

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

No. 6, 2014

国学与西学：国际学刊（半年刊）

GUOXUE YU XIXUE Guoji Xuekan (Bannian kan)

第六期：二零一四年六月

主编及出版总监

黄保罗（芬兰：赫尔辛基大学 / 国学与西学北欧论坛）

网络电子版：www.SinoWesternStudies.com

主 编：黄保罗（芬兰：赫尔辛基大学 / 国学与西学北欧论坛）

副主编：肖清和（中国：上海大学历史系副教授）

执行编辑

包克强（美国：世华中国研究中心 研究员），英语

陈永涛（金陵神学院副教授），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

Jorgensen, 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、北京师范大学哲学及社会学学院院长）

赖品超（香港中文大学文学院副院长、教授）

罗明嘉（芬兰：赫尔辛基大学系统神学系主任、教授）

麦格拉斯（英国伦敦英王学院，神学、宗教与文化中心教授、主任）

南乐山（美国：波士顿大学神学学院前院长、教授）

施福来（挪威：斯塔湾格神学与差传学院教授）

孙向晨（复旦大学哲学学院院长、教授）

田默迪（奥地利维也纳大学哲学博士、澳门圣约瑟大学哲学教授）

王晓朝（浙江大学基督教与跨文化研究中心众人、教授）

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：斯德哥尔摩大学教授）

杨熙楠（香港：汉语基督教文化研究所总监）

杨熙生（北京大学高等人文研究院世界宗教与普世伦理中心主任、教授）

张福贵（吉林大学文学院院长、教授）

钟鸣旦（比利时：皇家科学院院士、天主教鲁汶大学汉学系主任、教授）

张志刚（北京大学宗教文化研究院院长、教授）

钟志邦（新加坡三一神学院前院长）

卓新平（中国社会科学院学部委员、世界宗教研究所所长、中国宗教学院会长、教授）

特约评委（以姓氏拼音为序）

曹剑波（厦门大学哲学系教授）

陈建明（四川大学道教与宗教文化研究所教授、主任）

陈声柏（兰州大学宗教文化研究中心副教授、主任）

樊志辉（黑龙江大学哲学院教授、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、副主任）

游 斌（中央民族大学哲学及宗教学学院教授、副院长）

张先清（厦门大学人类学及民族学系教授、主任）

赵 杰（山东大学哲学及宗教学系教授）

赵 林（武汉大学欧美宗教文化研究所教授、所长）

朱东华（清华大学哲学系副教授）

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

本刊已被收入芬兰艺术 & 人文学索引（芬兰国家图书馆）。

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

No. 6: June 2014

Editor-in-chief and Publishing Supervisor

Paulos HUANG (University of Helsinki/Nordic Forum of Sino-Western Studies, Finland)

Electronic Version (Online): www.SinoWesternStudies.com

Editor-in-chief: **Paulos HUANG** (Adjunct Professor, Ph.D., Th.D., University of Helsinki, Finland)

Vice-editor-in-chief: **XIAO Qinghe** (Associate Professor, Ph.D., Shanghai University, China)

Excutive Editors

BARWICK, John (Researcher, Ph.D., Global China Center, Virginia, 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)

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

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

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

FÄLLMAN, Fredrik (Researcher, Dept. of East Asian Studies, Stockholm University, Stockholm, 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 and Sociology, Beijing Normal University, Beijing, China)

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

LAITINEN, Kauko (Previous Director of Confucius Institute in the University of Helsinki /

Director & Professor, Finnish Institute, Tokyo, Japan)

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

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

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

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

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

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

WANG Xiaochao (Prof. & Director, Center for Christianity and Cross-Cultural Studies, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, 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, Pekin University, Beijing, China)

ZHUO Xinping (Prof. & Director, 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)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Calligraphy of journal title by Prof. **LIU Dajun** (Chairman of the Chinese Yiching Association, Shandong University). Cover design is by **Joonatan Anming HUANG**.

The logo of journal is taken from a Han Dynasty brick carving. It is a flying dragon with one head, two wings, four feet and one tail; and it symbolizes the reality of Chinese thinking system. The Journal is indexed in Finnish Arts & Humanities Index (Finnish National Library).

目 录 Contents

卷首语 From the Editor's Desk*

黄保罗 Paulos HUANG	饶恕和解与认罪忏悔概念的缺乏..... 1 The Lack of Conceptions of Forgiveness/Reconciliation and of Confessing/ Repentance 4
---------------------	---

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

曹剑波 CAO Jianbo	反思《论确实性》中枢轴命题理论对宗教怀疑主义的批判..... 3 Reflecting the Theory of Hinge Propositions of On Certainty Criticizing Religious Skepticism 11
CHENG Jing 成 静	Is There a God?--an Examination of Anselm's Ontological Proof of God's Existence with Kant's Refutation 13 存在一位神吗? ——对安瑟伦神存在的本体论证明及康德的批驳的考察..... 24

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

卓新平 ZHUO Xinping	基督教在促进中美关系改善及中华文化发展上的作用..... 27 The Function of Christianity in Promoting the Improvement of Sino- American Relationship and in Developing Chinese Culture 31
SUN Shangyang HAN Qi 孙尚扬、韩琪	Church Choice of University Student Christians in Beijing and Their Religious Commitment 33 对北京市大学生基督徒的教会选择及其宗教委身调查分析..... 49

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

王 旭 WANG Xu	海德格尔论“再临时刻”的存在论意义..... 53 Heidegger on the Existential Meaning of the Kairos of Parousia ... 61
徐雪梅 XU Xuemei	大义灭亲为公义 ——《诗篇》82 篇“神”与“众神”关系透析 63 Trial of the gods of death for Righteousness —An Analysis of the Relationship between God and the gods in Psalm 82 75

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

霍克功	试论中国特色基督教·····	79
HUO Kegong	Discussing on Chinese Characteristics on Chinese Christianity ···	89
咸娟娟	传教、医疗与政治：博德恩医院的创建与西北基督教传播研究 ·····	91
XIAN Juanjuan	Missionary, Medicine and Politics: on Creation of the Borden Memorial Hospital and Research of Northwest Christian Propagation ·····	99

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

张 介	和谐社会 - 经济人与德兰修女 ·····	103
Eric Chieh CHANG	A Harmonious Society – Economic Men versus Mother Teresa ···	107
C. D. HANCOCK	The seven-fold wisdom of love A Comparative Confucian-Christian reading of 1 Corinthians 13 ·····	109
汉科克	爱的七重智慧：对《歌林多前书》十三章的儒基比较性阅读·····	117

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

肖清和、王丹丹	中国天主教贞女研究新论：评《基督的新娘：中国天主教贞女研究》·····	121
XIAO & WANG	New Research on Catholic Virgins in China: Bookreview on Kang Zhijie's <i>Jidu de Xinniang: Zhongguo Tianzhujiao zhennv yanjiu xinlun</i> [Bride of the Christ : The new Research on the Chinese Catholic Virgins] ·····	126

The Editorial Committee News for Abraham Chen's Doctoral Public Defense on T.C. Chao's Christology of IJOFSWS

本刊编辑部	陈永涛关于赵紫辰基督论的博士论文答辩通讯·····	129
-------	---------------------------	-----

The Editorial Committee A Report on Christian Forum of Peace and Reconciliation in Northeast Asia of IJOFSWS

本刊编辑部	东北亚和平与和好基督教论坛简讯·····	133
-------	----------------------	-----

投稿须知 Notes for Contributors ·····	135
注释体例及要求 Footnote Format and Requirements ·····	139

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

卷首语 From the Editor's Desk

饶恕和解与认罪忏悔概念的缺乏

黄保罗

(吉林大学匡亚明特聘讲座教授, 吉林 长春, 130012)

在 2013 年 11 月浙江大学举办的“基督宗教与中华民族的复兴梦想：基督宗教在中华文化建设中的地位和作用学术研讨会”之神仙会上，我作为特约嘉宾所作的主旨发言是“基督教对中国文化建设的战略性意义”。其中我特别强调，清理苦毒记忆与饶恕，对于个人的心理健康及整个民族的文化建设都具有的重要意义。所谓苦毒(Bitterness)，表示个人或民族因所受到(或自以为受到)的不公平待遇而产生的委屈和消极情绪所引起的伤害、痛苦与毒性影响。我们不仅从历史中而且更在急剧变化的现实中，都能看到许多的个人心理(记恨与委屈)与民族历史(近代以来的屈辱记忆)的苦毒。处理的方式可以很多，如：1) 在沉默中灭亡(被迫的忍耐导致自戕)；2) 在沉默中爆发(以暴力来报复)；3) AQ 精神(自我欺骗)；4) 将委屈转化为病态的动力而发愤图强(以民族情与强国梦为动力的病态发展，如，以鸦片战争、八国联军、不平等条约、被日本侵略等苦毒记忆为动力，在物质上虽然发展了，但心理、精神和价值观念却带有金钱主义、冲突论、后殖民主义论、新左、极左及社会达尔文主义等特点)；而我主张的选择则是：5) 积极地饶恕甚至和解。当时，我的发言引起了与会者的积极讨论，但多人觉得：虽好，却难以实现。

今(2014)年4月，我到韩国参加了由美国普度大学主办的“The Christian Forum for Peace and Reconciliation in Northeast Asia”(东北亚和平与和解基督教论坛)，有机会面对面地与来自中国大陆、香港、美国、韩国和日本的基督徒学者及教会领袖探讨和平与和解的问题。面对中日矛盾、韩日矛盾、中美矛盾、中韩矛盾、韩国与朝鲜矛盾、中国大陆与台湾关系、及各个国家与地区的内部冲突与仇恨等等，切身地感受到，东北亚现在既是经济政治上最活跃的地区，但同时也像一个炸药桶一样充满危险。特别是，当我看到一位日本的86岁高龄的老牧师为日本二战罪行的一次又一次道歉、看到来自长崎的一个受二战时核辐射影响之人的后代、几个深受福岛核泄露事故影响的基督徒、以及内心充满记恨苦毒的各个国家的人们，我实在感到和平与和解的重要。但这里遇到的核心是：真相、认罪、忏悔、饶恕与和解的关系到底是什么？

就基督教的信仰而言，认罪忏悔是一个人接受和相信基督并因此罪蒙赦免的前提，因为前者虽不是后者的充分条件，却似乎是必要条件。也就是说，只有当你认罪、忏悔、相信基督，基督才会饶恕与赦免你的罪。从经验的层面而言，这是每个基督徒的生活和生命之经历。这是大部分的华人基督徒都接受和遵循的教义。可是，这种教义带有严重的靠行为得救的律法主义倾向，即认罪、忏悔和相信，似乎都是人要做出来的“行为”。如此以来，就与基督新教所强调的“因信称义”和“唯独恩典”的教义相矛盾了。

耶稣基督说：“是我拣选了你们，不是你们拣选了我。”恩典在前，接受、相信与悔改在后，这是基督新教特别是马丁路德所强调的恩典与爱的次序，完全不同于世人强调的“犯罪者受惩罚、先认罪悔改、

然后才有可能得到饶恕”的公义次序。

但是，在“犯罪—惩罚—报复 / 犯罪—重新惩罚”的无止境循环链条中，永远是“恨换来恨”。只有在某个环节上，一个受害者愿意放弃为自己寻求公义，愿意甘心牺牲自己的利益而采取饶恕而不是惩罚与报复的方式，主动地改变“以恶制恶”的范式，代之以新的“爱仇敌”的范式，上述的恶性循环链条才可能被打破。耶稣基督做的就是这件事情。因此，一个人之所以能够“认罪、忏悔、相信和接受”耶稣基督，都是因为上帝已经先设定了耶稣基督为人类的死亡和复活、并且把“信”这个种子作为礼物赠送给了人们，借助圣灵的帮助并常常通过人的被动反应，一个人才可能有“认罪、忏悔、相信和接受（基督）”的经历；就此意义而言，得救的前提并非人的“行为”，而是上帝的恩典与拣选；这带有人无法完全理解的神秘主义特点。这是基督教文化的根基与本质。只有理解了这个问题之后，我们才可能来谈论饶恕和解与认罪忏悔的是否可能以及应该如何进行等问题。

就我对东北亚地区的观察，以中日关系为例，我发现部分中国人仇恨日本人的主要原因，是部分日本人不认罪忏悔，并且否定二战时的罪行真相，因此，中国人难以饶恕日本并与之和解。这里我们中国人遵行的是“公义”的原则，是无可厚非的。那么，部分日本人为什么不承认二战时的犯罪真相而认罪忏悔呢？一则可能他们从认识论的视角而言，根本不认为自己错了，自以为义，认为“举世皆浊，唯我独清；举世皆醉，唯我独醒”，比如有人认为战争没有是非而只有胜负，根本不存在战争是否正义的问题，所以就不认罪。二则有人可能从弱肉强食的社会达尔文主义的视角出发，认为日本只是败给了美国而不是中国，因此，日本只向美国臣服，而不愿意向中国臣服和道歉、认罪与忏悔。三则有人可能从实用主义的视角而言，担心与害怕：若认罪与忏悔，可能会在道义与实际生活中陷入被中国永远谴责与惩罚的境地，故而即使知道自己错了，也不愿意承认。这三种自以为义的认识论、社会达尔文主义的价值观与实用主义的本质在于没有“恩典”的概念，既缺乏对“认罪忏悔”的认识而去乞求他人给予恩典，又缺乏对“饶恕和解”的认识而愿意主动给予他人以恩典。

在一个缺乏绝对的外在超越的东北亚文化圈里，儒家的自以为义的乐观人性主义，不仅在认识论上使得真理无法被纯洁地保持在形而上之域，常被俗人侵扰，而且在实践论上很容易制造出许多虚伪的君子与圣人，既不承认自己有罪，又对他人缺乏饶恕与和解。因此，犯罪者一方面在无意识的层面中不认罪而自以为义，另一方面又在有意识的故意层面中不敢认罪而深怕被惩罚。同样，受害者一方面在有意识的层面中抓住对方的罪恶而不愿饶恕与和解，另一方面又在无意识的层面中不知道自己也是个罪人。

区分 *Coram Deo*（人与上帝的关系）与 *Coram Mundo*（人在世界里的人与人之间的关系）是马丁路德所特别强调的。在人与上帝的关系中，人是永远无法通过自己的行为而恢复与上帝和解的，只有依靠上帝的爱、恩典、救恩，即耶稣基督在十字架上的死而复活，将一种和解的美好关系作为礼物赐给人，而人只能通过“信”来被动地接受。在世界上人与人的关系中，依靠“种豆得豆、种瓜得瓜”的行为轨迹，是真实的存在，但却是痛苦的存在，需要借助从前一种人与上帝关系中所获得的圣爱（*agape*）力量，来改变已经畅行的规则，从而才在不可能中找到可能、在绝望中找到希望。儒家在世界的人与人关系中，有许多重要而美好的论述；但缺乏明确地人与上帝关系的论述，而这正是基督教与儒家在饶恕等概念上的主要特色与差异。

因此，在 2014 年 5 月的第三届尼山论坛中，我作了“儒家与基督教中的饶恕概念”，来试图做类似上述的探讨，以期走向全球化世界中担任领袖角色的中国文化提供一个参考的视角。我强调的核心是，在东北亚儒家文化圈中，缺乏对饶恕和解与认罪忏悔概念的认识。但是，5 月 20 日聆听了第三届尼山世界闻名论坛的第一场、由尼山论坛副主席、凤凰卫视董事局主席 / 行政总裁刘长乐主持的、由尼山论坛主席、山东大学儒学高等研究院院长许嘉璐和美国的地缘政治学家威廉·恩道尔（William Engdahl）参与的明湖高端对话“信任与伦理：文明对话的共同责任”。我意识到，论坛所邀请的这位大师，不仅无法为深陷自以为义的儒家提供参考，而且把自己的理性和自以为义当作了批判文艺复兴和启蒙运动以

来的种种弊端的唯一工具。对话中特别强调对“爱”的追求，却在笔者提问之前根本没有触及犹太基督教传统的“圣爱”概念；对话中特别强调对“假神”、强权和邪恶手段的反对，甚至使用了“愚蠢”一词来称呼比尔盖茨等世界富人，但是却没有提及基督教的“原罪”概念；对话中特别反对文艺复兴和启蒙运动以来的世俗主义和物质主义，大力强调文化的民族性传统并对中国的文化复兴加以赞扬，却没有真正提及超越的上帝。这种解构性的以理性为根基而抛弃上帝的人文主义批评，其本质是以一种解构的自以为义去批判另一种久已存在的自以为义，完全缺乏超越的绝对标准，除去引起国人的民粹激情以外，可能会让批西亲中的恩道尔大师成为部分人心中的“新神”；但这并没有给世界与中国带来认罪、饶恕或和解，在迎合部分儒家人士的心理之外，这位大师并没有跳出理性至上的盲目乐观主义；当他只使用理性作为批判的工具时，他就在不知不觉中将自己视为“聪明的”义人和“假神”，而这将使他不久即会成为另一批人解构的对象，重新陷入与他所批判的对象相同的范式之中。

由于对超越、原罪与圣爱的认识缺乏，“认罪”与“忏悔”就不会被理解为刚强与胜利，而是被误解为软弱和失败。“饶恕”与“和解”不仅也被误解，而且二者还被错误地等同起来，其实，饶恕主要是放弃“以牙还牙、以血还血”的野蛮，主要是主动让受害者摆脱苦毒；而“和解”则比饶恕更进一步，表示了和好如初的意义。两个无法和解的人与民族，也应该彼此饶恕，否则，就会生活在苦毒和仇恨之中，若能更进一步达成和解，则更是进了一层楼。

本期“人学、神学与国学”栏目，收录了厦门大学曹剑波教授的“反思《论确实性》中枢轴命题理论对宗教怀疑主义的批判”，与复旦大学哲学院成静博士的“存在一位神吗？——对安瑟伦神存在的本体论证明及康德的批驳的考察”；曹教授是国内知识论研究的专家，他的这篇文章体现了其系列研究中的最新成果。成博士学成于美国，体现了国内近年来日益加增的年轻神学家研究的成果。“实践神学与中西教会和社会”栏目收录了卓新平教授的“基督教在促进中美关系改善及中华文化发展上的作用”，与孙尚扬博士和韩琪博士的“对北京市大学生基督徒的教会选择及其宗教委身调查分析”。卓教授是中国宗教学界的领军人物，是中国社会科学院世界宗教所所长与中国宗教学院院长，及中国全国人民代表大会的常务委员，其论文不仅有重大理论意义而且在实践上非常切合中国的现实。孙尚扬博士是北京大学哲学与宗教学系的教授，韩琪博士是中国社会科学院的助理研究员。他们的这篇文章是对北京市大学生宗教信仰的分析，特别研究了大学生基督徒的教诲选择和宗教委身，对于读者了解当代北京的情况具有权威价值。“中西经典与圣经”收录了王旭博士候选人的“海德格尔论‘再临时刻’的存在论意义”与宁波大学徐雪梅教授的“大义灭亲为公义——《诗篇》82篇‘神’与‘众神’关系透析”。王博士候选人毕业于清华大学，现在德国攻读博士学位，其作有重要哲学和神学意义，探讨的是《圣经》中的一个具体问题。徐教授学成于香港中文大学，是过内少有的《旧约》与希伯来经典专家，其作不仅体现其李炽昌学派的特点，也体现了中国大学的《圣经》研究状况。“教会历史与中西社会”栏目收录了霍克功博士的“试论中国特色基督教”与咸娟娟的“传教、医疗与政治：博德恩医院的创建与西北基督教传播研究”。霍博士是宗教文化出版社的编审，在国家的宗教管理部门工作，其作不仅体现了一个学者在理解国家宗教政策的语境中对中国基督教特色的反思，而且从教会历史的视角入手、对基督教入华的早期历史提供了一些考古的新文献，其解读与诠释，可能会引起学界的不同意见，但这里触及了一个非常重要而有意思的问题。咸女士在西北地区的兰州研读，其作对于我们认识西北地区的教会历史有重要的补白作用。“比较宗教文化研究”栏目收录了张介教授的“和谐社会 - 经济人与德兰修女”与英国汉科克博士的“爱的七重智慧：对《歌林多前书》十三章的儒基比较性阅读”。张教授是香港大学商学院的院长，地位与社会影响都很重大，在世俗主义与商业泛滥的当今世界，作为这个角色的基督徒学者，探讨了经济人与德兰修女在和谐社会中的意义，其参考意义是不同于一般学者的论述与视角的。牛津的汉科克博士则是促进基督教与亚洲交流的重要学者，其作是他研究儒家与基督教对比的系列成果之一，谈论了核心的“爱”之概念。“书评与通讯”栏目收录了本刊副主编肖清和教授与其弟子王丹丹撰写的述评“中国天主教贞女

研究新论：评《基督的新娘：中国天主教贞女研究》，本刊编辑部提供的“陈永涛关于赵紫辰基督论的
博士论文答辩通讯”和“东北亚和平与和好基督教论坛”简讯。

2014 年 5 月于赫尔辛基与济南第三届尼山世界文明论坛

English Title:

The Lack of Conceptions of Forgiveness/Reconciliation and of Confessing/Repentance.

Paulos HUANG

Ph. D. & Th. D. ,University of Helsinki; Post-doctor, Tokyo University

Kuang Yaming Distinguished Chair-Professor, Jilin University, 130012 Changchun, Jilin, China

Editor-in-chief,International Journal of Sino-Western Studies

Adjunct-Professor,University of Helsinki

Email: paulos.z.huang@ gmail com

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

反思《论确实性》中枢轴命题理论对宗教怀疑主义的批判

曹剑波

(厦门大学哲学系教授；厦门大学知识论与认知科学研究中心研究员；福建厦门 361005)

提要：由于枢轴命题是不会出错的逻辑命题或语法命题，由于怀疑枢轴命题没有合理的理由，由于枢轴命题是行动的基础，是思想的基础，是怀疑的基础，由于怀疑枢轴命题是发疯或修辞的标志，因此枢轴命题是不可怀疑的。反怀疑主义者把“上帝存在”看作是枢轴命题，提出了两种反驳宗教怀疑主义的策略。用枢轴命题理论批判宗教怀疑主义，实质是用外在主义批判内在主义。由于它们的理论承诺不同，因此是一种不成功的批判。在承诺内在主义的知识理论的前提下，宗教信念的捍卫者应该重新审视已有的方式，另谋他路。

关键词：枢轴命题；维特根斯坦；不可怀疑性；宗教怀疑主义

作者：曹剑波，厦门大学哲学系教授；厦门大学知识论与认知科学研究中心研究员；福建厦门 361005。电子邮件：jbciao@xmu.edu.cn。电话：139-5000-1478。

从《逻辑哲学论》对唯我论的批评，到《哲学研究》对遵循游戏规则的强调，到《论确实性》中对枢轴命题理论的提出，都可看作是维特根斯坦对怀疑主义的回应，其思想都可用来反驳宗教怀疑主义。在维特根斯坦生命的最后一年半写的《论确实性》这本哲学笔记初稿，虽然不如经过精心酝酿的《逻辑哲学论》那样简练，也不如经过多年深思熟虑的《哲学研究》那样系统，而且其中有不少不够明确、前后重复，甚至不一致的地方，尽管如此，这本笔记却代表了维特根斯坦哲学生涯中所取得的杰出成果。维特根斯坦自己也认为，这本笔记是他哲学研究状态最佳时的产物，他说：“我突然发现自己的智力达到了研究哲学的最佳状态，我曾经绝对地确信我永远不能再研究哲学了。两年多来，幕帘第一次在我的头脑中掀起来。”^[1] 细心地研究，我们便可以发现在《论确实性》中，到处显现着光彩夺目的思想火花，其中用枢轴命题理论对怀疑主义的独特批判对我们最富启示。本文以《论确实性》中的枢轴命题理论为研究对象，系统研究枢轴命题理论中的反怀疑主义的思想，并探讨它对宗教怀疑主义的批判及其评价。

一、枢轴命题是不能合理怀疑的

在《论确实性》中，维特根斯坦用比喻的方法介绍了一类特殊的命题，“某些命题……好像……赖

基金项目：中央高校基本科研业务费专项资金资助项目《实验哲学》(2012221003)；教育部新世纪优秀人才支持计划《实验知识论》(NCET-110290)；福建省教育科学“十二五”规划常规课题重点项目《道德教育的实验哲学研究》(FJCGZZ12-003)。

[1] James Bogen, Wittgenstein and Skepticism, Philosophical Review 1974 (83 : 3):364.

以转动的枢轴” (§341)^[2]，这类命题就是“枢轴命题”。枢轴命题的作用与特征在《论确实性》中被反复地阐述，它们是“世界图景”，是“用来分辨真伪的传统背景” (§94)，构成了我们思想的“框架” (§211)，形成了“语言游戏的不可动摇的基础” (§403)。这类命题包括“我有两只手”、“我有大脑”、“我从未到过月球”、“地球早已存在”、“我知道我的名字”等。其特征概括如下：

[1] 对所有理智的人来说，枢轴命题是无疑的。

[2] 怀疑枢轴命题不是一个错误而是一种精神失常。

[3] 枢轴命题是偶然地通过接受受托的人造物而被继承的，而不是凭借它们的论证的真理而被继承的。

[4] 它们的意义没有经验命题清楚。

[5] 它们超越怀疑和确证。^[3]

枢轴命题是在生活习惯中继承下来的，而不是凭借论证而获得的，是不可证明的，具有不可确证性；枢轴命题是所有有理智的人都认可的，是不能被合理怀疑的，具有不可怀疑性。由于本文主旨的关系，这里仅谈枢轴命题的不可怀疑性。

维特根斯坦认为，枢轴命题是不可怀疑的，他说：“有理智的人不抱有某些怀疑。” (§220)“某些命题不容怀疑，好像就是这些问题和怀疑赖以转动的枢轴” (§341)。枢轴命题就是一些在日常生活中经过了实践的反复证明，绝对确实的，不会出错的命题，它们是任何一个“有理智的人”都持有的 (§252, 254)，是公认的、根本性的、为我们大多数人所深信不疑的，是人们进行怀疑游戏的基础，是构成知识体系的出发点。他举例说，“我从未到过月球”是不可怀疑的，“我不可能怀疑我从未到过月球。” (§222)“作为一个有理智的人，我对此（即‘我从未到过月球’——引者注）不能有任何怀疑。” (§219) 同样，不能询问“球在过去 100 年间是否存在” (§138)，不能怀疑“我现在住在英国” (§420) 等枢轴命题。为什么枢轴命题是不能合理怀疑，对怀疑具有免疫力呢？维特根斯坦的理由有：

1. 枢轴命题是逻辑命题或语法命题，是不会出错的

维特根斯坦认为，枢轴命题是“逻辑命题” (§51) 或“语法命题” (§§57-58)，是“在我们的经验命题体系中完成特殊逻辑任务的命题” (§136)；它们是绝对确实的，具有规则、规范的特征，“描述这幅世界图景的命题也许是一种神话的一部分，其功用类似于一种游戏的规则” (§95)；它服务于纯粹的语法作用，用以表明某些词是如何使用的，不能起事实陈述的作用；它们是流传下来的，我们不得不接受的世界图景；它们构成了命题体系、命题结构 (§102)；它们是我们的文化体系的基本部分，在认知活动中超越了认知评价，是认知评价的逻辑的一部分，是每一个有理智的人都深信不疑的。

在日常生活中，枢轴命题是绝对确实的、不会出错的，其“真实性属于我们的参照系” (§83)。以“我知道我的名字”为例，维特根斯坦写道：“我也许会问：‘关于我名叫 L. W.（路德维希·维特根斯坦的缩写——引者注）这件事，我怎么可能弄错呢？’我可以说：‘我看不出这怎么会是可能的。’” (§660)“我完全明确地知道我的名字。” (§577) 在枢轴命题上出错是不可想象的，错误终止于枢轴命题。以“我有两只手”为例，“因为这句话并不正确，即在从行星过渡到我自己的手时，错误的可能性越来越小。不是的，在某一点上这句话已经变得不可想象了。” (§54) 对某人来说，认识到“有两只手”不是他“知道”

[2] [奥] 路德维希·维特根斯坦 *Weitegensitan* (Ludwig Wittgenstein) 著，张金言 Zhang Jinyan 译：《论确实性》*Lun queshixing* [On Certainty]，（桂林 Guilin：广西师范大学出版社 Guangxi shifan daxue chubanshe 2002 年版），节 341。遵循学界引文惯例，对维特根斯坦 (Ludwig Wittgenstein) 《论确实性》(On Certainty) 一书中的引文都是标节数，而非页码，以下引文仅标节数。所有引文都有参考 Ludwig Wittgenstein, *On Certainty*, D.Paul & G.E.M. Anscombe (trans.), G.E.M. Anscombe & G.H. von Wright (eds.) (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1969)。

[3] Earl Stanley, 《上帝与枢轴命题》*Shangdi yu shuzhou mingti* [God and Hinge Proposition], (*Pre-Proceedings of the 26th International Wittgenstein Symposium*. Austrian Ludwig Wittgenstein Society, 2003), 124.

一个不可修正的信念，而是他“占有”一个不可修正的信念，没有理由怀疑“我知道我有两只手”。说在枢轴命题上弄错了，是“愚蠢的胡说”。以“我从未登上过月球”为例：

如果我说“我从未登上过月球——但是我可能弄错了”，那就是愚蠢的胡说。

因为即使那种认为我也许可能在睡梦中通过不明手段被送上月球的想法也不会给我任何权利说这里有可能出现错误。如果我这样做，我就是不会玩这种游戏。（§662）

在枢轴命题上，我们不会出错，是由“错误”和“真理”概念在我们生活中的作用决定的（§138），枢轴命题根植于我们的语言游戏中，根植于我们的生活形式中，生活中我们就是这样行事的。枢轴命题的不可错性与出自内心深处的确信相联，它是“一个没有理由的行动方式”（§110），是“一种生活方式”，“处于合理根据和没有合理根据之外”，是“某种动物性的东西”（§§358-359）。我们不怀疑枢轴命题在我们的生活形式中有其根源，生活中我们就是这样的，“我们不怀疑所有这些事实（即枢轴命题所描述的事实——引者注）只是我们的判断方式，因而也就是我们的行为方式。”（§232）不怀疑枢轴命题“是我做事的方式”（§148）。

2. 怀疑需要理由，怀疑枢轴命题没有合理的理由

维特根斯坦认为，怀疑需要有理由，需要有事实的根据，“难道人们进行怀疑就不需要提供理由吗？”（§122）“因此合理的怀疑必须有理由吗？我们也许可以说：‘有理性的人相信这一点。’”（§323）然而，怀疑枢轴命题却没有理由。以“我有大脑”、“地球早已存在”这些枢轴命题为例，如果有人怀疑这些命题，那么我们说他怀疑的理由，因为任何事实都支持这些说法，没有任何事实反对它们（§4，119），“不管我向什么地方看，我也找不到怀疑的理由。”（§123）“如果有人怀疑地球在100年前是否存在，我不理解他是由于这个原因：我不知道这个人认为什么仍可作为证据，什么不能作为证据。”（§231）这表明，枢轴命题具有最高的确实性，不可能找到有更高确实性的证据对它们进行怀疑。如果我们对起框架作用的枢轴命题怀疑，那么就没有“可以确信的判断了”（§490），那么包括我们藉以断言枢轴命题是可疑的那个命题，甚至连语词的意义在内的一切都是值得怀疑的，这会使一切“陷入一片混乱”（§613），会使一切“陷入矛盾”，失去“判断的基础”（§614）。例如，“如果想怀疑地球在我出生以前很久就已存在，我就不得不怀疑我所坚信的一切事情。”（§234）因此，怀疑枢轴命题会取消了怀疑的逻辑基础，会取消了怀疑本身。我们不怀疑枢轴命题并不是因为我们的怀疑精神不够，而是因为从逻辑上讲它们就是不可怀疑的。

在维特根斯坦看来，怀疑主义对枢轴命题的怀疑要不以反事实为理由，要不以含糊的“可能出错”为理由，要不以想象的可能为理由，这些理由都是不合理的。首先，怀疑主义者以反事实的理由为理由怀疑“我有大脑”是不合法的。因为一切事实都支持“我有大脑”，没有一个事实反驳它，若以“我的头骨在做手术时竟然被发现其中空无一物”这种反事实的可能作为怀疑“我有大脑”的理由就是一种不合理的怀疑（§4）。其次，怀疑主义者以“可能出错”作为理由也是不正当的，“如果有人认为我们的所有计算都是不确实的，并且我们不能信赖其中任何一次计算（通过说错误总是可能的来为自己辩解），那么我们也许会说他是疯了。”（§217）“当如果没有证据可以信赖，因而不能信赖目前的证据时，说‘也许我们弄错了’是没有用的。”（§302）再次，怀疑主义者以想象的理由如做梦假设、恶魔假设、缸中之脑假设或异常处境（如处于催眠、麻醉、酒醉或精神错乱状态等）假设作为怀疑的理由也是不恰当的。维特根斯坦举例说，在辩论时，如果怀疑主义者提出服麻醉药或做梦的质疑，那是非常可笑的，这表明他们正陷于无计可施，胡言乱语的境地了。他说：

“但是即使在这些事例上我不可能弄错，难道我不可能受了麻醉药的作用吗？”如果我受了麻醉药的作用，如果麻醉药已经使我丧失意识，那么我现在就不能真正进行谈话和思维。我不可能真正认为我此刻正在做梦。某个人做着梦说“我在做梦”，尽管他这时说话声可以听得见，却并不比他当真下雨时在梦中说“天在下雨”来得正确。即使他的梦的确与雨声有关。（§676）

当笛卡尔主义者争论说，我可能在做梦时，这个争论是无意义的，因为“如果我在做梦，那么这个说法也是梦想中的东西，实际上这些字有意义也是梦想中的东西。” (§383)

3. 枢轴命题是行动的基础、思想的基础，因而也是怀疑的基础，是不能怀疑的

枢轴命题是“用来分辨真伪的传统背景” (§94)，是“一切探讨和断言的基础” (§162)，是“行动的基础” (§411, 414)，是“思想的河床” (§97)，是“思想的框架” (§211)，是“思想的基础” (§411)，是“一切问题和一切思想的基础” (§415)，因此，也是怀疑的基础。纽曼认为：“没有对没有直觉、没有论证却是独立自主的真理的接受，我们既不能思考，也不能行动。”^[4] 维特根斯坦说：“把这些事情（即枢轴命题所描述的事情——引者注）看做绝对稳固的东西是我们进行怀疑和探索的方法的一部分。” (§151) “我们所提的问题和我们的怀疑依靠于这一事实，即某些命题不容怀疑，好像就是这些问题和怀疑赖以转动的枢轴。” (§341) “某些事情事实上是不受怀疑的，这一点属于我们科学研究的逻辑。” (§342)

维特根斯坦认为，怀疑必须预先假定有不受怀疑的东西，必须预设枢轴命题，“怀疑这种游戏本身就预先假定了确实性” (§115)。维特根斯坦举例说，有个学生不愿接受老师的任何解释，不断用他对事物的存在、语词的意义的怀疑来打断老师。老师无法回答，只好对他说：“不要打断我，照我讲给你的去做。直到现在你的疑问没有一点意义。” (§310) 在维特根斯坦看来，这位老师的要求完全正当，因为在学生还没有学会怎样提问，没有学会正在教给他们的游戏前，进行怀疑是没有意义的、空洞的、不合理的 (§312, 315)。这位学生的这种怀疑不是正常语言游戏中的怀疑，我们也不会选择这种怀疑的游戏 (§317)。不怀疑枢轴命题是学习正确的怀疑游戏的前提，“孩子通过相信成年人来学会懂得一些事情。怀疑出现在信念之后。” (§160) 如果一个有理性的人怀疑“地球在他出生以前就已经存在很久”等，那么，不管“怀疑”在这里是什么意思，他都学不会怀疑这种游戏。 (§327-329)

以“我有两只手”为例，在维特根斯坦看来，人们不能合理地怀疑“我有两只手”，因为如果要怀疑“我有两只手”，那就必须理解“我有两只手”的意思是什么，而这不可避免地涉及到“手”这个语词的意义 (§306)。在日常的语言游戏中，只要懂得“手”这一语词的意义，“我有两只手”就不会成为问题，它正是我所知道的东西，“如果你什么事实也不确知，那么你也就不能确知你所用的词的意义。” (§114) 如果有人怀疑日常的语言游戏中预先假设的“手”这个语词的意义，那么他就会“废弃”这种语言游戏，而这也排除了对“我有两只手”这个命题的怀疑。换言之，如果不怀疑“手”一词意味着什么，那么在日常语境下，他也就不能怀疑“我有两只手” (§370)。

4. 怀疑枢轴命题是发疯或修辞的标志

由于枢轴命题是不会出错的逻辑命题或语法命题，由于怀疑枢轴命题没有合理的理由，由于枢轴命题是行动的基础，是思想的基础，也是怀疑的基础，因此，如果某人怀疑枢轴命题，那么严格地说不能批评他出了错，而只能说是他精神错乱或者在搞笑，因为错误是可以用来理由来说明的，但没有理由解释人们为何要怀疑枢轴命题，因为怀疑枢轴命题会导致不一致和荒谬。人们可以对心智健全的、严肃的和有理智的人相信的许多命题提出怀疑，同样也可以怀疑作为怀疑基础的基本信念，但怀疑最终会结束于怀疑自己在怀疑这种游戏。怀疑自己在怀疑这种游戏只有疯子会去玩，只有为了引出笑料的喜剧演员会去玩，或者只有探求理智的限度的哲学家会去玩。

对枢轴命题进行怀疑，这是发疯的标志，而不是出错的标志^[5]，除非疯了，人们是不会怀疑或弄错枢轴命题的。维特根斯坦举例说，在他定居在英国时，如果有一些人走进他的房间，一致地宣称他现

[4] John Henry Newman,《借助一种同意语法的短论》*Jiezhu yizhong tongyi yufa de duanlun* [An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent], I. T. Kerr(ed.), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 118。值得一提的是，纽曼 (Newman) 的这种思想，对维特根斯坦 (Ludwig Wittgenstein) 《论确实性》(On Certainty) 产生了很大的影响。

[5] 错误与精神失常之间的区别是什么在于错误处于某种理性的结构中，不仅有原因，而且还有理由。“我们能说错误不仅有其原因，而且有理由吗？大体上说也就是：当某个人发生错误的时候，这种错误能够嵌进他所正确认识的事物之内。” (§74)

在不在英国，那么他只会认为或者他自己疯了，或者他们疯了 (§420)。关于自己的名字自己是不会出错的，要是出错了，那么就说明自己疯了 (§572)。“如果摩尔说出那些他宣称具有确实性的命题的反面，我们不应只是不同意他的意见，而是应该认为他精神失常。” (§155) 任何有两只手的人，如果对他自己有两只手表示怀疑，并想用一些方法和手段试图消除他是否真的有两只手这种疑虑，那么任何人都可以认为他一定精神异常了。人们“会认为他是个白痴” (§257)，整个社会都说他“精神错乱”、“精神失常”，除非他是一位喜剧演员，或者在进行哲学思考 (§467, 468)。怀疑枢轴命题不是“我们游戏中的怀疑” (§317)，我们也不会选择这种游戏。

二、作为枢轴命题的“上帝存在”

枢轴命题理论提出了一种独特的^[6]拒斥怀疑主义的策略。如果我们认识到某些命题在认知过程中起着“枢轴”的作用，认识到枢轴命题不可怀疑，那么怀疑主义就会被驳倒。维特根斯坦说：“怀疑主义并不是不能驳倒的，而是因为它试图在不能提出问题的地方产生了怀疑，所以显然是无意义的。”^[7]反怀疑主义者可以通过吸取维特根斯坦的枢轴命题理论来反驳怀疑主义。

以反驳关于外部世界存在的怀疑主义为例。枢轴命题理论的信奉者认为，“外部世界存在”的信念是所有理智的人都必定相信的和不容置疑的枢轴命题。任何心智健全的人都会拥有“外部世界存在”这个信念，这并不是说他拒绝不去怀疑，而是说他处于这样一种给定的状态，在这种状态中他能拒绝相信它却不会感到愚蠢或可笑。对所有人来说，在方法论上假定外部世界存在是任何神志正常的、前后一致的和理智的可持续性对话所必须的。从来没有人可以不要这个假定却仍然神志正常，且有任何前后一致的交谈。任何对外部世界存在的疑虑都会破坏每一次合理的交谈，包括使对外部世界存在的疑虑这种对话成为前后一致的可理解的交谈。由于个体的存在是外部世界的一部分，因此怀疑外部世界的存在必然导致怀疑个体的存在，甚至导致怀疑是否有这种怀疑状态的存在。怀疑这种怀疑状态的存在并寻找证据证明他处于这种状态的任何人，要么是一个喜剧演员，要么是一个疯子，要么是一位探求理智的限度的哲学家。因此，在正常的情况下，相信“外部世界存在”是不可避免的和不容置疑的枢轴命题。在枢轴命题理论者看来，正因为“外部世界存在”是不可怀疑的枢轴命题，因此怀疑外部世界存在的局部怀疑主义就被驳倒了。

维特根斯坦用枢轴命题理论来反驳怀疑主义的这种做法，对后来的反怀疑主义者影响很大。赖

[6] 虽然维特根斯坦 (Ludwig Wittgenstein) 用枢轴命题理论拒斥怀疑主义的方式，与摩尔 (Moore) 式反怀疑主义方式类似，但却有显著的不同，因为枢轴命题理论暗含对闭合原则的否认。维特根斯坦认为，在“正常的语言交流”中，对枢轴命题不能说“知道” (§260)，否则就好像在谈话过程中向某个人说声“早上好”一样无意义 (§464)。维特根斯坦举例说，假定我是一位医生，有个病人来到我这里，并让我看他的手，说：“这个看来像是一只手的东西并不是一件精致的仿制品而是一只真手。”维特根斯坦认为，即使“它的确具有知识的形式”，也不应把它看作是“一项知识”，即使看作是“一项多余的知识”也不行，而只能把它看作是“胡说”，因为它“缺少使它成为知识的背景” (§461)。说枢轴命题不是知识，与认知闭合原则相悖。认知闭合原则主张：对理性主体 a 来说，如果主体 a 知道 p，并且知道 p 蕴涵 q，那么 a 也知道 q。以“地球早已存在” (§84) 这个枢轴命题为例，由于具体的历史主张不是枢轴命题，因此人们可以前后一致地提出理由证明他发现诸如“奥斯特里茨战役 (Schlacht bei Austerlitz) 已经发生 200 多年了”。因此，他可以知道这些具体的历史主张如“奥斯特里茨战役已经发生 200 多年了”，而且知道这些历史主张蕴涵“地球早已存在”。根据闭合原则，他也会知道像“地球早已存在”这类枢轴命题 (§183)。

[7] Ludwig Wittgenstein, 《逻辑哲学论》*Luoji zhexue lun* [Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus], D.F.Pears & B.F.McGuinness (trans.) (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1974), 节 6.51

特^[8]、斯特劳森^[9]、威廉斯^[10]、普特南^[11]、斯觉尔^[12] 等都利用维特根斯坦提出的“枢轴命题”这个概念构建了各自的反怀疑主义理论。例如，赖特认为怀疑主义的错误在于设想枢轴命题如“外部世界存在”完全需要确证。他主张，这类命题既不能确证，也不能否定，因为它们是“事实陈述”(fact-stating)。赖特认为，怀疑主义者不顾所相信的命题是否在起关键的基础作用，处处要求命题都有理由的支持，误解了我们认知实践的真正本质。以枢轴命题为基础，他对怀疑主义提出了批判。^[13]

用枢轴命题理论来驳斥关于宗教信仰如“上帝存在”的局部怀疑主义，与用它来驳斥关于外部世界存在的怀疑主义相似。有两种利用枢轴命题理论来反对宗教怀疑主义的策略^[14]。第一种主张用“上帝存在”这个无基础的枢轴命题来支持宗教信仰。在这种观点看来，有很多非宗教的日常信念如“我有两只手”都是无基础的^[15]，非但如此，怀疑主义的怀疑理由也是无基础的，因此“上帝存在”之类的宗教信仰也是无基础的。这种观点的代表有纽曼^[16]和沃特斯托夫^[17]。在他们看来，所有非枢轴的信念都是基于无根据的预设（即某些枢轴信念），例如，任何科学都有其本体论预设，都有其不可定义的范畴，都有其不可证明的公理预设。正如人们不批评、不怀疑科学的基本信念一样，人们也应该不批评或怀疑与科学信念没有本质区分的宗教信仰。正由于宗教信仰与其它信念没有本质的区别，因此宗教怀疑主义基于宗教信仰预设某些核心的无根据的信念如“上帝存在”而只对宗教进行批评是不公正的。如果基于宗教怀疑主义的思路，人们同样应该怀疑所有其它的信念。

第二种主张在某种特定的意义上，承诺某些基本的诸如“上帝存在”的宗教命题是宗教的谈话基础，是不需要根据的枢轴命题。在这种观点看来，宗教怀疑主义对宗教谈话的基本信念要求认知根据误解了宗教实践的性质。维特根斯坦式的信仰主义(Wittgensteinian Fideism)”就是这种观点，代表人

[8] Crispin Wright,《怀疑主义与做梦：与恶魔结合在一起》*Huayiyi zhuyi yu zuomeng: Yu emo jiehe zai yiqi* [Scepticism and Dreaming: Imploding the Demon, Mind], 1991 (100), 87-115.

[9] Peter Strawson,《怀疑主义与自然主义：几种变种》*Huayiyi zhuyi yu ziran zhuyi: Jizhong bianzhong* [Skepticism and Naturalism: Some Varieties], New York: Columbia University Press, 1985) .

[10] Michael Williams,《不自然的怀疑：知识论的实在论与怀疑主义的基础》*Buziran de huayiyi: Zhishilun de shizailun yu huayiyi zhuyi de jichu* [Unnatural Doubts: Epistemological Realism and the Basis of Scepticism], (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996) .

[11] Hilary Putnam,《更新哲学》*Gengxin zhexue* [Renewing Philosophy], (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992).

[12] Avrum Stroll,《摩尔与维特根斯坦论确定性》*Moer yu Weitegensitan lun queshixing* [Moore and Wittgenstein on Certainty], (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994) .

[13] Crispin Wright, “事实与确定性 Shishi yu quedingxing” [Facts and Certainty], *Proceedings of the British Academy*, (1985 (71)), 429-472.

[14] Duncan Pritchard, “‘上帝存在’是一个宗教信念的‘枢轴命题’吗” *Shangdi cunzai shi yige zongjiao xinnian de shuzhou mingti ma?* [Is “God Exists” a “Hinge Proposition” of Religious Belief?], *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion*, (2000 (47)), 133-134.

[15] 因为枢轴命题经过了无数次实践的检验，是绝对确实的，不会出错的，人们不能提出比枢轴命题更确实的证据对它们进行证明，正因如此“这就是为什么我不能把看到我的手作为证实我有两只手的证据的理由。” (§250) 这表明，没有比“我有两只手”更根本、更确实的信念，能够用来为“我有两只手”的信念提供支持，因此没有理由能证明“我有两只手”，“我有两只手”是没有证据基础的，不可确证的。

[16] John Henry Newman,《借助一种同意语法的短论》*Jiezhu yizhong tongyi yufa de duanlun* [An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent], I. T. Kerr(ed.), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985) .

[17] Nicholas Wolterstorff, “宗教的知识论 Zongjiao de zhishilun” [Epistemology of Religion], in J. Greco & E. Sosa(eds.), *Epistemology*, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), 303-324.

物有菲力普斯^[18]和马尔康姆^[19]。这种观点认为,上帝绝不是神学和哲学所设想其所是的东西。上帝既不是可知的存在,也不是真实的可以被命题指称的实体,相反,上帝是担保宗教实践的世界图像的核心。

^[20] 维特根斯坦式的信仰主义者把“上帝存在”作为一个枢轴命题,主张用这种方式来信仰上帝。他们认为,人们不能基于证据主义来批评宗教言论,因此宗教言论中的“上帝存在”没有表达事实陈述的作用,它们形成了宗教生活形式的一部分,是独立于认知评价的,对怀疑和确证具有免疫力。因此,确证或否证上帝存在的努力是多余的、糊涂的和自我反驳的。斯坦利把维特根斯坦式的对上帝信仰的论证表述为:“枢轴命题是免除怀疑和确证的。信仰上帝是一个枢轴命题。因此,信仰上帝是免除怀疑和确证的。枢轴命题是如此基础的,以致在任何谈话中都不能对它们提出前后一致的怀疑,也根本不能要求什么确证。”

^[21]

如果“上帝存在”与科学的公理一样,那么只对宗教进行怀疑而对科学大加赞赏就是不公正的;如果“上帝存在”是不可怀疑的,必须接受的枢轴命题,那么宗教怀疑主义对“上帝存在”的怀疑就是不合理的,就是精神错乱的表现。这是基于枢轴命题理论对宗教怀疑主义所作出的结论。

三、对用枢轴命题理论来辩护“上帝存在”的评价

然而,在我们看来,以上两种策略并没有驳倒宗教怀疑主义。第一种策略非但没有驳倒局部的宗教怀疑主义,反而证明了全面的怀疑主义的胜利。这种借宗教怀疑主义的局部性试图捍卫宗教信念的合理性的做法是不成功的。^[22]

第二种策略的困境是,我们用这种形式来把握宗教言论的语义学果真正确吗?毕竟,如果上帝确实存在,而且宗教信徒与上帝有直接的关系,那么“上帝存在”的陈述形式怎么可能既不能确证,也不能怀疑,也不能知道呢?这种策略等于直接承认宗教怀疑主义的核心主张,即宗教信念有一些固有的特征使得它们既没有保证也不能认为是已知的命题。与其说这捍卫了怀疑主义对宗教信念的攻击,不如说充其量只不过提供了一种退让战术而已。

另外,维特根斯坦式的信仰主义中的“上帝存在”似乎没有资格成为枢轴命题。如果“上帝存在”这个信念真的是一个枢轴命题,那么它表达的将是不可避免和不容置疑的,以致所有理智的人都不得不占有。然而,对上帝的信仰似乎只是偶然接受的,而不是深思熟虑选择的产物,因为我们可以设想,在深思熟虑后可以对上帝的信仰加以放弃。对上帝信仰的放弃纵使人们不会因此使人们判断力更强,也不太可能使人们丧失理性,人们至少仍然可以保持同等的作出合理判断的能力。不是每个人都认为,信仰上帝是神志正常的对话的一个先决条件。

“上帝存在”看起来与其它公认的枢轴命题有重大的区分。用以“外部世界存在”的信念为例,用维特根斯坦的理论来说,这个信念是所有理智的人都必定相信的和不容置疑的。任何心智健全的人会拥有这个信念,这并不是说他不愿拒绝这样做,而是说他处于这样一种给定的状态,在这种状态中他不能

[18] D.Z.Phillips,《维特根斯坦与宗教》*Weitegensitan yu zongjiao* [Wittgenstein and Religion], (London: Macmillan, 1993)。

[19] Norman Malcolm, “信念的非基础性 Xinnian de fei jichuxing” [The Groundlessness of Belief], in Stuart C. Brown (ed.), *Reason and Religion*, (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1977), 143-157.

