



武汉大学马克思主义理论系列学术丛书

“以人为本”的 形上之思

陈曙光◎著

Research on People - Oriented
Thoughts by Metaphysics

中国社会科学出版社



武汉大学马克思主义理论系列学术丛书

“以人为本”的 形上之思

陈曙光◎著



中国社会科学出版社

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

“以人为本”的形上之思 / 陈曙光著. —北京: 中国社会科学出版社, 2017. 5

(武汉大学马克思主义理论系列学术丛书)

ISBN 978 - 7 - 5161 - 9600 - 7

I. ①以… II. ①陈… III. ①本体论 - 研究 IV. ①B016

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2017)第 005182 号

出 版 人 赵剑英
责任编辑 田 文
特约编辑 陈 琳
责任校对 张爱华
责任印制 王 超

出 版 **中国社会科学出版社**
社 址 北京鼓楼西大街甲 158 号
邮 编 100720
网 址 [http: //www. csspw. cn](http://www.csspw.cn)
发 行 部 010 - 84083685
门 市 部 010 - 84029450
经 销 新华书店及其他书店

印 刷 北京君升印刷有限公司
装 订 廊坊市广阳区广增装订厂
版 次 2017 年 5 月第 1 版
印 次 2017 年 5 月第 1 次印刷

开 本 710 × 1000 1/16
印 张 21. 25
插 页 2
字 数 353 千字
定 价 79. 00 元

凡购买中国社会科学出版社图书, 如有质量问题请与本社营销中心联系调换
电话: 010 - 84083683
版权所有 侵权必究

本丛书系武汉大学“985工程”项目“中国特色社会主义理论创新基地”和“211工程”项目“马克思主义基本理论及其中国化研究”成果

国家社科基金项目“以人为本的‘元哲学’研究”（批准号：08BZX012）成果

湖北省社科基金项目“‘以人为本’的人学沉思”（批准号：2013011）成果

总 序

顾海良

21 世纪之初，马克思主义理论学科的设立，是马克思主义中国化的显著标志，也是中国化马克思主义发展的重要成果。设立马克思主义理论学科，不仅是由马克思主义理论本身的科学性决定的，也是由马克思主义作为我们党的指导思想和作为国家主流意识形态建设的需要决定的，而且还是由当代马克思主义发展的新的要求决定的。

在马克思主义理论学科建设中，武汉大学一直居于学科建设与发展的前列。武汉大学马克思主义学院作为学科建设和发展的主要承担者，学院的教师和研究人員为此付出了极大的辛劳，作出了极大的贡献。现在编纂出版的《武汉大学马克思主义理论系列学术丛书》就是其中的部分研究成果。

回顾马克思主义理论学科建设和发展的实际，给我们的重要启示之一就是，马克思主义理论学科的建设和发展，既要尊重学科建设和发展的普遍规律，又要遵循学科建设和发展的特殊要求，要切实提高马克思主义理论学科的影响力。希望《武汉大学马克思主义理论系列学术丛书》的出版，能为切实提升马克思主义理论学科的影响力增添新的光彩。

第一，要提高马克思主义理论学科建设的学术影响力。把提高学术影响力放在首位，是从学科建设视阈理解马克思主义理论学科建设的 yêu求。学科建设以学术为基础。马克思主义理论作为一个整体的一级学科，在提升学科的学术性时，要按照学科建设内在的普遍的要求，使之具有明确的学科内涵、确定的学科规范和完善的学科体系。

学术影响力是学科建设的重要目标，也是学科建设水平的重要体现。马克思主义理论学科的学术影响力，不仅在于国内的学术影响力，还应该树立世界眼光，产生国际的学术影响力。在国际学术界，马克思主义理论是以学术研究为基本特征和主要导向的。注重马克思主义理论的学术研究，不仅有利于达到学科建设的基本要求，而且还有利于国际

范围内的马克思主义理论研究的交流，产生国际的学术影响力。比如，一个时期以来，国际学术界对《德意志意识形态》《共产党宣言》等文本、传播的研究，马克思经济学手稿的研究，科学考据版《马克思恩格斯全集》（MEGA2）的编辑与研究等，就是国际范围内马克思主义理论学术研究的重要课题。作为以马克思主义为指导的社会主义国家，在马克思主义理论学科建设和发展中，不但要高度关注和重视世界范围内马克思主义理论研究的重大课题，而且要参与国际范围内马克思主义理论重大课题的研究。在国际马克思主义学术论坛上，我们要有更广泛的话语权，要能够更深刻地了解别人在研究什么、研究的目的是什么、研究到什么程度、有哪些重要的理论成就、产生了哪些理论的和实践的成效等。如果一方面强调建设和发展马克思主义理论学科，另一方面却在国际马克思主义论坛上被边缘化，这肯定不是我们希望看到的学科建设的结局。

