对绝对君权的企求。服从上帝的一切指令，事实上也就是要求臣民服从殷王朝的发号施令。这不正是一种“政治的理想”、“政治的伦理”吗？殷王朝所以推行占卜，崇尚“政治的伦理”，正是当时社会历史的需要。……这种政治的需要和伦理的需要，就体现到了占卜当中，以宗教迷信的形式给以强化。⁶

《尚书·洪范篇》今人或认为系战国后期儒者所作，或认为作于春秋。但现代著名史学家柳诒徵云：

夏代有治国之大法九条，其文盖甚简约。流传至于商室，商之太师箕子独得其说。周武王克殷，访问箕子。箕子乃举所传者告之，是曰：“洪范九畴”，亦曰：“洪范九等。”⁷

5 郭沫若Guo Moruo:《中国古代社会研究》Zhongguo gudai shehui yanjiu[Research of Ancient Chinese Society],《沫若文集》第十四卷Moruo wenji dishisijuan[Collected Works of Guo Moruo(Volume 14)],(北京Beijing:人民出版社Renmin chubanshe[People's Publishing House],1963), 253.

6 李辑Li ji:《中国远古暨三代思想史》Zhongguo yuangu ji Sandai sixiangshi[Intellectual History of Remote Antiquity of China and Xia,Shang,Zhou Dynasties],(北京Beijing:人民出版社Renmin chubanshe[People's Publishing House],1994), 92-93.

7 柳诒徵:Liu Yizheng:《中国文化史》(上卷)Zhongguo wenhuashi(shangjuan)[The History of Chinese Culture(Volume 1)]·(上海Shanghai:东方出版中心Dongfang chubanshe[Orient Publishing Center],1988), 83.

《尚书·洪范篇》向我们展示了夏商以来一切都要通过占卜预决吉凶的事实，借以我们可以知道殷商官方政治文化方面的基本信息，明白占卜在政治生活中的自我和重要性：“汝则有大疑，谋及乃心，谋及卿士，谋及庶人，谋及卜筮。汝则从，龟从，筮从，卿士从，庶民从，是之谓大同。身其康疆，子孙其逢吉。汝则从，龟从，噬从，卿士逆，庶民逆，吉。卿士从，龟从，筮从，汝则逆，庶民逆，吉。庶民从，龟从，筮从，汝则逆，卿士逆，吉。汝则从，龟从，筮逆，卿士逆，庶民逆，作内吉，作外凶。龟筮共逆于人，用静吉，用作凶。”从这段人们耳熟能详的引文中，我们可以看到，在国君、卿士、庶人、卜、筮五方面因素中，起至关重要作用的是卜、筮的意见，国君、卿士、庶人的意见只是起一定的参考作用，而卜、筮的结果却具有最终的决定权。占卜资料都由王室官吏中的史、作册负责保管，成为王室的档案。

二、殷人的神灵系统

殷人的神灵很多，基本包括天神、地示、人鬼三大系统。根据甲骨文所描述的生存境域，这是一个由各种神祇支配的神灵世界。陈梦家考察卜辞后把殷人的崇拜对象分为三类：(一)天神，包括上帝和自然神，如日、东母、西母、云、风、雨、雪等；(二)地示，包括土地等自然神，如社、四方、四戈、四巫、山、川等；(三)人鬼，包括先王、先公、先妣、诸子、诸母、旧臣等⁸。金景芳对此表示赞同：“大体上说，殷人对自然崇拜，于天神有上帝、日、东母、西母、风、云、雨、雪等等；于地祇有社、方(四方)、山、岳、河、川等等；对祖先神不仅于先王、先妣有复杂的祭典，而且于名臣又有配享制度……。”⁹这些可以从卜辞、甲骨文、《诗经》中得到印证。

在自然诸神中，天神上帝的权威最大，是自然的主宰，有超凡脱俗、不食人间烟火、不为人的意志所左右的特点。胡厚宣先生把殷人的上帝的权威列为主宰大自然的风云雷雨、气象变化等八种¹⁰，陈梦家先生把殷人的上帝的能力分述为令雨、令风等16种。¹¹董作宾概括为5个方面即可：主宰大自然、降饥馑、授福佑、降吉祥、降灾祸。¹²这些又可以更简化地概括为两个大的方面，即主宰大自然和赐福降祸。主宰大自然是至上神的重要特性，赐福是要人们坚定对上帝的信仰，降祸则是对信众违背上帝意志的惩罚。上帝是至高无上的，具有绝对的权威。商代从武丁以后特别重视对天神上帝的崇拜，把自然现象中的风、云、雷、雨，都看成是天神上帝所驱使的神灵，天神上帝与这

8 陈梦家Chen Mengjia:《殷墟卜辞综述》Yinxu buci zongshu[Summary of Oracle Inscriptions from Yin Ruins],(北京Beijing:中华书局Zhonghua shuju[Zhonghua Book Company],1988), 562.

9 金景芳Jin Jingfang:《中国奴隶社会史》Zhongguo nulishehui shi[History of Chinese Slave Society],(上海Shanghai:上海人民出版社Shanghai renmin chubanshe[Shanghai People's Publishing House],1983), 97.

10 胡厚宣Hu Houxuan:《殷卜辞中的上帝和王帝》Yinbuci zhong de shangde he wangdi[God and Emperor in Oracle Inscriptions of Yin Dynasty],《历史研究》Lishi yanjiu[Historical Research],1959年第9期。

11 陈梦家Chen Mengjia:《殷墟卜辞综述》Yinxu buci zongshu[Summary of Oracle Inscriptions from Yin Ruins],(北京Beijing:中华书局Zhonghua shuju[Zhonghua Book Company],1988), 561-571.

12 董作宾Dong Zuobin:《董作宾先生全集》(乙编) Dong Zuobin xiansheng quanji(yibian)[Collected Works of Dong Zuobin(Volume 2)],(台北Taipei:艺文印书馆Yiwen yinshuguan[Yee Wen Publishing Company],1977), 339.

些自然神是一种上下等级的关系。天神上帝像人王一样需要一个供他役使的官僚系统，而他也确实有这么一套官僚机构：“帝正”（《合集》36171）、“帝史”（《合集》35931）、“帝臣”（合集217,14223）、“帝五臣”（《合集》30391）、“帝五臣正”（《合集》30391）、“帝五介臣”（《合集》34148,屯南930）、“帝宗正”（《合集》38230）。如前所说，他的臣子有风，“帝史风”（《合集》14225）；有云：“燎于帝云”（《合集》14227）。正因为天上有上帝这样一套像人间一样的官僚系统，所以他对于下界的事情不必事事恭亲。因此，我们也就不再奇怪，在风灾、旱灾、水涝多雨之时，人们不是直接祈求上帝息风止雨，而是向“土（社）”、“河”、“岳”等祈求。这说明在以帝为首的帝廷中，众神各有职守，帝臣可办理的，帝则不必恭亲。¹³总之，殷人认为天神上帝是一个自然神，统管一切自然现象，有命令风雨、为害或福佑人间的神威，还主宰一切人世间的万物，具有对商王和商王国的人事权能，所以殷人非常相信这个具有人格化和意志的上帝。

至于上帝是否为殷人信仰世界中的至上神，它与殷人的祖先神是否合一，这些问题，学界一直存在争议。学界的主流意见认为帝是殷人信仰世界中的至上神，它与殷人的祖先神是合一的。郭沫若认为殷人已有至上神的观念，起初称“帝”，后称“上帝”，殷周之际又称“天”。由卜辞看来可知殷人的至上神是有意志的一种人格神，上帝能够命令，上帝有好恶，一切天时上的风雨晦冥，人事上的吉凶祸福，如年岁的丰啬，战争的胜败，城邑的建筑，官吏的黜陟，都是由天所主宰。这个“上帝”或“天”同时又是殷人的祖宗神，便是至上神是殷民族自己的祖先，也就是卜辞中的“高祖夔”。殷人把自己的祖先移到天上，成为天上的至上神，这是殷人的独自的发明。¹⁴侯外庐进一步认为商人帝王宗教观是一元的，先王和“帝”都统一于对祖先神的崇拜之中；而周人的帝王观是二元的，先王之外又创造了上帝，上帝授命于先王，先王配上帝。¹⁵此说相当长的时间成为学界的主流，但仍然不断遇到有力的挑战。陈梦家就认为：殷人的崇拜可分为三类，一是天帝崇拜，二是自然崇拜，三是祖先崇拜。“殷人的上帝或帝，是掌管自然天象的主宰，有一个以日月风雨为其臣工使者的帝廷。上帝之令风雨、降福祸是以天象示其恩威，而天象中风雨之调顺是为农业生产的条件。所以殷人的上帝虽也保佑战争，而其主要的实质是农业生产的神。先公先王可上宾于天，上帝对于时王可一降祸福，示诺否，但上帝与人王并无血缘关系。人王通过先公先王或其他诸神而向上帝求雨祈年，或祷告战役的胜利。”因此，“卜辞中尚无以上帝为其高祖的信念”¹⁶，上帝和人世间的先公先

13 王晖Wang Hui:《商周文化比较研究》Shangzhou wenhua bijiao yanjiu[Comparative Research of Shang and Zhou Cultures],(北京Beijing:人民出版社Renmin chubanshe[People's Publishing House],2000), 36-37.

14 郭沫若Guo Moruo:《先秦天道观之进展》Xianqin tiandaogan zhi jinzhuan[Evolution of Natural Law in Pre-Qin Period],《中国古代社会研究》Zhongguo gudai shehui yanjiu[Research of Ancient Chinese Society],(石家庄Shijiazhuang:河北教育出版社Hebei jiaoyu chubanshe[Hebei Education Press],2000), 310-316.

15 侯外庐Hou Wailu:《我对中国社会史的研究》Wo dui Zhongguo shehuishi de yanjiu[My Research of Chinese Social History],《历史研究》Lishi yanjiu[Historical Research],1984年第3期。

16 陈梦家Chen Mengjia:《殷墟卜辞综述》Yinxu buci zongshu[Summary of Oracle Inscriptions from Yin Ruins],(北京Beijing:中华书局Zhonghua shuju[Zhonghua Book Company],1988), 580、582.

王先祖先妣是不同的。陈梦家似乎只承认上帝在殷人自然神中的至上地位，并不承认其与殷人祖先神的关系。对此，任继愈主编的《中国哲学发展史》（先秦卷）表示赞同：“从《尚书》中的《商书》各篇看来，殷人往往是把天神和先王对举，说明他们的至上神和祖宗神不是一回事。”¹⁷晁福林也认为，“帝只是殷代诸神之一，而不是诸神之长”。“帝能支配诸种气象……这些完全是帝的主动行为，而不是人们祈祷的结果。人们可以通过卜问知道某个时间里帝是否令风令雨，但却不能对帝施加影响而让其改变气象。帝对诸种气象的支配有自己的规律，并不以人的意志为转移”，因此，他主帝“实质上是自然之天与人格化的神灵的混合体”¹⁸。朱凤瀚也认为，殷人的上帝虽有广泛全能，但并未达到拥有无限权威的程度，其虽然建立了一套以己为核心的，有秩序的天神系统，但并不能号令商人祖先神与商人所树立的自然神，诸神灵与上帝间的从属关系不明确，而且，上帝也非商人的保护神，但朱先生同时也指出殷人的上帝拥有特殊的为其他神灵所未有的权能，即对风、雨、雷等自然天象有控制权与使命权，此外，帝有随意降予商王国自然灾害与人事灾害的主动权。¹⁹晁、朱两先生都指出祖先神在殷人心目中与自己更为亲近，相应上帝则威严而遥远。胡厚宣通过对商代甲骨文的研究认为“殷代从武丁时就有了至神上帝的宗教信仰。在殷人心目中，这个至神上帝，主宰着大自然的风云雷雨，水涝干旱，决定着禾苗的生长，农产的收成。他处在天上，能降入城邑，作为灾害，因而辟建城邑，必先祈求上帝的许可。邻族来侵，殷人以为是帝令所为。出师征伐，必先卜帝是否授祐。帝虽在天，但能降人间以福祥灾疾，能直接护祐或作孽于殷王。帝甚至可以降下命令，指挥人间的一切。”正因为这样，商王举凡祀典政令，必须揣测着帝的意志去做。商人相信帝的权能极大，日月星辰风云雷雨等都供帝驱使。由于相信上帝，所以在甲骨卜辞中有很多关于帝与风云雷电，帝与农业收成，帝与城邑建筑，帝与方国征伐，帝能降人间以福祸，帝能保祐作害于殷王，帝可以发号施令等内容的记载。²⁰

从现有的甲骨文中看到，殷人对上天的称呼只称“帝”或“上帝”。“帝”字在甲骨文中是花蒂的象形，“帝”即“蒂”。蒂是果实的孕育和产生者，用此象征种族绵延不绝的本根。清末吴大澂《字说》云：“象花蒂之形……蒂落成果。即草木之所由生，枝叶之所由发，生物之始，与天合德，故帝足以配天，虞夏禘黄帝，禘其祖之所从出，故禘字从帝也。”²¹王国维、郭沫若、侯外庐等均在此说的基础上有自己的发挥。王国维认为“帝者，蒂也……但像花萼全形，未为审谛，故多于其首加一……以识其在人之

17 任继愈主编Ren Jiyu zhubian:《中国哲学发展史》(先秦卷) Zhongguo zhexue fazhanshi(xianqin juan)[Development History of Chinese Philosophy(Volume Pre-Qin)],(北京Beijing: 人民出版社Renmin chubanshe[People's Publishing House],1983), 84.

18 晁福林Chao Fulin:《论殷代神权》Lun Yindai shenquan[On Theocracy of the Yin Dynasty],《中国社会科学》Zhongguo shehui kexue[Social Sciences in China]1990年第1期。

19 朱凤瀚Zhu Fenghan:《商周时期的天神崇拜》Shangzhou shiqi de tianshen chongbai[Deity Worship of Shang and Zhou Dynasties],《中国社会科学》Zhongguo shehui kexue[Social Sciences in China],1993年第4期。

20 胡厚宣Hu Houxuan:《殷墟卜辞中的上帝和王帝》Yinbuci zhong de shangde he wangdi[God and Emperor in Oracle Inscriptions of Yin Dynasty],《历史研究》Lishi yanjiu[Historical Research],1959年第10期。

21 吴大澂Wu Dacheng:《字说》Zi shuo[Interpreting Words],(台北Taipei,艺文印书馆初版Yiwen yinshuguan chuban[Yee Wen Publishing Company(First Edition)],1975), 2.

首。”²²郭沫若据此进一步引申，认为：“帝之兴必在渔猎牧畜已进展于农业种植以后，盖其所崇祀之生殖已由人身或动物性之物而转化为植物。古人固不知有所谓雄雌蕊，然观花落蒂存，蒂熟而为果，果多硕大无朋，人畜多以赖之为生。果复含子，子之一粒复可化而为亿万无穷之子孙……天下之神奇更无有过于此者矣。此必至神者之所寄，故宇宙之真宰即以帝为尊号也。人王乃天帝之替代，而帝号遂通天人矣。”²³刘翔从仰韶文化遗址等史前陶文中找出一些认为是“帝”之初文的符号，提出“帝”字最主要的部分像植物的子房，认为这“无疑是当时华夏民族对植物崇拜的原始的文化心理的反映……华夏文明是在植物文化的历史背景下孳生发育的，华夏民族称谓本身，就保存着原始植物崇拜文化的信息。华、花二字在殷代卜辞里是同一个形体，便是佳证。至于本像花蒂之形的帝字，其最初语义蕴涵的意念，即是对植物的原始崇拜，也是不言而喻的。就植物而言，开花结果，生生不息，花蒂是其根本。植物花蒂的这种带根本性的神异力量，很自然会引起人类的重视和崇拜，进而成为自然界至尊神的化身。到了殷商时代，隐没了花蒂本义的帝字，已经成为表述人们意念里的自然界至尊神的尊称。”²⁴因此，他们又以“帝”作为祖先神的别称。当他们同时以“帝”或“上帝”称呼天神时，实际上就是把天神当作本宗族的本根，把祖先神与天神结合了起来。詹鄞鑫指出：“古音与帝相近的字，多有根基、原始等义，如蒂表示花的基，柢表示（植物的）根基，底表示房屋的根基，胎表示人之所由生，始表示氏族之发源。”“最原始的‘帝’跟蒂、柢、胎、始的意思大体相同。古代所谓黄帝、炎帝、帝喾、帝挚等称，很可能也是从始祖的意义而称为帝的。”“天有生育万物之功，故称为帝，也就是说，帝的语源义是生育万物，……语言中的帝是对天的别名，其意义是从生育万物的功能来说的。”²⁵其实，传统文献中不乏这样的意思，如《易·益卦》：“王用享于帝”，王弼注：“帝者，生物之王，兴益之宗。”《礼记·郊特性》“祭帝勿用也”郑玄的注说：“因其生育之功谓之帝。”

“帝”有一个孳乳字“締”，有第一个造出之意（后来演变为双音节词“缔造”），这样也就不难理解为何可以用花蒂来指称上帝，原来“帝”的初意即为宇宙万物的始祖，是宇宙万物的生殖之神，与西方把“God”视为造物主的意思很接近。姜广辉经过研究更进一步引申说：“炎帝、黄帝时代，这是一个缔结部落联盟的时代，炎帝、黄帝是当时的两个中心氏族，后来融合为一。在这样一种归‘根’结‘蒂’的大联盟中，主盟者便被尊为蒂，即‘帝’。及其死后，其继承者对他的祭祀，便称为‘悻祭’。帝、蒂、締、悻数字本为一系。而在文字创造之前，凡表‘根本’之义者，即发 di 音，如

22 王国维 Wang Guowei: 《观堂集林》第一册 Guantang jilin diyice [Guantang Jilin (Volume 1)] (北京 Beijing: 中华书局 Zhonghua shuju [Zhonghua Book Company], 1959), 283.

23 郭沫若 Guo Moruo: 《甲骨文研究》 Jiaguwen yanjiu [Research on Oracle Inscriptions], 《沫若文集》第十四卷 Moruo wenji di shisi juan [Collected Works of Guo Moruo (Volume 14)] (北京 Beijing: 人民出版社 Renmin chubanshe [People's Publishing House], 1963), 341-342.

24 刘翔 Liu Xiang: 《中国传统价值观念诠释学》 Zhongguo chuantong jiazhi guan quanshixue [Hermeneutics of Traditional Chinese Values] (上海 Shanghai: 三联书店 Sanlian shudian [SDX Joint Publishing Company], 1996), 11.

25 詹鄞鑫 Zhan Yinxin: 《神灵与祭祀》 Shenling yu jisi [God and Sacrifice] (南京 Nanjing: 江苏古籍出版社 Jiangsu guji chubanshe [Jiangsu Classics Publishing House], 1992), 46-47.

氏、祗、底等，亦与‘帝’字音同义近，后来意义分化，在造字时以不同形符区别之。”²⁶张光直在经过研究甲骨卜辞指出：

卜辞中关于“帝”或“上帝”的记载颇多。“上帝”一名表示在商人的观念中帝的所在是“上”，但卜辞中决无把上帝和天空或抽象的天观念联系在一起 的证据。卜辞中的上帝是天地间与人间祸福的主宰——是农产收获、战争胜负、城市建造的成败，与殷王福祸的最上权威，而且有降饥、降谨、降洪水的本事。上帝又有其帝庭，其中有若干自然神为官，如日、月、风、雨；帝庭的官正笼统指称时，常以五为数。帝庭的官吏为帝所使，施行帝的意旨。殷王对帝有所请求时，决不直接祭祀于上帝，而以其廷正为祭祀的媒介。同时上帝可以由故世的先王所直接晋谒，称为“宾”；殷王祈丰年或祈天气时，诉其请求于先祖，先祖宾于上帝，乃转达人王的请求。事实上，卜辞中的上帝与先祖的分别并无严格清楚的界限，而我觉得殷人的“帝”很可能是先祖的统称或是先祖观念的一个抽象。²⁷

由此可见，在殷商早期中国原始的祖先崇拜开始向高级宗教的“上帝信仰”迈出了一大步，但同时，其“帝”与祖先神的关系仍很模糊，还是处于比较初期的阶段。这种情况后来逐渐发生了变化。

甲骨卜辞表明，对人而言，帝神只是“一种强大而意向又不可捉摸的神灵……看不出具有理性，恣意降灾或降佑”²⁸。但是，“商人同时认为，帝有圣能，尊严至上，同他接近，只有人王才能可能。商代主要有先王，像高祖太乙、太宗太甲、中宗祖乙等死后都能升天，可以配帝。因而上帝称帝，人王死后也可以称帝。从武乙到帝乙，殷王对于死了的生父都以帝称”²⁹，因此在廩辛、康丁以后的卜辞中，便出现了对于死去的人王称“帝”的记录，逐渐地“帝”就有了至上神和人王两种含义，使“帝”成为把祖先神和自然神结合在一起的主神。“殷人以为先祖死后，可以配天，也能降下福祸，授佑、作孽于人间，几乎同天帝是一样的。所以天帝叫上帝，人王叫王帝，都称作帝，他们共同掌握着人间的一切。”³⁰“不过上帝和王帝，在殷人心目中，究竟也还有所不同。殷人以为上帝至上，有着无限尊严。它虽然掌握着人间的雨水和年收，以及方国的侵犯和征伐，但如果有所祷告，则只能向祖先为之，要先祖在帝左右转请上帝，而不能直接对上

26 姜广辉主编Jiang Guanghui zhubian:《中国经学思想史》第一卷Zhongguo Jingxue sixiangshi diyijuan[History of Chinese Confucian Thought(Volume 1)],(北京Beijing: 中国社会科学出版社Zhongguo shehuikexue chubanshe[China Social Sciences Press],2003), 75.

27 张光直Zhang Guangzhi:《中国青铜时代》Zhongguo qingtong shidai[Bronze Age of China],(北京Beijing: 三联书店 Sanlian shudian[SDX Joint Publishing Company],1999), 372.

28 朱凤瀚Zhu Fenghan:《商周时期的天神崇拜》Shangzhou shiqi de tianshen chongbai[Deity Worship of Shang and Zhou Dynasties],《中国社会科学》Zhongguo shehui kexue[Social Sciences in China],1993年第4期。

29 胡厚宣Hu Houxuan:《殷墟卜辞中的上帝和王帝》Yinbuci zhong de shangde he wangdi[God and Emperor in Oracle Inscriptions of Yin Dynasty],《历史研究》Lishi yanjiu[Historical Resrarch],1959年第10期。

30 胡厚宣、胡振宇Hu Houxuan,Hu Zhenyu:《殷商史》Yinshang shi[History of the Shang Dynasty],(上海Shanghai: 上海人民出版社Shanghai renmin chubanshe[Shanghai People's Publishing House],2003), 510.

帝有所祈求。这是上帝和王帝不同的地方。”³¹尽管殷人崇拜的上帝和祖先有所不同，但实际上都有着内在的联系，都是作为一种宗教信仰对至上神的崇拜，体现了殷代帝权的本质特征。如何认识这一点？实际上，“天上统一至上神的产生，是人间统一帝王出现的反映。没有人间统一的帝王，就永不会有天上统一的至上神。殷代这一社会意识形态的宗教信仰，应该是同阶级社会的经济基础相适应的”³²。殷人的上帝及其“帝廷”无疑是殷王及其朝廷的投影，上帝是殷王室的国家保护神，他的命令为殷王统治权提供了神圣的保证。³³

这样，在殷人的宗教信仰系统中，人并不直接向天神行祭，每有所求，必须通过祖神这个中介来实现。因此，商人对于先公先王的祭祀，其名目之多，次数之繁，供献之丰盛都非我们所能想象。殷人几乎天天轮流祭祀先公先王的宗教习惯，恐怕就与它们的这种中介作用有关。这表明，在殷人的观念中，祖神的地位十分突出，人直接面对祖神，而不向帝神负责，帝神与人之间也因此没有共同遵循的准则。之所以这样，乃是由于“在绝地天通之后，人不能直接和天神交通，必须祭祀祈求高祖。”³⁴就是说，被神化了的商代先公先王，是可以宾于帝或配于天的，换句话说，他们升到“上帝”左右，即在“帝所”以后，就获得了和上帝相仿的某些权力，上帝就是他们的祖先，如《诗经·商颂》“有娥方将，帝立子生商。”他们死后似后还会回天上当帝王，所以，商王死后都尊称为帝，这就导致了商王朝后期“巫王合一”³⁵和“政教合一”³⁶体制的形成。

王贵民对殷代祭祀活动进行了研究，发现武丁时代到帝乙、帝辛时代，晚商的两百多年间，祭祀有一个由繁到简的定型过程，并与宗法制度逐渐完备同步。他说：

基于社会经济基础的发展变化，晚商中期的思想文化，同样经历着一个有意义的变化过程。人们都认为商代神权统治最重，但是这时在浓重的迷信神权的氛围中，开始出现较为趋向现实的薄明晨曦。祭祀用人牲的数量显见减少了；由前期祀典重远祖的礼制，开始转变为厚祭近祖和父辈，开始末期进一步疏远重近亲、轻旁系重直系的祭祀原则。同时，在祀典上也反映了自然神与

31 胡厚宣、胡振宇Hu Houxuan,Hu Zhenyu:《殷商史》Yinshang shi[History of the Shang Dynasty],(上海Shanghai: 上海人民出版社Shanghai renmin chubanshe[Shanghai People's Publishing House],2003), 517.

32 胡厚宣: Hu Houxuan:《殷墟卜辞中的上帝和王帝》Yinbuci zhong de shangde he wangdi[God and Emperor in Oracle Inscriptions of Yin Dynasty],《历史研究》Lishi yanjiu[Historical Resarch],1959年第9、10期。

33 吕大吉Lv Daji:《宗教学通论新编》下Zongjiaoxue tonglun xinbian xia[New Compiltion of General Survey of Religious Studies(Volume 2)],(北京Beijing: 中国社会科学出版社Zhongguo shehuixue chubanshe[China Social Sciences Press],1998), 566.

34 陈来Chen Lai:《古代宗教与伦理——儒家思想的根源》Gudai zongjiao yu lunli——Rujia sixiang de genyuan[Ancient Religion and Ethics: the Root of Confucianism],(北京Beijing: 三联书店Sanlian shudian[SDX Joint Publishing Company],1996), 114.

35 许倬云Xu Zhuoyun:《西周史》(增订本)Xizhou shi(zengdingben)[History of Weatern Zhou Dynasty(Updated Edition)],(北京Beijing: 三联书店Sanlian shudian[SDX Joint Publishing Company],2001), 26.

36 杨阳Yang Yang:《王权的图腾化——政教合一与中国社会》Wangquan de tutenghua——Zhengjiaoheti yu Zhongguo shehui[The Totemization of Kingship: Political and Religious Unification and Chinese Society],(杭州Hangzhou: 浙江人民出版社Zhejiang renmin chubanshe[Zhejiang People's Publishing House],2000), 58.

祖先神地位的转化，从而确立了祖先崇拜的主导地位。直系继承法才从本期起也完全确立，宗法制度进一步完善.....³⁷

甲骨文第一期即武丁时期，祭祀的自然神种类很多，到了第二期不少自然神的名称消失了，这可从祖庚、祖甲时期的卜辞中看出，如祖庚、祖甲时的卜辞出现了这样的辞例，即把帝字用来冠在父亲武丁之的前面，称之为帝丁；第三期癸辛、康丁时期，第四期武乙、文乙时期，自然神祭祀有所恢复，但已不象武丁时期之盛；到了第五期即帝乙、帝辛时期，卜辞中就完全见不到自然神了。有学者分析殷人把帝字用来冠在父亲武丁之的前面这一现象的意义说：“在此之前，商人把上帝看成是至高无上的自然神，而人只是处于神之下的世间的人。现在，却把死去的父王也尊为帝那样的神，也可以说是把先王神化，无异于把上帝和人之间的距离大大地缩短而连接了起来。商代人能够这样做，一方面当然是商王武丁，讨伐征服了众多的方国，开拓、商王朝的疆土，加之治理有方使得商王朝政治稳定、经济发展而国家富有兴旺。所以为后代所尊崇。另一方面也是商代人从武丁的所作所为以及商王朝的逐步强大看到了人的力量是巨大的，所以敢于把去世的先王武丁和上帝相提并论而尊称为帝丁。从崇拜意识发展演化来看，其中最关键的一点是看到了人的力量，从而也就降低了对于上帝的崇拜。在人类自我意识的发展史上，商代祖庚、祖甲称已去世的父王为帝，无疑是一大贡献。”³⁸

三、殷商神权与王权一体化

到了商代晚期，随着王权的扩充和强化，王总是“宾于帝”，这样还不如干脆把王神化得和帝一样，这样就逐渐形成了上帝—祖灵—时王三位一体的结构，共同主宰着天上人间，完成了神权与王权的一体化，形成了神道设教的政治思想体系。《尚书·盘庚》载商王“以常旧服，正法度”，就是用祖先即上帝的“旧服”（先王的法度），执行王命，就是执行祖先的法令，合天“帝”意；反之，倘若违抗王命，上帝就会“罚及尔身，弗可悔！”（《尚书·盘庚》），到那时就后悔也来不及了。所以，在卜辞中对死去的殷王径称“帝丁”、“帝乙”、“帝文武甲”等，王也就成了神，而且与上帝划等号。这种把祖先神与天神崇拜结合在一起的做法，在具体意义上有诸多局限，所以后来为周人所不取。但在抽象意义上，即赋予自然神以某种社会的属性这一点上，却对后来哲学史的发展有着深刻影响。后来儒家下学上达，尽人合天，天人合一的思想方式，可以说就发端于此。

商人神权与王权的一体化是有悠久的历史渊源的，在巫风浓郁的原始氏族社会中巫觋是所在氏族或部落出类拔萃的智者和知识拥有者，成为当时社会上最有地位和影响的群体。在氏族社会向国家的转变过程中，他们利用手握神权、政权的有利条件，变成

37 王贵民Wang Guimin:《晚商中期的历史地位》WanShang zhongqi de lishi diwei[Historical Status of Mid-Term of Late Shang Dynasty],《中国史研究》Zhongguoshi yanjiu[Journal of Chinese Historical Research],1983年第3期。

38 赵诚Zhao Cheng:《甲骨文与商代文化》Jiaguwen yu Shangdai wenhua[Oracle Inscription and Culture of the Shang Dynasty],(沈阳Shenyang:辽宁人民出版社Liaoning renmin chubanshe[Liaoning People's Publishing House],2000),46-47.

了早期国家的统治者，这在中外都不例外。“绝地天通”的事件就是一个标志性转变。有关“绝地天通”的传说最早见于《尚书·吕刑》，是以周穆王之口讲述出来的：“若古有训，蚩尤惟始作乱，延及于平民。罔不寇贼鸱义，奸宄夺攘矫虔。苗民弗用灵，制以刑。惟作五虐之刑曰法。杀戮无辜，爰始淫为劓刵椽黥。越兹丽刑，并制罔差，有辞。民兴胥渐，泯泯焚焚，罔中于信，以覆诅盟。虐威庶戮，方告无辜于上。上帝监民，罔有馨香，德刑发闻，惟腥。皇帝哀矜庶戮之不辜，报虐以威，遏绝苗民，无世在下。乃命重黎，绝地天通，罔有降格。”伪孔传：“重即羲，黎即和。尧命羲和世掌天地四时之官，使人神不扰，各得其序，是谓绝地天通。言天神无有降地，地祇不至于天，明不相干。”《国语·楚语下》说的更详细：

(楚)昭王问于观射父，曰：“《周书》所谓‘重、黎实使天地不通’者，何也？若无然，民将能登天乎？”对曰：“非此之谓也。古者民神不杂。……少昊之衰也，九黎乱德，民神杂糅，不可方物。夫(人)人作享，家为巫史，无有要质，民匮于祀，而不知其福。蒸享无度，民神同位。民渎齐盟，无有严威。神狎民则，不蠲其为。嘉生不降，无物以享。祸灾荐臻，莫尽其气。颛顼受之，乃命南正重司天以属神，命火正黎司地以属民，使复旧常，无相侵渎，是谓绝地天通。”

意思是说在早期人人祭祀鬼神，家家都有巫史，人们都可以自为巫史与鬼神交通，可以直接向鬼神求佑祈福，到了颛顼时代便把这种沟通上天与人间的宗教信仰权力交给巫觋阶层垄断起来，而巫觋又受帝王的控制，为帝王服务，同时严禁普通百姓自作巫史直接与鬼神沟通，这就形成了最早的巫政合一的专制型国家形态。张光直根据“绝地天通”的传说故事指出：“它为我们认识巫觋文化在古代中国政治中的核心地位提供了关键的启示。……古代，任何人都可借助巫的帮助与天相通，自天地交通断绝之后，只有控制着沟通手段的人，才握有统治的知识，即权力。于是，巫便成了每个宫廷中必不可少的成员。事实上，研究古代中国的学者都认为：帝王自己就是众巫的首领。”³⁹

《国语·楚语下》继续说颛顼之后“三苗复九黎之德，尧复育重黎之后，不忘旧者，使复典之。以至于夏、商。故重、黎氏世叙天地，而别其分主者也。”商代就是这样一个典型的“民神不杂”、祭祀上帝鬼神的权力高度集中的社会，事奉鬼神是商王的主要任务，而这项任务的完成主要通过频繁的祭祀好甲骨占卜的方式来实现，其目的就是加强商王与鬼神的沟通，祈望诸神为商王朝赐授福佑和提供保护，力图在诸神的名义下治国理政，保持殷商王朝政权的合法性与权威性。

在商代占卜并不是所有人都能够做的事，为此还有一批专门从事决断吉凶的人才，这就是巫、卜、史、祝。《国语·楚语》中说：“民神杂糅……家有巫史。”《说文解字》曰：“巫，祝也。女能事无形，以舞降神者也……覡，能斋肃神明者，在男曰覡，在女曰巫。”《周礼·春官·司巫》曰：“司巫掌群巫之政令：若国大旱，则帅巫而舞雩；国有大

39 张光直Zhang Guangzhi:《美术、神话与祭祀——通往古代中国政治权威的途径》Meishu,Shenhua yu Jisi——tongwang gudai Zhongguo zhengzhi quanwei de tujing[Arts,Myth and Sacrifice: The Path to Political Authority in Ancient China],(沈阳Shenyang: 辽宁教育出版社Liaoning jiaoyu chubanshe[Liaoning Education Press],2002), 29.

灾·则帅巫而造巫恒。”司马迁在《报任少卿书》中说：“仆之先人，文史、星历，近乎卜祝之间。”巫、卜、史、祝是专业祭祀阶层，是中国最早的知识分子。他们具有天文、历史等知识，能够预测吉凶、祈祷神灵，沟通天地人。从后世文献记载来看，夏禹即可能是一巫师，并兼人王。史籍上有关于“禹步的传说”：《尸子》云：“古时龙门未辟，吕梁未凿，……禹是疏河决江，十年未阨（《太平御览·皇王部》引作“窥”——引者注）其家，手不爪，胚不毛，生偏枯之疾，步不相过，人曰禹步。”西汉扬雄《法言·重黎》云：“巫步多禹”。李轨注曰：“姒氏禹也，治水土，涉山川，病足，故行跛也。……而俗巫多效禹步。”《帝王世纪》云：“故世传禹病偏枯，足不相过，至今巫称禹步是也。”道教《洞神八帝元变经·禹步致灵》曰：“禹步者，盖是夏禹所为术，召役神灵之行步，以为万术之根源，玄机之要旨。昔大禹治水，……届南海之滨，见鸟禁咒，能令大石翻动。此鸟禁时，常作是步。禹遂模写其行，令之入术。自兹以还，术无不验。因禹制作，故曰禹步。”张光直研究后也认为：“如夏禹有所谓‘禹步’，是后代巫师特有的步态。”⁴⁰又《国语·鲁语下》云：“昔禹致群神于会稽之山。”禹能使诸神会聚，必非凡人。可见，大禹与古巫有密切的关系。夏后启也是一个能够与神交通的巫师，《太平御览》卷八十二：“昔夏后启筮，乘龙以登于天，占于皋陶，皋陶曰：吉而必同，与神交通。”《山海经·海外西经》：“大乐之野，夏后启于此舞《九代》，乘两龙，云盖三层。左手操翳，右手操环，佩玉璜。”这样看来，夏后启也是一个可以与神交通的巫觋类人物。《山海经·海外西经》载：“巫咸国在女丑北，右手操青蛇，左手操赤蛇，在登葆山，群巫所从上下也。”《墨子·明鬼》篇中则一再称禹、汤等圣王能率天下百姓敬事鬼神，故鬼神以天下赏之。这些都说明早期的人王同时也是宗教领袖。所以，李宗侗认为在上古时代“君及官吏皆出自巫”⁴¹。李安宅就曾精辟地指出：原始时代的宗教职业者，凭着自己的机巧，“由私巫变成公巫。及为公巫，便是俨然成了当地的领袖。领袖的权威越大，于是变为酋长，变为帝王——酋长帝王之起源在此。”⁴²

通过对古代文献记载的分析可以看出，夏王朝的建立者禹可能本身就是一个“巫”，商王朝的开国者汤或许也是出身于“巫”。《吕氏春秋·季秋纪·顺民》载：“昔者汤克夏而正天下，天大旱，五年不收，汤乃以身祷于桑林……于是翦其发，磨其手，以为牺牲，用祈福于上帝。民乃甚说，雨乃大至。”同样的故事也在《淮南子·主术训》中有记载，“汤之时，七年旱，以身祷于桑林之际，四海之云凑，千里之雨至”。《尸子·君治》也有记载说：“汤之救旱也，乘素车白马，著布衣，婴白茅，以身为牲，祷于桑林之野”，《墨子·兼爱下》、《文选·思玄赋》李注、《太平御览》卷八十二引《帝王世纪》等等文献当中，均有关于这段故事的记载。从这些记载可以看出，身为国王的汤，要给

40 张光直Zhang Guangzhi:《美术、神话与祭祀——通往古代中国政治权威的途径》Meishu,Shenhua yu Jisi——tongwang gudai Zhongguo zhengzhi quanwei de tujing[Arts,Myth and Sacrifice: The Path to Political Authority in Ancient China],(沈阳Shenyang: 辽宁教育出版社Liaoning jiaoyu chubanshe[Liaoning Education Press],2002), 29.