[20] L.Wittgenstein,《讲演和谈话》*Yanjiang he tanhua* [Lectures and Conversations], (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), 63.

[21] Earl Stanley, “上帝与枢轴命题 God and Hinge Proposition”, *Pre-Proceedings of the 26th International Wittgenstein Symposium*. (Austrian Ludwig Wittgenstein Society, 2003), 124.

[22] Terence Penelhum, “宗教信念需要基础吗? Zongjiao xinnian xuyao jichu ma? [Do Religious Beliefs Need Grounds?], *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift*, (1986 (40)), 227-237.

拒绝相信它却不感到愚蠢或可笑。因此，相信“外部世界存在”是不可避免的和不容置疑的枢轴命题。在维特根斯坦看来，怀疑外部世界的存在如果不是一个哲学的玩笑，那么必定是精神失常的表现。然而，在笔者看来，怀疑上帝的存在却不会如此。“上帝存在”这个信念事实上并不为所有严肃的和理智的人所拥有，有不少著名的有着巨大的理智成就并因而获得尊重的人不相信上帝存在。这表明，否认上帝存在不会丧失理智。事实上，谈论对上帝存在的否认并不必然荒唐可笑和语无伦次。任何一个理智的宗教怀疑主义者都可以不假设上帝的存在却可以有意义地且前后一致地谈话。严肃认真地说“世界不是由上帝创造的，因为没有证明有上帝存在”，并不会明显地带来像说“总有一天会证明外部世界不存在”那样的不一致，并不会给人神智不正常的感觉。维特根斯坦所提出的精神错乱、白痴或傻子不能用来指称那些不相信上帝存在的人，“上帝存在”的假设在方法论上不是必然的。如果“上帝存在”受到怀疑，那么受到损害的只有亚伯拉罕传统的宗教谈话，其它宗教谈话则不会受到影响。不把“上帝存在”作为不可避免的和不容置疑的枢轴命题并没有什么错误。

事实上，维特根斯坦式的信仰主义的上帝仅仅嵌在世界图像（参考系或生活形式）中，上帝仅仅是相对于相信他的人而存在的，它没有自己的独立存在。这一切都表明：信仰上帝，甚至是维特根斯坦式的上帝，并不完全适合维特根斯坦所描述的枢轴命题。

用枢轴命题理论来反驳宗教怀疑主义，借用维特根斯坦对《论确实性》这本笔记的评价用语，可以说虽然“一直在瞄准靶子”，却没有“击中目标” (§387)。宗教怀疑主义是基于内在主义的，它主张，我们没有不窃取论题（non-question-begging）的方法为有争议的宗教命题提供足够的认知证据支持，因此，人们既不能知道，也不能有保证地相信宗教命题。其理论根据是“不能援引不窃取论题的理由作为相信某些命题的基础，蕴涵不能知道，或有保证地相信那个命题”^[23]。内在主义的知识理论要求人们对知道有自我意识，并直截了当地认为，如果人们不能为信念举出足够多的反思的可获得的理由，那么相信这种信念就不是有保证的，或者说这个信念不能被当作是知识。与此不同，枢轴命题理论在本性上“与研究所走的道路距离很远” (§88)，它是一种外在主义的理论。外在主义的知识论者承认存在有某些起框架作用的命题，它们在知识论上不需反思的可获得的理由的支持，不需要对知道有自我意识，因此也不认可建立在内在主义基础上的宗教怀疑主义。用枢轴命题理论批判宗教怀疑主义，其实质是用外在主义批判内在主义，由于它们的理论承诺不同，因此这是一种自说自话的、无力的批判。在承诺内在主义的知识理论的前提下，面对宗教怀疑主义的攻击，宗教信念的捍卫者应该做的是，重新审视已有的方式，另谋他路。

[23] John Haldane, “不可错性、权威与信仰 Bukecuoxing, quanwei yu xinyang [Infallibility, Authority and Faith], *The Heythrop Journal* (1997 (38)), 262-283.

The English Title:

Reflecting the Theory of Hinge Propositions of On Certainty Criticizing Religious Skepticism

CAO Jianbo

Professor, The Center for the Studies of Epistemology and Cognitive Science,
Department of Philosophy, Xiamen University, Xiamen 361005, Fujian Province, China. Email: jbao@xmu.edu.cn. Tel : 139-5000-1478

Abstract: Hinge propositions are undoubtable, because (1) Infallible hinge propositions are logical or grammatical propositions, (2) There are no reasonable reasons to doubt the propositions, (3) The propositions are the basis for actions, for thoughts, for doubt, (4) To doubt the propositions is a sign of madness or rhetoric. Taking “God exists” as a hinge proposition, the anti-skeptics put forward two strategies to refute religious skepticism. The essence of using the theory of hinge proposition to criticize religious skepticism is that of using externalism to criticize internalism. Their theoretical commitments are different, so the criticism is unsuccessful. Under the premise of the internalist commitment of epistemology, the defenders of religious beliefs should re-examine the existing methods and pursue other way.

Keywords: hinge propositions; Wittgenstein; undoubtability; religious skepticism

Is There a God?——an Examination of Anselm’s Ontological Proof of God’s Existence with Kant’s Refutation

CHENG Jing

(Fudan University, 200433 Shanghai, China)

Abstract : Kant refuted Anselm's ontological proof of God's existence by claiming that "being" is not a predicative word but only a link verb. Yet Alvin Plantinga wants to say that "being" is a predicative word, though a special one. Unlike other predicative word, this one cannot predicate by itself but always has to have another predicate going along with itself. This article would like to argue that even if "being" is a predicative word, just because it is that kind of "special" predicative word as Plantinga has pointed out, Anselm's ontological proof of God's existence cannot stand. Furthermore an attempted effort is made to provide a proof that this kind of “proof of God’ s existence” is impossible. Its ultimate mistake lies in its treating God in line with other objects that exist in this world.

Key words: God's existence, ontological proof, “being,” Anselm, Kant

Author: CHENG Jing, Post-doctoral Researcher in the School of Philosophy at Fudan University. Room 201, Wuchuan Road 78th Nong 30th Hao, Shanghai, 200433, P.R. China. Tel: +86-183-1713-762.3 Email : Jingch77@gmail.com

Is there a God? Every evangelist is first asked of this question when he or she tries to preach Christ toward a non-believer; any theology seems to have to start with this question. However not until more than one thousand years after Christ do we have the first ontological argument of God’ s existence by St. Anselm, who claims that God, “the being than which nothing greater can be conceived,” cannot be conceived not to exist. Though probably no Christian after Anselm is actually converted to his faith by this ontological proof, its witty argument attracted some of the most capable minds in the history of philosophy and theology to this pursuit of proving the existence of God through the effort of speculative reason—among them we find the names of St. Thomas Aquinas, Descartes, Spinoza and Leibniz—until such attempt was refuted by Kant, who denied the possibility of any speculative proof for God’ s existence at all.

This paper will re-examine Anselm’ s ontological argument as well as Kant’ s refutation of it. Through this process we will see that no matter whether Anselm accepts Kant’ s refutation or not his proof of God’ s existence does not stand. However, this does not mean we should thus deny the existence of God, but that we have to understand the existence of God in a way different from Anselm’ s.

God, than which nothing greater can be conceived, cannot be conceived not to exist—Anselm’ s ontological proof

To read Anselm’ s proof of God’ s existence, we need first to know what does he mean by “God.” In his *Proslogion*, Anselm confesses to God, “we believe that thou art a being than which nothing greater

can be conceived.”^[1] Believing so, Anselm claims that the being thus believed receives an existence in his mind, or understanding, in his own word: “... something exists in the understanding, at least, than which nothing *greater* can be conceived. For ... whatever is understood, exists in the understanding.”^[2] Taking that confession as an apophatic definition about God, Anselm forms a *reductio ad absurdum* argument for God’s existence:

“ And assuredly that, than which nothing greater can be conceived, cannot exist in the understanding alone. For, suppose it exists in the understanding alone: then it can be conceived to exist in reality; which is greater.

“Therefore, if that, than which nothing greater can be conceived, exists in the understanding alone, the very being, than which nothing greater can be conceived, is one, than which a greater can be conceived. But obviously this is impossible. Hence, there is no doubt that there exists a being, than which nothing greater can be conceived, and it exists both in the understanding and in reality.”^[3]

If we apply Anselm’s own definition of God here and have “God” take the place of “that, than which nothing greater can be conceived,” we see the proving steps in the argument more clearly:

- 1) Suppose that God exists only in the understanding and not in reality,
- 2) then we can conceive a being, which has all the properties that “God” already has, while this new being exists not only in the understanding but also in reality,
- 3) then this later conceived being is conceived as being greater than God,
- 4) but our premise is, God is the one, than which nothing greater can be conceived,
- 5) 3) and 4) contradict each other, therefore our hypothesis is untenable,
- 6) so, God exists not only in the understanding but also in reality.

One may immediately feel like asking Anselm, “What does it mean to be conceived?” “What does it mean to be greater? To be conceived greater?” For the first question, I would like to draw on Alvin Plantinga’s comments here and define that “to conceive a being” is “to construct a concept with no logical mistake.”^[4] To understand what does Anselm mean by “greater,” we have to look into the following quotation:

“ ...you say that when you hear of a being than which a greater is inconceivable, you cannot conceive of it in terms of any real object known to you either specifically or generally, nor have it in your understanding.

“But obviously this is not true. For everything that is *less good*, in so far as it is good, is like the *greater good*. It is therefore evident to any rational mind, that by ascending from the *lesser good* to the *greater*, we can form a considerable notion of a being than which a *greater* is inconceivable.

“For instance, who (even if he does not believe that what he conceives of exists in reality) supposing that there is some good which has a beginning and an end, does not conceive that a good is much *better*,

[1] St. Anselm, “Proslogion,” in *The Ontological Argument: from St. Anselm to Contemporary Philosophers*, ed. Alvin Plantinga (New York: Anchor, 1965), 4.

[2] St. Anselm, “Proslogion,” 4.

[3] St. Anselm, “Proslogion,” 4.

[4] Alvin Plantinga, “Kant’s Objection to the Ontological Argument,” *The Journal of Philosophy* LXIII (1966): 538, “to say that a state of affairs is conceivable is to say that there is no logical impossibility in the supposition that it obtains.”

which, if it begins, does not cease to be? And that as the second good is *better* than the first, so that good which has neither beginning nor end, though it is ever passing from the past through the present to the future, is better than the second? And that far *better* than this is a being—whether any being of such a nature exists or not—which in no wise requires change or motion, nor is compelled to undergo change or motion?”^[5]

Obviously here Anselm does not differentiate the meaning of “greater” in the sense of “greater amount” from the “greater” in the sense of “greater value,” or “better.” A big ball is greater than a small ball because the former has a larger volume, while a shorter man can be a better doctor than a taller one. In our judgment the former “greater” is objectively greater and absolutely greater, while the latter is subjectively greater and contingently greater. Because when we compare the value of different objects, we first have a goal in mind and judge the objects as means; ^[6]one is “better” than the other when one serves the goal better than the other; the value of the same object can change when our goal changes. A fresh apple is better than a rotting one because the fresh one is better for eating, but when one wants to use apples for fertilizer he will choose the latter. A lamp is better than a candle for illumination, but a candle may be better than a lamp if we want to create a romantic atmosphere.

In the above text Anselm repeatedly says, “one good is better than the other.” However, since he does not release to us anything about his interest, we cannot tell by which means “one good is better than the other.” To make his argument clearer we may want to make some revision of it. Say I did enjoy the party last night and one good thing about it is that it started and ended at the appropriate time. Wouldn’t it become boring if this party lasts forever? We even cannot imagine it to be without beginning. My suggestion is that in this text, we take “a good” as “a good nature” to prevent it from being understood as “a good object.” An originally good party starts to lose the nature of “goodness” when it exceeds the appropriate length of time and tires every participant. Now we see that Anselm’s “greater good” simply contains “a greater amount of good nature” than the “lesser good.”

Thus Anselm enlightens us to define “greater” in the sense of “greater value” through the “greater” in the sense of “greater amount.” Go back to our examples we discover that our better things contain some properties that serve the goals positively which the less good lack or possess to a smaller extent. The rotting apple does not have the freshness that the fresh apple has for eating. The light of a candle is not as bright as a lamp. Now we interpret that Anselm is measuring the greatness of a thing by the amount of positive properties it has. A lengthy party is not as great as a party which lasts for an appropriate length of time because the former lacks this advantage of the latter, though it may be of no difference from the latter in every other respect.

The more positive properties a being has, the greater it is. Now God is the being “than which nothing greater can be conceived.” Combining our interpretation of Anselm’s using of “conceiving” and “being greater,” we see that this God has such a characteristic that we cannot construct a concept that has more positive properties than He does without making logical mistakes. Therefore I suggest that logically this

[5] St. Anselm, “Proslogion,” 24-25.

[6] One reason that Christ urges us not to judge human beings because we are not allowed to take other human beings as means to serve our own interest. Therefore we can say one is a better doctor than the other, but we have no right to say one is a better person than the other.

God is a being that has the fullest amount of positive properties.

Being clear with these, let us return to Anselm's ontological proof. I suggest that at step 3) Anselm makes the most crucial movement in his argument. Here he claims that "a God that exists in the understanding and in reality" is greater than "a God that exists in the understanding alone." Obviously here "better" cannot work in the place of "greater." How can we definitely say that "existence in reality" is better than "absence from it"? We are even farther from deciding in the place of God that it is better for Him to show up in reality than to hide Himself from it. The claim in step 3) makes sense only if "greater" means "having more positive properties." In which sense "a God that exists in the understanding and in reality" is greater than "a God that exists in the understanding alone?" This is true only if we understand that it is because the former has the property of "existing in reality" while the latter does not. Therefore Anselm's ontological proof stands or falls, depends on whether "existence in reality" is a property or not. It seems that if we accept that "existence in reality" is a property which can be added to a being that already has got a certain amount of properties, then we have to accept Anselm's ontological proof of God's existence.

Being is not a predicate—Kant's refutation

"Being is obviously not a real predicate."^[7] Insisting this Kant claims to have undermined the legitimacy of any ontological proof of God's existence. For Kant, a predicate is "a concept of something that could add to the concept of a thing."^[8] The more predicates I am able to attach to a subject, the more I know about it. I know more about God when I can say, "God is love and justice" than when I can only say "God is love." The new predicate "justice" enriches my earlier concept of God, which contains only "love." But "being," Kant says, is "merely the positing of a thing or of certain determinations in themselves. In the logical use it is merely the copula of a judgment."^[9] Here, Kant uses the example, "God is omnipotent." In this statement "God" is the subject and "omnipotent" is the predicate, while "is" "... only posits the predicate in relation to the subject."^[10] That is, "is," alone, does not say anything about the subject "God" but only introduces the predicate to it:

"...if I take the subject (God) together with all his predicates, and say God is, or there is a God, then I add no new predicate to the concept of God, but only posit the subject in itself with all its predicates, and indeed posit the object in relation to my concept."^[11]

What is Kant's concern here? He explains, "Both [the object and my concept] must contain exactly the same, and hence when I think this object as given absolutely (through the expression, "it is"), nothing is thereby added to the concept, which expresses merely its possibility."^[12] The concept in my mind and the object in front of me have to match each other perfectly for me to name the object with that concept. So a given object realizes a concept of it and therefore expresses its possibility to be in reality but adds no

[7] Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, trans. Paul Guyer, and Allen W. Wood. (New York: Cambridge, 1998), 567, A598/B626.

[8] Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 567, A598/B626.

[9] Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 567, A598/B626.

[10] Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 567, A599/B627.

[11] Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 567, A599/B627.

[12] Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 567, A599/B627.

content to the concept itself. For example, when I point to an apple and say, “it is an apple,” the concept “apple” in my mind does not thus become richer at this announcement; my knowledge about apple does not thus grow. Say if I have never eaten an apple before and have only learned about its shape and color from books, at the moment when I recognize the thing in front of me to be an apple, I am only applying my earlier knowledge here, but my knowledge about an apple is not immediately enriched—what I do not know about an apple before, for example, its taste, I still do not know now. A blind man may judge this apple to be an apple by tasting it and feeling its shape, but his judgment tells him nothing about the color of it, neither does the concept of “apple” in his mind thus includes new properties about apples. One’s discovery of an external object to be an apple only tells him that it is possible for an individual that matches the speculative concept “apple” to exist in the experiential world, or world of appearances, in Kant’s words. Thus Kant arrives at a strange conclusion—“the actual contains nothing more than the merely possible.” Immediately Kant explains this puzzling statement as follows:

“A hundred actual dollars do not contain the least bit more than a hundred possible ones. For since the latter signifies the concept and the former its object and its positing in itself, then, in case the former contained more than the latter, my concept would not express the entire object and thus would not be the suitable concept of it.” ^[13]

Nobody would agree that a hundred actual dollars and the concept of one hundred dollars are the same; Kant himself admits that “in my financial condition there is more with a hundred actual dollars than with the mere concept of them (i.e., their possibility). ... yet the hundred dollars themselves that I am thinking of are not in the least increased through this being outside my concept.” ^[14] Now we understand that Kant does not mean that an actual object is no different from a possible concept but that they should contain the same amount of properties. If the amount of money in front of me is more than or less than one hundred dollars, I cannot apply my concept of “one hundred dollars” to it and say, “it is one hundred dollars.” Although it is the same apple in front that blind man and me, the “it” in his judgment, which contains taste and shape, is different from mine, which contains only shape and color; each is nothing more than what is already in each person’s concept about apple. Actually because neither one of us has a complete knowledge, that is, knows every single property of apples, neither judgment is absolutely correct; both of us can make mistakes.

Further Kant leads us to imagine an extreme situation in which we do know fully about the properties of an object, then, he thinks, it becomes even clearer that we should not take “existence” as a property:

“Thus when I think a thing, through whichever and however many predicates I like (even its thoroughgoing determination), not the least bit gets added to the thing when I posit in addition that this thing is. For otherwise what would exist would not be the same as what I had thought in my concept, but more than that, and I could not say that the very object of my concept exists.” ^[15]

Suppose that before I see this apple, I already have got a complete knowledge of all those properties of such an apple except that I do not know whether such a thing actually exists or not; now I see a thing, to which all predicates included in my concept “apple” can be attached, only that the very thing in front of me

[13] Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 567, A599/B627.

[14] Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 567, A599/B627.

[15] Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 567-568, A600/B628.

has the property of “existence” but my conceptual “apple” does not, if one insists that the very existence of this apple is an extra property of it beyond all what I already know about “apple,” Kant says, just as that I cannot call one hundred and one actual dollars “one hundred dollars,” I am not allowed to call the thing in front of me “apple,” because my concept of “apple” does not contain that property of existence that this particular apple has.

If we agree with Kant that being cannot be a predicate, consequently we will deny the legitimacy of Anselm’s ontological proof of God’s existence. Because if existence cannot be the property of an object, a being that exists both in reality and in understanding is by no means greater than a being that exists in understanding alone—step 3) in Anselm’s proof does not stand; therefore the whole argument fails.

What if “being” can be a predicate?

However, doesn’t my knowledge about apples grow when I actually see an existing apple than when I do not know whether there actually is such a thing called “apple” or not. Isn’t it different merely to understand the concept of a “flying horse” than to know also that such a thing really exists, either through my firsthand experience or from somebody else’s information? Say I now have the concept of “flying horse,” but about its actuality I can offer no opinion—since I never see one, I would lie if I say that it does exist, but because my experience is always limited, I cannot thus assure you that there is no such a thing at all. What if one day I do see a horse flying? Shouldn’t I immediately adjust my present concept about “flying horse” and say that a flying horse can exist?

Let us reread Kant’s definition of “predicate” and reconsider about the possibility of taking “existence” as a property. Kant says, predicate is “a concept of something that could add to the concept of a thing.” We notice that Kant is defining “predicate” through its relation with “concept” and with other “predicates.” I would like to interpret that this definition means, a predicate is an element of a concept, and a concept is a collection of predicates. To refine this statement, I would like to draw on Plantinga’s comments here and say, a concept is a collection of “a number of properties that are *severally necessary* and *jointly sufficient* for the concept’s applying to something.”^[16] It is not enough to say, “a predicate is a concept of something,” otherwise we could make a mistake by equalizing an element with a collection that contains only this one element: $100 \neq \{100\}$. That a predicate is “a concept of something that could add to the concept of a thing,” means, for a concept C expressed by the collection $\{P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots P_n\}$ —suppose that $P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots P_n$ are the properties jointly sufficient and severally necessary for a thing to fall under this concept—we can add P_{n+1} into it and get a new collection $\{P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots P_n, P_{n+1}\}$, that is, a new concept C1. That “Being is ‘merely the copula of a judgment’” can be understood as, in the equation $\{P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots P_n\} + \{P_{n+1}\} = \{P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots P_n, P_{n+1}\}$, being is that “=” which contributes nothing to the new collection but only connects what is before it and what is after. “Existence” simply cannot be that “ P_{n+1} ,” Kant says.

Fair enough, I would reply to Kant, but will your arithmetic still be correct, if you put “ \neq ”, or “ $<$ ”, or “ $>$ ” in the place of “=”? If you say, when I say “there is a God” I “add no new predicate to the concept of God”, will you admit that, if I say “there is no God” I am saying something different about God from the former? If “ P_{n+1} ” is a false or empty element, then $\{P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots P_n, P_{n+1}\} = \{P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots$

[16] Alvin Plantinga, *God, Freedom, and Evil* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1974), 95.

$P_n, \neg P_{n+1}\} = \{P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots P_n\}$ just like $1 + 0 = 1 - 0 = 1$. This obviously is not true for “existence.” “Existence” is different from “non-existence,” just like “red” is different from “non-red.”

But if “existence” can be that “ P_{n+1} ”, then $\{P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots P_n, P_{n+1}(\text{existence})\} \neq \{P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots P_n\}$, Kant would ask, then how can you name an actual object with your concept about it, when the latter has not included the property “existence” yet? I would say, we correctly name an object as long as the named object does not lack any properties that I list beforehand in the naming concept. Apparently we are not making any mistake to include a square under the concept of rectangle, though the former has an extra property of *having four equally long sidelines* beyond all that the latter already has. Immediately Kant may ask, are you going to call one hundred and one dollars “one hundred dollars” then? Of course not, one hundred and one actual dollars includes one hundred actual dollars and is one dollar more than the latter, but the concept of “one hundred and one dollars” and the concept of “one hundred dollars” are parallel concepts and one does not fall into the other. The collection of $\{101\}$ and the collection of $\{100, 1\}$ are different collections of numerical elements, although $100 + 1 = 101$.

Still, Kant can resist, O.K. you can take “existence” as a property, but how are you going to deal with “possibility”? Do you want to take it as a property also? One inference of my proposition that “Being is not a predicate” is that “the actual contains nothing more than the merely possible.” Obviously if you think an actual flying horse is different from a merely possible one, then “existence” should be a different property from “possibility.” I accept that you can let an object of $\{P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots P_n, P_{n+1}\}$ go under the concept $\{P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots P_n\}$, but can you have $\{P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots P_n, P_{n+1}\}$ under the name of $\{P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots P_n, P_{n+1}'\}$? If you insist that “existence” is a property, how can you name an object of $\{P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots P_n, P_{n+1}(\text{existence})\}$ with your concept $\{P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots P_n, P_{n+1}' (\text{possibility})\}$?

To answer this challenge we need to first differentiate two kinds of possibilities, namely, logical possibility and existential possibility. A concept is logically possible when its predicative elements do not contradict each other. This is true for every conceivable or logically legal concept; therefore any legal concept $\{P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots P_n\} = \{P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots P_n, P_{n+1}(\text{logical possibility})\}$, so we see that “logical possibility” cannot be added into a concept and make a new one; to apply Kant’s definition of “predicate” here, we conclude that “logical possibility” is not a true predicate. Moreover, with $\{P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots P_n, P_{n+1}(\text{existence})\}$ we can oppose $\{P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots P_n, \neg P_{n+1}(\text{non-existence})\}$, but with $\{P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots P_n, P_{n+1}(\text{logical possibility})\}$ we cannot oppose $\{P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots P_n, \neg P_{n+1}(\text{logical impossibility})\}$. There is no such thing as $\{P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots P_n, \neg P_{n+1}(\text{logical impossibility})\}$; what is logically impossible simply does not show up.

Nevertheless, existential possibility is a different case. A concept is existentially possible, means, it is possible for an actual object to have all the properties included in this concept. Now Kant can still ask, how are you going to name $\{P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots P_n, P_{n+1}(\text{existence})\}$ with $\{P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots P_n, P_{n+1}' (\text{existential possibility})\}$? Obviously, $\{P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots P_n, P_{n+1}(\text{existential possibility})\} \neq \{P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots P_n, \neg P_{n+1}(\text{existential impossibility})\} \neq \{P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots P_n\}$. However, I will ask Kant, are you ever able to claim the existential possibility of a concept before you actually find an object that matches this concept? Or are you going to jump to the conclusion that there can never be a real thing that matches this logically correct concept simply because you have not yet found one? Existential possibility can never be affirmed without actual existence; existential impossibility is never absolute simply because of contemporary absence; both “existential possibility” and “existential impossibility” are problematic before we encounter

actual existence. We have to agree that a problematic element cannot contribute to a collection, so we have neither a concept $\{P1, P2, P3, \dots Pn, Pn+1(\text{existential possibility})\}$ nor $\{P1, P2, P3, \dots Pn, Pn+1(\text{existential impossibility})\}$ before we actually meet an object of $\{P1, P2, P3, \dots Pn, Pn+1(\text{existence})\}$. Therefore it is a false question how can we name an object $\{P1, P2, P3, \dots Pn, Pn+1(\text{existence})\}$ with the concept $\{P1, P2, P3, \dots Pn, Pn+1' (\text{existential possibility})\}$.

Confidently I will go ahead to name the particular apple in front of me with the concept of apple in my mind, though the former has the property of actual existence while the latter does not. Moreover ever since I see a true apple for the first time, my concept about apple will include “existence” and I thus feel even more confident to name other actual apples with my “apple concept.”

However, here Plantinga would further defend Kant, if you take “existence” as a property, then for any concept $C = \{P1, P2, P3, \dots Pn\}$, you can add $Pn+1(\text{existence})$ into it and make a new concept $C1 = \{P1, P2, P3, \dots Pn, Pn+1(\text{existence})\}$ and say “C1 exists,” no matter how ridiculous a concept C is. For your imaginative concept “flying horse,” which contains the properties of “flying ability” and “being a horse,” you can simply add another predicative element “existence” and get a new concept “existing flying horse” and say “An existing flying horse exists.” Of course this is not true. On the contrary any other property is not threatened by this risk. Say I take the property “flying ability” and add it to the concept “horse,” then I get “flying horse” and I have no difficulty to say, “A flying horse flies.”^[17]

You can laugh at me, Plantinga, when I say, “An existing flying horse exists.” But there is nothing logically wrong in this sentence; I admit that this sentence has no realistic validity before we actually see a “flying horse” one day. However, can you claim anything more than logical validity with your sentence “A flying horse flies” before we actually see a horse fly? If you can only have your “horse” fly in your mind, why I am not allowed to have my “flying horse” simply exist in my mind. If you insist on teaching me *whether* I should take “existence” as a property or not, I can only thank you for telling me *when* I can add that property to a concept that lacks it. To avoid that embarrassing situation, in the future I will only add “existence” as a property to a concept after I do encounter a correspondent object of this concept in reality.

Moreover, Plantinga says, you can find an object to which the concept “rectangle” can apply while the concept “square” —which is “rectangle” plus “having four equally long sidelines” —cannot, but can you find an object to which you can apply “rectangle” but not the concept “existing rectangle” —which includes “rectangle” and “existence” —if you take “existence” as a new property? Every square is a rectangle, but not every rectangle is a square; however, every rectangle is an “existing rectangle,” while every “existing rectangle” is also a rectangle.^[18] “Existence,” unlike “having four equally long sidelines,” cannot be an independent property. “Being,” by itself, can never be a predicate.

I agree. In this sense I admit that Kant is right that we say nothing about God when we simply say “God is.” But I am not going to accept what he says immediately afterwards, that is, it is the same with the sentence “there is a God.”^[19]

Apparently “God is” is not a complete judgment, but “there is a God” is. Probably by “there is

[17] Plantinga, *God, Freedom and Evil*, 96.

[18] Plantinga, *God, Freedom and Evil*, 97.

[19] Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 567, A599/B627, “... if I take the subject (God) together with all his predicate, and say God is, or there is a God, then I add no new predicate to the concept of God, ...”

a God,” Kant simply means “God exists.” However, I would like to break the idiom “there is” and reorganize the lingual elements into “A God is there (or, here).” Kant would not object—it is Kant himself who emphasizes that we are not allowed to claim positively that “there is a God” unless we already have sense experience about God here or there; we can say, “There is God,” only after we experience that “God is there (or here).” Now let us take the sentence “God is here.” Obviously this is a complete sentence made up of a subject “God” and a predicate “is here.” In his example “God is omnipotent,” Kant skips the small word “is” and says, “omnipotent,” by itself, is the predicate of the subject “God.” But in our sentence, can he still omit “is” and say, “here,” by itself, is the predicate of “God?” Here nobody would deny that “here” has to go after “is” to predicate “God.” There has to “be” something “here,” something has to “exist” “here” for “here” to be its predicate. Neither can “is” predicate “God” by itself. “Here” and “is” have to be joined together to predicate “God.” If one would say that “being here or there” cannot be an internal predicate of a concept, or spatial location cannot be an internal property of an object, I would say, shouldn’t a completely correct knowledge about the statue of the Goddess of liberty include that it stands in New York rather than in Boston? The same is true with temporal predicates—you will laugh at me, if I tell you that Socrates is a contemporary person.

Therefore we conclude, the fact that “being” cannot be a predicate by itself should not prevent it from being a predicate at all. “Existence,” though not an independent property, should still be taken as a property. Only that we have to be aware that this property is different from other properties. That is, it can never be a property by itself; it can never be separated from other properties. We can take “redness” alone and form a concept containing only this property and still be able to differentiate some objects from others, but if we have “existence” alone in a concept, every object in reality will fall under it.

Accepting “existence” as a property, we have to admit that “a God that exists both in understanding and in reality” is greater than “a God that exists in understanding alone.” Shall we thus comfortably accept Anselm’s ontological proof?

Not yet. Our analysis of the characteristic about the property “existence” betrays another weak point in Anselm’s ontological proof. We have just found out that “existence,” even if taken as a property, is different from other properties. This property can never be a property by itself; it always goes along with other properties. An inference here is that whenever we add the property “existence” into a concept we cannot add this property alone into it but always together with some other properties.

To explain this more clearly, I would like to introduce two principles here, that is, the principle of determinability for concepts and the principle of thoroughgoing determination for objects. In his *Critique of Pure Reason*, Kant states,

“Every concept, in regard to what is not determined in it, is indeterminate, and stands under the principle of determinability: that of every two contradictorily opposed predicates only one can apply to it ...

“Every thing, however, as to its possibilities, further stands under the principle of thoroughgoing determination; according to which, among all possible predicates of things, insofar as they are compared with their opposites, one must apply to it.” ^[20]

“Everything existing is thoroughly determined,” — “not only that of every given pair of opposed

[20] Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 533, A571/B579-A572/B600.

predicates, but also of every pair of possible predicates, one must always apply to it.”^[21]

This means, a concept, which has not been applied to a particular object yet, is open for other properties, with which itself has no concern, to be attached to any object that it wants to include under its own title. Because of this, I am allowed to apply my concept “rectangle” to a square object, since the concept “rectangle,” which has no decision about “having four equally long sidelines” or not, is open for any “rectangular” object that either has four equally long sidelines or not. On the contrary, any realistic object is fully determined in every respect; it means, for any possible predicate P, either P or $\neg P$ is already decided in it, before I put it under whichever concept of mine. As a result, if I first bear a concept in mind, then seek its existence in reality, I cannot discover its actuality alone, but also some other properties that I have not yet thought of with this concept. Conversely if I try to form a common concept of any more than one objects, I have to throw away some properties each owns by itself—at least any two objects need to occupy two different spheres of space.

For my concept “rectangle” I cannot find in reality a pure “rectangle” that only has the properties included in that concept. I can only find rectangles in the shape of a rectangular window, a rectangular table, or a rectangular playground or at least a rectangle drawn on a paper, which has its own circumference and area. When I look for “one hundred dollars,” what I get is never merely “one hundred real dollars” but it is either a one-hundred-dollar bill, five twenty-dollar bills, a check of one hundred dollars, or one hundred dollars in any other forms. Even if for a perfectly designed sculpture, which is known completely by the sculptor, who knows its material, its size, its shape, and even where it will stand, once it is truly made and brought into existence, it takes some new properties that the sculptor may not expect; it thus has its own life and the artist cannot control what will happen to it and what else it may become. I can let you imagine a house and decide every detail about it—how tall it is, how many floors it has, how many rooms it has, what furniture is set in it, even what is planted around it, only that we do not know such a house actually exists or not. Say one day you really find a house exactly like this one, then you are able to say, that wonderful house really exists, but at this moment you do not only know about the actuality of the imagined house but also its location at least.

What if you claim to have such a thoroughly determined concept about a particular object, that nothing new about it can be told to you? Then I would say, at this time you are assured of the existence of an object before forming a concept about it. Not only so, it is the existence of this object that introduces all those knowledge about it to you, and you cannot know about the existence of this object without knowing any single property of it.

Then, what is wrong with Anselm? Anselm first constructs the concept of a being than which nothing greater can be conceived; to prove the actuality of such a concept, he first supposes that this being exists only in understanding and not in reality; next he conceives another being, which has everything what the earlier one already has, only that this new being has existence in reality. Now we discovers his fatal mistake, that is, he claims to introduce “existence” alone into a beforehand-conceived concept, as if “existence” could be thus dealt with as an independent property. Of course he have no sensible object by hand, from which he can draw out some other properties to accompany “existence,” when it is added into his concept about that being. The even more frustrating thing is that the concept about “that being, than

[21] Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, 534, A573/B601.

which nothing greater can be conceived,” is already so fed up that even if it allows you to introduce any other property to it at all, it would only accept “existence.” For anything else you want to bring to it? “This being” is going to refuse, telling you “I already have it.” Truly for any conceptual content to take existence in reality, it has to take a concrete form and allows itself to be limited by this form. Unfortunately Anselm’ s conceptual God is the kind of being that wants nothing but “existence” from reality. However, reality cannot simply offer “existence” to it.

But what if Anselm says, the concept about the being, than which nothing greater can be conceived, already includes the property “existence in reality?” Then the story changes, it means, Anselm has to encounter such an object in reality first, before he is able to form a complete concept about this being, than which nothing greater can be conceived. Obviously this never happens. On the contrary, he is going the other way around, that is, attempting to prove the realistic existence of a conceptual being by analyzing the concept itself.

Therefore we conclude, no matter whether “being” is a predicate or not, Anselm’ s ontological proof about God’ s existence does not work. Actually I would like to suggest a proof that the Anselmian ontological proof of God’ s existence is impossible. Let us presuppose that there is a valid proof “ $A \rightarrow B$ ”, in which “B” means “God exists.” For this “proof” to be valid we cannot have “ $B \rightarrow A$ ” at the same time, since if “ $A \leftrightarrow B$ ” then “ $A=B$ ”. Yet if “ $A \rightarrow B$ ” but “ $\neg (B \rightarrow A)$ ” then “A should be a sufficient but unnecessary condition for B,” that is “ $A \nrightarrow B$ ”, but if “God” is a being than which nothing greater can be conceived, He should never be this “B”, which is “truly included in” “A”. Therefore the presupposition that there is a valid proof “ $A \rightarrow B$ ”, in which “B” means “God exists,” is not sustainable.

So, there is no God?

So, there is no God? If you mean, there is no God in reality, in this world of experience, I have to answer, “Yes.” This is not only because that we have never had any sense experience of “that being, than which nothing greater can be conceived,” but also that any attempt to bring this being in reality, in this world of sensible objects, is a limitation of it and may end up negating it.

God, is like the ground under our feet. Whenever we try to grasp the ground, what we get is nothing more than something on the ground, i.e. a stone, a brick, some earth, etc., but never the ground itself. What is in our hand is not even a smallest part or a most tiny ingredient of it; the ground is so rich that no matter how much whatever you take from it the ground itself is still sufficient. We know that this ground exists only when we walk on it with full trust and no suspicion.

Maybe when I point to the ground and instruct you about its reality, you will say, “I see grasses, I see dirt, I see sand, I see pebbles, but I see no ground.” But can you walk on grasses, on dirt, on sand, or on pebbles? I mean, those things taken by themselves and not already supported by the ground. Truly, unless you confess that you are walking on the ground, how can you understand that there is a ground? How are you justified to say that there is a ground? Truly, for those who believe in God, God is in their heart.

The fatal disease of the so-called “proof of God’ s existence” lies in the attempt to objectify a reality that should not be objectified and that is actually grounding one’ s own subjectivity. Such an exertion of one’ s subjectivity, that is, attempt to objectify the reality that grounds one’ s own subjectivity, is ultimately self-undermining and doomed to fail. Leaving aside my suggested disproof of “proof of God’ s existence”, even if someone with some whimsical imagination managed to give a “proof of God’ s

existence” , such a “God,” proved by him, would not be the true God at all, who, grounding our very existence and subjectivity, refutes our attempt to objectify Him.

中文题目：

存在一位神吗？——对安瑟伦神存在的本体论证明及康德的批驳的考察

成静

复旦大学哲学学院博士后

上海市武川路 78 弄 30 号 201 室，200433；电话：+86-183-1713-7623

提要：康德否定了安瑟伦关于神存在的本体论证明的有效性，因为他认为“是”不是一个谓词，只是一个系词。可是普兰汀格提出“是”是一个谓词，只是这个谓词比较特殊；它不能单独做谓词，而总是要和别的谓词一道被使用。本文要论证的是，即使“是”是一个谓词，由于它的特殊性，安瑟伦的本体论证明仍然不能成立。本文进一步提出一个尝试性的论证以说明此类关于神存在的本体论证明不可能。其谬误归根结底在于它把神当作了一个存在于世界之中的客体。

关键词：神的存在、本体论证明、“是”、安瑟伦、康德

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

基督教在促进中美关系改善及中华文化发展上的作用

卓新平

（中国社会科学院世界宗教研究所，100732 北京，中国）

内容提要：党的“十八届三中全会公报”指出，要“最大限度地增加和谐因素，增强社会发展活力”。这在宗教问题上对于特别关注并正确引导基督教为我国和谐社会发展做贡献具有重要的指导意义。本文将探究中美关系及基督教在这一关系中的历史经验教训，论述当今中美关系中基督教可以发挥的积极作用，以便我们正确处理好目前我们所面临的基督教发展问题，促使其发挥正能量，减少其负面作用，从而使中国基督教能在当前中华文化复兴的伟大发展中起积极作用，有其正面功能。

关键词：基督教、中美关系、中华文化、和平发展

作者：卓新平，德国慕尼黑大学哲学博士，中国社会科学院学部委员、世界宗教研究所所长、中国宗教学会会长、全国人大常委。中国社会科学院世界宗教研究所，北京市建国门内大街5号，100732。电子邮件：zhuoxp@263.net

基督教在当代中国的发展，与其社会文化氛围相关联，这种关联又因宗教的历史渊源及跨国传播而使之范围扩大，很难就一个国家本身来谈论。基督教在中国的社会意义及社会定位恰好与这种处境相关。一方面，基督教在中国应实现其“中国化”，达致一种社会适应及文化融入；所谓“在地化”、“处境化”、“本土化”及“本色化”在中国社会氛围中实质上就是“中国化”即适应并融入中国社会文化。但另一方面，又不可能否认基督教的国际关联，而必须正视其信仰体系的“普世性”或“全球性”，看到其作为世界宗教的广泛发展。这样，基督教在国际关系中就是一个回避不了的话题。中国在今天国际关系中的地位及其发展变化，自然会触及基督教的相关问题。特别是在中美关系中，基督教在历史及现状中都有复杂纠结。过去西方列强侵华过程中曾有着基督教的负面参与，留下了许多遗憾和教训。“前事不忘，后事之师”，这在我们今天对基督教的反思及反省时是必须要记住的。然而，历史并非一成不变，其发展变化乃超出人们的想象和预期。在今天实现中华民族伟大复兴的“中国梦”之努力中，宗教与变化着的世界之关系也是值得我们密切观察和深刻思考的。而基督教在这种思考中理应占有很大比重。党的“十八届三中全会公报”指出，我们在今天的社会治理及社会发展中要“最大限度地增加和谐因素，增强社会发展活力”。这是在“全球化”背景下对国家安全的一种创新思考，尤其在宗教问题上对于特别关注并正确引导基督教为我国和谐社会发展做贡献具有重要的指导意义和实践意义。协调好与宗教的关系，团结广大信教群众，这是我国在新时期发展之“大安全”战略中的一项艰巨任务。而要“最大限度地增加和谐因素”，则不离对基督教的正确举措，因为全世界的基督徒几乎占了世界总人口的三分之一，而且其与众多世界大国或强国都有着社会发展和文化传统上的各种关联，特别是与美国的崛起及发展有着复杂

关系。如果我们不能处理好对基督教的关系，则很难实现“最大限度”增加“和谐因素”的目的。考虑到基督教与以美国为首的西方国家的特殊关系，我们也完全可以将基督教作为促进、改善中美关系乃至整个中西关系的重要桥梁。这种关系的改善，无论从政治层面、经济层面，还是从社会层面、文化层面，都有其不可估量的积极意义和价值。而中华文化想要真正取得其质的突破和在全球范围的发展，也有着其开放性地了解、对话、吸纳、融合基督教的任务

中美关系是世界大国关系中的重要一环，也是中国对外关系的重中之重。中美友好，则世界和平有了极为关键的保障；中美交恶，世界就会矛盾不断、冲突频仍，不得安宁。其涉及的不仅是中美关系本身，而且还会影响到周边地区是否安宁、跨太平洋地区的和平发展，甚至决定着整个国际局势的可能走向。在中美关系这盘大棋中，基督教的作用非常独特，其中关涉政治、外交、历史、文化、信仰等内容，特别是双方的基层交往在一定程度上也形成了两国关系的民意基础。而且，基督教在中美关系史上有着错综复杂的经历，值得我们今天好好反思和沟通。必须承认，中美关系在过去有着许多恩恩怨怨，今天的处境也并不理想，而化解其中不少关键矛盾，则与基督教有着直接关联。所以，通过中美对话梳理并分析这些矛盾，通过沟通来化解、消除这些矛盾，在当前乃十分必要，甚至有着其迫切性。大国对话总比大国对抗要好得多，在一个充满政治博弈的时代，大国之间的摩擦及由此导致的擦枪走火对整个世界都非常危险。在这种格局中，世界和平也是我国“大安全”战略所要力争的。对话走向和平，对抗导致危机，因而我们欢迎各种对话，注意防范各种冲突、积极化解任何潜在危机。其中中美对话是世界和平的关键因素，而这种对话的一个重要内容，就是审视基督教在中美关系上的参与及其意义，探讨基督教在今天实现中美关系和解并促进中美友好中的积极作用。

回溯历史，中美外交关系从一开始就有基督教的复杂参与。在“鸦片战争”前后，美国基督教传教士来华传教，随之即与美国对华外交联系起来。例如，1834年来华的美国传教士伯驾（Peter Parker, 1804-1888）在1847年就担任了美国驻华代办，1855年又升任为美国驻华公使，成为当时美国驻华全权代表，是第一位被美国政府任命为驻华首要外交官的美国基督教来华传教士。此外，1833年来华的美国传教士卫三畏（Samuel Wells Williams, 1812-1884）也在1855-1876年之间担任过美国驻华公使馆参赞和代办。而20世纪最为著名的美国驻华外交官、在1946-1949年间担任美国驻华大使的司徒雷登 John Leighton Stuart, 1876-1962）也是美国基督教来华传教士的背景，他出生在中国杭州，其人生经历了在华传教士、教育家和外交官这富有戏剧色彩的三部曲。1949年之前美国基督教与美国政府对外外交关系及政治定位的复杂联系，使基督教自觉不自觉地卷入了现实中国政治。在相应的对比中，我们则看到当时国民党的领袖人物如孙中山、蒋介石、宋美龄等人皈依基督教也有着明显的美国基督教背景。而且，基督教当时几乎一边倒地政治选位，明确站在国民党一边，也使1949年以后中国大陆基督教的处境发生巨变。司徒雷登本来曾尝试改善与中国共产党的关系，但当时的美国政府坚决反对，并让他立刻回国，故而奇迹没有发生。毛泽东以发表“别了，司徒雷登”一文而标志着当时中美政治及社会关系的中断。当20世纪50年代中美关系恶化后，中国基督教直接受到牵连，被社会边缘化、另类化。正是为了走出这一政治窘境，中国基督教才以具有政治色彩的“三自爱国”运动来获得其在新中国的生存与发展。所以说，“三自爱国”不是一种教会建制形式，而乃当时决定中国教会能否继续生存的社会政治参与。尽管如此，中国基督教仍然以其独有的宗教形式而断断续续、隐隐约约地保持了其与西方社会的文化关系和一定的宗教交往，而其中与美国的联系也依稀可辨。可以说，中美关系在20世纪下半叶因政治原因而恶化，中国基督教也主要因为这种政治变革的挑战而步入其“三自爱国”的发展；与之相关联，虽然中美官方关系在中国大陆中断，其上层交往基本停止，而基督教当时在中国大陆的存在和延续却使中美关系在民间仍以宗教等形式而有着复杂的保留和表现。

20世纪70年代，美国恢复与中国的交往，在中美建交前基督教在双方沟通上显然就起过一定的桥梁作用；例如，美国基督教现实主义神学家尼布尔（Reinhold Niebuhr, 1892-1971）就曾主张美国应

在外交上承认中国，让联合国接纳中华人民共和国。^[1] 在 1972 年尼克松访华之后，美国前总统老布什在北京担任了中美建交前美国驻华联络办主任，他也因这一特别经历而与中国基督教人士建立起良好关系。而自中国全面实行改革开放以来，基督教则构成了中美沟通的一个重要方面。在此期间，美国政府支持了至少三次美国宗教领袖代表团访华，其中绝大部分为基督教人士，其对中国的客观评价在美国也起到了促进中美关系良性发展的积极作用。一些美国基督教界人士对中国的支持，如美国福音派领袖葛培理等人呼吁美国政府给中国最惠国待遇和支持中国加入世界贸易组织（WTO）等举动，曾在一定程度上促成了中美政治经济关系的改善。为此，江泽民专门会见了葛培理父子，鼓励他们为中美友好多做贡献。本来，中国大陆对基督教福音派有比较负面的看法，认为其不仅保守、而且反共，但葛培理等人对华友好的姿态及努力，在一定程度上改变了这种传统看法，而且中国基督教“三自爱国”教会也通过在美国举办“《圣经》事工展”的合作亦与美国基督教会扩大了联系、加深了了解。所以，中美基督教会本身之间的联系和对话，可以为中美民众的联系和交往起示范、引导和先锋作用，这也就是我们所言之基督教在中美友好关系上的桥梁作用。中美基督教的这种沟通和联系有着其历史渊源，而在今天亦有其发展的巨大空间。

当然，中美基督教的联系及合作受到中美政治、经济和文化关系发展的影响。这些层面的沟通仍然困难重重，步履维艰，前途不明；对此，在宗教层面人们也谈到敌视中国的势力利用基督教对中国实施政治渗透、社会分化的问题，而且认为这种渗透主要是来自美国。可以说，美国对我们的渗透、对我们的影响乃是最大的，对之防范亦至关重要。我们必须正视这一问题的存在，看到中美关系目前的窘境和思想意识领域的巨大差异，以及美国教会本身的复杂构成和不同影响。为此，有必要开展比较广泛的中美基督教领袖对话，推动多层面、多教派的沟通，这种对话和沟通尤其在当前中国实施开放和走出去的大政方针之处境中就有着独特的历史意义和现实责任。

基督教在中美关系改善上要面对并解决的问题至少包括如下几点：

其一，根据基督教的“福音”理念和“博爱”精神，中美基督教应在中美两国传播、体现这种关爱，基督教的本真及核心是传播爱、推广爱，而不是增加仇视、敌意。最近美国儿童电视节目谈到美国借了中国那么多债该怎么办时，一个白人儿童“杀光中国人”的回答竟然没有得到节目主持人的及时纠正和正确引导的事件，让中美社会都感到震惊。美国自称是一个基督教国家，理应体现这种爱的精神和爱的传统；虽然童言无忌，而主持人的认可及麻木却让人不解、失望。美国教会应带动美国社会爱中国人，以当下的爱、善之姿态来缓和当前中美两国的紧张气氛，化解历史上留下的恩恩怨怨。而中国教会也应以其便利条件及合适身份推动中美两国民间交往，开展中美民间外交，培养两国人民大使。所以，以基督教信仰之“爱”来去除中美两国之间的怨恨、敌视，形成一种互信的默契，是中美关系会实现根本改善的信仰基础。目前离这种“互信”仍相差甚远，美国基督教会亦在观望和犹豫；我们必须意识到，只有“爱”才会带来“福”。

其二，在中美政治关系上多做化解矛盾、增加理解的工作，通过教会的影响及人气在社会舆论上促进两国政治和解、积极对话。我们应该尽快改变的一种状况，就是不再把对方“妖魔化”，不要对其政治体制无端攻击或说三道四。例如，一旦进入美国大选时期，美国社会舆论就会拿中国作为攻击对象，一些竞选政治家也喜欢散布“扳倒中国”的言论，使两国关系突然紧张，两国民众彼此不信任的气氛也随之升温。中美改善政治关系是改善一切关系的关键枢纽，具有纲举目张的意义，因此美国教会因促进美国社会去改善其对华关系，而不是无视或推动其恶化。中美政治制度各有其不同传统和社会基础，只能相互尊重而不是以己之治来取代对方，世界的多元当然包括政治的多元共存。于此，基督教在改善

[1] 参见 G. Harland: *The Thought of Reinhold Niebuhr*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1960), 204-205; 以及 *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica*, (1985, Macropaedia Vol. 13), 75.

