

画说经典
Classics Explained
by Cartoons

西方学者眼中的

「奥」雷立柏 著
Leopold Leeb

中西文化

Chinese and Western Culture in the
Eyes of a Western Scholar

之七

圣经故事——从夏娃到女娲

Bible Stories - From Eve to Nüwa



中国书籍出版社
China Book Press

画说经典之七

Classics Explained by Cartoons VII

西方学者眼中的中西文化

(Chinese and Western

Culture in the Eyes of a Western Scholar)

圣经故事——从夏娃到女娲

(Bible Stories—From Eve to Nüwa)

(奥)雷立柏(Leopold Leeb) 著

中国书籍出版社

China Book Press

图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

圣经故事：从夏娃到女娲：汉英对照 / (奥) 雷立
柏 (leeb, L.) 著. —北京：中国书籍出版社，2012. 7
(画说经典：西方学者眼中的中西文化)
ISBN 978 - 7 - 5068 - 3017 - 1

I. ①圣… II. ①雷… III. ①比较文化—中国、西方
国家—图解 IV. ①G04—64

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2012) 第 156318 号

策划编辑 / 李国永

责任编辑 / 赵丽君 刘洁琼

特邀编辑 / 苑文轩

责任印制 / 孙马飞 张智勇

封面设计 / 王 冰

出版发行 / 中国书籍出版社

地址：北京市丰台区三路居路 97 号（邮编：100073）

电话：(010) 52257143（总编室）(010) 52257153（发行部）

电子邮箱：chinabp@vip. sina. com

经 销 / 全国新华书店

印 刷 / 北京温林源印刷有限公司

开 本 / 880 毫米×1230 毫米 1/32

印 张 / 7.25

字 数 / 119 千字

版 次 / 2012 年 9 月第 1 版 2012 年 9 月第 1 次印刷

书 号 / ISBN 978 - 7 - 5068 - 3017 - 1

定 价 / 98.00 元

《画说经典》序

北京大学 汤一介

我曾经为蔡志忠用漫画方式画的《孔子传》在大陆出版写过“序”，由于孔子是一个人，虽然是圣人，但他的生平、事迹及某些思想毕竟有个述说的范围。但是，雷立柏博士《话说经典》包容的内容太广，几乎涉及古今中外的一切哲学问题，甚至可说是人神的一切文化问题。因此，这篇“序”实在难写。不过有了文本《画说经典》而使我大开眼界。我想，如果能选一个角度来说点看法，也许可以尝试地写点什么。在我阅读《画说经典》的过程中，使我想到在中外经典中大概都反映出不同文化中所包含的思想往往既具有其“特殊价值”意义的因素，又具有某些“普遍价值”意义的因素。比较中外文化所具有的“特殊价值”的意义固然重要，但寻求不同民族文化中的“普遍价值”的意义却也不能忽视。

在我据《画说经典》讨论上述问题之前，要有所说明：（1）因为此《画说经典》，既是画说，要了解画面所示的意义不容易；又是“经典”，那了解其真谛就难了，因为对“经典”的理解往往是“仁者见仁”，“智者见智”的。（2）《画说经典》所涉及问题太广，因而只能选择两个例子来说说我要讨论的问题。

我想，任何民族文化的形成都是由地理环境的不同和历史经验积累的差异、甚至某些偶然因素形成的，所以不可能完全相同是必然的。试以本书中关于“天时、地利、人和”来说明之。在《刘备与奥德修斯、摩西》中认为，（1）从中国（《三国演义》）的传统看：“值得注意的是：‘天时’、‘地利’、‘人和’都是人所占据的，似乎在神明的影响之外。”（2）古希腊人的观念则有所不同，“在《奥德赛》中，宙斯决定人们的命运，‘宙斯’……与dies（天）也有关系。……就‘地利’来说，古希腊人将地、大海和阴间归属于不同的神明。比如说，奥德修斯一次又一次祈求了一个河神保护他不受他的敌人波塞冬的危害”。但“奥德修斯和刘备一样是一个能够‘得人心’的人，他也‘可占人和’。”（3）“对《圣经》来说，天时、地利和人际关系都是‘由上主创造的’，也就是说，它不属于任何别的神灵的管辖。”“在《圣经》中，‘天时’、‘地利’和‘人和’都是上主掌握的，但同时也在一个特殊的意义上属于人的管理。”是什么“特殊的意义”？我认为，这“特殊的意义”应是“上主”所授与的。所以归根到底，“天时”、“地利”、“人和”的决定权仍在主上。

