

## 儒教专题

### Theme: Confucian Religion

对谈嘉宾：安靖如教授、陈明教授、干春松教授、任文利教授、卢云峰教授、赵峰教授、王庆新教授、程广云教授

Discussants: Professors Stephen Angle, Chen Ming, Gan Chunsong, Ren Wenli, Lu Yunfeng, Zhao Feng, Wang Qingxin

主持人：陈壁生教授

Host: Professor Chen Bisheng

时间：2017年3月12日

Date: March 12, 2017

地点：中国人民大学国学院经学与子学教研室会议室

Site: The Conference Room at the Classical and Confucian Studies Center at the National Studies Center of Renmin University

Abstract: two issues—religiosity and Confucianism as a civil religion—structure this dialogue. Acknowledging the importance of not using Western categories of religion to distort Confucianism, Angle distinguishes between religion and religiosity, and relates Confucianism to the latter. He argues that central to traditional Confucianism is an attitude of reverence for Heaven and the principle of Coherence that it embodies, which opens up its unique way of modernization and progress. The religiosity of Confucianism is also related to contemporary Confucianism as modern society needs to find a way to accommodate it—either as a state religion, civil religion, a background culture or an individual ethics. Finally, Angle cautions against excessive reliance on Confucian texts alone. All Chinese Confucians participating in the dialogue agree that Western categories do not fit neatly into an understanding of Confucian religion. Further, Chen Ming, makes a distinction between traditional Confucian religion and Confucian civil religion with its practical value. Lu Yunfeng and Wang Qingxin share the view that Confucianism as an indigenous form of religion is still tacitly shaping the moral sentiment of the Chinese. While Lu emphasizes the need to recognize diverse ways in which Confucian religion manifests itself, which include both elite beliefs and folklore, Wang specifically takes on Chen’s civil religion account as he believes that the narrowing down of Confucianism to its functional utility undermines the very religiosity of Confucianism. Drastically different from Angle and Chen, who see a sharp conflict between religion and modernity, Zhao Feng and Cheng Guangyun take divinity as indispensable to all great civilizations, which, in turn, calls for more of an effort to religionize Confucianism and broader Chinese culture.

陈壁生：我们今天下午的讨论现在开始。上个周日，安靖如教授和唐文明教授做了一个关于牟宗三的对话。今天主要是陈明老师和安靖如老师的对话，主题是儒教与公民宗教。先由安靖如老师做引言，陈明老师回应，然后各位老师、同学再一块提问、讨论。有一些具体问题的提出和争论，也可以在两位引言人的发言过程中进行。两位发言人的发言时间，每人在半小时前后。我们先请安靖如老师。

CHEN BISHENG: In today's dialogue, we have Chen Ming and Steve as our featured speakers, and the topic is Confucian religion and civil religion. Steve will give his opening remarks followed by Chen Ming's response. After that, the others present may ask questions for further discussion. If anyone has specific questions they'd like to raise, they may be asked during the two speakers' opening presentations. Each speaker has about half an hour. The floor is yours, Steve.

安靖如：好的。我也希望干老师会来。我今天要讨论他的一些想法。但我知道我对话的主要对象是陈明老师。我们今天主题是儒学与宗教的一些关系。这个可以说不是我专门研究的对象。但因为我对当代儒学和进步儒学有一些研究，正好也碰到这个主题，所以我有一些简单的、零碎的想法要跟大家来分享。我今天讲的主要有三个方面的内容。第一个方面跟宗教的定义有关系，特别是宗教与信仰之间的关系。第二个方面简要讨论一下传统儒学里面的宗教性。第三个方面是讨论现当代儒学本身的宗教性。那么，先从宗教与信仰之间的关系开始吧。

STEPHEN ANGLE: Our topic today is the connection between Confucianism and religion. Admittedly, this is not my area of expertise. However, as I have done some research on contemporary as well as progressive Confucianism, I have happened to come across this topic from time to time, and I have scattered thoughts to share with you all. There are three main aspects I'll talk about today. The first has to do with the definition of religion, especially the relationship between religion and faith (*xinyang*). The second issue is the religiosity of traditional Confucianism. The third issue is the religiosity of contemporary Confucianism. Now, let's start with the relationship between religion and faith.

我想，在座的或者是关心当代儒学的人，都有点担心当代中国思想太依靠来自西方的学术范畴。我觉得这是当代哲学界内很普遍的一个现象，那就是在了解哲学的时候，用来自西方的很多哲学概念或范畴。我知道现在在中国有很多知识分子希望中国思想能有更多的自主性，包括儒学在内。我想，这个倾向很好。我也很支持。我认为当代儒学自主的发展需要这样的自主性。我觉得儒学或者整个中国思想要对其他世界上的传统做出一些比较深刻而有意义的挑战或贡献的话，那么就需要依靠中国本土的一些范畴概念来发展其思想体系。正是在这个前提下，对过于依靠信仰这个概念来理解宗教，我采取一种怀疑的态度。

I believe that those of us here and all of those who care about contemporary Confucianism are all at least somewhat concerned about the over-reliance of contemporary Chinese thought on Western academic paradigms. I think this is a common phenomenon in all contemporary areas of philosophy: when we endeavor to understand something as philosophy, we mostly avail ourselves of Western philosophical concepts or categories. Many Chinese intellectuals hope to dispense with a rigid importing of and reliance on Western lexicons, and I think this aspiration is very positive and I wholeheartedly support it. The independent evolution of

contemporary Confucianism requires such autonomy. I think that, if there is anything we can make of Confucianism or Chinese thought in order to mount profound and meaningful challenges or contributions to other traditions in the world, then it has to rely on at least some native Chinese categories and concepts to develop in a coherent fashion. With all this in mind, I have a relatively skeptical attitude towards relying on the concept of faith to understand Confucian religion.

我最近把干春松老师写的《康有为与儒学的“新世”》那本书看完了。在他的书里面我看到有关宗教定义的几个说法。在他思路中，不是很明显的依靠西方的定义，但是实质上却依然是依靠西方关于宗教的定义。他说一个建制性的宗教需要几个要素，一个是要有一个宗教信仰对象，可以是佛或真主，上帝。二是要有信仰组织。三是要有信众和经典。这三个属性都有“信”这个字。我不是要专门来批评这个定义。我们也知道，这个定义对很多宗教都是适用的、有效的。但这就意味着所有的宗教性的传统都必须具有以上三个属性吗？我想不一定。假如某人要故意的、有意识的把儒学转为一个西方式的宗教（如基督教）的话，我想重视信仰的这个角度没有问题，甚至是必要的。虽然很明显的是依赖于西方的概念范畴，但却是有用处的。我想，在座的各位，都知道当下的中国有人想这样做。有人认为只有当儒学转为一个西方式的宗教，儒学才有足够的力量去对抗基督教。那么，这不是我的观点，甚至我想这样做是很有问题的。这等于把儒学转为西方的宗教。我没有说是转为一个“现代的”宗教。现代的宗教是多元的。现代基督教只是现代宗教的一个种类。假如，我们确实要依赖基督教，那么可以依靠信仰这个范畴与角度。假如不是要这样做的话，那就可以找到一个基于中国本土的范畴，那就不一定要依靠信仰。