中美政治关系上是完全可以大有作为的，希望美国教会能够真正走出这一步。政治对话最为关键，起着纲举目张的作用。

其三，在文化和精神上应倡导多元对话、不同宗教及信仰的宽容和包容。记得我第一次到美国参观时美国朋友在一个展示美国历史的博物馆曾给我看了一幅无景、百蝶多彩的对比图像，给我留下了深刻印象。中国是一个多民族、多宗教的国家，加之政治、文化信仰的多元呈现，与有着强大基督教信仰传统的美国全然不同。因此，基督教在中美关系上应倡导多元文化对话、多种宗教理解，而不是不顾国情地推行基督教，梦想中国成为基督教国家。其之所以行不通，乃是因为多数中国人认为“中华归主”实际上反映了20世纪上半叶“基督教占领中国”的殖民色彩，故此才会抵制对中华文化的侵蚀及改变。“中国梦”与“美国梦”不同，我们虽然是同“球”异梦，却仍可梦异而共在。在与中国社会文化的交往中，基督教应体会中国“舍得”智慧的精髓，只有“舍”才会“得”，如果舍弃自己的偏见，就能得到真诚的友谊。基督教若以其谦卑而做好了“仆人”的服务，其“先知”的意义则会自然显现出来。美国虽然很强大，美国的基督徒却仍然要奉行“非以役人，乃役于人”的基督谦卑精神，做推广多元对话的工作，成为让多种文化、多种精神共存的“仆人”，而不能以自己的信仰为“普世价值”而颐指气使、号令天下。只有文化多元，才能世界大同。

其四，基督教在中美关系上不是要推动其政治选择，而是要践行其社会服务。政治及意识形态的分歧在短时期内是很难彻底化解的，不同文化的认同也需要长时间的磨合。因此，基督教应搁置中美关系上的各种争论，先在行动上让大家走在一起，通过近距离接触来增进理解。社会服务本来就是基督教的长处，教会在这方面经验丰富、制度完善、历史悠久，故而可以驾轻就熟，立刻推行。在有着眼见为实、特别是近代以来推崇实用主义传统的中国，人们不是听你说什么，而是看你做什么。基督教只有放下身段，屈己濯足，进行不问收获、只顾耕耘的社会服务工作，才可能“感动中国”，被中国所认可。曾经让美国信服、让世界许多地方皈依的基督教要想感动“神州”，则必须以其“神召”来筚路蓝缕、始于足下。在中美关系上我们还没有陶醉于成功的喜悦，仍必须去付出探索的辛苦。

总之，中美基督教都要以学习、沟通的心态向彼此走近，在改善中美关系、增进中美友谊上起先驱和先知作用，做服务和仆人工作。世界及人类的整体性，却由于各种政治、经济、社会、思想、信仰、文化的纷争而被破坏，被撕破为碎片般的存在。在中国的基督教通过各自文化传统的沟通及交流而深知西方二元分割、对立之存在模式的不足，也能体悟中华文化整体统一的智慧。这种整体统一就基于多元共存、和而不同，其实现要靠包容他者、允许不同之存在，要能理解差异或差别、在充满弹性中实现社会的稳态和人心的静态。在目前美国仍是强者，也仍对我处于攻势，对之全方位的化解要靠具有实力的对话，要靠具有政治睿智的博弈和周旋，其中就要运用包括宗教在内的各种文化“软实力”。在此，中国基督教对于我们应该成为具有正功能的文化软实力，参与化解美国社会对我的压力和攻势。而美国基督教也必须认识到美国政治及其文化的相对性，引导美国社会以虚怀若谷的心态来认识世界、认识有着悠久文化传承的中国。因为基督教信仰的缘故，两国的基督徒更容易接近，也更能够理解，这就使其是筑桥者、开路者、探险家。我们欢迎中美基督教能带领广大信众在促进中美友好关系上敢为人先，披荆斩棘，架桥通路，以其信仰实践来创造奇迹、彰显神圣，在积极改善中美双边关系上真正成为两国民众中具有筚路蓝缕之功的先知和先驱。

The English Title:

The Function of Christianity in Promoting the Improvement of Sino-American Relationship and in Developing Chinese Culture

ZHUO Xinping, Ph.D. from München University, Fellow of China Academy of Social Sciences, Director of Institute of World Religions of CASS, Chairman of China Society for Religious Study, Standing Committee Member of the National People's Congress. Address: Institute of World Religions, China Academy of Social Sciences, Jianguomen nei Street No. 5, 100732, Beijing, China. Email: zhuoxp@263.net

Abstract :The Report of the Third Plenary Session of the Eighteen Communique points out that it is necessary “to maximize harmonious factors and to enhance social vitality” . For the issues regarding religion, this has an important guiding meaning in paying special attention to and in leading Christianity to contribute to the development of harmonious society in China. In the present article I explore the Sino-American relationship and the historical experience and lessons of Christianity in this relationship, and the positive function which Christianity may play in the contemporary Sino-Christian relationship. The aim is that we may deal well with the problems which are faced by Christianity in her development today in China, and help Christianity to have positive energy and to reduce negative effect, and finally Chinese Christianity may have a positive effect in the great development of Chinese cultural revival.

Key term :Christianity, Sino-American Relationship, Chinese Culture, Peaceful Development

Church Choice of University Student Christians in Beijing and Their Religious Commitment

SUN Shangyang

(Professor, Dept. of Philosophy and Religious Studies, Peking University, 100872 Beijing)

HAN Qi

(Assistant Researcher, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, 100732 Beijing)

Abstract: The data analysis of “Survey of Attitude of University Students in Beijing towards Christianity” shows that university students in Beijing convert to Christianity mainly because of the influence from their family and their social network. Moreover, their choices between three-self churches and house churches are largely influenced by these churches’ interpretation of religious doctrines (or the system of meaning) and their geographic proximity. These facts have verified some statements about conversion from the rational choice theory (Rodney Stark and Roger Finke). The fact that Christians, who belong to house churches which are in higher tension with the government, have higher degree of religious commitment than those who belong to three-self churches, has confirmed some statements about religious commitment from the rational choice theory. But another fact that those who belong to unregistered house churches are unable to keep stable participation in church’ s religious practices demonstrates that the rational choice theory cannot be completely applied to a religious market under ideological control.

Key words: university student Christians, conversion, religious commitment, rational choice

Authors: SUN Shangyang, P.h.D., Peking University, Professor, Dept. of Philosophy and Religious Studies, Peking University, Haidian District, 100872 Beijing. Email: sunsy@phil.pku.edu.cn

HAN Qi, Ph.D.from Peking University, Assistant Researcher, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences. Jianguomen nei Street No. 5, 100732, Beijing, China. Email: ksaiter@126.com

May 4th Movement, December 9th Movement, and August 9th Movement all reveal that in modern period of China, social movements launched or participated by university students in Beijing could normally inspire and motivate numerous people and thus make a strong impact on China’ s social, political and cultural development.

The attitude of university students in Beijing towards religion, their choice between the stands of pro-religion and non-religion (even anti-religion), and their choices among different types of church, may be a response to the social trend, and may influence the society as a whole due to their unique autonomy. From this we can conclude that a serious investigation of university student Christians’ choice of denomination has profound meaning both academically and socially.

In fact, there is abundant literature on university students’ religious choices and behaviors both in China and abroad. We have reviewed the literature in another paper and thus would save the space here.

1. Questions and Theories

Since the reform and opening-up policy was initiated over 30 years ago, with relatively loose social control, major traditional religions and folk religions have undergone a strong recovery. The recovery and fast spread of Christianity is the most salient phenomenon and has drawn most attention, and the reasons are as follows: Protestantism was introduced to China when China was invaded by imperialist countries, and was regarded as their “cultural weapon” to control Chinese people; the Chinese government worries about that Christian churches would serve as a tool for western countries to conduct “color revolution” in China; the conflicts between three-self churches and house churches have brought challenges to government’ s religious governance; Christian churches’ ‘soul hunting’ (preach) of young people, especially university students, has made the government anxious, etc.

As scholars in sociology of religion, we are mainly focused on value-free and objective academic issues: the difference of proportion of Christians among university students and among the total population, the mechanism of their conversion, their choice between three-self churches and house churches, and their response to the dichotomy of three-self church /house church, whether there exists a “folk wisdom” which blurs the line between three-self churches and house churches ^[1], their conversion mode, and their attitude towards the relationship between politics and religion which has drawn much attention from various circles of people, etc.

We would analyze the issues mentioned above within the model of rational choice theory. Ever since Warner pointed out the emergence of a new paradigm in sociology of religion in 1993 ^[2], the new paradigm based on rational choice theory has made great strides in sociology of religion in the United States. Stark, the most important figure of this paradigm, has based the rational choice theory on a common rule of human behaviors, that is, human beings all go after benefits and avoid costs. ^[3]Later on, faced with opposition and criticism, he admitted that he “does not mean that every religious behavior is based on rational choice—that’ s why non-religiousness or at least the indifference towards religion is so common—nor does he mean that all religious behaviors are out of deliberate cost/benefit calculations” . But he still firmly believes that “religious decision making are normally governed by costs/benefits calculations, and thus are rational behaviors, exactly the same as human beings’ other behaviors.” ^[4]

As for individual religious decision making (such as conversion), Stark defines “conversion” as the change in religious affiliation, and says that when people convert, they are trying to maintain their social capita formed by interpersonal attachment. If they have deeper attachment with people from another religious affiliation, they would become converts. In other words, compared with more attractive doctrines,

[1] Cao Nanlai’ s field research of churches in Wenzhou shows that in Wenzhou Christians’ ordinary life, there has already been a church type which transcends the dichotomy of house church/three-self church. This provides useful resources for system renovation and the harmonious development of society. See “Subjectivity and Locality of Chinese Religious Practices” , *Journal of Peking University*, 47(6), November 2010, 22-23, 27.

[2] R. Steven Warner, “Work in Progress toward a New Paradigm for the Sociological Study of Religion in the United States” , *American Journal of Sociology* 1993, 98 (5) .

[3] Rodney Stark, *The future of religion: secularization, revival, and cult formation*, University of California Press, 1985, 5-8.

[4] Rodney Stark, Roger Finke, *Acts of Faith—Explaining the Human Side of Religion*, Translated Version, Translated by Yang Fenggang, Beijing: Renmin University of China Press, 2004, 69.

the importance of social network in one's conversion is more subtle^[5]. Though Bourdieu is an opponent to rational choice theory, Stark creates the concept of "religious capita" by utilizing and transforming Bourdieu's concept of cultural capita, and maintains that religious capita is formed by one's mastery of and bonding with a certain religious culture; thus when people convert, they are inclined to maximize their religious capita, so as to optimize their capita and avoid the risk of capita investment. Stark also refers to other scholars' research, showing that in one's conversion, doctrine is "a tiny or even ignorable" factor. People are attracted to and eventually join a new group due to their bonding with members of this group.^[6]

All in all, in Stark's statement about the rational choice of religion, the image of the sophisticated "economic man" is very vivid and trenchant. This theory has many advocates as well as many opponents in the western academia. However, compared with fervent support or stubborn opposition, we show more appreciation to the mild criticism and constructive advices. For instance, some scholars point out that Stark ignores the collective religious rites and the religious emotion inspired by these rites, while at the same time affirming the rationality of the rational choice theory and try to synthesize the interactive rite theory and rational choice theory.^[7]

Of course, it needs to be pointed out that the rational choice theory is based on the empirical research of exclusive religions such as Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. The question is, is it appropriate to use this theory to analyze non-exclusive religions? In fact, some Chinese scholars who once used this theory have turned to challenge the legitimacy to use the religious market theory based on rational choice paradigm to explain phenomena in Chinese society.^[8] Although many such challenges and criticisms have their merits, the authors argue that we should try to understand the original intention of rational choice theory, that is, to reject and refute the old paradigm which regards all religions as lies, as the result of credulity or ignorance, which thus should be abandoned, and which regards religious behaviors as irrational behaviors or even behaviors caused by mental disorder.^[9] From this perspective, we can see that rational choice theory is especially appropriate to be used in modern China, where people are deeply influenced by the enlightenment discourse, and where disastrous religious policies have been implemented. Indeed, as what Stark and other scholars have repeatedly proved and emphasized, since we believe human beings' behaviors are generally rational, we have reasons to believe that human beings' religious behaviors are just as rational as other behaviors, although perhaps we should adopt more subjective and limited rational concept, that is, to admit that people seek different benefits or objectives and are faced with many potential costs, and we should know how actors define their situation.^[10] Moreover, since our object of study is the attitude and behaviors of university student Christians in Beijing, and Christianity is an exclusive religion,

[5] *Ibid.*, 143, 148-150.

[6] *Ibid.*, 143, 150, 154, 153.

[7] Joseph O. Baker, "Social Sources of the Spirit: Connecting Rational Choice and Interactive Ritual Theories in the Study of Religion", *Sociology of Religion* 2010, 71:4, 432-456.

[8] Lu Yunfeng, "Beyond the Sociology of Christianity: Probing the applicability of the religious economy model to China", *Sociological Studies*, 2008:5, 81-97.

[9] Rodney Stark, Roger Finke, *Acts of Faith—Explaining the Human Side of Religion*, Translated Version, Translated by Yang Fenggang, Beijing: Renmin University of China Press, 2004, 2, 51.

[10] *Ibid.*, 45-46.

it seems that we have no reason to doubt the applicability of rational choice theory in this research. Thus, we seek to examine the rational choice theory in sociology of religion based on the data of our project, and try to modify or complement this theory.

2. Data and Survey

The data used in this paper are from the research project “Attitude of University Students in Beijing towards Christianity” launched by Sun Shangyang, the first author of this paper, starting in April, 2011. This project targets at college students (440,030)^[11] and graduate students (master:143,017^[12]; PhD:46,514^[13]) in all 55 universities in Beijing, altogether 629,561 students. We adopted hierarchical ordering of data, multi-phase, proportional probability and scope sampling method. We dispatched 2,000 questionnaires and received 1,877 pieces back, among which 1,876 pieces are valid. This paper’s analysis is based on the data obtained from this survey.

In our questionnaire, there are 26 questions specifically designed for Christians, among which there are some variables related to the topic of this paper: the religious belief of university student Christians’ family members and social network; university student Christians’ church participation; the type of church that university student Christians belong to; the frequency of participation in church activities; amount of donation to the church; leaders of church; the reason for not joining three-self churches; their attitude towards house churches; their attitude towards government’s religious policies. Besides these questions, there are also some questions in other parts of the questionnaire which relate to the topic of this paper. This questionnaire can basically measure the reasons for university student Christians’ conversion and the condition of their religious commitment. The result of this survey can support the standpoint of this paper.

3. Basic Findings: Choice of Church and Religious Conversion of University Student Christians

Christians believe that “church is a group of people who belong to God, who are called by God to worship Him, and who are connected to Jesus”^[14]. Thus, “church” has always referred to a group of people. Christians’ emphasis on collective religious life in the church is perhaps the social origin why Christianity developed faster than other local traditional religions in China.

In fact, the history of house churches can date back to a long time ago, and even to the Apostle period when secret missionary activities were conducted. However, house churches didn’t appear in China until 1949, when Chinese government were trying to transform churches in the Three-self Patriotism Movement. This made some Christians feel unsatisfied with the connection between church and government, so they left three-self churches and organized their own house churches. After the reform and opening-up policy was initiated, house churches restored and developed very fast.^[15] Zhou Chun-shui classifies house

[11] Mainly including college students from grade 2007 to grade 2010, as well as some 5-year majors like medicine majors.

[12] Not including part-time Master students.

[13] Not including part-time PhD students.

[14] Zhou Chunshui, *Protestantism in the Lane—The study on House Church Lanzhou City*. Master’s Degree Dissertation of Lanzhou University in 2009, 11.

[15] *Ibid.*, 11.

churches into three types: first, the house churches which are under the jurisdiction of three-self churches^[16]. Most of these churches are legally registered as a part of a local three-self church. There is no professional priest in these churches. Priests from the local three-self churches would go there to administer the rites and training activities. Second, the semi-independent house churches. Most of these churches are independent but legally registered. Though they might also be affiliated to three-self churches, they are rarely influenced by them. Their leaders naturally come from their followers, and their gathering forms are relatively free. Third, the house churches which are not legally registered and refuse to participate in the three-self churches' activities. This is "house church" in the strict sense. In our research project, "registered house churches" belong to the second type, while "unregistered house churches" belong to the third type.

According to the data, university students in Beijing who claim to be Christian take up to 3.9% of all university students in Beijing, among which the protestants take up to 2.9%, the Catholics 1%.^[17] "Report of the Door-to-door Survey on Chinese Christians" from the Institute of World Religions of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences shows that in 2009 spring, Chinese protestants take up to 1.8% of the whole population of China, and over 60% of Christians are between the age range from 35 to 64^[18]. Christians take up below 1.8% of the whole population from 20-year-old to 30-year-old Chinese youths. However, the proportion of Christians among university students in Beijing is well above the national average proportion. This may result from that in recent years Christianity has enjoyed a relatively free and wide transmission among university students: according to our research, it is shown that over half of university students have been preached. This proportion is close to the data from "Survey of Chinese People's Spiritual Life" which was released by Center on Religion and Chinese Society at Purdue University in 2010. That survey shows that the self-claimed Protestants in China take up to 2.3% of the whole population^[19]. However, no matter which date above is adopted, our research can show that Christians among university students in Beijing is above the national average level.

Chart 1 Baptism of Christians Interviewed (unit: person)

Have you been baptized	Protestant	Catholic	Eastern Orthodox Christian	Others	Total
Yes	11	4	1	0	16
No	25	8	0	3	36
Total	36	12	1	3	52

We would first introduce the data about Christians in our research. As stated above, we have received 1876 valid pieces of questionnaire, among which there are 52 questionnaires from self-claimed Christians. Among the 52 Christians, 36 are Protestants, taking up to 72% of the total, and 12 are Catholics, 23%, 1 is Eastern Orthodox Christian. As for their educational background, 36 are undergraduate students, 11 are on

[16] *Ibid.*, 11-12.

[17] Sun Shangyang, Li Ding, "Chinese Culture Fever, Scarcity of Meaning, College Students' Interests towards Religion", *International Journal of Sino-Western Studies*, 2011,12(1), 63.

[18] The Institute of World Religions of Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, *Report of the Door-to-door Survey on Chinese Christians*, Chinese Religion Report(2010), Beijing: Social Sciences Academic Press, 2010, 191-192.

[19] Huang Haibo, "Civil Society in Construction—Christianity's Responsibility and Retrospect in China in 2010", *Chinese Religion Report*(2011), Beijing: Social Sciences Academic Press, 2010, 129.

master programs, and 4 are on doctoral programs. As for gender, there are 21 males and 31 females. Their age ranges from 18 to 30. As for the length of their church life, 37% are equal to or shorter than 3 years, 29% are between 4-8 years, 33% are equal to or longer than 9 years. Almost half of them join the church when they are 16 or younger. 27% of them have a father who is Christian, and 42% of them have a mother who is Christian, and at least 25% of them have parents who are both Christians. And 36% of them believe that the most influential factor in their decision to become Christian is their parents, and all of these people (altogether 18 students) have a mother who is a Christian. From this we can safely draw a conclusion that the proportion of early endowed Christians^[20] is at least 25%, which indicates that family tradition is a very influential factor in people's religious choice. At this point, Stark's rational choice theory is completely applicable, that is, "when people are making religious choices, they would try to retain their social capita", and "in normal situations, most people would not change religion or denomination."^[21] "Early Endowed Christians" are greatly influenced by their family and have a strong tendency to retain their family tradition.

From the length of their church life and their grade at school, about 45% of these Christians converted after entering college. 25% of these Christians claimed that they became Christians mainly because of the influence from their friends, classmates, or teachers. As a result, peers, friends at school, classmates, and teachers are another important way for the spread of Christianity. The two points made above show that social network is an important reason for university students to become Christians. Stark says that the religious capita can be divided into two parts: cultural capita and emotional capita. One need to know about the religious culture in order to follow that religion, and participating in religious practices with their family members would make people devote emotions to that religion, and such emotion would ultimately become innate. "When people are making religious choices, they would try to retain their social capita".^[22] Social capita formed through social network is the social foundation of university student Christians' faith.

How about these Christians' participation in church activities? Church is the structural basis for the validity of their faith. With the development of Christianity, the types of church are becoming more diverse. As for the choice of churches, among the 52 Christians, 38% go to a single church regularly. Plus the ones who have changed their church but attend the new regularly, this figure could reach 48%. 30% do not attend regular communion activities, and 17% attend 2 or 3 churches at the same time. From this we can see that nearly half of these college Christians attend a single church regularly, and one third of them have no regular church activities (maybe they are trying to find a satisfactory one), and the remaining ones go to multiple churches.^[23]

[20] Early endowed Christians refer to those college students who became Christians due to their parents' influence.

[21] Rodney Stark, Roger Finke, *Acts of Faith—Explaining the Human Side of Religion*, Translated Version, Translated by Yang Fenggang, Beijing: Renmin University of China Press, 2004, 148-149.

[22] *Ibid.*, 150-151.

[23] Since this research has not made inquiries of those who attend 2 or 3 churches simultaneously why they do that, thus we have no clue on whether the churches they attend belong to the same denomination. In this respect, we only intended to measure the overall forms of college student Christians participating in churches' ordinary religious activities. Moreover, our data analysis shows that college student Christians who attend 2 or 3 churches at the same time spend more time participating in churches' activities (worship not included) per week than those who attend a certain church regularly and who have no regular church to attend.

Chart 2 Church Participation of Christians Interviewed

Church participation	Protestant	Catholic	Eastern Orthodox Christian	Others	Total
Participate in a single church regularly	17	3	0	0	20
Participate in 2 or 3 churches at the same time	3	4	1	1	9
Change to a new church and attend it regularly	4	1	0	0	5
Have no regular communion	10	4	0	2	16
Others	2	0	0	0	2
Total	36	12	1	3	52

As for the frequency of their participation in church activities per month, 36.5% are below three times, 32.7% are over four times(including four times), 17.3% attend church activities only on festivals such as Christmas or Thanks-giving or when there are some special events. Except for the worship, 66% spend less than 2 hours at church, 20% spend 2-5 hours, and 10% 6-8 hours, 4% over 9 hours. Among those Christians, 40.4% read scriptures and pray every day or frequently, 23.1% read scriptures and pray only when they attend worship or bible-study, 19.2% read scriptures and pray only when they are in difficult situations, 13.5% seldom read scriptures and pray, 3.8% never read scriptures and pray. As for the donation to church, 23.1% donate less than 50 yuan to church, 19.3% donate 50-300 yuan, 11.5% donate over 300 yuan, and 46.2% donate nearly zero per month. Over 30% attend church meetings at least once a week, nearly 70% spend less than 2 hours at church except for the worship, 40% read scriptures and pray every day or frequently, 70% donate less than 50 yuan or nearly zero to church per month. Their frequency of church participation and of communion participation, the time and money they devote to the church, and the frequency of reading scriptures and praying show that their religious piety is on a fair level, but the time and money they devote to church is limited due to the limitation of their social and economic status—university student. Research data also shows that 60% of them believe that their faith has influenced over 70% of all the aspects of their life, which indicates their high degree of piety.

The data about which type of church they join shows that they prefer house churches. For protestants, 1/3 participate in three-self churches, 44% participate in house churches, and a limited number of them participate in three-self churches, registered house churches, and unregistered house churches at the same time.

Chart 3 Type of churches Christians participate in

Type of churches	Protestant	Catholic	Eastern Orthodox Christian	Others	Total
Three-self churches	10	3	0	0	13
Unregistered house churches	12	7	1	1	21
Registered house churches	4	1	0	0	5
All of the above	3	0	0	0	3
Others	7	1	0	2	10
Total	36	12	1	3	52

Analysis of the questionnaires shows that the reason why some Christians do not participate in three-self churches is mainly because three-self churches are too far away or they don't know where they are located. Over 20% of Christians are out of the former reason and over 20% are out of the latter reason. Moreover, 15% of them don't agree with the ideas of three-self churches or think there are too many people in three-self churches which makes the interaction inconvenient. There is no obvious influence from family or friends at this point. From this we can see that although the influence from family and

friends is evident in people's conversion, the choices among different types of churches are not relevant to family or friends' influence. It seems more likely that their choice of churches is mainly influenced by practical reasons as well as churches' ideas and activities. In fact, this relatively free choice would result in the popularity of house churches among the believers^[24]. Thus, we can reach the conclusion that university students convert to Christianity mainly because of their social network, while their choice of churches is mainly influenced by practical reasons and churches' ideas. Three-self churches are limited in number and weak on accessibility, which has in turn promoted the popularity of house churches.^[25]

Compared with three-self churches, house churches are more welcomed. 75% of Protestants claim that they like or very like house churches. Among those who attend house churches, 70% claim they like the worship and anthem in house churches, 27% claim they like the sermons there, and 38% claim they like the sense of belonging provided by communions. However, among the Christians who attend house churches, 27% indicate that they still cannot find the meaning of life, and 22% think that the churches interfere too much with personal life or the relationship between churches and government is too tense.

Chart 4 Christians' Attitude Towards House Church

Attitude towards House Church	Protestant	Catholic	Eastern Orthodox Christian	Others	Total
Very like	8	0	0	0	8
Like	18	9	1	1	29
Moderate	7	3	0	2	12
Total	33	12	1	3	49

Stark believes "religious commitment is the degree to which humans promptly meet the terms of exchange with a god or gods as specified by the explanations of a given religious organization."^[26] Religious commitment can be divided into two types: objective commitment (behaviors) and subjective commitment (belief and emotion). Objective commitment refers to all the behaviors which are consistent to the interpretation of doctrines supported by a religious organization, such as various religious participation or practices, donation, and following the rules which control our behaviors. Subjective commitment refers to the belief and understanding of the interpretation of doctrines supported by a religious organization, as well as the emotion of believers towards this religious organization^[27]. The variables which directly measure the objective commitment in our research are as follows: the frequency of participation in

[24] This survey also has a depth interview part. In this part, we randomly chose 60 students as our interviewees, among whom there are three Christians. As for the attitude towards house churches, a Christian said:

Q: Do you prefer three-self church or house church?

A: House church.

Q: Why?

A: I feel like there is less restraint and more freedom in house churches.

[25] Liu Peng believes that in the last ten years, the number of Christians is increasing fast, while the number of three-self churches is very limited, which makes it inconvenient for Christians to attend church activities. Against this background, the house church has well satisfied people's religious needs with its flexible and convenient form. This is a practical reason for the development of house churches. See Liu Peng, "House Church: Problem and Solution", *Leaders* (40), 2011, 6.

[26] Rodney Stark, Roger Finke, *Acts of Faith—Explaining the Human Side of Religion*, Translated Version, Translated by Yang Fenggang, Beijing: Renmin University of China Press, 2004, 127.

[27] *Ibid.*, 127-128.

communions, the frequency of reading scriptures and praying, the amount of donation, the time spent at church except participating in the worship. We have no variable to directly measure subjective commitment, but we can indirectly measure that from the question of which aspect of church life attracts them most.

According to Stark' s theory, we can make an analogy of three-self church and house church as “big church” and “small sect” . As the “big church” which has gained government' s approval, the three-self church is in harmony with the overall social and cultural environment, and in less tension with other social forces. Its religious activities are relatively canonical. However, if we put aside the objective factors which make people not to choose three-self churches, they are less attractive than house churches. As “small sect” , the house church provides its followers more diverse and colorful communion life and more energetic interpretations of doctrines, but it cannot provide completely satisfactory answers to their questions about the meaning of life, and its tension with society and its requirement for its believers make the minority of those university student Christians unsatisfactory.

In fact, the data analysis shows that on the variables of frequency of reading scriptures and praying, amount of monthly donation, time spent at church per month except the time of worship, university student Christians who attend house churches are slightly higher than those who attend three-self churches (see Chart 5 and Chart 6); and there is no notable difference on the frequency of attending church gatherings.

Chart 5 Frequency of Reading Scriptures and Praying of Christians Who Attend Different Types of Churches

Frequency of reading scriptures and praying	Three-self church	Unregistered house church	Registered house church	Attend all these churches	Others	Total
Read scriptures and pray every day or frequently	4	10	2	1	4	21
Only read scriptures and pray at the worship or bible-study	3	6	2	0	1	12
Only read scriptures and pray in difficult situations	5	2	1	1	1	10
Seldom read scriptures and pray	1	3	0	1	2	7
Never read scriptures and pray	0	0	0	0	2	2
Total	13	21	5	3	10	52

Chart 6 Amount of Monthly Donation to Church of Christians Who Attend Different Types of Churches

Amount of monthly donation to church	Three-self church	Unregistered house church	Registered house church	Attend all these churches	Others	Total
Below 50yuan	6	3	1	1	1	12
51-100yuan	1	4	1	0	1	7
101-300yuan	0	2	0	0	1	3
301-500yuan	0	1	1	0	0	2
Over 501yuan	0	3	0	0	1	4
Almost none	6	8	2	2	6	24
Total	13	21	5	3	10	52

Stark believes that if a religious group has higher tension with its environment, it would become more exclusive, and its members' commitment would be more costly, which, in turn, would lead to a higher

degree of commitment^[28]. Compared with three-self churches, house churches are in higher tension with the surrounding environment, and university student Christians in house churches indeed have a slightly higher degree of objective commitment, which coheres with Stark's theory. On the other hand, 70% of university student Christians who attend house churches claim that they like the worship and anthem there, and 38% claim they like the sense of belonging which is provided by the communion, and 27% claim they like the preach there. In three-self churches, 77% of university student Christians like the preach there, 54% like the worship and anthem there, and 23% like the sense of belonging provided by the communion. Thus, we can only show that university student Christians who attend house churches are different from those attending three-self churches in the variables measuring the subjective commitment. As a whole, university student Christians who attend house churches have a slightly higher degree of commitment than their counterparts of three-self churches.

Moreover, from Chart 7 we can also see that the majority (69%) of university student Christians of three-self churches attend a single church regularly. There are only three who attend 2 or 3 churches or do not attend communions regularly. But for members of unregistered churches, the situation is different: there are 7 of them who attend a single church, 6 attend 2 or 3 churches, 8 do not attend communions regularly. In other words, two thirds of unregistered church members have no stable commitment to a certain church.^[29] As a result, though house church followers are twice the number of three-self church followers, the commitment of the former is less stable than the latter. There are many factors contributing to this unstableness, such as the disadvantages of house churches which we mentioned earlier: the tension with the surroundings, the inability to provide satisfactory interpretation of doctrines to satisfy their followers' needs. Although there is only a small portion of house church followers who point out these disadvantages, yet it indicates indirectly that in Chinese society, people are cautious of religious groups which are in high tension with the society, even if they can provide higher religious payoff. And house churches should enhance the attraction of their interpretation of doctrines.

Chart 7 Church Participation of Christians Who Attend Different Types of Churches

The participation form of ordinary religious activities	Three-self Church	Unregistered House Church	Registered House Church	Attend all these churches	Others	Total
Attend a single church regularly	8	6	2	0	4	20
Attend 2 or 3 churches regularly	1	6	0	1	1	9
Having switched churches before, but currently having relatively stable participation	1	1	2	1	0	5
Don't attend church regularly	2	8	1	0	5	16
Others	1	0	0	1	0	2
Total	13	21	5	3	10	52

[28] *Ibid.*, 180-181.

[29] If believers attend two or three churches which belong to the same denomination, then not attending a certain church regularly does not prove anything. However, according to Liu Peng's research, most house churches in China belong to evangelicals, and are rarely influenced by denominational traditions. There is no unified regulations on theoretical training and how to choose priests. Every house church is equal and independent. (See Liu Peng: "House Church: Problem and Solution", *Leaders*(40), 2011,6.) Thus, it is reasonable to believe that currently in China, house churches are loosely connected and relatively independent, seldom subject to the influence of denominational tradition, especially in big cities like Beijing.

Of course, this phenomenon also shows that in current Chinese society, unregistered house churches should be legalized. In fact, religious organization with lower degree of tension with its surroundings and with legal status can better meet the religious needs of Chinese people. And only this kind of religious organizations can remain stable commitment rates and enjoy consistent development. When Stark examines the tension ^[30] between religious groups and their social cultural environment, he does not take the factor of “legitimacy” of religious groups into serious consideration, and this factor plays different roles in different societies. According to Stark, the “illegal” unregistered house church has the strongest tension with its surroundings, and higher-tension denominations have deeper-committed followers^[31]. However, we can see from our data that unregistered house church followers cannot be regarded as having the highest level of commitment. Actually their commitment is very unstable. It is true that house churches attract more followers, but if they want to continuously attract Chinese people, they have a long way to go. Of course, this conclusion is based on the data obtained from the survey about university student Christians in Beijing, and further analysis and tests are needed to see whether it also applies to other groups.

Combining all the analysis of university student Christians’ choice of church and their religious commitment, we can safely say that for most university student Christians, the difference between house church and three-self church is not so clear-cut, and they make their choices based on their personal needs and practical factors. Moreover, our data also shows that generally the religious commitment of house church followers is slightly higher than three-self churches, and registered house churches have stable membership commitment similar to three-self churches. There are very few Christians who attend both three-self churches and house churches; perhaps this may be the “folk wisdom” to solve the inherent historical conflict between three-self churches and house churches.

These university student Christians maintain that 38% of the churches they attend are led by three-self church priests, over 23% and 28% are led by foreigners and non-three-self church priests respectively. Other data shows that 25% of them attend three-self churches, 40% unregistered house churches, 10% registered churches, 6% attend all the three types of churches. Altogether there are about 40% of university student Christians who attend three-self churches, registered house churches, or attend all three types of churches. Given 38% of the churches they attend are led by three-self church priests, we can see these two figures are consistent. This indicates that currently most Christian churches are led by three-self church priests, followed by non-three-self church priests and foreigners. Taking the objective reasons for the prevalence of house churches into consideration, we can be certain that there is greater need for religious products and services among university students than what three-self churches can provide, and house churches satisfy this need to a certain extent. House church has flexible style, and as “small sect” ,

[30] Tension refers to the degree of distinctiveness, separation, and antagonism between a religious group and the “outside” world. See Rodney Stark, Roger Finke, *Acts of Faith—Explaining the Human Side of Religion*, Translated Version, Translated by Yang Fenggang, Beijing: Renmin University of China Press, 2004, 178. The prerequisite of Stark’ s theory is that only in completely competitive religious market, the tension can be proportional to the degree of commitment. He pointed out that high degree of commitment only exists in highly competitive and unregulated religious market, (Rodney Stark, Roger Finke, *Acts of Faith—Explaining the Human Side of Religion*, Translated Version, Translated by Yang Fenggang, Beijing: Renmin University of China Press, 2004, 317.)

[31] Rodney Stark, Roger Finke, *Acts of Faith—Explaining the Human Side of Religion*, Translated Version, Translated by Yang Fenggang, Beijing: Renmin University of China Press, 2004, 181.

it can provide sense of belonging (worship, hymn, communion) and interpretation of doctrines (preach), which are important factors to attract followers. Wang Chenli points out that three-self churches' lack of flexibility and communication between followers makes some young Christians more inclined to choose house churches. Wang also analyzes how house churches provide sense of belonging to their followers and stimulate their inclination to participate in church activities so as to deepen their commitment.^[32]

Our data shows that 22.4% of university students in Beijing agree that Christianity is the tool of foreign countries to manipulate Chinese people, 9.4% agree that the spread of Christianity is detrimental to the stability of China, and 6.2% believe that Christianity is a "foreign religion" which is completely alien to Chinese society and culture. This shows that there are a limited number of students holding that Christianity is related to foreign antagonistic forces which intend to manipulate Chinese people, and its growth would threat the stability of China, but the majority of them believe that Christianity's development in China is reasonable. Similarly, as for the reason why Christianity developed fast in China, 53.8% believe the reason lies in Chinese people's spiritual sterility and anxiety brought by the social transition in China, 48.5% believe the reason lies in the infiltration of foreign forces into China. Among the sample of 52 Christians, 4 (2 Protestants and 2 Catholics) agree that Christianity is the tool of foreign countries to manipulate China, 2 (1 Protestant and 1 Catholic) agree that Christianity is a "foreign religion" which is completely alien to Chinese society and culture, 5 (3 Protestants and 2 Catholics) agree that the spread of Christianity is detrimental to the stability of China. As for the reason why Christianity developed fast in China, these Christians' answers are different from our last sample. The "infiltration of foreign forces into China" ranks the third (the first is the initiative of Chinese Christians to do missionary work, and the second is the spiritual sterility and anxiety brought by the social transition in China). In general, the development of Christianity and the spread of house churches are indeed influenced by practical needs, but university students in Beijing believe that the infiltration of foreign forces in China should not be ignored. Only about 20% of churches have foreign priests, and nearly 40% of churches are led by three-self church priests. This, on one hand, shows that the practical needs stimulate the development of Christianity; on the other hand, it also indicates that we should pay attention to the role of foreign forces in this process.

Besides that, even if the practical needs contribute to the development of Christianity and the spread of house churches, there are still 27% of university student Christians who attend house churches reporting that they cannot find the meaning of life from the house churches. Our collective data analysis indicates that university students in Beijing have a high frequency of thinking about the meaning and purpose of life, and 40% of them often think about these questions, and less than 5% of them seldom do that. When asked about what they would resort to for help when they are in frustration, pressure or confusion, these students claim that they would first seek help from scientific worldview and non-Marxism philosophies, and then resort to religion, which takes 10.6% of the total. However, for those who have already committed to Christianity, there are still a limited number of them who think that religion cannot completely solve their confusion about the meaning of life. Even though house churches do better in this aspect than three-self churches, and the sense of belonging and the interpretation of doctrines which house churches provide for their followers are among the reasons why their followers are attracted by them, yet it still cannot

[32] Wang Chenli, *On the Quasi-organization of Youth Christian House Church, quasi-organization—Based on the Observation of Youth Christian House Church in a University in Shanghai*. Master's Degree Dissertation of Fudan University in 2010, 54.

satisfy the need of a limited number of university student Christians to find the meaning of life.

In the above, we mainly talk about some issues on university student Christians' conversion and religious commitment: their participation in church activities, the type of church they attend, the reasons for choosing house churches, their attitude towards house churches, the commitment condition of followers of different types of churches, etc. The house church has been a sensitive issue in the development of Christianity, and even today it still has the "grey identity". Qin Lili, in "Condition and Choice—Case Study of the Conversion of University Students", compares the completely different situation of university education and house church by which students try to build their own identity and realize their selfhood. She points out that the functional structure of university education mainly focuses on meeting students' low-level needs, while the functional structure of house church mainly focuses on their high-level needs; since the functional structure of higher education falls behind of university students' need structure, university students would choose to join illegitimate house churches to realize their selfhood.^[33] But as we have shown in early pages, the illegitimacy problem has negatively influenced the stability of house church' s followers' religious commitment.

4. University Students' Attitude Towards Politico-Religious Relationship

The "desensitization" of Christianity is related to government' s religion policies. How do university students in Beijing think about these policies? Our analysis of questionnaires shows that about 40% of university students in Beijing believe that the government should allow religions to freely compete with each other in the "religion market", and the government should not restrain or control the development of Christianity. They believe that the government should learn from Hong Kong and Taiwan to allow religions to freely develop. However, there are also 20% to 25% university students believe that the government should be cautious of the development of Christianity and should take measures to control its development, and they disagree with implementing the free-competition religious policy. Moreover, there are about one third of university students who are ambivalent towards the development of Christianity in China.

Comprehensive analysis shows that when other variables are controlled, CPC members are more inclined to believe that the government should be cautious of and constrain the development of Christianity, and they also oppose the free-competition policy; students growing up in urban areas and students having Christian relatives or Christian friends are in favor of the free-competition policy and oppose the constraining policy. Besides that, students who have greater needs for meaning (having higher pressure and higher frequency of thinking about the meaning of life) approve of the free development of religions, while at the same time approving of the development of folk religions. In general, the issue of whether or not to grant freedom to Christianity is influenced by students' political and cultural stands. Those who believe that Christianity is the tool of foreign countries to control Chinese people and that the development of Christianity would negatively affect the stability of China are more inclined to support constraining the development of Christianity; while those who believe the development of Christianity would promote the democracy of China are more inclined to oppose constraining the development of Christianity.

[33] Qin Lili, *Condition and Choice—Case Study of the Conversion of College Student*. Master' s Degree Dissertation of Minzu University of China in 2011, 54-55.

Chart 8 Advices on the Development of Christianity in China

	Highly Disapprove	Disapprove	Ambiguous	Approve	Highly Approve	Number of Respondents
The free-competition policy of Hong and Taiwan is recommendable for Mainland China	2.9	20.6	34.3	35.9	6.3	1,868
	3.2	20.6	34.0	36.3	5.9	1,868
The competitive strength of Chinese traditional religions as Buddhism, Daosim and folk religions is weak, and thus should be protected. We can't adopt the free-competition policy until these religions become strong enough.	3.8	22.5	34.2	34.5	5.1	1,868
	3.8	20.8	34.5	35.7	5.3	1,868
Chinese government and society should be cautious towards the development of Christianity in China, and should strictly control and constrain it.	6.0	38.4	37.0	17.3	1.4	1,867
	5.9	37.7	36.9	18.1	1.5	1,867
Chinese government should support the development of Chinese local religions such as Confucianism, Buddhism and Daoism, as a way to constrain the development of Christianity.	5.8	39.1	35.7	17.0	2.3	1,866
	5.5	38.4	36.1	17.4	2.6	1,866

Note : Every first line of data is non-weighted percentage, and every second line of data is weighed percentage.

As for the relationship between religion and politics, how do university students view that? From the chart below, we can see that over half of university students think that politics and religion should be independent with each other, and over 1/3 of university students believe that politics and religion should cooperate with each other. Only a few university students hold that politics should rule over religion or vice versa. It is also shown that when other factors are controlled, university students who come from economically privileged families are more inclined to support the mutual independence of politics and religion, while those who believe universities' political education is useful or believe the development of Christianity is detrimental to the stability of China do not support the mutual independence of politics and religion.

Chart 9 The Expectation of Ideal Relationship between Politics and Religion

You think the ideal relationship between politics and religion should be like	Un-weighed percentage	Weighed percentage
Politics rules over religion	6.2	6.5
Religion rules over politics	1.4	1.6
Mutual independent	54.6	53.4
Cooperate	35.2	36.0
Other	2.6	2.5
Number of interviewees	1,869	1,869

Among the 52 Christians, about half hold that the free-competition religious policy of Hong and Taiwan is recommendable for Mainland China, 17.3% oppose this free-competition mode, and 34.6% hold ambivalent attitude. Over 30% agree with protecting Chinese traditional religions and not adopting the free-competition religious policy until these traditional religions become strong enough, about 40% oppose this, and less than 30% hold ambivalent attitude. Among these Christians, only 5.8% hold that Chinese government and society should be cautious towards the development of Christianity in China and should strictly control and constrain it, 69.2% disagree with this standpoint, and 25% are ambivalent towards it. Thus, the attitude of Christians is basically supporting the free-competition religious policy, opposing protecting Chinese traditional religions before adopting free-competition policy, and disagreeing with government' s cautious attitude towards Christianity and with constraining Christianity by supporting local religions. This attitude is in accordance with the overall attitude of university students in Beijing, except that Christians' attitude is more firm, and they also oppose protecting Chinese traditional religions before adopting free-competition policy.

As for the relationship between politics and religion, 44.2% of Christians support the mutual independent relationship, 38.5% support the cooperation relationship, and 11.5% believe that religion should rule over politics, and very few hold that politics should rule over religion.

5. Discussion and Summary

All in all, university students in Beijing convert to Christianity mainly because of their social network. Their conversion is normally influenced by their parents, classmates, friends, or teachers. Christians among university students in Beijing prefer house churches to three-self churches, because house churches have flexible and variable forms and are widespread, their interpretation of doctrine is more attractive, their activities have better effects, and their members can get a sense of belonging more easily. Since house churches are normally smaller in size, people with similar educational background can get together more easily, and the members can better communicate with each other and share similar religious experience. Moreover, over half of Christians among university students in Beijing regularly attend a certain church, and normally have a relatively high degree of piety.

As for religious commitment, university student Christians who attend house churches normally have higher commitment than those who attend three-self churches. The majority of those who attend three-self churches and registered house churches regularly attend activities of a certain church, while the majority of those who attend unregistered churches do not have stable participation of a certain church' s activities. According to Stark' s rational choice theory, there is a positive correlation between believers' religious

commitment and the tension between the religious group and its social and cultural surroundings, and our analysis of data basically verifies this point. However, there is an exception in China: unregistered house churches have the highest degree of tension with its surroundings, but their members' commitment is the most unstable. We emphasize that in China, the "eligibility" of a religious group may have influence on individual believers' religious commitment, but this conclusion should be further examined in other groups in China. It should be added that Stark' s theory is more applicable to free religious markets. Besides, among university student Christians, just as in other groups, there are some people who attend both three-self churches and house churches. Are these Christians "free-riders" , or just those who try to maximize their religious capita? This question deserves more attention, and our current data is not enough to provide a satisfactory answer to it. Of course, their choice has invisible effects: breaking the dichotomy of house church and three-self church, and blurring the boundary between these two sides.

Among university student Christians in Beijing, although those who attend house churches are twice the number of those who attend three-self churches, yet most of these house churches are led by priests from three-self churches. There are some house churches led by foreign priests or priests of house churches, but this is not the mainstream. Although house churches satisfy university student Christians' religious needs, yet not all of their confusion about life' s meaning can be solved by house churches. And the tension between house churches and the Chinese government also affect their followers' commitment as well as the effect of their religious activities. This information is helpful for a comprehensive and objective examination of the overall current situation of Christianity in China.

In general, as for Chinese government' s religious policy, about 40% of university students in Beijing believe that eventually the government should allow all religions to compete freely with each other, disagree with controlling or constraining the development of Christianity, and also believe that Chinese government should follow Hong Kong and Taiwan' s free-competition religious policy, or the government can firstly assist the development of Chinese traditional religions and then allow all religions to freely compete with each other. Less than 25% hold that the government should be cautious of and control the development of Christianity, and oppose free-competition religious policy. As for university student Christians, besides advocating the free-competition policy, they also oppose firstly assisting the development of Chinese traditional religions and then allowing all religions to freely compete with each other.

In other words, the modern concept of religious freedom is deeply rooted in university students' mind in Beijing, and its influence on the whole society should not be underestimated.

中文题目：

对北京市大学生基督徒的教会选择及其宗教委身调查分析

孙尚扬

北京大学哲学博士，
北京大学哲学及宗教学系教授，
海淀区，100872 北京
电子邮件：sunsy@phil.pku.edu.cn

韩琪

北京大学哲学博士，
中国社会科学院助理研究员，
建国门内大街 No. 5, 100732, 北京，中国。
电子邮件：ksaiter@126.com

提要：来自“北京市大学生对基督教的态度调查”这一项目所获得的数据表明，大学生基督徒之皈依基督教主要受到家庭与社会网络的影响，而他们在三自教会与家庭教会之间的选择则主要取决于教会所提供的意义系统和教会的空间距离。家庭教会与社会之间的张力较大，但选择家庭教会的大学生基督徒的宗教委身高于选择三自教会的大学生基督徒，这一事实证实了理性选择的某些论断。但选择家庭教会的大学生基督徒却不能像选择三自教会的大学生那样长久稳定地参加某一固定教会的宗教活动，这一事实表明理性选择论不能生搬硬套地应用于一个受到某种意识形态控制的宗教市场之中。

关键词：北京市大学生基督徒、皈依、教会选择、宗教委身、理性选择

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

海德格尔论“再临时刻”的存在论意义

王旭

（吕讷堡大学神学与宗教教育学系博士研究生，德国）

提要：海德格尔在1920/21年弗莱堡冬季学期课程“宗教现象学导论”中探讨了“宗教现象学”作为一门学问得以可能的条件，从历史性的“实际生活经验”出发，海德格尔赢获了作为现象学阐释之开端的“形式指引”方法，经由这种前理论、非对象性、直指个体当下“实行”的现象学解释方法，海德格尔得以从本源处理解基督教宗教现象及其展开的可能性。基督教宗教现象从本源处展开的可能性恰恰在于“基督教实际生活经验生活着时间性本身”。在对帖撒罗尼迦前书5:1-11“基督再临”教导的现象学解释中，海德格尔首次把“基督再临”这一终末时间与生存联系起来，并从保罗对“再临”之“何时”问题的回答出发回到了原始基督教本真的实际生活经验。本文试图通过海德格尔对“再临时刻”的现象学诠释勾勒出“生存的终末论”的时间性，并由此显明“再临时刻”的生存论意义。

关键词：海德格尔、再临时刻、宗教生活现象学、实际生活经验、时间性

作者：王旭，清华大学哲学系硕士毕业生，德国吕讷堡大学神学与宗教教育学系博士研究生。电子邮箱：amelie88415@hotmail.com

海德格尔在1920/21年弗莱堡冬季学期课程“宗教现象学导论”中运用现象学方法解释了加拉太书与帖撒罗尼迦前后书。海德格尔对基督教的现象学理解与传统的神学-解经学或者历史研究大相径庭，他放弃了从外部对现象进行普遍性判断与定性的立场，而用自己特殊的现象学方法打开了一条“第一人称”当下经验之路，使得本真的基督教生存经验在当今的“重演”与“更新”成为可能。而他对基督教实际生活经验的特殊的生存论-现象学理解也预示了《存在与时间》中从时间理解存在的基本思路，更新了传统哲学对“存在”这一根本问题的发问与回应方式。在对帖撒罗尼迦前书5:1-11的现象学解释中，海德格尔首次把“基督再临”这一终末时间与生存联系起来，在“再临”的终末视野中达成了对基督教实际生活经验的本真理解，并由此赢获了从源始处展开基督教实际生活经验的生存论基础。本真的“原始基督教实际生活经验”本身不仅仅是一种与其他宗教派别或非宗教的生活经验方式并置的现成的生活模式，而是一种本真地生存的可能性。在此意义上，本真的“原始基督教生活经验”作为一种“生存典范”而能够为“实际生活经验”当下性的展开提供生存论的基础。

鉴于早期海德格尔对保罗书信的现象学解读的重要意义，本文试图从海德格尔对“宗教现象学”这一门学问本身的理解出发去考察他在文本中提出的对“原始基督教宗教性”的两重规定，并从他对“再临时刻”的现象学诠释中勾勒出“生存的终末论”的时间性及其生存论意义。

一、“宗教现象学”何以可能？

在展开海德格尔在“宗教现象学导论”课程中对保罗“再临时刻”教义的具体阐释之前，首先值得注意的是，这门课程远远不止以一套现成的现象学方法为引导去考察具体宗教现象那么简单。除了运用现象学方法“从宗教现象本源处经验对象”^[1]之外，一早在方法论分析中海德格尔就指出，“宗教现象学”的任务在于“从实际生活经验出发而赢获的哲学的自身理解”^[2]。这门课程的主题其实是早期海德格尔一直关心的“哲学的自我理解”问题，不过这次是在与宗教碰撞的过程中去赢获。问题在于，从宗教中如何能够赢获“哲学的自我理解”呢？通常的宗教哲学把宗教当作一个超时间性的法则的例证，并从宗教现象中抽取出那些具有“意识特征”的东西^[3]，但是海德格尔却提醒我们，“宗教”、“现象学”^[4]以及“导论”这三个概念并不是随意地置放在一起的，它们三个都纠缠于“历史 (das Historische)”这一核心现象之中，“宗教”不是成套的现成的世界观，“现象学”也不是一系列具体地可直接拿来操作的法则，它们都是从具体的历史性“实际生活经验”中展开的生存方式。如果说“宗教”是一种植根于实际生活经验的生存方式的话，“现象学”就是探讨它如何展开并为其展开“奠基”的学问。正是在此基础上才有“宗教现象学”，才能用现象学方法去诠释宗教现象，也才能从宗教现象中赢获哲学本身的自我理解。

以“实际生活经验”为出发点与旨归的哲学与其他科学不同，科学是从对象事物内容而来的普遍性的规定和排序，它要求确定性以及明晰性，而哲学表述却从其本身上来讲就是含混、多义及流动的，但这并不是哲学的“缺陷”，哲学的特殊性恰恰在于它对“前问题”的不断回溯，对哲学基本概念的不断修改以及更新。哲学的特殊性来源于它最根本的“对象”——实际生活经验。在实际生活经验中，我们首先遇到的绝不是抽象的理论化概念，而是活生生的、具体的、个体性的经验。“实际生活经验”中的“实际”不是指自然之真或由因果决定的，它也不是指物体意义上的真，它只能通过“历史的 (das Historische)”这一概念来理解^[5]。在实际生活中，历史为我们带来了“不安”的因素^[6]，而我们总是习惯于从“历史”激起的“不安”之中逃离，寻求“安全”的保障，却忽略了被“历史”的“不安”激起的是什么，而这“不安”的动因又是什么^[7]。被“不安”激起的正是“生活的真实”，是“操心地寻求自身安全保障的人类此在”^[8]。在寻求安全保障的过程中，人类此在操心的“对象”被客体化地让渡给了一个答案，而我们真正在“不安”中操心的“此在”却掉出了视线。海德格尔强调，我们不是要急于找到一个给生活以安定的普遍性的答案，从实际生活经验出发的哲学“要求与这种普遍性保持距离，要求注意每一实际性的此在，并返回到它”^[9]。作为现象学首要“对象”的“实际生活经验”首先不是主体认识对象的问题，而是以第一人称视角去经验世界的生存活动。“世界”取代“客体”成为体验进行的场所和领域。人在世界之中与水在杯子之中、

[1] Martin Heidegger, *Phänomenologie des Religiösen Lebens*, (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1995), 76.