这三种对待“天时”、“地利”、“人和”的不同，也许从一个侧面表现了三种文化的不同：

《三国演义》（中国传统）：“天时、地利、人和”皆由人。盖孔子“不语怪力乱神”，有某种无神论倾向。

《奥德赛》（古希腊传统）：“天时”、“地利”多由众神来管辖，而“人和”则可以由“人”来实现。此或为多神倾向。

《圣经》（希伯来传统）：“天时”、“地利”、“人和”都是上主掌握，此当为一神教倾向。

三种不同文化所表现的三种不同倾向，我认为它们都是有意义的。中国传统文化的最高理想是“内圣外王”，看重的是人自身的力量。当然，这种模式在实际社会生活中容易形成“人治”，

而不利于“法治”的建立。不过它对“德性”的修养有所帮助，也许其“特殊价值”正在于此。在古希腊传统中，有宙斯大神和众多的诸神，由它们决定人的命运，不过人对诸神的祈求（即对超越的外在力量的祈求）可以改变其命运，这是否可以说人的意志是能有所作为的，这种模式是否也具有某种“特殊价值”的意义？至于希伯来的《圣经》传统，由于人类社会全然要由外在的超越力量来支配，是不是预示着人类社会的维系需要一种不为人的个人意志所左右的“法治”来维护。这种模式同样具有“特殊价值”的意义。就此，我认为不同民族的传统中的某些思想如果从文化史上看往往都有其“特殊价值”的意义。

在《孔子与马可·奥勒留》中，有一节是讨论“自由意志”（Free will）的问题，在《论语》中确实没有出现“自由意志”这四个字连在一起的词组。至于由西拉的孙子从希伯来语译成希腊语的《德训篇》和奥勒留自己亲手写的《沉思录》中有没有出现过“Free will”这一词组我不知道，因为我没有读过这两篇书。什么是“自由意志”？在西方中世纪哲学中，特别是基督教哲学中曾讨论过“上帝存在”、“意志自由”、“灵魂不灭”三大问题。然而，如果我们把“自由意志”作为一个哲学问题来讨论，也许本书作者在“自由意志”一节中所说的“只要人愿意，他可以实现美德”，可以说是对“自由意志”最简明的解释。在这一节中所引用的《论语》、《德训篇》和《沉思录》的话，都是说的“只要人愿意，他可以实现美德”。

孔子所说的“我欲仁，斯仁至矣”，并不很简单，是要经过“修身”才有可能。而“修身”在儒家的思想体系中十分重要，在出土的《郭店楚简·性自命出》中说：“闻道反己，修身者也。”知道做人的道理，就必须反求诸己，这就是“修身”。又说：“修身近至仁。”“修身”是达到实现“仁”的境界的必由之路。实现“仁”是孔子追求的最高美德。而实现“仁”必须是自

觉的，所以孔子说：“朝闻道，夕死可矣！”这是一种极高境界的意志力。孔子又说：“杀身成仁。”为了实现其“仁者，爱人”的理想，他可以自觉地为此而牺牲。孟子又说：“舍生取义”。他认为，在“正义”和“私利”发生矛盾时，你应该毫不迟疑地选择“正义”，而“理智和正义”正是《沉思录》中的两条原则（4：26）。因此，我认为在孔孟的思想中，实现美德是自己自觉自愿的选择。文天祥为什么自觉自愿地选择“死”，这难道没有一点“自由意志”的意味吗？

《画说经典》的作者在“自由意志”一节中说：“《德训篇》指出，人不可以怪命运和上主，但他必须为自己的行动负责任，因为他拥有自由意志。”这是不是“自由意志”（Free will）作为一个词组第一次出现？如果是，那无疑是极其可贵的。如果不是，那我们应该注意到《德训篇》把“自由意志”和“责任”联系在一起，这确实可以说是指导人类社会的智慧之光。作者引用《德训篇》中的一段话：“……上主在起初就造了人，并赋给他自决的能力；又给他定了法律和诫命。假使你愿意，就能遵守他的诫命；成为一个忠信的人，完全在于你自愿。……”这段话说明，尽管人实现美德是上主的律令，但人要真正在行动中实现上主律令要求的美德，他必须是“自愿”的。人的“生死善恶，都在人面前：人愿意那样，（上主）就赐给他那样”。这就是说，虽然上主赋予了人“自决的能力”，至于人如何利用这种“自决的能力”去为善为恶，那就要靠人的意愿了。就这个意义上说实现为善为恶终究要靠自决自愿。这种“自决自愿”无论如何也是一种“自由意志”的体现。所以我常常记得安德烈·纪德的一句话：“神出主意，人做主意。”