Recently I finished reading the book *Kang Youwei and Confucianism's "New Era"* by Gan Chunsong.<sup>1</sup> In his book, Chunsong offers a couple of ways of defining religion. Although his thinking doesn't explicitly rely on Western categories, reading the book carefully reveals that it is still substantially dependent on the ways that religion has been defined in the West. He claims that an institutionalized religion should have certain elements: first, that there must be an object of religious belief, like the Buddha or Allah; second, that religious faith must be organized, as through a church or temple; third, that it needs believers and a canon. Each of these three characteristics depends on the idea of faith. Now, I don't want to be too critical here. We know that this definition is, for many religions, appropriate and effective. However, does this mean that all religious traditions must possess these three traits? I don't think that's necessarily the case. If someone wants to turn Confucianism into a Western-style religion, knowingly and intentionally modelling it on Christianity, then the emphasis on faith is not problematic. In fact, if that is your goal, it could even be mandatory to take such an approach. Although this kind of transformation of Confucianism would obviously rely on Western categories and concepts, it could still have its overall logic and coherence. That said, some scholars in China today think that only by following this path — transforming Confucianism into a Western-style religion — can

---

1

Confucianism have enough power to resist Christianity. Baulking at this attempt, I personally believe that doing so would lead to many problems. To be clear, my concern here is with molding Confucianism into a Western religion. This is different from making it a “modern” religion. Modern religions are diverse. Modern Christianity is only one type of modern religion. If we actually need to rely on a Christianity-oriented model, then we can lean on the category and perspective of faith. If our goal is not to transform Confucianism into a Western-style religion, though, we may find that we can rely on categories indigenous to China that doesn't necessarily intersect with the idea of faith.

我要问的是：在整个的儒家传统与佛道的传统中，信仰的重要性与核心性与基督教中的信仰的重要性与核心性是一样的吗？我觉得答案是否定的。我们很容易看的出，传统儒学中对礼、行为、态度、价值都很重视。但是我想在信仰上，儒学在理论上谈的不多。正是因为谈的不多，所以儒者没有对一个宗教有排他的一神教信仰，而同时也可以参加其他宗教传统。甚至也会过佛道二教的各种节日，这是中国的一个传统，而在西方是不行的。在西方，这样做是宗教教义上不被允许的。但在中国不是这样的。那么，我说信仰在儒学中不是重要的概念，并不是说传统儒学中关于天的信仰是假的。我的意思是说，信仰这一维度没有被理论所重视。我们也可以想到其他一些重视信的例子。比方说，佛教有《大乘起信论》。但是我觉得这个“信”跟西方宗教里头的信仰要区分开来。假如不重视信仰的话，我们如何去了解宗教？其实有很多办法。

What I want to ask is: in the entirety of the Confucian, Buddhist, or Daoist traditions, is the importance and centrality of faith the same as that of Christianity? I think the answer is “no.” It is easy to see that traditional Confucianism placed great emphasis on rituals, conduct, dispositions, and virtues. Confucianism doesn't have much principled discussion on the idea of faith. Precisely because it was not a centrally discussed issue, Confucians did not crusade against other religions, and instead accommodated other religions as they came into China and mingled with Chinese culture. It was common in China for one and the same person to celebrate both Buddhist and Daoist festivals as well as rituals associated with Confucianism. This kind of behavior would not be acceptable by congregations across the religious spectrum in the West. Now to be clear, by saying that faith is not an important concept in Confucianism, I do not mean that traditional Confucian reverence for Heaven is phony. What I mean is that faith as a concept was not emphasized theoretically. We may think of some other examples that emphasize faith. For example, there is the famous text *Awakening of Faith in the Mahayana* in Chinese Buddhism.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, I think that even this “faith” is different from the practice of faith in Western religions. Supposing now that we don't focus on faith, what else are we left with to discuss religion and religiosity? Actually, there are many approaches.

按照干老师的解释，康有为是如何了解“教”呢？干老师说从功能性入手。这是干老

---

<sup>2</sup> Ref

师的话，不是康有为的话。干老师说，康有为觉得所有劝告人民为善去恶的理论都是教。这个跟信仰没有关系。美国有名的哲学家、神学家南乐山（Robert Cummings Neville）先生，也对儒学感兴趣。他说，宗教有三个必要条件：一是有一个宇宙论，二是重视礼，三是有一个达到神圣上完美性的道路。有这三个等于有一个宗教。还有一些对宗教的定义，比如斯特伦（Frederick Streng）说宗教是达到终极的转化的手段，或者田立克（Paul Tillich）说宗教意味着最高关怀。总之，有很多宗教定义的说法，与我们最先提出的依赖基督教的说法有所不同。这就是说，当我们讨论儒学的宗教性的时候，不一定要过分重视信仰。这是我下面要讲的两点的一个前提。

According to Chunsong's interpretation, how does Kang Youwei understand "religion"? He suggests that we start with the instrumental value of religion — keeping in mind that this is Chunsong's interpretation, not what Kang said explicitly. He goes on to say that Kang subsumed under religion all theories that exhort people to goodness and expunge evil. Note that this way of thinking about religion is not strongly connected to "faith." To give you some context, the American philosopher and theologian Robert Neville (who is also interested in Confucianism, by the way) says that a religion must have three components: cosmology, ritual, and a path to spiritual perfection.<sup>3</sup> There are some other definitions of religion, like Frederick Streng saying that religion is a method to achieve "ultimate transformation," or Paul Tillich arguing that religion is centered on an "utmost concern."<sup>4</sup> All in all, there are many ways of defining religion, each of which differs in many ways from the Christian model we first proposed. What I'm driving towards is that when discussing the religiosity of Confucianism, we don't necessarily need to confine ourselves to religious faith. This is the premise upon which I'd like to continue my talk.

现在讨论第二点，即传统儒家的宗教性。传统儒家有很强的“宗教性”。当然，根据不同时代、不同经典，这种宗教性也有所不同，但是传统儒学中的宗教性是很明显的、不可反对的。我自己觉得儒学是不是宗教这个问题不是一个好问题。假如对宗教有一个定义是合适的，答案显然是肯定的。但是，问这个问题的人，又好像潜意识是在问，儒学是不是只是一个宗教。宗教范畴本身不是中国本土固有的。这个问题本身不太合适。但是，儒学传统是不是有宗教性？这个是可以讨论的，而且我的答案是肯定的。但是接下来也需要讨论儒学具有什么样的宗教性。这个题目很复杂，在座比我了解的也多得多。我打算只讨论两点，我希望都会帮助我以下对于当代儒学宗教性的讨论。

My second main topic is now to ask how we should approach religion in traditional Confucianism. We can say that traditional Confucianism has a very strong "religiosity." Of course, the exact shape and scope of this religiosity differs according to time and context, but religiosity in traditional Confucianism is obvious and undeniable. It doesn't seem to me a good question to ask "whether or not Confucianism is a religion." We can always answer this question in the affirmative, so

---

3

4

long as we use a suitable definition of religion! However, those posing this question often seem to be asking whether or not Confucianism is *only* a religion. The category of religion itself is not native to China, and hence when posed in this way, answers to the question are not very illuminating. Instead we should ask: whatever else it is, does the Confucian tradition possess religiosity? This is something we can discuss, and my answer would be affirmative. The crucial next step, though, is to discuss what sort of religiosity Confucianism possesses. This is a complex topic, and my interlocutors here understand it far better than I do. I plan only to discuss two points, which I hope can help us in the subsequent discussion of the religiosity of contemporary Confucianism.