第二，要提高对中国特色社会主义理论与实践的影响力。任何学科都有其特定的应用价值。马克思主义理论学科对中国特色社会主义理论与实践的影响力，就是这一学科应用价值的重要体现，也是这一学科建设和发展的重要目标和根本使命。在实现这一影响力中，深化中国特色社会主义理论体系的研究是重点；运用中国特色社会主义理论体系于实践、以此推进和创新中国特色社会主义理论体系是根本。马克思主义理论学科对中国特色社会主义理论与实践的影响力，要体现在对什么是马克思主义、怎样对待马克思主义，什么是社会主义、怎样建设社会主义，建设什么样的党、怎样建设党，实现什么样的发展、怎样发展等重大问题的不断探索上，并对这些问题作出新的理论概括，不断增强理论的说服力和感召力，推进中国特色社会主义理论体系的发展。马克思主义理论学科的建设和发展，一定要对中国特色社会主义的经济、政治、文化、社会、生态文明建设以及党的建设的理论与实践产生重要的影响力，为中国特色社会主义道路发展中的重大理论和实践问题的解决提供基本的指导思想，充分体现学科建设的应用价值。

第三，要提高对国家主流意识形态发展和安全的影响力。马克思主义作为党和国家的指导思想，自然是中国特色社会主义的主流意识形态。要深刻理解马克思主义理论学科的特定研究对象。马克思主义是我们立党立国的根本指导思想，社会主义意识形态的旗帜，是社会主义核心价值体系

的灵魂，是全党全国各族人民团结奋斗、夺取建设中国特色社会主义新胜利的共同思想基础。在学科建设中，我们要以高度的政治意识、大局意识和责任意识，进一步推进马克思主义中国化的发展和创新，进一步巩固马克思主义在思想政治理论领域的指导地位，进一步增强社会主义核心价值观体系的建设成效，进一步维护和发展国家意识形态的安全。

建设马克思主义学习型政党作为新世纪党的建设重大而紧迫的战略任务，对马克思主义理论学科建设提出了新的更高的要求。建设马克思主义学习型政党的首要任务，就是要按照科学理论武装、具有世界眼光、善于把握规律、富有创新精神的要求，坚持马克思主义作为立党立国的根本指导思想，紧密结合我国国情和时代特征大力推进理论创新，在实践中检验真理、发展真理，用发展着的马克思主义指导新的实践。

第四，要提高全社会的思想理论素质，加强全社会的思想政治教育的影响力。全社会的思想理论素质是一定社会的软实力的具体体现，也是一定社会的国家综合实力的重要组成部分。特别是在青少年思想道德教育、大学生思想政治教育中，如何切实提高马克思主义理论学科的影响力，是当前马克思主义理论学科建设的最为重要和最为紧迫的任务和使命。在这一意义上，我们可以认为，马克思主义理论学科的影响力，首先就应该体现在大学生思想政治理论课程建设的全过程中。用马克思主义理论，特别是用当代发展的马克思主义理论，即中国特色社会主义理论体系教育人民、武装人民的头脑，内化为全体人民的思想观念与理论共识，是马克思主义理论学科建设的艰巨任务，特别是其中的思想政治教育学科建设和发展的重要目标。

以上提到的四个方面的影响力——学术的影响力、现实应用的影响力、意识形态的影响力和思想政治教育的影响力等，对马克思主义理论学科发展是具有战略意义的。在对四个方面影响力的理解中，既不能强调学科建设和发展的学术性而否认学科建设和发展的政治性与意识形态性；也不能只顾学科建设和发展的政治性与意识形态性而忽略学科建设和发展的学术性。要从学科建设的战略高度，全面地探索和提高马克思主义理论学科建设和发展的影响力。