[2] *Ibid.*, 34.

[3] *Ibid.*, 76.

[4] 正如海德格尔 Martin Heidegger 一贯主张的那样，现象学在这里等同于哲学。参看 *Ibid.*, 5.

[5] *Ibid.*, 9.

[6] 参看 *Ibid.*, 37.

[7] *Ibid.*, 49.

[8] das menschliche Dasein in seiner Bekümmernis um seine eigene Sicherung “ *Ibid.*, 51

[9] 马丁·海德格尔 Martin Heidegger, 《存在论：实际性的解释学》*Cunzailun: Shijixing de jieshexue* [Ontologie: Hermeneutik der Faktizität], 何卫平 He Weiping 译, (北京 Beijing: 人民出版社 Renmin chubanshe [People's Publishing House], 2009), 22.

衣服在柜子之中不同，人并非现成地存在于世界里面，而是以操劳的方式带着情绪与周围、共在与个人世界纠缠，并从中寻求意义。

鉴于前理论、世界性以及个体性的实际生活经验的丰富性，与之相应的哲学任务就不能是用理论体系去固定体验的内容，而恰恰是要以其实行特性 (Vollzugscharakter) 解除理论对体验的固定，并把哲思之人推入前理论的个体化经验生发的场地，具体地生存出意义。海德格尔指出，“宗教现象学导论”中的“导论”也绝非随随便便的引导，而是“现象学”的本质特征。哲学的导论性质使得它“从不给出答案但是一直‘引向’问题，这便是哲学的本质”^[10]。

于是，哲学方法的努力就不在于理论体系的构建，而在于不断回溯“前问题”，不断寻找进入哲学的入口，利用哲学“保护此在借以道出自身的那些最基本词汇的力量”^[11]，并通过这些词汇的力量指引生存者“在其绝对的不可重复性中返回‘源始-历史’，在其独特的实行中返回历史处境”^[12]。

从“现象学”的“导论”性质出发，海德格尔找到了“形式指引 (Formale Anzeige)”^[13] 这一具有“现象学阐明之开端”作用的方法，并通过这一方法的引导回到剥离了教条的原初的宗教现象，让宗教现象本身作为生成的历史性生存活动铺陈开来。

“形式指引”中的“形式”指的是处于经验活动中的经验者与经验内容的关联之“如何”，它与经验的内容构成了经验的不同层次。但是在以理论为导向的哲学中，经验中的“关联”这一层次与内容不加区分地进入了理论活动，这样的哲学对于“关联意义”本身的关注采取了一种理论姿态，它在理论上把关联意义固定为一连串固定的范畴并对其进行等级排序，这一过程使得具有开放性和当下性的源始的关联意义成为了一种更隐蔽的“内容”与实事内容不加区分地进入了理论活动，成为其理论对象。

经验之关联与内容的重要区分在理论活动中是很容易被遮蔽掉的，然而它却可以在实际生活经验中通过“实行”显示出来。正因此，海德格尔才要更进一步通过实际生活中的“实行”来深化这种区分，并使得关联意义真正作为前理论的“如何”进入我们的理解。唯有通过实行，我们才能从源始处经验到本真的关联。

至此我们看到了理解实际生活经验三个层次——“内容 (Inhalt)”、“关联 (Bezug)”以及“实行 (Vollzug)”^[14]。作为生存现象的实际生活经验必须作为这三个意义方向的整体来理解。在这三个层次里面，实行占据了首要的位置，唯有通过实行，我们才能从源始处经验到本真的关联与内容。源始的关联意义是“实行的”关联，而源始的内容意义则是通过实行的关联展开并在这种实行关联中获得理解的具体内容。

为了保证现象源始的“实行特征”，维护这种本真的可能性，“形式指引”首先需要打断对关联意义的理论考察。“形式指引”中的“指引”首先是在否定的意义上给出的，在这里，指引恰恰意味着防御

[10] Theodore J. Kisiel, *Reading Heidegger from the Start: Essays in His Early Thought*, (State University of New York Press, 1994), 176.

[11] 马丁·海德格尔 Martin Heidegger,《存在与时间》*Cunzai yu shijian*[*Sein und Zeit*], 陈嘉映 Chen Jiaying、王庆节 Wang Qingjie 译, (上海 Shanghai: 上海三联书店 Shanghai sanlian shudian [Shanghai Joint Publishing Company], 2006), 253.

[12] “The return to the original-historical in its absolute unrepeatability, to the historical situation in its unique actualization” . Theodore Kisiel, *The Genesis of Heidegger's Being and Time*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 180-181.

[13] 孙周兴在《形式显示的现象学：海德格尔早期弗莱堡文选》中把 *Formale Anzeige* 译为“形式显示”。在德文中，*Anzeige* 既有指引的意义，也有显示的意义，但是 *Formale Anzeige* 的意思更贴近于“让…显示”，即“让现象如其自身那样显示自身”，它本身只指引出了这种可能性。因此本文采取“形式指引”的翻译。参看马丁·海德格尔 Martin Heidegger,《形式显示的现象学：海德格尔早期弗莱堡文选》*Xingshi xianshi de xianxiangxue: Haidegeer zaoqi fulaibao wenxuan* 编者前言，孙周兴 Sun Zhouxing 编译, (上海 Shanghai: 同济大学出版社 Tongji University Press, 2004), 1-21.

[14] Martin Heidegger. *Phänomenologie des Religiösen Lebens*, 63. 翻译参看《形式显示的现象学：海德格尔早期弗莱堡文选》，72。

滑入对关联意义的理论考察的危险，它以一种警告的方式和防御的姿态先行指引出现象的关联，使得现象的关联意义在实行之前仍然保持悬而未定^[15]。其次，它并不企图通过对实行步骤等等进行规定而把关联意义固定于其中，它只给出开端的指引，在置空关联的理论意义之后，形式指引的方法切断了从“理论”把握现象这条容易的道路，而不再追求对现象普遍的秩序性把握。失去了理论给出的安全保障之后，存在者被迫把自身及其与周围世界的关联当成一个悬而未决的问题。这样，真正的生存问题通过警告与防御得以显明，并把存在者推入了毫无理论凭借的实行，他不得不通过具体而当下(jeweilig)的实行显示出自身本真的可能性。在这种源始的实行中，生存者才得以从本源处理解在具体处境中本真的关联意义及内容意义。

我们看到，“形式指引”是彻底解构性的，它放弃了理论的建构与保障，但却没有因此沦为彻底消极意义上的否定，而是给出了原则性的开端与方向。在此意义上，解构恰恰意味着“回构(Zurückbau)”^[16]，通过对理论态度的防御与既定理论提供的方便与安全的路径的坚决拒绝，“形式指引”把我们推到了决断的关口，并带到了真正的问题面前。这问题的答案不可预期，只能通过本真的实行去回应^[17]。

海德格尔的“宗教现象学”把“宗教现象”放置于“实际生活经验”这样一个生存的平台上来考量。在此意义上，海德格尔的“宗教现象学”就不是“宗教意识现象学”，而是前理论的、更加源始的“宗教生活现象学”。通过“形式指引”的现象学理解，海德格尔针对保罗书信中的“宗教现象”提出了“原始基督教宗教性(Urchristliche Religiosität)”这一至关重要的“概念”。在书中，他对“原始基督教宗教性”给出了两重基本规定：

1. “原始基督教宗教性”存在于原始基督教生活经验之中，并且就是这生活经验本身。
2. 实际生活经验是历史性的，基督教生活经验生活着（“生活”的“及物意义”！）时间性本身。^[18]

两重规定中都蕴含的“本身”强调“原始基督教宗教性”与生活着“时间性”本身的历史的“实际生活经验”严格等同，它打断了对宗教现象的理论框定，而坚持从更加源始的“历史”路径去理解宗教现象。在“形式”地“指引”出的这两条规定下，海德格尔进入了保罗的实际生活经验，发现保罗在帖撒罗尼迦书中对“基督何时再临”这一“终末时刻”的问题的回答中达到了对自身信仰处境本真的理解。

二、保罗对“再临时刻”的教导——“再临”之“何时”的问题

在原始基督徒的生活经验中，“对基督再临的等待具有决定性”^[19]。在基督教中，上帝与信徒的关联作为一个最基本、最迫切、最具决定性的问题摆在每一个信徒面前。在整个基督教“救赎历史”中，“基督再临(παρουσία)”并不仅仅是在世俗秩序(世界与历史)之“终末”才发生的最终结局，而是信徒生存时间中最重要的“极点”，正是在对这一时刻的盼望中，信徒进入了与上帝的关联之中，并在这种“面向上帝存在”的基本关联中展开了自己的信仰生活。

海德格尔在“宗教现象学导论”中对 Parousia(παρουσία) 有一个概念史的简单归纳。在古希腊语中，

[15] Ibid., 63-64.

[16] Ibid., 139.

[17] “回应”是对德文 sich Verhalten 的翻译。德文词典对它的解释是“在某一处境中以某种方式对某人或某物做出回应”(in bestimmter Weise auf jemanden, etwas in einer Situation o.Ä. reagieren) 参看 https://www.duden.de/rechtschreibung/verhalten_handeln_sein_reagieren。这一形式化的解释(以某种方式)说明回应不仅仅限于理论上的态度的表明，还能够涉及“实行”。而本真的“回应”恰恰在于以自身当下的“实行”去响应通过“形式指引”方法显明的“生存”问题。本文此后的“回应”都是在此意义上使用的。

[18] Martin Heidegger. *Phänomenologie des Religiösen Lebens*, 80.

[19] Ibid., 97.

Parousia 的意思是到来、临在 (Ankunft/Anwesenheit)。Parousia 或者 ousia 通常的意义是“持续的在场 (constant presence)”^[20]；在旧约中，它拥有了犹太教历史观念的“终末”内涵，意味着“上帝在审判日的临在”，到了晚期犹太教，它意味着“作为上帝代表的弥赛亚的降临”；而在基督教中，Parousia 则意味着“已经来临的弥赛亚的再次来临”^[21]。在犹太 - 基督传统中，Parousia 的“到来”含义被突出出来，弥赛亚在将来的“来临”成为 Parousia 主导的意义，“在场”因为被置放到了“将来”而恰恰成为了一种“不在场 (abousia)”^[22]。但这种“不在场”在基督教的“再临”意义上又不是一种客观的、与信徒无关的“缺席”，上帝已经在“道成肉身”中来到信徒的近旁^[23]，并且将再次来到他们近旁，进行“生”与“死”的审判，并为信徒带来最终的救赎。在此意义上，上帝在到来中的暂时“缺席”迫使基督徒不断地追问“再临”之“何时”这一问题，并通过不断地追问把自己置身于对上帝持续的盼望中。

早期有一些基督教徒相信基督将会在他们活着的时候来到，因此有一些人变卖掉家产，无所事事，一心等待与计算着再临的日子^[24]。针对“再临时刻”在帖撒罗尼迦教会造成的问题，保罗在传道中对“再临”之“何时”的问题给出了特殊的回答。保罗不像那些“糟糕的先知”一样“以末日预言式的、千禧年主义式的或者其他教派的方式作为任何时间说明”^[25]，他并没有给出一个具体的时间点，也没有说不知道，而是说，“论到时候日期 (τὸν χρόνον καὶ τὸν καιρὸν)”^[26]，不用写信给你们，因为你们自己明明晓得，主的日子来到，好像夜间的贼一样。人正说平安稳妥的时候，灾祸忽然临到他们，如同产难临到怀孕的妇人一样，他们绝不能逃脱。弟兄们，你们却不在黑暗里，叫那日子临到你们像贼一样。你们都是光明之子，都是白昼之子。我们不是属黑夜的，也不是属幽暗的。所以，我们不要睡觉，像别人一样，总要警醒谨守。因为睡了的人是在夜间睡，醉了的人是在夜间醉。但我们既然属乎白昼，就应当谨守，把信和爱当作护心镜遮胸，把得救的盼望当作头盔戴上。因为神不是预定我们受刑，乃是预定我们藉著我们主耶稣基督得救。(帖前 5:1-9)”

首先，保罗以“再临”的突然性回答那些生活于平安稳妥中的人。“平安稳妥”是他们回应“再临”之“何时”问题的方式。那些无所事事的人把“再临”当成一件即将客观发生的事件并对其“确切”日子进行计算，通过这种方式，他们把“再临”之“何时”这一问题让渡给了一个理论与教条式的说明，并由此生活在一种事不关己的等待中。对于这些通过现成理论寻求“平安稳妥”的人，世界为他们提供了“平安稳妥”，但他们却也因此消散于世界所提供给他们答案之中而遗忘了那个“操心地寻求自身安全保障的人类此在”本身，“他们没有在本真的知的明晰性中拥有自身”，在此意义上，他们“在黑暗里”^[27]。对于这样的人，“再临”如灾祸一般以其绝对的“突然性”和“不可预料性”入侵他们，让“在黑暗里”的

[20] John Van Buren, *The Young Heidegger: Rumor of the Hidden King*, (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1994), 190.

[21] Martin Heidegger, *Phänomenologie des Religiösen Lebens*, 102.

[22] John Van Buren, *The Young Heidegger: Rumor of the Hidden King*, 190.

[23] 注意海德格尔对 Parousia 的翻译 Ankunft, Anwesenheit 中“an”的“近旁”的含义。

[24] 保罗针对不做工而“专管闲事”的人的传道参看帖后 3:10-12.

[25] 莱曼 Lehmann, 《基督教的历史经验与早期海德格尔的存在论问题》*Jidujiao de lishijingyan yu zaoqi haidegger de cunzailun wenti* [Christliche Geschichtserfahrung und Ontologische Frage bei jungen Heidegger], 刘小枫 Liu Xiaofeng 选编:《海德格尔与有限性思想》*Haidegger yu youxianxing sixiang* [Heidegger und die Theologie], (北京 Beijing: 华夏出版社 Huaxia Chubanshe [Huaxia Publishing House], 2002), 46.

[26] “时候日期 (chronos and Kairos)”的德语翻译是 Zeit und Augenblick (时间与时刻)，海德格尔特别强调保罗总是在一起使用这两个词。参看 Martin Heidegger, *Phänomenologie des Religiösen Lebens*, 102.

[27] *Ibid.*, 103.

他们无从逃脱。

保罗的回答不仅打断了那些无所事事的人对再临的“确切”日子的计算，还进一步提出了本真地理解与回应这一问题的可能性。“弟兄们，你们却不在黑暗里，叫那日子临到你们像贼一样。你们都是光明之子，都是白昼之子”。本真地理解了这一问题的信徒“明明晓得”的不是“再临”灾祸般的突然性——在本真的实际生活经验中经历“再临”的信徒并不囿于“时候日期”的不确定性——而是自己是“光明之子”、“白昼之子”。海德格尔指出，“那日子（帖前 5:4）”具有双重含义，首先，它意味着基督再临的日子，其次，它意味着与黑暗相对的对自身敞亮的知识。在这个意义上，帖撒罗尼迦信徒才被称为“光明之子”^[28]。而标识“光明之子”的恰恰是他们的生存方式——“警醒谨守”。

保罗对“再临”之“何时”的回答明确地指向了两种回应方式，“对‘何时’的追问指引回了我的回应，‘再临’如何处于我的生活，指引回了生活的实行本身”^[29]。在基督教中，对“基督再临”的追问与道说构成了“终末论”的核心。与“宇宙的终末论”或“历史的终末论”不同，海德格尔从保罗本真的实际生活经验出发解读出的“终末论”是与个人实行息息相关的“生存的终末论”。在这一视野下，保罗的“再临”教导显明了“再临”之“何时”问题“被问及的东西 (Gefragtes)”以及问题的真正意图——“问之何所以问 (Erfragtes)”^[30]。对于保罗来说，“再临时刻”首先不是宇宙与历史的客观终结点，“再临”之“何时”问题不是据此而进行推算的认知问题 (Erkenntnisfrage)^[31]，而是“再临”如何处于自身生活，自身又如何对此做出回应的生存问题。作为一个在本真的实际生活经验中遭遇这一问题的信徒来说，它本源的是操心地等待上帝来临的信徒自身（被问及的东西——操心地寻求自身安全保障的人类此在）如何通过自身的实行进入到与上帝本真的关联之中而“面向上帝存在”的问题（问之何所以问——“再临”之“何时”的意义）。因此，回答这一问题的关键点就不在于给出一个具有现成内容的答案，“在这里，事关宏旨的显然不是一个年代学上的具有实际内容的陈述”^[32]，而是对信徒保持“警醒谨守”并从清醒的自身出发进入与上帝本真的关联的催促。保罗的回答“形式”地“显明”了问题之关键，并把问题从外部世界拉回到寻求者自身，“指引”出了一种本真实行的可能性。

三、“生存的终末论”的“时间性”及其生存论意义

从保罗对“再临”之“何时”问题的本真理解中，我们整理出了在“基督再临”这一基本视野中从自身的追问出发，回到自身本真实行的“生存的终末论”。“再临”之“何时”问题从根源处取决于生活之实行，取决于如何“面向上帝存在”，过于匆忙地把它让渡给一个现成答案的做法不仅错失了进入与上帝本真关联的机会，它首先就错失了进入真正的问题的机会。唯有回到本真的实行，信徒才把自身带到了真正的问题面前。

前文已经提到，信徒与上帝的关联是决定信徒身份及其信仰生活的展开的最基本也是最迫切的问题。

[28] *Ibid.*, 104.

[29] die Frage nach dem „Wann“ leitet sich zurück auf mein Verhalten. Wie die παρουσία in meinem Leben steht, das weist zurück auf den Vollzug des Lebens selbst. “Martin Heidegger, *Phänomenologie des Religiösen Lebens*, 104. 着重为笔者自己所加。

[30] 关于海德格尔对“发问”的阐释，参看马丁·海德格尔，《存在与时间》，6 页及以下。

[31] *Martin Heidegger, Phänomenologie des Religiösen Lebens*, 102.

[32] 莱曼 Lehmann,《基督教的历史经验与早期海德格尔的存在论问题》*Jidujiao de lishijingyan yu zaoqi haidegger de cunzailun wenti*[Christliche Geschichtserfahrung und Ontologische Frage bei jungen Heidegger], 刘小枫 Liu Xiaofeng 选编：《海德格尔与有限性思想》*Haidegger yu youxianxing sixiang*[Heidegger und die Theologie], (北京 Beijing: 华夏出版社 Huaxia Chubanshe[Huaxia Publishing House], 2002), 46.

而“再临”本身则规定了信徒进入与上帝之关联的可能性。“再临”的应许首先确保了信徒“能面向上帝存在”，唯有以这种根本的可能性为基础，信徒才能够展开自身的信仰生活。因此本真地理解“信徒与上帝关联之如何”首先意味着本真地领会这一“能面向上帝存在”。

在保罗本真的追问与回应中我们可以看出，“面向上帝存在”源始的是作为一个彻头彻尾的问题出现的，它不是信徒与上帝之关联的最终答案，而是作为“实行之如何”的问题从追问之初就摆在信徒面前，催促信徒回到对自身本真的理解并以此出发来回应这个问题。正是在这个意义上，“再临”以其敞亮照亮了信徒自身。然而这个被照亮的“自身”首先发现自己置身于一种不安的困苦境地。在对保罗的“自我世界”分析中，海德格尔尤其提醒我们注意他极度的不安。“除了我的软弱以外，我并不夸口（林后 12:5）”。对于保罗来说，具有决定性的并非“恩典 (Begnadetsein)”，也不是“被提 (Entrückung)”，而仅仅是他的“软弱和困苦 (Schwachheit und Bedrängnis)”。在与上帝活生生的实行关联中，上帝的“再临”首先是以这种绝对的“困苦患难”被保罗经验到的。“软弱，凌辱，急难，逼迫，困苦（林后 12:10）”，保罗对这些词语的反复应用和堆砌并不是偶然的，这种绝对的困苦患难不是一种低级的、偶然的情绪，它恰恰来源于对“再临”的盼望本身，本质性地属于基督徒生活本身，构成了这种生活的基本特征。正是对“上帝之道”的领受带来了“大难”，甚至于，这领受本身就意味着把自身置于“患难”之中^[33]。而与之相伴的喜乐却是圣灵所赐，而非来自自我的经验。在这种对“再临”特殊的体验中，信、爱、望源始地是“因信心所做的工夫”、“因爱心所受的劳苦”以及“因盼望我们主耶稣基督所存的忍耐”（帖前 1:3）。

在再临盼望中经历的困苦正是“再临这一终末视域中的绝对操心”^[34]。信徒操心地陷入不安是因为领会到在信仰生活中，“面向上帝存在”对处于本真的生活经验中的信徒来说源始的是“如何面向上帝存在”，而“如何面向上帝存在”不是一个有待解答并在解答后被永远地克服和超越并置之脑后的问题，信徒与上帝之间不存在一种一劳永逸的关联，它始终作为一个问题摆在实行之际的信徒面前，在每一个当下的具体实行中被提出。在此意义上，它始终作为一个“前问题”指引信徒“先行”地否定一切取消它“问题”性质的理论路径，并在这一“前问题”给出的指引中回到提出问题的自身，从这样的自身出发进入到本真的实行中，让关联在当下发生 (geschehen)^[35]。

因此，本真地领会了作为“前问题”的“面向上帝存在”的信徒下决心捍卫它的问题性质，主动投身于悬而未决的问题之威胁中，清醒地去“畏”。这意味着对向周围寻求安全保障的沉沦趋势的坚决拒绝，对从任何一种现成的理论出发构建起来的对未来具体的谋划和算计性的预期的坚决否定。切断了一切既定的关联意义的信徒经历了“生存的中断 (Bruch in seiner Existenz)”，并由此回到了那个仅作为“能面向上帝存在”的彻头彻尾的可能性的自身。在经历了“生存的中断”的本真操心中，“再临时刻”灾祸降临般的突然性转变为生存的迫切性^[36]，催促着他们在不安的操心中进入一种“绝对转变 (Absolute Umwendung)”，即“离弃偶像，归向上帝（帖前 1:9-10）”^[37]。

在实行的“绝对转变”中信徒进入了与上帝活生生的“效果关联 (Wirkungszusammenhang)”之中^[38]。“再临”对信徒的意义取决于信徒“如何实行”，唯有在不安的操心中下决心进入“绝对转变”，信徒才进入到了本真的“能面向上帝存在”之中，它作为一种终末的极端可能性催促着信徒通过本真的

[33] Martin Heidegger, *Phänomenologie des Religiösen Lebens*, 95.

[34] *Ibid.*, 98.

[35] 本源的“历史 (Geschichte)”正源于此！从这里我们可以粗描出“原始基督教宗教性”提及的实际生活的“历史性”。

[36] 海德格尔借用路德对 Kairos 的翻译 Augenblick 刻画出了再临时刻的直接性、当下性与紧迫性。

[37] Martin Heidegger, *Phänomenologie des Religiösen Lebens*, 95.

[38] *Ibid.*, 95.

实行而“面向上帝存在”，在转变中“成为”基督徒。在“效果关联”的循环中，信徒打开了“实行历史 (vollzugsgeschichtlich)”的“处境”^[39]。

在这种本真的绝对转变中，上帝首先不是作为思辨对象呈现的，“上帝的对象性 (Gegenständlichkeit Gottes)”^[40]并不来源于“上帝”本身的内容意义。上帝是什么以及他的神圣性与永恒性等规定在实行关联中被置空了，在下决心的绝对转变中，上帝“悬临 (bevorstehen)”^[41]于基督徒的生活。因此“面向上帝存在”首先不是从空间意义上的“站在对面 (Gegen-stand)”，而是从时间意义上的“站在前面 (Bevor-stand)”来理解的。被本真地经验到的上帝以其绝对的不可规定性在每一个具体而当下的实行之“前”作为“前问题”指引着信徒，要回应这样的指引就必须保持未来的绝对开放性及其可能性，开放出那个源始的、仅仅作为“有终的将来”而来到信徒生活中的那个“来”，即源始的“能面向上帝存在”。

因此，本真的“面向上帝存在”便要求一种完全不同于计算预期规划的对未来保持彻底开放的“前”视角，这种视角彻底退回到“实行”之前，退回到进入关联“前”的那一“关头”，退回到那决定“生死”的“决断”之前，那是取消了一切对外寻求安全保障诉求的、悬而未决的、即将发生的时刻论意义上的源始的决断时刻 (Kairos/Augenblick)。而退回到决断时刻的在不安中操心的信徒把“面向上帝存在”作为未加任何理论规定的“能面向上帝存在”这种彻头彻尾的可能性去持守，唯此才能让悬临的上帝如其所是地来临，与信徒照面，唯此信徒才能回到最本己的自身，具体而当下地打开处境，进入自己的“此”。

我们看到，立足于自身实际生活经验被本真地经历到的“在临时刻”所呈现出的时间不仅仅是基督徒本身生活于其中的“时间”，它最特别的意义恰恰在于，它把生存者推入真正的问题之中，并把他指引到实行的决断关头，催促他通过当下的实行去回应。因此，并非“面向上帝存在”的信徒生活于“在临时刻”呈现出的时间之中，而是信徒在操心地回应“再临”抛向他们的问题之际接受问题的指引，通过决断转向上帝、生活着“时刻”本身^[42]。

“新约中的信徒 / 上帝关系最终是作为本真的时刻论时间生存出来的”^[43]。在基督徒本真的生存中，“时间性”所指的正是这样一种“时刻论 (Kairolgy)”的时间^[44]。时刻论意义上的决断意味着把自身先行置于源始的有终的将来带来的问题之威胁中，把“面向上帝存在”作为彻头彻尾的可能性开展出来，而它同时也意味着在理解了“再临”之“何时”问题的真正意图之际通过“绝对的转变”回到本真的无所关联的“能面向上帝存在”，并在这源始的领会中具体而当下地“成为”基督徒。决断时刻通过“先行”、“回到”与“具体而当下地成为”本身构成了“时间的完满 (fullness of time)”。通过决断抓住时机的信徒进入到与上帝的本真关联中，并在这一本真关联中达到对自身敞亮的知识。

最后需要强调的是，“成为基督徒”不是生活中一种偶然的現象，也不是一次性、一劳永逸的事件，它是被不断地在当下的决断中经历的，以至于“他们当下的‘存在’就是他们的‘成为’，他们的‘成为’就是他们当下的‘存在’”^[45]。“再临时刻”也不是时间的最后一刻，不是基督徒生活一劳永逸的转折点，

[39] 关于“实行历史”的“处境”参看 *Ibid.*, 90-93.

[40] *Ibid.*, p97. 注意 Gegenständlichkeit “站在对面”的意义!

[41] 这里借用了《存在与时间》中死亡的“悬临”。“终结悬临于此在”。参看马丁·海德格尔：《存在与时间》，第287页。注意 bevorstehen “站在前面”的意义!

[42] 注意海德格尔在前面给出的第二条形式规定强调的“生活”的及物意义!

[43] John Van Buren, *The Young Heidegger: Rumor of the Hidden King*. 190.

[44] 注意海德格尔对保罗把“时间”与“时刻”并置的强调，因为在本真的生存经验中，“时间 (Zeit)”指的正是这种具有“时刻 (Augenblick/Kairos)”性质的时间。

[45] Ihr jetziges sein ihr Gewordensein ist. Ihr Gewordensein ist ihr jetziges Sein. “Martin Heidegger, *Phänomenologie des Religiösen Lebens*, 94

它是决定“生”与“死”的时机，信徒必须通过不断地实行、不断地“成为”去持守生存最极端的可能性，不断地保持清醒，不断地去“重演”完满的“时刻”。“‘重演’意味着过去被重复为将来的可能性，这一可能性需要在时刻中被决断与实行”^[46]。通过在决断中本真的实行，信徒不是在简单地重复着“成为基督徒”这样的过去，而是打开了新的处境，建立起了全新的关联意义。对于做出决断的生存者来说，“终结”恰恰意味着不断地重新开始，在这层意义上，“再临时刻”才意味着生命完全更新的可能。“来临的上帝的终末论体现新造的人的形成。这是一种不会过去的变成 (Werden)，换言之，在来临的上帝的临在中，‘变成’成为‘长久的存有’ (bleibendes Sein)”^[47]。

The English Title:

Heidegger on the Existential Meaning of the Kairos of Parousia

WANG Xu

Ph.D. Candidate in Institute of Theology and Religious Education, Leuphana University Lüneburg, Germany. Email: amelie88415@hotmail

Abstract: In Heidegger's 1920/21 Winter semester "Vorlesung" *Introduction to the Phenomenology of Religion*, he discussed the possibility of "Phenomenology of Religion" as a special "knowledge", from the starting point of the historical "factual life experience", Heidegger found the method of "Formal Indication" as the beginning of phenomenological investigation, and by this pre-theoretical, non-objective and individual enactment-centered method, Heidegger was able to understand the phenomenon of Christian religion in its authenticity and explore the possibility of its unfolding. The possibility of unfolding from its origin lies exactly in that, "Christian religiosity lives temporality as such." In the interpretation of I Thessalonians 5: 1-11, Heidegger linked "Parousia" (the "Eschaton (end)" of time) with existence for the first time, and from Paul's answer of "When of Parousia", he revived the authentic factual life experiences of primordial Christianity. This thesis will explain the temporality of an "existential eschatology" through Heidegger's phenomenological explanation of "Kairos of Parousia", and therefore shows the existential meaning of "Kairos of Parousia".

Key words: Heidegger, the Kairos of Parousia, Phenomenology of Religious Life, Factual Life Experience, Temporality

[46] John Van Buren, *The Young Heidegger: Rumor of the Hidden King*. 192-193.

[47] 於尔根·莫尔特曼,《来临中的上帝: 基督教的终末论》, 23。

大义灭亲为公义

——《诗篇》82 篇“神”与“众神”关系透析

徐雪梅

(宁波大学外语学院, 315211 宁波, 浙江)

提要: 本文从“אֱלֹהִים”、“אֵל”以及“עֲלֵיוֹן”和“עֲלֵיוֹן בְּנֵי”等词汇出发,探讨了《诗篇》82 篇中“神”与“众神”的身份关系,认为“神”(אֱלֹהִים)与“众神”(אֵלִים)形成了两个对立营垒,“公义”是其分界线。“אֵל”神是诗歌中的至高者“עֲלֵיוֹן”,“至高者的儿子们”(עֲלֵיוֹן בְּנֵי)是受谴责的“众神”,沿袭古代近东传统,他们都是天上“众神的会”中成员,即异教列国的多神,由于众神不公义造成了宇宙根基的摇动,于是以色列的上帝耶和华掌管主持了天上的会,宣判众神死亡,维系了宇宙的稳定。

关键词: 《诗篇》82 篇、“神”(אֱלֹהִים、“אֵל”)、“众神”(אֵלִים)

作者: 徐雪梅, 香港中文大学哲学博士(2007 年), 北京大学世界文学与比较文学硕士(2000 年), 现任教于宁波大学外语学院, 主要从事大学英语教学工作。曾从事过多年外国文学与对外汉语教学工作。主要研究领域为“希伯来圣经”以及“中西文学与文化比较”。近期代表作品:“堕落之星 הֵלֵל (Hēlēl) 与太白金星——解读《以赛亚书 14:12-15》与《西游记》中的金星形象”。“星神陨落的反讽:《诗篇》82 篇的联想探究式阐释”。地址: 中国 浙江省宁波市 江北区 风华路 818 号 宁波大学外语学院。邮编:315211。E-mail: keilytsui@hotmail.com; xuxuemei@nbu.edu.cn。电话: +86-135-6790-5492。

《诗篇》82 篇是《旧约圣经》中一首非常特殊的诗歌, 其中写到了上帝在天上的会中审判众神, 尤其是诗歌指出, 是那些众神造成了“地的根基的摇动”(v.5), 因此才遭致上帝起来审判众神(vv.1, 6, 7), 从而不死的众神就有了死亡的命运, 诗歌因此引出了一个众神死亡的故事结局。本文要讨论的中心问题, 就是诗歌中“上帝之子”的众神与上帝的关系, 以及他们死亡的命运所带给诗歌的深层意义内涵。

显然,《诗篇》82 篇中出现的“神”(אֱלֹהִים、“אֵל”)与“众神”(אֵלִים)是古代近东宗教神话中沿袭已久的一个最普遍的观念。^[1]在该诗中, 这些“众神”因为不公义的行为以及失去智慧并行在黑暗中, 而被自称是他们父亲神的“至高者”(עֲלֵיוֹן), 以审判官的身份, 宣判了死刑。所有这些都与古代近东与迦南的神话观念绝不相同。那么,《诗篇》82 篇中的这位“神”与那些“众神”究竟有何所指? 他们之间又

[1] 有关古代近东的神话的研究著作很多, 这里仅举出几本作为参考 [There are a lot of research works on the ancient Near Eastern Mythology and here I just cite a few of them for a reference as below]: William K. Hartmann, *Astronomy: The Cosmic Journey*, (4th ed.; Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth, 1989); Edwin Oliver James, *The Worship of the Sky-God: A Comparative Study in Semitic and Indo-European Religion*, (Jordan Lectures in Comparative Religion 6; London: University of London, Athlone Press, 1963); Maureen Gallery Kovacs, *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1989); Lambert W. G., and A. R. Millard, *Atra-Hasis: The Babylonian Story of the Flood (with the Sumerian Flood Story, by M. Civil)*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969); E. Theodore Mullen, *The Divine Council in Canaanite and Early Hebrew Literature*, (Harvard Semitic Monographs, no. 24; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1980).

是怎样的关系呢？

一、身份与关系：“神”与“众神”

按五卷的分法《诗篇》82是《诗篇》集第三卷中（诗73—89篇）的诗，属于“艾洛希姆派”诗歌。^[2]因此，诗歌中关于以色列上帝耶和华的称谓“הוה”并未出现，而是以“אלהים”来表达的。“אלהים”这个字在诗中共出现了4次，其中第一次（v.1a）的出现与只出现一次的“אל”（v.1a）指同一位神，也就是诗歌中的至高者“עֶלְיוֹן”（v.6b），而另外3次则都是指诗歌中受到谴责的“众神”，也就是“至高者的儿子们”（בְּנוֹת עֶלְיוֹן）。^[3]

在《诗篇》82篇中，“神”与“众神”形成了两个对立的营垒，而分界线就是“公义原则”。这位“神”在诗歌中既被称为“עֶלְיוֹן”也被呼做“אל”，他的儿子们即那些“众神”又被叫做“בְּנוֹת עֶלְיוֹן”，而且这位“神”与“众神”有一个共同的名称“אלהים”。^[4]关于他们的身份问题，^[5]在学术界主要有三种说法，而德里克·肯得尼（Derek Kidner）对此做出过比较集中清晰的归纳：

正如肯得尼（Kidner）所言，关于“神”与“众神”的身份问题，关键是被再三重复提到的“众神”

[2] J. S. Ackerman, *An Exegetical Study of Psalm 82*, (Harvard University, PhD diss dissertation, 1966), 273-291; R. G. Boling, "Synonymous Parallelism in the Psalms," *Journal of Semitic Studies*, vol. v, (1960), 221-255. “艾洛希姆派”诗歌，是从希伯来文“אלהים”一词音译而来，它是个复数形式的名词，原意是“神们”，在旧约圣经中也常常被用来指对耶和华上帝的敬称。后来“艾洛希姆”就被用来指那些喜欢以“אלהים”一词指称以色列人的上帝耶和华的那些圣经作者们，也就是今天我们所称之为的“艾洛希姆派”。《诗篇》82篇也恰好属于“艾洛希姆派”的诗歌。有关“艾洛希姆派”的详细情况，可参考下面的著述与文章[Elohim school's poems are derived from the transliteration of the Hebrew word “אלהים”. It is a plural noun that means gods, usually, which also has been used as a honorific title to refer to YHWH in the Old Testament. Later, “Elohim school” has been used to point to the biblical writers who like to take the “אלהים” as the God YAHWEH of Israelites, namely, those whom today we call “Elohim school”. Psalm 82 also happens to belong to the “Elohim school”. About the details of it, see the following writing and articles]: Frank-Lothar Hossfeld & Erich Zenger, "The So-Called Elohist Psalter: A New Solution for an Old Problem," in Brent A. Strawn & Nancy R. Bowen, eds., *God So Near: Essays on Old Testament Theology in Honor of Patrick D. Miller*, (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2003); Alan W. Jenks, "Elohist," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol.2, 478-482; E. Mullen, *The Divine Council in Canaanite and Early Hebrew Literature*, 230, 478-482; Laura Joffe, "The Elohist Psalter: What, How and Why?" *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament*, vol. 15, no. 1, (2001), 142-166.

[3] 关于《诗篇》82篇中的不同名称神的所指的语法上的分析请参见[Concerning the syntactic analysis of different names of God in psalm 82, see] 徐雪梅 Xu Xuemei,《众神会中的审判：诗篇82篇研究探索》*Zhongshen huizhong de shenpan* [Judgement in the Assembly of the Gods: Probing into the Psalm 82], (香港 Xianggang : 香港中文大学博士论文 Xianggang zhongwen daxue boshi lunwen [Ph.D. dissertation in Chinese University of Hong Kong], 2007) 第四章开始释经部分的相关内容 [the relevant content of the fourth chapter in it].

[4] 有关“אל”与“אלהים”的词源以及意义的讨论，请分别参见[With regard to the discussion of the etymology and meaning about “אל” and “אלהים”, please refer to]: F. Cross, "אל El," *Theological Dictionary of Old Testament*, vol. 2, 242-261; Helmer Ringgren, "אלהים, Elohim," F. Cross, "אל El," *Theological Dictionary of Old Testament*, vol. 2, 265-284; Marvin H. Pope, El in the Ugaritic Texts, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1955); Conrad E. Rank *L'Heureux, Rank among the Canaanite Gods: El, Ba'al, and the Repha'im*, (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1979).

[5] 对这些众神会中被判死刑的成员的的身份主要有三种解释，即：(1)、他们是以色列人的统治者与法官；(2)、他们是列国万邦的统治者与法官；以及(3)、他们是众神会中的成员，即众神。而这后两种解释必须要联系在一起才能正确地阐释这个文本。关于对此诗不同的观点认识，请参见[There are mainly three kinds of interpretation about the identities of the gods who are sentenced to death in the assembly of the gods, namely, they are (1) the rulers and judges; (2) the rulers and judges in the nations; (3) the numbers of the assembly of the gods, meaning that they are gods. However, the later two interpretation Must be linked together in order to correctly interpret the text. About the different views of the psalm 82, see]: J. S. Ackerman, *An Exegetical Study of Psalm 82*, (Harvard University, PhD dissertation, 1966), 1-78; and H.-W. Jüngling, *Der Tod der Götter: Eine Untersuchung zu Psalm 82*, (Stuttgarter Bibelstudien; 38. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1969), 11-37.

(אֱלֹהִים)这个词,他们的身份是一个开放性的问题。^[6] 其中,有一种观点,认为这些“众神”是被授予了“神”之头衔的人类审判官,他们是作为上帝的人间代理。^[7] 这个观点主要依据是《出埃及记》21:6^[8] 与《约翰福音》10:34^[9] 以下的经文,在这些经文中,某些法律程序中的那些当事人被要求来到“上帝”(或者是“那些众神”^[10])的面前,同样地,他认为关于在《出埃及记》22:28(Heb.27)中“你不应该羞辱上帝(אֱלֹהִים)^[11]也不要诅咒你的民的统治者(אֲדָמָה)”的经文,把“上帝”(אֱלֹהִים)与“统治者”(אֲדָמָה)看成是同义。但是肯得尼却也指出这些段落并非就是结论性的。而且,最后的那个段落涉及到的材料并不包含有一个同义的意思,它也不需要这样的同义词。而前面那一组有关需要的声明不再是对那些地方官员们的,而只不过是摩西为他自己所做的声明,即,

“……百姓到我这里来求问神(אֱלֹהִים)。……我便在两造之间施行审判,我又叫他们知道神(אֱלֹהִים)的律例和法度。”(《出埃及记》18:15-16)^[12]

而叶尔·扎考维司(Yair Zakovitch)在对《诗篇》82篇中的“יְהוָה וְיִלְכֻט”进行阐释时,他找到了旧约中这个术语的平行对应,即在《创世记》6:1-4中的有关那些“众神之子”或“上帝之子”(בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים)与人类女儿们的故事,^[13] 他指出了这段经文引出了一个明确的多神神话背景,在这个背景中众神与地球上的凡人混杂在一起。^[14] 他认为,在《创世记》6:1-4中的这个故事的圣经改编中,故事本身经历了一

[6] Derek Kidner, *Psalms 73-150: A Commentary on Books III-V of the Psalms*, (The Tyndale Old Testament commentaries; London: Inter-Varsity Press, 1975), 296.

[7] 如 [for example]: Delitzsch, Perowne, Brigg 等人持这一观点 [etc., who hold this view]。参见 [See] Kidner, *Psalms 73-150*, 296-297.

[8] 《出埃及记》*Chu aiji ji* [Exodus] 21:6 “他的主人就要带他到审判官(אֱלֹהִים)那里(审判官或作神下同),又要带他到门前,靠近门框,用锥子穿他的耳朵,他就永远服事主人 [then his master shall bring him before God (אֱלֹהִים). He shall be brought to the door or the doorpost; and his master shall pierce his ear with the awl; and he shall serve him for life]。”这里希伯来的“אֱלֹהִים”被翻译成了人类的“审判官”[Here, the Hebrew word “אֱלֹהִים” is translated into human “judges”]。如果不加专门注释与说明,本文所有的圣经中文翻译皆引自新标点和合本的中文 [If no special annotation and explanation, this paper Chinese translation of the Bible, all from Holy Bible of Chinese Union Version with new punctuation] 《圣经》Shengjing [Holy Bible], (南京 Nanjing: 中国基督教协会 Zhongguo jidujiao xiehui [China Christian Council], 1995)。本文希伯来原文引自马索拉的圣经译本 [In this paper, all Hebrew texts quote from the Masoretic version of the Bible], 具体请参见 [and see] A. Alt; O. Eissfeldt & P. Kahle ... [et al.] (eds.), *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, pref. 1977); *John Joseph Owens, Analytical Key to the Old Testament*, vol. 3, (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1989-1992).

[9] 《约翰福音》*Yuehan fuyin* [John] 10:34-42:

[10] 在这三节经文中的“神”的前面都使用了定冠词,但是这种情况并非罕见,特别是在一个介词后面跟一个定冠词更是平常的事 [it is not uncommon for all these three verses to use the definite article before the word "God", and in particular, it is quite normal that the back of a preposition follows a definite article], 例如 [for example], 《创世记》*Chuang shi ji* [Genesis] 5:24, 在这同一个句子中“上帝”(אֱלֹהִים)出现前边有一个介词后边跟定冠词,而下一个(אֱלֹהִים)前边也有介词但未跟定冠词 [In this one sentence, before the “God”(אֱלֹהִים) there is a preposition and after it is a definite article. However, the latter one (אֱלֹהִים) before the “God” also has a preposition without following the definite article.]. 参见 [See] Kidner, *Psalms 73-150*, 296.

[11] 《出埃及记》*Chu aiji ji* [Exodus] 22:28 “不可毁谤上帝(אֱלֹהִים)也不可毁谤你百姓的官长(אֲדָמָה) [You shall not revile God(אֱלֹהִים), or curse a leader (אֲדָמָה) or your people]”。其中“上帝”一词在这里没有使用定冠词 [The word “God” here in this sentence does not use the definite article].

[12] Kidner, *Psalms 73-150*, 296-297.

[13] 《创世记》*Chuang shi ji* [Genesis] 6:1-4:

[14] Yair Zakovitch, "Psalm 82 and Biblical Exegesis," in Chaim Cohen, Avi Hurvitz & Shalom M. Paul, eds., *Sefer Moshe: The Moshe Weinfield Jubilee Volume: Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East, Qumran, and Post-Biblical Judaism*, (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2004), 213.

些扩散的共识，即那些“众神之子”（יְהוָה בְּנֵי מִיֵּהְלָאָה）他们只不过是上帝的宠臣、随从而已，而且那种神人结合的后代是必死的人类。然而，在寻求祛除每一条引起抵触的神话材料时，传统的评注者们采取了一种大胆的阐释，即他们把“מִיֵּהְלָאָה”解释为是师士/法官们，而“מִיֵּהְלָאָה”的儿子们“בְּנֵי מִיֵּהְלָאָה”（the sons of מִיֵּהְלָאָה）则被解释成师士/法官们的儿子们，也就是说，他们是凡人。^[15]

那么是什么导致了那些早期的阐释把“מִיֵּהְלָאָה”看作是等同于“师士们”呢？扎考维司(Zakovitch)认为，也许是第三节诗，即：“我的灵将不会永远审判（וְיָדִין）人，”这里的“וְיָדִין”被理解成是从动词“יָדַן”而来，意思是“审判”。许多米德拉西(midrashic)的段落把这个动词在审判的意义上作了阐释。^[16]扎考维司指出，圣经中的许多经文都涉及到上帝在司法程序中的作用问题，比如，他认为，《出埃及记》21:6与22:7-8，就支持了把词汇“מִיֵּהְלָאָה”看成是法官/师士的趋势，而这样的阐释在这些相同的诗节中是很流行的，同样地通过阅读《创世记》6章，它也受到了最大的影响。因此，他举例说，《出埃及记》21:6“他的主人就要带他到审判官（מִיֵּהְלָאָה הַלֵּלָאָה）那里，”文中的“מִיֵּהְלָאָה הַלֵּלָאָה”在希腊语、阿拉姆语以及叙利亚语中，就都被翻译成了“在审判官的面前”。^[17]

第二种观点是说这些“众神”是公国的君主与有权势的人物，即他们是“这个当前黑暗世界的统治者”。^[18]肯得尼认为旧约有几个地方涉及到这样或好或坏的当权者们。^[19]关于他们，在新约中是用“天使们”这样的术语来表达的，^[20]无疑，他们被描述为王子而非师士/法官，但这之间的区别在圣经中却并不明显。^[21]总之，肯得尼认为，这个观点似乎比起前面的这篇诗篇的语言^[22]以及旧约偶尔把术语“众神”或者“上帝的儿子们”用做天使们的用法要显得更为真实。^[23]

第三种阐释是认为在这里看到的是多神主义的遗迹，即那些“众神”是异教的多神，^[24]他们还没有

[15] 据 Zakovitch 所言，某些 midrashim，他们保留了作为“divine beings”“堕落天使”的众神之子身份 [According to Zakovitch, some midrashim retained as the identity of "divine beings", "Fallen angels" of the sons of the gods.]。参见 [See]Zakovitch, "Psalm 82 and Biblical Exegesis," 213.

[16] *Ibid.*, 214.

[17] *Ibid.*

[18] 《以弗所书》*Yifusuo shu* [Ephesians]6:12“因我们并不是与属血气的争战，乃是与那些执政的，掌权的，管辖这幽暗世界的，以及天空属灵气的恶魔争战。（两个“争战”的原文都作“摔跤”意 [The two "battle" of the original mean "wrestling"]）[For our struggle is not against enemies of blood and flesh, but against the rulers, against the authorities, against the cosmic powers of this present darkness, against the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly places]。”虽然，作者所引的是新约中的经文，因此意思的运用上不够准确，但还是表达清楚了这个分类的基本观点 [Although what the author cited is the New Testament Scriptures, and in the meaning of its application not accurate enough, he still clearly expresses the basic view of this classification]。

[19] 《以赛亚书》*Yisaiya shu* [Isaiah]24:21; 《但以理书》*Danyili shu* [Daniel] 10:13; 10:20-21; 12:1 ;

[20] 《启示录》*Qishilu* [Revelation]12:7“在天上就有了争战。米迦勒同他的使者与龙争战，龙也同他的使者去争战 [And war broke out in heaven; Michael and his angels against the dragon. The dragon and his angels fought back]。”文中的“使者”都作“天使”解 [The meaning of "envoys" in the sentence are the same to "angels"]。

[21] 《诗篇》*Shipian* [Psalm]72;

[22] 《诗篇》*Shipian* [Psalm]82:7 ;

[23] 《诗篇》*Shipian* [Psalm]8:5 ; 《约伯记》*Yuebo ji* [Job]1:6; 38:7; 也参考 [also see] Kidner, *Psalms* 73-150, 297.

