Theology and Interpretation

Journal for the Study of Christian Culture

神学与诠释
基督教文化学刊

（第10辑 · 2003 秋）

Theology and Interpretation

Journal for the Study of Christian Culture

神学与诠释
基督教文化学刊

(第10辑 · 2003 秋

神学与诠释
基督教文化学刊（第 10 辑·2003 秋）
中国人民大学基督教文化研究所　主编

编者絮语　神学的公共性与人文
学者的神学关怀

《基督教文化学刊》编辑部

就大陆的学术语境而言，有关基督教神学的研究大多是被"客串"的。这固然与神学尚不能独立进入学术建制的事实有关，同时可能也是由于教会内的神学话语仍然与学术性语境存有较大差异。而这两方面都涉及神学的公共性问题。简而言之，其一应当将我们引向神学研究之所以可能被"客串"的学理依据；其二则需要思考教会内的神学如何才可以在世俗社会中立身、并实现自己的价值。惟有充分意识到这两方面的公共性，基督教的"信仰群体"才能承担"话语群体"的潜能。

如果不惮攀附之嫌，"客串神学"之角色至少可以追溯到C.S.路易斯，其最为典型的"客串"成果则有《如此基督教》①。"如此"者，"纯粹"、"惟独"之谓也，这几乎是与卡尔·巴特同宗；而作为剑桥大学文学教授的C.S.路易斯不仅在BBC广播电台大谈基督教，还能被大多数信仰者和神学家所接受。可见，对神学的"客串"未必总是"野狐禅"。从另一方面看，这也说明神学完全可以正当地进入公共话语和社会生活，完全可以更

---

① 〔英〕C.S.路易斯：《如此基督教》（C.S.Lewis, *Mere Christianity*），台南，东南亚神学院协会，1991。

多地被人文学术所分享，而不必闭锁在教会的高墙之中。前人如此，那么今人如何呢？

就人文学研究而言，"客串"神学或者借鉴神学资源的关键，并不在于什么"比较研究"的方法论冲动，更非出于"跑马圈地"的权宜之计，甚至也与汉语学术中所谓"失语"的危机无关。需要扪心自问的，其实只是一个更基本的问题，即：人文学研究（或者"我"的研究），是否一定需要神学的视角、神学的维度和神学的研究空间？如果回答是否定的，则神学根本不应该属于人文学者的（或者"我"的）问题领域。强作撮合，未免两难。如果回答是肯定的，则必须依据人文学本身的限度，给出一种根本的理由。

从亚里士多德区分"纯粹的知识"、"实践的知识"和"创造的知识"等知识论模式，到康德建立知、意、情的批判框架，乃至哈贝马斯对操作领域与意义领域、"社会系统"与"生活世界"的判别，追寻真知、维系道德和表达情感，始终是西方人文学的三个基本路向。1960 年代美国学者组成的"人文学委员会"（Commission of Humanities），将"人文学"的概念限定于语言学、哲学、史学、文学、宗教学和艺术学的研究①，其意蕴也大体如一。中国当然有自己的人文学传统，不过自近代以来，即使是中国的本土思想其实也越来越多地采用西方的概念工具和理解范式。因此以上述三种路向来描述总体的人文经验，似并不为过。于是，我们便会遇到一系列难解的问题。

问题之一：对真知的追寻，最终是要面对"真理"与"真理

---

① 就此杜维明曾谈到："人生的价值问题、生命的意义问题、真善美的理想问题、……人的自我超升问题，一旦被逐出主流哲学的领域，便成为神学……所……关注的对象。"杜维明：《宗教学：从神学到人文学》，载《当代》，香港，第 23 期，22～23 页，1998。

的陈述"之间的绝对张力。正因为我们永远也无法使二者全然弥合，康德才会"作减法"，才宁愿将"理性的对象"界说为"人为自然立法"的那个"世界"，而不是"世界本身"①；同样，维特根斯坦也因此才相信"世界的意义注定是在世界之外"②；伽达默尔因此才宣称"能够被理解的存在就是语言"③。然而，如果一种"知"需要我们一再地限定，如果一种"知"只能求得逻辑上的自圆，它在何种意义上还能算是"真知"呢？