我衷心地希望，《武汉大学马克思主义理论系列学术丛书》能在提高以上四个方面影响力上作出新的贡献！

摘 要

“‘以人为本’的形上之思”，目的是从根本上回答“以人为本究竟是什么”，“人究竟何以为本”，“以人为本究竟何以可能”以及“以人为本的终极追求究竟是什么”等四个元哲学层次的问题。

“以人为本究竟是什么”。何谓“以人为本”，可以从四个“关键词”来解读：其一，以人为本是以什么“人”为本？“以人为本”必须体现“类”的向度，但要防止无视其他物类的人类中心主义；“以人为本”必须体现“群体”向度，但要防止用集体压制个人的集体专制主义和社会整体主义；“以人为本”必须体现个体向度，但要防止个人至上的极端个人主义。其二，以人为本是以人的“什么”为本？在社会主义初级阶段，“以人为本”不是以个别人、少数人的利益为本，也不是以所有人的利益为本，而是以最广大人民的利益为本；不是以最广大人民的“某些”利益或“所有”利益为本，而是以最广大人民的“根本”利益为本。其三，以人为本的“主体”是什么？从广义上讲，人人都是“以人为本”的实践主体，“以人为本”应该成为全社会各个阶层以及每个人的历史主体意识的一种自觉表现；从狭义上讲，其主体是中国共产党，贯彻和落实“以人为本”的科学发展观，关键在党。其四，以人为本的“本”是什么？以人为本的“本”不是指“本体”，而是指“根本”。科学发展观的“以人为本”不是一个本体论的概念，而是一个价值论、历史观的概念。

“人究竟何以为本”。科学发展观的“以人为本”，缘于价值观层面的讨论而起，却可以于存在论（本体论，下同）的高度展开。人学本体论探讨的是“人是什么”的问题，“以人为本”探讨的是“如何对待人”的问题。前者是本体论问题，后者是价值论问题。两者之间具有内在的逻辑关联，这就是：对“人是什么”的回答直接决定了对“如何对待人”的回答；或者说，要正确地回答“如何对待人”的问题有赖于正确地回答“人是什么”的问题。“以人为本”，价值论上缘起，存在论上解决。

寻找“逻各斯”是西方传统人学难以撼动的存在论情结，实体本体

论的纠缠是西方传统人学始终无法摆脱的强大理论传统。西方传统人学在追寻“实体”的过程中，遗忘了现实的人；在寻找“安身立命之本”的同时，却陷入了“无家可归”的境地。西方传统人学将某种物性实体、神性实体、理性实体奉为人的最高原因和最终根据，所以，在现实生活中，人也只能奉它们为本，人本向度被深深地遮蔽起来。

西方传统人学在黑格尔那里达到了顶峰，人学的发展开始呈现出从抽象的理性向现实的感性回归的趋向。在这条回归之路上，费尔巴哈是一个举足轻重、绕不开的人物。费尔巴哈第一次把“感性”提升到了本体论的地位，力图实现存在论的“感性”转向，但他终归未能贯彻到底而停留于“感性直观”的抽象层次上。感性直观本体论的滥觞使长久以来被深深遮蔽的人本向度燃起了新生的希望，但终归只是长久压抑之下的低度伸张和本能反抗，一回到现实生活世界，人本学的虚弱与感性本体论的贫乏就显露无遗了。

“存在论追究”是马克思人学不可或缺的意义维度。从马克思的文本看来，人之存在的存在论根据就在于“人的感性生活活动本身”，由此确立了具有现代生存向度的本体论——感性生活本体论。相对于传统本体论而言，感性生活本体论的出场是人学思想史上发生的一次“存在论断裂”，标志着通行于西方两千多年的实体本体论传统的彻底“崩塌”，标志着超感性的知性实体的统治秩序的彻底“瓦解”，标志着实体本体论的坚硬内核的彻底“摧毁”。感性生活本体论科学回答了“人是什么”的本体论问题，从而也科学解决了“应该如何对待人”的价值论问题。马克思的这一存在论境界直截了当地说明人类社会应当而且必须“以人为本”，历史上曾经出现的所谓“物本”、“神本”、“君本”、“资本”等等都是一种本末倒置、舍本求末的表现。

“以人为本究竟何以可能”。众所周知，尽管西方的人本主义传统历史久远，思想丰富，但理论的丰富不等于理论的成熟。西方传统人学由于其理论本身的缺陷，“以人为本”都遭遇了同样的命运：空想。马克思主义人学全面超越了西方传统人学的理论缺陷，为人们提供了一个正确认识和改造自己、实现人的自由全面发展的强大理论武器，推动“以人为本”实现了第一次历史性飞跃：从空想走向了科学。