41 李宗侗Li Zongdong:《中国古代社会史》Zhongguo gudai shehuishi[History of Ancient Chinese Society],(台北Taipei: 华刚出版社Huangang chubanshe[Hua Gang Press],1954), 535.

42 李安宅Li Anzhai:《巫术的分析》Wushu de fenxi[Analysis of Witchcraft],(成都Chengdu: 四川人民出版社Sichuan renmin chubanshe[Sichuan People's Publishing House],1991), 10.

长期的旱灾承担责任，以自己为牺牲，献祭给上帝祈雨，说明这时的商王是人与神之间的中介。

从殷墟甲骨文卜辞中常有王亲自卜问的记载看，汤以下的历代商王均保留了“巫”的传统，“王兼为巫之所事，是王亦巫也”⁴³。卜辞中频繁出现“王占曰”的习用语，说明殷王是政权的最高代表，同时也是宗教的最高祭师，凡重要宗教仪式都由殷王主持。陈梦家经过研究卜辞指出：“因为卜辞是商王室的卜辞，所以占卜的内容是以时王为中心的。从其对某些事类占卜的频繁，可以反映时王的愿望是：国境的安全，年成的丰足，王的逸乐，对于祖先和自然的崇拜。”⁴⁴正是在这个意义上，他强调：“卜辞也应属于王室的文书记录，是殷代的王家档案。”⁴⁵又据王晖教授考察甲骨卜辞中所祭祀的过去时代的大臣有伊尹、咸戊、黄尹、蔑、旨干、巫、伊奭、黄奭等等，甚至还有“东巫”（《合集》5662）、“北巫”（《合集》34140、34157）。而且卜辞中也有伊尹的宗位“伊示”（《合集》32847、32848）、黄尹的宗位“黄示”（《合集》6354反）。《楚辞·天问》谓伊尹“何卒官汤，尊食宗绪”，正与卜辞中的记载相合。最值得注意的是，伊氏家族的族长在殷代世世受祭，有十九代均入王室宗庙受祭：“丁巳卜，侑于十位伊又九”（《合集》32786，粹编194同）。伊尹族盖世袭尹职，故有十九代入商王室受祭。这一方面是伊氏家族的荣宠，则另一方面也说明商王用祭祀的权力牢牢地控制着伊氏家族为商王室效力。而且，在商代王权高度集中的情况下，王室之外的大臣只能由商王祭祀其祖，而自己无权去祭祀。这种情况由下条卜辞可见：“贞，唵黄多子出牛，侑于黄尹”（《合集》3255正）。“黄多子”是黄尹氏族的众族长。黄氏众族长出牛而在殷王室祭祀黄尹，可见这些族长是无权祭祀黄尹的。⁴⁶其实这种情况在《尚书·盘庚中》中早有反映：

子念我先神后之劳尔先，子丕克羞尔，用怀尔然。失于政，陈于兹，高后丕乃崇降罪疾曰：“曷虐朕民？”汝万民乃不生，暨予一人猷同心，先后丕降与汝罪疾。曰：“曷不暨朕幼孙有比？”故故有爽德，自上其罚汝，汝罔能迪。古我先后，既劳乃祖乃父，汝共作我畜民，汝有戕在乃心，我先后馁乃祖乃父，乃祖乃父乃断弃汝，不救乃死。兹予有乱政同位，具乃贝玉。乃祖乃父丕乃告我高后曰：“作丕刑于朕孙！”迪高后，丕乃崇降弗祥。

从中可知：商王在祭祀上帝及先公先王时也要去世的过去时代的重要辅政大臣来陪祀，“兹予大享于先王，尔祖其从与享之”，即在殷王大祭先王时，群臣的先祖跟着一起享祭。这说明商代祭祀权是绝对集中在商王室手中的。

43 陈梦家Chen Mengjia:《商代的神话与巫术》Shangdai de shenhua yu wushu[The Mythology and Witchcraft of the Shang Dynasty],《燕京学报》Yanjing xuebao[Journal of Yanjing],1936年第20期,第535页。

44 陈梦家Chen Mengjia:《殷墟卜辞综述》Yinxu buci zongshu[Summary of Oracle Inscriptions from Yin Ruins],(北京Beijing:科学出版社Kexue chubanshe[China Science Publishing],1956),43。

45 陈梦家Chen Mengjia:《殷墟卜辞综述》Yinxu buci zongshu[Summary of Oracle Inscriptions from Yin Ruins],(北京Beijing:科学出版社Kexue chubanshe[China Science Publishing],1956),46。

46 王晖Wang Hui:《商周文化比较研究》Shangzhou wenhua bijiao yanjiu[Comparative Research of Shang and Zhou Cultures],(北京Beijing:人民出版社Renmin chubanshe[People's Publishing House],2000),39-40。

在商代，商王之下的王室官吏大多也具有巫的本事，而商代有名的大巫大多同时也是商王朝的高官。如果仔细区分起来可以分成专职的和兼职的。专职的巫是指专门从事请神、降神的神职人员，地位要低于王室的官吏，但他们是商代巫的主体。《尚书·君奭》周公说：“我闻在昔成汤既受命，时则有若伊尹，格于皇天。在太甲，时则有若保衡。在太戊，时则有若伊陟、臣扈，格于上帝；巫咸义王家。在祖乙，时则有若巫贤。在武丁时，则有若甘盘，率惟兹有陈，保又有殷……”这里提到的七个商代名臣——伊尹、保衡、伊陟、臣扈、巫咸、巫贤、甘盘，其中至少伊陟、巫咸和巫贤三个都是“巫”⁴⁷。他们就是当时在朝的大巫，上能“格于皇天”、“格于上帝”，下能“又王家”、“保又有殷”，与著名的伊尹列在一起，在王室中的重要性是显而易见的，都是位极人臣的人物，所以后世称他们为相。《尚书·咸义序》：“伊陟相太戊，亳有祥，桑谷共生于朝，伊陟赞于巫咸，作《咸义》四篇。”《史记·殷本纪》整合了上面二说：“帝太戊立伊陟为相。亳有祥桑谷共生于朝，一暮大拱。帝太戊惧，问伊陟。伊陟曰：‘臣闻妖不胜德，帝之政其有阙与？帝其修德。’太戊从之，而祥桑枯死而去。伊陟赞言于巫咸。巫咸治王家有成，作咸艾，作太戊。……帝祖乙立，殷复兴，巫贤任职。”《史记·封禅书》：“伊陟赞巫咸，巫咸之兴自此始。”说明巫氏世代相于殷王室，具有很高的社会地位，享有很大的政治特权，出入王家，以卜筮参与军机决策。

商汤逝世后，伊尹辅佐他的后代，直至商汤的孙子太甲为商王时，太甲暴虐乱德。三年以后，伊尹把太甲放逐到桐宫，亲自摄政，接受诸侯的朝拜。帝太甲在桐工住了三年后，悔过自责，改恶从善，于是伊尹把太甲接出来，还政给他，自己告老还乡。太甲返位后，发扬商汤的德政，勤俭爱民，史诸侯归附，社会安宁。这一记载更表明神权在商代所得到的尊崇。据陈梦家研究，甲骨文中“尹”的意思是巫师之长。“卜辞中常有王卜王贞之辞，乃是王亲自卜问，或卜风雨或卜祭祀征伐田游。……王兼为巫之所事，是王亦巫也。”⁴⁸因此，他总结道：“由巫而史，而为王者的行政官吏；王者自己虽为政治领袖，同时仍为群巫之长。”⁴⁹张光直说：“既然巫是智者圣者，巫便应当是有通天地本事的统治者的通称。巫咸、巫贤、巫彭固然是巫，殷商王室的人可能都是巫，或者至少都有巫的本事。”“到了殷商时代，巫师与王室的结合已趋完备。巫师主要的职务应当还是贯通天地，但天地的贯通是只有王室才独占的权利，……”最后，他总结说：“……神鬼是有先知的，……生人对神鬼这种智能是力求获得的。……掌握有这种智能的人便有政治的权力。因此在商代巫政是密切结合的。”⁵⁰这种说法很有道理。总之，以巫师为代表的宗教集团在殷商政治生活中占据十分重要的地位，而王者往往也是大巫。商王不仅是政

47 童恩正Tong Enzheng:《中国古代的巫》Zhongguo gudai de Wu[Wizards in Ancient China],《中国社会科学》Zhongguo shehui kexue[Social Sciences in China],1995年·第5期。

48 陈梦家Chen Mengjia:《商代的神话与巫术》Shangdai de shenhua yu wushu[The Mythology and Witchcraft of the Shang Dynasty],《燕京学报》Yanjing xuebao[Journal of Yanjing],1936年第20期·第535页。

49 陈梦家Chen Mengjia:《殷墟卜辞综述》Yinxu buci zongshu[Summary of Oracle Inscriptions from Yin Ruins],(北京Beijing:科学出版社Kexue chubanshe[China Science Publishing],1956),562。

50 张光直Zhang Guangzhi:《商代的巫与巫术》Shangdai de wu yu wushu[Wizard and Witchcraft of the Shang Dynasty],《中国青铜时代》Zhongguo qingtong shidai[Bronze Age of China],(北京Beijing:三联书店Sanlian shudian[SDX Joint Publishing Company],1999),257、261、279。

治首领，而且也是宗教领袖。商代政治的特征，即在于神权与王权合一，祭政合一，政治领袖与宗教领袖合一。

商代中前期，大巫位高职尊，他们可与商王比肩，在祭祀程序中，他们是仅次于商王的领导者；在现实政治结构中，他们是一人之下万人之上的统治者。这对商王王权是一个很大的威胁。为了打击大巫的政治势力，商王逐渐直接控制宗教祭祀，身兼大巫之职。到了殷商末代，从甲骨卜辞看，商王权力膨胀，大小政令，多由己出，巫在宗教祭祀中的领导地位，逐渐为政治领袖同时身兼大巫的商王所取代。说明王权与神权的统一出现了矛盾，王权是逐渐加强的，而神权则逐步衰落。据《史记·殷本纪》载：

帝武乙无道，为偶人，谓之天神。与之博，令人为行。天神不胜，乃僇辱之。为革囊，盛血，印而射之，命曰“射天”。武乙猎于河渭之间，暴雷，武乙震死。

武乙自己做了个偶人称为天神，跟它下棋赌输赢，让旁人替它下子。如果天神输了，就侮辱它。又制作了一个皮革的囊袋，里面盛满血，仰天射它，说这是“射天”。这就大大地侮辱了天神，结果最后被雷击而死。末代纣王更是“郊社不修，宗庙不享，作奇技淫巧以悦妇人”（《尚书·泰誓下》），“昏弃厥肆，祀弗答”（《尚书·牧誓》），“纣夷处，不用事上帝鬼神，祸厥先神禋不祀，乃曰吾民有命”（《墨子》引《太誓》），《史记·殷本纪》说他“慢于鬼神”，《龟策列传》亦说他“杀人六畜，以韦为囊。囊盛其血，与人县而射之，与天帝争强。”可见纣王生活荒淫，侮辱鬼神，天帝争强，荒废祭祀，还自恃天命在握，最后导致败亡。

杨幼炯概括殷商时代政治之特征：一方为神权政治，他方为强权政治。君主之权大，而诸侯之势衰⁵¹。在殷代，商王有绝对的权威。甲骨卜辞所反映的商代社会生活，始终是围绕商王展开的。这种绝对权威集中体现在商王自称“余一人”的称谓上面。传统文献中有许多记载，如《尚书·汤誓》：“尔尚辅予一人，致天之罚，予其大赉汝！”《国语·周语上》：引《汤誓》曰：“余一人有罪，无以万夫；万夫有罪，在余一人。”《尚书·盘庚上》中出现“予一人”就近二十起，典型的如：“邦之不藏，唯予一人有佚罚”，“各长于厥居，勉出乃力，听予一人之作猷。”“汝万民乃不生生，暨予一人猷同心。”“尔无共怒，协比谗言予一人。”甲骨文当中也有记载：“余一人亡祸？”“绥余一人”。《英国所藏甲骨集》第1923条卜辞云：“癸丑卜，王曰贞：翌甲寅乞酹自甲甲至于后，余一人亡祸？兹一品祀。在九月。雩示癸壹彘。”有学者指出：说其祸被认为是集于余一人即王之身上的，这正说明殷王统治的世界是由王一人来体现的。⁵²“余一人”或“予一人”的自称表示商王是万民中的第一人，具有至高无上的权力。正如有学

51 杨幼炯Yang Youjiong:《中国政治思想史》Zhongguo zhengzhi sixiangshi[History of Chinese Political Thought],(上海Shanghai: 上海书店Shanghai shudian[Shanghai Bookstore],1984), 23.

52 伊藤道治Ito Daoji:《王权与祭祀》Wanguan yu jisi[Kindship and Sacrifice],载中国社会科学院历史研究所编《华夏文明与传世藏书—中国国际汉学研讨会论文集》Huaxia wenming yu chuanshi cangshu Zhongguo guoji Hanxue yantaohui lunwenji[Sinic Civilization and libraries: Proceedings of China International Seminar on Sinology],中国社会科学出版社Zhongguo shehuikexue chubanshe[China Social Sciences Press],1996年。

者所说：“‘余一人’者，以天下之大，四海之内，唯天子为至高无上，惟我独尊。这便充分代表了这种专制暴君的独裁口吻。这种专制暴君‘余一人’，不但由经籍金文观之，周代已经普遍使用，而从甲骨文和《商书》看来，在殷盘庚、武丁甚或商汤时即已行之。”⁵³“这些记载表明，初始意义上的专制王权观念，确已在殷人的思想意识中有了明晰的表现与反映。尽管这种意识与商现实政治生活中的专制只是初步的，但‘余一人’观念的提出，毕竟标示出一个事实，即商代的君王，是大权独揽、高高在上的，同时也是孤独、独立的”⁵⁴。这种权力并非仅仅停留在观念上，而是实际去做，最突出的莫如掌握对人的生杀予夺之权。不仅如此，为了将“上帝”掌握在统治者手中，他们还垄断了和上帝沟通的权利，既把世俗权力的集中于一己之身，也是群巫和祭司之长，是神与人的中介。王权包含着神权，神权为王权的体现。换句话说，自称“余一人”的殷王之所以拥有至高无上的政治权力，在当时人们看来，是由于殷王具有超乎他人的宗教权力。而这种宗教权力又是政治权力反映。“所谓宗教信仰和天神崇拜，都是一种意识形态，它是社会历史实际生活幻想式的反映。结合着社会上专制人王的出现，全能上帝的崇拜因而产生。天上皇帝的出现，是与地上皇帝的产生相适应的。没有统一的地上皇帝，就永不会有天上的统一的至上神。天上至上神的统一，只不过是统一的东方暴君的副本而已。因而这个全能的上帝，天上的至上神，始终是为王服务的，它成了地上皇帝统治人民的有利工具。只有人王才能配天，才能和上帝接近。因而上帝叫帝，人王也可以叫帝。上帝主宰着自然和人间的一切，人王也就天生地掌握着人世的一切，而可以残暴地为所欲为。”⁵⁵人们认为，现王与先王和上帝的血缘关系最为亲近，只有王最了解神灵的心愿，神灵也最信任国王。反映在宗教活动中，殷王不厌其烦地从事各种各样的祭神活动，从事政务前往要占卜，求得神灵的允诺和保护。殷王的政治行为被看成是受神灵之命，所谓“予迓续乃命于天”（《尚书·盘庚》）正是此一心态的活生生的体现。在这种情况下，国王不但能控制臣民的躯体和行为，而且可以介入人们心灵深处，控制人们的灵魂。因而，神权政治同时也是一种无所不及、无时不在的极端专制统治。这样，殷代统治者就完成了殷商国家对大一统意识形态的理论诉求。正如恩格斯所说：“没有统一君主就不会出现统一的神，至于神的统一性不过是统一东方专制君主的反映。”⁵⁶殷商神权与王权的结合、至上神与极端专制的结合在中国历史上是比较典型的，对后来中国式的“政教合一”、君主专制有重要影响，值得我们深入研究。

53 胡厚宣Hu Houxuan:《释“余一人”》Shi “yuyiren” [Explaintion of “Alone Me”],《历史研究》Lishi yanjiu[Historical Research],1957年第1期。

54 张广志、李学功Zhang Guangzhi,Li Xuegong:《三代社会形态——中国无奴隶社会发展阶段研究》Sandai shehui xingtai——Zhongguo wu nuli shehui fazhan jieduan yanjiu[Social Formation of Xia,Shang,Zhou: Research of Development stage of Chinese Non-Slave Society],(西安Xian: 陕西师范大学出版社Shanxi shifan daxue chubanshe[Shaanxi Normal University General Publishing House],2001), 177-178.

55 胡厚宣、胡振宇Hu Houxuan,Hu Zhenyu:《殷商史》Yinshang shi[History of the Shang Dynasty],(上海Shanghai: 上海人民出版社Shanghai renmin chubanshe[Shanghai People’s Publishing House],2003), 488.

56 《马克思恩格斯全集》第27卷Makesi Engesi quanji di ershiqi juan[The Complete Works of Marx and Engels,Volume 27],(北京Beijing: 人民出版社Renmin chubanshe[People’s Publishing House], 1972), 65.

The English Title:

The concept of religious authority and power of the monarch in Shang Dynasty

HAN Xing, Professor, majoring in ideological history, Renmin University of China, No. 59 Fusheng Street, Changyang Town, Fangshan District, Beijing. Postal code: 102488. Email: lthanxing@163.com

Abstract: The Shang Dynasty people practiced theocentrism, Valuing Sacrifices and serving ghosts, and everything had to be predicted through divination. There are many deities in the Shang Dynasty, including three major systems: heavenly gods, earthly spirits, and human ghosts. Di has the greatest authority and is the ruler of nature. He has the characteristics of being extraordinary, not being influenced by human will, and is the supreme god in the belief world of the Shang Dynasty people. He is integrated with the ancestors of the Shang kings. The original meaning of Di was the ancestor and the god of reproduction of all things in the universe, which was very similar to the Western concept of 'God' as the creator. In the religious belief system of the Shang Dynasty, people did not directly offer sacrifices to the heavenly gods, and every request must be achieved through the intermediary of the ancestral ghosts. After the death of the Shang kings, they were all honored as Di, which led to the formation of the "combination of sorcerers and kings" and the "the unification of politics and religion" system in the late Shang Dynasty. In the late Shang Dynasty, a trinity structure of Di, Ancestral Spirit, and Kings was formed, which dominated the heavens and earth jointly, completed the integration of theocracy and kingship, and the combination of supreme god and extreme authoritarianism, formed a political ideological system of Religious indoctrination, had an important impact on later Chinese history and is worthy of our in-depth study.

Key words: Shang Dynasty, religious authority, power of the monarch, political and religious unification

(本文编辑: 田野)

基于实践智慧的本体论说

——牟宗三“道德的形上学”建构得失试探¹

吴倩

(天津师范大学政治与行政学院 · 300387, 天津市)

提要: 牟宗三基于儒家独特的实践智慧建构了“道德的形上学”的哲学本体论。他对“道德的形上学”的论证不仅包含其后期哲学体系中的“本体论论证”，更包括牟氏思想中期梳理与重释儒家言说的“哲学史论证”。牟氏注重《中庸》、《易传》之“本体宇宙论”一路并以之作为《论语》、《孟子》之“道德实践”一路的圆满发展，以接续儒家“基于实践亲证而言本体洞见”的传统。不过，“道德的形上学”本体论最终主要继承了儒家的实践本体观念，而未能完成与此实践本体相应的实践本体进路的现代转化工作，使“道德的形上学”本体论之实践本体理念与其思辨的本体进路之间存在着根源性的张力。

关键词: 牟宗三 道德的形上学 哲学史论证 本体宇宙论 实践

作者: 吴倩 (天津师范大学政治与行政学院教授), 邮箱: wuqiannk@126.com.

已故美籍学者傅伟勋曾指出，“牟宗三是王阳明以后继承熊十力理路而足以代表近代到现代中国哲学真正水平的第一人”²。“道德的形上学”本体论是牟宗三哲学体系的核心，是基于传统儒家“以实践证知本体”的独特智慧建构的现代哲学本体论。学界对“道德的形上学”本体论已经进行了多方探讨³，在“道德的形上学”之本体论论证问题上，许其切中儒学真义者有之，判其强搬康德框架者亦有之；在“道德的形上学”之本体论

1 基金项目: 本文为国家社科基金重点项目“从宋明儒家乡治实践看国家与社会的互动”的阶段性成果。

2 [美]傅伟勋 Fu Weixun, 《从西方哲学到禅佛教》 Cong xifang zhexue dao chanfojiao [From Western Philosophy to Zen Buddhism], (北京 Beijing: 三联书店 Sanlianshudian [Joint Publishing], 1989), 25.

3 参见林安梧 Lin Anwu, 《新儒学理论系统的建构: 牟宗三两层存有论及相关问题检讨》 Xinruxue lilun xitong de jiangou: Mou Zongsan liangceng cunyoulun ji xiangguan wenti jiantao [The construction of the theoretical system of Neo Confucianism: a review of Mou Zongsan's Two Layer Existence Theory and related issues], 《杭州师范大学学报》(社会科学版) Hangzhou shifan daxue xuebao (shehui kexue ban) [Journal of Hangzhou Normal University (Social Science Edition)], 2013 年第 2 期; 杨泽波 Yang Zebo: 《智的直觉与善相: 牟宗三道德存有论及其对西方哲学的贡献》 Zhidezhihui yu shanxiang: Mou Zongsan daode cunyoulun ji qi dui xifang zhexue de gongxian [Intellectual intuition and Moral phenomenon: Mou zongsan's moral ontology and its contributions to western philosophy], 《中国社会科学》 Zhongguo shehui kexue [Social Sciences in China], 2013 年第 6 期; 《牟宗三纵贯纵讲的存有论内涵》 Mou Zongsan zongguan zongjiang de cunyoulun neihan [The Ontological implication of Mou Zongsan's "Vertical Interpretation of Vertical Relationships"], 《华东师范大学学报》(哲学社会科学版) Huadong shifan daxue xuebao (shehui kexue ban) [Journal of East China Normal University (Humanities and Social Sciences)], 2012 年第 5 期; 杨泽波 Yang Zebo: 《贡献与终结: 牟宗三儒学思想研究》第三卷 Gongxian yu zhongjie: Mou Zongsan ruxue sixiang yanjiu: disanjuan [Contribution and Termination: A Study of Mou Zongsan's Confucian Thought, Volume 3 (上海 Shanghai: 上海人民出版社 Shanghai People's Publishing House, 2014); 王兴国 Wang Xingguo: 《论牟宗三“道德的形上学”与哲学转向》 Lun Mou Zongsan daode de xingshangxue yu zhexue zhuanxiang [On Mou Zongsan's "Moral Metaphysics" and Philosophical Turn], 《中山大学学报》(社会科学版) Zhongshan daxue xuebao (shehui kexue ban) [Journal of Sun yat-sen university (social science edition)], 2014 年第 1 期。

涵问题上，认其为实有形态者有之，辨其为境界形态者亦有之。学界前贤对于“道德的形上学”本体论的思考可谓意见纷呈，甚至针锋相对。这些交锋揭示出“道德的形上学”本体论自身的复杂内涵，也透出进一步深入探讨的理论空间。本文试图从牟氏后期哲学体系与中期哲学史研判的关系出发更系统地考察“道德的形上学”之本体论证方式，以发掘“道德的形上学”本体论在学界已经揭示的“本体论论证”之外的“哲学史论证”，并进一步探析“道德的形上学”之本体论建构的理论得失。

一、“道德的形上学”之“本体论论证”

牟宗三在其“晚年定论”《现象与物自身》中建立“道德的形上学”体系来阐发儒家的天道本体论。在《现象与物自身》中，牟宗三借鉴康德所作的“现象与物自身”的超越区分，讲明“物自身”是一个价值意味的概念，在实质上相当于儒家所讲的“良知之体”，“道德的形上学”就是由此良知之体“开显”存在界而实现的。由此，《现象与物自身》本体论的关键就在于“无执的存有论”一节中“由知体之为存有论的实体开存在界”的问题，不过牟宗三并未在此进行哲学学理上的论证，而是以注释经典、疏解传统儒家义理的方式，援引传统儒学的洞见来证实良知之体可以开出存在界。在此基础上，牟氏借鉴了康德哲学的术语和框架建构起自身的现代儒学本体论，并且进一步地以“道德的形上学”批判康德哲学在此问题上思考的未尽之处，希望以儒家的智慧回应康德的问题。

关于牟宗三本体论的这一核心问题，学界已经达成基本的共识，认为其论证过程是在《智的直觉与中国哲学》一书中。实际上“知体明觉如何开出存在界”的问题也就是“知体明觉、良知之体如何能是世界本体”的问题，同时也就是“诚明心体所发的那种智的直觉式的天德良知如何可能”（“智的直觉如何可能”）、“我们人类这种有限的存在如何能有这种直觉”（人在何种意义上“虽有限而可无限”）的问题。对于“智的直觉如何可能”、“知体明觉如何能是世界本体”的问题，牟宗三在书中讲到了“在什么关节上理论上必肯定这种直觉”和“在什么关节上不但是理论上必肯定，而且是实际上必呈现”这两个方面。⁴

关于“智的直觉”之理论上的证立，牟宗三论证的基点是中国哲学独特的“性体”概念。“性是道德行为底超越根据，而其本身又是绝对而无限地普遍的。因此它不是个类名，所以名曰性体——性即是体”，“如此说性，是康德乃至整个西方哲学中所没有的”。⁵ 也就是说，中国传统哲学的“性体”概念不同于西方哲学中作为“类名”、指称“类性”的性概念，在中国哲学中，“性体”一方面是“性”——作为人类道德行为的根据内在于人心之中；另一方面是“体”，即是世界一切存在的源头和本体，“不但是吾人之道德行为由它而来，即一草一木，一切存在，亦皆系属于它而为它所统摄，因而有其存在”。因此，性体“不但创造吾人的道德行为，使吾人的道德行为纯亦不已，

4 牟宗三Mou Zongsan,《智的直觉与中国哲学》Zhi de zhijue yu zhongguo zhexue[The intellectual intuition and Chinese philosophy],(台北Taipei:台湾商务印书馆Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan[Taiwan Commercial Press],1994), 190.

5 同上·第190页。

它亦创生一切而为一存在之源”。由此可见中国哲学之“性体”不但是道德之“性”，而且更是一个“体”（本体），“即形而上的绝对而无限的‘体’”，是一个“创造原则”，“即表象‘创造性本身’的那个创造原则”，“吾人以此为性，故曰性体”。⁶那么，儒者通过道德行为警醒、觉知其内在根据——“性体”，同时也就通达了“一切存在之源”，而这种对于存在本源的通达也就意味着有限的人可以把握存在之源，或说可以拥有“智的直觉”，换句话说，先天内在的良知本体同时也就是世界万物的最终本体，“道德的形上学”之“知体明觉”可以开出存在界。

这样一来，问题的关键就归结到在何种意义上方能承认中国哲学的“性体”概念，承认儒家作为道德之内在根据的“性体”具有绝对的普遍性。惟有承认一个“绝对而无限地普遍”的性体，承认它“虽特显于人类，而却不为人类所限，不只限于人类而为一类概念”，“虽特彰显于成吾人之道德行为，而却不为道德界所限，只封于道德界而无涉于存在界”，而是“涵盖乾坤，为一存在之源”，才能使得传统儒家的“良知之体”同时就是世界的最终本体，从而由“知体明觉”开出存在界。

对于这个问题，牟宗三是通过“道德乃是无条件的定然命令”这一点来论证的。他在书中讲道，如果“本心”或“性体”是有限的，则其所发布的命令就是有条件的，道德就会丧失自律性，主体行为就会因掺杂感性因素而成为被动的。既然道德必是“依无条件的定然命令而行”，那么作为其内在根据的“性体”就必然具有绝对无限的普遍性。因此，“性体”、“良知之体”就是形上学的第一因、最终本体。那么人经由道德实践可以觉知“性体”这一“存在本源”，也就意味着人“虽有限而可无限”，可以拥有“智的直觉”。牟氏“道德的形上学”本体论得以在这一根本上证成。

不过牟宗三亦坦言，“此肯定尚只是理论上的，以上的一切论证都是分析的”，“惟此分析的、理论上的肯定必须视性体为本心仁体始可”。⁷也就是说，这种思辨理路的推导和证明，无论是性体的绝对普遍性，还是道德作为无条件的定然命令，它们在根本上是基于同一个前提，就是传统儒家的洞见。这种洞见是儒者在道德实践中体悟、亲证而得来，是一种实践理性的“证知”。具体说来，就是必须把性体当作具有无限感通性的“本心仁体”，或者换句话说，必须在道德实践中展露出性体作为“本心仁体”的感通性和遍润性，从而使性体的绝对普遍性得到具体而真实的印证。

牟宗三多次强调这种实践亲证的重要性，认为“这个关节即在本心仁体（性体）之诚明，明觉，良知，或虚明照鉴”。“本心仁体不是一个孤悬的、假设的绝对而无限之物摆在那里，因而设问我们如何能智的直觉之。当吾人说‘本心’时即是就其具体的呈现而说之，如恻隐之心、羞恶之心，是随时呈现的。……仁心随时在跃动在呈现，感通周流而遍润一切。”由此可知，性体、“本心仁体”是一个“随时在跃动的活动（activity）”，其作为“活动”的特征就在于明觉、遍润，也就是通过感通、觉润一切存在的践履活动来确证其绝对性和无限性。“只有当吾人郑重正视此明觉义、活动义，始能知本心仁体是一呈现，而不是一假设（不是一理论上的设准），因而始能知智的直觉亦是一呈现而

6 同上·第191页。

7 同上·第193页。

可为吾人所实有，不只是一个理论上的肯定”。⁸ 由此实践活动所彰显的性体、“本心仁体”之活动性，便可真正确证性体之为绝对普遍的本体，有限的人可以拥有这种通达存在本源的天德良知。

此处性体作为“本心仁体”的活动性，其实也就是性体、智的直觉之创生性，就是儒家“良知之体”对于世界的创生活动，具体分为三个阶段：

- (1) “本心仁体”在跃动中自我呈现，“本心仁体之明觉活动反身而自知、自证其自己”，也就是传统儒家所讲的“逆觉体证”。在这一阶段中，性体、本心仁体由于自身具有明觉性，因而能够反身自照，明了并确证自己作为性体这一道德根据先天地内在于人心之中。
- (2) “本心仁体”发动道德行为。性体既能逆觉而自证其自身，便会不容已地发布定然命令，并且使之见诸道德行为。如果像王阳明那样把“行为”（如事亲、读书等）当作“物”，那么可以说这些道德行为就是智的知觉的对象，是“本心仁体”所要实现的目标。“本心仁体”不容已地发动实际的道德行为，就是对这些“物”的创生。由此可见“本心仁体”的创造不只是理论的、形式上讲的创造，而是“可以具体呈现的具体而真实的创造”。“智的直觉之即创生之，是把它引归于其自己而由其自己所引生之自在物 (e-ject)”⁹
- (3) “本心仁体”基于其绝对普遍性，遍润一切存在而为其体。由于仁心的感通是“体物而不可遗”的无限的感通，因此“本心仁体”便不是仅限于发动道德行为，而是在充其极的意义上，可以妙润一切而为一存在之源。世间万事万物无不包容于这种感通和遍润之中。

由此可见，性体、良知之体通过以上逐步扩展的三个阶段的创生，便可从实践方面证实其本身是一个具有无限感通性的“本心仁体”。在此“本心仁体”真实无妄的“亲证之知”的基础上，智的直觉之“思辨的证立”便获得了确定的理论前提。

纵观牟宗三对其本体论之核心问题的解答，可以说它是通过援引儒学义理和借鉴康德哲学这两种方式结合完成的。作为儒家思想的现代传人，牟宗三在根本的思想观念上归宗于儒，继承了儒家以实践的亲证作为“本体之知”的主要来源的传统。他从传统儒学中直接援引了诸如本心性体的“逆觉体证”、“感通无限”等观点，以注释经典和疏解儒学义理的方式进行阐发，并以之作为自己本体论的前提和主要论据。作为一名现代哲学家，牟宗三比传统儒学更加注重学理上的推论和证明，无论是智的直觉之“思辨的证立”还是“实践的证立”，他都在重新疏解传统儒家智慧的同时结合现代哲学的范畴和问题意识进行阐述。为了更好地做到这一点，牟宗三选择了自己心目中最接近儒家智慧精神的现代哲学形态——康德哲学作为范本，在其现代儒学本体论的建构中依托康德哲学的问题意识和理论框架，以回应康德之问题、弥补康德之缺陷的方式阐发传统儒学的本体观。牟氏通过对康德哲学的两大核心问题（“意志自由是否为假设”、“智的直觉

8 同上，第193-194页。

9 同上，第198-199页。

如何可能”)进行儒家式的回答,力图做到“入其营、袭其垒”,在康德哲学的框架中建构起自己的现代儒学本体论。

二、“道德的形上学”之“哲学史论证”

在“道德的形上学”之本体论证方面,学界的主流观点认为牟宗三主要是借鉴西方康德哲学的理论框架来完成的。本文则力图指出,“道德的形上学”本体论虽然大部分借鉴了康德哲学的框架(体现于《现象与物自身》、《智的直觉与中国哲学》等书的论证过程中),但其在根本上意图接续的是传统儒家“本体宇宙论”(牟宗三语)一路之言说本体的思想传统。这一点鲜明地体现在牟氏思想中期梳理传统哲学史之“性与天道”问题的相关著作中,在一定意义上堪称“道德的形上学”本体论的“哲学史论证”。

牟宗三在其思想中期(即系统建构哲学体系之前)进行了较为系统的哲学史梳理工作,在他梳理儒家言说“性与天道”之方式的浩大工程中实际上包含着对于此后“道德的形上学”本体论的“哲学史论证”。在后期理论体系的建构过程中,牟宗三结合现代哲学思考对传统儒学言说本体的思路进行了重新诠释和创造性转化,一方面赋予传统儒家的本体言说方式以现代形态,另一方面力图用内在于儒家义理的传统本体理路解决现代哲学本体论的问题。

在梳理哲学史的过程中,牟宗三区分出传统儒家思考本体的两种理路,也即他所谓的儒家言说“性与天道”的两种方式,一种为“本体宇宙论地说”,一种为“道德实践地说”。他正是通过对两路之逻辑次序的独特安排和精神实质的重新诠释来实现接续传统精神慧命、回应现代本体问题的理论期待的。

具体说来,牟宗三对于儒家契入本体(言“性”)的方式,区分出《中庸》《易传》之“本体宇宙论的一路”(Cosmological approach)和《论语》《孟子》之“道德实践的一路”(Moral approach),而以前者作为后者在逻辑上的圆满发展。应当说“本体宇宙论”与“道德实践”的两路作为牟氏本体思考中期的重点,是其思想成熟时期本体理路的先声。(10)在他看来,两路分别偏重于天道之言说的存有论一面和道德实践一面,并且“在形而上(本体宇宙论)方面与在道德方面都是根据践仁尽性”(11)。具体说来,“本体宇宙论的进路”是一种“精诚的道德意识所贯注的原始而通透的直悟……以儒圣的具体清澈精诚恻怛的圆而神之境为根据”¹²,人们通过这种进路得以洞悉天道生生之德和人之道德本性。而这种对宇宙人生之道的洞悟是以“道德实践的进路”为基础的,通过儒者真实的道德实践方能达致那种天道人性的“本体宇宙论”的证悟。所以说以上两路虽然是

10 参见牟宗三Mou Zongsan,《中国哲学的特质》Zhongguo zhexue de tezhi [The Characteristics of Chinese Philosophy] (上海Shanghai: 上海古籍出版社 Shanghai guji chubanshe [Shanghai Classics Publishing House],1997), 54-55;《心体与性体》(上册)Xinti yu Xingtǐ (shangce) [Original Heart and Human Nature (Volume 1)] (上海Shanghai: 上海古籍出版社 Shanghai guji chubanshe[Shanghai Classics Publishing House],1999), 27、28、31。

11 牟宗三Mou Zongsan:《心体与性体》(上册)Xinti yu Xingtǐ (shangce) [Original Heart and Human Nature (Volume 1)],100。

12 同上,第162页。

分而言之，但在根本上是通贯为一的，“本体宇宙论”一路是“道德实践”一路所得出的形上洞见之表达。

在此基础上，牟氏对于传统儒学的致思取向进行了一种“调适而上遂”式的话语转换，把儒学从一种致力于安身立命的“成德之教”转换为对天道本体的哲学思考和现代本体论的自觉建构，这种转换是通过突出强调“本体宇宙论”一路的理论智慧而实现的。

相对于传统儒家注重“道德实践一路”的实有诸己、立身修德，一切学问指向生命践行的特点，牟氏的本体论着力强调了“本体宇宙论”一路对于本体的形上领悟。他着力凸显这种“本体宇宙论”的洞见作为“道德实践一路”之充其极的特点，并且在自己的本体论建构中尝试对这种本体进路进行现代转化。具体说来，牟宗三认为传统儒家由本体宇宙论的方面对本体的契接，在道德实践的路向之外形成了另一个非常重要的路向。这是由先秦《中庸》、《易传》所开启，而为宋明之横渠、明道、五峰、戡山一系所接续的理路，而究其实质，此路向亦不过是《论语》、《孟子》之道德实践地本体之路，“依一形而上的洞悟渗透充其极”而有的“‘性体与天命实体通而为一’之提升”，因而这种提升“实与孟子相呼应，而圆满地展示出”。进一步的，“先秦儒家如此相承相呼应，而至此最后之圆满，宋明儒即就此圆满亦存在地呼应之，而直下通而一之也：仁与天为一，心性与天为一，性体与道体为一，最终由道体说性体，道体性体仍是一。”概括而言，所有这些形而上的本体洞悟“只是一道德意识之充其极，故只是一‘道德的形上学’也。”此处之“充其极”、“圆满展示”等等表述，提示我们注意，牟宗三着力强调这形上本体论的领悟与“道德实践的一路”并非互相分离、互相对立，“此只可以圆满发展看，不可以相反之两途看”，更“不可以西方康德之批判哲学与康德前之独断形上学之异来比观”。¹³ 作为深研康德学理的现代哲人，牟宗三认为，“如果我们割离道德实践而单客观地看存在之物，自可讲出一套存有论，……儒家可以把它看成是知解层上的观解形上学，此则是没有定准的，由康德的批判即可知之。说到究竟，只有这么一个圆教下的实践的形上学。”¹⁴ 也就是说，不同于西方思辨形上学的独断前提与推证理路，这种“本体宇宙论”的形上学，只是道德实践至极而有的对本体之澈悟，是基于儒家生命实践而有的“实践的形上学”。“这不是顺知性思考之兴趣纯客观地积极地着于存在而施分解、推证与构造，如希腊传统之形上学之所为者。其着于存在而施分解乃是以道德的创造性为支点者，他是在此决定性的纲领下施分解，故其分解有定向、有范围，属‘道德的形上学’。根据‘维天之命、於穆不已’之根源智慧，一眼看定这整个宇宙即是一道德的创造，与见之于各人自己处之道德的创造为同一模型，同一意蕴，……此着于存在，是在道德的创造性之定向下着”。这种形上学建立于真实的生命实践基础上，是一种出于实践进路的“实践本体论”，“儒家之道德哲学必承认其涵有一‘道德

13 同上，第26-27、30-31页。

14 牟宗三Mou Zongsan:《从陆象山到刘戡山》Cong Lu Xiangshan dao Liu Jishan[From Lu Xiangshan to Liu Jishan] (上海Shanghai: 上海古籍出版社Shanghai guji chubanshe[Shanghai Classics Publishing House],2001), 157-158.