问题之二：对道德的维系，最终必须处理伦理行为与价值理想、"道德正当"与"绝对正义"之间的关联和分别。因而从"自然法学派"的先哲们开始，人与上帝之间的"约定"便遭到否弃，并被置换为人类出于"自我保全"和获得稳定利益的本能而相互达成的契约，"道德"、"法律"、"国家"均由此而得到解释。④ 但是当"道德"仅仅成为利益平衡的产物、当"正义"与否完全可能由于不同的处境和立场得到截然相反的证明时，"善"岂不是一个最为可疑的概念？一切最不道德的行为岂不都可以被论说为"道德"？

问题之三：对情感的表达，最终是要为"不可见"的理想找到"惟一可见的形式"。所以从柏拉图开始，"美在于彼岸"（普罗提诺）⑤、诗要"将世界浪漫化"（诺瓦利斯）⑥、"艺术要……

---

① ［德］康德：《判断力批判·导言》，第三章，第 IX 节，见杨祖陶、邓晓芒编译：《康德三大批判精粹》，北京，人民出版社，2001。

② ［英］维特根斯坦：《逻辑哲学论》，郭英译，94 页，北京，商务印书馆，1985。

③ Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, translated by Garpett Barden & John Cumming, New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1975, p.432. 另见 ［德］伽达默尔：《真理与方法》，洪汉鼎译，606 页，上海，上海译文出版社，1994。

④ 参见杨慧林：《西方文论概要》，第五章，第二节，北京，中国人民大学出版社，2003。

⑤ ［古罗马］普罗提诺：《九章集》，见章安祺编订：《缪灵珠美学译文集》，第一卷，缪朗山译，北京，中国人民大学出版社，1998。

⑥ 刘小枫主编：《20 世纪西方宗教哲学文选》，下卷，1293～1294 页，上海，上海三联书店，1994。

呈现无法呈现的东西"（利奥塔德）①　始终是西方文论和美学长河中的一道主潮，有时连哲学家也会去借助一种"诗性的道说"（海德格尔）②。而在现代人的审美实践中，所谓"诗性的智慧"和"艺术的符号"似乎不得不逐渐蜕变；或者成为一种关于符号的理论，或者成为最直接的感性体验和宣泄。就前者而论，"符号理论只是……洞见了'洞见在本质上的不可能'；其意义产生于对……'终极无意义性'的认识；其真理则是描述'人类可能不存在绝对真理'的事实。"③　就后者而言，一方面是大众消费着审美情感，同时大众也被"时尚"所消费；而另一方面，"对艺术本身的崇拜……又成为新的宗教"④。

　　基于如上的问题，神学才必须、而且必然进入人文学者的研究视野，神学诠释学、神学伦理学和神学美学的相应关注才成为正当和有效的。在此，久已有之的话题不能不被再度重申：神学诠释学最具普遍性的问题，就是在承认认识的有限性、理性的有限性、解释的有限性之前提下，如何确认"意义"；神学伦理学的追索，是在意识到人类价值的片面性、相对性和自相矛盾性的同时，如何落实善的要求；神学美学则是要超越艺术的教化目的和审美目的，使之与人类的终极体悟及其自我拯救相沟通，从而表达深层的精神期待。

　　五年以来，中国人民大学基督教文化研究所主办的《基督教

---

　　① ［法］利奥塔德：《呈现无法显示的东西——崇高》，见《世界文论》编辑委员会编：《后现代主义》（第二辑），北京，社会科学文献出版社，1993。

　　② ［德］海德格尔：《现象学与神学》，见刘小枫选编：《海德格尔与神学》，孙周兴译，香港，汉语基督教文化研究所，1998。

　　③ ［德］库舍尔：《笑：神学沉思录》，周辉等译，原文页码 36 页，香港，道风书社，2003。

　　④ Daniel Bell, *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism*, p.35, New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1976.

