

The Significance of Hope

盼望的价值

Journal for the Study of Christian Culture

基督教文化学刊

中国人民大学基督教文化研究所主办

第34辑 · 2015秋



文化出版社

The Significance of Hope

盼望的价值

Journal for the Study of Christian Culture

基督教文化学刊

中国人民大学基督教文化研究所主办

第34辑 · 2015秋



宗教文化出版社

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

基督教文化学刊. 第34辑, 2015年秋: 盼望的价值/杨慧林主编. -- 北京: 宗教文化出版社, 2015.12

(基督教文化学刊)

ISBN 978-7-5188-0136-7

I. ①基… II. ①杨… III. ①基督教—宗教文化—研究—丛书 IV. ①B978-55

中国版本图书馆CIP数据核字(2015)第316271号

盼望的价值

基督教文化学刊(第34辑·2015年秋)

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) 64095234(编辑部)

责任编辑: 霍克功

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 250千字

2015年12月第1版 2015年12月第1次印刷

书 号: ISBN 978-7-5188-0136-7

定 价: 28.00元

基督教文化学刊 (第34辑 • 2015年秋)

Journal for the Study of Christian Culture

盼望的价值

The Significance of Hope

中国人民大学基督教文化研究所 主办

主 编 杨慧林

编辑委员会委员 耿幼壮 刘小枫 罗秉祥 杨庆球

本辑执行主编 杨慧林

出版总监 钱秉毅 杨熙楠

学术委员会 (以姓氏拼音为序)

BAYS, Daniel

加尔文学院

FIDDES, Paul

牛津大学

FORD, David

剑桥大学

耿幼壮

中国人民大学

何光沪

中国人民大学

HOPKINS, Dwight

芝加哥大学

JASPER, David

格拉斯哥大学

JEFFREY, David

贝勒大学

江丕盛

香港中国神学研究院

KUSCHEL, Karl-Josef

图宾根大学

赖品超

香港中文大学

李炽昌

李秋零

刘小枫

罗秉祥

RUOKANEN, Miikka

SCHÜSSLER FIORENZA, Elisabeth

SCHÜSSLER FIORENZA, Francis

TORRANCE, Iain

VOLF, Miroslav

WARD, Graham

WELKER, Michael

温伟耀

杨慧林

杨熙楠

曾庆豹

张庆熊

赵敦华

赵 林

卓新平

香港中文大学

中国人民大学

中国人民大学

香港浸会大学

赫尔辛基大学

哈佛大学

哈佛大学

爱丁堡大学

耶鲁大学

牛津大学

海德堡大学

香港中文大学

中国人民大学

香港汉语基督教文化研究所

辅仁大学

复旦大学

北京大学

武汉大学

中国社会科学院

英文审校: Chloë STARR 陈德贞

编 辑: 张 靖 梅 瑛 李丙权 汪 海

Journal for the Study of Christian Culture

(Jidujiao wenhua xuekan)

No. 34 Autumn 2015

The Significance of Hope

Editor in Chief:

YANG Huilin

Members of Editorial Committee

GENG Youzhuang

LIU Xiaofeng

LO, Ping-Cheung

YEUNG, Hing-Kau

Executive Editor of This Issue

YANG Huilin

Publishing Supervisor

CHIN, Kenneth YEUNG, Daniel

Advisory Board (in alphabetical order)

BAYS, Daniel

CHIN, Ken Pa

FIDDES, Paul

FORD, David

GENG Youzhuang

HE Guanghu

HOPKINS, Dwight

JASPER, David

JEFFREY, David

KANG, Phee Seng

Calvin College

Fu Jen Catholic University

University of Oxford

University of Cambridge

Renmin University of China

Renmin University of China

University of Chicago

University of Glasgow

Baylor University

Hong Kong China Graduate School of Theology

KUSCHEL, Karl-Josef	University of Tübingen
LAI, Pan Chiu	The Chinese University of Hong Kong
LEE, Archie	The Chinese University of Hong Kong
LI Qiuling	Renmin University of China
LIU Xiaofeng	Renmin University of China
LO, Ping-cheung	Hong Kong Baptist University
RUOKANEN, Miikka	University of Helsinki
SCHÜSSLER FIORENZA, Elisabeth	Harvard University
SCHÜSSLER FIORENZA, Francis	Harvard University
TORRANCE, Iain	University of Edinburgh
VOLF, Miroslav	Yale University
WARD, Graham	University of Oxford
WELKER, Michael	University of Heidelberg
WAN, Wai Yiu	The Chinese University of Hong Kong
YANG Huilin	Renmin University of China
YEUNG, Daniel	Hong Kong Institute of Sino-Christian Studies
ZHANG Qingxiong	Fudan University
ZHAO Dunhua	Peking University
ZHAO Lin	Wuhan University
ZHUO Xinping	Chinese Academy of Social Sciences