两点都是跟宋明理学有关系的。第一是对加拿大汉学家秦家懿讨论朱熹理学中的宗教性的回应。秦教授觉得朱熹关于天地之心的说法是足够的证据，证明朱熹认识到最高智力具有有意识的、控制世界的能力，因此很像基督教的神。我觉得这个解释是有问题的。一方面，很明显的，朱熹在解释经典里面之处，好像是给天一种行为者的定位，他不把天当做一个行为者，反而说“也只是理如此”这样的话。这个跟所谓最高意识大不一样。另一方面，所谓天地之心和天理的主宰性的解释很多，不需要把朱熹当做有神论者来看。（比方说，我另外又一篇文章专门讨论朱熹的“天”概念。）我们不应该把传统儒学中的宗教性解释得太像西方基督教的上帝观念。如果这样的话，整个宋明理学对天的解释，就显得太基督教化。

My two points have to do with Neo-Confucianism. The first is a response to the Canadian Sinologist Julia Ching's discussion of religiosity in Zhu Xi's teachings. Professor Ching thinks that Zhu Xi's ideas on the "heartmind of Heaven and Earth" are sufficient to prove that Zhu Xi recognized a conscious "higher intelligence" that is capable of controlling the world, thus closely resembling the Christian God.<sup>5</sup> I find this interpretation to be very problematic. For one thing, when explaining passages in the Classics that seem to give Heaven agency, Zhu Xi explicitly denies that Heaven is an agent. On the contrary, he says things like "it is only that Pattern is like this." This is not the same as a so-called higher consciousness. For another, there are many other ways of explaining the "heartmind of Heaven and Earth" and the so-called "mastery" of the Heavenly Pattern. (Or, as I would prefer to translate *tianli* in this context, "cosmic Pattern.") We are certainly not forced to view Zhu Xi as a theist, and in fact, I have written an essay in which I specifically discuss Zhu Xi's notion of "*tian*," which I argue should be understood as "cosmos" rather than "Heaven."<sup>6</sup> We have no reason to model religious ideas in Confucianism upon the idea of God in Christianity. If we do, the entire Neo-Confucian understanding of Heaven would be trapped in an intellectual understanding that is inextricably Western-centric.

第二，宗教性假如不是西方那种，是什么呢？其实很多内容是很清楚的，比如朱熹说，“自然合理，故曰乐天”、“不敢违礼，故曰畏天”等。我想，乐、畏的态度跟宗教是很

---

<sup>5</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Ref

有关系的。但更明显的是，朱熹哲学中关于“敬”来表述，也是一种宗教性的态度。有一本很好的书教《Reverence: Renewing a Forgotten Virtue》，好像没有中文译本。作者是古希腊的专家。书的内容就是关于敬的，而且有一章是专门讨论“reverence”在中国思想里面。这本书把敬的宗教思想展开得很好。当然还有礼，礼也是具有很强的宗教性的表述。连信也可以讨论，但是儒学中的“信”不是信仰的信。在日本的荒木见悟先生的一本五十年代的书，《佛教与儒教》，荒木先生特别重视信，特别是在朱熹思想的脉络中。这个不是信仰，而是对天命流行的一种确信。这个信，很可能跟《大乘起信论》的信有关系，不一定是信神存在的那个信。那么，传统儒学的宗教性，很复杂，我没有完全展开。但是，至少我要强调两点，一点是不应该像秦家懿教授那样用西方的上帝来误读宋明理学的一些概念，另外，我也承认宋明理学中有很丰富的宗教性内涵。

Second, if Confucian religiosity is unlike that found in the West, then what is it? Several points come immediately to mind. For instance, Zhu Xi said, “Following nature and Pattern, that is called ‘delighting in Heaven.’ Daring not to violate ritual, that is called ‘being in awe of Heaven.’”<sup>7</sup> These attitudes of delight and awe are closely related to religion. Even more important than these passages is the idea of “reverence” (*jing*) in Zhu Xi’s thought. A few years ago Paul Woodruff wrote a book entitled *Reverence: Renewing a Forgotten Virtue*. The author is an expert on ancient Greece, but one chapter specifically discusses reverence in Chinese thought. This book does an excellent job of opening up the religious dimensions of reverence. Furthermore, we should of course also attend to ritual. Ritual can have a deeply religious expression. We can even include the character *xin*,<sup>8</sup> but *xin* in Confucianism is not the same as “faith.” In *Buddhism and Confucianism*, a book written in the 1950s by the famous Japanese scholar Araki Kengo, the author expounded on the idea of *xin*, especially in Zhu Xi’s system of thoughts. This was not faith, but an affirmation of one’s commitment to the “pervasive circulation of cosmic Pattern” — in other words, to the values intrinsic to the cosmos.<sup>9</sup> “Commitment” in this sense is quite different from a cognitive kind of “belief.” In fact, this meaning of “*xin*” may bear on “faith” in the *Awakening of Faith in the Mahayana*, instead of faith in the existence of God. In any event, the sense in which Confucianism is religious is too complex for me to explore in full here. To summarize, so far I’ve stressed two main points. First, we should not use the Western understanding of God to misread Neo-Confucian concepts. Second, there are rich and distinctive indigenous religious materials within Neo-Confucianism.

现在转到第三点：当代儒学自身的宗教性。我要谈到三点。第一，我们要用什么样的框架来了解当代儒学的宗教性？第二、第三个题目是两个问题，一个是跟政府有关系，一个是跟经典有关系。那么，我会跟找适当的框架开始。就是说，在当代中国里面，作为宗教的儒学可以是什么样的？至少有四个可能性或框架，也可能有更多。一个是国教，我想大家大概对国教都比较了解，不需要说很很多。可能只需要强调，如果有

---

<sup>7</sup> Ref

<sup>8</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Ref

国教，虽然国家中有其他的宗教存在，它们必须承认国教的权威。换句话说，把儒教当作国教，等于说把儒教放在其他的宗教之上。第二个框架，我们可以借用罗尔斯的完备性学说来解释。罗尔斯认为在当代多元性的社会中，有各种各样的完备性学说。这是说，可以有几个宗教，但没有一个有特别地位，国家、宪法对所有宗教一律平等看待。这种完备性学说，不需要依靠基督教以信仰为本的模式来解释，但是某一个完备性学说一定需要参加者的认同。那么，如果用这个框架来解释当代儒学的宗教性，就可以说有儒者的共同体、实践甚至于新的制度（比如学院），但同时这些儒者必须承认其他的完备性学说的平等存在的可能性。第三，是把儒学理解为一个公民宗教。我现在不多说，等会陈明老师可以进一步的展开。第四，把儒学当做一个中国的公民宗教的成分。贝拉在很有名的《美国公民宗教》里面并没有把美国的公民宗教等同于基督教，反而觉得基督教的一些概念、价值不过是笼统的公民宗教的一部分。在几个星期前，在香港开会时，香港城市大学的艾文贺教授说，中国的公民宗教应该是同样包括各种宗教的，不限于儒教。所以这是另外一个理解儒家在当代中国的宗教作用的框架。第一个框架给予儒家的社会地位最高，第四个给予的地位最低。那么，第二个框架，所谓完备性学说，跟两种公民宗教的模式都没有矛盾，可以同时存在。反正，这是四个可能的框架。这些框架可以解释儒学的宗教性，或宗教的地位。当然，儒学也有其他的作用，可能有一个宪政的、道德上的作用等等，这些跟宗教也会有关系。需要明确的是，这四个框架是针对宗教性问题而提的。