的形上学’，始能将‘天’收进内，始能充其智慧方向之极而至圆满。”¹⁵ 显而易见，牟宗三在其本体思考的成熟时期所期待建成的“从道德的进路入”的“道德的形上学”、基于生命实践的本体论，便是这种思路的进一步充实和发展。

由此可见，牟宗三在梳理传统儒家的本体理路时着力突显“本体宇宙论”一路契悟本体的洞见，并且强调其作为“道德实践”一路之“充其极”的特点，进而在最终建构本体论时接续了传统儒家基于实践证悟的“本体宇宙论”一路的传统智慧。通过这种创造性的诠释，他把儒学从一种关切安身立命的“成德之教”转化为现代哲学本体论的自觉建构。我们因此可以肯定，牟宗三在建构现代哲学本体论时不仅注重西方康德哲学的框架，更加注重援引儒学传统自身的智慧精神。牟氏对于传统儒家本体智慧的接续不仅仅在于肯定本体是一个价值本体，而且在于本体论证方式上接续了“基于实践亲证而言本体洞见”的本体宇宙论传统。(体现为他在本体论证上力图接续儒家“本体宇宙论”一路的传统，通过对其进行一种现代转化来完成自己的本体论建构。)牟宗三对本体论问题的思考在基本特质上与西方哲学的思辨理路迥然不同，在较为根本的意义上突显了儒学自身的理论特质，对于西方哲学的思辨本体观和本体论证方式进行了一种儒家式的回应和某种程度上的“纠偏”。

三、“道德的形上学”本体论之理论得失

本文对于“道德的形上学”本体论之理论得失的分析主要着眼于“本体观”和“本体进路”两个方面，本体观指的是“在根本上以什么为最终本体”的问题，“本体进路”则是指“通过何种理路达至或证立这一本体”的问题。在本文看来，牟氏在根本上期望建构的本体论力图接续传统儒家的实践本体观和实践本体理路这两个方面的智慧精神，然而他最终建成的“道德的形上学”本体论则与上述理论期待有所出入。具体来说，“道德的形上学”本体论未能圆满实现“既阐明价值本体、又接续实践本体进路”的理论期待，最终导致其在本体观与本体进路之间产生了较为深刻的内在冲突。

1、“道德的形上学”之实践本体观

“道德的形上学”的本体观主要来自于传统儒家出自实践的领悟、亲证而得到的“实践之知”，在根本上肯定的是一个通过道德实践得以呈现的“实践本体”、“本心仁体”。

牟宗三认为，“知不只是‘知性之知’(丽物之知、见闻之知)，还有实践的德性之知。理解不只是知识意义的理解，还有实践意义的理解。我们不只是思辨地讲理性之实践使用，还有实践地讲理性之实践使用。不只是外在的解悟，还有内在的证悟，乃至澈悟”¹⁶。相对于西方哲学注重思辨推理的、以知识的方式探讨本体的路向，中国哲学体现出注重实践的“亲证之知”的特点，这种实践亲证之路所得到的本体是实践的本体、

15 以上参见牟宗三Mou Zongsan:《心体与性体》(上册) Xinti yu Xingti(shangce)[Original Heart and Human Nature (Volume 1)],31.

16 同上·第145页。

实践的真理。牟宗三曾在《中国哲学十九讲》中讲到，真理可以大体分为两种，一种是外延的真理 (extensional truth)，一种是内容的真理 (intensional truth)。外延的真理是指科学 (如自然科学、数学等) 的知识，可称为“广度的真理”，它可以脱离我们主观的态度，指的是不系属于主体而可以“客观的肯断”的那种真理；内容的真理则是表述“属于人生全体 (human life as such, human life as a whole) 中的那个真实性”，可以称为“强度的真理”，它是系属于生命主体的真理，与外延真理一样是理性的，具有内容的普遍性。中国哲学的典型特征就在于它是一种“内容的真理”，其关键在于把人看作主体而非对象，倡导一种主体的学问、生命的学问。相对于西方哲学之外延真理的“抽象的普遍性” (概念的普遍性，abstract universality)，中国哲学之内容真理的普遍性则是“具体的普遍性” (concrete universality)，是在真实的生命中具体呈现的普遍之理。¹⁷ 总而言之，中国传统哲学所探讨的是一种关乎生命实践的“本体之真”，而把握这种真理的方式“只是与它‘靛面相当’的亲证”，“是实践的亲证，理解之即是证实之，即是呈现之；……不是知‘特定经验内容’的普通知识，而单是实践地知这‘实体’之知”¹⁸。与这种观点相对应，牟宗三在自己哲学体系之基础的本体观上，也力图接续传统儒家的本体观念，肯定的是一个价值意义上的实践本体。

2、“道德的形上学”之本体进路

虽然“道德的形上学”本体论致力于继承和接续传统儒家的本体观念和本体进路，但实际上它主要是继承了儒家价值本体的观念，而没有完成与此价值本体相应的儒家实践本体进路的现代转化工作。“道德的形上学”在某种程度上未能实现对儒家“基于道德实践而言本体宇宙论”之本体进路的现代转化，而是在自己的本体论建构中选择了西方思辨传统下的康德哲学框架作为主要的本体进路。这种安排导致牟氏接续儒家本体宇宙论一路的理论期待略显落空，亦使“道德的形上学”本体论之核心的实践本体理念与其思辨的本体论证进路之间存在着根源性的张力。

如上所论，牟氏哲学在根本上希望援引的是传统儒学的实践本体进路，这种本体进路作为传统哲学的一部分确实有必要进行一种现代哲学意义上的转化。因为，传统儒家的“本体宇宙论一路”只是对道德实践所得出的领悟直接进行表达，而现代哲学的本体论探讨已经有了更为严密、更为系统的论证要求。牟宗三在建构“道德的形上学”本体论时清楚地意识到现代哲学本体论与传统儒学天道观的区别，所以不再是像传统的“本体宇宙论一路”那样直接记录下对于天道本体的领悟，而是力图通过完整的哲学推证来得出结论、建构体系。不过，以何种方式对儒家这种本体进路进行现代转化方能保证既不流失其理论的独特性而又符合现代哲学的话语方式？这一任务显得十分艰巨。儒家本体进路的独特性在于它是一种区别于现代主流哲学之思辨理路的实践理路，而人们对此实践理路进行现代转化时很难找到一种相应的现代哲学作为模版，因为现代哲学之主

17 以上参见牟宗三 Mouzongsan: 《中国哲学十九讲》Zhongguo zhexue shijiu jiang[Nineteen Lectures on Chinese Philosophy], 20-36.

18 牟宗三 Mou Zongsan: 《心体与性体》(上册) Xinti yu Xingtǐ (shàngcè)[Original Heart and Human Nature (Volume 1)], 145.

流的多数西方哲学流派在根本上坚持的是思辨理路。牟宗三在此问题的处理上选择了借鉴康德哲学，这主要是基于康德的自律道德学说与儒家道德学说的相似性。然而，道德学说上的相似性并不能遮蔽两者之间的思辨理路与实践理路的根本差别。可以说这种借鉴康德哲学的做法在实际上未能处理好儒家基于实践的本体进路与康德基于思辨的本体进路之间如何融通的问题，未能真正实现儒家的实践本体进路的现代转化，从而最终导致“道德的形上学”难以处理好其所坚持的儒家式的实践本体与康德式的思辨进路之间的关系。在本文看来，如果对照传统儒家言“性”的两路，可以说牟宗三的本体论欲达致《庸》、《易》之“本体宇宙论”的结论，应当进行一种相应于《论》、《孟》之“道德实践一路”的哲学论证，显然康德哲学式的思辨理路难以胜任这一任务。

进一步分析来看，“道德的形上学”的本体进路主要是依托康德哲学的问题意识和理论框架提出的，而康德哲学在实际上与牟氏本体论所坚持的实践本体观以及在根本上希望继承的儒家实践本体进路之间均存在较大张力。一方面，康德作为西方近现代哲学的典型代表，在思维方式上承袭着西方哲学一贯的思辨探讨的传统。用牟宗三的话说，康德无论是讲本体还是讲道德，都是以“讲知识的方式”来进行的。康德的道德哲学是“思辨地讲理性之实践使用”，以意志自由为假设，通过步步分析和推论，最终得出道德律令的普遍必然性。这个论证过程在根本上体现出西方哲学注重逻辑分析、哲学思辨的问题探讨方式，而康德哲学的上述思辨理路与儒家的实践本体进路之间存在着根本性的差异，借鉴康德的理路是不可能完成儒家本体进路的接续和转化任务的。另一方面，在本体论问题上，康德哲学作为德国古典哲学的奠基者，体现着西方哲学发展到近代时期的“认识论转向”的典型特征。它主要注重对人类理性的认识和实践能力进行探讨，对本体论问题抱持着“存而不论”的态度。在《纯粹理性批判》中，康德的目标在于为知识划定界限，并不是像牟宗三所讲的那样，意在通过对知识的分析得出“物自身”的概念，进而建构本体论；在《实践理性批判》中，与其说康德是在发掘由实践理性通向最终本体的道路，不如说他更重视对人类理性之“实践使用”进行分析，确证道德律令的普遍必然性。康德进行实践理性分析的意图并非如牟宗三所继承的儒学传统那样，旨在通过道德实践之“感通”、“遍润”而通达存在本源。因此可以说，牟氏借鉴无意于探讨本体论的康德哲学是难以真正阐明儒家的实践本体、完成建构现代儒学本体论的理论任务的。在以上两方面基础上，我们认为牟氏借鉴康德哲学建构本体论的缺陷有二：一是由于康德的问题意识与牟宗三本体论重建的理论期待迥异其趣，他就需要面临完全扭转康德本身的问题意识的理论难题；二是由于康德哲学的建构方式在整体上体现出西方传统之思辨理路的典型特点，他这种依托康德哲学的本体论证方式就在根本上与“道德的形上学”所继承的传统儒家实践智慧之间产生了深刻的张力。

对于康德哲学的智慧精神，牟宗三曾经讲道，“康德哲学是处于朱子系和孟子系的居间形态”，其洞见是纵贯系统的洞见，其讲法却仍是知识的。康德不是“从心说理”，而是“从理说心”，总体说来未至成熟之境。¹⁹ 具体说来，牟氏指出康德在两个问题

19 牟宗三Mou Zongsan:《康德的道德哲学》Kangde de daode zhexue[Kant's Moral Philosophy],(台北Taipci:台湾学生书局Taiwan xuesheng shuju[Taiwan Student Bookstore],1982),266.

的思考上“未至圆熟之境”：一是关于“智的直觉”之有无的问题，康德以智的直觉为假设，而不认为它是真实的呈现；二是“智的直觉”是否“充其极”的问题，康德只在实践理性发挥作用的道德领域讨论“智的直觉”，而并未把此“良知之体”进一步“充其极”，突破道德的界限，遍润一切而为存在之源。按照上文对康德哲学的分析可知，康德哲学由于其自身具有与牟氏的理论期待不同的问题意识，并不希望建构以“智的直觉”为中心的本体论，因此不会把这一“自由意志”、“良知之体”充其极而“开显”存在界；基于其所身处的西方哲学的思辨理性传统，康德也不会放弃思辨的分析、推理而认同于实践体证地确证“智的直觉真实存在”的论证方式。对于这些问题，牟宗三在自己梳理儒家义理和翻译康德原著的书中，也曾以各种方式或多或少地提及，但是在建构自己的“道德的形上学”本体论时，还是对这个较为重要的问题有所忽略。由于康德的思考是以纯粹理性的思辨理路展开的，牟宗三以回应康德的方式所建构的本体论便也主要以思辨理性的方式来进行²⁰，虽然他在如此建构的同时屡屡强调这一切在根本上基于儒家的实践之知，但是却很难真正消解这两者之间的张力。由此我们或许应当思考，对于儒家的实践本体观和传统的实践本体进路而言，借鉴康德哲学式的思辨理路是否是儒学现代重释的最恰当途径？儒家传统的现代转化是现代中国哲学的重要理论任务，儒家本体论的现代转型与重建则是这一任务中最为根本的环节。牟宗三作为现代中国哲学家的典型代表，在这一问题上的探索展现出高远的哲学洞见。不过，牟氏在建构过程中对康德的借鉴也使得他在某种意义上局限于康德的思维方式，而对其在疏解儒家传统时所强调的生命本体、实践进路有所忽略。所以严格来说，牟氏没有圆满地完成儒家本体论之现代转型的理论任务。

综上所述，牟宗三的本体论思想在根本观点上继承了儒家传统之实践本体论的基本精神，但是他所选取的思辨哲学的建构理路导致最终对于儒家本体之为“生命本体”、“实践之知”的意义重视不够。可以说，牟氏哲学的思考是现代中国哲学本体论探讨中的一种开拓性尝试，在世界哲学探讨中显示了儒家智慧的精神特质，也展现出儒学在现代哲学话语圈中继续发展的一种可能理路。同时我们亦应明确，“道德的形上学”本体论并不是现代中国哲学本体论建构的完成，而毋宁说是展开了一个起点，指出了一种可能的方向，提示了若干重要问题和一些洞见，亦存在一些滑转和未尽之处，本体论领域的儒学重建尚有许多工作留待我们进一步的追问和反思。

20 本文认为，正是牟氏本体论在表面上的思辨论证方式遮蔽了其在根本上所坚持的实践本体智慧，使其受到学界的一些研究者的批评，甚至被称为“关于上帝存在的本体论证明”，因此，细致阐发牟氏哲学的实践本体智慧以及其与表面上思辨论证方式之间的张力，将有助于深化对于牟氏本体论的理解和研究。

The English Title:

Ontological Theory Based on Practical Wisdom—— An Exploration of the Gains and Losses of Mou Zongsan’s “Metaphysics of Morality” Construction

Wu Qian

Professor.School of Politics and Administration,Tianjin Normal University.Email: wuqiannk@126.com.

Abstract: Mou Zongsan constructed a philosophical ontology of “moral metaphysics” based on the unique practical wisdom of Confucianism.His argument for the “Moral metaphysics” not only includes the “ontological argument” in his later philosophical system,but also includes the “philosophical history argument” that reinterpreted Confucian discourse in the middle of Mou’s thought.Mou emphasizes the “Cosmological approach” in “Zhongyong” and “Yizhuan” and takes it as a successful development of the “Moral approach” in “The Analects of Confucius” and “Mencius”, in order to continue the Confucian tradition of “ontology insight based on practical evidence”. However,the ontology of “Moral metaphysics” ultimately inherited the practical ontology concept of Confucianism,but failed to complete the modern transformation of the practical ontology approach corresponding to this practical ontology,resulting in a fundamental tension between the practical ontology concept of “Moral metaphysics” and its speculative ontology approach.

Key words: Mou Zongsan; Moral metaphysics; Philosophical history argument; Cosmology Practice

比较宗教文化研究

**Comparative Religious and
Cultural Studies**

《天主实义》与中西思维的问题意识

谢文郁

摘要:《天主实义》是明末天主教传教士利玛窦在与儒家学者进行思想交流的一部重要作品。在理解这部著作时,我们需要对利玛窦思想背后的欧洲思想史背景有基本的认识和领会,比如,基督教自然神学、亚里士多德哲学、以及路德的神学思路(引发宗教改革运动)。在此基础上,我们可以追踪利玛窦对中国思想史的中心关注和理解程度。我们发现,利玛窦企图通过理性论证来证明天主教的天主,从而把整个对话转变为一种思想争辩。在这场争辩中,利玛窦忽视了中国思想史在本源、本体和善恶等问题上的挣扎,以及中国思想家在这个挣扎中所做的努力,未能深入地进入中国思想史运动。进入《天主实义》的写作语境,展示其中的争论盲点,可以帮助我们在深层意义上体会中西思想交流的困境。

关键词: 利玛窦、语境、本源、本性、为善无意

作者: 谢文郁, 山东大学哲学与社会发展学院教授、博士生导师, 美国克莱蒙特研究大学宗教哲学博士;
Email: xiew@sdu.edu.cn

作为中西思想对话的原始文本,《天主实义》在思想史上具有不可取替的地位。我想从思想史的角度,引入当时的思想语境对《天主实义》进行思维方式方面的讨论。我们要对“语境”二字在理解中的作用有深入感受。进入如下三个语境对我们的阅读和理解十分重要,1、利玛窦的天主教思想背景和广义意义上的基督教思想背景;2、利玛窦对中学的理解程度;3、利玛窦在华时中国思想界现状(阳明心学思路)。在这个思路中,我想对文本中的几个重要争论进行初步的分析,努力把这些争论置于相关语境中进行理解,并希望通过这些争论来深入理解中西文化的差异性,开辟中西思维方式比较的新思路。这种阅读可以定位为思想史阅读,不但在阅读中呈现《天主实义》的基本思路,同时还可以追踪相关思想史线索。

(一)

我们先来考察一下《天主实义》写作的三个语境。首先是利玛窦(1552-1610年)的天主教思想背景。利玛窦来华时30岁出头(1582年)。作为罗马天主教宣教机构的使者(耶稣会士),利玛窦接受了天主教教义和神学方面的基本教育。我们注意到,利玛窦来华时,欧洲的宗教改革(起于1517年)已经进行了几十年,整个欧洲思想界的格局动荡不定。因此,在理解利玛窦的思想背景时,我们注意到,利玛窦并非在一般意义上接受基督教神学教育,而只是接受了天主教教会中的基本神学教育。因此,利玛窦所代表的只是天主教立场和视角。从十一世纪开始,罗马教会从阿拉伯思想界(主要在西班牙地区)引入亚里士多德哲学,并追求用亚里士多德哲学来解释各种基督教神学问题;在思维方式采用了实在论,在神学体系上形成了所谓的自然神学。利玛窦在《天主实义》中所表达的思想观念和思路,就思维方式

而言,基本上是亚里士多德的实体论,比如,利玛窦使用亚里士多德的范畴论框架来应对儒家的宇宙观,因而他所描述的宇宙观对于那些对话者(中士)来说显得十分陌生。¹

利玛窦的亚里士多德思路(或托马斯·阿奎那的自然神学)十分强大。除此之外,我们在他的论辩中感受不到其他基督教神学传统。比如,他在论辩中几乎不引用奥古斯丁的恩典神学思路。我们知道,恩典和信心是奥古斯丁讨论宇宙问题时的核心用词。奥古斯丁之后,恩典神学就成了基督教神学的基本思路。罗马教会(后来的天主教)把奥古斯丁奉为“教会博士”。因此,利玛窦应该对奥古斯丁的恩典神学有所了解。有意思的是,我们在《天主实义》中几乎读不到有关恩典和信心的讨论。当然,利玛窦所受神学教育是自然神学,因而他的思路是亚里士多德式的。自然神学家是在追求用基督教信仰来解决认识大自然的问题。他们采纳了亚里士多德哲学来处理这里的认识论问题,并认为理性是关键关节。不过,缺乏恩典和信心这类概念来谈论认识论问题,这就和奥古斯丁传统就渐行渐远了。这种缺失值得我们重视。我们下面会进一步分析这个缺失。作为罗马天主教会的使者,利玛窦来中国是要建立天主教教会的。传教是主要使命。当然,他需要首先向他的听众宣讲天主教教会认可的教义和神学观点(自然神学),即:用亚里士多德解释过的神学命题。不过,奥古斯丁的恩典神学也是天主教教会认可的。作为后世读者,我们也许会期望利玛窦在这场儒家-基督教对话中提供更为全面的基督教神学立场(包括自然神学和恩典神学)。只有这样,这场对话对于思想史来说才更有意义。

从另一个角度看,利玛窦时代正是欧洲宗教改革运动时期。这个运动产生了一个教派,称为新教。新教在教义和神学上严厉批判罗马天主教,引发了整个基督教教会范围内的神学争论。可以说,在天主教和新教仍然在激烈对峙中的年代,利玛窦不可能传递任何新教神学观念。因此,我们在理解利玛窦的思想时,还需要把他放在这场争论中。新教和天主教的神学争论集中如何理解恩典和信心这两个重要概念上。马丁路德提出“唯独恩典”和“唯独信心”的说法。在路德看来,人只能在信心中和上帝发生关系。离开信心,人无法领受上帝的恩典,也无法认识上帝。信心一词在新教的语言中就是指基督信仰,即相信耶稣是基督。具体而言,在新教看来,耶稣从上帝那里来,是上帝的儿子,是上帝赐给人的恩典,是人和上帝之间的唯一中介。基督来到世间就是要向所有信徒彰显上帝的旨意和救恩。人必须相信基督,并在这个信心中领受从基督而来的神的恩典,进而认识神。从这个角度看,在新教看来,恩典和信心是基督教的核心概念。有意思的是,在阅读《天主实义》时,我们看不到这些概念。我认为,利玛窦不讨论恩典和信心,其原因是有意与新教神学保持距离。

1 这里提到的三个词,范畴论、实体论和实在论,是具有内在一致性的三种思维定式。简单来说,亚里士多德通过对语言的分析而建构了一种范畴论,认为我们可以通过十对范畴(实体、数量、性质、关系、地点、时间等等)来规范并理解世界上的一切事物。在理解一个词(属于某一范畴)时,我们使用系词结构。在系词结构中,主词是被谓词界定的(如,在X是Y这种表达中,Y作为为此是对主词X的界定)。主词所指的对象是一个待理解的事物,谓词是已经被理解的词。因此,理解事物就是界定主词。一般来说,在主词位置上的词称为“实体”。亚里士多德发现,有些词只能在主词位置上,不能放在谓词位置上。比如,张三这个词是不能放在谓词位置上的。这些词称为“第一实体”,所指称的对象都是个体事物。那些既可在主词位置上,也可以在谓词位置上的词,则称为“第二实体”,属于各种类词。这种说法,在哲学史上,称为实体论。亚里士多德之后,人们追问这样一个问题:如果第一实体指称的对象是外在的个体事物,那么,第二实体是否也指称一个外在的个体对象呢?如果做肯定回答,那就是实在论思路。中世纪思想家普遍接受了实在论,认为所用类词都指向一个外在对象,称为“抽象对象”。利玛窦的实在论思路并不明显,但具有固定的范畴论和实体论的定式。

第二个语境是利玛窦对中学的理解程度。利玛窦来到中国后，努力学习中文，积极主动地阅读和了解当代居主导地位的儒释道思想。特别地，利玛窦对先秦儒学文献的阅读用劲充足。在不少场合，利玛窦在对话中常常大段背诵儒家经典，令他的对话者赞叹不已。不过，思想并不仅仅是知识性的；在更深处，思想是情感性的。从先秦儒学到宋明理学，就思想史而言，人们追求认识天命，承载着一种对天命的敬畏情感，并在敬畏中寻求认识和把握天命。特别地，为了解决如何认识天命的问题，在“天命之谓性”这种基本设定中，儒家发展了一种在诚中呈现并认识天命的思路。中国思想史传统具有连续性，因而中国思想家一直是在承传先人问题意识中思想和追求对天命的认识。但是，利玛窦对中国思想传统的这种传承并没有深入的体会。我们注意到，利玛窦在对话中公然发动对宋明理学的两个开创性人物，周敦颐和张载，进行毫不留情地批判和否定，认为他们是儒家的异端。比如，他从本源论思路出发否定周敦颐的“无极而太极”说法；从意志论的角度否定张载的“为善无意”命题等等。这些否定阻碍了利玛窦深刻体会周敦颐和张载在思想史承传中的问题意识和回应思路。结果是，他的这些批判非但未能引起“中士”的共鸣，亦未触动他们的思想根基。明朝的儒士大都自认为是周敦颐和张载的思想的承传者。面对利玛窦的这些不到位的批评，他们在情感上是无法接受的。这种情感上的反感深刻地阻碍他们无深入了解利玛窦所引入的新观念。

第三个语境是宋明理学。明末思想界是阳明心学的天下。儒家思想从先秦到宋明的发展有一种显著的现象。先秦儒家，自周公起，人们一直在敬畏中谈论天命。敬畏情感指向一种外在对象。在敬畏中，人追求认识天命，进而遵循天命而行。人是如何认识这个外在的敬畏对象的呢？——在《中庸》的“天命之谓性”说法中，人们开始把认识天命的途径落实在认识自己的本性之上，认为，自己的本性乃天命之性，而认识自己的本性就是认识天命。一个人完全把握了自己的本性并加以遵循，他就是按照天意行事，走在正道上。这条认识途径在阳明心学中得到了深化。阳明心学认为，天命之性也就是人之本性。尽管天命是一种外在力量，但是，一旦天命成为人之本性，则人就只需向内而求天命，而向外而求就是徒劳无益的了。因此，人在诚中认识天命这种说法成了当时儒士的共识。我们知道，“诚”是一种指向内在的天命之性的情感。在“诚”这种情感中，人摆脱了自己的现有思想观念的制约而“不自欺”；同时，也摆脱外在的他人的思想观念之误导而“无妄”。也就是说，“诚”把人引入一种不受意念的遮蔽而真实地面对自己的本性的生存状态，并在这种状态中认识天命。这是一种向内而求、从本心出发的认识途径。

不难指出，与利玛窦进行对话的那些“中士”都是在这种阳明心学思路中浸淫甚深的学者。当利玛窦要求他们面向外在的天主而去认识并遵循天意时，他们很快就感受到西学的外求思路和阳明心学的内求思路之间的内在冲突。从思想史的角度看，从先秦儒学到阳明心学的发展具有深刻的内在要求和冲动。尽管利玛窦努力理解并体会“中士”的思想关注和思维方式，但是，在天主教的启示性思维方式中，利玛窦无法对宋明理学的思维方式发生共鸣。这就妨碍了他去感受上述儒家思想发展的内在要求和冲动。或者说，他的天主教信仰所引导的启示性思维方式与阳明心学内向性思维方式之间具有方向性的差异。一方面，他对先秦儒学在敬畏中谈论天命的说法有共鸣，认为这种思维和天主教信仰是相容的。另一方面，他对“天命之谓性”所导向的在“诚”中认识天命这个思路缺乏共鸣，企图引入

先秦儒学来压制阳明心学。这种思维方式上的不相容性阻碍了他和那些“中士”的深入交流。在这种情境中,利玛窦虽然在使用先秦儒学在敬畏中对“上帝”、“天命”的谈论方式,但这种引用根本无法触动那些“中士”的内心深处。反过来,他不得不承受强大的阳明心学之压力,最后走向与之对抗。结果是,这种对抗基本上终止了对话而走向各说各话。

(二)

为了对这场中西思想对话有更深入的了解,我想简略地分析其中三个争论:本原问题;本体论对实体论;至善问题。我们逐一分析讨论。

1、本原问题。这个世界在时间上必然有一个开端。这一点几乎可以说是人类共识,就像我们每一个人虽然没有见过太爷爷,却肯定地认为我们有太爷爷一样。不过,如何谈论这个开端呢?我们知道,在世界文明史上,我们发现至少有三种较有说服力且有影响力的谈论方式。在基督教文明中,基督教重要思想家奥古斯丁在解释《旧约·创世记》时提供了一种无中生有的创造论,认为这个世界是上帝无中生有地创造的。简略来说,他谈到,创造活动是由创造者独自完成的;起点是无(万物不以任何状态存在),结果是有(万物成形并有序构成宇宙而呈现为感觉对象和思想对象)。创造者随意设计宇宙,要什么,就造什么。万物的生成和运动规律都是在上帝的设计中确定下来的。因此,创造者同时还是这个被造宇宙的主宰者(通过设定规律和随意干涉)。创造者和万物之间不是一种连续的过程,而是一个间断的关系(无中生有),因为创造者创造什么这件事完全是在创造者的自由意志中决定的;他可以这样造或那样造,可以造这些事物也可以造其他事物。

但是,我们怎么知道有这么一个创造活动呢?在奥古斯丁看来,这个无中生有的过程只有创造者(作为唯一的当事者)才知道。如果创造者不告诉我们,我们就无法知道。进一步,如果创造者通过某人告诉(启示)了我们这事,我们只有在相信这个领受启示的先知及其宣告才能知道。在《圣经·创世记》中,摩西领受了上帝的启示,并把这启示记载下来。只要相信摩西所记载的,我们就能知道这个创造活动。不难看到,奥古斯丁的创造论是在“启示-信心”这种认识途径中阐述的。尽管奥古斯丁在中世纪也备受尊重,但是,利玛窦在《天主实义》从未提及这个认识途径。于是,创造论在对话中也未出现。

第二种谈论方式称为本源论。古希腊哲学中被称为自然哲学家(亚里士多德用词)的泰利士提出了一种本源论的说法,认为存在着一个时间上在先生成万物的本源。万物在原因上都可以追溯到本源;本源内在地包含了万物;从本源到万物是一个生成的连续过程,是从未发状态(本源)到已发状态(万物)的演化。不过,这个本源论很快就遭到巴门尼德的批评。巴门尼德认为,这个时间在先的本源无法避免本源之本源这种无穷追问,从而导致了我们在概念上无法确立本源。为了避免这样的追问,人们开始设想一种结构在先的原始存在,也称为“本原”,如元素论、种子论、原子论等,认为原始存在永恒不变,但通过各种结构而构成万物。本原在结构上是在先的存在,并在结构中构成万物;万物失去结构而复归于本原。

这种本源-本原的谈论方式是推论式的,本源或本原都是在推论中被理解的,属于思想对象。亚里士多德也在这个思路中,但认为这些自然哲学家的推论过于简单。为此,他提

出形式因、质料因、动力因和目的因这四种原因来处理本原问题，认为万物乃是由这四种原因组成；只要在事物中分辨清楚这四因，就是认识了这事物。就其终极原因而言，亚里士多德认为可以推论出纯粹形式因、纯粹质料因、第一动力因、最终目的因。在这种谈论方式中，原因这个词就成了认识万物的关键词。亚里士多德的原因论对中世纪的罗马教会在思维方式上留下深刻的痕迹；其代表性思想家托马斯·阿奎那基本上是采用这个思路来处理并解释所有的基督教神学问题的，达到了相当完满的程度，建构成了罗马教会的正统神学。利玛窦在接受神学教育时接受了阿奎那神学体系，因而也就同时接受了亚里士多德的原因论思维方式。在《天主实义》中，利玛窦虽然提到了万物皆天主所造，但是，他并未使用创造论和中士对话，而是完全在原因论思维中对天主进行反复论证。完全的创造论需要引入启示认识途径。利玛窦的文字里没有涉及恩典和信心，因而也就无法在无中生有的意义上谈论创造论。就其主要思路而言，《天主实义》中的天主是在本源论中呈现的。

中士对于利玛窦的原因论思维方式和逻辑论证是能够理解的。但是，这种原因论论证有一个根本性缺陷，即“本源之本源”的无穷后退问题。亚里士多德和阿奎那企图用“自身是自身的原因”来圆说。不过，这种圆说在逻辑上是违反原因论思维的。我们注意到，庄子的《齐物论》对原因论的这个根本性困境有相当到位的认识和展示，因而中士对这个困境是有深入体会的。而且，庄子提出“物化”和“无竟”这种说法来处理这个困境，宋明理学对此相当认同。我们可以通过分析《天主实义》中的中士所提到的周敦颐关于“无极而太极”的说法，来追踪中国思想界在这个问题上的思想史进程。

问题是利玛窦提出的。为了论证他的本源论思想，利玛窦颇费力气来反驳周敦颐，认为“无极而太极”的说法不符合原始儒家的本源论。然而，中士一直不同意利玛窦的这个论断。中国思想史上，《周易》认为万物就其起源而言可以归为来自“太极”。这个说法有点类似古希腊的本源论，乃是通过一种不严格的原因论来推论万物在时间序列上有一个最初起点（太极）。利玛窦在他的原因论思维中同意《周易》关于“太极”的说法，并强调，这个观念才是原始儒家的正统；周敦颐把“太极”归为“无极”，实际上是违背这个思路，走向老庄，因而是儒家的异端。面对利玛窦的这个指责，中士为“无”的说法做了一个辩护，指出这里所说的“无”并非简单的虚无，而是具有某种实在性的东西。之所以称之为无，乃是它作为万物的对立面，无法从万物的角度给它做任何规定。我们知道，先秦关于本源问题存在着一个争论。道家的开创者老子在《道德经》中提出“有无相生”的说法，认为万物起源于“无”，因而“无”乃万物之极（无极）。老子所说的“无”便是这样一种无法从万物的角度进行规定的东西。庄子的《齐物论》进一步把这个“无”理解为“无竟”，从可能性的角度来理解“无”，认为有无之分乃是两种存在状态之分，即“物化”与“无竟”之分，从而排除了本源之本源的无穷后退困境。在周敦颐看来，《周易》的“太极”作为万物的终极性起源，它产生万物，因而也不能从万物的角度对它进行规定；不然的话，它就不是万物的起源，而是万物中的一物了。从这个角度看，“太极”和“无极”实际上同指一个东西。因此，“无极而太极”这个命题中的“而”字，可以简单理解为，这两者可以相互界定。这样一来，就宇宙起源问题而言，周敦颐的“无极而太极”既解决了“本源之本源”的无穷后退困境，同时也从儒家的角度回应了道家在思想史上长期以来对儒家的批评。利玛窦显然没有跟上中国思想史上的这场争论。

中国学界有所谓利玛窦的传教策略之说,认为利玛窦对非信徒和信徒有两种说法.对非信徒以思想论证为主,力求通过理性方法说服对方;对信徒则阐述天主教的严谨教义,要求信徒在信心中接受.这种说法基于如下预设:利玛窦拥有对基督教教义和神学的全面把握,以及对儒家的全面理解.这个预设显然是不合适的.实际上,利玛窦在宇宙起源这个问题上是坚定的本源论者,非但缺乏对“无中生有”之创造论的认识,而且还是创造论的反对者.可参考《天主实义》215、216、218等节.在他的论述中,天主甚至不是信仰对象,而是在论证中呈现的思想对象.我想,传教策略之假说无助于我们的阅读.《天主实义》中的西士所表达的就是利玛窦自己所持有的实际想法.