English Proofreading STARR, Chloë CHIN, Agnes

Editors , ZHANG Jing MEI Ying LI Bingquan WANG Hai

编者絮语：

信仰的言说如何介入现实世界 ——莫尔特曼与“盼望”的价值

杨慧林

从信仰的价值立场介入现实问题，于是有“政治神学”；然而基于一定信仰传统的政治神学如何介入多元的世界，不能不说是个问题。莫尔特曼（Jürgen Moltmann）将“人的世界”关联于“自然世界”、政治秩序比之于生态秩序、人世间“正义和平”的“新政治神学”延展于宇宙间“环境公正”的“自然政治神学”，乃至对自然的滥用正如对他人的暴力，其实源于同样的“自我中心”幻想。由此，其政治神学的批判必然指向人类的僭越，甚至自身信仰传统中某些“导致教会和基督徒失败的行为模式”^①。就人文学术而言，这样的自我批判不仅极具启发性，而且是令人钦佩的。

按照莫尔特曼的说法，政治神学包含着不同的理论形态。在历史上的“无政府主义与君主集权”、当今世界的“恐怖主义与国家安全”这两组相似的“权力关系”中，某些政治神学（或者政治哲学）实

^① 莫尔特曼2014年10月15日在中国人民大学关于“政治神学及当代中国”的演讲，见本辑第32页。[Jürgen Moltmann, “Political Theology and Modern China,” lecture at Renmin University, October 15, 2014. See p. 32 of this issue.]

际上是为“宰制者”的“例外状态”提供了“超验且绝对”的合法性说辞。从而卡尔·施密特(Carl Schmitt)的定义“君主是决定例外状态的人”^①，被置换为美国政治家的“例外状态”，用“自上而下”的恐怖主义回击“自下而上”的恐怖主义。究其根底，莫尔特曼特别提到针对着“非正义”暴力的“正义战争论”(Just War)。在他看来：“我们不应该再有任何有关‘正义战争’的神学教义，只能有一种‘正义和平’(Just Peace)的新教义”，因为“正义战争”的本来目的正是“限制和克服战争”，而信仰本应“独立于任何权势阶级的政治利益”^②。

如果就此进一步追问：当“例外状态”受到质疑的时候，我们所能为者究竟是借助一定共同体的“社会正义”保证社会的和平，还是通过不同共同体之间的社会和平，反过来印证社会正义的存在？这可能关涉于“盼望”的独特逻辑及其何以有效，亦即为什么莫尔特曼反复强调“克服人们心理和头脑中的恐怖主义”，为什么“如果我们成为敌人的敌人，那么我们会试图尽可能多的去消灭敌人，但是敌对关系却依然存在”^③。这种莫尔特曼式的政治神学推导，从“地球上的和平”连及“与地球和谐相处”^④，其中对“例外状态”的反思同样清晰可见。

莫尔特曼曾于1999年发表《地球的毁灭和解放：生态神学》(The Destruction and Liberation of the Earth: Ecological Theology)一文，后来美国神学家斯塔克豪斯(Max Stackhouse)编辑四卷本的《上帝与全

^① Carl Schmitt, *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*, trans. by G. Schwab (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005 [1922]), 5.

^② 莫尔特曼2014年10月15日在中国人民大学关于“政治神学及当代中国”的演讲及答问，见本辑第33、47页等。[Jürgen Moltmann, "Political Theology and Modern China," lecture at Renmin University of China, October 15, 2014. See p. 33, 37 of this issue.]

^③ 同上，见本辑第48、46页等。

^④ 同上，见本辑第33页。

球化》时，将其收入第二卷《圣灵与现代权威》^①，作者将修订后的文章题目改为《地球的毁灭与疗救：生态学和神学》（*The Destruction and Healing of the Earth: Ecology and Theology*）。特别值得注意的是：莫尔特曼从生态问题展开的神学批判不仅直接针对西方社会和政治制度，也再次包括了基督教传统本身。