Now we'll come around to my third main topic: the sense in which contemporary Confucianism is religious in nature. I'll touch on three points. First, what kind of framework should we use to understand the religiosity of contemporary Confucianism? Then my second and third points will touch on the role of the state and the status of the Classics, respectively. When I speak of an appropriate framework, what I mean to ask is: what are the possible forms that Confucian religion can take in contemporary China? There are at least four possibilities or frameworks, and probably more. The first is that of a "state religion," which I believe we are all familiar with, and which doesn't warrant too much attention here. Perhaps I only need to stress that, if there is a state religion, even though other religions still exist in the country, they must recognize its authority. In other words, making Confucianism the state religion points to placing it atop all other religions. For the second framework, we can borrow John Rawls' idea of "comprehensive doctrine" in our explanation. Rawls suggests that there are various kinds of comprehensive doctrines in a diverse contemporary society. This means that several religions can co-exist while none of them have special status. The state and the constitution treat all religions equally. These comprehensive doctrines don't have to fit into the framework of Christian "faith," but a given comprehensive doctrine must certainly be identified with in its own way by its participants. If we use Rawls' framework to examine the religiosity of contemporary Confucianism, we might then say that there is one (or perhaps more?) Confucian community, made up of Confucian practices and institutions (such as academies), which coexists with other comprehensive doctrines. The third framework is understanding Confucianism as a civil religion. I won't say too much about it now — if we wait a bit, Chen Ming can further expand on it. Fourth, we may also take

Confucianism as an element of a *Chinese* civil religion. In his famous “Civil Religion in America,” Robert Bellah expanded on the connection between the American civil religion and Christianity, concluding that some Christian concepts and values are part and parcel of a broader civil religion.<sup>10</sup> A few weeks ago, at a meeting in Hong Kong, P.J. Ivanhoe from the City University of Hong Kong argued that any Chinese civil religion should be based on a variety of religions, not just on Confucianism. This is another framework with which to understand the religious function of Confucianism in contemporary China. The first framework grants Confucianism the highest public status, and the fourth the lowest. The second liberal framework has no tension with either of the two frameworks of civil religion as they can be perfectly in sync. Anyway, these are four possible frameworks. These frameworks at least point us to the sense in which Confucianism can be religious today. Of course, Confucianism has other functions: it may play a constitutional role, a moral role, and so on. These in turn may also be related to religion. What we need to be clear on is that these four frameworks specifically target the issue of religiosity.

现在转到另一个问题：当代儒学宗教性问题与政府的关系。我要强调的一点是，不管是贝拉本人，还是陈明，他们都觉得自由平等的公民是公民宗教的必要的前提。公民宗教不是传统可以有的东西。而必须是现代性的产物。这两位学者都意味着公民宗教具有某种价值，可以用来判断政府合法性。如果这样，公民必须对政府有一种独立性。如果政府告诉我们标准是什么，就不可能用公民宗教自己的标准来判断政府的合法性。还有一点。我最近读过干春松老师的书，里面说，康有为对孔教的工作，到最后，在宪法和概念上都没有成功。宪法上的失败是很清楚的。概念上的失败是指，没有人继续康有为的工作，用康有为所用的概念，来解释儒家的地位。干春松老师的著作认为原因在于，袁世凯等军阀试图利用儒家为自己的统治进行合法性论证。结果是五四知识分子达到一个结论，就是民主和宗教有一个非常绝对性的对立。想到当代儒家宗教性跟政府的关系的时候，我想必须考虑这两点。

Next let me turn to another issue: the relationship between contemporary Confucianism and the state. One important starting point is that both Bellah and Chen Ming have said that free and equal citizens are a necessary prerequisite for civil religion. A civil religion is not something that can be found in past traditions, but rather is a product of modernity. For both thinkers, civil religion provides a set of values that can be used to assess the legitimacy of the state. For that to be the case, the citizenry must have some measure of independence from the state. If the state tells us what the standards are, then we cannot use the criteria of the civil religion itself to judge the legitimacy of the state. In addition, we should note that Chunsong says in his book that Kang’s Confucian religion failed both as a constitutional edifice and as a philosophical ideal.<sup>11</sup> Its constitutional failure is very clear: no constitution of the Republic of China ever stipulated that Confucianism was the state religion. Its

---

<sup>10</sup> ref

<sup>11</sup> ref

conceptual failure lies in the fact that no one carried on Kang's work and used his concepts to decipher Confucianism. Chunsong's analysis suggests that the reason for the conceptual bankruptcy of Confucian religion rests with Yuan Shikai and other warlords who maliciously traded on Confucianism to legitimate their unseemly regimes. As a result, May Fourth intellectuals came to the conclusion that democracy and religion are absolutely opposed. When we think about the relationship between Confucian religiosity and the state, I think we must consider these two points.

最后一个题目是关于经典的地位。这个问题很大。不只是跟宗教有关，还跟当代儒学、进步儒学有很大的关系。接下来可以找时间讨论。今天只能有初步的展开。那么，我们可以问经典到底是什么？可以用什么样的解释方式才有合法性？是不是有的经典比较可靠？还有我们现在的人是不是可以跟经典有不同的态度，假如经典的作者犯了错误或者说的不清楚？我们在现代的社会里还说经典有神圣性到底是什么意思？如果我们把儒家的经典跟伊斯兰教经典做一个小小的比较，就会发现它们其实有一个不同，按照伊斯兰教自己的解释，《古兰经》是上帝直接告诉穆罕默德，所以是一种启示。《古兰经》有一个特别之处，那就是经上的话不可能是错误的，因为是真主说的。这跟伊斯兰教很重视的逊奈，一些关于穆罕默德所做的行为与故事不一样。逊奈有很多伊斯兰教派在解释，有说这个可靠，那个不可靠的。但是《古兰经》不可能这样解释。可是，《古兰经》有很明显的矛盾。而真主的话里面，矛盾应该是不可能出现的。怎么解释呢？按照他们的理解，穆罕默德有两次被上帝启示，一次在麦加，一次在麦地那。所以，穆斯林用这个解释方式来化解古兰经里面的矛盾。因为当时情况的需要，所以真主在麦加那样说；然后，有新的情况，所以真主在麦地那又有另外一个说法。而且传统的解释方法是，如果《古兰经》里有矛盾，应该按照后来的启示。这是伊斯兰教对《古兰经》的传统的解释方法。在二十世纪中年，苏丹的一个思想家（名字叫 Mohammed Taha）提出另外一个解释方法。他说最早的启示是最普遍性的，就是理想的状态；后来在麦地那，就是当穆斯林更有权力的时候，真主说，你暂时用这套，这是比较实用的，也没有说本来更理想的那套是不重要的，只是要等到可以实行的时间。

My last point is about what to include and exclude as Confucian texts or in other words as Classics. This is not only an important issue for Confucian religion, but also for contemporary Confucianism and for progressive Confucianism. This is a large topic that leads to several questions: What is the canon? What is the legitimate way to justify the Confucian canon? Are some canonical texts more reliable than others? Can we, as moderns, deviate from canonical views? What if the ancients were mistaken or opaque? To what extent are canonical texts are still relevant and sacred under modern conditions?