[24] 如 [For example] Ackerman, *An Exegetical Study of Psalm 82*; Hermann Gunkel, *Introduction to Psalms: The Genres of the Religious Lyric of Israel*, tr. by James D. Nogalski and completed by Joachim Begrich, (Mercer Library of Biblical Studies; Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1998); Sigmund Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, tr. by D.R. Ap-Thomas from the Norwegian, vols. 1-2, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1962); Mitchell J. Dahood, *Psalms: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, (vol. 2, *The Anchor Bible*, V. 16-17a; Garden City, N.Y: Doubleday, 1966-70) 等人都持这同样的观点 [The scholars above all hold the same view]。

被否认，但是却被教化并受到了责问与清算。肯得尼在谈到《历代志》上 10:13-14 的经文时，^[25] 认为，这里涉及到的是对魔崇拜的异教崇拜，同时他也认为这个例子澄清了这样的观点，即，偶像崇拜从来都不是中立的而是向邪恶及邪恶势力的低头与认同。^[26]

在持异教多神观点的人中，如 米切尔·J. 达胡得 (Mitchell J. Dahood) 就认为，《诗篇》82 篇，是一首上帝对异教众神进行审判的先知预言的礼拜仪式诗。^[27] 他提出诗歌由三部分组成：第一部分 (vv.1-4) 是一个叙述描写，或者更确切地说是有关一个天上法庭的异像，在这个法庭中上帝通过了对那些异教众神的审判 (v.1) 而且对他们所犯罪行进行了起诉，并做了总结 (vv.2-4)。第二部分 (vv.5-7) 包含了诗人对那些道德愚钝的异教众神的抨击，他们要对宇宙的失序负责并且他们也将要丧失不朽性，并要被逐出天庭进入阴间世界。而最后一节，则是诗人为在耶和华单独统治下的宇宙公义的恢复祈祷。^[28]

而若格森 (J. W. Rogerson) 与迈凯伊 (J. W. McKay) 也认为，^[29] 虽然，传统上把这些众神解释为是 以色列的人类审判官，这使得诗节 2-5 变得有意义，但是，它却很难作到对 6 节以下诗节的合理解释。相反，而当把这些众神解释为是天上的存在物，即众神时，不仅能使诗节 2-5 有意义，而且同样地使诗节 6 也能得到合理的解释。因此，若格森与迈凯伊更倾向于认为这些众神是天上的神，而且提出他们可能每一个都掌控着列国中一个国家的命运。^[30] 因此在《诗篇》82 篇的语境中，诗篇宣告了以色列的上帝对这些其它众神的权威，^[31] 为了要从那些强者中间保护那些弱者 (vv.2-5)，而颁布了对众神的判决 (v.6f.)。因为只有上帝的宇宙统治才会给万国 (v.8) 带来真正的公义。^[32]

总之，关于《诗篇》82 篇中这些“众神”身份的问题，本人赞同第三种观点。即这些众神是那些异教列国的多神，^[33] 他们是天上“众神的会”中成员，以色列的上帝耶和华掌管并主持了这个天上“众神的会”。^[34] 而沿袭古代近东传统，无论这些众神与至高神是否具有血缘关系，传统上他们都被称为是“至

[25] 《历代志》上 *Lidaizhi shang* [1 Chronicles]10:13-14 “这样，扫罗死了。因为他干犯耶和华，没有遵守耶和华的命；又因他求问交鬼的妇人，没有求问耶和华，所以耶和华使他被杀，把国归于耶西的儿子大卫 [So Saul died for his unfaithfulness; he was unfaithful to the LORD in that he did not keep the command of the LORD; moreover, he had consulted a medium, seeking guidance, and did not seek guidance from the LORD. Therefore the LORD put him to death and turned the kingdom over to David son of Jesse].” 这段经文主要是指扫罗求问鬼魂占卜未来的行为，也许可以看作是当时的一种民间信仰的反映 [This passage mainly refers that Saul asked the ghost and practiced divination to know this fortune. And this can be seen as reflecting a folk belief at the time].

[26] 《历代志》下 *Lidaizhi xia* [2 Chronicles]6:15f.; 也见 [Also see] Kidner, *Psalms* 73-15, 297.

[27] Mitchell J. Dahood, *Psalms: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, (1966-70), vol. 2, 268-271.

[28] *Ibid.*, 268.

[29] J. W. Rogerson & J. W. McKay, *Psalms*, (Commentary By J. W. Rogerson & J. W. McKay; 3 vols.; Cambridge Bible Commentary; New English Bible; Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977), vol.2, 163-164.

[30] 《申命记》*Shenming ji* [Deuteronomy]32:8 “至高者将地业赐给列邦，将世人分开，就照以色列人的数目立定万民的疆界 [When the Most High apportioned the nations, when he divided humankind, he fixed the boundaries of the gods].” Ackerman, *An Exegetical Study of Psalm 82*, 384-397; 也参见 [Also see] James L. Kugel, *The God of Old : Inside the Lost World of the Bible*, (New York: Free Press, 2003), 120-125.

[31] 《诗篇》*Shipian* [Psalm]95:3 “因为耶和华为大上帝 (יְהוָה), 为大王，超乎万神 (אֱלֹהִים) 之上 [For the LORD is a great God (יְהוָה), and great king above all gods (אֱלֹהִים)].”

[32] 《诗篇》*Shipian* [Psalm]58:1-2; 也参见 [Also see] Rogerson & McKay, *Psalms*, vol.2, 163-164.

[33] 徐雪梅 Xu Xuemei, 《‘万邦’与‘业’：重建公义世界——〈诗篇〉82 篇之观念探讨》‘Wanbang’ yu ‘ye’ : chongjian gongyi shijie——〈shipian〉82 pian zhi guannian tantao [“The Nations” and “Inheritance”: Rebuilding a Just World——Probing into the Ideas in Psalm 82], 《圣经文学研究》*Shengjing wenxue yanjiu* [Biblical Literature Studies] 第一辑 di yi ji, the 1st series, (北京 Beijing : 人民文学出版社 Renmin wenxue chubanshe [People's Literature Publishing House], 2007), 294-318.

[34] 关于“众神的会”问题请详见 [The details on the issue of “the assembly of the gods”, see] 徐雪梅 Xu Xuemei, 《众神会中的审

高者的儿子”们。^[35]

二、“至高者的儿子们”：“神之众子”

在《诗篇》82篇中出现的“众神”(אֱלֹהִים)与诗节6中出现的“至高者的儿子们”(בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים)显然是平行对应的同义关系。他们受到了谴责,并被那“至高者”(אֱלֹהִים)的以色列上帝宣判了死刑。而在诗节6中,诗歌对这些众神的身份做了清楚的界定,即用至高神上帝的话宣布:他们是“神”(אֱלֹהִים),而且是至高神的儿子“בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים”。

为了清楚地把握与认识诗歌中的“至高者”与“至高者的儿子们”的身份与关系,我们有必要首先对这两个词语的语源与意义分别做一个回顾。

“至高者”一字在希伯来文被写作“אֱלֹהִים”,意思是“被晋升的那一个”。^[36] 这个字源自于希伯来字“עָלָה”,意思是“上升(to ascend)”,在旧约中,“אֱלֹהִים”这个词或者可能会被用作一个形容词,描述某事物在空间上高于另外的事物,或者被用作一个实词,主要通常是指那“最高的”神。^[37] 在迦南万神殿中,“אֱלֹהִים”是被赋予给那些众神之中地位最高的神“’ilu”的头衔,^[38] 后来,这个词被希伯来人在以色列不同时段的国家生活中挪用为他们自己的神耶和华的称号。^[39] 而在《创世记》14:18-22中频繁出现使用的“אֱלֹהִים”一词就是与“אֱלֹהִים”这个名称结合在一起的。这种联合有不同的解释,并且与它的修饰成份一起被看作是一个神名,^[40] 或者是把它当作另外一个神名,并且由此,它也被当作是插进来的一个成份。^[41] 西格蒙德·莫温克(Sigmund Mowinckel)认为,那位“אֱלֹהִים”在前以色列时代就被作为至高神在耶路撒冷受到崇拜,在圣经中被译做“至高的上帝”(the Most Highest God)。^[42] 而且他指出一些碑文也证明了,在迦南和叙利亚,“אֱלֹהִים”是受到广泛崇拜的对象。其名称正与在乌迦里特的“Aleyan”是相同的。显然“אֱלֹהִים”的名称,无疑在祭仪和神王的观念上都起了重要作用,并且,“אֱלֹהִים”这个名称在以色列被吸收并成了耶和华的称号,他最后也成为以色列的“至高神”。莫温克(Mowinckel)进而认为,其它的在前以色列时代被崇拜的神还有:“מֶלֶךְ”(the King)王者,“שׁוֹמֵר” (约)神以及“צְדָקָה”(Justice)公义神。他认为,至少在以色列以前的时代某种程度上这些神曾经被看作是“אֱלֹהִים”显现。另外他也相信“אֱלֹהִים”还是太阳神,他的光线在破晓时分迫使那些邪恶的势力仓皇逃窜。^[43] 因此,莫温克提出,

判: <诗篇>82篇研究探索》Zhongshen huizhong de shenpan : <shipian> 82 pian yanjiu tansuo [Judgement in the Assembly of the Gods: Probing into the Psalm 82], 第三章第一节中的内容讨论 [the discussion in the first section of the third chapter].

[35] H. Haag, "Ben," in *Theological Dictionary of Old Testament*, vol. 2: 145-159, esp. 157-158.

[36] Frederich W. Schmidt, "Most High," in Bob Becking Karel van der Toorn & Pieter W. van der Horst, eds., *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, (Leiden; New York: Brill, 1995), 922.

[37] E. E. Elnes and P. D. Miller, "אֱלֹהִים Elyon," in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, 560.

[38] 关于迦南万神殿中的至高神“艾勒”(’ilu/ il)的内容讨论请参见 [The discussion of the most high God of Canaan in Pantheon, see] 徐雪梅 Xu Xuemei, 《众神会中的审判: <诗篇>82篇研究探索》Zhongshen huizhong de shenpan : <shipian> 82 pian yanjiu tansuo [Judgement in the Assembly of the Gods: Probing into the Psalm 82], 第四章的相关内容 [the related content in the chapter four].

[39] 《申命记》Shenming ji [Deuteronomy] 32:8-9; 《撒母耳记》下 Samu'er ji xia [2 Samuel] 22:14; 《诗篇》Shipian [Psalm] 7:17; 97:9.

[40] F. Cross, "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs," *Harvard Theological Review*, no. 55, (1962), 255-56.

[41] G. Della Vida, "El Elyon in Genesis 14:18-20," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, no. 63, (1944), 3-9.

[42] 《创世记》Chuang shi ji [Genesis] 14.8ff.; 《诗篇》Shipian [Psalm] 78, 89.

[43] 《诗篇》Shipian [Psalm] 46:6 “外邦喧嚷, 列国动摇。上帝发声, 地便熔化 [The nations are in an uproar, the kingdoms totter; he utters his voice, the earth melts].” 《以赛亚书》Yisaiya shu [Isaiah] 14:12-15 “明亮之星, 早晨之子 שֶׁן הַיָּמִין אֱלֹהִים אֲרָם, 你何竟从天坠落。你

在以色列耶和华本身变成了既是“王者”又是“公义”的神。他的圣殿被建造得如太阳的圣殿一般，与太阳一起向着东方开放，以至于太阳在昼夜的平分点(equinoxes)时会穿过打开那些大门直接照射在那“神圣中的神圣”上，而在这里，根据所罗门的即位祈祷，耶和华“他会居留在厚厚的黑暗中”。^[44]

因此，莫温克指出，在前以色列时期，毫无疑问地已经就有了把“לֵא וְיִלְעֵ”同“מֶלֶךְ”与“קִדְּשׁ”相结合的某些观念，即当时已经有了有关把那位“神”变成了“至高者”，变成了“那位王者”以及那位“公义”的挥舞者(wielder)的观念——一句话，这也意味着“皇室的权力”和“命运/财富”——以及“和平之约”的观念的产生。理所当然，“至高的神”(the Most High God)与那位“王者”(the King)提供了雨水、丰产与五谷，而且也保护他的人民的那些“权力”、“和平”与“财富”以及“和平之约”。所有这些都被以色列人吸收转移到了沙漠的战神耶和华身上，因而耶和华在摩西之前已经是法律与公义之神，和平之约的神，市场与道路之神。^[45] 可以看到这里迦南的至高神与以色列的战神耶和华的融合。

作为一个神名，“וְיִלְעֵ”或者是独自出现，^[46]或者与其它神名连在一起出现，^[47]而在《诗篇》82:6中，它则是与较低级的神的因素结合在一起，即以“יְיָ בְּוִלְעֵ”的形式出现在诗歌中。^[48] 本人认为在《创世记》14:18-22中出现的以色列上帝的称号“לֵא וְיִלְעֵ”虽然在《诗篇》82篇中是分开出现的，但也正好说明了，这两个词在诗歌中都是被用来做以色列上帝耶和华名称的事实。然而，在关于这个称号已经与摩西的宗教融合程度的问题上，学者们并未达成一致意见。有些学者，例如，安德森(A. A. Anderson)就相信，这个术语已经被以色列人完全吸收，即这个名称完全等同于耶和华以及对耶和华的崇拜。^[49] 不过，另外一些学者，如克罗斯(F. M. Cross)则论辩说，在前以色列时代的礼拜仪式与摩西时期的宗教之间存

这次败列国的，何竟被砍倒在地上。你心里曾说，我要升到天上。我要高举我的宝座在上帝众星 לֵא וְיִלְעֵ以上。我要坐在聚会的山上 בְּעֹמֶרֶה，在北方的极处 צְוֶפֶת，我要升到多云之上；我要与至上者同等 לֵא וְיִלְעֵ。然而，你必坠落阴间 שְׁאוֹל，到坑中极深处 כְּרִי כְרִי。[How you are fallen from heaven, O Day star, son of Dawn שֶׁנֶּכְרַח לְלִיָּהּ! How you are cut down to the ground, you who laid the nations low! You said in your heart, “I will raise my throne above the stars of God לֵא וְיִלְעֵ; I will sit on the mount of assembly on the heights of Zaphon צְוֶפֶת，I will ascend to the tops of the clouds. I will make myself like the Most High.” But you are brought down to Sheol, to the depths of the Pit].”

[44] 《诗篇》Shipian[Psalm]97:2-5; Mowinchel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, tr. by D.R. Ap-Thomas; foreword by James L. Crenshaw, (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2004), vol.1, 132-133.

[45] Mowinchel 在他的注中，进一步解释了他对于耶和华神身份问题的看法。他提出的“公义之泉”或者“审判”(“מַעְיָן שֶׁפָּט”——the fountain of justice/judgment)的观点，支持了耶和华的圣泉在“כֶּדֶשׁ”(Kadesh)的说法。他说在以色列人进入歌珊地(Goshen)之前，Kadesh是耶和华专门的祭仪地。并且也是以色列人离开埃及后的第一个目的地(goal)。在出埃及的故事中，这个联系是明显的[In his note, Mowinchel further explains the issue of the identity of God Yahweh that he holds, and puts forward the opinion of ‘the fountain of justice’ or ‘judgment’, which supports the saying that the Sacred Spring of YAHWEH in “כֶּדֶשׁ”(Kadesh). He suggests that Kadesh was the special place of cult of YAHWEH before Israelites went into the Goshen, and also the first destination after Israelites left Egypt, too. In the story of the Exodus, this internal relations is obvious]. 参见 [See] Mowinchel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, tr. by D.R. Ap-Thomas from the Norwegian, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1962), vol. 1: 133, n, 86。

[46] 《诗篇》Shipian[Psalm]9:3; 《以赛亚书》Yisaiya Shu[Isaiah]14:14 ;

[47] 关于“וְיִלְעֵ”与其它神名如“הוהי”与“מִיִּהֵלֵא”及“לֵא”(即“上帝”)一同出现的例子 [The examples that “וְיִלְעֵ” occur together with the other names’ of gods, such as “הוהי”, “מִיִּהֵלֵא” and “לֵא” (namely “God”)], 参见 [See] 《诗篇》Shipian[Psalm]7:18; 57:3; 73:11 ;

[48] 而在《但以理书》Danyili shu[Daniel]7:18, 22, 25, 27等节经文中，则涉及出现了阿拉姆语的“qaddîšê ‘elyônîn”的用法 [[In the verses of "the book of Daniel" such as 7:18, 22, 2 and 27, etc., they relate to the usage of the Aramaic words “qaddîšê ‘elyônîn”]. 而在《诗篇》Shipian[Psalm]89:27中，这个词却是指那位君王 [And in the psalm 89:27, the phrase refers to that King]. 也参见 [Also see] Elnes and Miller, “qaddîšê ‘elyônîn”, in Bob Becking Karel van der Toorn & Pieter W. van der Horst, eds., *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, (Leiden; New York: Brill, 1995), 560.

[49] Anderson, *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. 2, 412.

在着重大的不同。^[50] 而施米特 (Schmidt) 则认为,“עֲלֵי”这个术语在后来以色列国家的历史中,曾一度被忽略,仅仅在诗歌与礼拜仪式中被保存下来。但是在后流放时期这个词却获得了新的流行普及,而这个术语的使用,也促进了对上帝超越性的强调。^[51] E. 西奥多·穆仑 (E. Theodore Mullen) 也认为,至高者“עֲלֵי”在希伯来传统中被使用,是作为耶和华的一个称号这一点是无疑义的。^[52]

据此,我们把《诗篇》82篇中“עֲלֵי”看作是以色列的上帝“耶和华”应该是可能的,即在诗歌中对以色列上帝的称呼共出现了三个词语,即“אֱלֹהֵינוּ”、“אֱלֹהֵי”以及“עֲלֵי”。这与整个旧约圣经中出现的对耶和华名称的其它习惯称谓是相一致的。

既然,诗歌中的那些“众神”是“至高者的儿子”们,而“עֲלֵי”这个短语也只在《诗篇》82篇中出现过一次,它是个不多见的术语,那么这意味着什么?是说以色列的上帝耶和华曾经也有过子嗣?^[53] 还是说明了以色列曾经有过的多神崇拜的痕迹残留?而在《诗篇》82篇中,这些多神因为不公义而受耶和华的审判,而最后要彻底地消失殆尽到底意味着什么?带着这样的疑惑,让我们一起来继续探究“עֲלֵי”该术语的意味,以及在本篇诗歌中他们死亡意义的所指。

若格森与迈凯伊在承认那位“至高者”可能就是以色列上帝的一个称号的同时,^[54] 他们还进一步认为,那些“众神”是以色列上帝所创造的。而关于“至高者的儿子们”这个艰涩短语的意思,他们认为大概可能只是说这些众神是真正的神而已。^[55] 而穆仑 (Mullen) 却提出,也许最好应该把“עֲלֵי”这个短语翻译成“עֲלֵי”阶层的成员,比如“至高的众神”,但他认为,无论如何他们与“אֱלֹהֵינוּ”的身份是等同的,即他们是耶和华会中的成员。接着穆仑进一步指出,“עֲלֵי”甚至可能反射出了在《申命记》

[50] Cross, *Theological Dictionary of Old Testament*, vol. I, 256; Cross, "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs," 1962, 256.

[51] 例如在 [For example] 《但以理书》*Danyili shu* [Daniel]、《便西拉智训》*Bianxila zhixun* [Ecclesiasticus]、《以诺书》*Yinuoshu* [Book of Enoch] 与《以斯拉书》*Yisila shu* [Book of Ezra] 4 等中都是对上帝的超越性的强调 [the book or verses mentioned above, all stress the transcendency of God]。参见 [See] *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* vol. 2, 412. 另外,这个术语 (希腊语的 *hypsistos*) 也被在新约中有限的使用 [In addition, this term (Greek, *hypsistos*) also has been limited used in the New Testament], 参见 [see] 《马可福音》*Make fuyin* [Mark] 5:7 [=《路加福音》*Lujia fuyin* [Luke] 8:28;《使徒行传》*Shitu xingzhuan* [Acts] 7:48; 16:17;《希伯来书》*Xibolai shu* [Hebrews] 7:1. 也见 [Also see] Schmidt, *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, 922.

[52] Mullen, *The Divine Council*, 238.

[53] 旧约圣经中的以色列人的上帝耶和华,通常是被刻画为无家室无妻子儿女的唯一至高神,但在《诗篇》82篇中他却称“众神”是他的“儿子们”,并且宣判了他们的死刑,因此诗歌可能表现的是以色列一神信仰过程中某个阶段上的发展情况,可能从侧面揭示暗示了,以色列多神信仰向一神信崇拜过度期间神学斗争的现实。那些“至高者的儿子们”众神的死亡预示了以色列一神崇拜的阶段性胜利 [Yahweh, the God of Israelites in the Old Testament, usually is portrayed as only the most high God, who has no family, no wife and children. But in the psalm 82, he said that the "gods" were his "sons" and sentenced them into death. So the poem may represent the development of a stage in the process of Israelites' belief in one God and also reveal from the side the reality of theological struggles during the transition period of Israel polytheism to worship God. The death of the gods, "the sons of the Most High", indicates the gradual victory for Israel's God worship]。有关本诗至高神“אֱלֹהֵי”与迦南万神殿的至高的父亲神“’ilu”的关系问题 [About the relationship between the Most High God “אֱלֹהֵי” of Psalm 82 and the Supreme Father God of Canaan Pantheon “’ilu”], 请参见 [see] 徐雪梅 Xu Xuemei:《众神会中的审判:〈诗篇〉82篇研究探索》*Zhongshen huizhong de shenpan*: [Judgement in the Assembly of the Gods: Probing into the Psalm 82], 第三章的相关论述 [the relevant content in the third chapter of her PhD dissertation]。

[54] 《诗篇》*Shipian* [Psalm] 83:18 “使他们知道:唯独你——名为耶和华的——是全能以上的至高者 [Let them know that you alone, whose name is the LORD, are the Most High over all the earth].” 并也请参考 [Also see] 《诗篇》*Shipian* [Psalm] 57:2 “我要求告至高的上帝,就是为我成全诸事的上帝 [I cry to God Most High, to God who fulfills his purpose for me].”

[55] Rogerson and McKay, *Psalms*, vol. 2, 165.

32:8^[56] 中“עֲלֵי־יְהוָה”与耶和华在这些“עֲלֵי־יְהוָה”中分配万国这样一个背后的传统。^[57]而且诗节6令这样的意思变得更加清晰,即,这里耶和华是作为法官、检举人以及陪审员的身份而行动,他彻底否认了这些“至高者的儿子们”神的身份。^[58]

而 R. 雅克·图尔梅(R. Jacques. Tournay)提出,耶和华主持了由那些众神组成的天上的法庭会议,这些众神是“עֲלֵי־יְהוָה”的后裔(v.6)。他认为,那位叫亚萨的利未人的后代,在此利用了迦南古代的神话,使人联想起在迦南那由艾勒神主持的天上众神的聚会。^[59]而在本诗中,这些天上的众神要对世界的不公义负责。他们受审判死亡,等同于零并一定要堕落并消失,而与此同时,耶和华却将要起来统治整个宇宙。^[60]据此,图尔梅(Tournay)干脆把第6节诗句翻译为:

我曾对你们说:“你们是神,都是至高者的子孙!”

另外,图尔梅认为,乌迦里特的原始材料的回想强化了对这篇诗篇的分析。诗节v.1使我们回忆起《以赛亚书》3:13;^[61]而在诗节vv.2-4中的控告又令我们想到了《以赛亚书》3:14-15^[62]中的内容以及其它的神喻或者是《申命记》本源的那些文本。^[63]作为一种圣经外的平行对应,图尔梅还引用了来自乌迦里特“克

[56] 《申命记》*Shenming ji*[Deuteronomy]32:8-9“至高者‘עֲלֵי־יְהוָה’将地业赐给列邦,将世人分开,就照以色列人的数目立定万民的疆界。耶和华的份本是他的百姓;他的产业本是雅各[When the Most High apportioned the nations, when he divided humankind, he fixed the boundaries of the people according to the number of the gods; the LORD's own portion was his people, Jacob his allotted share].”据李焯昌所言,这里的译文是根据马索拉版本中的希伯来文翻译的,但是在希腊七十士的译文中,文中的“照以色列人的数目”是“就照众神的数目”,显然希伯来译本对这个词作了改动,是为迎合“耶和华信仰”的需要。况且文中的“至高者”本身与耶和华的身份在此似乎也并不太明朗,但在其它地方,他们却是合一的[According to Li Chichang, here the text is translated on the basis of the Masoretic version of the Hebrew translation. However, in the seventy Greek scholar translation, the verse of“according to the number of the children of Israel” is the “according to the number of the gods”. It's clear that the Hebrew version made changes to this word in order to meet the need of the belief in Yahweh. Furthermore, the “most high” itself and the identity of Yahweh in the text do not seem certain, too. But in other places, they are unified], 如参见 [e.g., see] 《诗篇》*Shipian*[Psalm]83:18; 57:2。

[57] 徐雪梅 Xu Xuemei:《‘万邦’与‘业’:重建公义世界——〈诗篇〉82篇之观念探讨》‘Wanbang’ yu ‘ye’: chongjian gongyi shijie——〈shipian〉82pian zhi guannian tantao [“The Nations” and “Inheritance”: Rebuilding a Just World——Probing into the Ideas in Psalm 82], 306-313。

[58] Mullen, *The Divine Council*, 238.

[59] *Ibid.*

[60] Raymond Jacques Tournay, *Seeing and Hearing God with the Psalms: The Prophetic Liturgy of the Second Temple in Jerusalem*, tr. by J. Edward Crowley from French, (*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplements*), 118; (Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Press, 1991), 184.

[61] 在《以赛亚书》*Yisaiya shu*[Isaiah]3:13中,“耶和华起来辩论,站着审判众民[The LORD rises to argue his case; he stands to judge the people]”与《诗篇》*Shipian*[Psalm]82:1中的“上帝站在至高者的会中,在众神中行审判[God has taken his place in the divine council; in the midst of the gods he holds judgment]”两诗句的确非常对应,都涉及到上帝站着审判的场景,只是一句的场景在地上,一个的背景是天上[The two verses are indeed very corresponding, and both all refer to the scene that God stands up to judge, however, a scene is on the ground, and the another is the background of the sky]。

[62] 《以赛亚书》*Yisaiya shu*[Isaiah]3:14-15“耶和华必审问他民中的长老和首领,说:吃尽葡萄园果子的就是你们;向贫穷人所夺的都在你们家中。主万军之耶和华说:你们为何压制我的百姓,搓磨贫穷人的脸呢[The LORD enters into judgment with the elders and princes of his people: It is you who have devoured the vineyard; the spoil of the poor is in your houses. What do you mean by crushing my people, by grinding the face of the poor? Says the LORD God of hosts?】经文与《诗篇》*Shipian*[Psalm]82篇对那些众神偏袒恶者以及谴责他们的不公义的行为意思是相近的[The meaning of the text is similar to Psalm 82, in which those gods who show favour to evil are also condemned for their injustice]。

[63] 《申命记》*Shenming ji*[Deuteronomy]10:18“他为孤儿寡妇申冤,又怜爱寄居的,赐给他衣食[who executes justice for the orphan and the widow, and who loves the strangers, providing them food and clothing].”《申命记》*Shenming ji*[Deuteronomy]24:17“你不可向寄居的屈枉正直,也不可拿寡妇的衣裳作当头[You shall not deprive a resident alien or an orphan of justice; you shall not take a widow's garment in pledge].”《申命记》*Shenming ji*[Deuteronomy]27:19“向寄居的孤儿寡妇屈枉正直的,必受咒诅!百姓都要说:‘阿

里特史诗 (the Keret epic)” 中的诗句：^[64]

“你没有为寡妇的案件辩护，你没有给那些不幸的人公义，你没有驱逐那些贫穷人的抢夺者，你没有给在你面前的孤儿食物，也没有喂养在你身后的寡妇。”^[65]

进而，图尔梅却指出，关于这些诗节以及评论者们对于诗节 v.7b 的翻译是非常不确定的：他提出，有关这些众神的身份，也许有几种可能：或者他们是那至高者的后代？或者他们是异教的神（同乌迦里特文本中的一样）？又或者他们是天使以及地上的统治者？^[66] 他说，这同样的问题在其它的文本中也被提出过，^[67] 而《诗篇》82 篇的语境却又使人立即就会回想起，似乎一旦遭遇到耶和华的绝对统治，那些异教神们的“死亡”是如此经常地在旧约中被宣告，特别是在《以赛亚书》与《诗篇》中更是如此。但是这个控告又要求我们要弄明白在这些生命存在中，谁会被降低贬值为无呢，显然是那些暴君与压迫者们的激发者们了，^[68] 于是《诗篇》82 篇中就有了众神被宣判死亡的结局。因此图尔梅认为，这一点就把《诗篇》82 篇与《以赛亚书》24:19ff.^[69] 的那些伟大的启示连接在一起：即大地将倾覆并倒塌；耶和华将会在同一个时间惩罚那些天军 (the armies of heaven) 与地上的统治者。当耶和华在锡安与耶路撒冷实行统治之时，他们所有的人都将被监禁在监狱中。那些邪恶的统治者，盲目而无知，使所有社会的根基处在危险之中。^[70] 只有一神信仰与一神信仰的道德才可以带给人类公义并尊重每一个人的权利。^[71]

总之，以上这些众多的阐释一方面表现了《诗篇》82 篇的开放性特点，另一方面也体现了“וְיִלְכְּטוּ הַגִּבּוֹרִים”这个术语本身所涵概着的丰富复杂的特性以及多种阐释的可能。

三、小结

本人认为，这些众神子，他们是天上的众神，被称为是“至高者的儿子们”，这个称谓表达的是众

们！’ [“Cursed be anyone who deprives the alien, the orphan, and the widow of justice” .All the people shall say, “Amen” !]” 等。这些经文都特别强调了保护孤儿寡妇等社会中弱势的人们 [In particular, these verses highlight to protect the social vulnerable people, such as orphans and widows, etc.]。

[64] John C. L. Gibson, *Canaanite Myths and Legends*, (2nd ed. from Godfrey Rolles Driver; Edinburgh: Clark, 1978), 102.

[65] Gibson, *Canaanite Myths and Legends*, 102 ; 也见 Tournay, *Seeing and Hearing God*, 184-185.

[66] Ackerman, *An Exegetical Study of Psalm 82*, 186.

[67] 《出埃及记》*Chuajiji* [Exodus]4:16; 7:1; 21:6; 《诗篇》*Shipian*[Psalm]58:2; 138:1。

[68] Tournay, *Seeing and Hearing God*, 185.

[69] 《以赛亚书》*Yisaiya shu*[Isaiah]24:19-23 “地全然破坏，尽都崩裂，大大地震动了。地要动倒西歪，好像醉酒的人；又摇来摇去，好像吊床。罪过在其上沉重，必然塌陷，不能复起。到那日，耶和华在远处必惩罚高处的众军，在地上必惩罚地上的列王。他们必被聚集，像囚犯被聚在牢狱中，并要囚在监牢里，多日之后便被讨罪（或译：眷顾）。那时，月亮要蒙羞，日头要惭愧；因为万军之耶和华必在锡安山，在耶路撒冷作王；在敬畏他的长老面前，必有荣耀。[The earth is utterly broken, the earth is torn asunder, the earth is violently shaken. The earth staggers like a drunkard, it sways like a hut; its transgression lies heavy upon it, and it falls and will not rise again. On that day the LORD will punish the host of heaven in heaven, and on earth the kings of the earth. they will be gathered together like prisoner in a pit; they will be shut up in a prison, and after many days they will be punished. Then the moon will be abashed, and the sun ashamed; for the LORD of hosts will reign on Mount Zion and in Jerusalem, and before his elders he will manifest his glory.]” 以上的经文与《诗篇》*Shipian*[Psalm]82:5 中出现的“地的根基”的摇动之后的众神被判死刑的内容是一致的 [The above verses are in accord with that the gods are sentenced to death in Psalm 82:5 after the foundations of the earth Shake in it]。

[70] 《诗篇》*Shipian*[Psalm]11:2-3; 《撒母耳记》上 *Shamu'er ji shang*[1 Samuel] 2:7-8; 《耶利米书》*Yelimi shu* [Jeremiah]4:22; 《弥迦书》*Mijia shu*[Micah]4:12; 《以赛亚书》*Yisaiya shu*[Isaiah]56:11。

[71] Tournay, *Seeing and Hearing God*, 185.

神与至高者同样的“神”之属性。但是在执行宇宙管理与实行公义的职责中，他们丧失了公义原则，造成了不公义行为与事件在人间的发生，宇宙因此而震动，他们要对自己的行为负责，而以色列的上帝更要对宇宙、众神以及世界负责，于是至高的上帝不得已而为之，判处“众神子们”死亡，结束宇宙颠覆、人间不公义的现实，维持世界的秩序与和谐。^[72] 进而，从诗歌本身来看，“יְהוָה וְיִלְגֵּעַ”作为“至高者的儿子们”，他们曾被至高者耶和華指派分配负责列国万邦的公义统治，^[73] 而他们的死亡则代表体现了公义的上帝对“不公义”众神的惩罚^[74] 以及耶和華对不公义众神的一场决定性胜利。同时也从侧面表现了以色列宗教思想在这个阶段中对古代迦南宗教传统思想的扬弃，即摒弃了“子嗣”是父亲生命延续的观念，但同时也吸收并改造了“儿子对父亲的义务与责任”的古代传统思想，同时更直接反对了古代迦南万神殿的至高神与众神子之间的父子神的关系模式，发展出了以色列人自己的至高神与众神之间的公义原则的关系模式：即，以色列的父亲神创造主耶和華在《诗篇》82篇中为了公义的原则，亲自审判他的众神子并宣判他们死刑。表现出了宁要公义也不要不公义的众神子的凛然正气。传统观念中的“儿子”对父亲”至关重要性的特征已经被彻底地淡化，为神子的死亡而悲痛哭泣的迦南父亲神的形象完全被颠覆，他已经蜕变演化成了以色列至高公义的上帝，充分展现了以色列新型的至高父亲神与他的众神子之间的神界公义原则的关系模式。诗歌表现了对不公义的众神子已经构成了宇宙崩塌与社会混乱失序的最大危险的观念主题。

附录：缩略词

AB *The Anchor Bible*

ABD *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*

DDD *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, ed. Bob Becking Karel van der Toorn, Pieter W. van der Horst (Leiden; New York: Brill, 1995)

HSM *Harvard Semitic Monographs*

HTR *Harvard Theological Review*

IDB *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*

IPGRLI *Introduction to Psalms: The Genres of the Religious Lyric of Israel*, by Hermann

[72] 徐雪梅 Xu Xuemei: “《‘天上的审判’，‘地上的公义’——解析《诗篇》82篇“审判”之主题》*Tianshangde shenpan, dishangde gongyi*——jiexi 〈shipian〉82 pian“ shenpan”zhi zhuti[“Judgment in Heaves” and “Justice in the Earth” : Interpreting the Subject of “Judgment” in Psalm 82],《宗教学研究 Zongjiaoxue yanjiu[Religious Studies], No.1 [Gen No.86], (成都 Chengdou: 四川大学道教与宗教文化研究所 Sichuan daxue dao jiao yu zongjiao wenhua yanjiusuo[Institute of Taoism and Religious Culture of Sichuan University], 2010), 105-109.

[73] 徐雪梅 Xu Xuemei, 《‘万邦’与‘业’：重建公义世界——〈诗篇〉82篇之观念探讨》‘Wanbang’ yu ‘ye’: chongjian gongyi shijie——〈shipian〉82pian zhi guannian tantao[“The Nations” and “Inheritance”: Rebuilding a Just World——Probing into the Ideas in Psalm 82], 294-318.

[74] 在旧约人的死亡观念中，一旦人到达了生命的尽头，就会与地上所有的生物一样走向同样的归宿 [In the death concept of the Old Testament, once the people get to the end of life, they will go to the same home with all creatures on the ground]. 参见 [See] 《约书亚记》*Yueshuya ji*[Joshua]23: 14;《列王记》上 *Liewang ji shang* [1 Kings]2:2;《约伯记》*Yuebo ji*[Job]30:23. 但神是不死的，关于神的死亡在旧约中仅有《诗篇》*Shipian*[Psalm]82:7 中一例 [But the God is not dead and there is only one case about the death of gods in Psalm 82:7 of the Old Testament]. 也参见 [Also see] E. Jacob, "Death," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*;vol. 2, 802.

Gunkel, trans. James D. Nogalski and completed by Joachim Begrich (Mercer Library of Biblical Studies; Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1998)

JBL *Journal of Biblical Literature*

JSS *Journal of Semitic Studies*

JSOT *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*

JSOTSup *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplements*

PIW *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, by Sigmund Mowinckel, translated by D.R.

Ap-Thomas from the Norwegian (Vols. 1-2, Oxford: Blackwell, 1962) and

translated by D.R. Ap-Thomas, foreword by James L. Crenshaw (Vols. 1-2,

Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2004)

SJOT *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament*

TDOT *Theological Dictionary of Old Testament*

TOTC The Tyndale Old Testament commentaries

中英译名对照表

安德森 A. A. Anderson

克罗斯 F. M. Cross

米切尔 . J. 达胡得 Mitchell J. Dahood

德里克 . 肯得尼 Derek Kidner

迈凯伊 J. W. McKay

西格蒙德 . 莫温克 Sigmund Mowinckel

E. 西奥多 . 穆仑 E. Theodore Mullen

若格森 J. W. Rogerson

施米特米特 Schmidt

R. 雅克 . 图尔梅 R. Jacques. Tournay

叶尔 . 扎考维司 Yair Zakovitch

The English Title:

Trial of the gods of death for Righteousness

—An Analysis of the Relationship between God and the gods in Psalm 82

XU Xuemei

Ph. D. from Chinese University of Hong Kong (2007) ; M. A. of World literature and Comparative Literature at Peking University (2000) ; Present, Associate Professor at The Faculty of Foreign Languages of Ningbo University, mainly engaged in English Teaching. Have many years of experience in the teaching of foreign literature and Chinese as a foreign language. Major research areas are Hebrew Bible as well as Comparison of Chinese and Western literature and culture. Recent articles : “The Falling Star “הֶלֶל” (Hêlêl) and “Taibai Jinxing” : Interpreting the Images of Venus in Isaiah 14:12-15 and Journey to the West” ; “On the Irony of the Star-gods Falling from the Sky : Exploratory Interpretation to Psalm 82” . Address : No. 818, Fenghua Road, Jiangbei District, The Faculty of Foreign Languages, Ningbo University, Ningbo City, 315211, Zhejiang Province, China. E-mail : keilytsui@hotmail.com; xuxuemei@nbu.edu.cn. Mobile phone No.: +86-135-6790-5492.

Abstract : This essay probes [into] the status and relationship between “God” and “gods” in Psalm 82 by analyzing the Hebrew words “אֱלֹהִים” , “אֱלֹהִים” , “אֱלֹהִים” and “אֱלֹהִים” in it. It suggests that the “God” (אֱלֹהִים , אֱלֹהִים) and the “gods” (אֱלֹהִים) have formed hostile groups in the Psalm and “justice” becomes their boundary. The god “אֱלֹהִים” is the Highest God, namely “אֱלֹהִים”, and “the sons of the Most Highest”(אֱלֹהִים) are the “gods” who are condemned. Following the traditions of the ancient Near East, both God and gods are the members of “the assembly of gods”, in other words, they are the gods of the paganism countries. Due to their injustice, the universal base has been shaken, so the Israelite God Yahweh takes charge of the conference of the heavens, and sentences the gods to death to maintain the universal stability.

Key words : Psalm 82, the “God (אֱלֹהִים , אֱלֹהִים)” , the “gods (אֱלֹהִים)”

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

试论中国特色基督教

霍克功

(宗教文化出版社, 100009 北京, 中国)

提要：本文首先提示了中国基督教在东汉即有传入的两大证据——江苏徐州汉画像石中一批东汉画像石造像出现了“上帝创造世界”、“夏娃被蛇诱惑图”等圣经故事和早期基督教艺术风格的图案；还有徐州汉代“基督铜镜”，铜镜上铭文含义：制作这面神镜，来尊崇敬拜独一无二的上帝。圣母玛利亚目证了耶稣基督是上帝的独生子，他有帝王一般的显赫。接着简要介绍了基督宗教传入中国的后续历史。

在中国特色基督教理论和实践中，主要有爱国爱教政治可靠，领导权掌握在爱国爱教的人士手中。“三自”是中国特色基督教最鲜明的特征。三自爱国运动消除了宗派，使信徒之间和谐相处。促进了中国基督徒与非信徒之间的和谐关系；促进基督教与社会主义社会相适应，使信众成为建设中国特色社会主义的积极力量。提高了中国教会在普世教会中的地位。圣经发行 6217 万本全球最多，内部出版期待公开。

中国的基督教会主要有两类，一是三自教会，二是家庭教会，另外有所谓“独立教会”，自由聚会。中国特色基督教神学思想主要有十个方面圣经观、上帝观、基督论、人性论、圣灵论、伦理思想、教会论、末世论、入世论、和谐论、教育与宗教分离、基督教可以设立非营利性医院等慈善机构等。

关键词：东汉传入、中国特色、基督教、三自教会、家庭教会

作者：霍克功，宗教学博士，宗教文化出版社编审，北京市高级职称评审专家，石河子大学政法学院客座教授。联系地址：北京市西城区后海北沿 44 号，邮政编码：100009。电子邮：hkgshr@sina.com, QQ1158513634, 电话：15801626138。

基督教产生于公元 1 世纪前后的巴勒斯坦地区。公元 1054 年，基督教东、西部教会发生分裂，形成西部的天主教（罗马天主教）、东部的正教（东正教）。16 世纪 20 年代，马丁·路德在德国发起的宗教改革运动形成燎原之势，在瑞士，茨温利和加尔文等的改革活动，进一步扩大和加深了新教的影响。英王亨利八世出于政治的原因，由上而下推行宗教改革，组成具有独特形式的新教会，以摆脱教皇的管辖。到 16 世纪中叶，新教的三大主要宗派，即马丁·路德创立的路德宗、加尔文创立的归正宗和作为英国国教的安立甘宗，都已在欧洲形成，并同罗马天主教相抗衡。此后，新教有了很大发展，18 世纪以后，这三个主要宗派又不断分化出许多小宗派，与此同时，神学思想也在不断发展。在中国，基督宗教先后经过了五次传播，并形成了中国特色的基督教。

一、古代、近代和当代——中国基督教的历史反思

（两个发现，一个观点。）

最早到中国传教的是天主教徒，之后才有基督教新教到中国传教。基督宗教最早传入中国有五种传

说, 1. 多马于东汉明帝时期将基督教传入中国; 2. 叙利亚传教士于东汉时期将基督教传到中国; 3. 巴多罗买曾经到印度并进入中国; 4. 基督徒在尼罗皇帝逼迫时期曾经逃难到中国; 5. 三国东吴有过基督教传入。

多马(天主教称多默)是圣经福音书中记载的耶稣十二门徒之一, 他的全名是低土马·犹太·多马, 意思是犹太的双生子。在《多马行传》中, 耶稣说:“我是多马的兄弟。”可见耶稣多么重视多马。

《多马行传》记载了多马被派到印度传教, 建立教会, 在异教地区, 首次点燃基督信仰之火的故事。相传多马从耶路撒冷出发, 来到巴比伦城, 然后坐船到达印度南部的马拉巴, 宣讲福音, 被异教祭司用长矛刺死。后来, 王后因用多马坟墓上的泥土治好了疾病而信了基督教, 国王也跟着信了。如今在印度还存有一些以多马为名的教会和与他相关的遗迹。

印度与中国相邻, 相传多马也到过中国传教。东汉明帝永平年间, 多马从印度搭乘商船来到中国, 在当时的京城洛阳建堂布道。新近解读的带有圣经故事和早期基督教图案的江苏徐州孔望山的汉代画像石造像, 证实了这种传说的可能性。2002年7月31日《江南时报》报道说, 中国基督教协会常务委员、基督教神学教育家汪维藩教授, 在对江苏徐州汉画像石艺术馆珍藏的汉画像石研究时惊奇地发现, 一批东汉画像石造像竟然出现了“上帝创造世界”、“夏娃被蛇诱惑图”等圣经故事和早期基督教艺术风格的图案。汉画像石的“上帝创造世界图”包含日月、鱼、鸟、走兽、爬虫等;“夏娃被蛇诱惑图”上有两天军、天使以及善恶树, 树下左边是善者, 右边为恶者。夏娃右手摘果子, 右袖被蛇咬住。汉画像石上的图案表现出中东地区的早期基督教艺术风格, 同时又兼有中国东汉时期的艺术特点。“夏娃被蛇诱惑图”中蛇和夏娃的形象完全是西汉遗风。经测定, 其中有的画像石刻凿于公元86年即东汉元和三年。如果这种说法成立, 基督教最早传入中国的时间提早了550年。^[1]

2009年6月24日, 中国新闻网刊登了一篇师城的文章《汉代“基督铜镜”现徐州 改写基督教传入中国历史》。马焕蹊学生王师是一位铜镜民间收藏家, 日前从收藏活动中获得一枚铜镜。徐州文物专家马焕蹊先生说, 根据此枚铜镜的型制、纹饰及铭文内容等因素综合分析, 它的制作年代应为东汉后期, 下限不应晚出曹魏, 也就是公元200到300年间。马先生称此铜镜为“汉代基督教福音铭文镜”, 它直径13.4厘米, 为园钮, 素园钮座, 外饰细线弦纹两道。马焕蹊解读了铜镜上铭文的含义:“制作这面神镜, 来尊崇敬拜独一无二的上帝。圣母玛利亚目证了耶稣基督是上帝的独生子, 他有帝王一般的显赫。凡立志信他的, 要重新、必须、再生一回。”^[2]唐晓峰博士认为, 铜镜铭文解读与此不同。



2009年12月29日在Fourviere华人牧灵中心召开的“圣多默与中国传教史”研讨会上, 几位历史学者也对徐州汉画像石的研究做了介绍。法兰西科学院院士Piere博士介绍说: 根据考古学的推断, 画像石出自东汉初公元60年左右, 时间跟圣多默传教时间极为相符。壁画中有各种信仰标记, 如十字架、洗礼、执事、棕榈枝、圣号等, 还有王子刘英受圣多默的启发, 接受了信仰, 受洗成为基督徒。文献记载,

[1] 武利华 WU Lihua, 王洪霞 WANG Hongxia and 刘远 LIU Yuan, “地下的汉朝之石头上的史诗 Dixia de Hanchao zhi shitou shang de shishi” [The Underground Epics of Han Dynasty Inscribed on Stones], <http://qkzz.net/article/6403245d-a159-400f-8575-594d3e4b94eb.htm>

[2] 师城 SHI Cheng, “汉代‘基督铜镜’现徐州 改写基督教传入中国历史 Handai ‘Jidu tongjing’ xian Xuzhou, Gaixie Jidujiao chuanru zhongguo lishi” [The Han Dynasty Christ Bronze Mirror is found in Xuzhou, and it will rewrite the Missionary History of Christianity into China], 2009年06月24日, 来源: 中国新闻网 www.China.com。

王子刘英是光武帝刘秀的弟弟，后来被发配到徐州，并在徐州自杀身亡。其实，他不是死于自杀，而是被人毒死的。原因很简单，他通外国，而且受洗，信奉另一位“王”，故有谋反的嫌疑。雅克博士则从文字的角度重点分析了前文提到的徐州汉代“基督铜镜”，铜镜中提到“尊崇唯一天主，热爱大德圣母”等主题。

汉画像石的存在时期主要在东汉，而这一时期正是基督教初级发展时期，也就是公元 33-220 年与东汉公元 25-220 年时代非常吻合。^[3] 如果以上事实成立，那么可以说东汉是基督教传入中国的最早时期，权作基督教第一次传入中国吧。

有文字记载的基督教最早传入中国的时间是唐朝，西安大秦景教碑是具体史料和证物。在中国称作景教的是早期基督教的一个派别，也称聂斯托利派(Nestorians)。聂斯托利(386-451 年)，叙利亚人，曾进入安提阿修道院作修士。于 428 年 4 月 10 日至 431 年 6 月 22 日出任君士坦丁堡牧首。他反对亚流派在基督论上的见解，提出了将耶稣的神性与人性分开的见解，即兼顾基督的神性和人性两方面各自的完整性。在公元 431 年的以弗所全教会会议上，他的这一主张被认定为异端。但是该派在波斯地区却极受欢迎，并向亚洲中部许多地区传播。公元 635 年，该派的叙利亚主教阿罗本沿着丝绸之路来到唐朝首都长安，太宗皇帝派宰相房玄龄亲往郊外迎接，请进宫中详细询问教义，阿罗本呈上圣经、圣像，并说明传教目的。皇帝让他留在长安，还让他到皇家藏书楼去翻译圣经。三年后的公元 638 年，皇帝又允许他传教，并提供经费支持，还为他建造了一座教堂“波斯寺”。之后的几位皇帝，都对景教实行优待政策。基本上每个省都建立了景教寺，发展了许多教徒，形成了中国为期 200 多年的第二个基督教传播时期。但是，到了会昌 5 年(845 年)唐武宗笃信道教，下旨禁止佛教、祆教(琐罗亚斯德教)、景教等外来宗教传播，景教随着佛教一起备受打击，至此基督教聂斯托利派(景教)在中国停止了传播，标志着基督教第二次来华传播失败。^[4] 宋朝也没有基督教传入的迹象。

几百年后的元朝，基督宗教第三次来华传播。也里可温教，是元朝蒙古人对来华基督宗教及其信徒的统称。唐武宗“灭教”之后，景教在中国内地已不复存在，但在一些边疆地区和少数民族中仍有留存。从这个角度说，第二次来华传播的火种，并没有熄灭，只是转移到了边疆。随着元朝的建立，景教重新传入内地，建成江南一带著名的景教“七寺”。