如他所说：“生态危机，首先是由西方科技文明所带来的危机。……如果不是以他人为代价、以第三世界为代价、以下一代为代价、以地球为代价，西方的生活标准就不可能维持。……同时，全球化的市场还迫使穷国不得不放弃他们赖以生存的经济，不得不为了世界市场植入单一的文化。……西方世界毁灭了第三世界的自然，又迫使第三世界破坏他们自己的自然环境。而反过来，第三世界的自然破坏（如砍伐热带雨林、污染海洋）则用气候变化的方式回击第一世界。”^②

进而言之，人对自然的滥用又是人间暴力和非正义的复制品：“正是对弱势人群的暴力，使得对弱势物种的暴力合法化。人类社会的非法，也将自己复制为非法地对待自然。……没有第一世界和第三世界之间的社会正义，就不会有和平；没有人类世界的和平，就只能有自然的毁灭。”^③ 因此只要“科学发现和技术发明……服务于政治的意志，即占有、保全和扩张权力”，只要“发展和进步的考量标准，仍然是经济、财政和军事力量的增长”，“我们所体验到的危机，就不仅仅是‘生态的’危机，仅仅用技术的手段也无法解决。”^④

沿此思路，莫尔特曼认为“生态危机……并非教宗若望·保罗二世所坚持的那样，仅仅是‘道德危机’，却是一场更根本的危机，

^① Max Stackhouse, Peter J. Paris & Don S. Browning, eds., *God and Globalization, volume 2: The Spirit and the Modern Authorities* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2001.)

^② Jürgen Moltmann, “The Destruction and Healing of the Earth: Ecology and Theology,” 168-169.

^③ Ibid., 169.

^④ Ibid., 171.

即：西方人所信赖的宗教本身的危机”^①。因为从根本上说，这一基督教“本身的危机”在于人对“全知全能”的“支配性”力量的摹仿：“文艺复兴以来，西欧人对上帝的理解就越来越片面，认为上帝就是‘全知全能’。……上帝是绝对的支配性主体，而世界只是上帝领地里的一个被动的对象。而在西方传统中，上帝越来越转向超验的领域，而世界则被理解为纯粹内在的、此世的。思考上帝可以无须世界，那么理解世界也就无须上帝。……现代西方基督教的这种严格的一神论，正是世界和自然之世俗化的根本原因。……作为上帝在地球上的形象，人注定会将自己视为……主宰，亦即知识与意志的支配性主体，高高在上地俯视着被动的对象。……正是在这一意义上，当现代社会初起之时，培根才赞美他那个时代的科学：知识就是力量。……相信上帝，相信天堂上的全能的主，导致了世界的世俗化。”^② 总之，“正是西方现代世界的神学决定了人与自然的关系以及人类统治自然这一人类学概念”。^③

我们当然可以说：问题并非出在上帝，而是人们对上帝的理解有所偏差。事实上作为神学家的莫尔特曼，也确实是从基督教的传统资源中重新找到“关于地球解放的三个观点”，即“宇宙性的性灵”、“该雅假说”的“新的地球科学”以及“上帝之约中的人和自然”。^④ 然而“文艺复兴以来西欧人对上帝的理解”毕竟已经成为基督教传统的一部分，这恐怕才是莫尔特曼所针对的问题，而绝非自辩之词。

^① Jürgen Moltmann, “The Destruction and Healing of the Earth: Ecology and Theology,” 170.

^② Ibid., 172-173.

^③ 莫尔特曼2014年10月15日在中国人民大学关于“政治神学及当代中国”的演讲及答问，见本辑第33页。[Jürgen Moltmann, “Political Theology and Modern China,” lecture at Renmin University of China, October 15, 2014. See p. 33 of this issue.]

^④ 莫尔特曼：《俗世中的上帝》，曾念粤译，台北：雅歌出版社，1999年，第127-142页。[Jürgen Moltmann, *Su shi zhong de Shangdi* (God for a Secular Society), trans. ZENG Nianyue (Taipei: Christian Art Press, 1999), 127-142.]

在这样的背景下，莫尔特曼对“怀旧”式的生态论显然不以为然：“在1990年莫斯科的‘全球论坛’上，北美印第安人、印度大使、蒙古的大祭司、非洲的祈雨者、加利福尼亚的新兴宗教信仰徒等等……都呼吁我们重返地球的‘子宫’。……但是前现代的宗教象征……能够帮助后现代世界的城市化人群解决工业社会的生态问题吗？……我们能放弃我们所追求、而现在又变得危险的自由吗？……我不相信。”^①