2、本体论与实体论之争.实体论来自亚里士多德的范畴论.我们知道,亚里士多德把认识对象划分为十对范畴,并在实体(本质)与属性(数量、性质、关系、地点等等)的框架内加以认识.在他看来,每一件事物(可用主词指称)都有一个本质(也作为该物的实体).本质或实体决定了这物的存在,使它成为它.认识一件事物就是认识这个本质或实体,即对那个指称它的主词进行了界定.界定主词便是认识主词所指事物的本质及其属差.我们称这个思路为实体论,属于一种存在论(或系词论),其特征便是强调事物之本质.利玛窦在和中士对话时提供了这种实体论思维.不过,利玛窦并没有完全采纳亚里士多德的十对范畴.在中国思想界这个语境中,利玛窦结合了他对中国语词的认识,另立了一个范畴表.利玛窦认为,每一物都有它的本质使它得以成为它;物的本质是上帝赋予的,因而每一个体事物都是独立存在,拥有一个本质,并分别为类,如人、动物、植物、泥土等.各类事物各自拥有不同的属性,如人拥有灵魂,兽类有觉魂,植物有生魂,泥土无魂等等.他强调,我们在谈论这些事物时首先要认识到,这些事物都是个体事物,拥有自己的本质,不能混淆,比如,我们不能把人的本质和兽类的本质混为一谈.

这种实体论思维对于那些中士来说是陌生的.先秦虽有名实之辨,但并未发展出像亚里士多德的范畴论那样的思路.汉代王充提出了一种“禀气说”,认为万物都是禀气而生.这种禀气说基本上为宋明理学所接受,进而发展出一种理气本体论学说.禀气说把呈现在感官中的万物理解为一种“象”,其本体是“气”.万物乃是“气”在不同结构中的呈现(“象”).“气”在一定结构中聚成各式各样的万物(象);散则复归于“气”(无象).因此,就本体而言,我们这些人和其他动物植物石头等都是由“气”而成,“气犹相近”.但是,由于禀气时所形成结构不同,所以呈现不同的“象”,千花百样,即万物.“气”在不同结构聚成时有精细与粗糙、洁净与浑浊等方面的区别.不同结构的“气”有不同的运动倾向和存在方式,因而万物各有自身的运动倾向和存在方式.因此,区别万物的关键是观察它们的运动倾向和存在方式.比如,人不同于禽兽乃在于人有“四端”(四种原始的运动倾向),由此形成人的生存方式.万物各有本性,乃在于它们禀气而生,并拥有自身的内在结构,从而导致自身的固定运动倾向和独特存在方式.就思想史而言,王充所谓的“禀气而生”是对《中庸》的“天命之谓性”的解读.人一旦禀气而生,即拥有“天命之性”.这里的“性”指的是“气”在一定结构中的原始运动倾向和存在方式.由于“性”乃天所命定,作为固定的决定事物之运动倾向和存在状态的“性”来自于天的命定.

这个思路通过了周敦颐和张载而成为宋明理学的基本思路.朱熹用“理”来指称这个“性”(即物中的“结构”),并用“理一分殊”的说法来表达天命和万物本性的关系.

也就是说,尽管每一事物都拥有天所命定的“本性”,且彼此相异,但是,事物结构都是天所命定的,本于“天命”。这个宇宙所包含的万物,虽然其本体都是气,但如果没有天命之性,则浑然一体,无法分辨,不成宇宙。朱熹因此认为,“理在气先”。在朱熹的用词中,“理”更多地是指称事物的内在结构及其运动倾向,以及万物之间的秩序。从这个角度看,“气”是在“理”中聚成万物的;万物是在“理”中聚成的“气”;万物本体即气,万物本性即“理”。因此,在本体上,万物是“气”的一种存在状态;在“分殊”的“理”中,万物各有自己的本性,并由分殊之理来规定其存在方式(“象”)。我们称这种思路为本体论,与范畴界定意义上的实体论有根本区别。

值得注意的是,宋明理学并不关心对万物的范畴界定。当代中国学界在对亚里士多德的实体说有相当理解的语境中,往往会把“理气说”和亚里士多德的实体说进行比较,认为“理”属于形式因,而“气”属于质料因。这种比较带有极大的误导性。就《天主实义》的文本而言,中士虽然客气地表示从利玛窦那里学到很多东西,但是,他们一直未能走向范畴界定意义上的实体论。这里的关键点是,儒家关心的是如何通过对自己的天命之性的体验而率性而动,以此建立一个符合“天理”的社会秩序;而实体说关心的是如何界定并理解各种事物,进而获得关于这个宇宙的真理性知识。这两种思想方式的走向是分道扬镳的。

我们可以进一步分析“理气说”这种本体论思路,追踪儒家思想的走向。在“理气说”中,物之“性”乃天所命定。“性”(或“分殊之理”)在一定的结构中聚集了一定的“气”而形成一定的事物。“气”乃阴阳之气,一动一静。在稟气中,“理”与“气”结合成事物(即有性之象)。于是,“性”作为事物的原始规定性,它决定了事物(“象”)的运动倾向。或者说,事物之气的阴阳运动受到了“性”的限制而有定向。儒家使用“情”这个词来指称这种有定向的事物运动,或事物运动倾向。有什么“性”,便有什么“情”,由此有性情之说。从认识论的角度看,我们只能观察到的事物的运动(“情”),而事物的内在构成(“性”)并不在我们的观察范围内。在性情这种说法中,我们可以根据所观察到的事物运动,进而推论事物的内在结构(分殊之理和阴阳之气)。对各种“情”(物之运动倾向、人的生存倾向)的观察、命名、分类乃是我们认识事物的基础。

近年来,当代儒家思想家越来越能够认识到“情”在儒家思想中的地位和作用,比如,李泽厚提出“情本体论”²的说法;陈来的“仁本体论”³对儒家思想中关于各种“情”进行结构性分类等等。可以这样说,儒家主要地是从通过观察并界定各种“情”来认识和理解事物的。至于亚里士多德意义上的本质概念,他们不关心,所以也就没有讨论。——就思想史而言,直到当今西方哲学界,人们对亚里士多德的实体或本质概念一直争论不休。因此,我认为,我们在理解和呈现儒家思想时需要进行情感分析,呈现儒家思想家在认识世界时对各种“情”的界定,以及对它们之间关系的认识和建构。儒家实际上是把世界理解为一

2 参阅李泽厚(Li Zehou)的两个对话集:《该中国哲学登场了?》Gai Zhongguo zhexue dengchangle [It IS Time For Chinese Philosophy],上海Shanghai:上海译文出版社 Shanghai Yiywen chubanshe [Shanghai Yiywen Press], 2011;《中国哲学如何登场?》Zhongguo zhexue ruhe dengchang [How Chinese Philosophy Debuted],上海Shanghai:上海译文出版社 Shanghai yiywen chubanshe [Shanghai Yiywen Press], 2012。

3 陈来 Chen Lai:《仁本体论》Ren benti lun [Ontology of Ren],北京 Beijing:三联书店 Sanlian shudian [Joint Publishing Houe], 2014。

种情感关系或情感结构。利玛窦在实体论思维中完全无法理解儒家的本体论。同样,中土对利玛窦的实体论只是有一点点的感觉。中国思想界接受并理解亚里士多德范畴界定意义上的实体论应该是五四运动以后的事。

3、至善问题。《天主实义》有一个围绕着张载的“为善无意”命题而展开的争论。张载在《正蒙·中正篇》中说道,“有意为善,利之也,假之也;无意为善,性之也,由之也。”利玛窦虽然没有点张载的名,但是,他在行文中对“为善无意”这个命题进行激烈的批评,认为这种说法“固异端之词,非儒人之本论”。然后,利玛窦从意志论的角度对“为善无意”进行了深入反驳。在利玛窦看来,人是在意志中进行判断选择的。人拥有善意念,并在此基础上判断善恶。对于判断为恶的事物,人在意志中加以拒绝并远避;对于判断为善的,则选择并落实在行动中去追求。因此,为善者一定要分辨善恶,并在意志中追求善。如果缺乏善意念、善恶判断和意志选择,则人无法做任何善事。不难看到,利玛窦在使用“善”一词时,是从善意念、善恶判断、以及意志选择等方面来理解的。这里的关键是善意念。人的判断活动是有根有据的;善恶判断的依据归根到底便是善意念。有什么善意念,人就有怎样的善恶判断,从而就有怎样的求善活动和生存方式。就意志论而言,利玛窦对“为善无意”的批评似乎十分有力。

“善”的问题是思想史上的恒久话题。人在生存中必然涉及善恶判断问题。每一个人都是一个判断者,并在自己的善恶判断中选择善的事物,并在选择中进入生存。但是,同一件事,在不同的判断标准和判断者中,给出善恶判断是不同。在此为善,在彼为恶。而且,当不同的判断者在同一件事上做出不同的善恶判断,并依据各自的判断而做事时,那就会引发现实生活中的冲突。即使一个群体拥有共同的判断标准,从而在本群体内可以消解冲突,但不同群体之间仍然会出现判断标准的不一致性,因而会导致群体之间的冲突。因此,不同文明中的思想家在“善”的问题上倾注了无限的努力。我们可以称之为“善的困境”。利玛窦认为,只要大家都信天主教的天主,就可以完全解决这个“善的困境”。其实,儒家也可以承认,天命(上帝、天主)是善的,只要遵循天命就能走出困境。但是,问题在于,我们如何获得天主之善(或认识并把握天命)?利玛窦并没有在“如何获取天主之善”这个问题上提供更多讨论。然而,这个问题才是关键所在。

《中庸》开篇就说:“天命之谓性”。这句话是在宣告“天命”在人的生存中的终极性。儒家长期以来对天命持有敬畏情感。天命既是天地万物空间秩序的主宰,也是时间次序的主宰。人在出生之初就领受了天命而拥有本性,因此,天命乃人之生存的终极性来源。人性本善也是从这个意义说的。人生活在世,只要遵循天命之性而为人处事,就能与万物及他人和谐相处,是为正道。但是,人如何能够认识并把握天命之性?在考察这个问题时,《中庸》注意到了人在生存中的两种完全不同的善,即观念之善和本性之善。

我们知道,人是在判断选择中进入生存的;判断所依据的是人的善意念。在善意念中给出的善,称为观念之善。人在判断中认定为善的,就会选择它并落实到实际生存中。有什么善意念,就有什么善恶判断,从而也就有什么选择,和什么生存方式。因此,善意念是人的生存的直接出发点。张载便是在这个意义上说:“有意为善,利之也,假之也;...”至于人的善意念,不难指出,乃是在人的生存过程中形成的。比如,人可以从他所尊重或信任的人(如

父母、长辈、老师等)那里领受各种善意念,并结合自己的生活经验和体会而形成自己的善意念.这些善意念乃是他进行善恶判断的根据.不同的个人拥有不同的善意念;共同的社会群体则拥有某种共同的善意念.人是在自己的善意念中生存的.不过,人的善意念是会变化的,昨天认为是善事,今天却后悔不及,认为自己做错了事.而且,不同的人之间,不同群体之间,各自的善意念也可以不同,从而各自做出的善恶判断可以是根本对立,导致彼此的冲突.在不同的善恶标准下,彼此会做出完全对立的善恶判断.也就是说,人的善意念是人的生存的直接出发点,同时它本身也是不稳定的、会改变的.

除了善意念中的善,人的生存中还有一种本性之善,即天命本性;这是与生俱来且伴随一生的善.作为人生的终极起点,天命之性源于那主宰一切的天.作为宇宙万物的主宰,天命即秩序.因此,人只要遵循天命而生活,就能与万物并行不悖、和谐相处.这种来自天命的善是纯善,是人生的源泉和基础.它是不可能成为恶的.但是,当人的意识完全由自己或他人的善意念所主导时,这个本性之善就消隐于人的意识中而失去作用,比如,人受别人的善意念的束缚,或完全固执己念;在这种情况下,他的天命本性就无法起作用.在《中庸》看来,本性之善只有在人摆脱了内外善意念影响的生存状态中才能呈现于人的意识中.这种状态称为“诚”.“诚”是一种内向情感,指向人自身中的天命本性.在“诚”这种情感中,人不受任何善意念的影响.这就是一种“无意”状态,即“诚”的状态.“无意”并非是一种无意识状态,而是指不受任何一种善意念的主导的意识状态.本性之善只有在这样的“无意”(诚)状态中才能显现于人的意识中.

人是在善意念中进行判断选择的,并且只选择并追求那被认定为善的东西.每一个善意念都是一个“意念”.人在善意念中追求善,因而是有意为善.利玛窦反复阐述这个生存事实.然而,问题在于,在社会中生活,自己认定而努力追求的善,在别人看来却是恶,从而必然引起善恶冲突.显然,善恶冲突来自不同的善意念.而且,如果双方都固执自己的善意念,冲突就永远无法消解.考虑到善意念并非一成不变的,不难观察到,解决社会冲突的关键是不断地完善或改善人的善意念.利玛窦并未深入涉及善意念的完善问题,而是直接要求听众相信天主,领受天主之善.其实,基督教在善意念之完善问题上是有深入讨论.保罗在《罗马书》中就提出,信徒在信心中领受神的恩典而不断地更新改变自己的心思意念,并在这过程中认识并把握神的旨意.不过,利玛窦并没有向中士们阐述这个过程.

然而,儒家是十分关心完善问题的.实际上,它是《中庸》的核心问题.人的善意念是不稳定的可改变的.一个人来到一个新地方,他的善意念和当地人并不一致.随着他在新地方居住时间渐长而习惯了当地的道德规范,他的善意念就改变而与之一致.不难看到,人的善意念是可以朝不同方向发生改变的.从终极意义的角度看,《中庸》认为,善意念的完善方向是天命之性.因此,在诚中呈现天命之性,并在此基础上完善自己的善意念,最终就能进入天人合一的境界.张载对儒家思想史的这一思路体会至深,所以他说:“无意为善,性之也,由之也.”利玛窦对于张载“无意为善”命题所隐含的思想史进程缺乏足够的体会,同时也没有引入保罗的“心意更新变化”说法.就此而言,《天主实义》未能实质性推进中西思维方式上的交流.相反,在“中士”看来,利玛窦的意志论在善的问题是一种缺乏深入思考的观点.

(三)

我们看到,《天主实义》本质上并非所谓的天主教传教著作;它更像是一本思想上的文化交流著作。利玛窦在学习儒家经典文本时,对于儒家思想的力量感触至深,十分推崇。实际上,这种感触和推崇在他的同伴们中间有广泛共鸣,推动了他们努力向西方学界翻译和介绍中国文化,引发了欧洲17、18世纪的译介中国思想的东学西渐现象,甚至在相当大程度上激发并参与了欧洲的启蒙运动。这就是说,利玛窦在写作《天主实义》时无意把自己放在高处而对儒家思想评头论足。他只是把自己当作一个思想者而与当时的儒士进行思想交流。在交流中,他提供了一些新观念和新思维方式。这些新观念和新思维方式,虽然远未代表西方主流思想,但对当时的儒士来说是陌生的、新颖的,并具有一定的吸引力。然而,儒家思想内含的与时俱进倾向,在思想史中有一个不断自我演化的过程。周敦颐和张载承传了儒家思想的核心问题意识,而他们对这些核心问题的处理在后学那里也得到了深远的共鸣。或者说,从先秦古典儒家到宋明理学的发展是具有内在线索的;周敦颐和张载是这条线索中的关键环节。利玛窦把他们和古典儒家割裂开来,并对他们进行严厉批评。这些批评显得十分仓促,而且远未到位。这反映出他对中国思想史的认识和体会尚欠火候。自然地,儒士在面对利玛窦的天主教说法时,反而让他们感觉到自己的思想有高度,视利玛窦乃西来学生而已。换句话说,对于当时的儒士来说,利玛窦的说法虽然有新意,但远未能触及到儒家思想的深处,无法刺激儒家思想的发展。

无论如何,《天主实义》提供了一本中西思想交流史上的重要文本,在中国思想史上具有不可忽略的意义。正是看到了这一点,《四库全书》的编者把它编入“子部杂类存目”,虽然不那么重视,也算承认它的存在意义。就中西文化交流而言,《天主实义》所传递的新观念和新思维方式,对于当今中国人来说,已经不再是新的了。国人在阅读、理解、消化西方思想这一点上,已经远非利玛窦时代可比。不过,利玛窦毕竟是中西思想交流史上的始作俑者。如果我们能够回到《天主实义》写作的原始语境来阅读、理解,并在此基础上呈现其中的争论,我想,这样做对于中国思想史研究和重构来说,仍然具有重要意义。

English Title:

The True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven and the Differences in Concerns between Chinese and Western Thinking

XIE Wenyu

Professor, School of Philosophy and Social Development, Shandong University. Email: xiew@sdu.edu.cn

Abstract: *The True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven* is a book recording the idea-exchange between the Catholic missionaries and Confucians in the Ming Dynasty. In understanding the book, it demands as the background the knowledge of the western history in thought behind Matteo Ricci's mind-set, such as natural theology, Aristotle's philosophy, and the Protestant theology. With this consideration in mind, we have traced Ricci's appealing to the way of logical arguments in demonstrating the existence of God, which presents Catholic dogma as a philosophy. In this way, Ricci became ignored of the development of Chinese thought regarding the issues of arche, essence, and good-evil. Indeed, Chinese thinkers have engaged profoundly in these issues and proposed various solutions which invite thinkers to engage in sentimental appreciation. Ricci's ignorance of these efforts results in blocking his understanding of Chinese thought at a deeper level. My analyses of the dialogue in the book show that this historical exchange of ideas stays only at a superficial phrase.

Key words: Matteo Ricci, context, arche, nature, doing good without consciousness

利玛窦与晚明思想世界的新视域: 对谢文郁教授《〈天主实义〉与中西思维的问题意识》一文的回应*

肖清和

摘要: 晚明以来随着利玛窦《天主实义》的出版与流行, 相关的批评不绝于耳。整体上来看, 对《天主实义》的指控不外乎三点: 援引落后的中世纪神哲学与科学、对本土儒释道的误解与曲解、为我所用式的传教诠释学。本文是对谢文郁教授有关《天主实义》文章的回应。文章从十个方面就谢文郁教授文章中的观点一一做了回应。文章认为利玛窦及《天主实义》对晚明中西文化交流、儒家思想的发展都起到了积极作用。如果认为这种作用不是很大, 其原因不在于利玛窦本人, 而在于儒家自身。

关键词: 利玛窦、《天主实义》、晚明思想、回应

作者: 肖清和, 北京大学哲学系长聘副教授、上海大学历史系兼职教授; Email: qinghexiao@126.com

谢文郁教授长期深耕于西方哲学史与基督教思想史领域, 出版过《形而上学与西方思维》、《自由与生存》、《自由与责任四论》等重要论著, 对西方哲学与思想中的自由、真理、自由意志、善、爱等重要术语与概念进行了深入分析与梳理。谢文郁教授还提出了情感认识论、生存意识等富有原创性、启发性的概念与分析框架, 引发学界广泛关注。近几年来, 谢教授颇为留意明清基督教, 尤其是对其代表性人物利玛窦 (Matteo Ricci, 1552-1610) 及其文本《天主实义》(1603) 颇有兴趣。《〈天主实义〉与中西思维的问题意识》就是谢教授研读《天主实义》后的一篇作品。¹

该文首先提出要阅读《天主实义》需要了解利玛窦的思想背景、利玛窦对中学的了解程度以及晚明时期的思想背景。在此基础上, 谢教授从本原问题、本体论与实体论、至善问题等三个方面, 探讨了利玛窦在《天主实义》中有关中西思想的理解与对话。通过分析, 谢教授认为利玛窦对宋明理学的批判、对中国思想的理解“显得十分仓促, 而且远未到位。”“谢教授尽管认为《天主实义》是中西思想交流史的一个重要文本, “在中国思想史上具有不可忽略的意义”, 但是同时认为利玛窦对中学尤其是儒学的理解“未能触及到儒家思想的深处, 无法刺激儒家思想的发展”。因此, 从整体上来说, 谢教授认为《天主实义》“未能实质性推进中西思维方式上的交流”。

可以看出, 谢教授对于利玛窦及其《天主实义》在中西思想交流方面的贡献持负面看法。谢教授认为利玛窦对于推进中西思想交流没有实质性的贡献。谢教授甚至以利玛

* 2023年5月16日, 谢文郁教授受华东师范大学方旭东教授邀请, 进行了一场线上讲座。讲座内容就是此篇论文。笔者作为回应者参与了此场讲座。本文即为此次回应的文字稿, 后有增删。

1 除了此文之外, 谢教授还撰有:《〈天主实义〉中的一些思维方式问题》*Tianzhu shiyi Zhong de yixie siwei fangshi wenti* [*The True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven and the Problems of Thinking*], 载《南国学术》*Nanguo Xueshu* [Academy in South China], 2018年第3期。

窦没有引进宗教改革的思想成果为由批评利玛窦，因为利玛窦引进的是较为落后的天主教神学与思想。此种对利玛窦“思想上的落后性”批评，非常类似于上个世纪六十年代对明清传教士“科学上的落后性”的批评。²

笔者则认为利玛窦及其《天主实义》在推动晚明中西思想交流方面有着重要贡献。其贡献在于不仅引入新的议题、概念与思想，而且还通过对话与批评刺激晚明思想的更新与变化；此外，利玛窦的贡献还在于其是通过再诠释 (reinterpretation) 的方式来对中国传统经典文本进行新的理解，激发了晚明思想界有关传统经典的认识。该影响在两个方面：一、是否可以绕开宋明理学的解释去理解古代经典，二、此种理解的依据是什么。除此之外，利玛窦在融合中西思想传统的基础上构建出“儒家一神论” (Confucian Monotheism)，提出“吾国陡斯，即华言上帝”这样伟大的命题，是为明清中西思想交流做出的极大贡献。在日益冲突的今天来说，利玛窦的这种融合中西的尝试依然值得我们借鉴。因此，我们不应站在今人的立场上对其进行指责，而应抱着“同情之理解”的态度，看到利玛窦及其《天主实义》在中西文化交流史的积极影响。

以下是笔者对谢教授此文的具体回应，主要就谢教授文章中的十个论点逐一进行回应与讨论。

二

首先需要说明的是我对于谢老师所讲的部分结论和观点是认同的，如中西方的某些差异、利玛窦对宋明理学的理解不是很“到位”、《天主实义》是一部文化交流的著作、利玛窦对启示神学、恩典、原罪等内容介绍得比较少等等。

实际上，明末以来对利玛窦及《天主实义》的批评就有很多。³1949年以后，何兆武先生、葛兆光先生对利玛窦及《天主实义》都有一定的批评。这些批评与谢老师很类似，都是认为利玛窦对宋明理学的理解非常肤浅，而利玛窦所要推广的是天主教神学。天主教神学与儒学之间本来就有天壤之别，因此，利玛窦的努力就注定了不会成功。

纪晓岚在《四库全书总目提要》中评价《天主实义》时说：“大旨主于使人尊信天主，以行其教。知儒教之不可攻，则附会六经中上帝之说以合于天主，而特攻释氏以求胜。然天堂、地狱之说与轮回之说相去无几，特小变释氏之说，而本原则一耳。”⁴此段话的意思是利玛窦附会儒家来传播天主教，但天堂地狱又与佛教类似。因此，天主教所讲的与佛教在本原上是一样的。此外，纪晓岚在评价利玛窦另外一部著作《畸人十篇》

2 参加侯外庐Hou Wailu主编：《中国思想通史》Zhongguo sixiang tongshi [A General Chinese Intellectual History]第四卷 [Volume 4] 下册 (北京Beijing: 人民出版社Renmin chubanshe [People's Publishing House], 1960年版, 1998年有再版), 尤其参考此书第二十七章《明末天主教输入什么“西学”? 具有什么历史意义?》。此章执笔者为何兆武先生。

3 相关批评文字可见于《圣朝破邪集》。利玛窦的继任者龙华民对利玛窦以及《天主实义》亦有微词，后来被多明我会传教士闵明我利用，成为支持其反对中国礼仪的重要资料。

4 参见 (意) 利玛窦Li Madou [Matteo Ricci]著、(法) 梅谦立Mei Qianli [Thierry Meynard] 注：《天主实义今注》Tianzhu shiyi jin zhu [Comments on *The True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven*]，北京Beijing: 商务印书馆Shangwu yinshuguan [Commercial Publishing House]，2014年，第223页。

的时候，特意提到了《天主实义》，认为《天主实义》纯涉支离荒诞，而《畸人十篇》立说较巧。⁵

由此可见，以纪晓岚所代表的清代儒家士大夫对天主教以及《天主实义》的看法颇为负面。然而，纪晓岚是乾隆时期的人。这个时期的士大夫已经将西学与西教分开，与利玛窦时代的士大夫还是有所不同。

就晚明来说，对利玛窦及其《天主实义》有批评，也有接受，甚至有宣扬的。《天主实义》的刻印者汪汝淳实际上就是把《天主实义》当作善书而付梓出版，认为这本书有助于世道人心，可以救正佛法而补益儒学的。

因此，对于利玛窦的《天主实义》而言，这些批评可以总结为三种：其一，诸如何兆武先生，认为《天主实义》援引的是落后的中世纪神哲学，所引入的科学也是落后的科学，尤其以托勒密的天文学为代表，不是最新的科学；其二，较多学者认为利玛窦对本土儒释道尤其是宋明理学有误解或曲解，尤其是对宋明理学中的核心概念如太极、理、万物一体等理解不到位；其三，认为利玛窦是一种“为我所用”式的传教式诠释学，即使用儒家诠释资源为传教服务，而不是真正的去理解儒家。谢教授对利玛窦及《天主实义》的批评实际上没有逃出此三类之藩篱。

为了客观评价《天主实义》，首先就需要明确《天主实义》是一本什么性质的著作。我们知道在《天主实义》的前身是《天主实录》，而《天主实录》参考了耶稣会在日本的《要理问答》。⁶《天主实义》在他们的基础上做了变通，将“或问”，改成“中士问、西士答”。这里面有些问答可能在现实中确实发生了，如利玛窦在南昌、南京确实与士大夫、佛教僧侣之间有过对话，但大部分是设问，是虚拟的对象在提问，而不是真实发生的。但《天主实义》不同于一般的要理问答，因为利玛窦希望通过自然理性(natural reason)的方式，向士大夫宣扬天主教的神学与思想，同时，又对宋明理学、佛教等提出批评。

因此，从整体上来看，《天主实义》是一本面向教外士大夫的著作，而不能归结为教内著作。据张西平教授研究，利玛窦有教内著作《天主教要》(1605)，主要内容是解读天主教的经文，包括《使徒信经》、《圣母经》、《天主经》等等。⁷这是两种完全不同的风格。是故，这本书的性质就决定了该书不可能讲很多恩典、启示等方面的内容，而是通过说理的方式来讲道理。这是首先要明确的。

其次，《天主实义》是一本交织(interweaving)⁸的著作，是将西方基督教、哲学，与先秦经典交织在一起。实际上利玛窦是利用西方基督教及思想资源对先秦经典进行重

5 参见朱维铮Zhu Weizheng主编：《利玛窦中文著译集》Li Madou zhongwen zhuyi ji [Collection of Writings and Translations of Matteo Ricci in Chinese]，上海Shanghai：复旦大学出版社Fudan daxue chubanshe [Fudan University Press]，2001年，第512页。

6 参见(意)利玛窦Li Madou [Matteo Ricci]著、(法)梅谦立Mei Qianli [Thierry Meynard]注：《天主实义今注》Tianzhu shiyi jinzhū [Comments on The True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven]，第3-23页。

7 张西平Zhang Xiping：《〈天主教要〉考》Tianzhu jiaoyao kao [Research on the Selected Doctrines of Catholicism]，《世界宗教研究》Shijie zongjiao yanjiu [Study on World Religions] 04 (1999) 90-98。

8 关于“交织”的概念，可以参见Nicolas Standaert, *The Interweaving of Rituals: Funerals in the Cultural Exchange between China and Europe*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 2008.

新解释。利玛窦最重要的论点是“吾国天主，即华言上帝”，全书基本上就是对此论点进行论证。因此，《天主实义》最大的贡献是引入了一神论，最后形成了儒家一神论 (Confucian Monotheism)。按照张晓林教授的理解，儒家一神论就是中西思想交织的产物，是独立于儒释道之外的第四教。⁹这就是当时文化交流的成果。

下面就谢老师所陈述的部分核心观点进行商榷。

1、谢老师讲到利玛窦入华之前，只是接受了天主教教会中的基本神学教育。

利玛窦是耶稣会修士。耶稣会是天主教反宗教改革 (Anti-Reformation) 的产物，由西班牙贵族罗耀拉 (Ignacio de Loyola, 1491-1556) 创办于1534年，1540年教宗保禄三世正式批准成立。¹⁰这个“反” (anti) 不是“反对”的意思，而是“应对”的意思。针对宗教改革，天主教会在1545到1563年召开了特利腾 (或称天特) 大公会议，重申了天主教会的一些基本原则，同时教会内部进行改革。

正是在这样的背景下，耶稣会不同于以往的任何修会。耶稣会的目标就是要培养出可以与宗教改革家、人文主义者相竞争的修士。因此，耶稣会非常注重教育，而在神学方面比较偏向于自由、宽容。¹¹

在利玛窦等耶稣会士所受的教育中，我们可以看到他们需要精读亚里士多德的著作及其注释，也需要精读古罗马的著作，同时，还需要学习数学、天文、历法、舆图、音乐等方面的课程。他们的老师有著名的数学家Clavius，还有著名天文学家伽利略。此外，他们还阅读过伊拉斯谟等人文主义者的著作。耶稣会士与启蒙思想家有一定的联系。

因此，谢老师将利玛窦当作天主教的代表，似乎是要与基督新教对立起来，这个不一定准确。他们知道宗教改革家的观点，我个人觉得，利玛窦甚至借鉴了宗教改革家的一些做法。现在好多有关中世纪天主教会看法，可能受到宗教改革家的影响。而这种“影响”下的看法不一定是对天主教会的准确、真实的认识。

2、谢老师说利玛窦使用了亚里士多德或托马斯阿奎那，但是不涉及恩典神学进路。

确实如谢老师所述，在《天主实义》中我们看不到有关启示真理或恩典的内容，只在《天主实义》末尾，大概只有几段的文字讲到耶稣道成肉身、拯救世人的事情，原文如下：“于是大发慈悲，亲来拯世，普觉群品，于一千六百有三年前，岁次庚申，当汉朝哀帝元寿二年冬至后三日，择贞女为母，无所交感，托胎降生，名号为耶稣，耶稣即谓拯世也。躬自立训，弘化于西土三十三年复升归天。此天主实迹云。”¹²

9 张晓林Zhang Xiaolin: 《〈天主实义〉与中国学统》Tianzhu shiyi yu zhongguo xuetong [The True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven and the Tradition of Learning in China], 上海Shanghai: 学林出版社Xuelin chubanshe [Academician Press], 2005年。

10 参见(德)彼得·克劳斯·哈特曼Hateman [Peter Hatmann]: 《耶稣会简史》Yesuhui jianzhi [The Brief History of Jesuits], 北京Beijing: 宗教文化出版社Zongjiao wenhua chubanshe [Religious Culture Press], 2003年。

11 参见孙尚扬Sun Shangyang、(比)钟鸣旦Zhong Mingdan [Nicolas Standaert]: 《一八四零前的中国基督教》Yiba siling nian qian de zhongguo jidujiao [The History of Chinese Christianity before 1840], 北京Beijing: 学苑出版社Xueyuan chubanshe [Xueyuan Press], 2004年，第109-110页。

12 参见(意)利玛窦Li Madou [Matteo Ricci]著、(法)梅谦立Mei Qianli [Thierry Meynard]注: 《天主实义今注》Tianzhu shiyi jinzhu [Comments on *The True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven*], 第217页。

由此可见，利玛窦对基督论的介绍非常简略，而且有所侧重与修改，比如未出现圣母的名字，以及将耶稣布道三年改成“弘化三十三年”等等。此外，利玛窦在《天主实义》中未讲到恩典与信心。为什么利玛窦不在《天主实义》中讲恩典和信心呢？这是要看《天主实义》这本书的目的是什么。实际上，在利玛窦写往欧洲的信件中，我们切切实实可以看到利玛窦充满灵性的话语，也有关于神迹方面的描写。在他的信件中，我们可以看到利玛窦非常重视恩典，也非常强调信心。1595年利玛窦本来可以去北京，但是因为朝鲜的战争，他不能去北京，利玛窦感到非常失望，做了一个梦。在梦中，利玛窦如愿以偿进了北京。梦醒后，利玛窦对同伴说“这也许不只是一个梦”。在此之前，利玛窦梦见自己见到了天主。¹³由此可见，利玛窦在遇到前所未有的挫折与失败之时，流露出对天主的信靠以及对神迹的期待。这在利玛窦的著作以及书信中都可以看到。

而按照利玛窦的解释，《天主实义》是面向没有入教的士大夫。它不是教义问答，也不是教内著作。这里需要提到一个故事。1600年，利玛窦进京，途径山东临清，当时的太监马堂拦下了利玛窦一行人，借着检查的名义，对利玛窦的行李进行搜刮，他们以为会有什么奇珍异宝。其中，有一个物件令马堂大惊失色，认为利玛窦是想进宫对皇帝施行巫术。这个物件就是耶稣被钉十字架的苦像。自此以后，利玛窦认为在公开场合不宜展示耶稣苦像。¹⁴

同样的道理，在没有相关宗教背景下，利玛窦认为也不宜向中国士大夫讲启示神学方面的内容，因为会引起中国人的反感与排斥。所以，我们在《天主实义》中看不到相关内容是非常自然而然的事情。所以在《天主实义》的首篇，利玛窦就说了不是以圣经作为依据，而是“先举其所据之理”。而且，利玛窦在讲上帝的时候，也没有照搬阿奎那，而是先讲上帝主宰，再讲创造，这样符合中国人的思维习惯。

此外，谢老师认为利玛窦所受神学教育是自然神学。利玛窦所受的神学教育依然是正统的天主教神学教育，而天主教正统神学当然强调恩典和信心，只不过受到宗教改革思想的影响，我们好像认为天主教会不讲恩典、信心，这个应该是不对的。马丁路德讲三个唯独，并不意味着天主教会就不讲圣经、恩典和信心。在晚明的天主教文献中，在讲道成肉身的时候，传教士以及中国信徒强调此事难以用通常思维理解，而需要用信心。此外，包括利玛窦在内的传教士都在讲信、望、爱。

只不过，在面向没有受洗入教的士大夫，利玛窦不可能直接宣讲恩典、信心以及圣经启示等方面的内容。根据利玛窦的理解，与中国儒家士大夫讲道理，可以依据的权威只有两个：一个是先师的语言，即先秦经典，另一个是依据自然理性。当然，宋明理学家的注释、皇帝的圣旨也算是权威，但在晚明时期，宋明理学家的注释以及皇帝的圣旨都没有很好的说服力。

13 (意) 利玛窦Li Madou [Matteo Ricci]:《耶稣会与天主教进入中国史》Yesuhui jinru zhongguo shi [The History of Jesuits Entering China], 北京Beijing: 商务印书馆Shangwu yinshuguan [Commercial Publishing House], 2014年, 第197页。

14 (意) 利玛窦Li Madou [Matteo Ricci]:《耶稣会与天主教进入中国史》Yesuhui jinru zhongguo shi [The History of Jesuits Entering China], 第279页。

利玛窦就是通过自然理性，来讲解天主教的思想，并对先秦经典重新做出解释，从而达到传播天主教的目的。所以，他用了很多四书五经的内容，也用了类比的方式，使用了排他律、矛盾律等形式逻辑方面的论证方式。

自然神学好像被误解为异端，因为涉及到自然神学的时候有人认为上帝在自然界留下规律、法则之后就退隐了。这可能是部分人的看法。实际上，自然神学从亚里士多德到阿奎那都有，其本质是从自然秩序和理性出发推论上帝的存在。因此，自然神学不是对上帝启示的一种描述，而是一种论证方式。阿奎那论证上帝存在的五路证明，其中一路即使自然神学，即第五路讲自然界的秩序与和谐，万物都趋向自己的目的。谁在背后安排呢？就是天主。然而，康德、休谟（反对类比）等哲学家对自然神学即这一套论证方式提出了质疑，只是对这种论证方式提出质疑，并不是对自然神学本身提出质疑。自然神学本身也不是否认天主的存在。对于天主教来说，自然神学只是论证上帝一种方式而已，实际上对于阿奎那以及利玛窦来说，天主存在是无须证明的，但是为了传教的需要以及应对科学的出现，还是需要自然神学的论证方式。

3、谢老师认为利玛窦批评周敦颐和张载，是因为利玛窦没有深刻体会周敦颐和张载的问题意识和思维结构。而利玛窦的批评又招致了儒家的反弹，阻碍了他们深入了解利玛窦所引入的新观念。谢老师还认为利玛窦缺乏中学素养，无法理解中士的说法。

对于利玛窦等传教士是否准确理解宋明理学，是一个见仁见智的问题。之前学者还使用误读、曲解等词。¹⁵按照我的理解，利玛窦等传教士是能够准确理解宋明理学，包括无极、太极、为善无意等等概念的。为什么？因为两个方面的原因。第一，当时有大量解读宋明理学的注释出版，包括朱子的《四书章句集注》、张居正的《四书直解》都有大量出版。这是因为科举考试，因此对于官方意识形态的程朱理学的解读、注疏的书非常多，传教士获取也很方便。像利玛窦这样的传教士可以阅读这类著作。第二，利玛窦身边有为其提供帮忙的儒家士大夫，他们对宋明理学了解非常深。假如利玛窦不能理解，而这些儒家士大夫自然可以帮忙解释。而且，利玛窦等人的著作，这些儒家士大夫都是有参与的。正如《明史》所谓：“士大夫如徐光启、李之藻辈，首好其说，且为润色其文词，故其教骤兴。”¹⁶在写作《天主实义》之前，利玛窦就已经学完《四书》，并开始将其翻译成拉丁语。¹⁷利玛窦在其书信中就明确说过，《天主实义》在出版前已由一位士大夫朋友（即著名士大夫冯应京）审阅校订过，而“他非常谨慎，每改动一字都要事先与我商议。”¹⁸

15 参见Sun Shangyang, "Misreading and Its Creativity in Sino-Western Cultural Communication at the End of the Ming Dynasty" · in ed.By Yang Huilin and Daniel H.N.Yang, *Sino-Christian Studies in China*, Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Press, 2006, pp.2-16.