《画说经典》的作者在《孔子与马可·奥勒留》的《自足的德行》一节中引用了《沉思录》的一段话：“观照内心。善的源泉是在内心，如果你挖掘，它将汨汨地涌出。”尽管奥勒留认为，

人应该在“尊奉心中的神”的前提下“观照内心”，因为“神”在你心中。然而“观照内心”是要你在自己内心去挖掘“善的源泉”，这样“善”的美德才能“汨汨地涌出”。所以在“自由意志”中作者引奥勒留的话：“理性灵魂有下列性质：它观察自身，分析自身，把自身塑造成它所选择的模样，它自己享受自己的成果，……它达到它自己的目的而不管生命的界限终于何处。”（11：1）人成善成德要靠你自己内省（观察自身，分析自身）要求在生活中把自己塑造成什么模样，这是你意志力的自由选择。我想，这虽与孔孟的道德理想的“自由意志”在表现形式上有所不同，但就其特别重视基于“意志力”的选择却是对“自由意志”的极高明的表述。

如果我们可以不同传统的文化中找到以不同形式、不同出发点、不同理论基础表述的“自由意志”的意义的因素，那么我们能不能说“自由意志”具有某种“普遍价值”的意义？今天人类社会在全球化的形势下，如何找到“共存”之道？我想，我们必须努力发掘在人类文化中所确实存在着“普遍价值”意义的因素。我认为，不承认在各个不同民族的文化中都存有的“普遍价值”意义的因素，那么很可能走上文化上的“相对主义”，认为没有什么“真理”（哪怕是相对性的真理），只能是“公说公有理”、“婆说婆有理”了。这样在不同文化之间就很难形成对话，很难找到共同的话语，很难对遇到的共同的问题达成某种解决的共识。虽说“真理”总是带有理想性的人类所追求的目标，但它总给人们以“希望”。

雷立柏博士花了很大的力气写这本《画说经典》，图文并茂，涉及的问题广泛，有哲学的、宗教的、伦理的、文学艺术的、政治法律的、自然科学的种种方面，这无疑是个极难的学术研究项目。我不能说，他画写的已是尽善尽美，但这本《画说经典》可以启迪人们的思考，同时也告诉我们应该重视“经典”。中国古

老的经典《周易》常说《易》有三义：不易、变易和简易。我们不是说文化中确定具有讨论文化中的“普遍价值”是有某种“不易”的因素；而不同民族文化中的“特殊价值”具有某种“变易”的意义，因为由于各种因素，如时间、空间、条件等等的不同，文化总是在变动中形成，因而我们必须承认各种民族文化中特有的东西往往对人类社会也是有意义的。而“真理”的表述常常是很“简易”的，并不一定那么深奥难测的。上天给了人智慧，人必须学习以便了解并在生活实践中运用这“智慧”。因此，在《孔子与马可·奥勒留》的《开头和宗旨》一节中说：“一本书开头也许会暗示其基本宗旨。”作者指出《论语》、《德训篇》和《沉思录》的开头讲的都是“学习”。我认为，这是雷立柏的智慧。我们必须谦虚，向“经典”学习。这也许就是《画说经典》的意义。

汤一介

2010年7月23日

Preface

(Prof. Tang Yijie, Peking University,
Department of Philosophy)

Some time ago I was asked to write a preface for Cai Zhizhong's *Life of Confucius*, a book which also contains many cartoons. However, Confucius is one individual person, and therefore the scope of that book was limited. The *Classics Explained by Cartoons* of Dr. Leo Leeb have a very wide horizon, they deal with many philosophical questions of antiquity and modernity, of China and the West, they even contain cultural

questions related to God and humankind. Thus it is very hard to write a proper preface for this collection of drawings. The explanations of the drawings were a great eye-opener for me, and as I contemplated these drawings I felt that the different classical books always reflect some elements of “special values” and at the same time also present some elements of “universal values”. In the comparison of Chinese and other cultures the “special values” are surely important, but neither should the “universal values” be neglected.

Before I will discuss this question as it appears in these cartoons, I want to clarify two points: First, these booklets contain drawings and discuss classical books; the drawings are perhaps not always easy to understand, and even the meaning of the classical books is not easy to grasp, since the classics are often interpreted in many different ways. Secondly, the problems and questions raised in these booklets are so manifold that I can only choose two examples to elaborate my own views.