If we do a brief comparison between Confucian Classics and the Islamic canon, we may easily find that there is one, most important difference between them. According to the Islamic doctrine, the *Quran* is the word of God directly given to Muhammed; it is a "revelation." The *Quran* thus has a special status: the text cannot be mistaken, as it reflects and conveys the words of Allah. This is different from the *Sunnah*, another

part of the Islamic canon, which relates to the practices and stories of Prophet Muhammed. Historically and even today, different sects of Islam have different views on what are legitimate stories to include in the *Sunnah*. However, the *Quran* cannot be parsed in this way. The thorny issue is that some very obvious contradictions exist in the *Quran*. Since these are the words of Allah, you might think that there shouldn't be any contradictions or inconsistencies. How can this be explained? Well, tradition holds that Muhammed received Allah's revelations twice: once in Mecca and then again in Medina. Muslims often appeal to this circumstantial gap to resolve the inconsistencies within the *Quran*. Because of what the circumstances demanded at the time, Allah said such-and-such in Mecca, and there were new circumstances later on, which led Allah speak differently in Medina. Moreover, the traditional way of interpretation is that if there are inconsistencies in the *Quran*, one should follow the later (Medinan) revelation. In the mid-twentieth century, a Sudanese thinker by the name of Mohammed Taha proposed a new way of interpretation. He argued that the earliest revelation was the most universal, as it was aimed at ideal conditions. Later, in Medina, when Muslims became more powerful, Allah in effect says, "Use these for the time being, as they are more practical." It's not to say that the original ideal is not relevant anymore, but just that Muslims needed to wait until the time is right for the earlier, more universal ideals to be put into practice.<sup>12</sup>

Taha 觉得在他那个时候，时间到了：穆斯林应该开始实行更理想的价值。苏丹的政府不同意，而他被判死刑。这跟儒家的经典有什么关系呢？Taha 的解释方法有点像康有为对小康和太平世的区分。康有为对经典的解释，不只是靠小康太平的区分，还靠他所想象的古人的口说等，可能跟刚才那个《古兰经》的解释，是一样勉强、复杂。那么，伊斯兰《古兰经》是上帝启示而来，所以可能其教徒必须用这样解释方法。但是儒家经典的地位，是不是也必须让我们采用这样又复杂又勉强的解释方式呢？干春松老师书里说，康有为是“经典的埋葬者”，不知道他是不是跟我现在说的一致。反正，看康有为对经典的解释，我们会疑问，我们真的需要这样做吗？所以最后我可以向陈明老师问：公民宗教对经典的看法是什么？是不是有复杂的解释？还是只要重视其中的一些话语，而其他可以不看，或不太重视？

Taha believed that, in his time, that day had arrived, and that Muslims should start implementing the more universal, ideal values. The Sudanese government disagreed and sentenced Taha to death. Now, what does this have to do with the Confucian Classics? Taha's method of interpretation resembles Kang's. Kang's interpretations of classics not only differentiated between the Small Tranquility and the Grand Union, but also depended on the words of the ancients as he conjectured. Hence, perhaps Kang's interpretation is as contrived and complicated as the interpretation of the *Quran*. Now, the *Quran* comes directly as a revelation from Allah, and so perhaps the faithful need to use such an interpretive method. However, considering the position of the Confucian Classics, is it also necessary for us to explain them in this complicated

---

12

and contrived fashion? Perhaps because Kang's approach seems to make such complex hermeneutics necessary, Chunsong's book dubs Kang "the man who buried the Classics." I don't know if Chunsong will agree with what I'm saying! Anyway, having seen Kang's interpretation of the classics, we should question whether we need to follow in his footsteps. Therefore, at last, I can ask Chen Ming a question: what is the view of civil religion on its classics? Are we required to use complicated, forced interpretations? Or is it that we only pay attention to some anecdotes and do not bother with the rest? And with that I'll end.

陈壁生：谢谢安靖如老师。刚才他讲的三个问题，第一个是宗教与信仰的关系，第二是传统儒学的宗教性，第三个是当代儒学的宗教性，这三个问题互相关联。对于儒家跟宗教的关系，特别是当代儒学建构中的宗教性问题，是许多朋友特别关心的。陈明老师好几年前就提出把儒学往公民宗教的方向建构。不过我认为，安靖如老师最后提的那个问题，非常精确地打中陈老师的要害。要用什么经典来构建一个公民宗教呢？这里面涉及的问题非常复杂，接下来我们请陈明老师发言回应。

CHEN BISHENG: Thank you, Steve. He touched on the relationship between religion and faith and the senses in which traditional and contemporary Confucianism can be rendered religious. The three issues are closely intertwined. Many Chinese scholars today are concerned with the relationship between Confucianism and religion, especially the issue of religiosity in the contemporary reconstruction of Confucianism. Many years ago, Chen Ming proposed Confucianism as a civil religion. However, I think that the last question Steve asked really hit the crux of Chen Ming's argument. What Classics should we use in constructing a civil religion? This itself invites many complex issues. Next, we'll invite Chen Ming to respond.

陈明：壁生真是个很好的主持人！他制造了一个矛盾，说安教授刚才提的这个问题打中了我的要害，这从何说言起呢？但成功的激起了我对话的兴致。

CHEN MING: Bisheng is truly a great host! He's created some conflict here, saying that Steve's question hit me where it hurts. Shall I begin there? In any case, he's successfully piqued my interest in this conversation.

我还是从公民宗教问题说起吧。美国的亨廷顿（Samuel Huntington）、贝拉论述美国的公民宗教，或者卢梭乃至更远一点，古希腊的公民宗教，其实都没涉及经典问题。因为公民宗教，civil religion不是a religion，它主要是宗教社会学、政治哲学概念，指的是宗教在社会、在政治生活中的作用。这种作用以某一个或某几个宗教（a religion）的存在为前提，而这些宗教本身才有经典或理念的问题。我说儒教是中国社会中的公民宗教，是从功能和意义的角度说的，是从它在现代或未来中国社会中的定位来说的，相对的是康有为和蒋庆他们的国教诉求或想象定位来说的。

Let me start from the perspective of civil religion. No one who has discussed civil religion, from Samuel Huntington, Robert Bellah, and Rousseau all the way back to

the ancient Greeks, really touched on the question of Classics. They avoided confronting this issue for good reason: civil religion is not a religion. Civil religion is mainly a concept pertaining to religious sociology and political philosophy, which pivots around the role it plays in people's social and political lives. Civil religions must depend on one or more actual religions in order to exist, but it is only these religions themselves that face the question of choosing classics and ideals. When I say that Confucianism is the civil religion in today's Chinese society, I say this from the perspective of its function and significance — its position in the present or future of Chinese society. My stance stands in stark contrast to those of Kang Youwei or Jiang Qing.