如此，莫尔特曼“生态神学”（Ecological Theology）或者“神学生态学”（Theological Ecology）的最重要价值，绝不仅仅是一种悲天悯人的态度，却在于它与政治神学的基本追求互为表里。也许莫尔特曼本人的称谓最为恰切，进入公共话语的生态神学，实际上亦是“自然政治神学”：人间的公正还原于“环境公正”，而“环境公正”最终落实于更趋合理的世界秩序；作用其间的，则是对任何“例外状态”的批判和拒斥，对任何“自我中心”的警惕和检点。

莫尔特曼涉及的问题领域并非神学所独有，也在诸多学科引起广泛的关注。但是“批判”并非必然摆脱“自我中心”的逻辑惯性，因此我们才看到太多居高临下的道德呼唤或者“自以义”的顾影自怜：前者有时并非真的不同意什么意见，而只是不同意“同意”；后者则是习惯性地从自己的传统中拣选几条从来不缺少的佐证，似乎借此就可以包治百病。这样两个极端上的“批判”或者“赞成”，其实都没有什么意义。

再者，对社会弊端的种种“批判”常常都是愤世嫉俗、掷地有声，却不自觉地沦入一种“防御性”的价值立场。然而真正介入现实问题并不在于决绝的姿态，莫尔特曼也许特别值得借鉴：作为欧洲

^① Jürgen Moltmann, "The Destruction and Healing of the Earth: Ecology and Theology," 174-175.

人，他认为“欧洲的神学不应再以欧洲为中心”；作为男性，他相信“神学不应再以男性为中心”；他生活在“第一世界”，但是他所建构的神学“不应该反映宰制者的观点”，却“应该使人听到受压制者的声音”。总之，神学“在自身的脉络中必须放弃自我立场的前设绝对性”。^① 如此的黄钟大吕之声，始终回荡在莫尔特曼政治神学与生态神学之间，其中的“盼望”也将相关讨论真正带入了问题的核心。

关于莫尔特曼不断延伸的神学思考，其高足林鸿信有一妙喻：“结束就是开始”^②。施莱尔马赫的结束开始了巴特，巴特的结束开始了莫尔特曼；我们对中国学者与莫尔特曼的对话也满怀期待，期待中西交融的“盼望”之旅得以开启。

^① Jürgen Moltmann, "Preface," in *The Trinity and the Kingdom of God: The Doctrine of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1981), xii.

^② 林鸿信《结束就是开始：莫尔特曼神学思想简介》，见本辑第3页。[LIN Hong-Hsin, "In the End-the Beginning: An Introduction to the Theology of Jurgen Moltmann," p.3 of this issue.]

Editorial Foreword

How Can Faith Discourse Intervene in the World? Jürgen Moltmann and the Significance of “Hope”

YANG Huilin

Translated by Chloë F. Starr

“Political Theology” emerged when faith values began to be involved in real world problems, but the question of how a Political Theology based on specific faith traditions can have an effect in a pluralistic world remains a critical issue of our time. Jürgen Moltmann connects the human world with the natural world, compares the political order with the ecological order and extends the “Just Peace” of “New Political Theology” to the “Just Environment” of “Natural Political Theology”, arguing that the manipulation of the natural world is exactly the same as violence against others: both are rooted in a self-centered fantasy. Following this, Moltmann’s Political Theology naturally targets human usurpation, and his criticisms are also turned towards his own faith tradition, including the “pattern of behavior in the catholic and protestant political traditions which apparently led to the failure of churches and Christians.”^① As far as the humanities are concerned, such self-criticism seems enlightened and admirable.

According to Moltmann, Political Theology embraces various theoretical forms. Whether in the historical power relations of “Anarchism versus Sovereignty” or the similar contemporary case of “Terrorism versus State-safety,” certain Political Theologians (or Political Philosophers) have furnished a kind of “transcendental and absolute” legitimacy for the “state of exception” of “the ruler”. Carl Schmitt’s famous definition, “Sovereignty

^① Jürgen Moltmann, “Political Theology and Modern China,” lecture at Renmin University of China, October 15, 2014. See p. 31 of this issue.

is the one who decides on the state of exception,”^① has been replaced by American politicians’ “state of exception” and applied in their actions against “terrorism from below” using “terrorism from above”. Moltmann traces the roots of such a mind-set to the “Just War” theory which originally targetted “unjust” violence. In his opinion, there should no longer be any valid theological doctrine of “just war”, but a new doctrine of “just peace”, because the prime purpose of “just war” is to overcome and control war, while faith should be “independent of the political interests of the powerful.”^②

If we take this a step further and ask, when “the state of exception” is under question, should what we ultimately do to maintain peace in society be to rely on the “social justice” of a certain group of people, or rather on the “social justice” of different collective groups or communities (which themselves may prove the existence of social justice)? This may relate to the particular logic of Moltmann’s “Hope” and why it is effective, and to why Moltmann repeatedly emphasizes the need to “overcome the terrorism in people’s mind and head”, and why “if we treated ourselves as the enemies of our enemies, we might have ended up with eliminating as many enemies as possible, but the friend-enemy relation would remain.”^③ Moltmann’s Political Theology thus transforms “peace on earth” to “living harmoniously with the earth”^④, and his reflection upon the “state of exception” is very clear.

