

Western Marxism and Theology
Journal for the Study of Christian Culture

西方马克思主义与神学

基督教文化学刊

(第24辑·2010秋)

中国人民大学基督教文化研究所主办



基督教文化出版社

Western Marxism and Theology

Journal for the Study of Christian Culture

西方马克思主义与神学

基督教文化学刊

(第24辑·2010秋)

中国人民大学基督教文化研究所主办



图书在版编目(CIP)数据

基督教文化学刊。第 24 辑, 西方马克思主义与神学/中国人民大学基督教文化研究所编.--北京: 宗教文化出版社, 2010.12

ISBN 978-7-80254-348-5

I. ①基… II. ①中… III. ①基督教-宗教文化-研究-丛刊 IV. ①B978-55
中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2010)第 249151 号

西方马克思主义与神学

基督教文化学刊

中国人民大学基督教文化研究所 主办

出版发行: 宗教文化出版社

地 址: 北京市西城区后海北沿 44 号(100009)

电 话: 64095216(发行部) 64073175(编辑部)

责任编辑: 贾玉梅 温 洁

封面设计: 司博文

印 刷: 北京柯蓝博泰印务有限公司

版权专有 不得翻印

版本记录: 880×1230 毫米 32 开本 10.5 印张 280 千字

2010 年 12 月第 1 版 2010 年 12 月第 1 次印刷

书 号: ISBN 978-7-80254—348-5

定 价: 28.00 元

编者絮语：西方马克思主义与神学

耿幼壮 中国人民大学

对于《基督教文化学刊》来说，“西方马克思主义与神学”并不是一个新主题。在已经出版的 23 辑中，除散见的相关论文外，至少有两辑的主题与此密切相关，它们分别为《选择穷人》（第 16 辑，2006 年秋季号）和《批判理论与神学》（第 22 辑，2009 年秋季号）。其实，如该两辑编者已经指出的，“选择穷人”与“批判理论”正是西方马克思主义与神学的两个关联所在，或者说根本就是一种关联的两个向度。一方面，“神学家们通常认为，‘选择穷人’的观念来自解放神学与马克思主义的某种结合，却始终可以在基督教信仰和社会教义中找到依据。”^①另一方面，“批判理论作为‘新马克思主义’的一支，【虽然】积极于抵抗历史现实中的种种宰制状况，……【但其】本身甚至可以【被】视为一种‘隐蔽神学’或神学的世俗化形态。”^②

^① 杨慧林：“编者絮语：‘穷人’何谓？”，《基督教文化学刊》第 16 辑，北京：宗教文化出版社，2007 年，第 2 页。

^② 林子淳：“编者絮语：批判理论与神学的对话”，《基督教文化学刊》第 19 辑，北京：宗教文化出版社，2009 年，第 1-2 页。

那么，西方马克思主义与神学之间的关联到底何在呢？就最一般的意义而言，即是在马克思异化思想和基督教末世学说的理论背景下，诉诸受压迫群体的独特经验和边缘话语，对现实社会和人类生存处境进行否定性批判乃至抵抗，进而寻求一种乌托邦/弥赛亚希望和审美/政治解放。阿多诺（Theodor Adorno）和霍克海默（Max Horkheimer）意义上的“否定神学”、布洛赫（Ernst Bloch）和莫尔特曼（Jurgen Moltmann）的希望神学，古铁雷斯（Gustavo Gutierrez）及其后的各种解放神学，如黑人神学、女性神学等，无不可以从这一角度加以理解。即使在新一代西方马克思主义者那里，我们仍能看到沿着这一思路继续进行的探讨。其中，一个最明显的例证就是英国著名西方马克思主义批评家伊格尔顿（Terry Eagleton）在其近年来的“神学转向”中所进行的相关思考。

2 2003年，伊格尔顿出版了一部题为《理论之后》（*After Theory*）的著作。今天来看，这部著作并不算十分出色，但其标题却具有一种强烈的象征意义。有学者认为，这部著作的出现表明，“由于新理论浪潮在整个60年代发展出来的理论话语模式已经不足以用于解说一种紧迫的、后千禧年的政治境遇，为了把握和批判这些新状况，左派必须要运用一些新概念。”^①的确，大约就是在这部著作问世前后，伊格尔顿开始重新回到基督教神学传统，试图寻找一些新的理论资源，其早年论述中曾经涉及的一些神学论题也再度出现。例如，在谈及德行和伦理时，伊格尔顿在亚里士多德的幸福、犹太-基督教的爱和马克思的社会主义之间找到了一种关联。他特别指出，犹太-基督教传统将亚里士多德的有

^① James Smith, *Terry Eagleton: A Critical Introduction*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2008, 150.