“以人为本”的理论维度与实践维度并不完全是一致的。经典马克思主义致力于未来理想社会来理解“以人为本”，而当代中国则主要立足于

现实来推进“以人为本”，这就产生了理想性的“以人为本”与现实性的“以人为本”的分野。马克思主义人学的诞生标志着“以人为本”具备了理论上的可能性，但可能性不等于现实性。在马克思那个时代，“以人为本”已经不是一种空想，但却仍然只是一种理想。社会主义从理论变为实践以后，“以人为本”才逐渐从理想变为现实，这是“以人为本”的第二次历史性飞跃。

“以人为本的终极追求究竟是什么”。马克思主义认为，共产主义社会是“以每个人的全面而自由的发展为基本原则的社会形式”，实现“每个人的自由全面发展”是马克思主义的终极关怀，人类历史发展不可能有比每个人的自由全面发展基础上的“自由个性”更高的理想了。如果说尊重人的自由权利、促进人的全面发展是“以人为本”的基本要义的话，那么，“每个人的自由全面发展”无非就是“以每个人为本”的同义语，“以每个人为本”也无非就是要求实现“每个人的自由全面发展”。既然实现“每个人的自由全面发展”是共产主义社会的终极追求，那么，“以每个人为本”也就必然是“以人为本”的终极追求和最高境界。

“以每个人为本”与“以个人为本”是完全异质的。“以人为本”必须落实到个体，但不能降低为“以个人为本”。“以每个人为本”既不是个体主义的命题，也不是整体主义的命题，而是一个彻底的集体主义的命题，是集体主义的最高表现和完成形态。共产主义社会是“以每个人为本”的社会。共产主义的实现意味着“以每个人为本”的实现，但不是“以每个人为本”的完成。“以每个人为本”从来都不是、也永远不可能是一种完全成就了的事实，永远不可能完全地、一无遗漏地得到实现。“以每个人为本”永无止境、永在途中。

关键词：以人为本 西方传统人学 马克思主义人学 存在论 元哲学 以每个人为本

Abstract

“The metaphysical research on People – Oriented Approach” aims at giving a fundamental answer to the four meta – theoretical level problems, that is: “What is ‘people oriented?’”, “Why people are oriented?”, “Why people oriented can be reality?” and “What is the ultimate pursuit of ‘people oriented’?”.

“What is ‘people oriented’?”. As to what is “people oriented”, it can be explained from four “key words” following: Firstly, what does the “people” of “people oriented” refer to? There are three dimensions: class, group and individual. The existences of human being include class existence, group existence and individual existence, “people oriented” ought to be surveyed and studied from this three dimensions also. “People oriented” must reflect the “Class” dimensions, but prevent from Anthropocentrism which disregards other species; “people oriented” must reflect the “Group” dimension, but prevent from Collective Absolutism of which the collective suppresses the individuals; “people oriented” must reflect the “Individual” dimension, but prevent from extreme individualism that is personal supremacy. Secondly, what is the object of “people oriented”? China is still in the initial stage of Socialism and is a class society, “people oriented” is not oriented in each individual, not in the interests of the minority and everyone, but in the interests of the overwhelming majority of the people; not in the “certain” benefits or “all” interests of the overwhelming majority, but in most people’s “fundamental” interests. Thirdly, who is the subject of “people oriented”? Broadly speaking, everyone is the main practical subject of “people – oriented”. “People oriented” should be a conscious performance of the historical – subject and democratic sense of the whole sectors and everyone in the society. In the narrow sense, its subject is the Communist Party of China (CPC). The key of implementing and applying the

Scientific Outlook on Development of “people oriented” is the CPC. Fourthly, what is the basis of “people oriented” refer to? It does not refer to the “noumenon”, but means the “fundamentality”. The “people oriented” of the Scientific Outlook on Development is not an ontological concept, but a concept of value theory and an idea of history viewpoint.