文化学刊》已经出版十辑，而自第八辑改版以后，每辑集中讨论一个主题已成惯例，故而有《俗世的神学》、《信仰的伦理》和《神学与诠释》三卷。为了进一步落实上述思路并就教于各界方家，我们拟在未来三年内陆续推出以下选题：

第 11 辑：神学的公共性（重点讨论神学话语在人文学领域及当代社会的有效性和正当性）

第 12 辑：对话的神学（重点讨论基督教神学本身的对话性质及其对当代多元文化的回应）

第 13 辑：选择穷人（重点讨论"全球化"和"后殖民"时代的基督教）

第 14 辑：虚己与非空（重点讨论佛教的"空"、"非空"与基督教的"虚己"和"自我倾空"）

第 15 辑：审美的神学（重点讨论基督教与文学、艺术、美学及审美体验的关联）

第 16 辑：神学的神话（重点讨论神学的叙事、逻辑及其与人文学的同构或对人文学的启发）

人文学的根本性质，有时恰是在无路可退的神学意义上才格外得到彰显。惟愿神学的逻辑能够在语言的牢笼之外支撑起一片天地，使我们抛弃任何僭越的妄想，却仍然有力量承担起看护意义的责任。

Editor's Foreword
The Publicity of Theology and the Humanist's Theological Concern

Christian theology has been studied and researched within China's academic circles, but largely in an adjunct capacity. Obviously this is in part because theology has yet to be accepted as an independent field within the academic structure of China. But it may also be true that there is a significant difference between the theological language within the church and the academic context. In both cases, we face the issue of theology's publicity. Simply put, exploring the issue can help us (1) to understand the reason for theology's allegation to an adjunct position, and (2) how theology can move from the confines of the church into secular society and establish its relevance. Only as these two aspects of theology's publicity are understood, can the "faith community" of the Christian Church realize its potential as a "community of discourse".

Preposterous as the association may appear to some, we would like to trace the origin of "adjunct theology" to C.S.Lewis. We credit to the success of adjunct theology, works such as *Mere Christianity*.[1]

---

[1] C.S.Lewis, *Mere Christianity*, Tainan: Southeast Asia Theological Association, 1991.

"Mere" means "pure" or "only", in the very tradition of Karl Barth. As Cambridge University's Chair of Literature, C. S. Lewis not only discussed Christianity on the BBC radio program, but was widely accepted by theologians and laity alike. Therefore, an adjunct role need not imply diminution of quality or significance. C. S. Lewis has shown us that theology could dialogue with the public and address society in a meaningful way. It is therefore deserving of greater appreciation by students and scholars of the humanities, and should not be cloistered within the walls of the church. If this was possible in times past, why not today?

From the standpoint of humanities research, the raison d'etre of "adjunct theology" or theology as a resource or reference, is not simply for the sake of "comparative" or "interdisciplinary" study, or a case of what scholars would call "the crisis of the lost word". In all honesty, there should be just one basic question: does humanities research (or the study of "self") require the theological perspective, its breadth and the creation of a space for theological studies? If the answer is no, then theology has no part in the humanities or the inquiry of "self". There is no point in forcing an alliance. But if the answer is yes, then we must offer a legitimate reason for its place according to the parameters of humanities.

From the Aristotle's epistemological distinctions between "pure knowledge", "practical knowledge" and "creative knowledge", to Kant's critical framework based on the distinctions of "reason", "volition" and "emotion", to Jürgen Habermas's definitions of the realm of action versus the realm of awareness, of "societal system" versus "the world of daily living" — in all these ideas are three

fundamental elements: the pursuit of truth, the maintenance of morality, and the expression of human emotion. In the 1960's, the Commission of Humanities, founded by American scholars, defined "Humanities" as research in the fields of linguistics, philosophy, literature, religion, and art. [1] The definition encompasses the same fundamental elements. China, understandably, has its own tradition of Humanities. But in recent years, indigenous Chinese thought has increasingly adopted these western conceptual tools and interpretive frameworks. Therefore, it is not unreasonable to choose to describe the entire humanist experience along these three fundamental lines. In so doing, we encounter a series of challenging questions.

Question One: in the pursuit of truth, one encounters the tension between "truth" and the "narration of truth". Because there is no seamless match between the two, Kant had to resort to "reductionism", defining the objective world of reason as the world in which man legislates for nature, distinguishing it from the "world itself"[2]. For the same reason, Wittgenstein believed that the awareness of the world necessarily exists outside the world itself[3], while Hans-Georg Gadamer propounded that language is existence

---

[1] Du Weiming said, "Once the questions of the value and meaning of life, the ideals of truth, goodness and beauty... and man's own self-transcendence are expelled from the mainstream of philosophical discourse, they become... the object of concern for theology." "Religious Study: from Theology to Humanities", published in Times, vol.23, March, 1998, pp.22–23.