罗马天主教也在元朝第一次来华传播，方济各会修士柏郎嘉宾、鲁布鲁克等人先后出使蒙都和林，至 1294 年教皇特使约翰·孟德高维诺抵达汗八里(今北京)，天主教正式传入中国。孟德高维诺在华建堂布道、蒙文译经，并于 1307 年被教皇克莱门特五世任命为汗八里总主教区总主教。此后罗马天主教曾派出七个主教来华协助孟德高维诺传教，其中有三人的到达，并开辟了泉州等主教区。元朝天主教在其鼎盛时期曾发展了 3 万多信徒，但随着 1368 年元朝的覆灭，“也里可温”所涵盖的景教和天主教亦跟着消亡，这意味着基督宗教的第三次来华又以失败告终。

将近 200 年后，基督宗教第四次来华传播，以明末清初天主教的传入为肇始。这次传教始于西班牙人耶稣会士方济各·沙勿略，他 1551 年从日本搭乘葡萄牙商船到中国广东上川岛，但他因明朝海禁而无法入内地传教，不久病死岛上。后来，澳门的耶稣会神父范礼安认识到在中国传教需要改变策略，于是他选择一些有学问的传教士，先在澳门学习汉语，希望传教时可以得到中国官员的支持。意大利传教士罗明坚等人虽最早入内地传教，但未获成功。

1583 年，意大利耶稣会士利玛窦作为罗明坚的助手到广东肇庆传教建堂，此为近代天主教在中国内地传教的真正开端。利玛窦成功在北京觐见皇帝，而且在士大夫中建立了良好声誉，开启了日后其他

[3] “基督教最早何时传入中国? Jidujiao zuizao heshi chuanru Zhongguo?” [When was the earliest date when Christianity entered into China?] <http://wenwen.soso.com/z/q306469645.htm>

[4] <http://iask.sina.com.cn/b/14093648.html>

传教士进入中国之门。利玛窦可以说是基督教在中国传教的开创者之一。1601年，利玛窦与西班牙耶稣会士庞迪我一道身穿儒服，获准长驻北京传教。利玛窦对中国传统的习俗保持宽容的态度。他容许中国的教徒继续传统的祭天、祭祖、敬孔。据他的了解，这些只属尊敬祖先的仪式；只要不掺入祈求、崇拜等迷信成分，本质上并没有违反天主教教义。利玛窦主张以“天主”称呼天主教的“神”（英语的“God”或拉丁文的Deus），因为中国人以天为至大，以主为至尊；但他亦认为天主教的“神”早已存在于中国的思想，因为中国传统的“天”和“上帝”本质上与天主教所说的“唯一真神”没有分别。利玛窦本人更穿着中国士人服饰。利玛窦的传教策略和方式，一直为之后跟随他到中国的耶稣会传教士所遵从，称为“利玛窦规矩”。^[5]其后，西方耶稣会传教士纷纷来华，如汤若望、艾儒略、南怀仁等人按利玛窦的方式以其西学知识来助其学术传教，掀起了西学东渐的高潮。其间返欧的传教士亦将中国思想文化知识带入欧洲，从而引起东学西传的结果。中国天主教至18世纪初已有澳门、南京和北京三个主教区，信徒已达30余万人。

然而，明清之际以耶稣会为首的天主教在华传播一方面受到中国一些高层人士的抵制和反对，另一方面在天主教各修会之间和传教士内部也因“中国礼仪”问题及在华传教策略之争而形成分歧和矛盾。前者引起各地教案和全国禁教之风，后者则围绕“中国礼仪之争”而发展成罗马教皇与中国皇帝之间的权威之争。1715年，罗马教皇克雷芒十一世颁布《从这日起》通谕，宣布在华传教士不得重提中国礼仪问题，违者将被视为异端而革出教门。清朝文献称这一通谕为《禁约》，康熙皇帝因此而针锋相对，宣布禁教、驱逐传教士出境。自1723年雍正登基后，清廷开始了长达百年的禁教，基督宗教第四次来华传教惨败。

基督教新教于19世纪初传入中国，也是基督宗教第五次来华传教。1807年英国伦敦会传教士马礼逊来华，是基督教新教传入中国大陆的开始。马礼逊是西方派到中国大陆的第一位基督新教传教士，他在华25年，在许多方面都有首创之功。他在中国境内首次把《圣经》全译为中文并予以出版，使基督教经典得以完整地介绍到中国；编纂第一部《华英字典》，成为以后汉英字典编撰之圭臬；他创办《察世俗每月统纪传》，为第一份中文月刊，在中国报刊发展史上位居首尊；他开办“英华书院”，开传教士创办教会学校之先河；他又和东印度公司医生在澳门开设眼科医馆，首创医药传教的方式。他所开创的译经、编字典、办刊物、设学校、开医馆、印刷出版等事业，使其成为开创近代中西文化交流的先驱。这只是基督教第五次来华传教的开端。到了19世纪中期，基督教开始大规模在华传教。

1840年代鸦片战争后，中国在西方强迫下打开国门，清政府被迫签订一系列不平等条约，基督教的传教活动亦被列入条约，传教士以此为护身符进入内地传教，大批西方传教士以沿海通商口岸为基地迅速扩展基督教，建立教堂。一些基督教会在中国建立医院、学校、孤儿院，开展了一些慈善活动，为中国传播了近现代文明。

1911年中华民国成立，中华民国临时约法中明确保障宗教自由，一些革命人士，如孙文、宋教仁、张謇等也是新教徒，因而在民国初期基督新教有了一定发展。由于基督教教义强调只能拜耶和华上帝，不能崇拜偶像，因此与祭祖等中国传统习俗发生了抵触，使得基督教在中国传播不顺，直到来华传教的刚恒毅（1922年—1932年）与雷鸣远神父向教宗解释中国人祭祖敬孔是为了向已亡的父母和祖先表达尊敬，并不违背教会的信仰。教宗碧岳十二世因而在1939年12月8日删除了祭祖敬孔的禁令。

抗日战争时期，男性大多参军，为了延续教会事工，中华圣公会决定在香港按立李添媛女士为牧师，然后派往澳门赴任，成为全世界第一位被按立的女性牧师。中华圣公会的决定引起当时全世界教会的反对。在普世圣公宗其他教省要求之下，李添媛被迫辞去牧师职位；另一方面，中华圣公会努力斡旋，说明当时中国形势的险峻。最后，中华圣公会的决定终于得到普世圣公宗及其他教省的认同，影响了中国

[5] <http://zhidao.baidu.com/question/334937779>

教会后续历史，但李添媛并未复任牧师。到现在，中国已有很多女牧师。

1949 年中华人民共和国成立后，外国教牧人员离开大陆，迁至台湾、英属香港或回到母国。当时，基督教在中国被称为“洋教”，1949 年仅有信徒 70 万左右。

1950 年 7 月，中国基督教界吴耀宗等人联名发表“三自宣言”，发起了三自爱国运动，号召教会“自治、自养、自传”。中国基督教会从此走上了独立自主自办的道路。

1954 年 7 月，中国基督教第一届全国会议召开，正式成立了中国基督教三自爱国运动委员会，吴耀宗当选为第一任主席。会议提出在中国共产党和人民政府的领导下，团结全国基督徒，热爱祖国，遵守国家法令，坚持自治、自养、自传，独立自主自办教会的方针。

1958 年各种不同信仰礼仪背景的教会实行了“联合礼拜”。从此中国教会进入“后宗派时期”，基督教的宗派组织在我国不复存在。

“文革”时期，中国基督教受到严重冲击，教堂被毁、被占，教徒被迫害，一切宗教活动停止。

“文革”结束后，党和政府“拨乱反正”使中国教会得到恢复。实行改革开放政策后的 1980 年，中国基督教三自爱国运动委员会恢复活动，召开了第三次全国会议并成立了中国基督教协会，在新的历史条件下继续推进三自爱国运动，开始了按三自原则办好教会的新探索。会议选举丁光训为主席。1996 年基督教第六次全国会议，将这一时期的探索总结为坚持“按三自原则办好教会”，必须坚持独立自主、必须坚持爱国爱教、必须努力增进团结、必须大力落实三好（自治要自好、自养要养好、自传要传好），向全国基督徒发出了“一个好基督徒应该做一个好公民”的号召。

随着中国基督教三自爱国运动的发展，在丁光训主教的大力倡导下，中国基督教界积极开展神学思想建设。1998 年 11 月，中国基督教三自爱国运动委员会、中国基督教协会在济南召开全体委员会，作出了开展神学思想建设的决议。神学思想建设的主要内容是：如何结合中国国情和文化，阐述基督教的基本信仰及道德规范，使中国基督教与社会主义社会相适应。

2008 年 1 月，中国基督教第八次代表会议在北京召开，傅先伟当选为新一届中国基督教三自爱国运动委员会主席，高峰当选为新一届中国基督教协会会长。^[6]

2013 年 9 月，中国基督教三自爱国运动委员会第九届、中国基督教协会第七届委员会在北京召开。傅先伟再次当选新一届中国基督教三自爱国运动委员会主席，高峰再次当选新一届中国基督教协会会长。会议通过了《凝心聚力，建设一个和谐、健康发展的中国教会》的工作报告。

二、中国特色基督教理论和实践

（一个辨析，一个概念，七大特色。）

一个辨析，是指东西方宗教辨析。

通常人们是按意识形态、社会制度、发达程度来划分东西方国家的。西方国家，是指西方意识形态占主流、实行资本主义制度的发达国家。一般而言，它是指美国、加拿大、欧洲经济共同体成员国（法国、英国、德国、意大利、比利时、荷兰、爱尔兰、卢森堡、希腊、西班牙、葡萄牙和丹麦）、澳大利亚、新西兰，统治血统为白人。因日本是实行资本主义制度的发达国家也被认为是西方国家。第二次世界大战结束后，人们统称社会主义国家和资本主义国家为“社会主义阵营”和“资本主义阵营”，通常把二者的关系称为东、西方关系。现在，虽然“阵营”已不复存在，但“西方国家”一词依然沿用。近几年来，每年举行的美国、英国、法国、德国、意大利、加拿大和日本七国首脑经济会议，经常也被称为“西方

[6] “基督教历史及中国基督教的历史 Jidujiao lishi ji Zhongguo jidujiao lishi” [History of Christianity and History of Chinese Christianity], 网址：http://www.gov.cn/test/2005-07/26/content_17214.htm

七国首脑会议”。

如果东西方国家按此定义，那么，世界三大宗教基督教、佛教、伊斯兰教都产生于亚洲，没有一个产生于西方。基督教形成于亚洲西部的巴勒斯坦，后被传播到西方，成为西方的主要宗教和意识形态，但也早已成为世界性宗教。而马克思主义才是真正产生于西方德国，经过俄国十月革命传到中国，成为中国革命和建设的指导思想。当然马克思主义不是宗教。

一个概念。中国特色基督教，是指带有某些中国文化要素及一些社会主义成份的基督教。试论述如下：

（一）爱国爱教，政治可靠。基督教会的命运和祖国的命运密不可分，基督教接受中国共产党的领导，高举爱国爱教旗帜，坚持走与社会主义社会相适应的道路。接受政府依法管理，自觉在宪法、法律、法规和政策范围内开展宗教活动，坚定维护民族团结和社会稳定，坚决反对和抵制利用宗教进行的危害祖国和人民利益的活动。基督徒热爱祖国，为祖国的发展和稳定服务，既做好教徒又当好公民。实现爱国与爱教的和谐统一。多数基督教神职人员政治上靠得住、宗教上有造诣、群众中有威信、关键时刻起作用。确保基督教会领导权牢牢掌握在爱国爱教人士手中，中国基督教三自爱国运动委员会和中国基督教协会每 5 年换届一次，领导层，一般由宗教局和统战部提名，大会选举产生。这样可以确保领导权掌握在爱国爱教人士手中。某种角度说，中国是政权大于教权。

（二）“三自”是中国特色基督教最鲜明的特征

1950 年 9 月 23 日，《人民日报》头版发表了题为《中国基督教在新中国建设中努力的途径》（简称《三自宣言》）。中国基督教由此在全国范围内开展了自治、自养、自传的三自爱国运动。所谓自治，指中国教会内部事务独立于国外宗教团体之外；自养，指教会的经济事务独立于政府财政和国外宗教团体之外，但由政府拨付基本工资和费用，亦有教徒捐献；自传，指完全由本国教会的传道人传教和由本国教会的传道人负责解释教义，不准在教堂外传教。经过 60 多年努力，中国基督教会三自爱国运动取得了巨大成就，如“改变了基督教‘洋教’的形象，为独立自主自办教会扫清了障碍；激发了信徒的爱国热情，积极为祖国做出贡献；协助党和政府落实宗教政策，创造良好的环境；摆脱宗派纷争，走上了合一道路；推进各项事工的开展，夯实了三自基础；扩大对外友好交往，提高了国际地位。”^[7]

三自爱国运动消除了宗派，“促进了中国基督教信徒之间的和谐”^[8]。自 1807 年基督教（基督教新教）传入中国后，各国传教士纷纷涌入中国，至 1949 年，西方教会在中国有 70 多个宗派，分属 120 多个传教差会，他们之间矛盾重重，信徒彼此不够团结。只有三自爱国运动才使得中国教会完全摆脱了西方宗派性差会体系，各地教会先后实行联合礼拜，逐步消除了宗派，信徒之间和谐相处。

三自爱国运动，促进了中国基督徒与非信徒之间的和谐关系；促进基督教与社会主义社会相适应，使信众成为建设中国特色社会主义的积极力量。“基督教在中国的传播，是依靠了不平等条约所规定的特权，而不平等条约的订立，有不少是由于教案的纠纷。在这样基础上生长出来的基督教，就必然被一般人看做‘洋教’。”^[9]基督教的部分教义、礼仪与中国社会习俗之间的不同，常引起基督徒与非信徒的

[7] 中国基督教两会 Zhongguo jidujiao lianghui [China Christian Three-Self Patriotic Movement Committee and China Christian Council] 编：《基督教爱国主义教程》Jidujiao aiguo zhuyi jiaocheng [Textbook of Christian Patriotism]（试用本），（宗教文化出版社 Zongjiao wenhua chubanshe [Religious & Cultural Press], 2006），260—265。

[8] 陈田元 CHEN Tianyuan, “论中国基督教三自爱国运动的和谐作用” [On the Harmonious Function of China Christian Three-Self Patriotic Movement], 中国基督教网站 Zhongguo jidujiao wangzhan, 2010 年 8 月 28 日，网址 <http://www.ccctspm.org/church/semin/2010/827/1082722.html>

[9] 吴耀宗 WU Yaozong, “展开基督教革新运动的旗帜 Zhankai Jidujiao gexin yundong de qizhi” [The Flage of Reforming Christianity Movement], 载于《中国基督教三自爱国运动文选 1950—1992》Zhongguo Jidujiao sanzi aiguo yundong wenxuan [Selection of Articles on China Christian Three-Self Patriotic Movement], （罗冠宗 LUO Guanzhong 主编，中国基督教三自爱国运动委员会出版 Zhongguo

冲突,甚至发生教案。三自爱国运动,割断了中国教会与西方差会联系,更能体现基督教的中国特色,调整了信徒与非信徒的关系。新中国时期“建设具有中国特色的社会主义社会,既反映了全国人民的愿望,也符合所有宗教徒的根本利益”^[10],因此,基督教信徒“也是建设有中国特色社会主义的积极力量”。

三自爱国运动提高了中国教会在普世教会中的地位,为构建和谐世界贡献力量。西方差会控制下的中国教会,没有独立地位。而“三自运动的重点在于发展中国基督教的自我”^[11]。中国教会在平等、合法、公开的基础上积极与世界各国教会进行友好交往,赢得了普世教会的尊重与接纳。1991年,中国教会回到世基联这个大家庭之中。

(三) 圣经发行全球最多,内部出版期待公开

近5年来,中国每年出版发行《圣经》350万册,5年共出版发行《圣经》1750万册,成为世界上发行《圣经》最多的国家之一。自1980年教会恢复至2012年底的30多年来,基督教全国“两会”共出版发行《圣经》6217万册。近年中国还出版发行了8种少数民族语言文字的《圣经》和盲文《圣经》。

世界其它国家许多都有正规出版社出版的《圣经》,在书店也能买到。中国的佛教、道教、伊斯兰教都在中国正规出版社出版了各自的经典,并在书店出售。但基督教的《圣经》目前只是由基督教全国两会内部出版发行,不能在书店出售,期待公开出版。

(四) 三自教会和家庭教会

中国的基督教会主要有两类,一是三自教会,二是家庭教会。三自教会是指经政府批准的基督教会。家庭教会也称家庭聚会,是指没有得到政府批准、未正式注册的基督教会。

《中国日报》2010年3月17日以《家庭教会在北京茁壮成长》为题介绍了北京家庭聚会的情况。这是中国官方媒体第一次正面报道家庭聚会。近年来,家庭教会增长很快,一个原因是三自教堂过于拥挤,一些信徒的实际需求得不到满足。2008年,北京有5万基督徒,但只有17个三自教堂,平均每3000基督徒才有一间教堂。^[12]5年过去了,基督徒数量增长很多,而教堂数基本没变,许多信徒只得家庭聚会。家庭教会数量增长的另一个原因是政府的态度越来越宽容。尽管家庭教会在不断增长,但目前家庭教会在法律上仍没有合法地位。一些家庭教会曾经尝试向政府申请正式登记,但未被受理。

有人认为,目前中国基督教的主体是“家庭教会”,大约占教徒总数的70%，“三自”教会占30%。但是,在“三自”教会中还有一种可称为“独立教会”。所谓“独立教会”,即在政府里登记,但教会主导权在教会手里,名义上是“三自”,但实际上与“三自”教会有很大不同。温州就有独立教会,当地人称之为“不三不四”。就信徒个人而言,还有相当一部分基督徒自由聚会,即到三自教会聚会,也到家庭教会聚会,这次到一个教会聚会,下次可能又到另一个教会聚会。这算是第四种形态吧。

关于基督徒的数量,有几种统计结果,一是《中国宗教报告2010》的2305万人,约占全国人口总数的1.8%。^[13]美国皮尤研究中心的报告根据2011年底的统计,中国大陆有基督徒6841万。还有一种说法是4000万。

Jidujiao sanzi aiguo yundong weiyuanhui [China Christian Three-Self Patriotic Movement], 1993), 12。

[10] 罗竹风 LUO Zhufeng 主编:《中国社会主义时期的宗教问题》Zhongguo shehui zhuyi shiqi de zongjiao wenti [The Problems of Religion in the Period of Chinese Socialism], (上海社会科学出版社 Shanghai shehui kexue chubanshe [Shanghai Social Sciences Press], 1987), 129。

[11] 丁光训 DING Guangxun: “三自为何必要? Sanzi weihe biyao?” [Why the Three-Self is necessary?], 载于《丁光训文集》DING Guangxun wenji [Collection of Ding Kuangxun's Articles], (译林出版社 Yilin chubanshe [Yilin Publishing House], 1998), 45。

[12] 段琪 DUAN Qi、唐晓峰 TANG Xiaofeng,《2008年中国基督教研究报告》2008 nian Zhongguo jidujiao yanjiu baogao [Blue Book Annual Report on China Christianity 2008]。

[13] 《中国宗教报告2010》Zhongguo zongjiao baogao 2010 [Annual Report on China Religions 2010], (社会科学文献出版社 Shehui kexue wenxian chubanshe [Social Sciences Academic Press], 2010年8月版), 10。

（五）中国特色基督教神学思想

什么是神学思想？它有何作用？丁光训主教认为“神学是教会在思考。”陈泽民博士说“神学是教会灵性经验的理论，在历史上某一个特殊时代中教会的宗教经验的总结。”胡笏认为：“一般而言，神学思想是教会灵性经验的反思及理论表达。如果说圣经的真理和基督的福音是不受时间和空间制约的话，神学却受特定的历史条件的限制，因时代、民族和国家的特殊情况以及当时当地教会的特殊经验而有所不同。”而“中国基督教在与社会主义社会相适应的过程中，不乏一些闪光的思考，这些思考就是中国教会的神学思想。”^[14] 我以为“神学是对圣经做出的符合国情和时代的解读，是对圣经思想的发展。”

为什么要建设中国特色基督教神学思想？因为在殖民主义和差会支撑时期，教会强调信与不信对立、否定现世、轻视中国文化，以信废行、鄙视人性为绝对邪恶、以及对社会的绝望、宣扬末日已经来临等神学观点，对中国基督教发展极为不利。所以 1948 年吴耀宗先生指出：“中国基督教的信仰与思想，几乎就是美国基督教的翻版。”它是“逃避现实的、个人主义的、奋兴式的宗教”，必须“创造中国信徒自己的神学系统。”艾伯林说：“神学是对宣道的操心。”讲道是神学的“载体”，从某种意义上说，中国基督教神学思想建设正是对中国教会“自传”工作的“操心”！到了社会主义时期，在中国教会内部仍存有那么一股“因信废行”的神学思想，丁光训主教指出：“我们中国基督教至今仍有人为了突出信与不信的矛盾，竟然否定道德的价值……把救恩与道德说成对立的两件事。他们以高举救恩为藉口，不惜把道德说成无关紧要”^[15]。他认为：“扩大信徒关怀的范围，指导信徒从信仰出发，考虑一些超越个人祸福的伦理道德问题，这是提高我国基督教会素质之道。”^[16] 神学是信仰经验的提炼，反过来又指导教会实践。从而使信徒在自己的信仰实践中为主作出美好的见证。

1996 年 12 月，中国基督教第六届全国会议提出“为了办好教会，要加强神学教育和神学思想建设”的要求。1998 年 11 月，中国基督教“三自”爱国运动委员会、中国基督教协会全委会二次会议（称为“济南会议”）做出了《关于加强神学思想建设的决议》。“济南会议”的召开，标志着中国基督教神学思想建设的正式发起。

中国特色基督教神学思想主要是由丁光训主教创立，赵紫辰、陈泽民、曹圣洁等积极发展的成果。从长远讲，神学思想建设是要建立中国特色的神学思想体系。从近期讲，是要用与社会主义社会相适应的神学思想指导信徒的信仰生活，促进中国教会的健康发展。

综合起来，中国特色基督教神学思想主要有以下 10 个方面：

1. 圣经观。丁光训主教认为“全部圣经的主题只有一个，就是上帝怎样爱人”，“整本圣经从头至尾都是讲上帝与人的关系，讲这关系发生了什么变化”。这就是他的圣经观。

2. 上帝观。丁主教认为“上帝是爱”，并指出：“什么是上帝最重要最根本的属性？是他的爱。在基督身上看到的那种爱，在痛苦和十字架面前也不回头的那种爱，使他为他的朋友舍命的那种爱。上帝的公义也还是上帝的爱，爱要是普及到广大人群，就成为公义。就是这个爱进入了世间。爱不是来毁灭，而是来托住，来医治，来教育，来救赎，来赐予生命”。

3. 基督论。基督是宇宙的基督。“认识基督的宇宙性，在于帮助我们至少明确两个问题：一是基督的主宰、关怀和爱护普及整个宇宙。二是基督普及到整个宇宙的主宰以爱为其本质。这种爱是上帝的最高属性，是上帝创造宇宙，推动宇宙的第一因。”这是丁主教“上帝是爱”观点的延伸。如何能克服人

[14] 胡笏 HU Jia, “当代中国基督教神学思想建设的探索 Dangdai Zhongguo jidujiao shenxue sixiang jianshe de tansuo” [An Exploration on the Theological Construction in Contemporary China], <http://www.360doc.com/resaveArt.aspx?articleid=213028663>, [来源：中国民族报 Zhongguo minzu bao | 发布日期：2012-05-22]

[15] 《丁光训文集》DING Guangxun wenji [Collection of Ding Guangxun's articles], 363。

[16] Ibid., 278。

的罪性? 信或不信基督教有什么区别? 信基督教者与不信者之间的关系应该如何? 这些问题的讨论, 将有利于基督徒正确对待基督教信仰在信者身上所起的积极作用, 处理好基督徒同不信基督教或信别的宗教的人的团结, 并正确看待不信者的善行。

4. 人性论。丁主教认为人要参与上帝的创造工程, 因为“上帝所求的是团契, 他不是一位征服者”, “经过人们的合作, 把一切可能的善带入世界。”人性是善的, 所有一切是为了把善带入世界。

5. 圣灵论。如何把握理性与灵性的关系, 也是很重要的。中国基督徒极其注重灵性经验, 需要引导他们认识理性也可以受圣灵的引导, 把虔诚的热情与理性的思考结合起来, 避免在属灵与属世之间, 不恰当地划线, 造成二者对立的思维方式。

6. 伦理思想。必须处理好人与神、人与人、人与自然的和谐关系, 并及时回应社会发展对传统基督教道德规范的冲击。(1) 基督教的伦理原则是爱神和爱人的统一。圣经说: “你要尽心、尽性、尽意爱主你的上帝, 这是诫命中第一也是最大的; 其次也相仿, 就是要爱人如己。”(太 22: 37-40, 可 12: 30-31) 就是说首先要爱上帝, 同时也要爱别人。基督教崇尚爱, 同时主张公平正义, “以善胜恶” 以和平方式达到维护正义的目的。(2) 圣经要求教会和社会的治理有序。圣经说“神不偏待人”(徒 10: 10), 这项教义阐明了人权平等的基本思想, 不同性别、种族、肤色、社会地位的人都是平等的。(3) 生态伦理是中国基督徒开始关心的神学领域。圣经《创世纪》说“上帝看着一切所造的, 都甚好”(创 1: 31), 神创造适合人居住的环境, 并将宇宙交于人管理。现在有人没有用好“管理”权, 破坏生态平衡, 造成许多灾害, 如雾霾严重、PM2.5 超标, 水污染频发, 严重影响人类的生存环境和健康。而人与宇宙都是“受造之物”, “受造之物一同叹息劳苦直到如今”, 一同“指望脱离败坏的辖制, 得享神儿女自由的荣耀。”(罗 8: 19-23) 人应该将自己的命运与生态环境密切联系起来。

7. 教会论。中国基督教与普世基督教相比, 既有共性又有其特殊性。这就要求我们创立中国特色的基督教神学思想。如何总结中国基督徒办教的经验, 在神学上说明中国基督教所走的三自道路丰富了关于教会的教义, 不仅对于巩固三自爱国运动有决定性意义, 对于普世教会也是重大贡献。

8. 末世论。究竟是强调世界的毁灭还是更新, 在许多教会内已经成为一个难以避免的问题。在上个世纪末流行的观点, 认为物质建设发展, 或者世界上发生战争、饥荒、地震都意味着世界末日将临, 已经产生许多负面影响, 亟须有新的认识。^[17] 改造世界是必须的, 人们要克服负面的事物, 发扬正面的事务。

9. 入世论。基督教鼓励信徒发扬入世的人生观及舍己、诚实、宽容等美德。(1) 基督教提倡“做光做盐, 容神益人”的人生观, 信徒应以积极的态度处世。过去, 中国基督教界较多注重“出世”, 强调基督徒是“天上的国民”、“不属于这世界”, 导致许多基督徒把改变今生现实生活的努力视为“爱世界”, 与“爱神”相对立。“三自爱国运动”开展以来, 强调当代中国基督徒的生活准则是“作光作盐, 荣神益人”(太 5: 13-16), 采取积极“入世”的态度, 在服务于人的工作中完成荣耀上帝的事工。光要照耀四周, 盐要进入食物调味, 只有基督徒的好行为才能将荣耀归于上帝。(2) 耶稣所启示的人生价值在于“舍去”, 而非“索取”。耶稣要求门徒“若有人要跟从我, 就当舍己, 背起他的十字架来跟从我, 因为凡要救自己生命的, 必丧失掉生命; 凡为我的福音丧失掉生命的, 必救了生命。”(可 8: 34) 基督徒要知道自己所有的一切, 都是出于神的恩典, “白白的得来, 也要白白的舍去。”(太 10: 8), 强调“舍己”、“奉献”。圣经说“人子来, 不是要受人服事, 乃是要服事人, 并且要舍命, 作多人的赎价。”(可 10: 43) 基督徒应效法主的榜样, 扩大爱心和服务范围, 不是只以传教为目的, 也不是仅以信徒为我们的服务对象。基督教要践行服务社会的理念。服务社会是中国基督教在当代中国社会发挥积极作用的重要方式。要积极参加建设和

[17] 丁光训主教神学思想观点 DING Guangxun zhujiao shenxue sixiang guandian” [The Theological Thinking and Viewpoints of Bishop Ding Guangxun], 百度文库, <http://wenku.baidu.com/view/9b095722aaca998fcc220ed0.html>

谐文化、构建和谐社会。要秉承“上爱天主，下爱世人”的基督精神，积极开展社会服务，热心举办扶贫济困、救难赈灾、抚孤安老、医疗救助、捐资助学、打井修路等公益慈善活动，努力探索服务社会、造福人群的新方式和新途径，用爱心、善心和真心回报社会。在社会生活中不斤斤计较个人得失，能够自觉为社会多做贡献。

10. 和谐论。神学思想建设如何为构建社会主义和谐社会做贡献。(1) 传“和平的福音”，使信徒真正成为和谐社会的创造者。抵御境外基督教团体利用非法手段组织力量到中国来“大传福音”。福音是神的大能，教会应该有组织、有序地传播“和平的福音”，使人与神和好，人与人和好。而不是鼓动极端的、狂热的宗教情绪，更不能怂恿他们因信仰问题与他人、与社会闹对立。(2) 诚实和宽恕是当前特别值得提倡的。耶稣要求信徒“你们的话，是就说是，不是就说不是。”（太 5：37）这就是说实话。圣经说“为什么看见你兄弟眼中有刺，却不想自己眼中有梁木呢。”（太 7：3）就是说不要只看别人的错，自己也有错。这样的教义会使信徒比较愿意宽恕别人，利于人际关系的和谐。(3) 宗教对话，与其他宗教信仰者增进了解。基督教崇拜独一神，其教义不可能与其它宗教混淆。基督教认为信仰不同宗教的人都是神所造，也都是神所爱的对象。“没有宗教间的和平，则没有世界的和平”，“没有宗教之间的对话，则没有宗教之间的和平。”^[18] 要通过对话知晓其它宗教的信仰，增加了解，彼此尊重，和平共处。要帮助广大信教群众树立宗教和谐理念，以宽容的精神对待信仰差异，增进与信仰不同宗教的群众和不信教群众之间的团结友爱，共同致力于建设和谐社会的崇高愿景。做到宗教和谐、社会和谐。

中国特色基督教神学思想是丰富的，不断发展的，它指导信众荣神益人，为建立和谐社会和追求美好生活而努力。

(六) 教育与宗教分离

中国实行教育与宗教分离的政策。《宪法》第 36 条“任何人不得利用宗教进行破坏社会秩序、损害公民身体健康、妨碍国家教育制度的活动。”《教育法》第 8 条规定：“国家实行教育与宗教相分离。任何组织和个人不得利用宗教进行妨碍国家教育制度的活动”。

《义务教育法》第 62 条规定，可以由“社会组织或者个人依法举办的民办学校实施义务教育”。《民办教育促进法》又再次根据《宪法》和《教育法》的规定，重申：“第四条，民办学校应当贯彻教育与宗教相分离的原则。任何组织和个人不得利用宗教进行妨碍国家教育制度的活动”。

因此，基督教不能办普通学校，也不能向 18 岁以下儿童传教。但神学院可依法举办。

按国际公约，在其它国家办教会学校是合法的。

1.《世界人权宣言》第 26 条，针对教育作出规定，“父母对其子女所应受的教育种类，有优先选择的权利”。就是说，是父母，而不是国家，有权替子女决定他们应该接受什么样的教育。

2.《公民权利和政治权利公约》第 4 条在论述父母对子女教育的选择权时，特别指出教育选择权包括了宗教教育：“本公约缔约各国承诺，尊重父母和法定监护人保证他们的孩子能按照他们自己的信仰接受宗教和道德教育的自由”。

3.《儿童权利公约》第 14 条规定“缔约国应遵守儿童享有思想、信仰和宗教自由的权利”。

4.《经济、社会、文化权利国际公约》第 3 条，对宗教教育和儿童教育有更综合的表述，“本公约缔约各国承担，尊重父母和法定监护人的下列自由：为他们的孩子选择非公立的但系符合于国家所可能规定或批准的最低教育标准的学校，并保证他们的孩子能按照他们自己的信仰接受宗教和道德教育”。

(七) 基督教可以设立非营利性医院等慈善机构

2013 年 2 月 16 日，国家宗教局与中央统战部、发改委、财政部、民政部和税务总局等部门联合印发《关

[18] 孔汉斯 KONG Hansi (Hans Küng),《世界伦理手册》*Shijie lunli shouce* [World Ethics], (生活·读书·新知三联书店 2012), 91, 139。

于鼓励和规范宗教界从事公益慈善活动的意见》。宗教界可以依法设立公益慈善组织。依照《医疗机构管理条例》、《医疗机构管理条例实施细则》等规定，申请设立非营利性医疗机构，并进行民办非企业单位登记。也可依法申请设立“专项基金”或“社会福利机构”。这是一个巨大进步。基督教界完全有能力和意愿设立医院等，为社会造福。

总之，中国的基督教在许多方面都有中国特色，是中国特色基督教。

2013 年 11 月 23 日星期六

The English Title:

Discussing on Chinese Characteristics on Chinese Christianity

HUO Kegong

Ph.D. in Religious Study,

Editor in Religious & Cultural Press,

Guest Professor in College of Politics and Law at Shihezi University, Xinjiang, China. Address: No. 44, Houhai Beiyuan, West District of Beijing City, 100009 China. Email: hkgshr@sina.com, QQ1158513634. Tel: +86-158-0162-6138

Abstract: The paper discusses the history on Christianity coming from western culture into Chinese culture. It reminds that there are two obvious evidences proving that it was introduced in the Eastern Han Dynasty (东汉). They are a batch of images in stone relief and Christ-Bronze-Mirror made in Xuzhou, Jiangshu.

The contents on Chinese characteristics of Chinese Christianity mainly include three ideas. The first is that one must be a patriotic citizen while being Christian. The Second is that the control mode of the Chinese Churches is the Three-Self-Mode. The third is that the circulation of the Bible is the number one in the world in spite of its restricted publication.

There are two kinds of the Chinese Church. One is Three-Self Church, and the other is House Church. They represent different theological views on the Bible, on God, on Christ, on human nature, on the Holy Spirit, on ethics, on church, on eschatology, on going into the society, on harmonious, on the separation of education and religion, on charity organization, etc.

Key terms: Christian mission to China in the East Han Dynasty, Chinese characteristics, Chinese Christianity, the Three Self Church, the House Church

传教、医疗与政治：博德恩医院的创建与西北基督教传播研究

咸娟娟

（西北师范大学历史文化学院，兰州）

提要：19 世纪末 20 世纪初，基督教开始进一步向中国内陆传播。为打开传教之门，吸纳教徒，医疗传教被提上议事日程，并付诸实施。地处西北边陲的甘肃兰州博德恩（纪念）医院（the Borden Memorial Hospital）便在此背景下应运而生。因为传教士的努力，医院建立得到了当地政府和地方官员，以及绅士的支持。医院建成后，也确实为当地百姓带来了福音，而且在一定程度上带动了整个西北医疗近代化的发展。传教、医疗与政治的有机结合，为基督教在西北的传播，扫除了障碍。

关键词：西北 基督教 传教士 博德恩医院 近代化

作者：咸娟娟，西北师范大学历史文化学院硕士研究生。联系地址：甘肃省兰州市安宁区西北师范大学历史文化学院，邮编：730070。电话：-86-150-9534-8466。电子邮箱：xianjuanjunk1163.com。

近代以来，随着一系列不平等条约的签订，外国传教士在中国的活动逐渐合法化。因为这些条约，传教士一改往昔的卑微谦恭姿态，伴着帝国主义的坚船利炮昂首阔步地来到中国，开始他们的传教事业。于是，从沿海到内陆，乃至边陲之地，都有了这些特殊群体的身影。不过，“与谋一己之利的商人相比，他们的执意进取来自内心的信仰”。^[1]正如费正清所言：“十九世纪时，商人们来中国谋求利益。外交官和军人来到中国谋求特权和让步。外国人中间惟有基督教传教士到中国不是为了获得利益，而是要给予利益；不是为了追求自己的利益，而至少在表面上是为了中国人的利益效劳”。^[2]如此言辞，虽多溢美，但也不失客观。尤其是进入十九世纪末期以来，随着传教方式的多样化，这样的趋势渐有加强倾向。无论手段如何，其最终目的都是为传教扫除障碍，铺平道路。然而，不得不承认的是，传教士的某些行为活动却在一定程度上于不自觉中与其初衷相悖，促进了中国近代社会的转型。这其中，医疗传教士的到来，西医的引进与推广，医院的创设和建立，便是典型。

现坐落于兰州市城关区的兰州市第二人民医院，其前身即为传教士创办于 20 世纪初的博德恩（纪念）医院（the Borden Memorial Hospital），而其建立的背景正是传教士陆续进入中国内陆、边疆，基督教传播范围及势力的不断扩大。不过，作为教会医院，从建院之初，该院就一直秉承“上帝爱人”、“济世活人”的宗旨，为西北穆斯林、藏族、蒙古族以及汉族人民等服务，并因此赢得了地方政府及民众的欢迎与支持，对基督教在西北的传播起到了重大作用，也对西北地区医疗卫生事业的近代化做出了一定贡

[1] 顾卫民 Gu Weimin 著：《基督教与近代中国社会》*Jidujiao yu Jindai Zhongguo shehui* [Christianity and modern Chinese society], 上海 Shanghai：上海人民出版社 Shanghai Renmin chubanshe [Shanghai People's Publishing House], 2010，第 1 页。

[2] 费正清 Fei Zhengqing 著：《剑桥中国晚清史》*Jianqiao Zhongguo Wanqingshi* [Cambridge Chinese History of Late Qing Dynasty], 北京 Beijing：中国社会科学出版社 Zhongguo Shehui Kexue Chubanshe [China Social Sciences Press], 1985，第 4 页。

献。

一、博德恩医院的创建与发展

基督教在中国的传播由来已久,“自唐朝景教入华,历经元代天主教东传,明清之际耶稣会士再度梯杭而来,直至近代天主教、新教和东正教的大规模输入,数起数落,历时弥久,在政治、文化和社会生活中留下了深刻的印痕。”^[3]然而,由于地处边陲,基督教新教直至19世纪70年代才开始传入甘肃。^[4]据统计,到1923年止,甘肃省内教会依旧稀少,“西教士不过七十二人,教友不过二千五百十九人”。^[5]在当时的传教士眼中,甘肃仍然是“远方的黑暗之处”。^[6]但是,从基督教最初传入,到此时拥有两千多教友、信众,这样的成绩于传教士而言,依旧可喜。甘肃民族成分复杂,且占其人口大多数的穆斯林,都具有坚定的伊斯兰信仰。同时,信奉藏传佛教的藏民,其虔诚程度更是令人敬佩。就连曾于此游历并传教的英国女传教士金乐婷(Mary Geraldine Guinness)都说:“藏民的礼拜或祈祷,从某种程度上而言,从不间断……无论白天黑夜”,^[7]这一点就连她自己都自愧不如。如此情形,要在这里传教,困难程度不言自明。那这两千多教友又是如何被吸纳的呢?其中很重要的一点得益于教会医院的开设。传播福音,行医救人,医疗与布道的双重结合,打开了基督教在西北传播的封闭之门。“医药事工与布道工作如影之随行,布道工作开展到什么地方,医药工作也随之开展到什么地方”。^[8]兰州博德恩医院(the Borden Memorial Hospital),也便在这样的背景下应运而生。

其实,早在1904年时,基督教内地会就曾以“上帝爱人”的旨意,派遣休伊特医生(Dr•J•M•Hewtt)和普雷迪先生(Mr•A•Preedy)来兰从事医药事业。^[9]当时的兰州,缺医少药,而生活于此的群众则大多依赖民间医术,中医很少,西医更加无人问津。直到10年之后,英格兰人金品三(George•E•King)到来,并在黄河北一片荒坡上选址设立医院开始,西医在兰州的传播才有了更进一步的发展,而这所由金品三建立并正式挂牌行医的医院,就是我们现在所知的博德恩医院(the Borden Memorial Hospital)。关于医院的创办时间,目前文献所记比较一致的说法是1914年,在慕寿祺所著的《甘宁青史略》中,就有“兰州河北医院开幕”^[10]的明确记载,时间正是1914年。除此之外,从现保存于兰州市第二人民医院的“博德恩医院旧址纪念馆”中之“金品三先生纪念碑”上,亦可看到“次年秋,遂来兰州”的字样,根据碑文所说,“次年秋”恰是1914年秋天。

[3] Ibid. 1.

[4] 郭厚安 Guo Hou'an, 吴廷楨 Wu Tingzhen 主编:《悠久的甘肃历史》*Youjiu de Gansu Lishi* [The long history of Gansu], 兰州 Lanzhou: 甘肃人民出版社 Gansu Renmin chubanshe [Gansu people's publishing house], 1986, 第234页。

[5] (英)季理斐 Ji Lifei 译,北平古云阶 Beiping guyunjie 笔述:《西北边荒布道记》*Xibei Bianhuang Budaoji* [The Sermon Notes of China's Wild Northwest], 上海 Shanghai: 上海广学会印行 Shanghai Guangxuehui Yinxing [Shanghai Institute of Christian wide], 1930, 第1页。

[6] Ibid.2.

[7] Mrs. Howard Taylor, *The Call of China's Great North-West or KanSu and Beyond, China Inland Mission*, 1923, 135.

[8] (韩)李宽淑 Li Kuanshu:《中国基督教史略》*Zhongguo Jidujiao Shilue* [A brief history of China Christian], 北京 Beijing: 社会科学文献出版社 Shehui Kexue wenxian chubanshe [Social Sciences Academic Press], 1998, 第295页。

[9] 森林 Sen Lin:“百年前兰州有家博德恩 Bainianqian Lanzhou Youjia Bo De'en” [There was a Borden in Lanzhou for hundred years ago],《兰州日报》*Lanzhou Ribao* [Lanzhou daily], 2006年4月4日,第B03版。

[10] 慕寿祺 Mu Shouqi:《甘宁青史略》(第二十八卷) *Ganningqing shilue* [A Brief History of Gansu, Ningxia and Qinghai], 兰州 Lanzhou: 兰州俊华印书馆 Lanzhou Junhua Yinshuguan [Junhua Printing House in Lanzhou], 中华民国二十五年,第16页。

医院初建,即命名“博德恩(纪念)医院”,取纪念捐资人博德恩(William•W•Borden)先生之意。“博德恩是最早志愿到中国穆斯林中传教的西方传教士之一……热衷于在中国西北穆斯林中传教,后获准加入内地会”,^[11]曾打算赴甘肃传教,并为此专门到埃及开罗的语言学校学习阿拉伯语,但学业未成却于1913年4月突患脑膜炎不幸逝世,年仅25岁。“其母痛念其子不已,遂捐其家产之一部,建筑此院,以纪念其子。约费八万金……”^[12]该院建立之初,由金品三(George•E•King)负责医疗事务。金乃基督教医疗传教士,故博德恩医院在民间也称“福音医院”。刚刚建立的博德恩医院“住院部分男、女医院二部,设病床近50张,还特别设立了穆斯林病房”,^[13]另外,从现在保存的‘原兰州福音医院’全景示意图^[14]中,我们可以进一步了解到医院在后期发展过程中不断完善的基本布局,其中包括门房、挂号住院处、礼拜堂、外国人住区、中国职员住区、女病院、女麻风病院、男麻风病院、藏民病房、勤杂工宿舍、食堂、马厩,以及三个工人的住房和外国人纪念碑。而其周边即为市民住区,紧靠医院外围的还有一处宁夏省主席马鸿逵的私人木材厂。这就是费正清所说的建立在城市中的典型的基督教新教布道站格局。^[15]

20世纪40年代,博德恩医院(the Borden Memorial Hospital)的发展随着毕业于英国皇家医学院的新一任院长侯文辅(Dr. Stanley Hoyte)的到来,开始向着更加专业化、正规化的方向迈进,医院发展也在此时进入黄金阶段。

二、博德恩医院与民国地方政治之关系

基督教作为外国宗教,要在中国本土社会生根发芽,首先必须寻找适宜的“土壤”和“水源”,而作为其传播者的传教士,也因此将拉拢的对象锁定在了地方上层人士的身上,这其中既有政府高官,又有地方名绅,而吸引这些人目光的手段与方式,则是先进的科学技术与方法。在闭塞的西北,西医的引进,医院的创设,足以解决上述问题。加之传教士在各方面所做的各项工作,无疑更加促成了这一事业。

作为内地会在兰创办的教会医院,博德恩医院(the Borden Memorial Hospital)的医疗传教士大都为外籍人士,这样的情况下,要于西北这样封闭落后的区域开展工作,如果不善交际,不能取得与地方政府的友好关系,要进行传教事业必然寸步难行。所以内地会在医院建立之时,即派遣苏格兰人金品三(George•E•King)来开展此项工作。金于1887年出生中国,后在英国接受教育,并取得医学博士学位,1910年回到中国,曾先后在上海、河南开封、山西平阳从事医药工作,^[16]对中国境内情况较为了解。因此,金入兰后,凭借其娴熟的外交手段,不仅得到了当地政府的信任,更赢得了地方名流的支持,当即“在黄河北岸白塔山公园东边购得荒山一段,鸠共修建”。为了保证质量要求,还“特聘李国新的祖父担任监工”。^[17]一年后,医院建成。在医院落成典礼上,时任甘肃督军的张广建即赠送“活活泼泼”的四

[11] 转引自韩永静 Han Yongjing:“西方传教士在中国穆斯林中的早期传教活动研究 Xifang Chuanjiaoshi zai Zhongguo Musilinzhong de zaoqi chuanjiao huodong yanjiu”[A Study on Western Missionaries' Early Works among Chinese Muslims],《北方民族大学学报》Beifang minzudaxue xuebao [Journal of The Beifang University of Nationalities], No.5,2011.

[12] 林鹏侠 Lin Pengxia 著,王福成 Wang Fucheng 点校:《西北行》Xibeixing [Northwest Tour],兰州 Lanzhou:甘肃人民出版社 Gansu Renmin chubanshe [Gansu people's publishing house], 2002,第49页。

[13] Ibid9.

[14] 该图现存于兰州市第二人民医院 Lanzhoushi Di' er renmin yiyuan,由原“福音医院”杨光锡 Yang Guangxi 老人提供草图,胡秀英 Hu Xiuying、颜玉兰 Yan Yuyan 等知情人员考证,医院工会负责绘制,2002年9月完成。

[15] Ibid 2, 615.

[16] 参见“博德恩医院纪念馆旧址”介绍 Bo De' en Yiyuan Ji' nian guan Jiuzhi [The Borden Memorial Hospital Site]。

[17] 张蒙恩 Zhang Meng'en,郭景周 Guo Jingzhou:“兰州博德恩纪念医院概况 Lanzhou Bodeen Jinian Yiyuan Gaikuang”[A Survey

字匾额,巨绅刘尔忻也奉送“扁鹊再生”匾。^[18]同时收到的匾额还有兰州福音教会赠送的“上帝爱人”匾,社会各界人士参加了开院典礼,一时成为兰州一件大事。

在地方人士的支持下,博德恩医院(the Borden Memorial Hospital)在建立之后也积极努力的争取各阶层的好感。在此期间,传教士就曾因全力救治一位穆斯林官员的儿子,而获得穆民的支持。在医院之后于兰创办学校时,这位穆斯林官员不仅“自己出资 500 元,同时还承诺其他地方官员也将为此慷慨解囊”。^[19]同时,“伊斯兰教的阿訇和其他人也都对此事给予了很大的宽容”。^[20]

除外籍传教士的努力之外,中国籍传教士为基督教在西北的传播也做出了巨大贡献。高金城(Gao Jiancheng),便是其中之一。高乃河南省襄城县人,幼时曾因家庭贫困在乡间福音堂做过杂工。13岁时随英籍传教士赵立民(Zhao Limin)到县里基督教内地会学堂学习。中学毕业后被保送至开封英国人金纯仁(Dr. G. Whitfield Guinness)等创办的教会医院学医,五年后顺利毕业,随即回家乡行医、布道。^[21]1917年应友人邀请来到兰州博德恩医院(the Borden Memorial Hospital)协助金品三(George•E•King)工作。为打开传教之门,其曾先后在甘州、肃州行医、传教,取得了地方人士的广泛好评。20世纪20年代初期的西北处于马家军阀的残酷统治之下,社会一片黑暗。借助传教士兼医生的身份,高金城(Gao Jian Cheng)得以在地方高官之间行走,并因此认识了当时的肃州镇守使吴桐仁、道台齐连元、臬台朱赞,但此三人依仗与马家军阀的亲密关系,到处欺压百姓,无恶不作,致使民众一片怨声载道。因为要在地方传教,高也曾对其有所妥协。但他利用牧师的身份,进入监狱为受害百姓医治的诸种行为,却引来了地方官员的憎恶。加之,高因领导群众示威游行的事件,由此便招来了“劫监砸狱,放走人犯”的罪名,并被捕入狱。后经甘肃省调查核实,无罪释放,而吴桐仁则因畏罪潜逃新疆。此后“捕了高大夫,吓走吴镇守”的故事一时在河西三州传为美谈。^[22]高金城(Gao Jian Cheng)不畏生死,敢于同政府高官作对的英勇行为无疑为其赢得了民心,而这也为基督教在肃州的传播打开了局面,让更多人知道并信仰了这一宗教。

三、博德恩医院的医疗贡献及传教事工

除与地方官员和士绅阶层搞好关系,对西北地方政治有所影响之外。博德恩医院(the Borden Memorial Hospital)作为兰州最早的西洋医院之一,它的建立也对近代甘肃缺医少药的现实困境,在一定程度上起到了帮助与改善作用,为生活在此的穆斯林、藏族、蒙古族以及汉族等人民提供了切实的服务,带来了真正的福音。而在此之前,甘肃绝大部分地区的医疗卫生状况则十分落后。紧邻兰州的临夏“没有医疗设施,没有专职医生,只有几种‘牛痘’者,俗称‘花先生’……根本无力解决当地广大群众

of The Borden Memorial Hospital in Lanzhou],《甘肃文史资料选辑》(第31辑) *Gansu Wenshi Ziliao Xuanji* [Gansu Selected sources of literature and history],兰州 Lanzhou: 甘肃人民出版社 Gansu Renmin chubanshe [Gansu people's publishing house], 1989, 第163页。

[18] 甘肃省志宗教志编纂委员会 Gansu zongjiaozhi bianzuan weiyuanhui :《甘肃省志·宗教志》 *Gansu shengzhi zongjiaozhi* [The Religion of Gansu Province], 兰州 Lanzhou : 甘肃人民出版社 Gansu Renmin chubanshe [Gansu people's publishing house], 2005, 第360页。

[19] Mrs. Howard Taylor, *The Call of China's Great North-West or KanSu and Beyond, China Inland Mission*, 1923, 34.