“Why people are oriented?” The beginning of the “people oriented” in the Scientific Outlook on Development was due to the discussion of values, but it can be expanded in the level of Ontology. The hominology ontology mainly emphasizes “what is human?” though “people oriented” mainly talks about the issue “how to treat people”. The former is an ontological problem, the latter is a value problem. There is inherent logic association between them, that is: the answer to “what is human?” will determine the answer to “how to deal with people”. In other words, giving a correct answer to the question “how to deal with people” depends on a correct answer to the question “what is human?”. The origin of “people oriented” is the problem of values, but it should be solved on the ontology level.

As we all know, looking for “logos” is a consistent complex of the western traditional hominology. The entanglement of the substantial ontology is a strong theoretical tradition that the western traditional hominology can not get rid of. The western traditional hominology forgot the real people when they were in the process of pursuing the “identity” (logos); at the same time, they fell into the “homeless” situation when they were looking for “the foundation of Man”. The road of searching for the “substance” leads to “a road of enslavement of people”. The western traditional hominology regards some physical properties substance, divinity substance, rational substance as the ultimate reason and base for the person. So in the real life, people have to see them as the foundation, and the humanistic dimension was covered.

The western traditional hominology study reached its peak in Hegel and started to appear a trend that is from abstract rationality to returning to realistic sensibility. In this regression road, Feuerbach was a significant figure who can not be avoided. Feuerbach firstly elevated the “sensibility” to the status of ontology, trying to realize a sensitive turning of the ontology, but he failed to car-

ry it out in the end and only stopped in an abstract level of sensibility. Feuerbach's perception ontology is exactly perceptual – intuitive ontology. Although Feuerbach shouted the slogan “the main body of the god is rationality” passionately in order to counter the primary theological principle “I am what I am”, which opened up a new path that replaced “God is the highest human nature” by “Man is the highest human nature” and greatly shook the hard core of theological ontology as well as the value orientation of “god oriented”, but failed to complete the noble mission of “pushing over the god authority to restore human supremacy”. Although Feuerbach put forward the scientific proposition “the subject of rationality is human” with full of wisdom to counter the modern philosophical tradition “rationality materialization”, which opened up a new direction of ending the rationalist tradition that is “I think therefore I am” by “I wish therefore I am”, but ultimately failed to get rid of the strong tradition of blasphemy of the rationality ontology. The beginning of the perceptual – intuitive ontology gives a new hope to the humanistic dimension which was deeply covered for a long time. But after all, it is only low extension and instinctive resistance under a long suppression. When returns to the real life, the weakness of the humanistic science and the poorness of the intuitive ontology were fully exposed.

Ontology – Pursuits an indispensable meaning dimension of Marx's hominology. It appears in Marx's texts that the basis of the ontology that human existence lies in the “human perceptual living activities”, which established ontology with modern survival dimension which was called “perceptual – living ontology”. Compared with the traditional ontology, the appearance of perceptual – living ontology is an “ontology break” in the history of hominology thought. It indicates a thorough collapse of the two – thousand – years tradition of substantial ontology and a complete destroy of the ruling order of the ultra – perceptual intellectual substance and an absolute disruption of the hard core of substantial ontology. The perceptual – living ontology gives a scientific answer to the ontology problem about “what is human?” and correctly solves the values problem about “how to deal with people”. The western traditional hominology seeks the base of why human can be human from the external of the human, thus the human is

situated in a subordinate situation and is dominated by the physical properties substance, the divinity substance and the rational substance which are out of the human being. Marx's answer of "what is human?" is: the base why human can be human is the human perceptual livings activities themselves. Thus the answer to "how to deal with people" is "people oriented". The Marx's ontology realm shows that it does not need the substances outside the human being to confirm the human – being existence, does not need the subjects out of the human being to regulate the development process for human being and does not need credit the greatness and nobleness of human being to the physical properties substance, the divinity substance and the rational substance. The status, value and dignity of human do not require the God's security, which directly shows that the human society and the history should and must take the human being as the basis. The emergence of the so – called "material first", "god first", "monarchy first", "capital first" and so on are all performances of putting cart before the horse.

"Why people oriented can be reality?" As is known to us that the western humanism tradition has a long history, it is rich in ideas and has a complete system. However, the abundance of theory is not equal to its maturity. The traditional western hominology didn't solve the problems followed: "In what world can people be oriented?", "What do the 'people' of 'people oriented' refer to?", "How people can be oriented?", "How to achieve 'people oriented'?" and so on. Due to the own shortcomings of the traditional western hominology, the "people oriented" suffered from the same fate: fantasy. Marxist hominology surpasses the fault of the traditional western hominology comprehensively, providing a powerful theoretical weapons of recognizing and rebuilding themselves as well as promoting the "people oriented" to achieve its first historic leap: from escapism to science.