16 张廷玉Zhang Tingyu等撰:《明史》Ming shi [History of Ming Dynasty] 卷三百二十六 Volume 326《列传第二百十四·外国七》·北京Beijing: 中华书局Zhonghua shuju [Zhonghua Publishing House] · 2000年 · 第5669页。

17 (意)利玛窦Li Madou [Matteo Ricci]:《利玛窦书信集》Li Madou shuxin ji [Collection of Letters of Matteo Ricci] · 北京Beijing: 商务印书馆Shangwu yinshuguan [Commercial Publishing House] · 2018年 · 第104、203页。

18 (意)利玛窦Li Madou [Matteo Ricci]:《利玛窦书信集》Li Madou shuxin ji [Collection of Letters of Matteo Ricci] · 第215页。

可能的原因是利玛窦理解宋明理学，但在著作中有意做了别的理解与诠释。¹⁹实际上，利玛窦也知道，对于太极这个概念有不同的理解，但是他在《天主实义》中还是认为太极不能理解为万事万物本原，而在其书信中，利玛窦曾经说过，可以将太极理解为类似于天主一类的概念。因此，利玛窦有意选择这样的诠释，其实主要目的是为了引入新的概念，即天主教的一神论，并将天主取代太极等宋明儒学的概念，而将天主等同于上帝和天。这是他的诠释上的策略。而这种策略是他与徐光启等士大夫交流之后达成的，也是他谨慎思考之后选择的。

包括徐光启在内的晚明士大夫，对宋明理学颇为不满，而有意要回到先秦儒家，甚至有人认为宋明理学对经典的解释是胡说八道，还有人说朱子道、陆子禅。如徐光启的座师焦竑所谓：“孔孟之学，至宋儒而晦。”²⁰在这种情况下，利玛窦是作为先秦儒家的卫道士身份出现在世人面前的。因此，不能说所有人都反感利玛窦的做法，其实当时有不少士大夫是认可利玛窦的。

除了对先秦经典的想法不同之外，晚明耶稣会士对于经典与注疏之间的看法是不同的。利玛窦、徐光启等人是想跳过宋明理学家的注疏，而直接回到先秦，实际上是“旧瓶装新酒”。但是，龙华民等人认为不能忽视宋明理学家的注疏，因为这些注疏实际上就体现了当时士大夫的看法。如果从这个角度出发，龙华民就认为儒家的主流实际上是无神论。龙华民认为利玛窦是过分讨好儒家士大夫，因而在传达天主教神学、教学方面就会大受折扣，那些被利玛窦所容忍的儒家经典及其概念，按照宋明理学家意即当时主流士大夫的看法，实际上就是无神论，与天主教背道而驰。此即利玛窦的诠释策略为礼仪之争埋下了隐患。

从中可以看出，利玛窦是尊重古儒、批评宋儒，力图对古儒经典进行再诠释(reinterpretation)，从而融合中西不同传统；但是龙华民等人虽然是尊重宋儒，实际上是一种文化排他主义或欧洲中心主义，试图将天主教取代儒家，反对借用、挪用、化用儒家思想资源。

4、谢老师认为与利玛窦对话的中士是阳明心学的内在思路，而利玛窦是外求的思路，二者之间相互冲突。

实际上，利玛窦在晚明心学大本营南昌获得了空前的成功，陆九渊所说的“东海西海，心同理同”往往成为他们交往、认同西学的一个重要口号。一般都认为晚明的阳明心学成就了利玛窦的事业。类似于焦竑、李贽等心学人物都与利玛窦有过交往。

19 利玛窦是否是有意曲解，还是误解，实际上见仁见智。反对利玛窦的传教士认为利玛窦对儒家经书以及佛教的理解有误，如龙华民、闵明我等。龙华民还指出瞿太素认为利玛窦对三教的理解有误。参见龙华民Long Huamin [Niccolo Longobardi]、闵明我Min Mingwo [Domingo de Navarrete]:《闵明我评注龙华民〈关于上帝、天神和灵魂以及其他中文名称和术语的简短回答〉》Min Mingwo pingzhu Long Huamin guanyu shangdi, tianshen he linghun yiji qita zhongwen mingchen he shuyu de jianduan huida [A Short Answer Concerning the Controversies about Xang Ti, Tien Xin, and Ling Hoen and other Chinese Names and Terms]，载《国际汉学译丛》Guojih xhaxue yicong [International Sinology Series 1]，北京Beijing: 学苑出版社Xueyuan chubanshe [Xueyuan Press]，2023年，第81页。

20 焦竑Jiao Hong:《澹园集》Danyuan ji [Collection of Danyuan] 卷十二Volume 12, 转引自(日)荒木见悟Huangmu jianwu [あらかきけんご]:《明代思想研究——明帝的儒佛交流》Mingdai sixiang yanjiu [Study on the Thoughts in Ming dynasty]，济南Jinan: 山东人民出版社Shandong renmin chubanshe [Shandong People's Press]，2022年，第243页。

二者之间的冲突是否就是外在与内在的冲突？我个人认为可能还要看具体的议题，如心学将伦理道德行为归结到致良知上，而天主教认为要认识到人性的罪，但也要相信自己的理性能力。这一点都有积极乐观的心态，都是强调内在的进路。

另外，晚明心学左派流行儒学宗教化，其中有佛教的影响，也有回到儒家敬天的传统。这种宗教化思潮实际上与天主教很像，都是认为仅仅凭借良知或内心是无法真正的作圣，无法实现良好的道德行为，因为没有人知道你的内心是良知，还恶知，这里面就会出现任意妄为的情况。当然，至于儒学宗教化是否是受到天主教的刺激，还是其他原因，学者都有不同的观点。利玛窦将灵魂中的司爱欲等同于仁，司明悟等同于义，利玛窦的仁就是爱天主以及爱人，而这仁是上帝赋予人心，即其所谓“圣学在吾性内，天主铭之人心。”这一点与心学非常接近。同时，天主教也强调人人皆可得到救赎，与心学的“满街结尾尧舜”也很近似。当然，在灵魂论等方面，天主教与心学可能有所不同。²¹

5、关于无极而太极这个问题，谢老师认为利玛窦没有跟上中国思想史上的这场争论。

按照我的理解，利玛窦是知道有两种生成论，一种是圣经旧约中的神创论，另一种是古希腊哲所讨论的物质本原化生论。其实，这两种生成论的关键区别在于前者是神在运作，后者是自然运作。

利玛窦当然理解无极而太极是什么意思，但是为了推广神创论，所以，利玛窦对无极而太极进行了严厉批评。在《天主实义》中，无极只出现了一次，太极出现了20多次。利玛窦认为，太极不能作为本原，因为太极被理解为理，而理为依赖者，而不是自立者。利玛窦实际上消解了太极作为宋明理学最高本体的哲学意义，其目的是为了宣扬人格神天主及其创生论。

很明显，利玛窦是有意从神学角度来理解哲学本体意义的太极。利玛窦说：“物之无原之原者，不可以理、以太极当之。”换言之，太极、理不能作为万物本原。这个本原是指创生角度而言，不是哲学意义上的本原。在英语上，二者区别是create和generate的区别。总体上说，传教士都是将太极理解为虚理，或谓理、或谓气，或谓元质，都不能创生。利玛窦对于太极和理是分别处理的，对理比较排斥（在书信中讲过），而认为太极可以等同于天主，不过天主概念比太极更加清晰。他认为天主就是先秦文献中的上帝或天。

所以，谢老师说利玛窦是创造论的反对者，我感觉是不是有点过了？《天主实义》首篇就讲天主创生万物并主宰安养之。不过，在讲上帝创生的时候是从自然神学的角度进行论证的。自然神学与启示神学二者并不是对立。自然神学的实质是从自然理性的角度对上帝存在进行论证，这是与启示神学有着根本不同。为什么从这个角度进行论证，当然是与《天主实义》这本书的性质有关。

21 参见张凯作Zhang Kaizuo: 《明末清初天主教与阳明心学关于“灵魂”的论辩》Mingmo qingchu tianzhujiao yu yangming xin xue guanyu linghun de lunbian [Debate on Soul between Catholicism and the Idealist Yangmingism in Late Ming and Early Qing] · 《北京行政学院学报》Beijing xingzheng xueyuan xuebao [Journal of Beijing Institute of Administration] 2 (2021): 121-128.

6、关于本体论与实体论之争。

我个人认为利玛窦是知道宋明理学有关人与物之区别，以及理气、体用的关系。利玛窦之所以强调人、动物、植物等之间存在着本质的区别，其原因就在于每个人、物体所对应的本质不同，也就是所谓的identity不同。正如利玛窦所谓的“性”，“乃各物类之本体耳。”利玛窦用“性”与“本”对于事物进行区分，“性”是本体，“本”是类别。宋明理学讲万物一体、民胞物与，但同时也讲爱有差等、人与禽兽不同。那这二者的区别非常大，我觉得二者所讲的根本就不在一个层面上，宋明理学更多的是从境界论角度去讲，然后又加入气和理，对此进行论证。而利玛窦是从实体论角度去讲，是从存在之链(chain of being)去讲的。

利玛窦为什么反对宋明理学所讲的本体论，实际上是为了反对万物一体，更是为了推广天主教所讲的不同物体之间有着本质的区别，不可混淆，人与人之间也是互相独立的。这样，每个个体需要承担个体的责任。这样就突出个体在信仰方面的重要性。这就与集体报应观有着根本的差异。²²

7、有关无意为善的争论。谢老师认为利玛窦没有在如何获取天主之善的提供更多讨论，这个才是关键所在。

我个人认为利玛窦批判无意为善，并非是要引出获取天主之善，因为按照利玛窦的理解，天主教徒或者一般人只要按照教会的教导，尤其是十诫的要求，迁善改过就可以做一个善人。

利玛窦批判无意为善主要基于两个方面的目的：首先，推广基督教的责任伦理，即每一个行为背后都体现出个体的自由意志，需要承担相应的后果。如果说无意为善，似乎表明善恶与意志无关，个体是否需要承担后果也不太重要。其次，为其论证天堂、地狱提供必要性说明。能否为了其他目的而施行道德行为？利玛窦认为是可以的，最大的趋利避害就是进天堂而避免下地狱，为了这个目的可以做善功。如果说无意为善，似乎天堂地狱就没有必要存在的。

当然，这里利玛窦可能是有意曲解了有意为善的意，将其理解为目的。其然，这里确实还有目的的意思，但儒家更多从境界论去讲的，是一种无意识的自然而然、率性而为，排除主观臆断和私心杂念。张载所讲的这句话，我想也只有圣人才能做得到，因为无意为善，性之也，由之也。普通人根本没有办法做得到。因此，利玛窦的立场其实与佛教类似，主要通过功利主义来劝善改过。

利玛窦批判的是儒家的道德纯粹主义，即为了善而善，这种道德说教根本没有办法在实际生活中实现，因为对于普通老百姓来说，那些高远的圣人境界可望而不可即。因此，利玛窦认为正是这样才导致了社会道德沦落。这一点在《天主实义》中利玛窦讲得比较多，也很容易引发晚明士大夫的共鸣。

22 关于天主教与儒释道报应观之间的区别，参见肖清和Xiao Qinghe:《感应、报应与赏罚: 明清中西有关善恶报应的对话》Ganying, baoying yu shangfa, Mingqing zhongxi youguan shane baoying de duihua [Dialogues on Retribution for Good and Evil during Late Ming and Early Qing Dynasties]. (澳门)《文化杂志》[Culture Journal] 2020年第110期。

利玛窦认为用天堂地狱劝善可以起到好的效果，正如徐光启所谓的发自由衷的去做好事，不做坏事，因为有敬畏之心。而天堂地狱是死后的赏罚，因此，又避免了现实中的利益冲突。所以，利玛窦认为有意为善是可行的，也是有用的。

8、谢老师讲利玛窦并未深入涉及善观念的完善问题，而是直接要求听众相信天主，领受天主之善。

实际上，《天主实义》讲善恶问题比较多。对于利玛窦而言，善恶的关键在于意志，“意为善恶之原”。利玛窦认为正意方可有善行；正意、恶行都不是善。利玛窦认为可爱可欲者谓善，可恶可疾为恶。利玛窦还区分了性善与德善，性善为良善，德善为习善。良善是天主所赋予的，而德善是人不断积累的。利玛窦还认真分析了积累善功的具体工夫，主要是克制自己的欲望；仰慕天主，因为天主是诸善之聚。

利玛窦还强调仁者爱人并非是因为对方为己所有，而是爱对方的善与美。因此，爱人之善，根源在于天主之善，并非人之善；对于恶人也是这样，并非爱其恶，而是爱其恶者之祸可以改恶而化善。

利玛窦指出：“贵邦儒者病正在此，第言明德之修，而不知人意易疲，不能自勉而修，又不知瞻仰天帝以祈慈父之佑，成德者所以鲜见。”在这里，利玛窦强调恩宠的重要性，即天主在人迁善改过中有重要作用。

总而言之，在利玛窦的世界中，天主是至善，当然要仰慕天主，因为天主是众善之源，但其也强调迁善改过的工夫论，即神操和七克等等。

9、谢老师认为利玛窦把他们和古典儒家割裂开来，并对他们进行严厉批评。这些批评显得十分仓促，而且远未到位。

我认为谢老师对利玛窦的这种批评可能过于苛刻。宋明理学所讨论的问题域显然与先秦儒家不同，尽管他们有内在的线索。宋明理学受到佛道教影响也是毋庸置疑的，这些新的问题域实际上就是佛道教所提供的，包括本体论、宇宙生成论、理气论等等。

此外，区分古儒与后儒不仅仅是利玛窦本人的做法，晚明时期不少士大夫也是这么做的，原因就是因为他们对宋明理学不满，尤其是认为他们受到佛道教侵蚀，对先秦儒家经典的解释出现了问题。

至于利玛窦的批评是否到位，这取决于利玛窦的目的，他批评的目的不是要把宋明理学打败，而是要借着这个靶子来宣扬西学。

而利玛窦对于宋明理学当中的一些核心概念的批评如太极、理、善恶观念、万物一体等等还是非常深刻的。

10、谢老师认为《天主实义》未能实质性推进中西思维方式上的交流。

我认为《天主实义》还是引入了新的思想，促进了明末中西思想的交流。²³这些新的思想就是亚里士多德哲学以及天主教神学，首先最重要的是一神论。这个新的思想对于晚明的儒家宗教化有一定的影响。

23 关于利玛窦《天主实义》对明清思想的影响，可以参见吕妙芬Lv Miaofen: 《另类的儒耶对话——〈天主实义〉与明清儒学》Linglei de ruyue duihua: Tianzhu shiyi yu mingqing ruxue [Another Dialogue between Confucianism and

此外，有关本性、善恶观念、义利之辨、太极、理气，天堂地狱的讨论，都是中西思想方面的交流与对话。这些思想对于明末清初学术与思想的转型有着直接或间接的影响，对于乾嘉学派的影响也是有的，如戴震。戴震说：“性者，血气心知本乎阴阳五行，人物莫不以别焉，是也。而理义者，人之心有思辄通，能不惑乎所行也。”戴震就是把性理解为区分人、物的本质所在（事物所属的种和类，形式因）。与利玛窦相一致。

三

正如吕妙芬所言，《天主实义》所讨论的相关论题持续在中国儒学内部发酵，产生了各种新的论述，从而丰富了十七世纪儒学的内涵。包括利玛窦在内的晚明天主教参与了明末清初的学术发展，带给中国士人新的思想资源与刺激，引发更多的思索与新的论述。²⁴《天主实义》中所讨论的鬼神是否存在、人死后是否有知、灵魂与魂魄为何、万物如何分类、万物是否一体等议题，在安世凤、魏裔介、王夫之、王嗣槐、劳史等儒家士大夫身上都得到了不同程度的回响，激发了儒家士大夫就这些以及相关议题展开思考与对话。

在梁启超所著《中国近三百年学术史》中，我们也可以看到利玛窦等传教士对明清思想的影响，正如学者频繁引用的梁启超的名句所谓：“明末有一场大公案，为中国学术史上应该大笔特书者，曰欧洲历算学之输入。”梁启超还认为明末天主教的进入是继佛教后，中国第二次大规模与外国知识进行接触。梁启超认为，清朝一代的学者都对历算感兴趣，而且喜欢谈经世致用之学，都是受到利玛窦、徐光启等人的影响。²⁵

因此，利玛窦及其《天主实义》对明清思想以及儒学有着重要影响是毋庸置疑的。至于此影响到底有多深、多广，不同学者可能观点不同，但毫无疑问，利玛窦以及《天主实义》在明清思想上占有重要的一席之地。然而，从比较保守的儒家立场来看，他们可能不承认利玛窦以及《天主实义》的地位。其原因在于儒家保守主义者对于天主教以及外来文化持负面态度，认为天主教有“以夷变夏”之嫌。此种批评实际上从利玛窦入华久开始了，1616年南京教案、17世纪30年代的反教运动以及清初历狱，到晚清的反教运动都有类似的指控。

然而，不可否定的是儒家的发展往往也受到这些外来文化包括佛教、天主教在内的积极影响，不仅是从这些外来文化吸收营养，而且也会从外来文化的“批评”中获得更新的动力与资源。如果一种文化缺乏必要的刺激，估计也就会很快失去活力。从这个意义上讲，利玛窦以及《天主实义》对宋明理学的批评或曲解，实际上为宋明理学的发展提供了一个新的可能。

此外，利玛窦所引入的西方哲学资源，以及回到先秦的诠释路径，无不预演了明末清初思想与学术的转型。可惜的是儒家士大夫并没有抓住这个机会，没有利用好这个窗

Catholicism: The Tianzhu shiyi and the Ming-Qing Neo-Confucianism]·(香港)《中国文化研究所学报》Zhongguo wenxue yanjiusuo xuebao [Journal of the Chinese Studies] 76 (2023): 41-79.

24 吕妙芬：《另类的儒耶对话——〈天主实义〉与明清儒学》，第73页。

25 梁启超：《中国近三百年学术史》，北京：研究出版社，2021年，第9-10页。

口期，反而因为种种原因转入到皓首穷经的考据学中去了。当西学中源说甚嚣尘上的时候，也就意味着儒家本位主义开始浮出水面，将晚明开放、宽容、带有普世色彩的儒家尤其是心学一扫而空，取而代之的是华夏中心主义以及传统的封闭、排外与盲目自大。在讨论近代中国为何落后、挨打的原因之时，是否应该将儒学思想的“内卷”作为其中之一呢？此或许是今天思考利玛窦以及晚明中西文化交流及其意义的时代命题。

English Title:

Matteo Ricci and the New Horizon of the Intellectual World in late Ming: A Response to Prof.XIE Wenyu's Article "The True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven and the Differences in Concerns between Chinese and Western Thinking"

XIAO Qinghe

Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies, Peking University; Adjunct Professor, Department of History, Shanghai University; Email: qinghexiao@126.com

Abstract: With the publication and circulation of *The True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven* by Matteo Ricci (1552-1610) since the late Ming Dynasty, related criticisms abound. On the whole, the accusations against this book are no more than three: invoking backward medieval theosophy and science, misunderstanding and misinterpretation of the indigenous Confucianism, Buddhism, and Taoism, and a missionary hermeneutics in the style of "for my own use". This article is a response to Prof. XIE Wenyu's article on *The True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven*. The article responds to each of the points in Prof. Xie Wenyu's article from ten aspects. The article argues that Matteo Ricci and *The True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven* played a positive role in the cultural exchanges between China and the West and the development of Confucianism in the late Ming Dynasty. If this role is not considered to be significant, the reason lies not in Matteo Ricci himself, but in Confucianism itself.

Keywords: Matteo Ricci, The True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven, Thought in Late Ming, Response

书评与通讯

Reviews and Academic Reports

思想史的定义和方法及其他相关问题

——兼谈马丁·路德思想在中国的被接受史

杨莹

(上海大学 文学院 · 上海 宝山 200444)

摘要: 思想史 · 追溯人类思想的历史 · 是对人类历史上出现的各种思想和观念的认识和呈现。汉语“思想史”术语译自英文的“intellectual history”和“history of ideas”，这两个英文术语曾一度被混用共用，尤其是在20世纪，其中原因至少有两个：对“idea”的定义和学术门类的发展历史。英文术语使用混乱无疑是对思想史内涵的界定出现众说纷纭现象的反映。柯林伍德、洛夫乔伊、以赛亚·伯林、昆廷·斯金纳等众多著名思想史家在关于思想史的含义方面有着不同的表述，这体现出了“什么是思想史”的含混性。同时，他们的表述也异中存同，基本上都指向了人类在精神层面上的历史创造和经验，即普遍流传过的、有文字记录的思想。基于各自对思想史的认识和聚焦，史学家们分别从纯粹性历史、哲学性历史、社会性历史等视角，运用多样的研究方法把握人类历史进程中的思想和观念，以期发现具有价值和意义的质素。基于此，以马丁·路德及其思想在中国的被接受史研究为实例，进一步说明思想史的内涵、方法及其他相关问题。

关键词: 思想史；术语；内涵；研究方法；路德思想的中国接受史

作者: 杨莹，上海大学文学院世界史在读博士研究生。电子邮件: yinying17853321152@163.com。通讯地址: 上海市宝山区南陈路333号。

一、思想史的术语问题

思想史，从属于历史学，是用历史的方法追索和展现人类的各种思想和观念。关于“思想史”这一术语，汉语学界最初采用了日本学者的翻译，即“思想史”对应“intellectual history”和“history of ideas”两个英文术语。在当前的汉语语境中，前者基本上专指“思想史”，而后者则被统一译为“观念史”。

在英语世界中，思想史有两个名字，即“intellectual history”和“history of ideas”，前一术语首次出现在1755年^[1]，后一术语最早可见于1723年的*Historia philosophica de ideis*一书^[2]且现在也是观念史的英文术语。“一般来讲，前者主要是指心智、知识、精神等等内容，‘知识分子’就是这一词汇（‘Intellectual’）；而后者更多地指‘思想’（‘thought’）这样的观念性的内容。”^[3]在思想史成就卓越的20世纪，两个英文思想史

1 “Intellectual history” · in *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/intellectual%20history>, 2023-06-24.

2 后来，“观念史”被维柯的《新科学》(*New Science*)一书借用为“une storia delle uma idee”，成为使用这一名称的正式起点。参见Donald R. Kelley, “What is Happening to the History of Ideas?” *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 51, (1990), 4.

3 李宏图 Li Hongtu, 《西方思想史研究方法的演进》Xifang sixiangshi yanjiu fangfa de yanjin [The Evolution of Research Methods in the Western Intellectual History], 《浙江学刊》*Zhejiang xuekan* [Zhejiang Academic Journal], No. 1, (杭州 Hangzhou: 浙江省社会科学院 Zhejiang sheng shehui kexue yuan [Zhejiang Academy of Social Sciences], 2004), 85.

术语被共用混用、彼此“纠缠不清”^[4], 这至少与两方面有关: (1) 学者们是否能有效地定义“idea”是什么, F. Oz-Salzberger 认为这是思想史术语两面性所传达出的思想史学科背后的紧张关系之一, 而且至今仍充斥在英语学者们之间, 但其他语言的思想史术语因一直忠于以“idea”为分析单位, 故未曾受到质疑和挑战。^[5]也就是说, 英文思想史术语因没有统一有效地对“idea”进行定义而造成了20世纪的混乱。例如, 美国当代哲学家阿瑟·奥肯·洛夫乔伊 (Arthur Oncken Lovejoy, 1873-1962) 以“unit-ideas” (单元观念) 进行阐释, 认为它是永恒不变的独立实体;^[6]英国政治思想史家昆廷·斯金纳 (Quentin Skinner, 1940-), 主张任何单元观念都是一定历史条件或环境下的产物, 绝非永远不会发生变化, 都需置于一定历史语境中进行理解。^[7]一方面他们对“idea”的看法几乎相反, 另一方面却共用“history of ideas”这一术语, 于是在20世纪语境中出现了英文思想史术语词汇一致但内涵却十分不同的共用或混用现象, 即“history of ideas”既是今日所谓的观念史, 又与“intellectual history”混用起来共同指向今日所谓的思想史, 正如现在学术界一般将洛夫乔伊的研究称为观念史 (history of ideas), 而把斯金纳的研究划分为思想史 (intellectual history)。作为20世纪思想史学家的代表, 斯金纳大部分仍沿用了之前洛夫乔伊的术语“history of ideas”, 并且时常交替使用术语“intellectual history”作为其所研究的思想史范畴, 究其原因可能有两个: 一是斯金纳注意到术语“history of ideas”经洛夫乔伊等人的发挥后已被广泛采用、无法回避^[8]; 二是斯金纳关于“intellectual history”的定义非常宽泛^[9]; 三是斯金纳的思想史论述的关键基础之一便是对洛夫乔伊的反思和批评。(2) 与学科门类的发展历史有关。至少从17世纪哲学史出现以来, 观念史 (history of ideas) 作为比较古老的历史门类就一直存在。^[10]19世纪末, 文化史学家力求突破以往历史研究中的政治史窠臼, 将“观念” (idea) 引入历史解

4 西方学者莫里斯·曼德尔鲍姆 (Maurice Mandelbaum, 1908-1987) 早在1965年就注意到了“history of ideas”、“intellectual history”和“the history of philosophy”三个术语之间的种种运用情况。他不希望从更广泛的意义上思考前两者有时会出现的等同情况, 而是要把关注点放在出现在两个平行发展的运动上面, 一个是洛夫乔伊发起的观念史研究, 另一个是德国概念史, 这两个运动或许都可被视为促进“the history of philosophy”研究向更狭义、更具技术性方面发展的一种尝试。关于此问题的详细解读可见Maurice Mandelbaum, “The History of Ideas, Intellectual History, and the History of Philosophy,” *History and Theory*, vol. 5, (1965), 33-66.

5 F. Oz-Salzberger, “Intellectual History,” *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, vol 11, (2001), 7605.

6 相关论述可见: Arthur O. Lovejoy, *The Great Chain of Being: A Study of the History of an Idea*, (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press), 2001.

7 相关论述可见: Quentin Skinner, “Rhetoric and Conceptual Change,” *Redescriptions Yearbook of Political Thought, Conceptual History and Feminist Theory*, vol. 3, (1999), 60-73; Quentin Skinner, “Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas,” *History and Theory*, vol. 8, (1969), 3-53.

8 Quentin Skinner, “Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas,” *History and Theory*, vol. 8, (1969), 3-53.

9 Stefan Collini, J. G. A. Pocock, Quentin Skinner etc., “What is Intellectual History?,” *History Today*, vol. 35, (1985), 50.

10 [英]约翰·罗伯逊 John Robertson, 《1950~2017年英国思想史: 剑桥学派的贡献——从观念史到思想史》1950~2017nian Yingguo sixiangshi: Jianqiao xuepai de gongxian [The History of British Thought from 1950 to 2017: The Contribution of the Cambridge School ---- From the History of Ideas to Intellectual History], 李宏图 Li Hongtu, 孟钟捷 Meng Zhongjie 主编: 《全球思想史论丛 (第1辑): 概念的流动》*Quanguo sixiangshi luncong (di yi ji): gainian de liudong* [Global Intellectual History Series (Part 1): The Flow of Concepts], 关依然 Guan Yiran 译, (北京 Beijing: 社会科学文献出版社 Shehui kexue wenxian chubanshe [Social Sciences Academic Presee(China)], 2019), 14.

释并视观念为公共事件背后的原因，于是观念史的研究正式应运而生。^[11]发展到20世纪上半叶，西方学术界涌现了大量的观念史研究，其中尤为突出的是洛夫乔伊对观念史的理论建构。之后，随着以斯金纳为代表的思想史学家对洛夫乔伊等人进行的“语境主义”批判，观念史先是被归入政治思想史范畴，后又被看作是整个思想史的组成部分。20世纪下半叶的思想史是涵盖了观念史内容的广义思想史，如同剑桥政治思想史家约翰·罗伯逊(John Robertson)所说的“20世纪50年代以来思想史研究在英国的演进……过程也就是从‘观念史’(history of ideas)到‘思想史’(intellectual history)的转变过程”^[12]。因此，可以说在20世纪的大多数时间里，“history of ideas”和“intellectual history”都是思想史，它们在许多学者那里基本上是等同的，但英语学者主要使用的是“history of ideas”。如今，或许是为了与观念史相区别，思想史学界越来越青睐“intellectual history”，当然仍有思想史研究者共用、混用两个术语，这些人依旧受到上文中提到的那种术语两面性紧张感带来的困扰，但大部分学者已经分别视“intellectual history”和“history of ideas”为思想史和观念史的固定术语了，认为前者无疑是一种历史研究，即研究思想的历史，将思想置于广阔的历史社会环境或语境之中进行考察，更具历史性；后者接近哲学史研究，更加突出理论性质，分析和探讨思想或观念本身，从而把握它们的演变和意义。

此外，思想史术语还有法语 *l'histoire des idées*、德语 *Ideengeschichte* 和 *Geistesgeschichte*，以及意大利语 *la storia delle idee* 等等。

综上所述，思想史术语主要在英文中的应用情况较为复杂，尤其是在20世纪里还包括今日所谓观念史方面的实际研究。所以，在今天对思想史(intellectual history)的含义、理论方法等问题作历史追溯和回顾时，特别是关于20世纪思想史的论述，应当且必须将有关“history of ideas”的内容(包括洛夫乔伊等观念史学家的研究工作)也纳入进来，如此才能更加完整地展现思想史的历史脉络，对思想史的相关问题作出符合历史事实的回答，当然大部分许多文章亦是如此做的，尽管目前对两个术语的指称已比较明确。

二、思想史的内涵及流派

思想史的内涵或含义其实也就是思想史是什么。关于“思想史是什么”这一问题，众说纷纭。有的学者受到哲学的影响，有的学者完全坚守历史立场……这也使得他们形成了许多独具特色的思想史研究流派。

11 Franklin L. Baumer, *Modern European Thought: Continuity and Change in Idea, 1600—1950*, (London: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1977), 2-3.

12 [英]约翰·罗伯逊 John Robertson, 《1950~2017年英国思想史: 剑桥学派的贡献——从观念史到思想史》1950 zhi 2017 nian Yingguo sixiangshi: Jianqiao xuepai de gongxian [The History of British Thought from 1950 to 2017: The Contribution of the Cambridge School ---- From the History of Ideas to Intellectual History], 李宏图 Li Hongtu, 孟钟捷 Meng Zhongjie 主编: 《全球思想史论丛(第1辑): 概念的流动》*Quanqiu sixiangshi luncong (di yi ji): gainian de liudong* [Global Intellectual History Series (Part 1): The Flow of Concepts], 关依然 Guan Yiran 译, (北京 Beijing: 社会科学文献出版社 Shehui kexue wenxian chubanshe [Social Sciences Academic Presee(China)], 2019), 14.

(一) 思想史的内涵

思想史研究者们分别从不同角度对思想史的内涵进行了阐述，现择主要代表人物作一概述。

受到英国分析哲学影响的柯林伍德 (Robin George Collingwood, 1889-1943) 就其对克罗齐之“一切历史都是当代史”的认识，提出了一个著名命题：“一切历史都思想史”。基于此，他主张思想史 (并且一切历史) “都是历史学家在自己的心灵中重演过去的思想”；历史学家是用自己已有的知识结构在心灵中实现重演，并在重演过程中进行批判，形成自己的价值判断。^[13] 被称为“思想系统的历史学家”的福柯 (Michel Foucault, 1926-1984) 提出“知识考古学” (the Archeology of Knowledge, l'archéologie du savoir)^[14] 的理论，以反对传统的思想史学径路。在他看来，思想史很难被界定且融贯了现有学科，研究的应当是不完整、不严格、未能达到科学程度的知识的历史，从文学、艺术乃至日常生活中的“影子哲学” (philosophies d'ombre, shady philosophy) 的历史，以及从未得到严格或个体的凝练的主题的历史、各种次文学、报纸、杂志等包含隐伏思想的历史^[15]。英国哲学家以赛亚·伯林 (Sir Isaiah Berlin, 1909-1997) 直接指出思想史这个概念不清楚、不自明，仅仅将政治观念、数学观念等方面的历史进行简单排列得不出具有普遍意义的思想史，只有定义不清但内容却十分丰富的“普遍观念” (“general ideas”) 及其发展才是思想史的研究对象，即无法准确定义、无法检验真实性的各种观点、态度、思维与情感等，它们处于中间地带，通常可以被大致地概括为“知识背景” (“intellectual background”)、“舆论氛围” (“climate of opinion”)、“社会习俗” (“social mores”) 以及“普遍看法” (“general outlook”) 的东西。^[16] History Today 期刊曾于2016年刊发了一篇题为“*What is Intellectual History?*”的文章^[17]，其中共有七位思想史学家探讨了思想史，但本文主要列举两位学者关于思想史的认识。昆廷·斯金纳对思想史的定义非常宽泛，包括“研究过去那些主要的宗教和哲学体系；研究普通人有关神圣与凡俗、过去与未来、形而上学与科学的信念；考察我们的祖先对长与幼、战争与和平、爱与恨、白菜与国王的的态度；解释他们在饮食、穿着、膜拜对象等方面的倾向；分析他们在健康与疾病、善恶、道德与政治、生殖、性以及死亡等方面的想法”^[18]。迈克尔·亨特 (Michael Hunter) 选择从“什么是思想史”这一主题的内部着手再向外延展，认为“至少从惯常的研究来看，思想史的核心在于研究以往时代的高级观念、那

13 [英]柯林伍德 Robin George Collingwood, 《历史的观念 (增补版)》*Lishi de guannian (zengbu ban)* [The Idea of History: With Lectures 1926-1928], 何兆武 He Zhaowu, 张文杰 Zhang Wenjie, 陈新Chen Xin 译, (北京Beijing: 北京大学出版社 Beijing daxue chubanshe [Peking University Press], 2010), 215-216.

14 “知识考古学”既是福柯的专著题名，又是福柯提出的理论术语。“知识考古学”本身就是一种思想史的方法，但表现为对理性主义历史观的批判，对传统思想史的反叛和革新，对“话语”——各种知识领域的话语的描述、建构和分析，认为思想、观念、信仰等都是通过“权利”的“话语”来建构的，研究者的任务便是走出它们制造的牢笼，进入它们随各种背景、平台而变化的过程，最终得以把握思想的历史流变脉络。

15 Michel Foucault, *L'Archéologie du Savoir*, (Paris: Gallimard, 1969), 179-183.

16 Isaiah Berlin, *The Power of Ideas*, Herry Hardy ed., (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2013), 81-83.

17 Stefan Collini, J. G. A. Pocock, Quentin Skinner etc., “What is Intellectual History?” *History Today*, vol. 35, (1985), 46-54.