德行的幸福生活理解为爱的生活，这意味着人与人之间的一种相互实现，而“这种伦理学的政治形式就是社会主义”。因为，如马克思所说，每个人的自由发展是所有人的自由发展的前提条件。^①再有，在谈及道德问题时，身体问题得到了特别的强调。伊格尔顿指出，正是由于身体的存在，我们才能够谈论作为普遍性的道德问题。因为，正是通过身体，我们才能够互相连接在一起。作为人类存在是给定的最可见标志，身体成为我向他人呈现的方式，而这一呈现又必定以将我排除的方式实现。这样，身体的非个人性便与爱的无名性联系在一起。^②最值得注意的是，在谈及解放和革命时，圣经意义上的贫困者（anawim）主题再次出现。伊格尔顿声称，世上的不幸者在《旧约》中被称之为 anawim，他们作为现在的失败者是未来的希望所在，而耶稣就被《新约》的作者们视作 anawim 的代表。^③

事实上，早在 1960 年代，伊格尔顿就已经开始关注这一主题。例如，在《作为语言的身体：一种“新左派”神学的纲要》（*The Body as Language: Outline of a “New Left” Theology*, 1970）中，伊格尔顿就已经指出，《圣经》意义上的贫困者与马克思所说的无产阶级有着密不可分的联系。他在这部早期著作中，对于“贫困者”或“穷人”有这样的讨论：

对于基督教徒来说，神圣在世界中的呈现主要有两种形式：基督既呈现在我们称之为教堂的符号结构中，也以更为根本的方式呈现在被压迫者和被剥削者之间。这些人，旧约中的 anawim，曾经为基督在八福中所提及，就是落在精心编

^① Terry Eagleton, *After Theory*, New York: Basic Books, 2003, 122.

^② Terry Eagleton, *After Theory*, 167.

^③ Terry Eagleton, *After Theory*, 175-176.

织的社会政治结构之外的“污垢”，他们是不为社会所容纳的人；这样一来，他们就成为对社会制度的一种有力挑战，一种有效的和神圣的革命力量。以其自身所是，他们代表着处于一种社会秩序中心的辩证矛盾；他们是处在社会边缘和缝隙之处的社会失败、无组织的和无结构生活的一种标志，对此，社会秩序不摧毁自身就无法加以解决。^①

不难发现，在伊格尔顿的早期思想中，“选择穷人”已经是其“批判理论”的一个核心问题。在伊格尔顿 2000 年以后的“神学转向”中，对于贫困者的分析和对于悲剧性的探讨则构成了这个核心问题的两个方面。

例如，在出版于 2002 年的《甜蜜的暴力：悲剧观念》(Sweet Violence: The Idea of the Tragic) 中，伊格尔顿在耶稣受难时的表现中看到了痛苦、暴力和死亡可能引发的革命性转变。伊格尔顿发现，如同对待他人的或者说一般意义上的苦难一样，耶稣本人对于自己的苦难也持有一种反感和抗拒的态度。在死亡之际，“耶稣只剩下了对其称之为父者的一种绝望的信念，尽管这一有能力者现在似乎已经抛弃了他。但是，正是这种被遗弃之痛，于一个经典悲剧故事中品尝到最后一滴苦涩的被遗弃之痛，才可能成为再生的生命源泉。重要的是这个故事所具有的政治意义。人类的穷困状况若想得到彻底改变，就必须被完整经历一遍，必须被挤压到一种无意义和悲苦的坠入地狱之极限，而不是被否认、补救或躲避。”^②这也就是说，耶稣受难这一事件之所以是悲剧性的，

^① Terry Eagleton, *The Body as Language: Outline of a "New Left" Theology*, London: Sheed and Ward, 1970, 67-68.

^② Terry Eagleton, *Sweet Violence: The Idea of the Tragic*, London: Wiley-Blackwell, 2002, 37.