In 1999 Moltmann published “The Destruction and Liberation of the Earth: Ecological Theology”, later entitled “The Destruction and Healing of the Earth: Ecology and the Theology” and included in American theologian Max Stackhouse’s series “God and Globalization”.^⑤ It is worth noting that

^① Carl Schmitt, *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*, trans. by G. Schwab (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005 [1922]), 5.

^② Jürgen Moltmann, “Political Theology and Modern China,” lecture at Renmin University of China, October 15, 2014. See p. 33, 37 of this issue.

^③ Ibid., p. 48, 46 of this issue.

^④ Ibid., p. 33 of this issue.

^⑤ Jürgen Moltmann, “The Destruction and Healing of the Earth: Ecology and Theology,” in *God and Globalization, volume 2: The Spirit and the Modern Authorities*, eds. Max L. Stackhouse, Peter J. Paris & Don S. Browning (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2001), 166-190.

Moltmann's theological reflection on ecology not only addresses Western society and political systems but also the Christian tradition per se.

As Moltmann notes,

This ecological crisis is in the first place a crisis brought about by Western scientific and technological civilization. ... The Western standard of living cannot be universalized. It can only be sustained at the expense of others: at the expense of people in the 'Third World,' at the expense of coming generations, and at the expense of the earth. ... In addition, the global market is compelling poor countries to give up their subsistence economy, to plant monocultures for the world market, to cut down the rain forests, and to overgraze the pastureland. ... The Western world destroys nature in the Third World and forces Third World countries to destroy their own natural environment. Conversely, the destruction of nature in the Third World – the cutting down of rain forests and the pollution of the seas – strikes back at the First World by way of climatic changes.^①

Moreover, the destruction and violence human beings have exerted upon the earth replicates the violence and injustice in human society: "Violence against weaker people justifies violence against weaker creatures. Social lawlessness reproduces itself in lawless dealing with nature. ... Without social justice between the First and the Third Worlds, there will be no peace; and without peace in the world of human beings, there will be only the destruction of nature."^② In as much as scientific discoveries and technological inventions still "serve the political will to acquire, secure, and extend power," and growth and progress "are still gauged by the relative increase of economic, financial, and military power,"^③ the crisis we are now experiencing is not purely an ecological crisis, and cannot be solved merely by technology.

^① Jürgen Moltmann, "Destruction and Healing of the Earth," 168-169.

^② Ibid., 169.

^③ Ibid., 171.

Furthering this line of thinking, Moltmann argues that “the ecological crisis of the earth is a crisis of modern scientific and technological civilization. ... It is not only a ‘moral crisis’ either, as Pope John Paul II maintained; it is a more profound crisis – a religious crisis involving that in which people in the Western world put their trust.”^① This crisis in Christianity itself is essentially due to human beings’ modelling themselves on the controlling power of an “omniscient and omnipotent” being:

Ever since the Renaissance, the understanding of God in Western Europe has been increasingly one-sided: God is the “Almighty.”... God is the absolute determining subject, and the world is the passive object of Gods’ sovereignty. In the Western tradition, God moved more into the transcendent sphere, while the world was understood in a purely immanent and this-worldly sense. God was thought of without a world, so the world could be understood without a God.... The strict monotheism of modern Western Christianity is an essential reason for the secularization of the world and nature, ... as God’s image on earth, human beings were bound to see themselves,... as rulers – that is, as the determining subjects of knowledge and will, standing over against this world....It was in this sense that, at the beginning of modern times, Francis Bacon lauded the sciences of his time: “Knowledge is power”; it was through their power over nature that human beings were to be restored in their character as the image of God. ^②

In short, “It was the theology of the modern world in the West which determined the human relationship to nature and the anthropological concept of the human lordship over nature.” ^③

^① Jürgen Moltmann, “Destruction and Healing of the Earth,” 170.

^② Ibid., 172-173.

^③ Jürgen Moltmann, “Political Theology and Modern China,” lecture at Renmin University of China, October 15, 2014. See p. 33 of this issue.