18 同上书，第13页。

些参与当时学术文化的知识人的主张，以及16、17世纪那些经常以当时的国际学术语言拉丁语写作的著作家，也“开始注意一个时代的哲学及其他理论观念和学识”，同时提出不论怎么看，术语“intellectual history”都比“history of ideas”更加可取，由此题材才能更加广泛，可以将深奥的观念都纳入其中，而且不会引起误会和反感。^[19]“剑桥思想史学派”创始人之一的约翰·邓恩(John Dunn)解释自己使用“history of ideas”概念不过是为了表述方便，实际上它应当如同在日常言说中一样尽其所能表达出一种广泛的内涵，而不仅仅是洛夫乔伊及其追随者们赋予它的那种相当个别的含义，其主题在原则上应当包含历史上所有的思想，而科学、史学、政治理论等特定智识学科是这个概念范畴下的特殊实例。^[20]当代思想史家唐纳德·R. 凯利(Donald R. Kelley)认为思想史是一种实践、一种理论或一组理论，与文化史的联系更多^[21]，是对包含着人类思考过程的文本、文化遗产的历史调查^[22]，并在《观念的源流》(*The Descent of Ideas*)一书中回顾了以往学者对思想史的认识后，主张思想史与文化史的关系更加密切，将思想史阐发为可借助语言、诠释、研究者团体的演变和承袭来抵达其关键之处的思想传统(intellectual tradition)^[23]。马克·贝维尔(Mark Bevir)的《观念史的逻辑》(*The Logic of the History of Ideas*)从哲学逻辑入手，通过对人类推理论证过程的系统调查，为人类思想的历史研究建立一个哲学性的合理根据，认为思想史就是公开的历史角度研究人类文化的各个方面——家庭生活模式、政治辩论、宗教仪式、技术发明、科学信仰、文学和艺术——及其所传达出的意义^[24]。

中国学界对思想史的讨论始于梁启超，他于1926年提出了“学术思想史”的说法，把学术史与思想史合论，并将其视为文化专史中的一部分，与语言史、神话史、宗教史等同，下分四个部分：道术史(即哲学史)、史学史、自然科学史、社会科学史。^[25]之后，侯外庐撰写了多卷本的《中国思想通史》，并指出该书内容涉及广泛且复杂，综合研究了哲学思想、逻辑思想和社会思想。^[26]但是，侯外庐基本上以中国的精英思想为主线进行了叙述，这反映出了他对思想史内涵的一个基本看法。如今，“在西方学界思想史研究领域普遍渐渐衰落时，在中国，思想史研究却仍然是热门”^[27]。中国学者在理论

19 同上书，第20-21页。

20 John Dunn, “The Identity of the History of the Ideas,” *Philosophy*, vol. 43, (1968), 100.

21 [美]唐纳德·R. 凯利 Donald R. Kelley, 《思想史：从观念到意义》Sixiangshi: cong guannian dao yiyi [Intellectual History: From Ideas to Meanings], [加]南希·帕特纳 Nancy Partner, [英]萨拉·福特 Sarah Fooo 主编: 《史学理论手册》*Shixue lilun shouce* [The SAGE Handbook of Historical Theory], 余伟 Yu Wei, 何立民 He Limin 译·(上海 Shanghai: 格致出版社 Gezhi chubanshe [Truth & Wisdom Press], 上海人民出版社 Shanghai renmin chubanshe [Shanghai People's Publishing House], 2017), 112.

22 Donald R. Kelley, “What is Happening to the History of Ideas? .” *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 51, (1990), 4.

23 Donald R. Kelley, *The Descent of Ideas: The History of Intellectual History*, (New York: Routledge, 2017), 1-8.

24 Mark Bevir, *The Logic of the History of Ideas*, (Cambridge, England/New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 1.

25 梁启超 Liang Qichao, 《中国历史研究法》*Zhongguo lishi yanjiufa* [The Chinese Historical Research Method], 汤志钧 Tang Zhijun 导读·(上海 Shanghai: 上海古籍出版社 Shanghai guji chubanshe [Shanghai Classics Publishing House], 1998), 279-288.

26 侯外庐 Hou Wailu, 《中国思想通史》(第1卷) *Zhongguo sixiang tongshi(di yi juan)* [A General History of Chinese Ideas (Volume 1)], (北京 Beijing: 人民出版社 Renmin chubanshe [People's Publishing House], 2011), 14.

27 葛兆光 Ge Zhaoguang, 《什么才是“中国的”思想史?》*Shenme caishi “zhongguode” sixiangshi?* [What is the “Chinese” Intellectual History?], 《文史哲》*Wen shi zhe* [Literature, History and Philosophy], No. 3, (济南 Jinan: 山东人民

建构和具体研究两方面一直努力开展“中国的”思想史研究，这其实和中国各个领域的发展目的同步。葛兆光从历史的角度描述思想史，倡导一般的思想史：“关于思想史，可能有种种定义和解说，但作为一种“历史”，它必然需要呈现不同文化、民族和国家的生活环境，以及这些“环境”为何使生活在其中的人想这些而不是想那些，为何是这样想而不是那样想”^[28]。金观涛提出从思想史转向观念史的观点，即思想史若需要接受经验的检验，那么只能以观念史作为自己的基础：思想必须考察万花筒的斑斓景象如何出现，而景象是由观念碎片醉成的，即使意识形态解体后整体意义消失，但组成景象的大部分基本元素（即观念碎片）仍会存在，继续在人类生活起到重要作用；历史是沉淀在关键词当中的，是观念的产物，而观念就是“人用某一个（或几个）关键词所表达的思想”；观念史最终要实现社会化，与社会行动相联系，从而能够给予人一个理解历史的较为稳定的系统；反对使用小传统研究思想史，应当选择那些跟大传统联系在一起的史料。^[29]王汎森另辟蹊径，关注到思想与生活交织性，提出“如果了解思想在历史发展中实际的样态，则不能忽略‘思想的生活性’与‘生活的思想性’的问题，所以，一方面‘思想是生活的一种方式’，另一方面是‘生活是思想的一种方式’……此处所谓的‘生活’，包括的范围比较宽，其中当然也包括社会生活、经济生活、政治生活……在讨论思想史时应该留意它有一个纵深，需要了解并处理思想在社会中周流的实况，免得误将某种‘思想的存在’自然而然地当作‘历史的现实’”^[30]。

综上，关于何为思想史这一议题，中西方的学者们各执一词，甚至有些描述走向了两个极端，非常矛盾：有的学者对思想史的定义极其广泛，包含了人类几乎所有思想和观念，如斯蒂芬·柯林尼、昆廷·斯金纳、约翰·邓恩等；有的学者却极力反对那些没有经典文本支撑的“小传统”以及那些流传于底层民众之间的思想和观念，主张将关注点集中在经典作家、经典文本的大传统上，这明显体现在中国学者金观涛的研究之中；有的学者推崇经典之外的小著作家及其文本和思想，普通民众的观念，或者是那些不严格、未能达到科学程度的知识，认为如此才能真正地把握人类所思所想，如葛兆光、福柯。对此，本文认为不应该把“精英”（或称“大传统”）与民众（或称“小传统”）视为两个对立面，因为民众的观念有时也会影响着精英学者，从而使得后者在文本中将这种具体历史语境下的民众情感、观念和思想的表达出来，换言之，精英思想家们的著作中既有一种超时空性质的因素，也包含有对当时具体时代环境中民众的普遍思想的反映。对于此问

出版社 Shandong renmin chubanshe [Shandong People's Publishing House], 2011), 44.

28 葛兆光 Ge Zhaoguang, 《什么才是“中国的”思想史?》 Shenme caishi “zhongguode” sixiangshi? [What is the “Chinese” Intellectual History?], 《文史哲》 Wen shi zhe [Literature, History and Philosophy], No. 3, (济南 Jinan: 山东人民出版社 Shandong renmin chubanshe [Shandong People's Publishing House], 2011), 45.

29 金观涛 Jin Guantao, 《导论: 为什么从思想史转向观念史?》 Daolun: weishenme cong sixiangshi zhuanxiang guannianshi? [Introduction: Why Shift from the Intellectual History to the History of Ideas?], 金观涛 Jin Guantao, 刘青峰 Liu Qingfeng: 《观念史研究: 中国现代重要政治术语的形成》 Guannianshi yanjiu: Zhongguo xiandai zhongyao zhengzhi shuyu de xingcheng [A Research on the History of Ideas: The Formation of Important Political Terms in Modern China], (北京 Beijing: 法律出版社 Falü chubanshe [Law Press], 2010), 1-7.

30 王汎森 Wang Fansen, 《思想是生活的一种方式: 中国近代思想史的再思考》(序) Sixiang shi shenghuo de yizhong fangshi: Zhongguo jindai sixiangshi de zaisikao (xu) [Thinking as a Way of Life: Contemplating Modern Chinese Intellectual History(The Preface)], (北京 Beijing: 北京大学出版社 Beijing daxue chubanshe [Peking University Press], 2018), 1-3.

题，王汎森进行了另一种解读：思想史存在不同的层次，虽然各层次之间的界限有时模糊不清，但分层仍然是必要的，由此才能让人避免产生一种误解，即那种理所应当地将思想史阐述过的视为早已流转进一般人民脑海中的思想，这也就是说传统思想史研究中对抽象的思想概念的分析与一般社会思想所表现的现实之中往往会存在断裂，所以说不仅要关注作为山峰的大思想家，还要注意河谷到山峰间的状貌，也就是思想在社会现实中的流转。此外，思想也不总是按照“上”影响“下”的发展次序，实际上“影响”来自四面八方，而且还要了解决定不同层次关系的时代背景、社会经济条件等重大变动，从“生活”的广阔天地中讨论思想。^[31]其实，过分推崇精英分子或普通民众的思想观念都是有失偏颇的，无视大思想家便无法把握思想史在整体上的真正面貌，忽略普通民众便造成思想与广阔的社会“生活”的割裂。

另外，还有这样的一组对立观点：一是提出思想史的核心就是人类过往经验中的一种永恒不变的精神性东西，洛夫乔伊称这种东西为“单元观念”；另一种观点坚持思想或观念会随具体的社会历史语境变化的主张，主要以昆廷·斯金纳为代表。其实，在实际的思想史研究之中，洛夫乔伊和斯金纳的这种内外之别并非决然分隔，而应当有意识地将两者进行结合，既探究所定历史阶段中不曾发生本质性变化的某一特定概念或观念，也发现其在具体时代语境中所呈现出的模样及与外部环境的互动关系，如此才是由“思想+历史”构成的思想史。

最后，可以发现学者们对思想史内涵的看法差别甚大的原因很大程度上在于他们的视角不同，主要涉及了政治、经济、社会、哲学、文化等方面。针对此繁多的回答，本文认为思想史从属于历史学，是一种属于描绘人类以往非物质性经验和活动的历史，关注人类历史中在精神层面的发明和创造，即思想史研究的乃是普遍传播过的、存在文字记录的思想观念，具体内容为把握这些思想观念的演变脉络，剖析它们与社会行动、历史事件之间的互动关系，展现它们在具体历史语境中的不同形态、如何流传和为何流传，挖掘其中所蕴含的现代价值和意义。

(二) 思想史的研究流派

中外思想史家们对思想史各种问题进行了非常丰富的的讨论和研究。根据思想史家对研究对象、研究内容、研究方法的不同看法，形成了各具特色的许多派别，主要有：

“**剑桥政治思想史学派**”：20世纪60年代后，以约翰·波考克、昆廷·斯金纳和约翰·邓恩为代表的剑桥学派的兴起给思想史研究注入了新活力。剑桥学派不满以往思想史研究中只局限于对伟大思想家的经典文本进行抽象解释的方法，这种研究被昆廷·斯金纳总结为四种不切实际、凭空捏造、随意攀附的“神话”；要求发掘思想的知识和社会语境，重新更新对伟大的经典文本的认知，致力于书写不以经典著作为中心的政治意识形态史。

31 关于“思想史的层次”的论述可详见王汎森 Wang Fansen, 《思想是生活的一种方式: 中国近代思想史的再思考》*Sixiang shi shenghuo de yizhong fangshi: Zhongguo jindai sixiangshi de zaisikao* [Thinking as a Way of Life: Contemplating Modern Chinese Intellectual History], (北京 Beijing: 北京大学出版社 Beijing daxue chubanshe [Peking University Press], 2018), 1-32.

认为那些不太重要的思想家反而更能代表一个时代的主要思想，因为这些思想家虽然原创性不高但阐发了一个时代最为普遍的思想。他们还受语言学和诠释学的影响，着重强调语言、语汇、修辞、范式等在思想史研究中的重要性，主张这些文本的组成单位能够展现真实的思想、反映和回复时代的诉求，对西方乃至中国的思想史研究产生了极为重要的影响。不过，随着历史学研究的发展，“剑桥学派”的弊端也逐渐暴露出来，比如实施语境主义方法时必须要求掌握核心的史料，否则研究难以进行；很难解释因量变引起的重大政治突变等。^[32]

“斯特劳斯学派”：“施特劳斯学派”一词应当主要用来指称列奥·施特劳斯本人 (Leo Strauss, 1899-1973) 及其学生和追随者，并非以往将其当做是保守派知识分子的一个对政治哲学史和和美国宪法史特别有兴趣的变种。“施特劳斯学派”走上了与“剑桥学派”相反的方向，前者从政治哲学的视角推动政治思想史的发展。在施特劳斯主义学者看来，前现代的哲学比现代的哲学要好，这是对“进步”的历史观念的一个颠倒。哲学和社会的冲突的解决方式应当是哲人进行的隐秘教导——通过“字里行间”的书写方式将哲学秘密地流传下去，而哲人们也的确这么做了。施特劳斯相信他独自发现了真理，在从柏拉图到霍布斯和洛克的“伟大传统”中发现了隐藏的信息：上帝不存在，道德的基础是不正义的，社会的基础是不自然的。^[33]因此，此派学者专注于前人的文本，主张文本已包含了思想家所有的思想成分，无需在意文本之外的社会环境，思想史家的唯一任务便是全面且深入地挖掘思想家在文本中隐藏起来的真正想法，而这隐藏起来的思想也并非谁都能解读，只有少数人才能领略到。此外，在读前人作品的时候，会专门区分thought和doctrine之间的区别：thought指作者真正的思想，而doctrine则是一套便于向人们传授的学说。^[34]

观念史研究：代表人物为洛夫乔伊。洛夫乔伊在1922年创立的观念史学社与1936年出版的《存在巨链：对一个观念的历史的研究》代表着其学派思想史研究的广泛影响力。其学派思想史研究理路可以简述为：通过分析具有永恒不变特质的单元观念在不同思想家、思想体系中的表现，即单元观念在不同历史时代中与其他观念经重组后所展现出的不同形态，梳理思想家理论著作之间援引、继承和扬弃的文本证据，由此呈现观念的历史演变脉络。^[35]

32 “第四十四讲：左敏博士‘英国剑桥学派与思想史研究’” Di sishisi jiang: Zuo Min boshi “Yingguo jianqiao xuepai yu sixiangshi yanjiu” [Dr. Zuo Min’s “Research on the Cambridge School and the History of Thought”, <http://www.cbs.shisu.edu.cn/1b/d7/c3029a72663/page.htm?fknohdjmgdbaimop>, 2023-08-05 ; Quentin Skinner, “Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas,” *History and Theory*, vol. 8, (1969), 3-53 ; 姜静 Jiang Jing, 《“剑桥学派”政治思想史研究的兴起与发展》“Jianqiao xuepai” zhengzhi sixiangshi yanjiu de xingqi yu fazhan [The Rise and Development of the Study of the Political Thought History of the “Cambridge School”], 《光明日报》 *Guangming ribao* [Guangming Daily] (2023-5-22), 第14版。

33 《为什么施特劳斯和施派 (Leo Strauss and the Straussians) 在中国这么火?》 Weishenme Shitelaosi he shipai zai Zhongguo name huo? [Why Is Leo Strauss and the Strauss So Popular in China], https://www.zhihu.com/tardis/bd/ans/722347228?source_id=1001, 2023-08-05.

34 《线索提要 *Nature Right And History* By Leo Strauss (兼论施派与苏格拉底)》 Xiansuo tiyao *Nature Right And History* By Leo Strauss (jianlun shipai yu Sugeladi) [A Summary of Clues of *Nature Right And History* (Also on Shipai and Socrates)], https://www.douban.com/note/763057366/?_i=1650318QMaPx_7, 2023-08-05.

35 参见张旭鹏 Zhang Xupeng, 《观念史的过去与未来：价值与批判》 Guannianshi de guoqu yu weilai: jiazhi yu panduan [The Past and Future of the History of Ideas], 《武汉大学学报(哲学社会科学版)》 *Wuhan daxue xuebao (zhexue shehui*

中国哲学思想史派:“这一学派的地位由胡适《中国哲学史大纲(上卷)》的出版而奠定。“从胡适到冯友兰、钱穆、张岱年以及海外“新儒家”都是此学派的关键参与者。他们更侧重于对人类灵魂的关注·要人们走出世俗生活的樊篱·以研究中国人的宇宙人生观念的发展为己任·成为了中国的哲学史派。“究其论旨·以‘接着讲’(冯友兰语),或‘推扩’(钱穆语)中华传统精神为务。除开极‘左’思潮时期的不良影响(这对各派都有影响),本学派在用各种科学方法来解释各家、各历史时期道术学说的内容·借以推进中华传统文化的精神与现代社会的融合方面·有突出的学术成就。港台和海外的现代新儒家·亦多循这条研究之路。”^[36]

中国社会史学派:“从蔡尚思论中国思想史是中国社会科学史·侯外庐将哲学思想、逻辑思想和社会思想的一体化·认定思想史的研究范围·直至张岂之提出‘思想史是理论化的人类社会意识的发展史’·此为思想史研究的‘社会史’学派。“^[37]该学派——李振宏所谓马克思主义思想史学派主要以侯外庐为主要代表·以精英思想家为轴·使用马克思主义的唯物史观方法关照思想史·在经济结构和社会结构基础之上对哲学思想、经济思想、政治思想、宗教思想和科学思想等社会思想的综合研究。“关注社会史研究与思想史研究的结合·唯物与唯心、社会与阶级、进步与反动是这一学派的基本话语元素”^[38]。

一般态思想史:葛兆光出于对以往中国思想史的精英式研究进路的批评和翻翻·提出了关注精英和经典之外·“还有一种近乎平均值的知识、思想与信仰·作为底色或基石而存在·这种一般的知识、思想与信仰真正地在人们判断、解释、处理面前世界中起着作用”。他曾断言自己的思想史研究是“一般的知识、思想与信仰的世界的历史”^[39]。“根据这样的学术理念·思想史研究的方法论就要作出创造性地改变·就要走出从子书到子书、从思想到思想或从社会到思想的研究套路围和资料范围”^[40],如早期中国的星占历算、祭祀仪轨、医疗方技、宫室陵墓建制·还有敦煌文书的经变、各种类书、私塾教材等。

kexueban) [Wuhan University Journal(Philosophy & Social Science)], No. 2, (武汉 Wuhan: 武汉大学 Wuhan University, 2018), 65-72.

36 蒋广学 Jiang Guangxue, 《“中国思想史”研究对象讨论之评议》“Zhongguo sixiangshi” yanjiu duixiang taolun zhi pingyi [Comments on Discussion of Study Object of “Chinese History of Ideology”], 《江海学刊》 *Jianghai xuekan* [Jianghai Academic Journal], No. 2, (南京 Nanjing: 江苏省社会科学院 Jiangsu sheng shehui kexue yuan [Jiangsu Academy of Social Sciences], 2003), 141-143.

37 同上·第141页。

38 李振宏 Li Zhenhong, 《中国思想史研究中的学派、话语与话域》 *Zhongguo sixiangshi yanjiu zhong de xuepai, huayu yu huayu* [The Schools, Discourse and Domain in the Study of Chinese Intellectual History], 《学术月刊》 *Xueshu yuekan* [Academic Monthly], No. 11, (上海 Shanghai: 上海市社会科学界联合会 Shanghai shi shehui kexue lianhehui [Shanghai Federation of Social Science Associations], 2010), 120.

39 葛兆光 Ge Zhaoguang, 《中国思想史·导论》 *Zhongguo sixiangshi (daolun): qishiji qian zhongguo de zhishi, sixiang yu xinyang shijie* [Chinese Intellectual History: The World of Knowledge, Thought and Belief in China Before the Seventh Century], (上海 Shanghai: 复旦大学出版社 Fudan daxue chubanshe [Fudan University Press], 1998), 3-13;

40 李振宏 Li Zhenhong, 《中国思想史研究中的学派、话语与话域》 *Zhongguo sixiangshi yanjiu zhong de xuepai, huayu yu huayu* [The Schools, Discourse and Domain in the Study of Chinese Intellectual History], 《学术月刊》 *Xueshu yuekan* [Academic Monthly], No. 11, (上海 Shanghai: 上海市社会科学界联合会 Shanghai shi shehui kexue lianhehui [Shanghai Federation of Social Science Associations], 2010), 122.

许多中外思想史家们对思想及思想史的认识存在很大的差别，因而形成了各具特色的思想史流派，分别从不同的视角关照人类的思想史，使其呈现出纷繁的局面。

三、思想史研究方法

学者们对思想史的认识不同决定了他们的研究理路也存在较大差异，甚至形成了在思想史研究上存在根本分歧的两大派别——“施特劳斯学派”和“剑桥学派”。思想史家们根据自身的研究对象、研究目标等运用了多种方法，包括创造性地借用其他历史学分支或其他学科的方法，研究一个著名作家、一个思想派别或体系、一个区域或国家、一个或一系列思想和观念的历史，甚至将古老的、被遗忘的、普遍流传到不被人注意到的及其他种种的人类精神经验和活动呈现在当下，以期对人类的历史作完整的和现代性的诠释，以下为使用和讨论较多的四种(细分为六种)方法：

“单元观念”法。“单元观念”不仅是洛夫乔伊阐发的理论，而且其也是总结出的研究方法，这集中体现在《存在巨链：一个观念的历史的研究》(*The Great Chain of Being: A Study of the History of an Idea*)一书之中。在洛夫乔伊看来，单元观念是哲学学说或哲学体系的最小成分，能在长久的人类历史中保持稳定，总是按照自身的逻辑发展，并不依赖于人类的具体活动或一般的社会语境。这些最基本的观念可以在某个具体时期或是哲学家那里重新排列组合后成为显露的复合观念，如浪漫主义、现实主义等各种主义流派以及持这些学说的人，但它依旧以最初的形态存在，自然地被每个时代的西方人继承并延续下去，成为影响甚至决定思想演进的“伟大之链”。然而，洛夫乔伊也承认单元观念很难辨认和界定，但研究者的任务不在此，而是在清理单元观念的这种模糊性的时候，列举它们间的细微差别，考察单元观念在具体时空下的混乱的组合方式形态，于是便可串联起和展现每个时代的思想，突破之前沿着思想哲学体系书写和专注经典文本的陈旧方法，从而暴露出一个问题的本质，更容易地理解和把握思想史和哲学史。因此，在研究思想史时，可以将关注点置于这些稳定不变动、最小不可再分的单元观念上，讨论它从古至今的发展和演变，还有以何种方式存在于各个时期或思想家的思想体系。洛夫乔伊同时在此书中直接使用这一方法研究了西方哲学史上一个非常重要的单元观念“存在之链”(the chain of being)(洛夫乔伊将它归入特定的命题和原理类型之中)，即世界万物从高到低的自然界排列次序，最高位的是上帝，最低位是一些物质。他考察了“存在之链”从柏拉图开始到18世纪的发展脉络。^[41]

“历史语境”法。这个方法被看作是“剑桥思想史学派”的最突出特点，主要和昆廷·斯金纳和J. G. A. 波考克有关系，尤以前者为中心。斯金纳提出的语境研究方法是在政治思想史研究领域进行的，注重思想在历史中的状态，受到语言哲学家奥斯汀言语具有行动性理论的影响，认为研究材料就是那些产生于特定语境下的特定言论，也就是文本，但并非对整个文本进行研究，而是分析文本中的语词，因为语词包含着行动指令，通过与外在普遍的社会语境相联系，剖析和还原作者的意图，解释文本作者的行动(政治

41 详见Arthur O. Lovejoy, *The Great Chain of Being: A Study of the History of an Idea*, (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 2001)。

行动), 实现将关注点从只对文本的阐释转移到具体的历史语境上, 以及追寻最真实的 (政治) 思想史的目的, 否则便会产生时代误置 (anachronism), 永远无法得到关于文本作者思想的正确认识。具体来看, “历史语境” (historical context) 法至少包含三个层次: 首先, 研究材料是诞生于随社会语境变化而变化的文本, 所以文本里不可能存在永恒问题、永恒智慧, 而且只关心作者自己思索的问题, 与我们无关; 其次: 聚焦点作者在文本中使用的语词, 因为它包含着行为意图; 最后, 语境是认识和解读文本的关键所在, 所以要联系文本与其所在的历史语境及作家的生平事迹, 还原作者的思想行动意图, 揭示思想和观念在语境中的演变。^[42]波考克同样十分重视话语, 以及它与语境之间千丝万缕的紧密关系: “倾向于使用‘话语’ (discourse) 这个词, 它的意思是‘言’ (speech)、‘文’ (literature) 或一般意义上的公开言论, 它涉及到某种理论要素, 在各种语境中发挥作用并和语境之间有着千丝万缕的联系。这一方法的长处在于它能够使我将思想活动的历史写成不同条件下人们所实施的行动的历史; 这种行动不仅影响到其他人, 而且影响到这些行动所实施的条件 (即便只是引起了关于这些条件的讨论或争论)。”^[43]

“文本隐微解释”法。此方法专注对经典文本的细读和领悟, 走向了与“历史语境”法相反的方向, 由“施特劳斯派”所开创。列奥·施特劳斯从哲学视角出发, 认为正确的政治哲学思想观念已经蕴藏在古典著作家笔下的经典文本里了, 因为文本是自给自足的、连续的, 完全不需要外在的东西帮助和补充, 而后人能做的就是对这些观念的继承和发展, 也就是领悟到了那些关于人类命运的真理。但是, 这些正确的基本观念被古典作家通过“隐微式”的矛盾写作隐藏起来了, 如此哲学家可以保护自己, 同时也使得很难被其他人发现, 只有极少数人才能体会到, 大多数人能够读懂的内容是作者以“显白式”的方式写成后有益于大众的。所以, 基于这种观点, 斯特劳斯一头扎进经典文本的海洋中, 开始了无穷无尽的阅读和思考, 关注文本中的经典问题, 努力寻找出文本中的永恒答案和观念。^[44]

“社会史”方法。“社会史”方法指的是运用社会史学的某些方法开展思想史的研究, 给思想史领域带来冲击和转向, 主要有两个: 首先是韦伯通过“理念型” (Idea Type) 寻求“理解”的方法, 这被金观涛总结和阐发为“走进去、走出来”和“理念型”。韦伯把严格目

42 [英]昆廷·斯金纳 Quentin Skinner: 《近代政治思想的基础》 *Jindai zhengzhi sixiang de jichu* [The Foundation of Modern Political Thought], 奚瑞森 Xi Ruisen, 亚方 Ya Fang 译, (北京 Beijing: 商务印书馆 Shangwu yinshuguan [The Commercial Press], 2002); Quentin Skinner, “Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas,” *History and Theory*, vol. 8, (1969), 3-53; Stefan Collini, J. G. A. Pocock, Quentin Skinner etc., “What is Intellectual History?,” *History Today*, vol. 35, (1985), 50-52.

43 [英]斯蒂芬·柯林尼 Stefan Collini, [英]J. G. A. 波考克 J. G. A. Pocock, [英]昆廷·斯金纳 Quentin Skinner 等, 《什么是思想史?》 *Shenme shi sixiangshi* [What is Intellectual History?], 丁耘 Ding Yun 主编: 《什么是思想史》 *Shenme shi sixiangshi* [What is Intellectual History], 任军锋 Ren Junfeng 译, (上海 Shanghai: 上海人民出版社 Shanghai renmin chubanshe [Shanghai People's Publishing House], 2006), 17.

44 [美]列奥·施特劳斯 Leo Strauss, 约瑟夫·克罗波西 Joseph Cropsey, 《政治哲学史》 *Zhengzhi zhhexueshi* [History of Political Philosophy], 李天然 Li Tianran 等译, (石家庄 Shijiazhuang: 河北人民出版社 Hebei renmin chubanshe [Hebei People's Publishing House], 1993); [美]列奥·施特劳斯 Leo Strauss, 《什么是政治哲学》 *Shenme shi zhengzhi zhexue* [What is Political Philosophy?], 李世祥 Li Shixiang 译, (北京 Beijing: 华夏出版社 Huaxia chubanshe [Huaxia Publishing House], 2011)。

的理性行为构建为一种“理念型”，因此便可依照因果关系将那些受情感支配的非理性行为视为对它的偏离，从而可以帮助社会学在理性的基础上无歧义地理解这些非理性行为，反映了韦伯对情感等非理性及其影响下的行为之间因果性的追寻。这样每个社会行动都可以看作是各种因果性环节的混合。因此，借助表现为清晰的因果性的“理念形态”之工具，可以走向“理解”他人的道路，而理解也就是要求思想史家走进研究对象（社会行动者）的主观世界，体验他们的心态、情感和经验，发现和诠释他们的思想脉络。^[45]其次是在从法国心态史开始，之后被推进到新社会文化史的两研究种方法：一，

“从符号学的角度出发，社会中的很多象征都是人创造的，这些存在物又反过来再生产着社会；它体现着人们一定的价值观念，而同时，这些价值观念又不断影响着许多人，甚至控制着人们的思想；这样，原来以所谓的‘经典著作’作为自己的研究文本，而现在，文本发生了变化，人们的观念和能够体现这些观念的一切创造物都被看作为文本，并要在那个时代的语境中来解读其意义”^[46]；

二、借鉴人类学方法而产生的思想史的“高”与“低”的研究：

“高”为社会中的上层群体的思想观念，现在则开始向下看，研究下层人民这种“低”的思想观念。并且，研究思想观念从‘高’到‘低’的传递发展过程。他们还更进一步的注意到，很多思想观念并非仅仅分为“高”和“低”，而是混和与交叉的”^[47]。

其实，研究思想史的学者和派别几乎都有自己的一套研究思路，本文仅是列举了四种（具体可区分为六种）广泛使用的方法，其他的还有德国概念史（Begriffsgeschichte）方法：概念史不是一个学科，而是思想史领域的一种研究路径，每个时代都会存在一些集中反映当时历史特征的重要概念，即历史沉淀于概念之中，史学家可以对这些概念进行分析探讨，“既审视语言符号的形式又探究他们的语义和作用”，关注它们在当时历史环境中的具体应用，从而借助概念认识特定时期的历史^[48]；福柯的“知识考古学”；传统的对思想家和思想体系的研究……

就以上的这些思想史研究方法而言，每一种研究方法都或多或少地存在某些弊端：“单元观念”法忽视了单元观念与外部的历史环境之间的互动作用，“历史语境主义”方法

45 [德]马克斯·韦伯 Max Weber, 《社会学的基本概念》 *Shehuixue de jiben gainian* [Soziologische Grundbegriffe], 胡景北 Hu Jingbei 译, (上海 Shanghai: 上海人民出版社 Shanghai renmin chubanshe [Shanghai People's Publishing House], 2005); 《浅谈韦伯的“理解”和“理念型”》 Qiantan Weibo de “lijie” he “linianxing” [On Weber's “Understanding” and “Idea Type”], <https://book.douban.com/review/14638553/>, 2023-07-16.

46 李宏图 Li Hongtu, 《西方思想史研究方法的演进》 Xifang sixiangshi yanjiu fangfa de yanjin [The Evolution of Research Methods in the Western Intellectual History], 《浙江学刊》 *Zhejiang xuekan* [Zhejiang Academic Journal], No. 1, (杭州 Hangzhou: 浙江省社会科学院 Zhejiang sheng shehui kexue yuan [Zhejiang Academy of Social Sciences], 2004), 91.

47 同上书，第92页。

48 方维规 Fang Weigui, 《什么是概念史》 *Shenme shi gainianshi* [What is Conceptual History], (北京 Beijing: 生活·读书·新知三联书店 Shenghuo dushu xinshi sanlian shudian [SDX Joint Publishing Company], 2020), 18-22.

则走向了将外部环境视为一切的极端，而“文本隐微解释”方法极易将人淹没在文本之中且会造成“六经注我”还是“我注六经”的问题，“社会史”方法似乎又存在将思想史“溶解”的危险……同时，也可清楚地看到这些研究方法能够被大致地分为“内在的”和“外在的”两个方向，正如凯利指出思想史存在两个研究进路并加以讨论：一是内在的(ternalist或“intellectualist”)，它采取内在动态和逻辑的形式追踪思想，关注思想和观念本身，以理解经典文本为内容；二是外在的(externalist或“contextualist”)，它将思想置于特定时间、地点和环境下，关注思想的社会语境及其所产生的社会影响。^[49]因此，或许在具体的研究实践中，可以采取内外相结合的方法，不仅探讨特定的单元观念、概念、思想在不同时代中的重组及其演变，而且剖析外部语境对思想观念的影响以及思想观念与历史事件等之间的交互关系。

四、实例：从思想史看马丁·路德在中国的被接受史

马丁·路德是西方思想史上的重要人物，曾阐述过“自由”、“意志”、“天职”、“平等”、“世俗权力”、“因信称义”、“人人皆僧侣”、“两个国度”、“契约”、“婚姻”、“恩典”、“爱”等诸多重要思想和观念，涉及到西方宗教思想、政治思想、经济思想、教育思想等等，极大地影响了西方思想史的发展。此外，这些思想不仅在西方历史上发挥着重要作用，而且从清末民初开始流传到中国，成为中国思想史的重要部分。基于此，从思想史的角度看马丁·路德在中国的接受是具有重要价值和意义的。本节第一部分在列举和分析诸多著名学者关于思想史内涵的界定之后，总结并提出了对思想史内涵的认识，即认为思想史属于一种描绘人类以往非物质性经验和活动的历史，关注人类历史中精神层面的发明和创造，也就是那些记载在文本中、普遍传播过的概念、观念和思想，把握它们的演变脉络，剖析它们与社会行动、历史事件之间的互动关系，展现它们在具体历史语境中的不同形态、如何流传和为何流传，以及挖掘其中所蕴含的现代价值和意义。因此，可以清楚地看到，诞生于西方历史文化语境中的马丁·路德思想在清末民初时跨越国家和文化的阻隔传播至中国，影响了包括梁启超、康有为、徐继畲等在内的一批知识分子。其中，康有为、宋恕等维新派持完全积极的态度，叶德辉、章炳麟等顽固派和革命派对此进行了消极评价。康有为曾在《德意志等国游记》中阐述了自己对路德婚姻思想的想法，认为路德的婚姻主张符合人对情感的追求。但是，总体而言，路德思想在这时基本上是被遗漏的，即使有些学者提及路德的思想，大部分也都是基于社会背景和政治立场进行的照搬或挪用，以此来张扬自己的政治意图和改革目的。自此，路德及其思想融入了中国历史的洪流之中，越来越多的由中国学者撰写的历史类书籍将路德及其思想进行了归纳和说明，如沈惟新的《万国演义》、高一涵的《欧洲政治思想史》、蒋方震的《欧洲文艺复兴史》。此外，还有许多教内人士对路德思想展开了讨论和重新诠释，比如倪柝声、贾玉铭、王明道以及其后的三自教会里的牧者等。新中国成立至改革开放前，路德及其思想毫无疑问的被置于阶级斗争之中，与其他西方思想一起遭到严厉的批评和

49 Donald R. Kelley, "Intellectual History in a Global Age," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 2, (2005), 155-167.

遗弃。20世纪80年代，中国学界各个领域的研究都开始复苏，逐渐地将路德及其思想作为一个重要的研究领域，开始了从更为客观的学术角度看待路德思想，现已有诸多学者对路德进行学术讨论，产生了许多研究成果，如张仕颖的《马丁·路德称义哲学思想》，林纯洁的《马丁·路德天职观研究》、《马丁·路德年谱》，黄保罗的“马丁·路德与第三次启蒙”主张及一系列学术文章著作，以及肖安平的《马丁·路德论爱及其对中国教会的启示》等等。与此同时，信义宗教会及其他非信义宗派也加紧脚步，从神学视角阐述路德的各种思想——天职观、两个国度、婚姻观、因信称义等。因此，对路德及其思想在中国的接受史这一议题的探讨可以使用“历史语境”和观念史的方法。具体而言，首先要立足于具体的历史文化语境中，分析路德的重要思想在清末民初以来的各种类型文本中的不同形态，勾勒出路德思想在中国的历史动线和脉络，包括为何及如何跨越国家、文化等界限流传至中国，不同的人 and 团体对路德思想的诠释与应用（呈现出什么模样），以及与中国的重要社会事件之间的历史互动等方面，并对照西方重要的基督教宗派及神学家、学术研究流派等有关路德思想的解读，最后回归到现代语境中对此做出价值判断和历史评价，由此希望以路德思想为一条明线串联起路德的思想在异质中国语境中的接受情况以及中西思想的历史演变脉络，呈现出一种“跨文化”的思想史。

五、结语

思想史是思想的历史、一种关于人类精神性创造和文明的历史，而且被一些史学家视为人类唯一真正的历史。思想史有着诸多语言的术语，而在英语学界中的使用情况最为复杂，曾在20世纪的大部分时间内指向思想史 (intellectual history) 和今日所谓的观念史 (history of ideas)，这主要和“idea”的定义不清及学术发展史有关系。目前学术界很大程度上已将思想史和观念史相分离，但也必须不承认一个事实，即观念史在历史中曾一度被纳入思想史领域之中，成为思想史的重要组成部分，所以在追溯思想史的发展及其相关问题时，不能忽略观念史的研究状况、历史贡献，以及对以往思想家及思想体系式的思想史编撰带来的冲击和影响。英语术语的混用情况在一定意义上也反映出了学者们对思想史内涵的界定繁复。中西方思想史家们依据自己的侧重点而提出了各种思想史，如洛夫乔伊关注最基本的观念成分“单元观念”；波考克聚焦于政治话语和语境的关系，提出思想史和观念史都是一种最终期望获得历史哲学的元历史，不存在区别；约翰·邓恩指出思想史应当包含人类历史上出现过的所有思想，包括所有特定的智识学科；列奥·斯特劳斯专注于古典哲学文本通过隐微写作方式传达出来的永恒智慧；葛兆光认为思想史是人类思索问题的历史……学者们关于思想史内涵的表述虽然莫衷一是，但依旧存在共性，即追索人类精神性活动和经验的历史，梳理和诠释人类思想和观念，展现思想观念的演变脉络，从而以不同的角度关照现实。同时，需要对思想史的主题加以限制，思想史必须以具体的现象为中心，特别是以互有意义关系事件和人物为中心。^[50]对思想史认识

50 Wolfgang von Löhneysen, “Geistesgeschichte und was damit zusammenhängt,” *Zeitschrift für Religions und Geistesgeschichte*, vol. 47, (1995), 83.