就在于这一死亡是不可避免的和无条件的，因而是一种不带有任
何补偿性的真正牺牲。用伊格尔顿的话来说，这是一种绝境。不
过，也只是因为如此，这一死亡才可能是富有成果的。在对作为
“贫穷者”代表的耶稣本人的悲剧命运进行了详尽讨论之后，伊
格尔顿自然而然地得出了这样的结论：“马克思主义和基督教试图
补救的正是人类的悲剧状况，但它们也都只有将自己置于悲剧的
中心才有可能实现。马克思主义是对阶级社会的内在批判，而非
对其的乌托邦替代；而对基督教来说，复活也包含在十字架上的
受难和堕入地狱。否则，对于二者来说，被改变的就不会是这种
状况，即处于全然的绝境和绝望之中。”^①

2007年，伊格尔顿为弗雷泽（Giles Fraser）选编的《福音书》
新版撰写了一篇很长的引言，再次深入阐发“选择穷人”的主题，
即圣经意义上的贫困者主题。在这篇文章中，伊格尔顿坚称，耶
稣在其生活的那个苦难时刻以天启式语言所描绘的第二次降临的
真正意义在于：“拯救并不在于宗教仪式或行为法规，而在于送出一
片面包、一杯白水。天国令人吃惊地呈现出唯物主义色彩，它是
非现世的只在于其意指着未来人类状况的改变，而不是说那是
死后的幸福或不能实现的允诺。”^②至于如何实现这一人类状况
的改变，则在于一种革命性反转。这是伊格尔顿反复讨论的主题，
只是这次 *anawim* 的典型是圣母玛利亚。在全文引述了天主教的
《圣母玛利亚颂》后，伊格尔顿再次对 *anawim* 主题进行了详尽
的阐发：

这种革命性反转的主题在《旧约》神学中累见不鲜。耶

^① Terry Eagleton, *Sweet Violence: The Idea of the Tragic*, 40.

^② Terry Eagleton, Introduction to *The Gospels*, selected and Annotated by Giles Fraser, London: Verso, 2007, xviii.

和华既无形象又无名字，但是当你看到穷人得到提升而富人被剥夺财富时，你就知道他是谁了。最深刻的苦难和最强烈的兴奋密切相连，这是犹太教传统主题之一；同时也在西方悲剧中不断出现。真正的力量源自无能为力，其典型例证就是耶稣在十字架上殉难和复活的学说。穷人和受剥削者是当权者失败的标志，因为他们说明了当权者为获得权力制造了多少苦难。在这个意义上，一无所有者是公正社会的负面形象。他们也的确如此，因为与他们的统治者相比，他们几乎没有没有什么可以失去，因而也就对这一社会的改变更有兴趣。玛利亚本身是这种革命性反转的典型，作为一个身份卑微的加利利妇女，她别无选择地成为耶稣的母亲。在一个重大的时刻，她的地位得到提升，而上帝却屈尊以血肉之躯进入她的腹中。在这个意义上，路加把玛利亚当作《旧约》称之为“贫穷者”的一个标志，圣保罗更是粗鄙地将之称作“世上的屎”——无用、无力、遭受遗弃，但在他们身上却强烈体现着即将到来的王国。^①

在一定程度上，伊格尔顿近年来的这些思考和论述可以被称之为一种“革命神学”，其显然是对早期西方马克思主义者们所提出的“否定神学”、希望神学和解放神学的一种补充和延续。不过，也正因为如此，其存在的问题和限度也是明确无误的。首先，即使他自己不会承认甚至持反对态度，但在其著述中似乎始终存在着一种将宗教与政治问题审美化的趋向。其次，尽管他个人持有的一种毫不妥协的政治态度和积极的实践精神，但其思想却带有浓厚的乌托邦色彩。最后，在理论形态上，伊格尔顿的“革命神学”

^① Terry Eagleton, Introduction to *The Gospels*, xix-xx.

固然旗帜鲜明，却似乎略显粗糙和简单。即使在其更富有理论深度的新著《与陌生者的麻烦：伦理学研究》(Trouble With Strangers: A Study of Ethics, 2008)中，上述几点仍然清晰可见。例如，在借助拉康理论分析圣餐仪式后，伊格尔顿得出了这样一种直接的推论：“复活的耶稣，上帝之道，是带有语言的所有普遍有效性的人的身体。我们已经看到，在圣餐食物中，这一身体的‘真实’，通过其自死亡的牺牲过渡为标志，如何以一种如同意义被呈现在词语之中的方式，呈现在面包和酒，即圣餐参与者之间象征交流的媒介的普遍‘语言’之中。这样，真实界和象征秩序便被混合为一种行动。……于是，圣餐欢庆，一种会饮式的和他人同在，就像一种爱的节庆，预示着一个和平与正义的未来王国。”^①从这一段落可以看出，在伊格尔顿的神学思想中，身体始终处于一个中心位置，由此进入到与“穷人”相关的苦难、死亡、恶、暴力与革命等问题；而圣餐仪式既是起点又是终点，他者与交往，爱与解放，和平与正义，希望与未来等问题都可以藉此得到说明和实现。不过，这样的进路似乎有些过于仓促和直接。