至于儒教本身的经典系统，我确实有所思考。这种思考是围绕儒教的神学理论系统这个问题来进行的，我认为它主要由《易传》、《中庸》和《大学》这三本书构成：《易传》是天道；《中庸》是天人论；《大学》是天道信念经由人的体验落实，在私人领域和公共领域里的展开。我有一篇文章初步提到了这些，现在正在写一本书进一步论证。这些对于作为一个宗教的儒教是很重要的，对于作为公民宗教的儒教则不是特别重，因为这些理念在公共领域发挥作用，主要是对通过一些基本价值、礼仪形式发挥作用。这是一种其它宗教价值、符号和仪式所不具有的文化权重或文化地位、影响力。但它们作为理论本身是很薄的，是从一些经典中抽绎出来的，但具有基础性或奠基性，所以极为重要。卢梭提出的公民宗教是 *religion of the citizen* 主要是服从服务于国家建构的。我讲儒教是中国的公民宗教也有凸显儒教对于中国帝国建构、社会整合这一作用的目的在。但同时，我也强调，儒教因为渊源久远，是一个社会的文化传统，而不是由主权者所建立的，所以，它还有对国家权力、对君主权力的约束、限制的意义，这是与卢梭以及其他外国学者的公民宗教论述不一样的地方。它既不是伊斯兰教那样的政教合一，也不是卢梭那样以国家为中心，也不是贝拉或亨廷顿那样的立足于社会。天是最高存在，但孔子作为圣人却并不拥有任何行政权力，是所谓“素王”，这就很能体现儒教的特殊性——这是第一。

As for the system of Classics in traditional Confucianism itself, I do have some thoughts, which pivot mostly around this question of a theoretical-cum-theological system for Confucian religion. I think it is comprised mostly of the *Ten Wings of the Book of Changes*, *The Doctrine of the Mean* and *The Great Learning*. *The Ten Wings* represents the Heavenly Way; *The Doctrine of the Mean* is the theory of man and Heaven; *The Great Learning* is the actualization of the Heavenly Way in human experiences as it unfolds in both public and private spheres. One article of mine briefly touched upon these, and I'm further discussing them in a book I'm writing now. These are very important for Confucianism as a religion, but not so important for Confucianism as a civil religion because these ideas mainly function in the public sphere through the intermediary of fundamental values and ritual forms. They have a kind of cultural significance, position, or influence that other religious values, symbols, and rituals lack. However, as theories, they are quite shallow, since they have been selected out from Classics. But still, they are crucial and have a foundational value. The civil religion put forward by Rousseau is the "religion of the citizen" which

serves nation-building. Both of my claims — that Confucian religion is the civil religion of China and that Confucian religion had many manifest functions for Chinese empire-building and social cohesion — convey similar meanings to that of Rousseau. However, at the same time, I still stress that Confucian religion is cultural in nature and not deliberately established by individual sovereigns. Therefore, it also has the power to restrain and limit state power. This is a point of divergence from Rousseau and other foreign scholars' discourse on civil religion. It is not a union of church and state like that of Islamism, nor is it like Rousseau's making the nation the center of everything. It is also not rooted in society in the way described by Bellah or Huntington. Heaven is the highest existence, but Confucius as a sage did not have any executive power. He is the so-called "uncrowned king," reflective of Confucian religion's unique qualities. This is my first point.

第二，儒教以天为最高信仰。它不仅是善的，也比人有更高的位格，是人和制度的根源。那天壁生说，董仲舒很重要，仅次于孔子，我很同意。董仲舒为何重要，一个是董仲舒建构了一套理论，把一个早期的信仰体系，由生命论述拓展到了政治的论述，如“王道三纲，可求于天”，如“名则圣人所发天意”等；一个是将这一套理论实现了与现实政治的结合，给一个武力创造的政权赋予伦理和神性的品质，使中华文明获得完整成熟的形态。如果说作为中国的公民宗教的儒教也有经典的话，那么《白虎通》可能就是了。

Second, Confucian religion regards Heaven as the highest object of faith (*xinyang*). It is not only good but also has a higher status than humans, and it is the wellspring of humanity and its institutions. Bisheng once said that Dong Zhongshu is very important, second only to Confucius. I agree wholeheartedly. Why is Dong important? First, Dong came up with a theory that expanded earlier beliefs into a full-blown political discourse. For example, he said, "the three cardinal guides of the Kingly Way can be sought from Heaven,"<sup>13</sup> and "names are the means through which sages promulgate the Heavenly will."<sup>14</sup> Second, Dong wedded his discourse to real politics, bestowing divine and moral qualities upon a regime founded in violence, thereby rendering Chinese civilization complete and mature. If Confucian religion, serving as the Chinese civil religion, has a canon, then it may just be the *Bai Hu Tong*.<sup>15</sup>

儒教问题在当代的讨论从外部说表现为对康有为的重视。康有为作为一个儒者我觉得主要要从他的活动而不是著述去理解——对于思想家来说写作与其说是研究不如说是表达、是其实践活动的特殊形式。康有为一生的工作我觉得第一个是国家建构，变法是救国、建国的前提，保皇则是建国的路径、手段，这在干春松的书里讲的很清楚；第二个是儒教的国教化努力。因为康有为对中国的理解与排满的革命派不同，是包含满蒙回藏汉的大中华，因此，他意识到这个帝国需要儒教作为共同的文化认同，而这就需要孔教作为国教规定下来，稳定社会、延续文明——与前面那个国家建构相联

---

<sup>13</sup> 春秋繁露 基义

<sup>14</sup> 春秋繁露 深察名号

<sup>15</sup> ref

系而又有所不同，可以叫做国族建构吧。这是我的理解。

Viewed from the outside, contemporary discussion on the issue of Confucian religion is inextricably connected to Kang Youwei. Kang as a Confucian, I think, should be understood through his action rather than writings. For him, works were more of an expression and practice than theoretical research. Kang's primary concern was nation-building. Political reform was the prerequisite of the survival and revival of the nation. Protecting the emperor was a means to, a stage in, nation-building. This is clearly explained in Chunsong's book.<sup>16</sup> By comparison, Kang's effort to make Confucian religion the national religion was secondary. His understanding of China was different from that of the anti-Manchu revolutionaries in the sense that his Greater China included Manchus, Mongols, Muslims, Tibetans, and Han. Therefore, he realized that the empire needed Confucianism to serve as a shared cultural identifier, and that required the rendering of Confucianism as the state religion in order to stabilize society and sustain civilization. This bears on the national construction that we just mentioned but has notable differences. Let's call it ethno-nation building. That's my understanding.

大陆新儒家因为对康有为的重视而被叫做新康有为主义。在这个群体里，曾亦和陈壁生主要是从经学的角度理解康有为。我认为是不够全面的，虽然学界长期以来就是这样。因为在我看来，从经学去说儒学的时候，实际上已经预设或暗含了一个政教合一的儒学理解、一种政教合一的政治制度理解或安排。而汉代的经学已经放弃了这种思想，表现就是将孔子素王化了，虽然仍然是圣人，但却不再像文武周公那样拥有行政权力。董仲舒虽然是相信孔子，相信孔子的政治理想的，但他也必须将孔子素王化，因为现实中的真王、时王地位不可动摇、权威不可挑战。所以，他的工作主要是在尊重这一现实的前提下去实现这个儒家的政治目标，那就是与真王、时王也就是汉武帝合作，通过这样一个新的政治制度形式去做到这点。所以，欧阳修注意到三代与秦汉的政治区别：“三代以上，治出于一，三代以下，治出于二”，就是政教合一与政教分离。

Mainland New Confucianism has been called “New Kang-Youwei-ism” because of its emphasis on Kang. Within this group, Zeng Yi and Chen Bisheng primarily interpret Kang from the perspective of Classical Studies. This is a long-standing practice within academic circles. As I see it, when we understand Confucianism through Classical Studies, we're taking a theocratic understanding of Confucianism for granted. Han Dynasty Classicism did away with this approach, as evinced by its rendering of Confucius as an “uncrowned king.” Despite the fact that he was a sage he did have the authority of the real kings, unlike earlier sage-rulers such as King Wen, King Wu, and the Duke of Zhou. Although Dong believed in Confucius and his political ideals, but Dong emphasized that Confucius was “uncrowned” because the actual power of real kings in his day could not be challenged. His job was primarily about acting on

---

<sup>16</sup> ref

the political goals of Confucianism within the framework of the empire, which led to pragmatic cooperation with hereditary kings. As the Song dynasty scholar Ouyang Xiu put it, the difference between the political systems of the three ancient dynasties — Xia, Shang, and Zhou — and those of the Qin and Han Dynasties was that “in the Three Dynasties, rule came from one; after the Three Dynasties, rule came from two.”<sup>17</sup> We can understand history after Qin as the separation of state from religion.