I think the culture of any people has been slowly formed by historical accretion, by the geographical environment, and even by some accidental elements, thus the different cultures can obviously not be similar in every respect. If we take the chapter “Time, Space and Society” from the series about Liu Bei and Odysseus, the author thinks (1) that in the *Three Kingdoms* it is interesting that all these three factors (timely circumstances, geographical advantages, and the allegiance of men) are in the possession of certain human beings and beyond the influence of the gods. (2) The view of the Greeks was different. In the *Odyssee* Zeus determines the fate of the people. . . Zeus has to do with the Latin

word ‘dies’, which means day... The regions of the earth, of the sea and of the underworld were divided among different gods and goddesses, for example, Odysseus prayed once to a river god to protect him from his enemy, Poseidon, the god of the sea. “However, as to ‘the allegiance of men’, Odysseus himself is known to ‘win the hearts of the people’, just like Liu Bei.” (3) In the Bible, time, the wide earth, and human relations are all created by God, that is to say, they do not belong to the domain of any other god... Therefore time, space, and society are under God’s guidance and given to human stewardship in a special way. What does “in a special way” mean? I think it is insofar as they are given by God, thus in the last analysis the power of deciding time, space, and allegiances of men rests with God.

Seen from this new perspective these three views regarding “time, space and human relationships” can tell us something about the differences between the three cultures:

The *Three Kingdoms* (Chinese tradition) says, that “time, space and society” are determined by human beings, and thus if Confucius does not talk about strange forces and disorderly gods, there is some atheist tendency.

The *Odyssey* (the tradition of ancient Greece) often has the gods decide “time and space”, but human contacts are accomplished by men, which is the tendency of polytheism.

The Bible (the Hebrew tradition) lets God control “time, space and social relationships”, which is the tendency of monotheism.

These three cultures express three different tendencies, but I think all three of them are very meaningful. The highest ideal of

Chinese tradition is the inner sage and outer king (nei sheng wai wang), which emphasizes the potential of man as such. Of course, in the practical social life this model easily becomes the model of the rule of men and does not help to establish the “rule of law”. However, this model helps to foster moral education, and perhaps its special value lies here. In the Greek tradition mighty Zeus and many other gods decide the fate of a person, but the prayer to the gods (which is the prayer to a transcending power outside man) can change the human destiny. Perhaps one could say that here the human will has its function, and perhaps this model also constitutes a “special value”? As to the Hebrew and Biblical tradition, human society is dominated by a transcending power coming from outside, which perhaps suggests that human society needs a rule of law that does not depend on any individual human will. And this model again has a “special value”. Thus I believe that exactly because of the difference of ethnic traditions their cultural and historical expressions often contain some “special values”.

In the series about Confucius and Marcus Aurelius one chapter discusses the problem of the free will. Indeed, in the *Analects* Confucius does not directly mention the free will“. As to whether in the *Book of Sirach* and in Aurelius' *Meditations* there appears the expression free will, I do not know, because I have not read these books. What is the free will? Medieval western philosophers discussed three profound topics: the existence of God, the immortality of the soul and the free will. However, as a philosophical problem the free will is perhaps what the author of this passage means when he says “the realization of virtue simply

depends only on a man's intentions", which might serve as a simple explanation of the free will. In this chapter we find quotations from the *Analects*, from the *Book of Sirach*, and from the *Meditations*, which all seem to say: the realization of virtue simply depends on a person's intention.

Confucius' famous word "You only have to really want benevolence, and it will come" is certainly not a shallow phrase, since it also demands the "cultivation of the person" (xiu shen). The xiu shen is very important in the Confucianist tradition, and it implies that someone who understands the meaning of human life must in all situations turn back to himself (fan qiu zhu ji). Another passage reads "the cultivation of the person approaches benevolence" (xiu shen jin zhi ren), thus the cultivation of the person "is the way to attain the lofty ideal of benevolence". Benevolence (ren) was the highest virtue in Confucius' thought. The practice of benevolence needs self-awareness and a strong will, even to the point that Confucius demands to sacrifice one's body and accomplish benevolence (sha shen cheng ren). In order to realize the ideal of a benevolent person loving others (ren zhe ai ren) Confucius would consciously sacrifice himself. Mencius again says "she sheng qu yi" (to sacrifice life to obtain justice). He thinks that when facing the choice between justice and personal benefit "you should choose justice" without any reluctance. Reason and justice "are also two central principles of the *Meditations* (4:26), thus I think that in Mencius' thinking the practice of virtue is a personal, self-conscious, and voluntary choice. Why could the hero Wen Tianxiang (1236 — 1283) consciously and voluntarily "choose death"? Was that not an

expression of the free will?