尽管如此，伊格尔顿的“神学转向”仍然是一个最鲜明的表征，它表明在当代西方马克思主义理论界，转向神学传统来探讨我们时代的文化和政治问题，俨然成为一种潮流。如詹姆斯·史密斯(James Smith)已经指出的，“在这个历史时刻，伊格尔顿并不是转而思考神学话语和基督教传统中激进隐含内容的唯一左翼知识分子，著名理论家齐泽克、德里达和巴丢属于三个最引人注意的例证。”^②对此，我们至少还可以加上阿冈本(Geogio

^① Terry Eagleton, *Trouble With Strangers: A Study of Ethics*, London: Wiley-Blackwell, 2008, 323.

^② James Smith, *Terry Eagleton: A Critical Introduction*, 140-41.

Agamben) 和南希 (Jean-Luc Nancy) 的名字。整体而言, 我们可以在这一潮流中清楚地看到一种反转或反向神学的倾向, 这在之前的阿多诺那里已经得到说明, 并在其后的齐泽克 (Slavoj Zizek) 那里得到了进一步阐发。而且, 即使转向宗教和神学问题是否能够为解决我们时代的文化和政治问题提供一个答案仍然是一个问题, 新一代西方马克思主义者就此进行的相关理论探讨显然亟须被纳入我们的学术视野。为此, “西方马克思主义与神学” 作为一个新的主题被明确提了出来。

Editorial Foreword: Western Marxism and Theology

GENG YouZhuang, Renmin University of China

“Western Marxism and Theology” is not a new topic for the Journal for the Study of Christian Culture. Among the twenty-three previously published issues, there are at least two issues with topics closely related to this theme, not to mention the individual articles within other issues. The two issues are entitled “Option for the Poor” (No. 16, Autumn 2006) and “Critical Theory and Theology” (No. 22, Autumn 2009). In fact, “option for the poor” and “critical theory” are, as the editors of those issues noted, precisely the two dimensions of the connection between Western Marxism and Christian theology. On the one hand, “theologians generally agree that the concept of ‘option for the poor’ grew out of liberation theology and Marxism [b]ut its roots are to be found in the Christian

faith and its social doctrine;”^① and on the other hand, “[c]ritical theory as a part of Neo-Marxism, actively resists the manifold forms of oppression throughout history.... [but] can even be seen as a kind of ‘hidden theology’ or as a secular form of theology.”^②

10

What, then, is the relationship between Western Marxism and Christian theology? Roughly speaking, the Marxist theory of alienation and Christian eschatology are both implicitly utilized as theoretical backgrounds within Western Marxist discourse. In this sense, both appeal to the unique experiences of the oppressed and discourses of the marginalized, criticize and even resist the existing societal and human conditions, and pursue a utopian or Messianic hope through an aesthetic or political liberation. The “negative theology” of Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer, the theology of hope of Ernst Bloch and Jurgen Moltmann, the liberation theology of Gustavo Gutierrez and those who followed, and black theology, feminist theology and the like, could all be understood in light of this perspective. Even in the current generation of Western Marxists, we can find a continued exploration in this direction. One of the most telling examples may be the relevant thinking of the famous Marxist critic Terry Eagleton, with his “theological turn” in recent years as background.

In 2003 Eagleton published a book entitled *After Theory*.

^① Yang Huilin, “Editorial Foreword: What does it mean by ‘the poor’?” *Journal for the Study of Christian Culture* No.16, Beijing: Religious Culture Press, 2007, 2.

^② Jason Lam, “Editorial Foreword: Dialogue between Critical Theory and Theology”, *Journal for the Study of Christian Culture* No. 19, Beijing: Religious Culture Press, 2009, 1-2.

Though it is not viewed as his masterpiece, its title conveys a significant message. Some scholar comments that its publication shows “that the modes of theoretical discourse developed by the wave of progressive thinkers through 1960s were no longer sufficient for addressing an urgent, post-millennial political conjecture, and that new concepts must be employed by the Left in order to comprehend and critique these new circumstances.”^① Indeed, it was around the time of this publication that Eagleton found his way back to the tradition of Christian theology in the attempt to search for a new theoretical resource as some of the theological topics in his earlier works reemerged. For instance, he discovered a correlation amongst Aristotle’s idea of happiness, Judeo-Christian’s concept charity and Marx’s notion of socialism in the discussion of virtues and ethics. He argues, specifically, that the Judeo-Christian tradition considers Aristotle’s “happy life of virtues” as the life of charity or love, which implies a mutual self-realization among human beings, and that “the political form of this ethic is known as socialism”. This is the result when, as Marx stated, “the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all”.^② Furthermore, the issue of the body is particularly highlighted where morality is concerned. Eagleton suggests that it is only with the existence of the body that one can speak about the matter of universal mortality. For it is through the body that we can relate to one another As the most visible sign of my

^① James Smith, *Terry Eagleton: A Critical Introduction*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2008, 150.