康有为是意识到了这一点的，当然也是基于现实的感受与考虑，必须尊重皇帝，必须依赖现有的政治系统去实现儒家的政治目标，而不是像革命派那样。这个问题看起来好像是他失败了，革命派成功了，但革命派究竟是否真取得了胜利？这个胜利的代价又当如何评估？都还是问题，这里不去说。国教问题，现在又重新被提出来，则肯定能够说明康有为的思考与思想的深邃性。现代中国是继承满清帝国的帝国的政治遗产而来，广土众民就必然有一个民族的问题，就是社会的整合、文化的认同的问题。国族是一个想象的共同体，它要诉诸共同的政治愿景（vision），而这样一种想象又不能不与民族的文化记忆和宗教理念发生关联，这就需要某种文化共识来化解文化差异和紧张，形成政治学所谓的共同善（common good）。我认为康有为就是基于这样的考量，即从文化共识的塑造出发而提出自己的国教方案和构思的。

Unlike the revolutionaries in his day, Kang Youwei was similarly pragmatic and realist. He knew that it was impossible to deliver on the political goals of Confucianism outside the existing political system. On this question, it may seem that he failed, and the revolutionaries succeeded. However, did the revolutionaries really emerge victorious in the end? How should we look at the cost of this victory? These questions aside, the topic of national religion has emerged once again, which speaks to the depth of Kang’s thought. Modern China was a direct heir of the Manchu Qing Empire. With its vast territory and diverse population, it’s incumbent on China to address issues of societal integration and cultural affirmation. A (political) nation (*guozu*) is an imagined community, and it must appeal to a collective political vision. This ideational fabrication must find a way to connect to the cultural memory and the religious ideals of these peoples, which requires us to transcend cultural differences and tensions for the sake of the common good. I believe that Kang was proposing Confucian religion as a way of addressing deep schisms in Chinese society.

上次我们讨论的牟宗三他们被叫做港台新儒家，我觉得他们实际是现代新儒家，而所谓的大陆新儒家则应该叫做当代新儒家。港台新儒家只是居住写作在台湾香港，讨论的问题完全是整个中国的，他们的语境是五四或后五四的，那是一种救亡的语境，所以他们所从事的是一种由政治危机导致的西方文化压力下的思想活动。而我说的当代，是以冷战结束划线的，九十年代到现在。由一个工业革命形成的乐观的进步的情绪，即启蒙话语，相信民主宪政的制度安排，可以解决很多问题，可以终结历史，就像福山说的那样——这可能是进步主义的极致了吧。但是，福山似乎很快就意识到了问题，那就是文明的冲突，文化、文明作为实体的意义被凸显。如认同等问题，它不仅不是

---

<sup>17</sup> 新唐书 志第一 礼乐一

宪政民主的制度安排可以解决，欧洲甚至美国，民粹主义、保守主义就是作为它们的应对而被激发起来的。这是另外一个问题，先不说。

Scholars like Mou Zongsan are called Hong Kong-Taiwan New Confucians, but I think they are actually Modern New Confucians, and the mainland New Confucians should be called Contemporary New Confucians.<sup>18</sup> For Mou and his ilk, their historical context is either May-Fourth or post-May-Fourth, both molded under the influence of Western culture triggered by a series of political crises. In contrast, what I call “contemporary” starts with the end of the Cold War, i.e., from the 1990s till now. We are facing, not the triumph of liberal democracy, but the clash of identities and civilizations, with the real significance of culture and civilization becoming apparent.

回到刚才说的，为什么要提儒教之公民宗教说？对儒教，我实际是一个二元论述，即作为一个宗教的儒教和作为公民宗教的论述，the Confucianism as a religion and the Confucianism as civil religion。形成这样一个论述的过程，我简单说一下。十年文革的结束使对传统的理解有了新的可能。之前完全把儒学作为一个统治阶级的意识形态来理解。意识形态是一种权力正当化理论，是这一目的制造出来的。虽然儒家并非如此，但意识形态化的理解根深蒂固。我们中国社会科学院宗教研究所的老所长任继愈先生，在对文革反思批判的过程中，认为文革是封建思想复辟，这种思想就是儒家学说，像个人崇拜之类，就是宗教性的，于是从宗教角度理解定义儒家，提出儒家思想是宗教的所谓儒教论。这是意识形态论的学术化——他曾亲口跟我说这是他一生最重要的学术贡献。某种程度上也可以这么说，因为他由此在宗教所建立了一个“儒教研究室”，我就是在这里读的博士研究生，后来又留在那里工作了十三年。也正是这种经历，使我接触到了宗教，并渐渐意识到宗教是一个比哲学而更好的描述、理解和想象儒家思想的学科范式或进路（approach）。

Why would I suggest the idea of Confucianism as a civil religion? I have a two-track narrative of Confucianism: Confucian learning as a religion and Confucianism as a civil religion. Let me briefly talk about how these narratives came about. The end of the ten-year-long Cultural Revolution offered new possibilities for understanding the tradition. Previously, Confucianism was entirely understood as the ideology of the ruling class. An ideology only serves to legitimize political power. This ideologized understanding has deep roots and wide appeal. Ren Jiyu, the former chair of the Institute of Religious Studies at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, even understands the Cultural Revolution as a variant of Confucianism. He felt that the era's personality cults were religious in nature, which he traced back to Confucianism. This is the application of the ideological approach to Confucianism, and he once told me that he considers this insight to be his most important contribution. I've been influenced by him to some extent. Ren established a “Confucian Religion Research Center” in the Institute of Religious Studies. I was a doctoral student there and, later, stayed on to work for another thirteen years. This experience brought me into contact

---

<sup>18</sup> For more on this distinction, see Dialogue 1.

with religion, and I gradually realized that religion is a better approach than philosophy for describing, understanding, and envisioning Confucianism.

五四以来，儒家被拉进一个西方哲学的范畴去理解，但是从来没去反思，这样合适不合适？我的导师就是冯友兰先生的学生，任继愈跟冯先生关系则不太好，他说冯先生不喜欢他，虽然他们有亲戚关系，不知道这是不是任先生提出儒教论的原因之一？但是，需要指出的是，任继愈的观念中，宗教是坏的，是封建社会的思想形态。他把儒学说成宗教，是为了更加彻底地否定儒学这个传统，将它拒斥在现代社会的现代中国的门外。宗教是好是坏今天虽然可以讨论，但在中国曾经更多的是一个负面的形象。对我来说，我是见证了从哲学角度理解儒学的各种努力和尝试的，觉得它们彰显不多，遮蔽不少，十分的难尽人意。因为哲学这个概念是外来的，是一种对象性的知识研究，以理性为方法，而儒学虽然有概念的系统，但它的起点、目标却是对意义的论证，是实践性的，情感和信仰占有相当比重。正是因为这点，它才在与生活和生命建立有紧密的联系，才在历史上发挥着重要的作用，才在数千年中保持着发展的连续性。我的博士论文《儒学的历史文化功能》<sup>19</sup>就是做这样的研究。它使我意识到儒学在历史上确实有很多的作用，政治的、社会的、文化的，并且相当不错。而这种作用，与西方比较，显然是更接近宗教而不是哲学。