There are differences between the theoretical dimension and practical dimension of "people oriented". Classical Marxism is dedicated to understand the "people oriented" in the future ideal society, but the contemporary China promotes the "people oriented" mainly based on the reality, which generate a distinction between the ideal "people oriented" and the realistic "people oriented".

ted” and derive another issue that how “people oriented” can achieve “the return from ideality to reality” as well as “the transition from reality to ideality”. The birth of Marxist hominology indicates the “people oriented” has a theoretical possibility, however the possibility is not equal to the reality. In the Marx’s era, “people – oriented” was not a fantasy, but still an ideal. After Socialism becomes practice from theory, “people oriented” also turns into reality from ideality gradually. But Socialism is a constantly perfected process, the realistic “people oriented” is also a transition process from non – ideal condition to the ideal. Viewed from the practice of Socialism, “people oriented” becomes reality from ideality in the fact level and tends to ideality from reality in the value level gradually, these changes are two aspects of the same progress. At present, China is still in the primary stage of Socialism which will last a long time, and still far away from the ideal “people oriented” society that Marx and Engels have envisaged. The distance is also the gap between realistic “people oriented” and the ideal “people oriented”. Contemporary China should promote “people oriented” to become reality from all aspects, including material conditions, political foundation, system security, ecological conditions, cultural environment and so on. At the same time, we should push “people oriented” from reality to ideality by improving the level of “people oriented” continuously. The practices of “people oriented” in Socialist countries are a unity of “the return from ideality to reality” and “the transition from reality to ideality” as well as a unity of “ideality actualization” and “actuality idealization”, which realized the second historic leap of “people oriented”.

“What is the ultimate pursuit of ‘people oriented’?” Marxism considers the Communism as “a social form whose basic principle is the full and free development of each individual,” to achieve “the full and free development of each individual” is its ultimate concern. It is the supreme ideal to get a free individuality based on the free and full development of each individual. If we say that respecting human freedom rights and promoting human development are the basic meanings of “people oriented”, then “the free and full development of each individual” is a synonym of “taking everyone as the basis”, “taking everyone as the basis” just means “achieving free and full development of each in-

dividual”. Now that realizing “the free and full development of each individual” is the ultimate pursuit of the future Communism, then “taking everyone as the basis” must be the supreme pursuit and the highest state of “people oriented”. “People oriented” must lay down in everyone, but not in individual. “Taking everyone as the basis” is completely heterogeneous from “taking individual as the basis”. “Taking everyone as the basis” is neither individualism nor a holism proposition, but an absolute collectivism proposition and is the maximum features and completion forms of the collectivism. It is only the Communist society that can be the society which “takes everyone as the basis”. Presently, “taking everyone as the basis” has not been reality, however, it is no longer an irrealistic illusion. The realization of Communist society means the implementation of “taking everyone as the basis”, but not the accomplishment of it. “Taking everyone as the basis” has never been and will never be a finished fact, it can not be achieved completely and comprehensively. It will be ever – lasting and always on the way.

Key words: Scientific Outlook on Development; People Oriented; Ontology; Meta – Philosophy; Take Everyone as the Basis

目 录

导 论	(1)
一 选题依据及其意义	(1)
二 主要内容	(4)
三 重要观点	(9)
四 主要创新点	(11)
五 研究方法	(13)
第一章 何谓“以人为本”	(17)
一 以人为本是以什么“人”为本	(17)
二 以人为本是以人的“什么”为本	(24)
三 以人为本的“主体”是什么	(33)
四 以人为本的“本”是什么	(35)
第二章 “以人为本”的边界厘定	(41)
一 从“包含关系”解读以人为本	(41)
二 从“交叉关系”解读以人为本	(44)
三 从“对立关系”解读以人为本	(48)
四 从“并列关系”解读以人为本	(51)
第三章 “人何以为本”的存在论之思（一） ——实体本体论的僭妄与人本向度的深度遮蔽	(54)
一 迷恋实体：西方传统人学难以撼动的“存在论情结”	(56)
二 困境与悖论：寻找“安身立命之本”却陷入“无家可归之境”	(65)
三 “人本”维度：一个尚未开启的意义领域	(71)