^② Terry Eagleton, *After Theory*, New York: Basic Books, 2003, 122.

being as given, “the body is my way of being present to others in ways which are bound in part to elude me...[thus] the impersonality of the body, therefore, is related to the anonymity of love.”^① Notably, in the discussion of liberation and revolution, the theme of anawim in the biblical sense reappears. Eagleton asserts that those wretched of the earth, called anawim in the Old Testaments, are the hope of the future though the failure of the present, and that Jesus himself was regarded as a type of the anawim by the authors of the New Testaments.^②

In as early as the 1960s, Eagleton had begun to explore this topic. For instance, in *The Body as Language: Outline of a “New Left” Theology* (1970), he points out there is an inseparable relationship between the poor in the Biblical sense and the proletariat in Marxist theory. In that early work, there is a long paragraph concerned with “the poor”:

For the Christian, the presence of the sacred in the world takes two major forms: Christ is present in that articulated structure of signs which we call the church; he is also present, more fundamentally, in the oppressed and exploited. Those men—the anawim of the old testament whom Christ speaks of in the beatitudes—are the “dirt” which falls outside the carefully wrought political structures of society, those whom society cannot accommodate; as such, they stand as a living challenge to

① Terry Eagleton, *After Theory*, 166-167.

② Terry Eagleton, *After Theory*, 175-176.

its institutions, a potent and sacred revolutionary force. They represent, simply by what they are, the dialectical contradiction at the heart of a social order; they are the articulate signs of its failure, of the shapeless, unstructured life in its margins and crevices with which the order cannot deal without destroying itself.^①

Hence, it is not very difficult to observe that an “option for the poor” in Eagleton’s early thoughts had been among the key components of his critical theory. In his post-2000 “theological turn”, his analysis of the poor and the discussion on the nature of tragedy constitute two aspects of this key issue.

For instance, Eagleton argues that, in *Sweet Violence: The Idea of the Tragic* (2002), a possible revolutionary transformation initiated by suffering, violence and death can be seen in the tragic crucifixion of Jesus. Eagleton finds that Jesus himself also feels resentful and resistant to his own suffering, as he feels towards the sufferings of others. At the moment of his miserable death, “Jesus was left only with a forlorn faith in what he called his Father, despite the fact that this power seemed now to have abandoned him. But it was precisely this bereftness, savored to the last bitter drop, which in a classically tragic rhythm could then become the source of renewed life. It is the political meaning of this rhythm which matters. The destitute condition of humanity, it was to be fully restored, had to be lived all

^① Terry Eagleton, *The Body as Language: Outline of a “New Left” Theology*, London: Sheed and Ward, 1970, 67-68.

the way through, pressed to the extreme limit of a descent into the hell of meaningless and desolation, rather than disavowed, patched up or short-circuited.”^① That is to say, the event of Jesus’ crucifixion is tragic, because his death is unavoidable and unconditional, a real sacrifice without any compensation. In the word of Eagleton, Jesus’ death is a cul-de-sac. Otherwise it could not be fruitful. After elaborating the tragic destiny of Jesus himself as a representative of the anawim, Eagleton draws a logical conclusion that “[it] is the tragic which both Marxism and Christianity seek to redeem, but they can do so only by installing themselves at the heart of it. Marxism is an immanent critique of class society, not simply a utopian alternative to it; and resurrection for Christianity involves a crucifixion and descent into hell. Otherwise, what is reclaimed in both cases would not be this condition, in all its deadlock and despair.”^②

In 2007, Eagleton composed a long introduction for a new version of the Gospels, edited by Giles Fraser, in which the topic of “option for the poor”—that is, the concept of the anawim in the biblical sense—was further elucidated. He insists that the true meaning of the Second Coming, described by Jesus’ apocalyptic words at a critical moment in his life, is that “salvation consists not in religious ritual or codes of conduct but in the donation of a crust of bread or a cup of water. The Kingdom of heaven turns out to be a surprisingly materialist affair. It is otherworldly in the sense of

^① Terry Eagleton, *Sweet Violence: The Idea of the Tragic*, London: Wiley-Blackwell, 2002, 37.

^② Terry Eagleton, *Sweet Violence: The Idea of the Tragic*, 40.