[20] *Ibid.*

[21] 郑仁泉 Zheng Renquan, 全士英 Quan Shiying :“祁连魂——党的忠诚战友高金城烈士 Qilianhun —Dang de zhongcheng zhanyou Gao Jincheng Lieshi” [Qilian Soul: Gao Jincheng is a Loyal Comrade for Our Party],《城关文史资料选辑》(第10辑) *Chengguan wenshi ziliao xuanji* [Chengguan selected sources literature and history], 2006, 第149页。

[22] *Ibid.*, 150.

的就医问题”。^[23]而在张家川，民众一旦生病，“回族吹‘都哇’，许‘乜提’；汉族（则）求神拜佛”。^[24]至于甘南藏区，“广大农村牧区基本上处于无医无药的状态……疾病蔓延，人民的健康受到严重威胁……疾病广为流传，死亡率之高，实堪惊人”。^[25]仅就救死扶伤，挽救生命而言，博德恩医院在建立之后，确实做出了积极的贡献。

1914年，博德恩医院 (the Borden Memorial Hospital) 正式对外开始收治病患，在医院设综合门诊部，同时在山字石教会内设立门诊，平均日接诊量 30 余人次。^[26]此后，还在甘肃临夏建立了专门的穆斯林医院，“在前两个星期就已经做了 14 个三氯甲烷手术和 20 多个小手术，并且已经治愈 260 多个病人”。^[27]

1932 年，博德恩医院 (the Borden Memorial Hospital) 应国际麻风病会委托，在医院内建立麻风病院，并逐渐接收麻风病人。“兰州雁滩麻风病患者冯约翰第一个被收入住院治疗，以后有夏河县的卢毛吉、赵志华，临夏的张焕等麻风患者一一入院治疗。”^[28]同时建院之初，就已经开始收治“西北各省以及四川、西康等地的麻风病人 80 余人次”。^[29]

在积极救治病患，为西北人民减轻疾病痛苦的同时，博德恩医院也在西北地区近代医院的建设和医疗人员的培养、培训，以及地方社会陋俗的改善方面，取得了不少成绩。

医院建立之初，就已拥有进行“手术和化验用的两层相连的主楼，砖木结构的病房 100 多间，以及医护人员住房多处”。^[30]截至 1935 年，该院已设置有“男女医院、麻风病院，及肺病院等，组织既称完善”，^[31]“几乎是西北唯一一所在兰州设备良好的现代化医院”。^[32]除此之外，医院从建立到日后的发展中，无论是建设，还是管理方面，在西北都可谓首屈一指。仅从其开办的科室来说，博德恩医院就拥有普外科、内儿科、妇产科、五官科、皮肤科、放射科，以及检验科、病理科等，而这些科室在当时兰州几乎绝无仅有。在具体设备上，1914 年始，博德恩医院 (the Borden Memorial Hospital) 就已拥有 X 光机，可

[23] 《临夏回族自治州概况》*Linxia Huizu zizhizhou gaikuang* 编写组：《临夏回族自治州概况》*Linxia Huizu zizhizhou gaikuang* [A Survey of Linxia Hui Autonomous Prefecture]，兰州 Lanzhou：甘肃民族出版社 Gansu Minzu chubanshe [Gansu Ethnic publishing house]，1986，第 121 页。

[24] 《张家川回族自治县概况》*Zhangjiachuan Huizu zizhixian gaikuang* 编写组：《张家川回族自治县概况》*Zhangjiachuan Huizu zizhixian gaikuang* [A Survey of Zhangjiachuan Hui Autonomous County]，兰州 Lanzhou：甘肃民族出版社 Gansu Minzu chubanshe [Gansu Ethnic publishing house]，1986，第 77 页。

[25] 《甘南藏族自治州概况》*Gannan Zangzu zizhizhou gaikuang* 编写组：《甘南藏族自治州概况》*Gannan Zangzu zizhizhou gaikuang* [A Survey of Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture of Gannan]，兰州 Lanzhou：甘肃民族出版社 Gansu Minzu chubanshe [Gansu Ethnic publishing house]，1986，第 227-228 页。

[26] 兰州市卫生志编纂委员会 Lanzhoushi weishengzhi bianzuan weiyuanhui：《兰州市志·卫生志》*Lanzhoushi zhi Weishengzhi* [The Health Records of Lanzhou]，兰州 Lanzhou：兰州大学出版社 Lanzhou Daxue chubanshe [Lanzhou University Press]，1999，第 215 页。

[27] “New Hospital in Gansu”，*The Chinese Recorder and Educational Review*, the Editorial Board Head-quarters, 1925, 128.

[28] 和政策养院编辑委员会 Hezheng Liaoyangyuan bianji weiyuanhui：《甘肃省和政策养院院志：1923 年——2010 年》*1923 nian-2010 nian: Gansusheng Hezheng Liaoyangyuan yuanzhi* [The Records of Sanatorium at Hezheng in Gansu Province]，内部资料未刊出 Neibu ziliao weikanchu (unpublished material)，第 7 页。

[29] *Ibid* 26, 213.

[30] *Ibid* 17.

[31] *Ibid* 12.

[32] 转引自尚季芳 Shang Jifang：“亦有仁义：近代西方来华传教士与西北地区的医疗卫生事业”*Yiyou renyi: Jindai xibei laihua chuanjiaoshi yu xibei diqu de yiliao weisheng shiye* [With Kindness and Humaneness: Missionaries from the West and Medical Health System in Modern China]，《西北师大学报》*Xibei Shida Xuebao* [Journal of Northwest Normal University]，No.3, 2011.

对一般的胸、骨透视及四肢关节摄片，而整个兰州市，直到解放为止，也只拥有这一设备 4 台而已。^[33]

在医院的管理方面，博德恩医院 (the Borden Memorial Hospital) 更是为兰州以及甘肃未来医院的发展树立了典范。从建院初期，医院就开始实行严格的管理工作体制。“医院护士分白班、夜班，每周由护士长排班……医院护士等级严格，职责明确，如发生差错，严格处理……（同时），博德恩医院有较完整的护理体制，进行病房管理。主要制度有晨会、交接班、差错登记、简单的消毒隔离、晨晚间护理、特别护理记录等”。^[34]

在积极治病救人，播撒福音之余，医院也在努力为西北地方社会培养医疗卫生人才，期间“开办了四年制的医学班和护士班，培养了许多医生和护士，在地方发挥了较大作用”。^[35] 在博德恩医院的女护士中，就有很多这样的例子。比如，裴约兰 (Pei Yuelan)、沈翠兰 (Shen Cuilan)、沈玉兰 (Shen Yulan)、王欢英 (Wang Huangying)，以及王恩护 (Wang Enhu) 和马桂香 (Ma Guixiang) 等，她们都曾先后在博德恩医院担任护士一职，并与医院医生结婚，婚后又都相继在天水、平凉、靖远、临夏、兰州等地从事医药卫生工作。^[36] 同时，当时甘肃地区许多地方医疗机构的医生也都来此学习培训。如“英国内地会传教士任守谦 (E. J. Mann) 为打开天水传教局面，选送了天水的吴杰天 (Wu Jietian)、芦恒山 (Lu Hengshan)，甘谷的刘基 (Liu Ji)、巩守仁 (Gong Shouren) 在博德恩医院学习。他们于 1929 年毕业后，在天水、甘谷行医传教，号称陇南的‘四大大夫’，把西医传到了陇南一带”。^[37]

另外，医院传教士在传教期间，也在努力引领并教育广大百姓改善着生活



[33] *Ibid* 26, 219.

[34] *Ibid* 26, 228-229.

[35] 参见“兰州市第二人民医院网站·医院介绍 Lanzhoushi Dier Renmin Yiyuan Wangzhan Yiyuan Jieshao (www.d2yy.cn)”。

[36] 沈滋兰 Shen Zilan: “兰州基督教会的华英女子学校和博德恩医院的女护士们 Lanzhou Jidujiaohui de Huaying Nüzi xuexiao he Bode' en yiyuan de Nühushimen” [The Female Nurses at Huaying Christian School and Borden Hospital in Lanzhou], 《甘肃文史资料选辑》(第 31 辑) *Gansu wenshi ziliao xuanji* [Gansu selected sources of literature and history], 兰州 Lanzhou: 甘肃人民出版社 Gansu Renmin chubanshe [Gansu people's publishing house], 1989, 第 181-182 页。

[37] 李爱如 Li Airu: “甘谷县基督教的产生与发展 Ganguxian jidujiao de chansheng yu fazhan” [The Emergence and Development of Christianity in Gangu County], 《甘谷文史资料》(第 6 辑) *Gangu wenshi ziliao* [Gangu Sources of literature and history], 1990, 第 109-110 页。

中所存在的遗风陋俗。从如今保留下的珍贵照片中，我们依旧可以清晰地看到医院工作人员为裹着小脚的妇女讲解缠足危害的场景，以及帕瑞医生和来医院戒除鸦片的烟民的合影。

缠足、吸食鸦片，这些陋俗和恶习，在近代西北随处可见。缠足不仅损害女性身体健康，而且也使其心理大受其害，对后代的孕育更是危害极大。而绚烂美丽的罌粟花背后，却是人性的泯灭，家庭的崩解，以致整个国民意志的消沉。传教士的到来，尤其是医疗传教的到来，为解决西北社会存在的上述问题，做出了积极的贡献。从一定程度上而言，他们确实践行了自己的誓言：救人且救灵。特别是在麻风病的救治方面更是以自己的实际行动影响着人们对麻风病及麻风病患者的原有观念与态度，极大地祛除了民众“谈麻色变”的恐慌心理，给了麻风病人温情和希望。同时，传教士们身体力行的作为，也为医患关系的改善起到了一定的师范效应。

四、博德恩医院建国后的走向与发展

因为传教士的上述努力，加之新一批专业医疗工作者的到来，博德恩医院 (the Borden Memorial Hospital) 在 40 年代进入黄金阶段，为西北地区的医疗卫生事业做出了更大的贡献。但作为外国宗教，基督教及其传教士始终与外国政治势力存在着千丝万缕的关系，对我国的内政外交都造成了一定程度的影响。建国后，为巩固新生政权，中央政府在全国范围内相继开展了土地改革、三反、五反以及镇压反革命等，在宗教方面，也开始了轰轰烈烈的三自革新运动。“1950 年 9 月中国基督教界吴耀宗 (Wu Yaorong) 等联名发表‘中国基督教在新中国建设中努力的途径’的宣言，号召全国基督教割断教会与帝国主义国家的关系，肃清帝国主义的影响，实行自治、自养、自传，建立中国人民自己的教会”。^[38] 为响应号召，甘肃省在同年 12 月于兰州举行基督教界人士座谈会，开始全省范围内的三自革新运动。随着该运动渐次展开，基督教会以及传教士在华期间的不法行为，渐渐被揭发出来，舆论一片哗然，控诉之声此起彼伏。在这次运动中，中华内地会甘宁青基督教联合会所受打击最重，而博德恩医院 (the Borden Memorial Hospital) 正在此机构管辖之内，医院发展受此影响，一时陷入困境。见于此种情况，从 1951 年 8 月开始，内地会甘宁青基督教成员相继撤离，其教会财产由甘肃省人民政府逐一接收。兰州博德恩医院 (the Borden Memorial Hospital) 也在这一时期被甘肃省人民政府正式接管，并改组为兰州市人民医院。“据当时估计，被接办的医院，除不动产外，药械价值人民币 100 万元以上”。^[39]

与此同时，博德恩医院 (the Borden Memorial Hospital) 于 1932 年设立的麻风病院，也在 1952 年 1 月由“甘肃省人民政府卫生厅派刘牧之等正式接收”，^[40] 并命名为“甘肃省兰州麻风病院”。至 1952 年 5 月，甘肃省兰州麻风病院住院人数增加到 109 名，当时的设备条件已不能适应甘肃省内收容和治疗病人的需求，而扩大收容又会对兰州市民的健康带来一定威胁。因此，从 1952 年 4 月开始，鉴于临夏专区发现的麻风病人较多，又迫切需要收容治疗的实情，甘肃省卫生厅与临夏当地领导商议决定在临夏和政县建立麻风病院。8 月甘肃省卫生厅派刘牧之到和政县负责建院工作。1953 年 1 月，兰州麻风病院开始正式搬迁，随之也将院名更为“甘肃省麻风病院”。^[41] 此后，从 1954 年开始，为扩大收容范围解决麻风病人的就医紧张问题，该院又在原来的基础上重新划分调整为“甘肃省第一疗养院”和徽县“第二疗养院”。

除此之外，从 1954 年起，“中央卫生部决定将北京市范围内所发现的麻风病人都送到甘肃省第一

[38] 马祖灵 Ma Zuling 等编辑：《甘肃宗教》Gansu Zongjiao[The Religion in Gansu]，兰州 Lanzhou：甘肃人民出版社 Gansu Renmin Chubanshe[Gansu people's publishing house]，1989，第 304 页。

[39] Ibid 17, 165-166.

[40] Ibid 28, 8. Ibid. Ibid, 10.

[41] Ibid.

疗养院治疗……据 1955 年统计，当时住院病人来自 16 个省，有 7 个民族”^[42]，而“兰州市人民医院”也从 1978 年起正式更名为“兰州市第二人民医院”，并一直沿用至今。

进入 21 世纪，随着全球化进程的加快，医院正在逐渐成为沟通西北与外界交流的桥梁。由于教会医院的历史，来这里参观、访问的学者不乏其人，当中那些曾在此工作过的传教士后裔也陆续到来，对医院历史的传承和中外交流都起到了一定作用。

余论

19 世纪末，基督教传教士开始大规模进入中国，他们采取各种措施传播基督教义，吸纳教徒。在其所施行的方法当中，进行医疗救治，从事慈善事业，成为不二选择。所以，在中国范围内由传教士主持的救灾、赈济事业不断出现，同时戒烟所、诊所、医院以及免费的教会学校等也于此时期相继建立。然而，就像费正清所说：“新教徒参加这些活动有时有确定的目标，但往往产生意外的效果。即为广泛地改变中国的生活开辟了道路”。^[43]

博德恩医院 (the Borden Memorial Hospital) 正是在近代“西潮东进”的背景下，西方传教士为传播基督教，打开西北门户而在兰州建立的甘肃乃至西北最早的教会医院之一。然而，却在行医布道的过程，为西北百姓带来了切实的福音。同时，西医的引入，专业医师的配备，以及先进的管理方式等，都为西北医疗卫生事业的发展树立了典范，加速了西北医疗近代化的进程。不过，行医毕竟只是手段，传教才是真正目的。传教士无论付出多少，其最终愿望都是“中华归主”，这一点不容置疑。借助教会医院，传教士在西北的传教取得了丰硕的成果。传教、医疗与政治的紧密结合，为基督教的传播扫除了障碍，铺平了道路。



[42] Ibid, 10.

[43] Ibid 2, 615.

The English Title:

Missionary, Medicine and Politics: on Creation of the Borden Memorial Hospital and Research of Northwest Christian Propagation

XIAN Juanjuan

Postgraduate in Northwest Normal University Culture college.

Anning District Lanzhou City Gansu Province China, 730070. Tel: +86-150-9534-8466.

Email:xianjunjuankl@163.com

Abstract: Christianity had spread widely in the inland areas of China at the dawn of the 20 century. Medical missionary had been put on the agenda and put in practice for opening the window of preaching and drawing the chiliasts. The hospital named the Borden Memorial Hospital which was located in the border of northwestern China was built under this kind of historical background. The article tells about the missionaries' efforts, the local government and local officers as well as the gentlemen who supported this project. It proved that this hospital did bring the Gospel to the local people and to some extent it promoted the development of the whole northwestern part of China' s medical modernization. Missionary, medical and political integrated and removed some obstacles for spreading the Christianity in the northwestern part of China.

Key words: the northwest, Christian, missionaries, the Borden Memorial Hospital, modernization

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

和谐社会 - 经济人与德兰修女

张介

(香港大学经济及工商管理学院 院长)

提要： 当代经济学采用了“经济人”一词描述典型的经济活动参与大众。“经济人假设”假定人的行为动机是为了满足自己的私利，而工作是为了得到经济报酬。这一假设与圣经对堕落后世界里的“人论”是吻合的。许多当代经济学家也同意“道德风险”是导致最近金融危机的重要原因之一。清楚认识“经济人”的工作动机及合理控制无所不在无孔不入的道德风险，两者对发展和谐社会均至关重要。而基督徒的“重生”经历与“生命”转变过程，除了赋予当事人平安，喜乐与生命意义以外，同时也逐渐把一个经济人从利己转变成利他。这一种转变在促进社会繁荣与和谐上可以说是更加积极正面及更具成效。

关键词： 经济人、德兰修女、道德风险、金融风险、社会责任

作者： 张介，香港大学经济及工商管理学院院长、国之基金教授(金融学)及财务金融学讲座教授。地址：香港薄扶林道梁銋珣楼5楼502室。电话：+852-3917-4567。电邮：ecchang@hku.hk。

社会的核心是“人”。人既是促进社会进步的推动者，也是“社会”最终要服务的对象。当愈多社会里的人感觉到活得平安、喜乐、有意义，社会就会愈加和谐。

使得人会失去平安、喜乐，或者不觉得生命有意义的因素很多。这两天与会的专家们，也从各人的专业不同的角度，讨论过这个重要的问题。既然我是一个金融经济学者，又是商学院院长，请容许我主要从经济行为的角度，来狭义的讨论这个问题。

我所选定的这一个讨论题目，是从两种人来看基督教与和谐社会建设的议题。我提到了经济人一词，我也提到了德兰修女。

用德兰修女作一个虔诚信仰基督的代表，能够在这一个场合节省很多口舌去描述，什么是成熟的基督徒的新生命。虽然绝大部分的基督徒的生命比不上德兰修女的境界，但是每天上帝都在帮助着他们的生命，向着这个模范成熟境界迈进。我想没有一个人会否认，在我们的社会中，每多一个德兰修女，社会就一定会更和谐一点。

而对于一个非基督徒的中国知识份子，对家事国事天下事，事事关心的现代人，“认识”并且能“同意”圣经所启示“经济人”的假设，作为在建设和谐社会任务执行过程中的重要的“自然律”之一，也至为重要。一方面要顺势运用这个自然律，去发挥经济人在社会建设中的积极性。一方面要逆势警觉这个自然律，去防范经济人在建设中可能的破坏性。

甚么是“经济人”的定义？为甚么说“经济人”跟圣经启示有关系？

经济学采用了“经济人”一词，对参与经济活动所有大众的典型行为动机，作了明确的“定性”。“经

“经济人假设”最早的立论者，至少可以回溯到亚当·斯密 (Adam Smith)。他对“理性经济参与者”的行为动机有着如下的定性：“经济参与者的行为动机是为了满足自己的私利，而工作的动力就是为了得到经济报酬。”这就是为什么这种“理性经济人”又被称为“实利人”或“唯利人”，有所谓“唯利是图”的意思。

这一个假设，是当代经济学最重要的基础之一。人的逐利动机进而成为经济文明发展的动力。而当代经济学，能够在已开发先进国家发挥了有效指导的功能，就证明了它理论的假设是正确的。

西方经济学有把握的把一切的理论建立在这一个假设上，除了实证的观察外，最重要的根据，来自于圣经对堕落后的人的人性的启示。

离开了伊甸园的人，在世代相传的原罪主导下，自私与利己成了根深柢固生命本质的一部份，所以说西方经济的发展和动力实来源于对人原罪的认知。

在个人层面上，修身养性的主要目的之一，就在节制降低这个强烈的贪欲。要注意，佛教在这一方面，也有类似的观察。它的核心思想之一，就是先肯定贪欲是一切痛苦的根源。而佛教对之解决的方案，就是修行以除欲。因此，有的时候会令人觉得较为消极出世。

在道德规范层面，因着明白失控的自私与利己，或者说是贪心，是具有伤害性的，是具有破坏性的，大多数文明中的道德律，就明确的谴责贪心，甚至同时立法惩戒贪心所带出来的行为。

在圣经里，神与人最有名的对话之一，就是旧约的十诫。其中的后六诫，是特别提到人在社会中的行为规范。在当孝敬父母以后的五诫（不可杀人，不可奸淫，不可偷盗，不可作假见证陷害人，及不可贪恋人的房屋、也不可贪恋人的妻子、仆婢、牛驴、并他一切所有的），只有一诫，就是最后一诫，是涉及人的“动机”，那就是不可贪心，或者说不可贪恋。

诫命说“不可”，就表示上帝清楚明白，被原罪所辖制的人所面临最大的试探，就是自私利己或者是贪心的生命本质，一旦失控变成脱僵的野马，会遗害苍生。

要知道十诫是上帝对人类最重要的立法规管。今天西方社会法律的源头几乎可以回溯到圣经的十诫。十诫顾名思义，是一个负面清单的管理方式。我们知道，选择用负面清单管理方式的政府或老板，通常给与了管理对象极大的自由活动空间。因此他们必需极为有把握的肯定，所列的负面清单能够提纲挈领的掌握住整个规管的核心。因此采用负面清单立法者的考虑，必须要更周详，智慧要更卓越，否则挂一漏万，就会功亏一篑。

上帝的无所不知的无穷智慧，早就告诉了社会学家，经济学家，企业家，或是政府监管机构，自私、利己、贪心是我们所面对的所有的人性。接受这个自然律，对增进社会的和谐方面，至少有两方面的重要意义。

第一，对于我们搞经济和管理，管理的艺术就在设立恰当的诱因，所谓的 incentives，能顺应人的这一个利己或是贪婪的本性，因势利导，使得公司的目的，能在个人因着利诱而发挥的积极性的过程中实践完成。这个典型的经济人对促进社会进步的贡献，众所周知，我就不遑多论。第二方面的意义则在于，不管是经济学家或是政府监管机构，一旦失去了对这一个贪婪之心是无所不在无恐不入这一个自然律应有的警觉性或是防范心，它对社会和谐的破坏力和伤害性，是可以超出想象的巨大。

全世界刚刚度过了 2008 年金融危机的五周年纪念日。这一次的金融危机危害甚大，甚致使得有些人用金融海啸一词，来形容它的严重性。灾难以后，经济学家或是政府监管机构，都有许多的反省：惨剧发生的背后，到底是因为过去做错了些甚么事？事后诸葛亮们的主要结论，都跟在此之前 15 年之间，监管制度大幅放松有关。具体来说，包括了三方面。第一，衍生性金融商品过多。第二，金融机构过于庞大。第三，个人及金融机构们所使用的财务杠杆过高。

这些原因都很正确。然而，我们也必须明白，过去每一个监管政策的改变，不管是允许这些新金融商品的上市，是允许金融机构扩大业务范围，以至节节增大，或是允许个人或是金融机构们使用较高的财务杠杆，都经过经济效益的评估，都是在肯定了这些产品，经济规模，及杠杆使用上，对社会

有正面的贡献前提下,才通过的。为甚么原以为是正面的,有益的经济政策,至终却带来如此的具大破坏?经济学家们在反思的过程中,深感必须要把这些问题往更深的一个层次看。

其实正如圣经所说,日光之下没有新事。在经济学上,早就对另一个由人的自私自利而衍生出来的自然律有所共识,这个自然律就叫作 **Moral Hazard**, 中文把它翻译成“道德风险”。它是从风险的角度来描述普及在人生活中,因为贪心而表彰出来的风险行为。它的定义很简单:每当预知,大部份因承担风险而遭致“损失的后果”,是由别人承担时,当事人就会额外的挺而走险。

道德风险的无所不在无孔不入的例子,比比皆是。典型的例子如下:

买了全额汽车保险的人,他在开车时候的小心程度,会低于在还没有买保险的时候的小心程度。

如果买房子不用首付就能向银行借款买房的话,房子涨价归我,房价大跌就把跌了价的房子丢给银行,很多人就会想,多多借钱,多买几栋,在房市投机中玩大一点。经典的例子就是次按危机前的美国,当首付低到百分之五,甚至是百分之零,投机的例子不但是屡见不鲜,事后一走了之的案例也不甚枚举。

人同此心,地产开发商也会想多向银行借一点钱,多开发一些地产项目,因为赚的是我的,赌输了银行买单。因此,用高杠杆,大量开发会层出不穷。它的效果之一,就是产能过剩或是举债过高的社会现象。

投资银行承销人员只要能顺利促成证券的交易就能从承销交易得到巨额分成,当不需要为承销证券交易完成后价格下跌的损失负责任时,他就可能在促销过程中,对诚信妥协。

房贷经手的经纪人或银行贷款交易完成佣金到手,就能把整个房贷合约转卖给其它投资人时,他在审核贷款时,对承贷人的信用要求就会愈来愈低。

这些举不完的例子,背后的原则都是一样的。正常完善均衡的金融市场,本来会有一只看不见的手在运作,会使得高风险与高平均回报,在金融市场中永远成合理的正比关系。本性贪婪的人,之所以不敢全力以赴,埋头一味盲目的追求最高的平均回报,就在于清楚明白,如此而行伴之而来风险的可怕。而一旦发现,承担大部份高风险所可能带来的损失的,竟然不是自己而是他人,道德风险由是产生。速度之快,范围之大,超过你的想象。根本不需要人教,因为这只是人根深蒂固贪婪本性的自然流露。

明白圣经对人原罪罪性的启示,接受它是一个不可逆的自然律。掌握经济人的生命本质,进可攻,就是顺势而为,设立诱因,让经济人因自利而促进社会进步,退可守,就是监督防范,设立规管,防堵道德风险,而杜绝金融危机于未然,都是认识圣经,或者说基督教能对人类,和谐社会建设的贡献。

然而,这样子的贡献,只是我仅仅只选择一个狭义的经济金融的切入点,只用从“认识经济人唯利是图”的角度,所推导出来基督教对建设社会和谐的一个可以说是被动地贡献。我必须要用剩下来的一点时间,谈一谈,基督教对建设社会和谐,更为重要,也更为明显的积极的贡献。

这来自于信徒个人,在家庭,工作和其他社会场所中,奉行的以博爱为核心的价值观,和在行为上的努力。也就是人,不仅作为一个经济人存在,也是一个社会人。

我虽然不是一个社会学家,但作为一个信基督 40 多年的经济学人,我深感耶稣的利他神性,能修正和超越经济人的利己本性。这种功效是主动的,是个人的,更是社会的。所以是对呼唤和谐社会的一个天然应答。

原罪是基督教的重要启示之一。但是圣经更重要更核心对“人”的启示是,这个被原罪所控制的生命,可以被更新,可以被替换。用圣经的术语说,人要被神“重生”一次。这个新的生命,会得到神的帮助,渐渐的“自私利己”变成“博爱利他”。再把它说清楚一点,这个有新生命的人,是持续的在一个“蜕变”过程中,渐渐的从“自私利己”变成“博爱利他”。

这个翻天覆地的改变,最具代表性的当代例子之一,就是我们所熟悉所敬重的德兰修女。德兰修女在印度 50 年,对被家人和社会遗弃的垂死生命的关怀,是尊重生命和博爱的一个说明,更是在基督信仰中人,可以改变利己本性的一个证明。

有了爱人如己的这样的奠基石，一个基督徒的价值观，是会体现在他所处的各种关系中。圣经在这方面的教导，丰富且具体。在家庭生活中，丈夫要爱妻子，妻子要尊重丈夫；子女要孝敬父母，父母不可惹孩子的气。在职场上要做仆人，尽心尽职，要服从上司。对国家不仅要遵纪守法，更要积极地为当政者祷告，为国家人民祈福。面对各种诱惑时，时时查验自己的真实内心，向祷告上帝寻求胜过试探的力量，或是通过教会的牧者或弟兄姐妹来帮助自己。

身为商学院的院长，培养出具有社会责任感的企业家，是我们的责任，也是我们的梦想。我们所面临的挑战，就是如何才能有效的调教出理想而具有社会责任感的企业家。不过，我内心可以很有把握的说，如果德兰修女有机会，来对经营企业，作一个示范，在经营的过程中，面对 People (人)，Planet (环境)，和 Profit (利润) 这三个重要的 P，我们不需要担心，她会是一个只顾利润 (Profit) 的企业家。因为对一个拥抱“博爱与利他”生命的人来说，利润只会是目标之一，而不是目标的全部。

在“爱人如己”的人生观之下，利润与财富都是可以，也是应该可供分享的。分享 (sharing) 在基督教里是非常重要的美德之一。米勒 (Jean-Francois Millet) 的名画“拾穗”，是一幅家喻户晓的名画，它的灵感就出自圣经利未记第 23 章第 22 节，“在你们的地收割庄稼、不可割尽田角、也不可拾取所遗落的、要留给穷人和寄居的。我是耶和华你们的神。”它教导说，有收成的时候，不是因为是你的劳力所得就“尽归己有”，要留一些分给穷人。分享的精神，使得人在富裕的时候贫富悬殊不至于太大，它是一个包容性 (inclusive) 社会的基础，它是对资本主义凡事利己观念的一个平衡，对建设和谐社会是太重要了。

因为“人”是如此的重要，如果德兰修女是一个企业家，她不会失去对员工应有的尊重和照顾，因此劳资纠纷会减少。

因为“人”是如此的重要，德兰修女也不会成为一个工作狂 (workaholic)，她会在事业与家庭中作好恰当的平衡。

因为“人”是如此的重要，她会学习上帝的信实，而把它运用在所有人际关系中。本持诚信，她的配偶可以信任她，她的合作伙伴可以相信她，甚至政府都可以相信她，她做生意，不会做假帐，不会偷税漏税，不会搞商业贿赂。

面对我们生存的大地环境，她知道上帝所赋予人的责任，就是要作一个好管家。作好管家，是耶稣再三提醒门徒们应有的身份。因此唯利是图，杀鸡取卵，破坏环境的行为，都是失责。而环保则是管家的天赋责任。

这样的生命，就是我所说的，基督教对建设社会和谐，有着重要的积极贡献。要实现中华民族，伟大复兴的中国梦，我们需要“积极”，而不是去世外桃源去修行。基督的态度，不是消极的除掉欲望，而是积极的爱人如己，转变自己的生命，博爱与利他。

我们这一代是中华历史中非常幸运的一代，从来没有一代的人比我们距离，中华民族复兴这个梦想来得更近，基督精神是非常能在这关键时代，带给我们正面积极的能量。

身为一个经济学家，一个管理学院院长，能教导出一批有社会责任的企业家 是我的责任。而我自己，作为一个基督徒，为国家民族祷告，也是我的责任。事实上，如果今天在中国有三千万的基督徒的话，可能有一半的基督徒，是常常在为国家民族的富强与和谐祷告。容许我，分享一首民间流行的基督教的诗歌，作为这一讲的结束，诗歌的名字叫作“中国早晨五点钟”。它的内容如下：

中国的早晨五点钟，传来祈祷声，
求神带来复兴和平，赐下合一得胜，
中国的早晨五点钟，传来敬拜声，
人人都献出真诚的爱，一心一意为中国，
中国的早晨五点钟，传来祈祷声，
飞越了万水千山，融化冰冷的心灵，

再没有枷锁，再没有战争，
为中国祝福扭转了命运，再一个好收成。

这是一首出自中国农村基督徒创作的诗歌。当我们在寻找基督教是否已经中国化证据的时候，诗词与歌曲都是一个可以提供线索的方向。这一首诗歌，出自中国草根民间，既充满民族情感，又不违反圣经真理，或许它就是一个虽小但却有力的，对基督教已经是相当程度的中国化了的佐证。面临中国崛起，在建设和谐社会的梦想的途径中，唯愿基督生命也成为积极的能量之一。

The English Title:

A Harmonious Society – Economic Men versus Mother Teresa

Eric Chieh CHANG

Dean & Quoin Professor in Finance & Chair of Finance

Faculty of Business and Economics, The University of Hong Kong

Address: Room 502, K K Leung Building, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong

Telephone: +852 3917 4567. E-mail: ecchang@hku.hk

Abstract: Modern economics builds on the assumption that players are economic men who act rationally on complete knowledge out of self-interest and the desire for wealth which is consistent with the biblical view of man in a fallen world. Many believe morale hazard played a central role in the events leading up to the recent financial crisis. Understanding the fundamental motives of economic men and keeping the pervasive and inevitable feature of moral hazard under reasonable control are essential to a developing and harmonious society. The born-again experience and process of life transformation of Christians essentially converted the economic man from self-interest to altruism which is a far more proactive, positive and effective approach contributing to the prosperity and harmony of the society, on top of granting personal peace, joy and fulfillment.

Key words: economic men, Mother Teresa, morale hazard, financial crisis, social responsibility

The seven-fold wisdom of love

A Comparative Confucian-Christian reading of 1 Corinthians 13

Christopher D. HANCOCK

(Wycliffe Hall, Oxford University)

Abstract: This is the third paper in a series of comparative Confucian-Christian studies by the author. The paper examines points of contrast and comparison between ‘love’ (Gk:agape) in the ‘Hymn to Love’ of 1 Corinthians 13 and *Jen/Ren* and *Ai* in the Confucian classics (esp. *Analects/Lunyu*). Drawing on earlier studies of the ‘love’ theme in Confucius, the paper resists forced parallelisms and explores seven comparative resonances that recognize the multi-faceted conceptual and practical character of ‘love’ in classical Christianity and Confucianism. Through both traditions, a global appeal to harmony and selfless service is voiced.

Key words: Love, 1 Corinthians 13, Confucian-Christian dialogue, T E Lawrence, Harmonious Society

Author: Christopher HANCOCK, Ph.D., Director of Oxford House & Honorary Fellow of Wycliffe Hall, St Peter's College, Oxford, UK. Wolfson College, Oxford OX2 6UD. Email: chancock@oxfordhousereseach.com.

Introduction

This is the third paper in a series of comparative Confucian-Christian studies. In the first paper, “‘Wisdom as Folly’ : Comparative reflections on a Pauline Paradox’”, published in the *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* in 2006 ^[1], I argued that classical Confucian, Mohist, and Daoist texts could be found which reflected something of St Paul’s paradoxical view of true wisdom (revealed for him paradoxically in the crucifixion of Jesus Christ) as seeming to many people profoundly ‘foolish’. As *Zhuangzi* 22.61, memorably asks, “Is it when not knowing that one knows? Is it that when one knows one does not know? Who knows the knowing which is not-knowing?” Or, as we read in *Dao de jing* 71:35, “To know yet to think that one does not know is best.” In the second paper, a reply to Harvard Professor Tu Weiming at a Library of Congress Conference in January 2008, entitled ‘What hope Confucianism?’ , I contrasted the prominence of the ‘hope’ theme in the New Testament and much twentieth century Western theology, with its notable absence in classical, neo- and New Confucian writings, where fatalism and determinism appear to pre-dominate. Indeed, Confucius’ abrupt answer to Zilu’s question about death – “You do not understand life – how could you possibly understand death?” ^[2] – is widely recognised as illustrative of the

[1] See , Christopher D. Hancock, “‘Wisdom as Folly’ : Comparative reflections on a Pauline Paradox’”, *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, Vol. 33:3 (2006), 421-438

[2] *Analects*, 11.12 (see *Confucius’ Analects. With selections from traditional commentaries*, Translated by Edward Slingerland, (Hackett Publishing Company, Inc: Indianapolis/Cambridge, 2003), 115

Master' s general reserve in talking about death and the after-life.

Building on this earlier work, the comparative analysis in the present paper examines 'love' (Gk: *agape*; Chinese: *Jen/Ren* or *Ai*) as it is articulated in two texts, viz. the 'Hymn to Love' in Chapter 13 of St Paul' s first letter to the young Christian church at Corinth and the Confucian classics, especially *Analects*.^[3] As in my other papers, my aim is neither to force an artificial harmony in understanding, nor to deny the potential mutual illumination comparative studies of this kind can produce. As indicated in the synopsis, I am grateful for other treatments of the 'love' theme in Confucius, such as Yao Xinzhong' s *Confucianism and Christianity: a comparative study of Jen and Agape* and the more general works of Wm Theodore de Bary, Raymond Dawson, Charles Moore, Julia Ching and Tu Weiming. ^[4] In contrast to these authors, I approach the theme first as a Christian theologian and then as a student of Confucius. Like them, however, my aim is to let the texts speak to us and to each other, for the 'wisdom of love' in a troubled world to be heard. Hence the title of my paper, 'The Seven-Fold Wisdom of Love: A comparative Confucian-Christian reading of 1 Corinthians 13' .

The Seven Pillars of Wisdom and Love

As students of Western history and literature will recognise, my title echoes World War I soldier and author, TE Lawrence (of Arabia)' s *The Seven Pillars of Wisdom*, a text which he famously lost in MSS form when he was changing trains at Reading Station in 1919, but which he re-wrote, abridged, and re-published in various versions between 1919 and 1926. Though conceived before the war as a study of seven great Middle Eastern cities, the final theme of Lawrence' s work is his experience while serving as a liaison officer with rebel forces during the Arab Revolt against the Ottoman Turks between 1916 and 1918. To most scholars *The Seven Pillars of Wisdom* is less a work of history and more an oddly romantic, rather idiosyncratic, recollection of how Lawrence experienced the war. The work is, as scholar diplomat Charles Hill aptly dubbed it, "a novel traveling under the cover of autobiography" . But few doubt its fascination and power to disclose the inner turmoil of an iconic figure of British imperial life. Lawrence took the title from the Old Testament Book of Proverbs, Chapter 9:1f, "Wisdom has built her house; she has hewn out its seven pillars"^[5], which he had applied to one of the dramatic rock formations he saw when based in Wadi Rum (in present day Jordan) between 1917-18. In Proverbs, the image evokes the creativity, hospitality and durability of the wisdom that begins in "the fear of the Lord" (1.7). Lawrence' s work is valuable for us in providing more than a vivid geological or architectural image: love appears prominently in the dedicatory poem to "S.A." which Lawrence placed at the start of the 1922 Oxford text. "S.A." is thought by many to

[3] Cf. The paper draws on an unpublished MSS *Christianity and Confucianism: A dialogue between cultures* (T&T Clark, forthcoming). Quotations from the *Analects* are necessarily selective, and are made mindful of the breadth, depth and fluidity of many of the topics treated here within Confucian tradition.

[4] Yao Xinzhong, *Confucianism and Christianity: a comparative study of Jen and Agape* (Sussex University Press (UK), 1997); See Wm Theodore De Bary, *The Trouble with Confucianism* (Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Mass, 1991); Raymond Stanley Dawson, *Confucius* (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1981); Charles Moore, ed., *The Chinese Mind. Essentials of Chinese Philosophy and Culture* (East-West Center Press/University of Hawaii Press: Honolulu, 1967); Julia Ching, *Chinese Religions* (Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke, 1993); among many titles by the same author, see Tu Weiming, *Humanity and Self-Cultivation: Essays in Confucian Thought* (Lancaster-Miller Publishers: Canada, 1978)

[5] The Holy Bible, New International Version (Zondervan Corporation, 1996)

be Selim Ahmed ‘Dahoum’ , the dark, young Syrian Arab Lawrence employed in archeological work in Carchemish before the war and as a translator during it, until the former’ s death from typhus in 1916. The poem begins,

*I loved you, so I drew these tides of
Men into my hands
And wrote my will across the
Sky and stars
To earn you freedom, the seven
Pillared worthy house,
That your eyes might be
Shining for me
When we came*

In the stanzas that follow, Lawrence’ s affection for (some would say, obsession with) “S.A.” - before death “...took you apart:/Into his quietness” - expresses itself in vivid imagery drawn from the dust and stuff of earth and the radiant luminosity of a starry-sky. But, for Lawrence, no temporal house, or earthly memorial, is adequate to capture the memory of the profound ‘gift’ of human affection. As the poem ends,

*Men prayed me that I set our work,
The inviolate house,
As a memory of you
But for fit monument I shattered it,
Unfinished: and now
The little things creep out to patch
Themselves hovels
In the marred shadow
Of your gift.*

Whatever we think of Lawrence or his relationship to Salem Ahmed, *The Seven Pillars of Wisdom* is a useful reminder that poetry and architecture, imagery and memorials are inadequate tools to fashion what St Paul called “the most excellent way” of love; for it is love, *agape*, as Swiss theologian Karl Barth translated the end of 1 Corinthians 13, “that alone endures” ^[6]. However, as we can see in 1 Corinthians 13, all of these tools can usefully serve the greater purpose of turning the elusive idea of “love” into a concrete, visual, physical form.

Agape in 1 Corinthians 13

As intimated earlier, 1 Corinthians 13 appears to have been inserted (textually rather awkwardly ^[7]) by Paul as “a ready-made piece” ^[8] that he deemed relevant both to his argument and to the proud and conflicted spiritual situation of the Corinthian church. In Chapter 14.1 he picks up the theme of “spiritual gifts” (especially speaking in tongues and prophecy) that he has been addressing in Chapter 12. In-

[6] q. Charles Kingsley Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 2nd Ed., (A&C Black: London, 1971), 299

[7] For a discussion of the textual puzzles surrounding 1 Cor 12:31, see Barrett, 297

[8] Barrett, 297

between, we find thirteen rhythmic verses that celebrate the greatest “gift” (NB. as in TE Lawrence) of love. To nineteenth century German Liberal Protestant theologian Adolf von Harnack 1 Corinthians 13 was, “the greatest, strongest, deepest thing Paul ever wrote”^[9]. For our present discussion, its central theme of love, *agape*, must feature in any meaningful comparative philosophical-theological discussion of Christian theology and practice. For, if Christianity cannot be articulated apart from reference to the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, neither can it be separated from the “law of love” that shapes and guides a believer’s relationship to God and neighbour. As an exposition of the word *agape*, which the early Christian community took and applied as “a new word for a new idea” (Morris^[10]), 1 Corinthians 13 is unique in the New Testament. As Australian scholar Leon Morris summarises the distinctive Christian meaning of *agape*,

Whereas the concept of love before the New Testament was that of a love for the best one knows, the Christians thought of love as that quality we see displayed in the cross. It is a love for the utterly unworthy, a love that proceeds from a God who is love. It is a love lavished upon others without a thought whether they are worthy to receive it or not. It proceeds rather from the nature of the lover, than from any merit in the beloved. The Christian who has experienced God’s love to him...sees men (sic) in a measure as God sees them. He sees them as the objects of God’s love, as those for whom Christ died. Accordingly his attitude towards them is one of love, of self-giving *agape*.^[11]

This is the general meaning which 1 Corinthians 13 unpacks in celebration of the seven-fold wisdom of love. *Agape*, I argue in this paper, constitutes a divinely-inspired, radical invocation of unconditional neighbour love, which in its moral expression produces a quite different type of social and relational contract from the measured obligation of Confucian social relationships.

Agape and the seven-fold wisdom of love

Agape is, as we have seen, described by Paul in verse 1, firstly, “*the most excellent way*” . Like that most fundamental, natural and ‘fitting’ of Chinese philosophical principles^[12] *dao* (way) the Greek *hodos* (way) combines a sense of identity, journey, morality and overarching theology, or philosophy. Like Jesus’ self-description as “the way” in John 14.6, *agape* is presented here by Paul as the pre-eminent truth about the Christian’s vocational identity, life journey, social morality and perception of theology. In contrast to *dao*, however, this “way” is first a “gift” from God, not the moral fruit of human effort, or even that higher orientation and transcendent sense of purpose of classical Confucianism and Daoism; as we find self-motivation stressed in *Analects* 7.6, “The master said, ‘Set your heart upon the Way, rely upon Virtue, lean upon Goodness, and explore widely in your cultivation of the arts.’”^[13] The “way” of love to Paul and the early Christian community begins, as we heard in Morris, in the demonstrative outpouring of love seen in the life and death of Jesus Christ. It is a “way” that is personal and visual before it is moral or relational. Its inner dynamic is

[9] q. Leon Morris, *1 Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary*, (IVP: Leicester, 1976), 180

[10] Morris, 181

[11] Morris, 181

[12] See *Analects* 6.17; and Zhang Dainian, “The concept of *dao* is perhaps the most important concept in Chinese philosophy” , in *Key Concepts in Chinese Philosophy*, Transl. Edmund Ryden (Yale University Press: New Haven & London and Foreign Languages Press: Beijing, 2002), 11

[13] q. Slingerland, *Analects* 7.6, 65; see also *Analects* 2.4

a “gift” generously given and thankfully received, not a work performed or an effort made.

The second feature of *agape* from verses 1-3, is that it is *the substance and end of Christian spirituality*. As we read,

If I speak in the tongues of men and of angels, but have not love, I am only a resounding gong or a clanging cymbal. If I have the gift of prophecy and can fathom all mysteries and all knowledge, and if I have a faith that can move mountains, but have not love, I am nothing. If I give all I possess to the poor and surrender my body to the flames, but have not love, I gain nothing.

Paul’ s words are a searing critique of the forms of pagan piety, mystery religions, and rigorous asceticism that prevailed in the first century Greco-Roman world where unintelligible incantations, bell-ringing, secret truths and magical arts, together with self-centred acts of charity, flagellation and immolation, were common. In Paul, *agape* is the highest expression of Christian spirituality and the antithesis of empty religiosity and ritual indulgence. The necessary balancing of interiority (in motivation) and exteriority (in action), that characterises Paul’ s account of *agape* stands in stark contrast to sound moral intentions (that remain private) and impressive charitable works (that are essentially self-interested). In many respects, Paul’ s attitude towards the potentially deflecting power of ritual and the need to cross-examine human motivation echoes Confucius in *Analects*. For, though Confucianism is ‘a tradition of ritual’ ^[14], the Master was clear in his advice to Zixia, in *Analects* 6.13, “Be a gentlemanly *ru*. Do not be a petty *ru*.” ^[15] Hence we find in *Analects* 3:3, ‘If a man is not humane (*ren*), what has he to do with ceremonies (*li*)? If he is not humane, what has he to do with music?’ The true *ru* is above material inducements and bureaucratic pettiness, and pursues virtue and graciousness to do the *right* thing, rather than simply to do the *proper*, *convenient* or *advantageous* thing. As we see in *Analects* 1:12, Confucius esteemed ritual insofar as it enabled and reflected ‘harmony’ (*he*), in which a person’ s ‘native substance’ (*zhi*) and ‘cultural refinement’ (*wen*) are preserved in an easy, or natural, balance (see also 3:8; 6:18). In living ‘the Way’ the true *ru* surrenders results to ritual, convenience to rightness, and personal advantage to social benefit.

The third pillar in Paul’ s exposition of the wisdom of love is as *the height of social and relational civility*. Listen to verses 4 and 5, “Love is patient, love is kind. It does not envy, it does not boast, it is not proud. It is not rude, it is not self-seeking, it is not easily angered, it keeps no record of wrongs.” If *agape* is contrasted in verses 1-3 with other forms of religious practice, it is antithetical here to other types of social behaviour: the power of love’ s positive character being the more forcefully expressed by a series of negations. Reading this in light of *Analects* and what we know of Confucius’ life, I am struck by their common emphasis on propriety, deference and humility in inter-personal relations; as we read of the *chün-tze* in *Analects* 6:27 “The superior man (*chün-tze*) studies literature (*wen*) and restrains himself with the rule of propriety (*li*). Thus he will not violate the Way (*dao*).” ^[16] Likewise, in *Analects* 12:1, we read, “Yen Yuān asked about humanity. Confucius said, ‘To master oneself and return to propriety is humanity. If a man (the ruler) can for one day master himself and return to propriety, all under heaven will return to

[14] Yao Xinzong, *An Introduction to Confucianism* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2006), 101

[15] q. Slingerland, *Analects* 6.13, 57; see also *Analects* 13:4, 20, and perhaps 2:12

[16] See Slingerland, *Analects* 6.27, 62 for an alternative translation

humanity.’ ”^[17] Confucius would agree *ren* does not envy, does not boast, and is not proud. However, in presenting *agape* as “not rude...self-seeking...easily angered... (nor keeping a) record of wrongs” , Paul presents an exalted view of civility and moral propriety. Though Confucius does much to democratize his pedagogy and moral vision, classical Confucian tradition sees the *chün-tze* as an exceptional individual whose thought and behaviour are benevolent, disciplined and exemplary. There is relatively little sense here that *ren* or the conduct expected of the *chün-tze*, apply to relationships with the socially inferior or the unknown neighbour,^[18] for the moral virtues of the *chün-tze* are honed to suit the public servant fulfilling his obligations to his superior, not the general duty of a moral person living as a civilising agent in a wayward society. Hence, in *Analects* 17:6, with the public servant clearly in mind, Confucius presents *ren* as the overarching virtue to be seen in the *chün-tze*,

To be able to practice the five virtues everywhere in the world constitutes humanity (*ren*)...: Reverence, magnanimity, trustworthiness, diligence, and kindness. He who is courteous is not humiliated, he who is trustworthy wins the people, he who is diligent attains his objective; and he who is kind can get service from the people.^[19]

Ren, like *agape*, as we begin to see here, is far from vague: it is a structured, deliberate expression of thoughtful, loyal (*zhong*), reciprocal (*shu*) altruism that the *chün-tze* seeks to embody and inspire; as we read in *Analects* 6.30, “The humane man, desiring to establish himself, seeks to establish others; desiring himself to succeed, he helps others to succeed. To judge others by what one knows of oneself is the method of achieving humanity (*ren*).” Crucially, it is often pointed out that if *ren* and *agape* have similarities in Confucius, in his disciples *ren* is more frequently paired with *yi* (viz. what is right, or ought to be done) than in the Master himself. In Mencius, for example, *ren* is essentially a family virtue and *yi* that which is owed to society and a worthy person. Taken together *ren-yi* constitutes the virtuous end of human endeavour; as we read in Mencius, “If one abides in benevolence and proceeds from respect, then the great person’ s affairs will all be included.”^[20]

In verses 6 and 7 Paul celebrates *agape* as, fourthly, *the epitome of practical wisdom*. He connects love with truth, or truthfulness, as well as with the practical relational acts of protection, trust, hope and perseverance. Hence, “Love does not delight in evil but rejoices with the truth. It always protects, always trusts, always hopes, always perseveres.” That is, to Paul, *agape* does not take pleasure in another’ s misfortune, does not fixate on corruption or lies, and does not turn a blind eye to moral questions. Instead, it is passionate about truth, eager to forgive another’ s flaws, inclined to believe another’ s good intentions, and always keen to look beyond the immediate to the ultimate in an attitude of single-minded fortitude. There is much here which is common to Confucian morality; the single-minded pursuit of moral and ritual propriety (*li*) warranting the *chün-tze*’ s greatest effort. As we find in the Master’ s exchange with Gong Xihua in *Analects* 7.34, “The Master said, ‘How could I dare lay claim to either sageliness or Goodness?