[2] Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Reason: Preface*, 3: IX, refer to *Selections from Kant's Three Major Critiques*, translated and edited by Yang Zhutao and Deng Xiaomang, Beijing: People's University of China Press, 2001.

[3] Ludwig Josef Johan Wittgenstein, *Philosophy of Logic*, translated by Guo Ying, Beijing: Commercial Printing Press, 1985, p.94.

that can be understood. [1] If "knowledge" has to be redefined time and time again, and can only explain itself by logic, in what sense is this knowledge "true knowledge"?

Question Two: in maintaining morality, we must ultimately deal with the relationship and distinction between ethical conduct and value thinking, "moral oughtness" and "absolute rightness". Since the early philosophers who believe in natural law, God's "covenant" with man has been discarded in favor of mutual contract between men to ensure self-preservation and mutual benefit, thus explaining the evolution of "morality", "law" and "nations"[2]. However, if "morality" is simply the product of an effort to balance benefits, and "rightness", a mere factor of situations and viewpoints so that it can entertain completely opposite interpretations as situations and viewpoints shift, then wouldn't "goodness" become a highly dubious concept? Any immoral behavior can be justified as moral, depending on the situation and one's point of view.

Question Three: in expressing emotion, the ultimate purpose is to find the unique visible form that embodies the invisible ideal. Beginning with Plato, beauty lies on the distant shores (Plotinus)[3],

---

[1] Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, translated by Garpett Barden & John Cumming, New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1975, p.432. See also, *Truth and Method*, translated by Hung Ying, Shanghai: Shanghai Translations Publishing House, 1994, p.606.

[2] Refer to Yang Huilin's *Guide to the Western Literary Theory*, chapter 5, section 2, Beijing: Renmin University of China Press, 2003.

[3] Plotinus, *Aneades*, translated by Miao Langshan, see Zhang Anqi edited, *The Collection of Aesthetical Translations by Miao Langshan*, Vol.1, Beijing: Renmin University of China Press, 1998.

poetry must romanticize the world (Novalis)[1], and art expresses the inexpressible (Jean-Francois Lyontard).[2] Ultimately, they form the mainstream of western literary theory and aesthetics. On occasion, even philosophers would borrow from "poetic narrative" (Heidigger)[3]. In modern man's practice of artistic appreciation, the so-called "poetic wisdom" and "artistic symbolism" have been transformed, having become a theory about symbols or a direct sensory experience or expression. In the former case, the theory of symbols is the perception of what is by nature imperceptible, deriving its meaning from realizing the ultimate meaninglessness of things, and presenting the reality that possibly absolute truth does not exist for humanity.[4] In the latter case, sensory expression has become a commodity of public consumption. Meantime, the public is itself consumed by what is "trendy". Art itself has become a new religion, an object of worship.[5]

Based on the questions above, it is imperative and natural for theology to become part of humanities' field of vision. Only then will theological hermeneutics, ethics, and aesthetics and their

----

[1]   *The Reader of Western Religious & Philosophical Studies in 20ᵗʰ Century*, edited by Liu Xiaofeng, Shanghai: Shanghai Sanlian Bookstore, 1994, pp.1293−1294.

[2]   Jean-François Lyontard, *Sublimity: to express what is inexpressible*, see *Postmodernism*, 2ⁿᵈ issue, Beijing: Social Sciences Documental Press, 1993.

[3]   Martin Heidigger, *Phenomenology and Theology*, *translated by Sun Zhouxing*, *see Heidigger and Theology*, *edited by Liu Xiaofeng*, Hong Kong: ISCS Press, 2003, p.36.

[4]   Karl-Josef Kuschel, *Laughter*, translated by Zhou Hui, Hong Kong: ISCS Press, 2003, p.36.

[5]   Daniel Bell, *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism*, New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1976, p.35.

complementary concerns become legitimate and consequential. Here, we must reiterate the following issues: (1) The commonest question in theological hermeneutics is how one can confirm "meaning" given the premise that knowledge, reason, and interpretation are all finite. (2) Recognizing that human values are relative, contradictory, and often reflect limited points of reference, theological ethics asks how man can fulfill the imperative of goodness. (3) Theological aesthetics seeks to transcend the instructional purpose and appreciation of art, so that art communicates with man's ultimate encounter and self-redemption, in the process of which it expresses the depth of man's spiritual longing.