存在差别也意味着他们形成了不同的思想史流派，如“剑桥学派”、“斯特劳斯学派”、“观念史学派”、“哲学史流派”、“一般思想史研究”等，而且会导致他们采用不同的方法从事相关研究，其中主要有“单元观念”之观念史的方法，“剑桥学派”的“历史语境”法，“施特劳斯派”对经典文本的“隐微解释法”，引用自社会史学的“理念型”、符号学和人类学方法，以及德国概念史的“概念阐释”法等等。史家们从纯粹历史学或历史哲学的角度，运用这些方法研究了人类自古至今的各种思想，向人们呈现了一个不同以往的历史。

当前，思想史领域又出现了许多新的发展方向，如“全球思想史、知性实践的文化史，以及借重数位人文学工具的思想史研究”，逐渐开始寻求中、西思想史研究的互动和对话。^[51]例如，有些学者已开始从概念史或语境出发，具体探讨和分析思想史与文学研究及文学文本之间的联系，指出每个文学文本中都有语境的痕迹，每种语境也都是文本的一部分；思想史与文学之间的相互阐释是文学研究的一项持续性工作。^[52]那么，在这些新方向之下，思想史家们也有了一项紧迫的任务：必须提醒广大公众注意到概念和思想（如移民、财富、教育、宽容）如今是如何被那些负责共同利益的人以一种不可理解和扭曲历史的方式所使用的，这可能会从重新思考对21世纪人们而言有效的知识条件开始。^[53]

那么，思想史的意义在哪？或许如汪丁丁所说：“思想史相当于一幢装满‘心智地图’的大厦，在哪里，又遗存在传统里的各种思考。只要我们承认我们不是历史上出现过的最聪明最智慧的人，我们就要认真浏览这些心智地图。”^[54]又或许如库里克里所认为的那样：思想史是发现活生生的日常生活中，还有涉及人类动机的“真正”要素方面没有传达出来的东西，它并不会提升物质、道德的生活，也不会对社会科学有什么贡献，不过它也根本不想达到这个目的，而是要“对一般意义上人类所面临的恒久问题的历史研究”有一定裨益，“在艰难的岁月，它给予我们以希望，在骄狂的时代，它使我们保持一定的谦卑，这些德行并非无足轻重”。^[55]

51 参见傅扬 Fu Yang, 《思想史与近代史研究: 英语世界的若干新趋势》 Sixiangshi yu jindaishi yanjiu: yingyu shijie de ruogan xinqushi [Studies on Intellectual History and Late Modern Period: Some New Trends in the English-speaking world], 《中央研究院近代史研究所集刊》 Zhongyang yanjiuyuan jindaishi yanjiusuo jikan [Bulletin of the Institute of Modern History, Academia Sinica], No. 99, (台北 Taipei: 中央研究院近代史研究所 Zhongyang yanjiuyuan jindaishi yanjiusuo [Institute of Modern History, Academia Sinica], 2018), 79-100.

52 Carsten Dutt, “Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte: Die hermeneutischen Potenziale der Begriffshistorie,” *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte*, vol. 97, (2023), 53-63; Andreas Mahler, “Relevanz des Imaginären Das Programm der ›Geistesgeschichte‹ und das Problem des Kontexts,” *Dtsch Vierteljahrsschr Literaturwiss Geistesgesch* vol. 97, (2023), 387-406.

53 Cesare Cuttica, “Intellectual History,” *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences* (2nd edition), vol. 12, (2015), 260.

54 汪丁丁 Wang Dingding, 《思想史基本问题》 Sixiangshi de jiben wenti [The Basic Issues of Intellectual History], (北京 Beijing: 东方出版社 Dongfang chubanshe [The Eastern Publishing co., Ltd], 2019), 4.

55 [英]斯蒂芬·柯林尼 Stefan Collini, [英]J. G. A. 波考克 J. G. A. Pocock, [英]昆廷·斯金纳 Quentin Skinner等·《什么是思想史?》 Shenme shi sixiangshi [What is Intellectual History?], 丁耘 Ding Yun 主编:《什么是思想史》 Shenme shi sixiangshi [What is Intellectual History], 任军锋 Ren Junfeng 译·(上海 Shanghai: 上海人民出版社 Shanghai renmin chubanshe [Shanghai People's Publishing House], 2006), 20.

English Title:

The Definition, Methods and Other Related Issues of Intellectual History

——Also on the History of Martin Luther's Thoughts in China

YANG Ying

Translator, Department of History, Shanghai University. Email: yingy17853321152@163.com. Nanchen road 333, 200444 Baoshan District, Shanghai, P. R. China.

Abstract: Intellectual history, tracing the history of human thought, is the understanding and presentation of various thoughts and concepts that have appeared in human history. The Chinese term 思想史 is translated from the English terms “intellectual history” and “history of ideas”, which were once used interchangeably, especially in the 20th century, since at least two reasons: the definition of “idea” and the history of the development of academic disciplines. The use of English terms in confusion is undoubtedly a reflection of the phenomenon of different opinions on the definition of the connotation of the intellectual history. By enumerating the explanations about the meaning of intellectual history of Collingwood, Lovejoy, Isaiah Berlin, Skinner and many other famous, not only to show the ambiguity of what is intellectual history, but also to seek uniformities among the different definitions. It is that intellectual history points to the spiritual creation and experience of human beings, and can guide people to discover and reach the most real place of history. Based on their respective understanding on intellectual history, historians use various research methods to pursue the thoughts and concepts in the course of human history from the perspectives of pure history, philosophical history, social history, etc., in order to find something valuable and meaningful. On the basis of sorting out and analyzing the basic problems of intellectual history, this paper further illustrates the connotation and methods of intellectual history by taking the study of the history of Martin Luther and his thoughts in China as an example.

Keywords: intellectual history; terms; connotation; research methods; the history of Martin Luther's thoughts in China

论思想史的内涵与研究方式

——以解放神学的起源为例

何丹春

(上海大学文学院, 200444, 上海市)

提要: 思想史研究的内涵主要体现为“思想”与“历史”两方面, 因而其研究主要处理两类问题: 一是从思想维度看某位思想家说了什么, 二是从历史维度判断他为什么这么说。思想史的研究进路也因此分为“外在研究法”与“内在研究法”。外在研究法特别重视思想与历史情境的交互关系, 将人置于历史情境的脉络中加以观察分析, “内在研究法”则重视解析思想体系在理论发展上的周延性。本文以研究解放神学的起源为例, 兼顾“连续性”与“非连续性”的书写方式, 并用“内在研究法”与“外在研究法”, 具体而言表现为文本分析、推理法与演绎法、越辩证法等方法。在此基础上, 本文提出解放神学的起源可以从基层教会组织、基督教思想、罗马天主教改革、解放神学家的个人情况等多个因素进行考虑。

关键词: 思想史、外在研究法、内在研究法、解放神学

作者: 何丹春, 上海大学文学院博士研究生。地址: 上海市宝山区上大路99号。电子邮件: hedanchun@qq.com。
电话: +8615925874020。

引言

思想史是某个具体领域或具体对象的思想研究, 与哲学史、知识分子史、观念史等概念之间有着错综复杂的关系。思想史与哲学史在研究内容上有高度的相似性, 但其研究目的、研究方法有所不同。历史系的张巍教授曾提到“思想史就是用历史的方法来研究思想。历史系的学者可能会更关注历史, 以历史为目的, 以思想为研究对象来重构历史, 这可能是他们的主要目的”。而哲学系的孙向晨教授则区分了哲学史和思想史, 认为“哲学史讲究概念, 尤其是黑格尔以后, 强调概念之间的关系和每个时代凝结成的概念之间的逻辑。他提出历史和逻辑的统一, 重在把逻辑关系讲清楚”, 这在某种意义上掩盖了一部分历史。哲学系的林晖教授也曾提到, “哲学史主要是围绕它的学科的传承传统一脉, 而思想史在范围上更大, 涉及到各种活生生的历史的社会的跨学科的领域。每个时代都有它关注的时代问题社会问题生活问题, 所有关照都是基于这些问题的, 但是把这些问题凝聚在哪个点上是有不同的。“哲学较思想史而言焦点较少, 哲学的研究是把这些问题凝结在一些核心概念, 譬如康德对于形而上学的反思。

思想史与知识分子史的侧重点不同, 但也有相似之处。知识分子史 (intellectual history) 以知识分子为中心, 兼顾知识分子个人或群体的思想及其生平经历以研究思想。韦伯、曼海姆、葛兰西、福柯、利奥塔、布尔迪厄、萨伊德等思想家都在各自的思想体系的基础上对知识分子理论提出了许多富有启发性的见解。其中法国学者让-弗朗索瓦·西里奈利 (Jean-Fran ois Sirinelli) 在其论著中涉及方法论的部分中始终强调知识分子史的研究要在历史发展的背景下将各个历史时期知识分子的发展过程进行梳理; 要对知识分子群体内部

结构的独特性进行考察；从代际更替的角度把握知识界内部的新陈代谢。¹此外，近年来知识分子史的研究中还兴起了集体传记研究法 (Prosopography)，集体传记法研究的代表人物劳伦斯·斯通 (Lawrence Stone) 认为，集体传记法为研究历史上一群行动者的共同背景特征提供了一种有价值的方法，²以解释知识分子集体行动根源，分析隐藏在政治话术修辞之下的更深层次的利益问题以及政治团体的社会经济关系。相比知识分子史，思想史侧重于“思想”而非“人”，重点解释那些历史发展中产生重要影响、且形成系统的思想。但同时，思想史也需要从那些进行过充分思考从而毕生追踪特定人类生活轨迹的人们中发掘其思想的动力。

此外，思想史还和观念史有着密切联系。根据复旦大学哲学学院教授丁耘的说法，“原来的思想史就是思想家的思想体系史，每个时代的代表性观念就是通过这个时代的若干的大思想家的体系呈现出来的。后来因为每一代思想家都想做一点跟前人不一样的东西，于是就要找一种没有思想家的思想史，也是观念，但是这个观念史体现在大量民间的、非经典文献的材料中的”。正是在观念史方法的影响下，思想史的重心不断下移和扩展，从占主流地位的，有文献记载和支撑的信仰与精英思想，逐渐拓展到人民大众、民间的想法，比如墓碑，或者是口头记载的，或者是当地的一些小的宗教信仰，或是记录在家谱中的一些资料。

思想史与知识分子史、哲学史、观念史等概念重叠交错，因此有必要对思想史的概念进行进一步阐释。作为一类历史研究，思想史较哲学史而言研究对象更为具体，较知识分子史而言更侧重于思想的研究。思想史研究主要处理两类问题：一是某位思想家说了什么，以探寻作者的思想是基于没有明述的理由。而这样做的本质是在重构作者的论证，包括补充缺失的论证环节，理顺散乱的论证线索等，以便于我们更清晰的理解作者的意图。这一类问题多用思想史的内在研究法进行分析。二是他为什么这么说。“为什么这么说”可以从理论与理论本身之外来进行思考。理论本身之外的问题则旨在说明作者因为某种历史局限性、独特性情乃至写作时精神恍惚等无意识层面的缘由。这类问题多用外在研究法进行分析。除了解释思想史的内涵之外，本文还将以解放神学的起源为例分析思想史的研究方式。

在后现代语境中，“起源”的研究已日益减少、逐渐不被关注。或许是因为在起源研究中，造成具体研究对象产生的各种因素的先后顺序难以界定清晰，研究者需要视情况界定回溯的程度；亦或许是因为造成“起源”的因素繁多，研究者难以穷尽。或许正是因为研究思想史起源的这些困难，在当前思想史的研究中，某种思想的发展或演变才是研究者偏爱的话题。但是“起源”作为思想产生的最根源问题，在解释思想的历史发展上有着无可替代的重要意义。而本文从思想史研究的多种研究方式出发，以期为解决研究思想史起源的阻碍提供可借鉴之处。

1 朱晓罕 Zhu Xiaohan,《让-弗朗索瓦·西里奈利的法国知识分子史研究》Rang fulangsuowa xilinali de zhishi fenxi shi yanjiu【The Studies concerning French Intellectual History of Jean-Fran ois Sirinelli】,《史学理论研究》Shixue lilun yanjiu【Historiography Bimonthly】, No.4,(2005), 135.

2 Lawrence Stone:“Prosopography”,*Historical Studies Today*, No.1,vol.100, (1971), 46.

一、思想史的内涵：“思想”与“历史”

观念史作为一门独立的学术研究最早始于美国的阿瑟·洛夫乔伊 (Arthur O. Lovejoy) . 1936年, 他出版了《存在的巨链: 对一个观念的历史的研究》, 阐述了“单元观念”(Unit idea) 的概念, 提出“单元观念”指的是西方思想传统中基本的和经久不变观念, 并奠定观念史的研究理论和方法论基础. 20世纪60年代起, 洛夫乔伊的“单元观念”的持续不变性引起了“剑桥学派”的昆廷·斯金纳 (Quentin Skinner) 等其他历史学家的批判, 斯金纳否定了洛夫乔伊观念史的非历史性, 提出要从历史背景中去分析思想的形成与发展. 斯金纳在1978年出版的《现代政治思想的基础》便是运用“历史”方法研究思想史的代表性著作. 斯金纳将语境主义引入思想史研究, 开启了思想史的自我更新.³综合来看, 我们可以将思想史可以分为“思想”和“历史”两个部分.

思想是思想史的重要组成部分. 历史是人的行动, 而人的社会行为有一个最重要的特点: 它是有价值的行动. 人的任何行为与行动都是观念的产物. 历史上任何一个社会事件的发生, 都是由人的价值取向导致的. 然而在历史的记载中, 观念却容易被遗忘. 思想史正是研究历史上发生过的观念的研究, 观念跟历史上发生过的事件的互动研究.

在对思想的文本研究中, 观念语词是社会意识形态的高度浓缩, 大多以单字 (单词) 或双字词 (词组) 形式出现.⁴20世纪60年代, 美国的诺夫乔伊以“单元观念”为对象, 重点关注“一个时期或一种运动中的神圣语词或成语”⁵. 诺夫乔伊对于观念史的这种研究方法深刻影响了思想史的研究. 此后, 诸多思想史研究者开始将观念语词作为研究某种思想的素材. 其中, 晁福林在王权观、神权观、忧患观、宗法观等思想史研究的基础之上, 进一步提出单元观念在阐述宏大叙事时的重要性,

“经过漫长时间筛选而存留下来的吉光片羽, 是历史研究的珍贵资料. 通过对这种历史碎片的研究、对个案的探讨, 可以找到阐释历史的新角度……一些历史碎片往往承载着丰富的历史信息, 捕捉这些信息, 认真研究它, 就会推动相关研究的深入.”⁶

从历史发展的脉络中挖掘其背后的思想动力, 不仅仅要依赖经典的文献文本, 更需要深刻理解经典文献在历史中积淀的思想, 从而把控思想背后的历史. 正如本杰明·史华兹 (Benjamin I. Schwartz) 所说: “思想史的中心课题就是人类对于他们本身所处的‘环境’的‘有意识反应’”. 的确, 人的思想是由历史环境来决定的, 是由政治、经济来决定的, 通过对历史的研究从而了解当时的政治和经济, 那么我们就知道当时的人是怎么想的. 在

3 张文静 Zhang Wenjing, 《微观视角与中西互动: 全球思想史研究的新趋向》 Weiguan shijiao yu zhongxi hudong quanqiu sixiangshi yanjiu de xinqxiang[【Microscopic Perspective and Chinese-Western Interaction: A New Trend in the Study of Global Intellectual History】], 《山西师大学报: 社会科学版》 Shanxi shida xuebao shehui kexueban [【Journal of Shanxi Normal University (Social Science Edition)】], No.47, vol.04,(2020),63.

4 桓占伟 Huan Zhanwei, 《观念史方法与思想史研究的新趋势》 Guannianshi fangfa yu sixiangshi yanjiu de xinqushi [【The New Tendency of the Research of the History of Ideas and Intellectual History】], 《人文》 Renwen [【The Journal of Humanities】], vol.7, (2022),40.

5 阿瑟·奥肯·洛夫乔伊 Arthur Oncken Lovejoy, 《存在巨链》 Cunzai jvlian [【The Great Chain of Being】] 张传有 Zhang Chuanyou译, 高秉红 Gao binghong译, (北京 Beijing: 商务印书馆 Shangwu yinshuguan [The Commercial Press]), 2015, 14.

6 晁福林 Chao Fulin: 《发挥好历史碎片的大作用》 Fahuihao lishi sui pian de dazuyong [Making Good Use of Historical Fragments], 《人民日报》 Renmin ribao [People's Daily] (2015年7月20日), 第16版.

思想史研究中对于某位思想家说了什么,最重要的前提工作是处理作者的无意识层面,以重构作者的历史语境。

李宏图提出在把握思想家文本的思想主题的同时,将思想家组织文本时的“修辞战略”纳入研究范围,他以社会主义思想为例,提出欧文和一批社会思想家使用“新与旧”这样的对比性措施,借以突出一种未来性与感召性,并通过对“旧”的否定性论证来摧毁现存社会的合理性。因此,在关注思想家的文本的同时,需要格外重视思想家们的话语体系和修辞方式以及隐含其后的线性的社会演进方式。⁷

此外,为把握思想史的“历史”,还需要处理思想史的传播和接受的问题。思想并不只在一个国家内形成和发展,在思想的形成过程中,思想在不同的时间空间内不断碰撞、融合,因为正是在文本的传播与接受中,可以更好地梳理和厘清思想的发展史,发现其内部共同点与差异。从时间和空间的维度上展开,才能更好地理解某种思想如何被互相接受,形成认同,与形塑为共有与共享的一致性概念和观念,而同时又在对立、排斥与修正发展中形成多样性的流派与表达。⁸研究文本的传播和接受不仅帮助我们更好地梳理思想史的形成,还是研究对象是否能构成思想史研究的标准,因为在思想史的研究中有一条原则:凡是不可以用来普遍传播的观念是不可以判别真伪的。

二、思想史的研究方式:“外在研究法”与“内在研究法”

从思想史的研究内涵“思想”与“历史”的这两个角度出发,思想史的研究进路可大致分为“外在研究法”与“内在研究法”。外在研究法特别重视思想与历史情境的交互关系,将人置于历史情境的脉络中加以观察分析,其中心课题在于探讨人类对本身所处之环境的意识反应。使用“外在研究法”的研究者所关心的问题如下:思想家在何种历史环境或脉络里提出其理论系统?思想家提出理论时,与当代或后代之历史情境有何互动关系?在何种具体而特殊的历史脉络下,思想传统的哪些会被思想家加以显题化而成为具有时代意义的重大议题?思想家在何种语言情境(linguisticity)之中提出其论述?

但是,“外在研究法”的理论基础如果推到极致,就会将思想人物完全视为社会结构制约下的产物,而使人的自主性为之沦丧,不免流为某种形式的“化约论”——认为思想只不过是人心对外在环境之刺激所作的反应,因而忽视思想家超越时代藩篱的创发面。再者,由于“外在研究法”的注意焦点为思想与环境之间的关系,因此对于内容丰富却未在历史上产生重大影响的思想家,往往给予过低的评价。“外在研究法”所潜藏的局限性,使研究者在分析过程中往往拙于应对以下问题:何以同一时代的思想人物会提出南辕北辙、形同水火的

7 李宏图 Li Hongtu,《关于欧洲近代社会主义思想研究的若干思考——一种思想史视角的进路》Guanyu Ouzhou Jindai shehuizhuyi sixiang yanjiu de ruogan sikao【Some Reflections on the Study of Modern Socialist Ideas in Europe - An Approach from an Intellectual History Perspective】,《首都师范大学学报(社会科学版)》Shoudu shifan daxue xuebao shehui kexueban【Journal of Capital Normal University (Social Science Edition)】,No.2,(2023),18.

8 李宏图 Li Hongtu,《关于欧洲近代社会主义思想研究的若干思考——一种思想史视角的进路》Guanyu Ouzhou Jindai shehuizhuyi sixiang yanjiu de ruogan sikao【Some Reflections on the Study of Modern Socialist Ideas in Europe - An Approach from an Intellectual History Perspective】,《首都师范大学学报(社会科学版)》Shoudu shifan daxue xuebao shehui kexueban【Journal of Capital Normal University (Social Science Edition)】,No.2,(2023),22.

思想？在历史变迁的关键时刻里，为何同属于某团体的思想人物，会有不同的政治见解？为了深入掌握上述问题，从而提出相应的解答，研究者必须认识到不同的思想人物都是具有独立思考能力的个体，而非“客观”历史环境的奴隶。

因此，如果完全运用“外在研究法”，那么对于思想体系里诸多“单位观念”间的复杂关系，往往不能精确解析。例如解放神学中的天主教的社会变革方式的话题牵涉到许多问题，其中最重要的就是“上帝之国”与“世界之国”的对待问题。“上帝之国”与“世界之国”的对待这个问题之另层意义，就是“神圣”和“世俗”的对待，它落实在社会经济的具体实现上就是基督徒参与世界之国的限度问题；一旦落实到政治层次也就激发了历代基督徒聚讼纷纭的“政教关系”的争论。完全从“外在研究法”的角度，就可能无法深入掌握这些概念之融合与转折变化，因此必须寻求“内在研究法”的支持。

“内在研究法”所侧重的是思想系统内部观念与观念间的结构关系。“内在研究法”在理论上先假定：一个思想或概念被提出后即取得了自主性的生命，成为可在公共领域里自由发展的论述，不受社会政治环境变迁的支配。“内在研究法”特别重视解析思想体系在理论发展上的周延性，以及体系中诸多“单位观念”本身的意义与彼此间的复杂关系。采用这种方法的研究，通常集中于特定的思想家、学派或者时代思潮，对他们思想的内在结构进行分析，经常探讨的问题如下：某个思想家、学派或者时代思潮，发展了哪些不可再加以细分的“单位观念”？这些“单位观念”之结构性或阶序关系为何？思想系统中潜藏着何种“未经明言的”的“文法”或“深层结构”？思想系统的理论周延性为何？

“内在研究法”认为，一个思想或概念被提出后即取得了自主性的生命，成为可在公共领域里自由发展的论述，不受社会政治环境变迁的支配。“内在研究法”特别重视解析思想体系在理论发展上的周延性。思想理论的形成过程固然与时代背景有关，但它们一旦被提出后，就脱离了当时的历史情境，而成为一个可被不断推行、批驳或者补强的议题，持续地吸引后代思想家的注意。但“内在研究法”的应用亦存在局限，因思想抽离发生时代的背景，便很可能遭致误解。因为对某项命题的历史脉络掌握不足造成曲解。

此种研究方法的优点，在于能对各种思想之“内部结构”作较充分的解析，然而对思想之“发生脉络或历程”的掌握却常显得无力；对思想家论述的“言内意旨”(locutionary intention)有较细致的探讨，但对“言外意旨”(locutionary intention)与“言后意旨”(perlocutionary intention)则较少措意。既然“外在研究法”的理论基础可能导致将思想人物完全视为社会结构制约下的产物，而“内在研究法”所侧重的是思想系统内部观念与观念间的结构关系，那么应该如何平衡这两者的关系呢？下文将以解放神学的起源为例，阐述几种具体的方法，“外在研究法”与“内在研究法”的平衡有赖于几种研究方法的并用，以更好地扬长避短。

三、思想史的具体研究方法

思想史的研究包括研究思想的起源、发展与演变等话题，这一章主要通过解放神学的起源的研究案例来阐述思想史的具体研究方法，如文本分析法、演绎法和推理法、越辩证分析法等等。解放神学是20世纪60年代末在拉丁美洲兴起的一种神学思潮，这种思潮将天主教

神学理论同社会现实相结合,主张天主教应以争取被压迫、被剥削而处于“非人”的贫困中的人们摆脱一切奴役,获得物质和精神生活的解放为宗旨。解放神学的诞生背景十分复杂,不仅涉及长期处于军人独裁统治之下时代背景,还涉及到美苏冷战、古巴革命、马克思主义思想的传播、依附论的兴起、基督教思想的发展等等因素。因此,解放神学的起源研究需要多种研究方法并用,多层次、多方面地进行分析。

在内在研究法中,文本分析对文本内容是最为重要的研究方式,能够对思想中的“单元观念”和“神圣词语”进行分析。近年来,随着科学技术的发展,很多思想史的研究者通过建立语料库、数据库或利用软件进行文本词频分析。金观涛教授曾将数据库方法引入观念史研究,比如通过统计近代以来的“科学”、“革命”、“民主”观念出现的频次,分析这些概念如何影响中国社会和历史进程。目前已有一些软件可帮助我们进行词频分析,比如质性分析软件Nvivo软件。

NVivo是一款支持定性研究方法和混合研究方法的软件。Nivio作为一种重要的质性研究分析软件,适用于团体讨论、访谈、调查、录像、音频、社交媒体等非数量信息的处理。通过节点和编码,完成不同格式文件资料的提炼和萃取,揭示数据中细微的关联。目前Nvivo多用于文本或政策内容分析,以研究相关政策内容的特点与发展趋势。如:《新时代大学生思想政治教育政策特征与发展趋势——基于NVivo12·0的政策文本分析》、《2012-2021年山东省人才政策文本分析》、《体育精神的时代变迁与新闻话语建构——基于新中国成立以来《人民日报》的文本分析》等。

Nvivo软件可以对思想理论进行词云分析。字词是文本最基本的意义单元,统计文本用词的频次,能够反映某个主题及相关方面的趋势和特点。因此,可以对相关思想理论进行词频分析,排除无关词项后,保留出现频次在前列的关键词,形成相关思想理论的词云图,以分析基督教思想体系中《圣经》以及奥古斯丁、阿奎纳、马丁路德等人的理论中,教权与政权、神学与政治、宗教与社会、现世与终末之事、属灵与肉体等多对矛盾辩证对立中的张力,以深入探讨这些理论对解放神学的影响。

Nvivo软件还可以用来分析不同时期思想内容特点与思想变迁。通过对节点结构变化的整理分析,可以发现解放神学的发展的特点,从而追溯起源。通过Nvivo软件,我们可以分析解放神学中的核心概念如“解放”,“革命”,“改革”和“历史性与政治性解放”和“上帝超验性和由上而来的救恩”等,通过这些概念的有机之结构关系,从而陈述解放神学对“解放”本质的观点。在解放神学的研究中,研究者可从“解放”、“基层教会”、“穷人”、“实践”、“人民”、“革命”等解放神学家频繁使用的词语分析的入手,从这些文本的流变揭示其中的“产生之源”与“存在之链”。

但正如上文所提到的内在研究法的缺点,内在研究法恐不能考虑到解放神学所提倡的激进变革方式是在当时拉丁美洲进口替代工业化模式受限、贫穷问题日益凸显等历史背景下形成的。此外在使用这种方式时所需要注意:虽然这种方式能够帮助我们发现那些频次较多的词汇以及它的背后意义,但是这并不意味着一些未曾出现的词汇就是不重要的,可谓是说“有”易,论“无”难。

因此在使用“内在研究法”中,我们还需要兼用“外在研究法”说明历史脉络,使思想家之论述所针对的对象及其意向性(intentionality)豁然彰显。在解放神学起源问题上的,演

绎法和推理法可作为“外在研究法”的其中一种具体方式。解放神学是由一些拉美革新派神学家们在与贫苦的拉美百姓接触中，在深切感受到他们的贫困与不幸后深入的神学反思而建立起来的，因此它是一种经验性、实践性的神学。就研究方法而言，有人认为它与传统神学有很大的不同：它属于归纳法，而传统神学属于演绎法。也就是说，传统神学是从启示内容为出发点，然后从理论上进行演绎推理，最后才与牧灵和信仰实践相联系；而解放神学正好相反，它从大量的社会实践，包括社会、政治、经济、文化和宗教特定的形势出发进行分析，聆听穷人的呼声，由此对信仰进行反省，归纳形成解放神学。⁹从演绎法推断，秘鲁神学家古铁雷斯所提出的“解放神学”可以演绎推理至当时基督徒的实践，比如基层教会组织等，而基层教徒组织的发展又与当时的社会背景息息相关。他们所欲指涉的对象或论述意图，唯有透过具体的历史情境才能较为完整地理解。

越辩证法则阿根廷解放神学家斯堪诺内提出的一种研究方法。他认为在神学和历史之间，有一个哲学维度：在对社会的把握中总是包含了一种对根本人性的见解，由此而在神学、哲学和历史之间构成一个三维度的关系。用越辩证法，其基本设定为：不同维度之间的联合不是先验地必然的，而是历史地、事实地联合在一起，各个维度之间的连接不是必然的，然而并不是说这种跳跃是随意的，而是受到其他维度以及历史条件的制约，理论有被实践修正和确证的可能性，但并不因此取消对实践的辨别。神学历史地置身于政治实践中，但并不委身于政治，在神学（理论）与政治（实践）之外，还有信仰起作用。因此说解放神学以基督信仰的名义为政治作证是不对的，因为与神学相对的政治选项并非唯一，而是有些可供选择的选项，这些选项是历史地、事实的，解放神学是神学家在历史面前的自我拯救，而不是下山行道，拯救苍生。¹⁰

越辩证法运用了跨学科研究法，从神学、哲学、历史多学科角度从整体上对解放神学进行综合研究。在研究中，我们可以从哲学与神学的维度去辨别解放神学的历史发展。比如在探究解放神学的缘由时，我们可以从马丁·路德的“灵魂关怀”学说、“两个国度”理论等相关理论去剖析解放神学家在论述“解放神学”概念时的历史背景。路德曾提及灵魂关怀的最终目的是要获得自由：一是区别于动物的自由即在上帝面前在绝对真理面前的一种选择，以及人类在世界面前的选择。二是作为社会成员的自由，即崇拜自由、免于匮乏的自由和免于恐惧的自由。三是成为一名公义、圣洁和完美的被造者的自由。个体，其突破权威而获得自由。

路德所谓的自由意味着解放，解放神学的概念便是希望就是把人从苦中解放出来，结合当时拉美的现实情况，首先是从物质的贫乏中解放出来。从军政府的人权镇压中解放出来，从发达国家所控制的世界政治经济体系中的剥削中解放出来，从而获得多重的“灵魂关怀”。此外，解放神学的兴起很大程度上得益于解放神学家的推动，如果缺少信仰的角度，很难理解1980年萨尔瓦多主教奥斯卡·罗梅罗等解放神学家的舍身取义的壮举。但同时思想

9 段琦Duan qi,《解放神学的发展变化》Jiefang shenxue de fazhan bianhua【The Development and Changes of Theology Liberation】,《基督宗教研究》(第二辑)jidujiao zongjiao yanjiu【Study of Christianity】,(北京 Beijing: 社会科学文献出版社shehui kexue wenxian chubanshe【Social Science Academic Press】,2000),133、

10 叶健辉Ye Jianhui:《第二代解放神学——草民神学管窥》,Dierdai jiefang shenxue【The Second Generation of Liberation Theology-the popular theology】,《现代哲学》Xiandai zhexue【Modern Philosophy】,No.5,(2009),19-20.

史的研究中,我们应以历史为主线,将神学与哲学的研究方式与视角作为一种补充,防止学科属性的模糊。当前学科间的联系越来越紧密,在语言、方法和某些概念方面,有日益统一化的趋势,这既是一种机遇也是一种挑战。

四、思想史的书写方式:兼顾“连续性”与“非连续性”

在思想史研究中,不仅需要并用“内在”与“外在”的多种研究方式,还要兼顾“连续性”与“非连续性”的书写。按照时间书写是历史书写的基本方式,这种方式体现了历史发展的“连续性”,从希腊罗马时期希罗多德的《历史》、波里比阿《通史》,后人的历史撰写也基本遵循了这种书写方式。十九世纪末兰克实证主义提倡在搜集和准备史料上下功夫,以为历史研究的对象是“象事实一样”的真实存在,从而把自己的精力和时间局限在由事实决定的因果联系之中。兰克所撰写的《罗曼与日耳曼族群史1494-1514》、《世界史》等著作成为“连续性”的历史撰写代表作品,

然而在全球联系日益紧密的背景下,思想观念的发展已不再像过去那样呈单线型推进,巴勒克拉夫的《当代史导论》提出历史决不是连续性的而是“各种点和跳跃”,并将思想观念作为历史进程中的一个非连续因素,阐述了思想观念是如何推动历史的发展和新旧时代,让我们看到史学家视野在时间和空间上的扩展。巴勒克拉夫认为“连续性决不是历史最显著的特征”,而是类似于罗素所提的“世界全是各种点和跳跃”。《当代史导论》除了第一章论述方法论之外,其他七章都以历史的非连续性因素来讲述当代史。在第七章“观念的挑战——共产主义理论和苏联范例的影响”中,巴勒克拉夫将思想观念作为历史进程中的一个非连续因素,阐述了思想观念是如何推动历史的发展和新旧时代的转换。

“连续性”和“非连续性”的两种书写方式,对书写思想史的借鉴意义有如下几点。首先是全球性思维。全球联系日益紧密的背景下,思想观念的发展已不再像过去那样呈单线型推进。历史改变了以往的格局,如果不采用全球性的眼光,就不能够理解解塑造思想史的各种力量。传统的线型历史研究方法在新的历史面前不合时宜。在追溯解放神学的起源时,仅仅考虑拉丁美洲的情况是不够的,基督教神学思想、1968年罗马天主教改革都是影响解放神学的重要的国际因素。

其次是相同点与不同点并重。正如“重要的并不是论述历史女神的长袍是无缝的天衣,而是辨别其中所编织的各种不同的图案”¹¹,因而我们所寻求的有意义的东西不是两种思想的相同点而是它们的不同点,不是它们的连续性因素而是非连续因素。一种思想并非另一种思想的发展到一定阶段的渐进结果,在不同的历史背景之下或许新思想的方方面面几乎都是全新的。但事实上巴勒克拉夫的“非线性”的全球史观所强调的个体之间的联系、事物之间的差别、影响和后果等重要因素都是基于兰克所倡导的“线性”历史之上的,因此也不可忽视相同点连成的连续性。在研究解放神学的起源时分析其他思想,不仅要注意两种思想的不同点,也要通过不同点来判断这种思想是否对解放神学产生影响。

11 杰弗里·巴勒克拉夫 Geoffrey Barraclough:《当代史导论》*Dangdai shi daolun* [An Introduction to Contemporary History], 张广勇Zhang guangyong、张宇宏Zhangyuhong译, (上海Shanghai: 上海社会科学院出版社 Shanghai kexueyuan chubanshe [Shanghai academy of social sciences press], 2011), 21.