[17] Cf. as Slingerland translates the final sentence of this paragraph in *Analects* 12.1, “The key to achieving Goodness lies within yourself – how could it come from others?”

[18] There is some sense of this in *Analects* 6.30, but it is for Confucius the rarely found sage who “extends his benevolence to the common people and brings succour to the multitudes.”

[19] See Slingerland on *Analects* 17.6 for commentarial disagreement surrounding the meaning of *min* (diligence)

[20] Mencius 7, Exhausting the Mind A, #33; q. Dainian, Key Concepts in Chinese Philosophy, 295

What can be said about me is not more than this: I work at it without growing tired and encourage others without growing weary.’ Gong Xihua observed, ‘That is precisely what we disciples are unable to learn.’ ”

^[21] But *agape* goes beyond this duty of moral courage and readiness to commend what is right. It avoids moral superiority or censure by demonstrating acceptance, forgiveness, healing and hope. It is difficult to find a comparable generosity or lasting tenacity in Confucian social mores. A tone of moral conditionality runs through *Analects*. We see this, for example, in Confucius’ opinion of his disciples Zilu and Ran Qiu voiced to Ji Ziran in *Analects* 11.24: they are only “useful” not “great ministers” being “minimally competent” in their official duties. ^[22] Likewise, in *Analects* 4.3, “The Master said, ‘Only one who is Good is able to truly love others or despise others.’ ” In contrast, Paul celebrates the gracious durability of *agape* in the link sentence at the beginning of verse 8, “Love never fails” (*katargeo*); literally, it does not “collapse” or “fall” . *Agape* is the practical wisdom that does not easily give up when it is disappointed by other people. As John Donne’ s seventeenth century poem puts it, “Love is not love, that alters where it alteration finds.” As Swiss theologian Karl Barth expresses this, quoting the historicist sceptic Ernst Troeltsch, love is “the power of this world which already as such is the power of the world to come.” ^[23] It endures because its source is trans-temporal and supra-human: it comes from God and shares his eternity.

Paul develops this in verses 8-10, celebrating *agape* as also *the infinite and enduring heart of life*. We read,

Love never fails. But where there are prophecies, they will cease; where there are tongues, they will be stilled; where there is knowledge, it will pass away. For we know in part and prophesy in part, but when perfection comes, the imperfect disappears.

Returning to the pattern of contrasts seen in verses 1-3, Paul presents *agape* here as that perfect reality which survives after the charismatic gifts of spiritual prophesying, tongue-speaking and divinely inspired insight have faded away or been fulfilled. They are, for Paul, provisional and partial. *Agape*, however, participates in both the eternity and the perfection of its divine source. There is no place here for an impersonal, deterministic ‘mandate of heaven’ or a humanistic confidence in individual self-improvement. *Agape* is for Paul the central reality at the heart of the divine will, which Jesus’ life and death demonstrate in visible, tangible and historical form. It is the inspiration at the heart of faithful Christian discipleship. This is not to deny the power classical Confucianism ascribes to the human spirit, moral virtue and the will of heaven; all have a demonstrably dynamic function in *Analects* and other early Confucian texts. For ren is, as Hall and Ames put it, “a person-making process” ^[24] in which “the completion of self means humanity (*ren*)” ^[25] . This stands in stark contrast, however, to the essentially theological, or Christological, core of Christian faith and practice which we see in *agape*. For Paul, and the classical Western theological tradition, the heart and source of *agape* are perceived by faith, not the exercise of human reason, will, effort, sight, or intellect. Though *dao* possesses a transcendent quality in much classical Confucian thought, it requires active pursuit of ren for it to be fully realized; as we read in *Analects* 15.29, “The

[21] q. Slingerland, *Analects* 7.34, 75

[22] See Slingerland on *Analects* 11.24, 121

[23] q. Barrett, 305

[24] David L Hall & Roger Ames, *Thinking through Confucius* (State University of NY Press: Albany, 1987), 84

[25] Wing-Tsit Chan, *A Source Book of Chinese Philosophy* (Princeton University Press: Princeton, 1963), 108

Master said, ‘Human beings can broaden the Way – it is not the Way that broadens human beings,’ ” [26] The orientation of moral or spiritual, energy is quite different in 1 Corinthians 13.8-10: *agape* is caught from God not taught by humans or investigated by the diligent.

This leads us on to the sixth pillar of Paul’ s poetic celebration of *agape*; namely, love as *the expression of mature reason*. The progressive, developmental element in this ‘Hymn to Love’ resonates with Confucian pedagogy. The *chün-tze* aspires with ‘sincerity’ (*cheng*) to learn, grow, and develop in understanding and self-discipline. [27] Spiritual cultivation comes through ‘nourishing the vital force’ (*yangqi*) and ‘developing virtues by righteous deeds’ (*jiyi*). The quest for maturity is not an alien concept in either Confucianism or Christianity. 1 Cor 13.11,12 represent two different perspectives on progress towards Christian spiritual maturity. In the first, in verse 11, mature talk, thought and behaviour are contrasted to ‘childish ways’ : “When I was a child, I talked like a child, I reasoned like a child. When I became a man, I put childish ways behind me.” *Agape* induces and expresses itself both in the process and in the fulfilment envisioned here. For love transforms speech, thought and act and draws a Christian to a mature rejection of old, childish behaviour and an embrace of maturity. Crucially, the instrumental agency in this development is *agape*, not human effort, scholastic formation, moral discipline or even communal tradition and expectation. But, as Paul makes clear, this development is both rational and intentional: *agape* is not irrational sensibility or erotic passion. It is trained service, selfless generosity, humble obedience and mature, practical wisdom at work in God’ s world. The second perspective on progress towards Christian maturity is teleological: maturity is being drawn into a future when imperfect vision, understanding and knowledge will be displaced by their perfect future forms. As we read in verse 12, “Now we see but a poor reflection in a mirror: then we shall see face to face. Now I know in part; then I shall know fully, even as I am fully known.” If, as argued in my previous paper, there is little sense of eschatological hope in classical Confucianism, this teleological perspective on moral understanding and love’ s fulfilment in 1 Corinthians 13 is distinctive and new. To Paul, the Christian looks forward – indeed, is drawn forward – by a dynamic, eschatological Spirit of love and hope into the fulfilment of all things in heaven and eternity. In contrast, the fulfilment of life in classical Confucianism is in recovering the golden age of King Wen, in treasured ritual memory of loved ones through acts of filial piety, and in the harmony the human spirit finds in virtue and ritual. As we read of ritual (*li*), for example, in *Analects* 1:12.

Among the functions of propriety (‘*li*’) the most valuable is that it establishes harmony. The excellence of the ways of ancient kings consists of this. It is the guiding principle of all things great and small. If things go amiss, and you, understanding harmony, try to achieve it without regulating it by the rule of propriety, they will still go amiss. [28]

Agape knows life as more than the disciplined pursuit of moral or ritual, maturity: it is the dynamic love which transcends human individuality and imperfection, and fulfils human identity in relationship with God.

Finally, the enduring solidity and spiritual durability of *agape* is expressed for Paul in its outlasting

[26] Q. Slingerland, *Analects*, 15.29, 185

[27] Cf. Chan, *A Source Book of Chinese Philosophy*, 465, fn.28: *Cheng* “means not only sincerity in the narrow sense, but also honesty, absence of fault, seriousness, being true to one’ s self, being true to the nature of being, actuality, realness” (q. Yao Xinzong, *An Introduction to Confucianism*, 217)

[28] See Chan, *A Source Book of Chinese Philosophy*, 21

even faith and hope; that is, creedal convictions about the truth of God and persevering courage grounded in belief in, and experience of the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. To echo Lawrence, these are mere “hovels” in comparison with the seven-pillared “*inviolable house*” which true love is and inhabits. As we read in verse 13, “And now these three remain: faith, hope and love. But the greatest of these is love.” *Agape* is here then, for Paul, lastly, *the highest and most enduring virtue*, and finds its true form amidst the other Christian realities of faith in God and hope in Christ. Though, as we have seen, classical Confucianism has a highly-developed sense of love as relational responsibility and, even, romantic fulfillment, the centrality of *agape* to Christian tradition generally and 1 Corinthians specifically, is striking. Though Confucius stressed, “The gentleman (*chün-tze*) does not go against Goodness (*ren*) even for the amount of time required to finish a meal,”^[29] he recognizes the partial and provisional nature of the human act and quest for *ren*. As we read in *Analects* 4.6, “The Master said, ‘I have yet to meet a person who truly loved Goodness or hated a lack of Goodness.’”^[30] Though we find in Confucius’ ‘paradox of *wu-wei*’ a sense that *ren* is the highest virtue that can be developed into unselfconscious spontaneity of ‘goodness’, he still wonders, “Is there a person who can, for the space of a single day, simply devote his efforts to Goodness?”^[31] His doubt contrasts with Paul’s confidence in *agape*; which he trusts not as a human exercise of will, but as a divine and eternal ‘gift’. But we do not say this in competitive or adversarial terms; for that would be to miss the heart of the love-principle Christianity enjoins. For, as we see in 1 Corinthians 13, *agape* possesses a remarkable rhetorical power and issues to all a global invitation to embrace and be embraced by it in our quest for a harmonious world.

中文题目：

爱的七重智慧：对《歌林多前书》十三章的儒基比较性阅读

汉科克 博士，牛津学院院长 & 威克里夫院名誉院士，牛津大学圣彼得学院，英国。地址：Wolfson College, Oxford OX2 6UD, UK。电子邮件：chancock@oxfordhousereseach.com

提要： 本文是作者探索儒基对话的第三篇文章。该文分析《歌林多前书》第十三章“爱之歌”里的“爱”（希腊语为 *agape*）与儒家经典（特别是《论语》）里的“仁”和“爱”的对比与比较之点。根据笔者先前对孔子的“爱”之主题的研究，本文拒绝强制的并行主义，探索七个比较共振来确认古典基督教与儒家中的“爱”的多面的概念性和实践特征。通过这两个传统，可以听到一个全球化的对和谐与无私的呼吁。

关键词： 爱、林前十三章、儒基对话、托马斯·爱德华·劳伦斯、和谐社会

[29] q. Slingerland, *Analects* 4.5, 31

[30] q. Slingerland, *Analects* 4.6, 31

[31] q. Slingerland, *ibid.*

书评与通讯
Reviews and Academic Reports

中国天主教贞女研究新论：

评《基督的新娘：中国天主教贞女研究》

肖清和、王丹丹

（上海大学历史系，200444，上海，中国）

康志杰：《基督的新娘：中国天主教贞女研究》，北京：中国社会科学文化出版社，2013年。

作者：肖清和，上海大学历史系副教授，上海大学历史系，200444。电子邮件：qinghexiao@gmail.com；王丹丹，上海大学历史系硕士，上海大学历史系，200444，电子邮件：jjedandan2@163.com。

明末清初的天主教人物以其特有的历史魅力与学术价值，已经吸引了诸多学者的广泛关注，研究成果亦非常丰盛。然纵观已有天主教人物研究成果，我们可以发现学术界呈现两多两少的趋向：以主流群体为切入点者多，关注边缘群体者少；以精英阶层为研究对象者多，关注草根阶层者少。学者多从宏观视角分析天主教与中国社会之间的互动，一些经典著作亦多关注颇具影响力的耶稣会传教士、中国士大夫官员、知识分子以及社会上层人士。相比之下，由于资料的零碎和“三层边缘性”的地位，对女信徒特别是对明末清初贞女的研究历来薄弱，著作更是微乎其微。对于这样一个有悖于中国儒家传统思想的贞女群体的研究，已有的一些寥若晨星的成果大多是从区域史、断代史的视角进行了简略探究。^[1]而对于贞女群体的生活、工作等全方位的历史考察还有待进一步深入。康志杰教授的新著《基督的新娘：中国天主教贞女研究》（以下简称《基督的新娘》）则在一定程度上弥补了这一研究领域之空白：从基层天主教人物——贞女的日常生活起居出发，将天主教贞女研究推向了一个新的高度。

本书题为“基督的新娘”是一种比喻，来自于《圣经》。《新约》把教会比作基督的新娘，而贞女是教会的中坚，因追随基督而守贞，被誉之为“基督的新娘”同样恰当。故守贞的姑娘只认一位“新郎”，

[1] 关于天主教贞女的研究主要有：晏华阳 Robert Entermann, *Christain Virgins in Eighteenth-Century Sichuan*, in Daniel H. Bays, ed., *Christianity in China, From the Eighteenth century to the Present*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996, p. 180--193; 梅欧金 Eufenio Menegon, *Christian loyalists, Spanish Friars and Holy Virgins in Fujian During the Ming-Qing Transition*, in Monumenta Serica 51(2003); 张先清 Zhang Xianqing, 《官府、宗族与天主教：17-19 世纪福安乡村教会的历史叙事》 *Guanfu zongzu yu Tianzhujiao: 17-19 shiji Fuan xiangcunjiaohui de lishi xushi* [Government, Lineage and Catholicism: A Historical Narrative of the Village Church in Fu'an during 17-19 century], 第五章“信仰与生活” Diwuzhang “Xinyang yu shenghuo” [Chapter Five, Faith and Live], (北京 Beijing: 中华书局 Zhonghuashuju [Zhonghua Book Company], 2009); 秦和平 Qin Heping, <关于清代川黔等地天主教童贞女的认识> “*Guanyu Qingdai Chuanqian dengdi tianzhujiao tongzhennv de renshi*” [Understanding on Catholic Virgins in Sichuan, Guizhou and other places during Qing dynasty], 《四川大学学报》 *Sichuan daxue xuebao* [Journal of Sichuan University], No.6, (成都 Chengdu: 四川大学出版社 Sichuan daxue chubanshe [Sichuan University press], 2004); 周萍萍 Zhou Pingping, <明末清初天主教贞女群体> “*Mingmo Qingchu tianzhujiao zhennv qunti*” [On Catholic Virgins Group during late Ming and early Qing dynasty], 于《江苏社会科学》 *Jiangsu shehuikexue* [Jiangsu Social Sciences], No.6, (2010)。

即主耶稣基督。^[2] 作者在其第一篇关于贞女的论文《被模塑成功的女性角色——明末以后天主教贞女研究》^[3] 的基础上，持续探索，深入挖掘，终成此书。其研究对象不言而喻是中国天主教贞女。

关于贞女的界说，中外学者已有相关阐释，如张瑞云《当代女性独身教友》中说：“贞女现象，意指那些不结婚，并且为教会工作，奉献自己的年轻妇女”。^[4] 此外还有一些学者认为贞女即“修道的女性”、“未婚女性义工”。那究竟何为贞女？本书认为贞女应该分为广义与狭义两类：广义的贞女包括三类女性——修女、贞女和女性独身教友（多为知识女性）；而狭义的贞女则专指那些在家（或组成团体）过守贞生活、完全献身于教会事业，且没有进入修会团体的独身女性。^[5]

《基督的新娘》一书共十二章，分上、下两篇：上篇第六章以历史为经，阐述了贞女群体的历史轨迹。第一章从中国古文献出发，结合西方关于“贞”的界说，详尽细致分析了贞女的释义及其称谓。第二章中国天主教贞女制度缘起，内容主要涉及西方传教士对中国女性的特殊传教策略的解说及明清之际中国贞女群体的出现，在细列典型贞女案例（如贞女陈子东）之后，作者归纳总结了明清之际的贞女群体特点。第三至第五章则展现了清中叶禁教后、福安和苏州教案期间以及鸦片战争以后的贞女群体的发展及宗教生活状况。第六章论述了欧洲女修会进入中国后，中国贞女身份的转型及贞女群体的进一步发展。上篇论述围绕以下两个问题：在“夫妇为人伦之首，婚嫁尤必以时”^[6] 的传统儒家思想的背景下，在不被世俗社会理解和接纳的形势下，为什么仍有虔诚的天主教女信徒选择守贞生活？他们守贞的动机与目的是什么？作者在深入梳理和分析“贞女”的释义及称谓的基础上，指出天主教贞女的独身理念来自信仰，独身体制来自西方天主教会。^[7] 正是这至高无上的天主教信仰给这一群柔弱的女子带来了巨大的勇气，一致其敢于面对世俗社会的压迫，为天主坚守童贞。被卷入教案面临死亡的贵州贞女林昭的遗言：“升天堂有两条近路，一条是守贞，一条是致命”^[8]，即深刻鲜明的反映了贞女守贞的动机和目的。

本书下篇第六章以制度（或问题）为纬，通过贞女群体面面观，剖析了贞女的心态、生活及工作。第七章论述规章制度的拟定、完善及特点，并分析《童贞修规》出台的必要性，及针对不合修规行为的处

[2] 康志杰 Kang Zhi Jie,《基督的新娘：中国天主教贞女研究》*Jidu de Xinniang:Zhongguo Tianzhujiao zhennv yanjiu xinlun* [Bride of the Christ : The new Research on the Chinese Catholic Virgins], (北京 Beijing : 中国社会科学出版社 Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe[China Social Science Press], 2013), 3。

[3] 文章载陶飞亚 Tao Feiya,《性别与历史：近代中国妇女与基督教》*Xingbie yu lishi: jindai zhongguo funv yu jidujiao* [Gender and History: Women and Christianity in Modern China], (上海 Shanghai : 上海人民出版社 Shanghai renmin chubanshe [Shanghai People's Publishing House], 2006)。

[4] 张瑞云 Zhang Ruiyun,《当代女性独身教友》*Dangdai nvxing dushen jiaoyou* [On Contemporary Single Female Catholics], (台湾 Taiwan : 光启出版社 Guangqi chubanshe[Guangqi Press], 1999), 1。

[5] 康志杰 Kang Zhi Jie,《基督的新娘：中国天主教贞女研究》*Jidu de Xinniang:Zhongguo Tianzhujiao zhennv yanjiu xinlun* [Bride of the Christ : The new Research on the Chinese Catholic Virgins], (北京 Beijing : 中国社会科学出版社 Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe[China Social Science Press], 2013), 5-9。

[6] 《湘阴狄氏家谱》*Xiangyin Dishijia pu* 卷五 (vol.5)《家规·第十四条》*Jiagui • Di shisi tiao*, 1938 年重修本，转引自张先清 Zhang Xianqing :《官府、宗族与天主教：17-19 世纪福安乡村教会的历史叙事》*Guanfu zongzu yu Tianzhujiao: 17-19 shiji Fuan xiangcunjiaohui de lishi xushi* [Government, Lineage and Catholicism: A Historical Narrative of the Village Church in Fu' an during 17-19 century], (北京 Beijing : 中华书局 Zhonghuashuju [Zhonghua Book Company], 2009), 278。

[7] 康志杰 Kang Zhi Jie,《基督的新娘：中国天主教贞女研究》*Jidu de Xinniang:Zhongguo Tianzhujiao zhennv yanjiu xinlun* [Bride of the Christ : The new Research on the Chinese Catholic Virgins], (北京 Beijing : 中国社会科学出版社 Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe[China Social Science Press], 2013), 20。

[8] P. Roeser S. V. D. :《中华光荣》*Zhonghua guangrong* [Glory of China], (山东 Shandong: 兖州府天主堂 Wongzhoufu tianzhutang [Cathedral Press of Yanzhou],1925), 212 ; 转引自康志杰 Kang Zhi Jie,《基督的新娘：中国天主教贞女研究》*Jidu de Xinniang:Zhongguo Tianzhujiao zhennv yanjiu xinlun* [Bride of the Christ : The new Research on the Chinese Catholic Virgins], (北京 Beijing : 中国社会科学出版社 Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe[China Social Science Press], 2013), 116。

理办法,进而延伸到贞女修规的续编,即根据形势变化继续编修贞女修规——《守贞要规》。第八章论述贞女的衣食住行,主要讨论世俗生活中的贞女的状况,内容涉及贞女的经济状况及财富观、贞女与家庭、缠足与放足的社会习俗以及贞女的服装头饰等等。第九章和第十章主要讲述在教会扮演各种角色的贞女的不同工作(工作对象、形式及报酬等)。第十一章主题为信仰视野下的守贞理念与实践,内容涉及天主教的守贞观,守贞生活的完成及贞女的领袖等。第十二章则细数了天主教贞女与儒释道及其他各类独身女性的异同。在此篇中,作者采用纵横交错的写作架构,从身体观、宗教经验以及灵修生活等视角深入核心问题,全面、客观的解读了贞女人生的方方面面。深入细致的归纳了天主教贞女守贞生活的特点;探析了她们的生活与世俗女性之间的区别;洞察了世俗社会的非基督徒对于守贞姑娘的态度;深入浅出的陈述了天主教贞女与同样作为独身女性的信仰佛教、道教的独身女性之间的区别,以及其与世俗社会的独身女性(如自梳女)之间的差异。除此之外,作者还探明了贞女与同样作为天主教的独身女性修女及又同样作为基督教的独身女性新教单身女传道士之间的区别,可谓是为我们展现了一幅栩栩如生的中国天主教贞女生活的画卷。

对福建天主教贞女做过较为深入研究的梅欧金教授(Eugenio Menegon),在其博士论文《祖先、贞女与神父》(*Ancestors, Virgins, and Friars: The Localization of Christianity in Late Imperial Mingdong (Fujian, China), 1632-1863*)的^[9]第六章中,详细讨论了帝国晚期闽东地区的天主教贞女。与《基督的新娘》一书不同,梅欧金关注的是闽东地区贞女的守贞观与儒家传统思想之间的冲突。在阐明天主教童贞观传入闽东之前当地的社会背景之后,梅欧金努力探索与传统社会格格不入的“守贞”行为(perpetual religious virginity),是如何成功传入并被闽东地区所接受的?^[10]为达到此目的,作者完成了两个任务:首先,洞察中国在医学、社会和法律领域如何看待天主教童贞;其次,努力探索与宗教禁欲和婚姻阻制相关的文献。梅欧金将对贞女研究的重点放在天主教童贞观与传统儒家贞洁观的辩诘之上,通过对现有传教士文献和中文记载的分析与整理,阐明了天主教贞女的概念及天主教童贞观在闽东女性群体中的传播。

《基督的新娘》同样选择了几乎被历史忽略了其存在的、有悖于中国传统礼制的女性群体——中国天主教贞女作为研究对象。与梅欧金的个案区域研究不同,《基督的新娘》不仅对贞女的兴起与发展、在教会及中国世俗社会中所扮演的角色、对教会发展所作的贡献等进行了深入的探讨,而且还将这一特殊群体置于具体的时代、具体的社会和场景下进行比较全面的整体与系统分析,具有重要的学术价值和意义。

首先,《基督的新娘》对于贞女群体历史沿革的探讨与分析,从一个侧面反映了中国天主教的发展过程。尽管以平信徒贞女作为主题的研究很难成就宏大叙事,但这个弱小的群体的发展与中国天主教历史的所有重大事件紧密相关。如从清朝雍正初年开始的禁教时期,教会活动进入秘密状态,传教资源逐渐转入偏远的乡村。在这种形式下,贞女群体并没有萎缩,相反在福建福安,贞女却成为了教会的骨干、传教士的资助者和支持者。^[11]贞女们以实际行动证明了:“在禁教时期,勇敢的贞女们在以一种明显的方式自己管理自己,她们是新皈依者的主要支持者。”^[12]鸦片战争后,贞女人数持续增长,组件团体成为

[9] 梅欧金 Eugenio Menegon, *Ancestors, Virgins, and Friars: The Localization of Christianity in Late Imperial Mingdong (Fujian, China), 1632-1863*, (UMI, 2002)。

[10] 同上 *Ibid.*, 401。

[11] 康志杰 Kang Zhi Jie,《基督的新娘:中国天主教贞女研究》*Jidu de Xinniang: Zhongguo Tianzhujiao zhennv yanjiu xinlun* [Bride of the Christ: The new Research on the Chinese Catholic Virgins], (北京 Beijing: 中国社会科学出版社 Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe [China Social Science Press], 2013), 41。

[12] Right Rev. J. M. Blois, *P. F. M. Chinese Virgins, Catholic Missions (Monthly)*, June, 1923, p.139, 转引自康志杰 Kang Zhi Jie,《基督的新娘:中国天主教贞女研究》*Jidu de Xinniang: Zhongguo Tianzhujiao zhennv yanjiu xinlun* [Bride of the Christ: The new Research

守贞生活的主要模式。^[13]而当欧洲修女会进入中国后,中国天主教贞女的身份发生转型,大部分贞女进入了修会。^[14]作者突破了“西方中心论”、“帝国主义侵华论”、“挑战与回应”和“地方观念”等种种范式,从天主教贞女的视角,结合特定的历史时空元素,将这一特殊女性群体放在具体的时代、社会和背景下进行的分析,除了能让读者对中国天主教贞女有一个全面的认识和理解之外,同时,更能让读者通过这些女性的生存史,透视天主教各修会在华传教的策略和特点,洞察罗马教廷对华政策和天主教修会制度的调整和完善,据此领悟中国天主教的发展史。

其次,《基督的新娘》关注的视角是贞女群体的生活,此举新颖独特,独树一帜。关于宗教人物的研究,学术界一直独爱男信徒和传教士,而对于宗教女性的研究成果却寥寥可数。殊不知,在宗教团体中,女信徒经常在人数、事奉、献金等方面都有超过男信徒的现象。^[15]就贞女群体而言,在严守男女之大防的中国社会,她们是给妇女讲道,带领妇女宗教活动的必要人。^[16]现有关于妇女与宗教关系的著作中,有个比较明显的倾向,即大多数的研究注意到了从各类宗教经典中考察性别议题,却忽略了妇女在实际社会宗教组织中的地位、处境、生活。据此,一些学者发出了“妇女在哪里?(where are the women?)”^[17]的感慨。《基督的新娘》一书突破陈规,从妇女生活史的角度来考察中国天主教贞女群体的制度、身份、衣食住行以及贞女的工作和信仰,为读者展示了中国天主教贞女作为中国天主教组织中的一份子的真实生活。这在妇女与宗教关系的研究生具有不可或缺的意义。

再次,《基督的新娘》一书运用了大量一手材料和一些珍贵的口述史料。由于中国天主教贞女一直是一个被忽略的群体(在教内是最低层的平信徒、未婚女性义工;在世俗社会是违背儒家传统礼制、败坏妇德的不良女人;在学术界是研究的边缘群体),且大多数贞女都是文盲或者识得少量的文字,因而关于她们的记录很少甚至可以说是完全没有。然而来自草根阶层的中国天主教贞女却对维持教会的正常运作扮演过十分重要的角色,是一个具有非常潜力和能量的女性群体。^[18]因而对于贞女的探寻对于中国教会和中国社会都具有深远的价值和意义。亦或正是这个深远的价值和意义引导本书作者跋山涉水,深入上海、河北、山西、辽宁、广东等地教会,寻找健在的老一辈天主教贞女,这种精神实在可贵,然更可贵的是作者在这些田野调查中带回的鲜活的资料。这些富于故事性的采访资料,不仅仅是充实丰富

on the Chinese Catholic Virgins], (北京 Beijing: 中国社会科学出版社 Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe[China Social Science Press], 2013), 57.

[13] 康志杰 Kang Zhi Jie,《基督的新娘:中国天主教贞女研究》*Jidu de Xinniang:Zhongguo Tianzhujiao zhennv yanjiu xinlun* [Bride of the Christ: The new Research on the Chinese Catholic Virgins], (北京 Beijing: 中国社会科学出版社 Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe[China Social Science Press], 2013), 93-112.

[14] 同上, 117-167.

[15] 李贞德 Li Zhende, <最近中国宗教史研究中的女性问题>“*Zuijin zhongguo zongjiaoshi yanjiu zhong de nvxing wenti*” [On the Questions of Female in the Recently Research of History of Religion in China], 于李玉珍 Li yuzheng、林美玫 Lin Meimei,《妇女与宗教:跨领域的视野》*Funv yu zongjiao: Kualingyu de shiye* [Women and Religion: Horizon from Interdisciplinary], (台北 Taipei: 里仁书局 Liren shuju,2003), 4.

[16] [比]燕鼎思 Yan Naisi [Jozef Jennes]:《中国教理讲授史:自十六世纪至一九四零年天主教在中国传播福音及讲授教理的历史演变》*Zhongguo jiaoli jiangshoushi: Zi 16 shiji zhi 1940 nian tianzhujiao zai zhongguo chuanbofuyin ji jiangshoujiaoli de lishiyanbian* [Het Godsdienstonderricht in China], (台湾 Taiwan: 天主教华明书局 Tianzhujiao huaming shuju, 1976), 111.

[17] 李贞德 Li Zhende, <最近中国宗教史研究中的女性问题>“*Zuijin zhongguo zongjiaoshi yanjiu zhong de nvxing wenti*”, 于李玉珍 Li yuzheng、林美玫 Lin Meimei,《妇女与宗教:跨领域的视野》*Funv yu zongjiao: Kualingyu de shiye* [Women and Religion: Horizon from Interdisciplinary], (台北 Taipei: 里仁书局 Liren shuju,2003), 24.

[18] 康志杰 Kang Zhi Jie,《基督的新娘:中国天主教贞女研究》*Jidu de Xinniang: Zhongguo Tianzhujiao zhennv yanjiu xinlun* [Bride of the Christ: The new Research on the Chinese Catholic Virgins], (北京 Beijing: 中国社会科学出版社 Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe[China Social Science Press], 2013), 2.

了本书内容，更是以一些鲜活的例子给我们展示了中国天主教贞女的现实生活。^[19]此外，作者还远赴欧洲的图书馆和档案馆，获得大量的一手文献资料特别是图片资料。^[20]更增加了本书的学术价值。

本书的另一大特色在于其索引的新颖独特。作者在书末附有主题词索引，为读者的阅读提供了极大的方便。然金无足赤，本书在印刷中出现了一些小瑕疵，如：“四川宗座代牧博主教（Pottiers）请求马罗传信部做出裁定”^[21]一句将“罗马传信部”印成了“马罗传信部”；“一个合格的传道员应该具体以下要求”^[22]中的“体”应改为“有”；“没有独立自由的自由”^[23]应该更正为“没有独立自主的自由”；“由于欧美女修会的培训，修女综合素质得到提高”^[24]中的“修女”应是“贞女”。

另外，此书仍有一些值得商榷之处。如关于贞女的释义。《基督的新娘》第一章明确界定了贞女的概念（即指全职服务于教会，且没有进入修会团体的独身女性），并将这个天主教独身群体的特点归纳为三个基本元素：第一，为信仰而独身；第二，守贞既是人生选择，同时要与天主缔结“契约”，即需要向天主发誓，表示已经与天主建立一种特殊的关系；第三，全身心为教会工作（主要在基层教会服务），且没有任何薪酬。^[25]而本书第三章在归纳福安女子热衷守贞缘由时得出此地很大比重的女性守贞的缘由是家中有人或自己患有麻风病，而因主观信仰而守贞的却占小部分。^[26]众所周知，在医疗卫生条件相对落后的传统社会，患有麻风病无疑是对死者宣布了死刑，其病毒的传播与感染性，也使得人们对麻风病的恐惧与忌惮殃及患者家庭的所有成员。因而，倘若一个年轻的女性患有麻风病或是出生在有麻风病患者的家庭，无疑她必须选择单身，因为没有家庭愿意接受这样的妇女。显然这一人群对于天主教贞女生涯的选择应属“退而求其次”，并非全因信仰而独身。此外，本书第九章论述贞女的工作的章节中，提到济南主教府的“姑娘院”里的守贞姑娘，她们的生活费用由教会负责。^[27]教会的资费大多来自信徒和贞女们的捐赠，而此处教会补贴给贞女的“生活费用”该如何去理解？或许，作者应该对贞女的生活费用等经济问题有更多说明。

其次是关于贞女与修女的区分。《基督的新娘》第十二章详细比较了天主教贞女四类独身女性之间的差异：儒家贞节观及儒家文化影响下的守贞女性、佛道教中的独身女性、中国社会各类独身女性和新教单身女传道员。其实更应该关注的是天主教贞女与修女之间到底有何差异？因为二者不论是在称谓还是在工作上都有重叠的部分。纵观全书，恍惚得出贞女群体与修女的区别如下：贞女大多数居住在自己的家中，随着贞女团体的成立，部分贞女迁居贞女团体，修女居住在修会；贞女仅发贞洁愿，而修女需发三愿——神贫愿、贞洁愿、服从愿；^[28]据此似乎已明白贞女与修女的比主要区别。然此书中仍有一些

[19] 作者并未将全部采访稿载于本书，部分采访材料参考本书第八、九章。

[20] 本书大部分文献资料来源于欧洲图书馆和档案馆。

[21] 康志杰 Kang Zhi Jie,《基督的新娘：中国天主教贞女研究》*Jidu de Xinniang: Zhongguo Tianzhujiao zhennv yanjiu xinlun* [Bride of the Christ: The new Research on the Chinese Catholic Virgins], (北京 Beijing: 中国社会科学出版社 Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe[China Social Science Press], 2013), 177。

[22] 同上 Ibid., 260。

[23] 同上 Ibid., 261。

[24] 同上 Ibid., 137。

[25] 同上 Ibid., 7-8。

[26] 同上 Ibid., 43-45。

[27] 同上 Ibid., 250。

[28] 同上 Ibid., 183-184。

模棱两可之处，如“基督徒贞女必须住在他们父母的房子里，因为四川没有修女院”。^[29] 据此，如果有了修女会，这些贞女就应搬至修女会居住？那么以善会和中华修女会为住处的是贞女还是修女？又如“这里没有修女院，但这里却有真正的修女。他们自愿和双亲住在一起，用自己的双手劳动养活自己。”^[30] 此处有到底是修女亦或是贞女？此外，本书第六章叙述了自欧洲修女会进入中国后，中国贞女的身份发生转型，大部分的贞女进入修会，从而开始了修女的生活。由此，能否理解为贞女、贞女团体是修会进入中国之前中国本土的修女、修会雏形？

上述之商榷丝毫不影响此书之学术价值。《基督的新娘》以宗教妇女生活的角度出发，深刻独到的论述了中国天主教贞女群体的兴起、发展、生活、工作、经济支柱以及转型，为读者展现了一幅精彩的中国天主教贞女的画卷。其意义之广远、价值之重大，有目共睹，相信不仅大大推动明清以来的中国天主教研究，而且对于研究女性与宗教、性别史、口述史等相关学科亦大有裨益。

The English Title:

New Research on Catholic Virgins in China: Bookreview on Kang Zhijie's Jidu de Xinniàng: Zhongguo Tianzhujiao zhennv yanjiu xinlun [Bride of the Christ : The new Research on the Chinese Catholic Virgins]

XIAO Qinghe

PhD. Associate Professor

Department of History, Shanghai University, China, 200444

Qinghexiao@gmail.com

WANG Dandan

MA Student

Department of History, Shanghai University, China, 200444

jiedandan2@163.com

[29] 同上 Ibid., 49。

[30] 同上 Ibid., 186。

News for Abraham Chen's Doctoral Public Defense on T.C. Chao's Christology

The Editorial Committee of IJOFSWS

Abraham Chen is approaching the end of his doctoral studies. The Faculty Council (Faculty of Theology, University of Helsinki) has in March granted him a permission to defend his doctoral thesis in public; his public defense took place at 12:00 o' clock, 11 June, 2014. The location of this event was on 3rd floor, Fabianinkatu 26, Helsinki. The supervisors of Abraham Chen were professor Miikka Ruokanen and Paulos Huang. The opponent was prof. Philip Wickeri, and custos was acting professor Pekka Kärkkäinen.

Abraham Chen has been a faculty member at Nanjing Theological Seminary (Nanjing, China) since early 1990s. Before he came to Finland for his doctoral studies, Chen was also an assistant editor of *Nanjing Theological Review* for nearly 20 years. Chen's doctoral research on T. C. Chao's Christology is motivated by his serious concern with the construction of a Chinese theology in general and a Chinese Christology in particular. Chen's thesis is titled "Chinese Christ: The Christology of T. C. Chao." T. C. Chao was the most important Chinese theologian of his time, one who attempted to construct a contextual Chinese theology. Chen's present thesis aims at analyzing T. C. Chao's interpretation of Jesus Christ in the Chinese cultural and socio-political context of his time as it appears in his publications from the late 1910s up to 1950. Chen's analysis of Chao's Christology also leads to his own proposal for a Chinese Christology.

Abraham Chen's thesis is composed of eight chapters. After the Introduction, Chapter 2 describes T. C. Chao's life and depicts an overall picture of his struggle for a Chinese Christology in the cultural, ideological, religious, theological, social, and political environment of his time. Attention is paid to his background, both historical and intellectual, which is formative for the emergence of Chao's thinking. In Chapter 3, Chen analyzes the concept of the person of Jesus Christ in Chao's early Christology, which focuses more on the "human-divine" Jesus rather than on the "divine-human" Christ. Chapter 4 analyzes and discusses the work of Jesus Christ in Chao's early thinking. In Chapter 5, Chen analyzes Chao's understanding of the person of Jesus Christ in his later Christology, which is characterized by the fact that he made a shift from the "human-divine" Jesus to the "divine-human" Christ. Chapter 6 focuses on the work of Jesus Christ in Chao's later Christology. In these four chapters (2-6) Chen observes how Chao was trying to establish a balance between the uniqueness of Christianity and Christ, or the orthodoxy of the faith as he understood it, and the necessity of creating indigenous theology relevant to the Chinese context of his time. Chapter 7 contains a brief comparison between Chao and five other Chinese theologians (Wu Leichuan, Wu Yaozong, Xie Fuya, Ding Guangxun, and Wang Weifan), both his contemporaries and those of the next generation. Chapter 7 also includes Chen's own attempt at developing a Chinese Christology of today referring to the relevance of Chao's thinking and proceeding beyond him. In this chapter, Chen

intends to show the necessity and possibilities of drawing an overall map of Chinese Christology during the period in question, demonstrating its continuity with the Chinese theological development of today. Chapter 8 is the conclusion of the study.

In his thesis, Abraham Chen shows well that Chao's Christology always deals seriously with the context in which he was doing his Christology for the Chinese people and Chinese Christians, and in which he attempted also to deal seriously with the encounter between Christianity and his context. Chao attempted to develop a relevant theology as a response to the context and the rapid social change of China during the period 1910-1950. He always had a good intention to seek the uniqueness of Christianity while aiming at a contextually relevant understanding of the faith.

Abraham Chen also indicates that Chao's contextual theology could be seen as an expression of Steve Bevans' "synthesis model." In both Chao's early and later periods, while applying the synthesis model to his contextual theologizing, Chao also used the "translation model" through which he tried to apply a Christianity that was relevant to the Chinese people living in the midst of the modernization process of society. The difference between the two periods, however, was that his understanding of the very kernel of Christianity was different. This resulted in great variation in his Christological outlook between the two phases. His early Christology was much closer to the Western liberal understanding of Jesus Christ, while the Christology of his later period seems to return to a traditional understanding.

According to Abraham Chen's observation, Chao's Christology focuses on God's creation and humanity, and theology of creation is the starting point of his Christological thought. In the Chinese cultural setting, however, a concentration on humanity may not be the same as an anthropocentric model of Christology; in Chao's own words, Christology could be appropriately defined as "both theocentric and anthropocentric." From the point of view of the theology of creation, Chao attempted to highlight human creativity, dignity, and freedom together with the problem of the sinfulness of human life. In so doing, he always attempted to maintain the three dimensions of his Chinese theology: Christian faith, cultural identity, and social context.

After analyzing T. C. Chao's Christology, Abraham Chen draws a sketch of a Chinese Christological thinking reaching beyond Chao to the context of Chinese Christianity today. With a brief discussion and comparison, Chen aims to discover how Chao's ethically oriented Christology closely relates to the Christological interpretations of other Chinese theologians, both his contemporaries and those of the next generation. Although they have different concerns, all of them make a responsible attempt at constructing a Chinese theology. Along with different approaches and emphases, they share similar themes, such as God's love, the cosmic dimension of Christ, and an ethically and practically oriented Christology. Finally, Chen proposes that a contextual Chinese Christology should be a *Dao* Christology, which needs to be built upon Scripture, Christian tradition, Chinese culture, and the experience of the faith community. A *Dao* Christology is not a Christology of mere thinking but that of following. In believers' imitation of Jesus Christ, the images of the kenotic Christ, the cosmic lover, and the self-giver in human suffering can be highlighted. By following Jesus Christ, the Chinese church, with its rich ethical nourishment, can "produce" many Jesus-like or Christ-like Christians. They are new creatures who can make the Kingdom of God come, the will of God be done on earth as it is in Heaven. This is the significance of an ethically concerned *Dao* Christology.

中文题目：

陈永涛关于赵紫辰基督论的博士论文答辩通讯

《国学与西学国际学刊》编辑部

A Report on the Christian Forum of Peace and Reconciliation in the Context of Northeast Asia

April 21-25.2014 Korea

By

The Editorial Committee of

the International Journal of Sino-Western Studies

Duke Divinity School Center for Reconciliation invited 44 scholars, church and civil organizations leaders from South Korea, Japan, China, USA, Hong Kong and Finland to hold a Christian Forum of Reconciliation in Northeast Asia in Pilgrim House, 58-3, Dodee-ri, Buk-myeon, Gapyeong-gun, Gyeonggi-do, Korea 477-841 in April 21-25, 2014.

The forum had for goals as follows: 1) To create fresh space of community and learning which will strengthen Christian leadership for God' s ministry of reconciliation in Northeast Asia. 2) To build relationship and learn together within a framework that is theological, contextual, practical, including worship, Scriptural reflection, and eating together. 3) To engage key themes of the missional and contextual challenge in the region related to the ministry of peace and reconciliation. 4) To create a catalytic space for long-term partnership, common mission, and deeper collaboration between Christian leaders, ministries, and institutions.

In the opening ceremony on the first day, the Korea Catholic Bishop Kang gave a speech on the issues, which need to be reconciliated in Northeast Asia. There were altogether four daily themes: 1) After sharing our stories of pain and hope, the second day' s theme was: Reconciliation toward what? God' s gift of New Creation. Japanese senior pastor Hiroo Sekita gave a presentation on repent and apology as a Japanese Christian, Church formation in the southern part of Kawasaki, Sakuramoto and Tode. 2) The theme for the third day was: Where are we and what is going on? God' s gift Lament. Assistant professor Yuko Fukushima presented on the topic Gift of lament in the Scriptures (Jer. 11:17; Lam. 1:5; 2:4, 11, 17; 3:1-3, 7-8, 19-24; 4:10. Judges 11:1-11, etc.). 3) The theme for the fourth day was: What does hope look like? God' s gift of stories, models and signs. Professor Lung-Kwong Lo, from the Chinese University of Hong Kong, gave a presentation with the topic "What does hope look like? ---- A Biblical vision of Hope in Romans" , by concentrating on Rom. 5:1-5 to discuss about justification, reconciliation and Hope, by concentrating on Rom. 4:16-18 to discuss about the story of Abraham as the father of both Jews and Gentiles (many nations), and by concentrating on Rom. 8:14-28 to discuss about hope for the future glory of the children of God. 4) The theme for the last day was: How does God sustain the ministry of reconciliation over the long haul? God' s gift of a Christ-centered spirituality. Dr. Hae-young Choi from the Catholic University of Korea gave a presentation with the title above. President Obama was visiting Japan and probably was going to say something, which might have made the Northeast situation worse.

There also were three kinds of group discussions.

First was story sharing on pain and hope, in addition to individual pains and hopes. The hatred

among Japan, Korea and China, the conflict between South and North Korea, the negative influence of Fukushima nuclear accident, and the conflict between ethnic groups in China, etc., were also much discussed.

Second was the country group discussions, and each group reported top three challenges and top three hopes.

Dr. Paulos Huang reported on behalf of the China group as follows: Challenge 1 is within church: the conflict between house and TSPM church, the quality of pastors and church leaders, the low level education of theology. Challenge 2 is within society: Political theological issues between Christianity and Chinese rulers, cultural theological issues between Christianity and Chinese identities (Confucianism, Daoism, Buddhism, Islam, etc), Pragmatic problems between Christianity and Chinese commercial, secular and folk religious context, and balance of religious policies in China. Challenge 3 is concerning the influence of China's growth in the global international context, especially the conflict of values between China and the other part of the world. Sign 1 of hope is in developing theological education. Sign 2 is to reconstruct the old church and to help the new church and generation to emerge. And sign 3 is to reflect the essence of Christianity so as to help Christianity survive and develop in the context of China.

Dr. Catherine Kwong, from the Urban Peacemaker Evangelical Fellowship of Hong Kong, reported on behalf of the Hong Kong group as follows: Challenge 1 is the mistrust between Hong Kong people and Beijing government. Challenge 2 is the gap between profits and classes in Hong Kong. Challenge 3 is social issues such as the occupying challenges by mainland Chinese tourists and immigrants to Hong Kong. Sign 1 of hope is genuine dialogue. Sign 2 is mutual relationship. Sign 3 is in new generation of church.

Dr. Yuko Fukushima reported on behalf of the Japan group as follows: The main challenge is that people have not been treated humanly in the Japanese social structure. Sign of hope is to look for a humanly dialogue and to unite church and people.

The first South Korea group reported three challenges: 1) After rapid economic growth, people suffer more and more. 2) Competition in the context of secularism and capitalism. 3) Militarist culture. Three signs of hope are: 1) God works through Holy Spirit. 2) New community movement, faith/discipleship training. 3) Realization of problems which people are confronting.

The second South Korea group reported challenges such as: 1) The horrible influence of Government's spies. 2) Government's inconsistent policies on the reconciliation between South and North Korea. 3) Rumors confuse people to doubt the government's militarist situation. Signs of hope are in the difference between three generations.

The USA group reported as follows: Challenge 1 is the role of USA in the conflicts on Northeast Asia between democracy and communism, and in demonization of calling North Korea as evil. etc.. 2) American Christians are highly influenced by USA government and mass-media. 3) Decline and growth of different denominations of church, and Pentecost is one of the main phenomena. Sign 1 of hope is in 20 years, USA will become more multi-racial and global multi-national interests will be emphasized. Sign 2 of hope is that the new generation is concentrating more and more on issues such as world future, community and social responsibilities. Sign 3 of hope is that more and more second generation of immigrants in USA start to believe in Jesus Christ.

Third was issue Group discussions: 1) Christian vision and mission for peace, reconciliation and

unification of Korea. 2) Developing the next generation of Christian leaders for peace and reconciliation. 3) Creation and Human Technology: A Christian approach. 4) Christian response to territorial disputes. 5) Developing a theology of reconciliation and peace for the Northeast Asia Context. 6) 21st Century Christianity and Nationalism: What is required from Christian theology and Witness?

中文题目：

“东北亚和平与和好基督教论坛”简讯

本刊编辑部《国学与西学国际学刊》

《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. 著作者人投稿本刊，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 Agaiér《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 chubanshe [The Press of Renmin University of

China]), 2005, 30.

Fung Yulan, *A History of Chinese Philosophy*, tr. by Derk Bodde, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952), 150.

4. 外文稿件引用中文资料 Chinese literature in non-Chinese articles :

Liang Qichao, *Gushu zhenwei jiqi niandai* [The Genuinity of Chinese Ancient Books and their Dates], (Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan [The Commercial Press], 1923), 20.

5. 文集集中的文章 Articles in collections :

张敏 Zhang Min,《基督徒身份认同——浙江温州案例》Jidutu shenfen renting ---- 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 renting yanjiu :guannian :taidu :liju [A Study on Personal Identity], (上海 Shanghai : 上海人民出版社 Shanghai renmin chubanshe [Shanghai People's Publishing House], 2006), 101-105.

Zhuo Xinping, "Comprehensive Theology: An Attempt to Combine Christianity with Chinese Culture," in Miikka Ruokanen & Paulos Huang, eds., *Christianity and Chinese Culture*, (Grand Rapids & Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2010), 185-192.

6. 报纸中的文章 Articles in newspapers :

曹曙红 Cao Shuhong,《信仰之旅 慈善之行——上海玉佛寺禅寺觉群慈爱功德会参访团西藏行纪实》Xinyang zhi lu, Cishan zhi xing —— Shanghai Fochansi Juequn ciai gongdehui canfangtuan Xizang xing jishi [The Trip of Faith and the Travel of Charity],《中国民族报》Zhongguo minzubao [The Newspaper of Chinese Ethnic Minorities] (2011年8月23日), 第5版。

David E. Sanger, "U.S. and Seoul Try to Ease Rift on Talks with the North," New York Times, (11 June, 2005).

7. 期刊中的文章 Articles in journals :

李炽昌 Li Chichang,《跨文本阅读策略: 明末中国基督徒著作研究》Kuawenben yuedu celue: Mingmo Zhongguo jidutu zhuzuo yanjiu【The Strategy of Readings in Chinese Christian Writings】,《基督教文化学刊》Jidujiao wenhua xuekan【Journal of Christian Culture】, No. 10, (北京 Beijing: 中国人民大学出版社 Zhongguo renmin daxue chubanshe【The Press of Renmin University of China】, 2003), 168.

J. R. Carrette, "Religion and Mestrovic's Postemotional Society: The Manufacturing of Religious Emotion," Religion, vol. 34, (2004), 271.

8. 会议论文 Conference papers :

田海华 Tian Haihua,《汉语语境中的“十诫”: 以十九世纪基督新教的诠释为例》Hanyu yujing zhong de ' Shijie' : Yi shijiu shiji jiduxinjiao de quanshi wei li [The Ten Commandments in the Chinese Context],“第四届‘基督教与中国社会文化’国际年青学者研讨会”Disijie 'Jidujiao yu Zhongguo shehui wenhua' guoji qingnian xuezhe yantaohui [The Fourth International Young Scholar Conference on Christianity and Chinese Social Culture], (香港 Xianggang, 香港中文大学 Xianggang zhongwen daxue [Chinese University of Hong Kong], 2008年12月5-9日), 3.

John Barwick, "Liu Tingfang, Chinese Protestant Elites, and the Quest for Modernity in 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 Wumumuqi : 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 bianzhuan 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)

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						
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 €

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林大学前进校区 6227 0009 4256 0079 382 (账户名：Paulos Z. Huang) . International payment: Bank Account : Nordea Bank, Account number 200166-36836.

or 或 Bank draft € _____ payment to Sanovan Press Company

Please charge to my credit card account for 以信用卡付款 € _____

I would like to pay my order(s) by 信用卡别 Visa _____ Mastercard _____

Card No. 信用卡号 _____ - _____ - _____ - _____

Cardholder' s Name 持卡人姓名 _____

Cardholder' s Signature 持卡人签名 _____

Expiry Date 有效期 _____ Verification No. 信用卡末尾三个号码 _____ 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 : _____