Over the past five years, the Institute for the Study of Christian Culture at the People's University of China has published ten issues of the *Journal for the Study of Christian Culture*. Since Issue No.8, we have focused on a chosen theme in each issue: "Secular Theology", "Religious Ethics", and "Theology and Interpretation". Along the same line, the following themes will appear in our publications for the next three years:

Issue 11: The Publicity of Theology (focus: Theological language, its effectiveness and legitimacy in the Humanities and contemporary society)

Issue 12: Theology of Dialogue (focus: the nature of dialogue in Christian theology and its response to contemporary pluralism.)

Issue 13: Option for the Poor (focus: globalization and post-colonial Christianity)

Issue 14: Kenosis & "Double Negation of Emptiness" (focus:

Buddhist notions of "emptiness" and "non-emptiness" and Christian notions of "kenosis" and "self-emptying")

Issue 15: Theology of Artistic Appreciation (focus: the relationship between Christianity and literature, art, aesthetics and artistic appreciation and experience)

Issue 16: The Myth of Theology (focus: the narrative and logic of theology, structural similarities with or inspiration for humanities)

At times, the very quintessence of humanities will be all the more manifested when it is encounters the ultimate theological consciousness. Only the logic of theology may probably break through the prison of language and open up a new vista so that we can cast aside all fantasies of playing the role of God and at the same time find the strength to exercise our responsibility of guarding human consciousness.

征稿启事暨匿名审稿制度说明

　　《基督教文化学刊》（简称《学刊》）由中国人民大学基督教文化研究所（佛教与宗教学理论研究所宗教学理论研究室）主办，并得到国际教育服务机构（PESI）的支持，先后由东方出版社、人民日报出版社和宗教文化出版社出版，凡九辑。为便于编辑工作，《学刊》自第十辑起将改由中国人民大学出版社承担出版及发行工作，相应调整谨请学界朋友留意。

　　《学刊》每年于清明、寒露之际，各出一辑；所设栏目的名称，均选自基督教初入中土时的景教文典，以示纪念。改版后，《学刊》将每辑推出一个论题，特别欢迎有关中国文化与基督教的对话、基督教思想家研究、理论与经典读解、基督教文化与文学研究、基督教与社会—伦理问题研究、汉语基督教史料研究、书评及新书介绍等方面的来稿，并拟酌情选译当代西方宗教学研究之重要文献。选题计划请参阅《学刊》"编辑絮语"。

　　《学刊》出版以来，承蒙海内外学界同仁予以厚爱，并赐寄鸿篇，中国人民大学基督教文化研究所及《学刊》编辑部对此感铭在心。然自创刊伊始，本刊便对全部来稿实行严格的匿名评审。因此或有学界硕儒而遭退稿者，切望谅解。

　　国际间实行匿名审稿制度的学术出版物，对来稿格式要求甚严。格式不规范之稿件，通常不予评审。本刊作者遍及大陆、港台、欧洲、北美，行文习惯各异，注释方式不一。为确保匿名审稿工作的顺利进行，谨将来稿格式规定如下，供有意赐稿之学人参考：

1. 本刊所用稿件长短不限，但一般以 8 000—15 000 字为宜。

2. 来稿可用电子邮件传送，但应寄送相应文字稿件。

3. 译文请寄原文复印件，并负版权责任。

4. 注释请用脚注，其格式为：［国籍］（中国作者不必注国籍）作者名：书名，版别，卷次，页码，出版地，出版时间。引自外文书目者，不必翻译，照录原文。

5. 请务必提供内容提要（中、英文各 500 字）和作者简介（中、英文各 100 字）。

6. 编辑部收到格式规范的来稿后，将匿去作者姓名，根据所及内容送交两位以上的有关专家（祖国大陆和海外各一）进行评审；《学刊》主编将参照专家填写的匿名评审书处理稿件。

7. 本刊自收到稿件之日起，即视为获得版权转让；其间如有任何变化，务请作者立即通知本刊。

《学刊》所发文章虽不必代表编辑部和出版社之观点，但我们愿以"和而不同"为鉴，为中外学人、教俗两界的神交提供更多的机会。

中国人民大学基督教文化研究所
《基督教文化学刊》编辑部
联系地址：100872，北京中关村大街 59 号
　　　　　中国人民大学 7 号信箱
电子邮件地址：meiying@ruc.edu.cn