The author of the *Classics Explained by Cartoons* says in the chapter about the free will: Sirach points out that anyone is responsible for his deeds because of his free will. "Perhaps in these passages there is an early or even the first discussion of the free will", which is very precious. We should pay attention to the way how this text links free will "and responsibility", which is truly a wise insight and a guiding light for humankind. The author quotes Sirach: "When God in the beginning created man, He made him subject to his own free choice. If you choose you can keep the commandments; it is loyalty to do His will. "In this passage, although the practice of virtue may be seen as the law and commandment of God, but if a person really wants to live out the virtues of the divine law, he or she must do it voluntarily. Before man are life and death, whichever he chooses shall be given him. This is to say that even if the "free choice" of a person has been given by God, it depends on the human will and decision how he or she uses this power to make a free choice. In this regard we can say that good and evil deeds finally depend on the free choice and free will of a person, thus I often remember a word from Andre Gide: God proposes, and man disposes.

If we can find in different cultural traditions with different theoretical bases and different approaches the same common elements of a free will, can we then say that the free will has the meaning of a "universal value"? How can our human society in the era of globalization find to a fruitful way of coexistence? I think we have to work hard to find more elements of the "universal values" which are really there in different traditions. I

believe if we do not admit that there are some universal values in the cultures of different peoples, we are likely to go down the road of relativism and will deny the existence of any truth (even relative truth), and finally each one will only talk to himself. In this way it will be very hard to find to a dialogue between the cultures, we will not find a common language and even less arrive at common solutions for our common problems. Some say the truth is only some ideals beyond reach, but these ideals and aims still can give us hope.

It took Dr. Leo Leeb much time and energy to write this *Classics Explained by Cartoons*, since each drawing also has an explanation and the scope of the questions is very wide, comprising philosophy, religion, ethics, literature and esthetics, politics and law, and even the sciences. This is doubtless a huge and very difficult project for academic research, and I cannot say that all the drawings are perfect, but the drawings and the explanations can provoke us to think, and at the same time they tell us that the classics should be respected. The old Chinese classic *Yijing (Book of Changes)* often mentions three concepts: unchanging (bu yi), changing (bian yi) and simplified change (jian yi). Thus we cannot say the “universal values” within different cultures have some unchanging (bu yi) elements, but we rather say that the “special values” of different peoples have some changing (bian yi) elements, because culture is always in the process of becoming, and thus we should admit that the special elements of all cultures are meaningful for the human society at large. The expression of truth is often “simplified change” (jian yi), it is not necessarily so mysterious and hard to

understand. God gives human beings wisdom, and we humans should try to learn and understand and practice this wisdom in our lives. Thus in the chapter “The Beginning is the End” of the booklet about Confucius and Marcus Aurelius we find this sentence: “The beginning of a book can show its main orientation”. The author points out that the *Analects*, the *Book of Sirach* and the *Meditations* all open with a passage on learning”. This, I believe, is the wisdom of Leo Leeb. We should be humble students of the classics. Perhaps this is the meaning of this *Classics Explained by Cartoons*.

Tang Yijie

July 23rd, 2010, Beijing

序

中国社会科学院 卓新平

谈起哲学、宗教、神学，人们会很自然地想起亚里士多德的形而上学和黑格尔的思辨体系，感到玄而又玄、深不可测。然而，用简单的线条和点睛之笔，使这些深奥神秘的“玄学”变得通俗易懂、一目了然，则可谓这一探询之路上的曲径通幽、别有洞天。在此，摆在读者面前的这些漫画和中英文简短说明，就是奥地利学者雷立柏博士尝试将上述“玄”学变为“显”学之匠心独到的探索和创举。

雷立柏博士受过西方哲学、神学和古典语言的系统训练，又在北京留学和研习多年，读完中国哲学和宗教的博士学位，因而视野开阔、兴趣广泛，对于中国和西方思想文化的比较研究尤为专心。在其创作的漫画中，我们可以看到关涉上述比较的多种题材，既有宏观叙述、又有微观切入，如“屈原与科学的突破”、“简明思想史”、“圣经故事”、“超越东西方的心灵家园”、“西方人看汉字的奥妙”、“先知灵感与《猫城记》”、“刘备与奥德修斯、摩西”、“孔子与马可·奥勒留”、“窦娥与安提戈涅、苏撒纳”、“皇帝与恺撒”等。这些题材涉及到中西思想文化史的方方面面，论及众多人物，触及各种问题，并引述了不少历史故事、文化典故和民间传说。对此，雷立柏博士有自己的提问、解答和立意。他没有太多的论证和系统的分析，而是以漫画这种形式对之加以图解，用简练的笔触勾勒出其关键之处，同时附以少量文字对之作出画龙点睛的说明。这样，一种图解哲学、艺化宗教和美术神