最后是关注思想史中的“言外意旨”。就像巴洛克拉夫在提到列宁主义或者说马克思主义形式最终成为自由主义的最大对手，其中原因之一便是列宁本人的有力影响和非凡品格，因此在分析思想史也要注意“言外意旨”。在解放神学中，解放神学者个人的个性特点与生活际遇也对解放神学的诞生产生重要影响，值得研究者的关注。例如萨尔瓦多主教奥斯卡·罗梅罗 (Oscar Romero)，正是由于其好友——支持贫农互助组的进步耶稣会士古拉迪被暗杀，向当时的阿图罗·阿曼多·莫利纳政府请求调查被无视后，才从保守派变成了解放神学者。

五、总结

思想史作为某种思想的历史研究，其“思想”层面和“历史”层面共同构成了思想史区别于“哲学史”、“知识分子史”和“观念史”等概念的地方。与哲学史相比，思想史侧重历史，弱化了概念之间的关系与逻辑，重点还原思想或概念的历史背景；与知识分子史相比，思想史侧重“思想”而非“人”，重点解释那些历史发展中产生重要影响、且形成系统的思想，而形成那些思想的“知识分子”只是作为“思想”研究的某个方面进行考察；“观念史”则与“思想史”有着错综复杂的关系。观念史侧重于“单元观念”的研究，而“思想史”正是在否定观念史的非历史性中实现自我更新；此外，思想史最初是作为思想家的思想体系史，但在观念史小传统研究方式的影响下，思想史的重心下移和拓展，逐渐从占主流的精英思想逐渐拓展到人民大众、民间的想法。

“历史背景”与“人的思想”在思想史的研究中缺一不可、相辅相成。在思想史的撰写中，若没有思想，史料就不会说话，若没有历史，思想就难以被理解。因此在论述思想史中，不仅要描述历史过程，还要解释历史过程、挖掘历史事件背后的深层次的动力，特别是思想动力。

根据“思想”与“历史”的这两个层面，可将思想史研究方法分为“内在研究法”与“外在研究法”，“外在研究法”旨在分析重视思想与历史情境的交互关系，如推理法和演绎法等。而内在研究法侧重于分析思想系统内部与观念建的结构关系，如文本分析法。本文以解放神学运动的起源为例，并用“内在研究法”和“外在研究法”以解释解放神学运动兴起的动因。本文列举了文本分析、质性分析软件、推理法与演绎法、越辩证法、“连续性”与“非连续性”的书写分析等方法，并兼顾“连续性”和“非连续性”的书写方式，提出解放神学的起源可以从基层教会组织、德国神学思想、罗马天主教改革、解放神学家的个人情况等多个因素进行考虑。

但其实“内在研究法”与“外在研究法”只是“理想类型”，而且是为了讨论方便所作的人为区分。并且，“外在研究法”的理论基础如果推到极致，就会将思想人物完全视为社会结构制约下的产物，而内在研究法”的应用亦存在局限，因思想抽离发生时代的背景，很可能遭致误解。因此，在实际研究过程中，两者应该交互为用，相与启发；也只有两者并行，才能相得益彰，左右逢源。

On the Definition and Research Methods of Intellectual History:

Taking the Origin of Liberation Theology for example

HE Danchun

College of Liberal Arts, Shanghai University, Nanchen Rd 333, Baoshan District, 200444, Shanghai, P. R. China

Abstract: As a kind of historical research consisting of “ideas” and “history”, the study of the intellectual history mainly deals with two kinds of problems: one is to see what a thinker said in the dimension of ideas, and the other is to judge why he said so from the dimension of history. Therefore, the research approach of intellectual history can be divided into “external research method” and “internal research method”. The external research method pays special attention to the interactive relationship between thought and historical context, and places people in the historical context to be observed and analyzed, while the internal research method pays special attention to analyzing the circumference of the system of thought in the theoretical development. This paper analyzes the origin of liberation theology as an example with external research method and internal research method, such as qualitative analysis software, inference and deduction, transcendental dialectic, and also applies the writing patterns of “continuity” and “discontinuity”. The paper proposes that the origins of liberation theology can be considered in terms of a number of factors, including Christian ecclesiastical base, German theological thought, Roman Catholic Reformation, and the personal situations of liberation theologians, etc.

Key words: Intellectual History, External Research Method, Internal Research Method, Liberation Theology

Author: He Danchun, PhD Candidate, College of Liberal Arts, Shanghai University, Baoshan, Shanghai, China, Email: hedanchun@qq.com, Tel: 15925874020

论思想史视域下的神学与哲学研究

——以马丁·路德对海德格的影响为例

李瑞翔

(上海大学 文学院·南陈路333, 宝山区 200444, 上海)

提要: 在传统汉语学界的历史研究中, 往往思想史相对于政治史、革命史来说, 都是次要和冷门的。而这样的偏向所带来的局限, 则非常清晰地体现在了传统汉语学界对马丁·路德的研究观点和态度中。路德往往被僵化地限定在了农民革命运动、宗教社会史、教会史的界域里; 其思想在西方思想史以及相关人文领域的发展中的重要贡献则一直被忽略。本文前两节将从目前西方不同的思想史研究流派和研究方法出发, 一方面论述西方思想史的研究进路与纯神学、哲学学科的不同, 另一方面论述目前西方思想史研究中不同流派的方法 and 特点, 以此来通过思想史进路, 可以对路德的贡献进一步来深入和挖掘。第三节将展开在思想史视域下, 路德对海德格的影响研究切入点与问题意识。第四节将通过第三节的创新点, 论述此研究中相对于前人的创新和突破。通过此研究, 可全面、系统地体现路德在西方思想史发展中的重要性。同时, 联动于目前汉语学界的“马丁·路德与第三次启蒙”系列研究, 呼吁路德思想不仅不应该被忽视, 还应当被放在西方思想史研究中的重要位置。

关键词: 思想史视域、路德、海德格、第三次启蒙

作者: 上海大学文学院世界史专业研究生·南陈路333, 宝山区 200444, 上海大学·电邮: 409768074@qq.com

一、传统汉语学界对思想史以及神学、哲学史的研究进路

在传统汉语学界的历史研究中, 政治史、革命史往往被认为是梳理一个时代或朝代更新迭代的核心范式。而历史发展与更替的阐释, 则必然也会以围绕政治史与革命史中的改革、斗争、兴衰等维度, 作为阐释的框架和根基。而这样的阐释进路, 推进到西方思想史的研究中, 对于一个时代的思想发展或者某些重要思想家的研究, 则也很容易被纳入到“生产力-生产关系”以及“经济基础-上层建筑”这套预设的研究框架中来。进而, 思想自身的形成和发展, 往往会无形中沦为生产力、政治关系的投影和服务工具。

这样的局限所体现出的后果, 就是很多思想家的思想独立性和贡献在先入为主的研究框架中被忽视。而对于传统汉语学界中对马丁·路德的思想研究情况, 则是最能体现出这种局限的例子。传统汉语学界中, 对于马丁·路德完全是放在了西方革命史、宗教政治史、宗教改革的社会运动等视域中予以考量。而路德的思想成果及其对其后西方思想史和人文领域发展所带来的贡献, 则基本予以忽视¹。

1 黄保罗 Paulos Huang, 《马丁路德与第三次启蒙丛书之三 寻找思想史中的失踪者马丁路德》 Madinglude yu disanciqimengcongzhisan xunzhao sixiangshi zhong de shizongzhe madingdelu [Martin Luther and the Third Enlightenment Series No. 3 In Search of Martin Luther, the Missing Man in the History of Ideas], (芬兰 Fenlan: 《国学与西学国际学刊》杂志社 guoxue yu xixue zazhishe, 2022), 1-30.

而在神学史、哲学史的学科研究领域，虽然近些年汉语学界逐渐兴起了不少对路德神学的系统性研究，但是更多还是在强调路德思想中教义、信条等宗教维度；对于路德思想中的思辨深度以及其在哲学史中的影响，则基本是忽视的。而单纯局限于抽象思辨与文本分析的研究界限，也往往难以突破学科壁垒，考察路德在其他人文学科和领域的贡献。而目前汉语学界中，“马丁·路德与第三次启蒙”系列研究，则是在呼吁学界重视路德，强调以思想史的进路来重新梳理路德的在西方各个人文领域中的重要贡献²。

因此，对路德这样的思想家的研究，就不仅应当放在政治史、神学学科的研究视域里，还应当独立的在思想史研究视域被重视，从而考察路德思想在西方思想史中的贡献。

思想史指的是对人类思想发展和变迁的历史过程进行研究的学科。它关注的是人类思想的演进，以及在各种历史、文化和政治背景下，思想的发展是如何产生影响和被影响的。“思想史”的内核是研究人类思想的演变过程中，不同历史时期和不同文化背景下，思想自身独立维度的发展与表达（尤其是本体论和神圣维度的真理）。因此，在西方思想史的研究中，往往没有处于“生产力”的预设根基里，而是强调思想自身的独立维度，以及思想与生产力之间不分主次的辩证关系。

对于政治史、经济史等历史研究领域的进路中，往往其中主导的意识形态都是实证主义的。而不断发展的计量、考古等技术领域则更是不断加固这样的意识形态。在这样的历史研究进路中，强调人们不能“随心所欲地创造”³，而是要在自然规律的框架下进行（也即“尘世的粗糙的物质生产中”⁴）。而在西方思想史的研究内核中，不同研究进路的背后却有着丰富且多元的哲学体系。

在西方不同神学和哲学的框架背景下，对思想史的研究和界定往往与实证主义和唯物主义有着不同甚至是对立的哲学前提。在这其中，比较激进的有新黑格尔主义的克罗齐 (Benedetto Croce, 1866~1952)，即“一切(真)历史都是当代史”，同时所谓的“客观”往往只能说是“历史著作的名目”⁵。而在他之后，柯林伍德 (Robin George Collingwood, 1889—1943) 提出“一切历史都是思想史”，即历史学家在自己的知识结构中对历史的重演⁶。而后现代思潮中，罗杰·夏蒂埃 (Roger Chartier, 1945-) 更是认为历史学家的写作必然也会蕴含“文学方式”⁷。

2 黄保罗 Paulos Huang, 《马丁·路德与第三次启蒙论坛 第一季 马丁·路德与第三次启蒙丛书之七》Madinglude yu disanciqimeng luntan diyiji madinglude yu disanciqimengcongshuzhiqi [Martin Luther and the Third Enlightenment Forum Season 1 Martin Luther and the Third Enlightenment Series No. 7], (芬兰 Fenlan: 《国学与西学国际学刊》杂志社 Guoxue yu xixue zazhishe, 2022), 1-30.

3 马克思 Max, 《路易·波拿巴的雾月十八日》Luyibonaba de wuyueshibari [Louis Bonaparte's Eighteenth Day of the Misty Moon], 中央编译局 Zhongyangbianyijuju译·(北京 Beijing: 人民出版社 Renminchubanshe, 1995) · 532.

4 马克思·恩格斯 Max·Engels, 《神圣家族》Shenshengjiazu [The Holy Family], 中央编译局译 Zhongyangbianyijuju, (北京 Beijing: 人民出版社 Renminchubanshe, 1995) · 191.

5 克罗齐 Croce, 《历史学的理论和实际》Lishixue de lilun he shiji [Teoria e storia della storiografia], 傅任敢 Furengan译·(北京 Beijing: 商务印书馆 Shangwuyinshuguan [The Commercial Press], 1982), 3.

6 柯林伍德 Robin George Collingwood: 《历史的观念(增补版)》Lishi de guannian (zengbu ban) [The Idea of History: With Lectures 1926-1928], 何兆武 He Zhaowu, 张文杰 Zhang Wenjie, 陈新Chen Xin译·(北京Beijing: 北京大学出版社 Beijing daxue chubanshe [Peking University Press], 2010) · 213.

7 伊格尔斯 Lggers, 《二十世纪的历史学: 从科学的客观性到后现代的挑战》Ershi shiji de lishixue: cong kexue de keguanxing dao houxiandai de tiaozhan, 何兆武 Hezhaowu译·(济南 Jinan: 山东大学出版社 Shangdongdaxuechubanshe,

不同哲学流派之间的争论超出了本文的讨论范围，因此本文仅将探讨不同哲学体系背后所带来的思想史研究进路的差异。在西方种种强调思想自身的独立性（甚至是优先性）的流派中，对于人类思想的演进历程的探讨，则往往不会优先考虑“外在”的物质维度对思想的影响，而是通过对原著文献的研究和文化解读，探究人类思想“内在”的演进过程，从而揭示人类思想自身的内在规律和历史发展趋势。同时，在思想和观念的独立维度，分析和界定人类思想的本质和意义，关注人类思想的本质特征和思想行为的形成原因，从而理解思想观念的内涵和意义。

同时，如此研究进路在上述对不同思想家的原著文献的研究基础上，会进一步横向研究不同思想体系间的联系与影响；以此来深入研究不同思想体系间的相互作用，发掘并阐述不同思想观念、理论、价值观念对于其整个时代的思想问题的回应与解答。在同时代横向拓展的基础上，将进一步拓展到历时性维度，关联不同时代的思想问题，突显人类思想对整个社会历史发展的影响。

本文第二节将在上述基础上，展开分析和介绍目前西方思想史中一些有着开创性影响力的研究流派和方法进路。

二、西方思想史研究学派与研究方法

在本节的内容中，将介绍观念史学派、剑桥思想史学派等学派。在对这些学派进行介绍的同时，将重点选择单元观念法、语境分析研究、社会史分析等研究方法。

在观念史学派中，代表人物为阿瑟·洛夫乔伊 (Arthur Lovejoy, 1873—1962)。洛夫乔伊认为人类的知识和权力不是一种确定的实体，而是一种实践和权力关系的网络，通过权力和知识形成的制度性规则将个体整合到社会中。洛夫乔伊在二十世纪三十年代在创立的“观念史俱乐部”与出版的《存在巨链：一个观念的历史的研究》⁸代表着其学派思想史研究的广泛影响力。其学派思想史研究理路可以简述为：通过分析不同思想家思想体系中的核心概念，梳理思想家理论著作之间援引、继承和扬弃的文本证据，阐释观念术语和思想体系在不同时代之间的传承与发展。而其后戈登等人在此基础上，提出不应只注重思想家的著作，还要从其语境与历史背景出发，还原其生活背景、成长经历和时代思想处境等具体历史处境的史实。

在剑桥学派中，代表人物有赫伯特·帕特菲尔德 (Herbert Butterfield, 1900—1979) 和昆廷·斯金纳 (Quentin Skinner, 1940—) 等人。帕特菲尔德为英国著名历史学家，基督教思想家，是20世纪“剑桥学派”中的重要代表人物。他所委身的卫理公会的循道主义信仰对他有着很大的影响⁹。同时他对辉格式历史编纂的反思，以及对“信仰与历史”两者之间关系的持续关注，成就了他在20世纪西方知识界的独特性。帕特菲尔德也深受神学

2006), 44.

8 Arthur Lovejoy, *The Great Chain of Being: A Study of the History of an Idea*, Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1936.

9 Michael Bentley, *The life and intellect of Herbert Butterfield: History, Science and God*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011, 206.

家立敕尔 (Albrecht Ritschl, 1822—1889年) 和公认的继承路德思想传统的教会史学者哈那克 (Adolf von Harnack, 1851—1930) 的影响, 强调基督教思想史的重要性。巴特菲尔德认为, 思想的演变不是简单的进步和升级, 而是相对于自身的传统而言的复杂过程。历史学家应该在语境和历史处境的“天然背景中”, 在“与我们能够理解的事物之间的关联”中¹⁰, 把握外部-内部、过去-现在的复杂性和整体性。

昆廷·斯金纳是剑桥学派的另一位代表性学者, 其著作有《近代政治思想的基础》¹¹ 等。在批判观念史学派的“单元观念”的基础上, 提出了“语境主义”的研究进路。斯金纳认为, 在原著文献的思辨中, 往往仅会在某一领域内, 针对某些抽象思辨上的不同见解和观点而形成互相对立的群体。因此, 斯金纳认为局限于单元观念和文本内部只会造成研究视域的狭隘。斯金纳强调要回到思想家和其原著文本的历史处境和语境关联中, 来建构文本形成和发展的完整解构。

在上述内容的基础上, 本文还将深入思想史不同研究进路背后的哲学观点和历史哲学。在传统汉语学界的历史学科中, 往往不会过多深入不同思想史进路背后的历史哲学。而因着当代西方思想史不同研究进路中普遍存在的差异性 (甚至是对立性), 对不同研究进路背后的历史哲学家的关注, 也是非常重要的。此处将介绍几位重要的历史哲学家 (以及下一节将重要提及的海德格尔)。

列奥·施特劳斯 (Leo Strauss, 1899—1973) 在二十世纪的历史研究中, 可以说是自成一派。施特劳斯从古希腊哲学家和城邦时期的历史研究入手, 强调哲学思想和政治之间的矛盾。施特劳斯在这基础上, 提出了文本中的“隐微”维度 (隐微教诲需要小心谨慎且训练有素才能被读出¹²), 并认为随后犹太教-基督教等冲突, 都体现了哲学思想和政治之间的对立矛盾。这样的冲突, 必然就会产生出种种“异端”标准, 政治和宗教迫害。施特劳斯在这种不同思想立场的矛盾和张力中, 开创了其独立的政治思想史研究进路。

新康德主义马堡学派的中, 代表人物为恩斯特·卡西尔 (Ernst Cassirer, 1874—1945)。卡西尔认为二十世纪初的德国思想界充满了“浮躁和自负”¹³。卡西尔作为海德格尔的主要对手, 认为人类的各种文化活动可以概括为一系列的符号系统, 而这种符号系统则构成了文化的核心。卡西尔主张哲学主要不是研究认识对象, 而是认识的方式, 因为客观世界只是“先验原则”和经验现象的结合。他还强调扩大康德批判方法的应用范围, 变康德“静态”的理性批判为“动态”的理性批判, 以便容纳更丰富、更广阔的人生经验。卡西尔的哲学思想是一种人类文化哲学, 是从探讨人和人类文化本质入手来展开全部思想体系的。他认为人是符号的动物, 文化是符号的形式, 人类活动本质上是一种“符号”或“象征”活动, 在此过程中, 人建立起人之为人的“主体性” (符号功能)。

10 巴特菲尔德 Butterfield, 《历史的辉格解释》Lishi de huige jieshi, 张岳明 Zhangyueming、刘北成 Liubeicheng译·(北京 Beijing: 商务印书馆 Shangwuyinshuguan [The Commercial Press], 2012), 14.

11 昆廷·斯金纳 Quentin Skinner: 《近代政治思想的基础》Jindai zhengzhi sixiang de jichu [The Foundation of Modern Political intellect], 奚瑞森 Xi Ruisen, 亚方 Ya Fang 译·(北京 Beijing: 商务印书馆 Shangwu yinshuguan [The Commercial Press], 2002)。

12 施特劳斯 Strauss, 《什么是政治哲学》Shenme shi zhengzhixue, 李世祥 Lishixiang 等译·(北京 Beijing: 华夏出版社 Huaxiachubanshe, 2014), 215-216.

13 Ernst Cassirer, The Problem of Knowledge, trans. W. H. Woglom · New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950, 3.

并构成一个文化世界。语言、神话、宗教、艺术、科学和历史都是符号活动的组成和生成，彼此表示人类种种经验，趋向一个共同的目标——塑造“文化人”。

卢卡奇 (György Lukács, 1885—1971) 也是二十世纪上半页的重要思想家。卢卡奇的代表作《心灵与形式》¹⁴也是不可被忽视的存在，被同代人称为“精神科学运动的重要出版物”。卢卡奇的思想史研究强调文学和艺术，认为这些是道德、哲学以及社会形式的表现，是人类精神生命的表征。卢卡奇认为“史诗时代”不复存在，历史已进入“小说时代”，只有通过自己的有限精神构思自己历史的无限未来。

而在上西方思想史研究流派中，本文将主要介绍单元观念法、语境分析研究、社会史分析、文化研究等研究方法。

洛夫乔伊的“单元观念法”是影响力广泛的研究进路，其著作《存在巨链：一个观念的历史的研究》¹⁵也是其研究进路的重要体现。洛夫乔伊认为单元观念是一个思想体系的最小单位。在这基础上，洛夫乔伊强调要通过寻找单元观念，以此来分析一个思想家的思想体系中的核心概念、论证进路，体系结构等维度。在这基础上，要进一步寻找一个时代的普遍观念中的“神圣词语”，进而分析这其中的传承、理论体系、组织形式和实践方式。

而斯金纳在对“单元观念法”进行批判的基础上，提出了“历史语境法”的语境主义进路。斯金纳认为，思想和文本中应当重视其形成语境。语境即语言背后的客观环境，主要指语言活动赖以进行的时间、场合、地点等因素，也包括表达、领会的前言后语和上下文。在这基础上，以宏观的视野来分析思想家自身的问题意识，所要回应的时代问题，可以进一步凸显某一历史时期占主导地位的价值观念、思想观念、文化特色等历史维度。斯金纳通过“语境主义”进路的研究中，对霍布斯的研究是其重要成果¹⁶。

除了上述两种进路以外，西方社会史、人类学等研究发展中，也对思想史研究有着补充。社会史分析强调研究思想与社会历史背景的关系，研究特定时期，特定地域的社会、政治、经济文化背景对思想发展的影响。这种方法主要适用于研究某一历史时期或社会现象中的思想内涵和文化意义。

在进行社会史分析时，需要考虑社会的经济、历史演变以及社会现象等因素。通过对社会历史进行深入分析，可以揭示出其中的思想内涵和文化意义，帮助我们更好地理解某一特定历史时期或社会现象中蕴含的思想内涵。同时，社会历史分析也可以帮助我们更好地了解社会发展演变的规律和历史进程，从而更好地认识和理解社会的发展趋势。列维-斯特劳 (Claude Lévi-Strauss, 1908—2009) 的结构主义研究进路就是对思想史非常重要的补充¹⁷。

14 György Lukács, *soul and form*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.

15 Arthur Lovejoy, *The Great Chain of Being: A Study of the History of an Idea*, Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1936.

16 Quentin Skinner, *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

17 Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Anthropologie structurale*, New York: Pocket, 2003.

综上所述，思想史研究方法中，不应只依赖一种方法，而是要考虑不同研究进路中的互相补充与兼并综合。文本分析、文本历史语境、文化研究、社会史以及人类学等多种进路中，都有不可或缺的一面。

文本分析中，通过研究思想史文献，重点分析思想文本的语言、逻辑和风格等方面，探究其中所蕴含的思想观念和价值。这种方法主要适用于研究文献、著作、文化作品等具有明确文本形式的资料。在研究中，思想家的原著文本和思想论证是绝不可少的。

除了文本分析外，也需要考量原著文本背后的历史处境和多维度史料的搜集。不同的历史时期和社会背景带来的影响非常大的；因此需要了解文本所处的历史背景，包括政治、经济、文化等方面的因素。在这其中，作者个人背景和个人心理维度也是不能忽略的。从而，研究所需要的史料，也就同样要一并地包含上述所有维度。

在上述基础上，社会史、文化研究等维度强调历史文化的地域差异对思想发展的影响，从人类文化的角度来探讨人类思想的演进过程。这种方法尤其适合宗教、艺术、哲学等思想研究的辅助和佐证。文化研究中需要注重文化的历史演变，需要了解相关的历史演变过程，包括其起源、发展、转变等方面。同时也需要注重其社会背景。通过对文化进行深入研究和分析，可以了解其中蕴含的思想内涵、价值观和信仰体系，从而更好地理解某一特定时期或地区的文化现象。同时，文化研究也可以帮助我们更好地了解不同文化之间的差异和联系，促进不同文化之间的交流和理解。

而在综合上述各个维度的基础上，就可以来尝试从微观到宏观地逐级递进（“层层拓展、以小见大”）：即思想家个人思想体系——同时代思想家之间的对话——横向建构思想家对其时代处境和时代问题的回应与解答（及其对相关群体的影响）——纵向对比不同时代的思想家之间的宏观思想史传承与发展（真理与历史）。

在下一节中，将通过具体例子，即马丁·路德对海德格爾的影响，来考察从思想史的独特研究视域中，不同于传统研究的切入点与创新点。

三、关于路德对海德格爾的影响的研究切入点与创新性

海德格爾作为现当代重要的哲学家，其影响力是不言而喻的。学界对于海德格爾的传统研究视域中，其哲学方面的议题已经推进得非常深入细致。但是，从思想史的维度来看马丁·路德在海德格爾思想中的重要性，一直都是被学界所忽视且缺乏系统性研究的。而路德作为西方历史中的重要人物，一直被学界局限于宗教社会史的领域；对于路德在西方现当代人文思想中的影响，学界也是长期不予重视的。因此，考察马丁·路德对海德格爾各个时期的思想所产生的影响，对于思想史研究进路来说，是一个重要的突破。在研究海德格爾思想发展中路德的贡献的同时，借着学界所公认的海德格爾对于西方思想史中人文领域的影响，也可以论证出马丁·路德在现当代西方思想史中所应被重视的隐含贡献。

在此研究中，应兼顾洛夫乔伊为首的观念史学派理路与其后斯金纳、彼得·戈登（Peter Gordon）（1969-）等人提出的语境主义进路。通过洛夫乔伊的《存在巨链：一个观念

的历史的研究》¹⁸以及学派的研究进路，可以用来梳理海德格尔著作中对路德原著的援引、继承等直接文本证据，分析二人思想体系之间的传承。在观念史学派的理路中，应注重其时期代表绝对真理的“神圣语词”，在此基础上构建“充裕、连续、渐进”¹⁹的理论综合体系。而通过斯金纳、戈登等人的语境建构的进路，兼顾原著的基础上，将进一步还原海德格尔的成长背景、信仰经历和时代处境等具体历史处境的史实²⁰。目前张汝伦与高瑞泉²¹等国内学者，以及思想史研究权威葛兆光教授的《思想史的写法》等系列著作中，也是倡导着同样的理路²²。

相关研究方法中，将选用海德格尔相关文献中的原文和汉语翻译成果的史料；并从与海德格尔和路德相关的历史学、哲学、神学、心理学、科学哲学、政治哲学的著作文本入手。在研究史料的选取中，哲学和神学文献部分涉及到海德格尔的《存在与时间》²³、《早期著作》²⁴、《宗教生活现象学》²⁵等核心原著文献。海德格尔相关的个人书信、回忆、自述、报告、论文、诗歌等第一手文献有：《海德格尔与妻书》²⁶、《讲话与生平证词》²⁷、《演讲与论文集》等。在这些史料中，可以全方位还原海德格尔的思想维度与个人生存维度。

从上述思想史视域和相关史料的切入点中，可以从海德格尔生平不同时期与影响分为五个章节。

研究的第一章将从海德格尔青少年时期与其时代思想处境着手（1889-1914），选用其晚年回忆以及青少年时期的个人书信、成长环境等相关史料，梳理海德格尔成长环境、时代背景、个人经历。从而可以通过明确的文本证据得出结论：在海德格尔个人求学和信仰成长经历中，通过路德原著思想的阅读和学习，对认识到天主教体系里的局限以及脱离天主教起到的核心作用。

第二章将论述海德格尔一战服役到高校入职这段时期的个人信仰与思想的发展（1914-1922）。海德格尔在其博士论文、教资论文的撰写中，已经逐渐表明了其个人思想和信仰立场向着路德的转向。一战前后临近前线与战火的经历以及与路德宗妻子的成

18 Arthur Lovejoy, *The Great Chain of Being: A Study of the History of an Idea*, Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1936.

19 Daniel Wilson, "Lovejoy's The Great Chain of Being after Fifty Years" · JHI, Volume 48, Issue 2, 1987, p. 187-206.

20 Peter E. Gordon, "WHAT IS INTELLECTUAL HISTORY? A FRANKLY PARTISAN INTRODUCTION TO A FREQUENTLY MISUNDERSTOOD FIELD." Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, <http://history.fas.harvard.edu/people/faculty/documents/pgordon-whatisintellhist.pdf>

21 高瑞泉 Gaoruiquan, 《平等观念史论略》 Pingdeng guannianshi lun lue, (上海 Shanghai: 上海人民出版社 Shanghai renmin chubanshe, 2011)。

22 葛兆光 Gezhaoguang, 《思想史的写法——中国思想史论》 Sixiangshi de xiefa—Zhongguo sixiangshi daolun, (上海 Shanghai: 复旦大学出版社 Fudandaxue chubanshe, 2004), 1-30.

23 Martin Heidegger, *Sein und Zeit*, Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 2001.

24 Martin Heidegger, *Frühe Schriften*, Frankfurt: Vittorio Klostermann Verlag, 1972.

25 Martin Heidegger, *Phänomenologie des religiösen des Lebens*, herausgegeben von Matthias Jung und Thomas Regehly, Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1995.

26 Heidegger, 《Mein Liebes Seelchen!》 Briefe Martin Heidegger an seine Frau Elfride 1915-1970, 2005, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt.

27 Martin Heidegger, *Reden und andere Zeugnisse eines Lebensweges 1910-1976*, Frankfurt: Vittorio Klostermann Verlag, 2000.

婚，让海德格尔个人信仰脱离了天主教。同时在海德格尔的高校课堂和讲座的相关史料中，可以明确得出结论：海德格尔在个人信仰方面明确地承认信仰路德新教²⁸（但反对路德宗体制化的宗教体系）；同时海德格尔思想中核心的方法论，即现象学的“存在论解构（拆解）”、“形式指引”，也明确承认了有着对路德思想的继承。

第三章将论述海德格尔成名期的思想和学术活动中蕴含的路德思想理路（1923-1930）。海德格尔在这个时期自己的思想史体系已经彻底成型，并且在课堂和讲座中有着很多从路德思想的进路来对现代性中的理性、科学、哲学进行批判的文本。通过相关史料的分析，可以看出：海德格尔的成名作《存在与时间》和神学文本《现象学与神学》中，核心问题意识、人论、罪论、良知等核心议题，都明确对路德思想有着继承和援引。

第四章将从海德格尔与路德思想之间隐含的矛盾出发，论述二战前后海德格尔成名后逐渐走向与路德完全背离的思想道路（1931-1950）。同时在与纳粹政权保持着高度紧密的思想实践时期（1931-1945）中，对待路德的态度亦转向了忽视与利用。

第五章将从海德格尔前期思想（1914-1935）对于欧陆当代各个人文学科的开创性影响力出发，论述路德通过海德格尔在西方当代各个人文思想流派背后所起到的隐含贡献。不论是法国的现象学转向思潮，还是德国的卡尔·巴特，对他们进行宏观思想史阐释之时，必然要涉及路德思想。综上所述，可以看到，路德思想在现当代欧陆思想史的发展中，依然有着重要贡献，且是不应被忽视的。

四、通过研究马丁·路德对海德格尔的影响所体现出的学术意义与现实意义

在上文提及的研究路德对海德格尔及其之后神学转向的现象学流派时，不光希望得出路德及海德格尔相关的思想史学术意义，而且希望通过论述路德在现当代思想史中的价值，延续近两年上海大学文学院中欧人文研究与交流中心的“马丁·路德与中国第三次启蒙”系列研究，即在看到路德思想被用来解决欧陆思想史问题的同时，从路德思想中探索当下中国思想界的启蒙问题。

在“马丁·路德与第三次启蒙”系列讲座系列丛中，黄保罗教授已经指出，启蒙就是祛魅（*enchantment*），中国的第一次和第二次启蒙运动分别是在1919年和1978年，但他们的主要目的都不是为了寻求真理。相反，它是通过培养民族主义和爱国主义来针对其历史环境。对比中国的启蒙运动和西方的启蒙运动，我们可以很容易地看到它们之间的重大区别。虽然产生了许多声称可以代表真理的理论，但其中少有经得起时间考验的。只有实用主义和功利主义留了下来，进而与民族主义一起，在过去一百年的大部分时间里主导了广泛的中国人文社会领域²⁹。

28 Heidegger, 《Mein Liebes Seelchen!》Briefe Martin Heidegger an seine Frau Elfride 1915-1970, 2005, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 155.

29 黄保罗 Paulos Huang, 《马丁·路德与第三次启蒙丛书之四 马丁·路德芬兰学派与汉语语境的互动》Madinglude yu disanciqimengcongshuzhishi Madinglude fenlanxuepai yu hanyuyujing de hudong [Martin Luther and the Third Enlightenment Series No. 4 The Interaction between Martin Luther's Finnish School and Chinese Contexts], (芬兰 Fenlan: 国学与西学国际学刊杂志社 Guoxue yu xixue guojixuekan zazhishe, 2021) · 1-20页。

汉语学界要想复兴和发展，就必须深刻理解西方思想史的脉络。从本质上讲，第三次启蒙运动所呼吁的核心是寻求真理以照明人心，克服思想的成熟，去追求独立和自由。同时，它旨在帮助人们挣脱权威、传统和制度的枷锁。这是为了让人们能够参与到公共领域，正确地运用他们的理性。它还可以帮助人们规范自己的道路，不过度依赖主观或压制主观。相反，通过论述路德的思想的现当代思想史中的价值，我们可以对“人类中心主义”和“上帝中心”有一个正确的理解，这将使我们能够准确地定义人类的主体性，包括其神圣性和罪恶的倾向。这样一来，我们就能重视理性的各个方面，同时接受理性的活动和局限性。目前关于路德与中国传统不同宗教的对话已经在不同学者和流派中展开³⁰。

因此，通过研究路德对海德格尔思想的影响，可以在黄教授所研究的路德对近现代哲学的影响的基础上，以同样的问题意识来探索路德思想给我们当代社会提供的思想进路。此研究借着海德格尔，将全面展现西方思想史中以路德十架神学思想为视角的全新脉络，以及路德思想在现代性处境中需要被重视的必要性。在宗教改革时期，西方从路德的思想中受益于内在性和主体性的确立。但在其后却否定和背离路德，到了现当代，主体性膨胀也就带来了思想领域的一系列危机。进而，在海德格尔所面对的与路德时期高度相似的时代思想处境之中，从路德神学来批判和回应这个时代问题就显得非常必要。

结语

本文在论述了当代汉语学界对路德研究的局限性以及可以借鉴的西方思想史的研究方法和进路之后，着重探讨了“马丁·路德对海德格尔的影响”的这个问题意识背后的思想史价值。对于马丁·路德对海德格尔的影响的研究，不光体现着路德与海德格尔相关内容的学术价值，更是可以在现有的“马丁·路德与第三次启蒙”系列研究的基础上，继续论述路德思想对于中国当代思想领域中的重要性。此研究方向在论述和展现路德思想对于上述问题的解决和回应的同时，也同样表明，路德的思想在中世纪向近代思想发展中的历史地位，是可以与笛卡尔比肩，且足以承担起汉语学界“第三次启蒙”这份重任的。

因此，在海德格尔以及其后现象学神学转向的思潮中，如果缺少了路德，其思想史脉络将彻底断线且无法给出有效的阐释。同时更重要的，是看到海德格尔同样在面对其现代性时代中思想领域问题的时候，选择了与路德高度一致的解决进路。这说明了路德思想的价值不应只是局限于中世纪的历史思想，其对于解决当下时代的具体问题也是有着高度的借鉴意义的。同时，在哲学领域所关注的各种真理、绝对和超越维度的问题中，海德格尔给出了与路德福音神学高度切合的结论；并且之后以海德格尔为开端的现象学神学转向，更是说明了哲学领域中所追问的真理问题，都可以带回到路德福音神学面前。

30 黄保罗 Paulos Huang, 《马丁·路德与第三次启蒙丛书之四 马丁·路德芬兰学派与汉语语境的互动》Madinglude yu disanciqimengcongshuzhisi Madinglude fenlanxuepai yu hanyuyujing de hudong [Martin Luther and the Third Enlightenment Series No. 4 The Interaction between Martin Luther's Finnish School and Chinese Contexts], (芬兰 Fenlan: 国学与西学国际学刊杂志社 Guoxue yu xixue guojixuekan zazhishe, 2021) · 1-20.

English Title:

Discussion on the Study of Philosophy and Theology in the Perspective of the Intellectual History:

Taking Martin Luther's Influence on Heidegger as an Example

Li Ruixiang

College of Liberal Arts, Shanghai University, Nanchen Rd 333, Baoshan District, Shanghai 200444
E-mail: 409768074@qq.com

Abstract: In the study of the intellectual history in the traditional Chinese academia, the intellectual history is often secondary and indifferent in comparison with the history of politics and revolution. And the limitations brought about by such a bias are very clearly reflected in the traditional Chinese academic circles' perspective and attitude towards the study of Martin Luther. Luther has often been rigidly confined to the realm of peasant revolutionary movements, social history of religion, and church history; the important contribution of his intellect in the development of Western intellectual history and related humanistic fields has often been overlooked. The first two sections of this paper will start from the different schools and methods of research in the intellectual history of in the West, discussing on the one hand the differences between the research paths in the intellectual history in the West and those in pure theology and philosophy, and on the other hand the research methods and paths of the different schools in the intellectual history in the West, in order to illustrate the important contributions of Luther's intellect in the path of the history of ideas. Section three will develop in depth the entry points and innovations of the study of Luther's influence on Heidegger in the context of the history of intellect. Section four will discuss the innovations and breakthroughs in this study in relation to its predecessors through the innovations in Section three. Through this study, the importance of Luther in the development of Western intellectual history can be comprehensively and systematically represented. This study will be linked to the current series of studies on "Martin Luther and the Third Enlightenment" in the Chinese academic circles, calling for Luther's intellect not only not to be neglected, but also to be placed in an important position in the study of the history of Western intellect.

Key words: intellectual history, Martin Luther, Heidegger, the Third Enlightenment

《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, 而圣经则指基督宗教的圣典);

“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 Yu-lan, *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——上海玉佛禅寺觉群慈爱功德会参访团西藏行纪实》 Xinyang zhi lü, 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:

李焯昌 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 Hisotry 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 Xinping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 Xinping, etc.

14、其他 Others:

河北省地方志编纂委员会 Hebei sheng difangzhi bianzuan weiyuanhui [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
Mail Category 邮寄方式	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: _____