如果宗教是一个比哲学更有效的理解框架的话，那么，儒教又应该是一种什么样的宗教？在西方，存在宗教进化论的理论，认为一神教是宗教发展的最高阶段。另外，宗教一定要讲来世、讲生死，等等。这都使得我们在谈到儒教时必须思考如何处理应对这些问题。由于我的论文接近社会学，有功能主义的影响，所以，我觉得可以先绕开宗教这个概念所必然带来的问题，从历史文化功能的考察，看它有哪些作用，如果它跟卢梭、贝拉、亨廷顿他们说的那样，功能上与公民宗教相通相近，可以达成其在中国具有公民宗教的地位和作用，那么，就可以逻辑推导出，这样一种公民宗教功能的发挥、存在，必定是以儒教作为一个宗教（a religion）的存在为前提的——最开始我就是这样一种思路，先证明它有公民宗教的功能，然后证明它可以成为宗教，再然后从公民宗教的角度去定位他在未来中国社会中的功能意义。

Since May Fourth, Confucianism has been subject to the sway of Western philosophical perspectives, but does it make sense to continue the philosophical approach? My advisor Ren was a student of Feng Youlan. They didn't see eye to eye, however. He said that Feng didn't like him, even though they were related. I don't know if Ren's proposing a theory of Confucian religion is one of the reasons for this? In any event, the key thing we need to realize is that for Ren and others like him, religion is a bad thing, a kind of feudal ideology. He identified Confucianism with religion only as a means to more thoroughly discredit the tradition and toss it to the curb of modern China. Now whether religion is good or bad is a large question that we could discuss, but in China it has typically been seen in a negative light. At the same time, I have witnessed all kinds of efforts and attempts to understand Confucianism from a philosophical perspective. They don't so much demonstrate as conceal and are ultimately unsatisfying. This is because the concept of philosophy is

---

<sup>19</sup> 陈明：《儒学的历史文化功能——以中古士族现象为个案》，北京：中国社会科学出版社，2005年。

Western-centric. It is an objective field of intellectual study that uses rationality as its methodology. On the other hand, although Confucianism also has concepts and systems, its point of departure and ultimate objectives concern the demonstration of meaning and are fundamentally practical; emotions and beliefs play very significant roles. It is tightly bound together with our lives and it has thus played a major role in our historical development. We don't so much study Confucianism as practice it. My doctoral dissertation, *The Historical-Cultural Function of Confucianism*<sup>20</sup>, explored precisely this topic. Writing it made me aware that Confucianism had played significant political, social, and cultural roles in China. These functions, if we take the West as a point of comparison, are obviously closer to those of religion than philosophy.

Supposing that religion is a more plausible framework for understanding Confucianism than philosophy, what kind of religion should it be? In the West, there is a theory of theistic evolutionism, which suggests that monotheism is the highest level of religious development. Additionally, a religion must talk about afterlife, life and death, and so on. As a result, we have to think about how to deal with these issues when we talk about Confucian religion. My dissertation drew on sociological functionalism in order to avoid being trapped in Western discourse. I believed that we could initially put aside the problems that come with the category of "religion" and explore Confucianism through its historical and cultural functions. My hypothesis was that if we could show that these functions resembled what Rousseau, Bellah, and Huntington had characterized as a civil religion, then we can logically conclude that such a civil religion in China owes its existence and development to the prior existence of Confucianism as a religion. This was my thought process starting from the very beginning. We first prove that Confucianism functioned like a civil religion, and then we can prove that it can be a religion. After that, we establish its future role in the Chinese society using the definition of civil religion.

前面讲的主要是我的自我阐述，算是一种间接回应。现在对你刚才讲的几点，做一个简单的直接回应。您讲到儒教的理解能否摆脱基督教等的影响？我非常赞同。作为一个宗教，儒教在宗教的类型学意义上跟基督教、伊斯兰教相比，它的神学、组织形态、社会功能是怎样的？这些都是迟早要回答的。我现在在思考，从系统神学到修炼法门等，希望今后能有成果出来。至于南乐山的宇宙论，我理解实际上是上帝论或天命论。而礼仪作为宗教仪式，从祭祀到行为，是人与神的理论关系在实践中的实现或重建，我想应该属于成圣论。

So far, I've been elaborating on my own views, which is an indirect response to Steve. Now, I will engage with him directly. You discussed whether or not our understandings of Confucian religion can break free from the influence of Christianity. I say yes. When compared with Islam and Christianity, what is the theology,

---

<sup>20</sup> 陈明：《儒学的历史文化功能——以中古士族现象为个案》，北京：中国社会科学出版社，2005年。

organizational type, and social function of Confucianism as a religion? We need to answer these questions sooner or later. These are questions I am working on right now from the perspectives of systematic theology and religious cultivation. I hope this effort will bear some fruit at some point. In terms of Neville's cosmology<sup>21</sup>, I actually understand Confucianism as a theory of God or a theory of the Mandate of Heaven. Moreover, rites as religious rituals, from sacrifices all the way to daily practices, constitute the theoretical relationship between humans and God — and I believe this ought to include the Confucian theory of becoming a sage.

最后我要感谢你说的对于“信”的问题的提醒，尤其要感谢你对“敬”的强调。基督教来自犹太教，犹太教的上帝信仰又是产生于对以色列人自身对多神信仰的抛弃或超越，有一个文化断裂，所以必须依靠“信”，并且要立约为凭。这就决定了这个“信”的理性、交易的性质，需要意志控制、理性塑造维持，而不可能由情感直接养成。所以，犹太教更重要的是“约”。到基督教，因为需要向外邦人拓展，这个时候“约”就不重要了，就完全靠“信”了。而中国儒教之天，一直就是华夏族群崇拜敬仰的对象。它的升华、升格是一个自然的过程。换言之，它一直就在那里，一直就在心里，只是你对它理解的程度、与它连接的关系如何深化、如何自觉化的问题。这就是敬了。圣贤是有自觉的，就是《中庸》的“自诚明”；而一般人却需要教化唤醒，就是所谓“自明诚”。从字源上说，敬者肃也；肃者战战兢兢也。这是对人之心态、形态的描述。《二程·萃言》说，“主一之谓敬”，“无适之谓一”。朱子进一步说，“敬者主一无适之谓”。宋儒受禅宗影响，有所谓“内卷化”倾向，即将本体内置于心。明代有人说，所谓一者必有所指。结合《诗经》里“敬天之怒”、“敬天之渝”的诗句，如果从天的角度去理解这个“一”，从儒学史和儒教理论来说，它的意义更准确，也更有必要。根据训诂学家考释，“一”就是“壹”，“壹”就是“壶”，“壶”就是“孕育”，就是“天地絪縕万物化生”的宇宙大生命之大德生生的起点与过程。祭与畏——君子有三畏，都是敬的表现形式，祭是用礼物表达，畏则驱动实践行为。魏了翁指出，“孔门说仁处，大抵多有敬意”。董仲舒说，“仁，天心”。朱子说，“仁者天地生物之心”。这就能解释二者的内在联系了。敬的目的或所导致的内心结果就是仁，就是“德”的自觉，就是与“一”、与天的关系建立。英文宗教 religion，原意就是人与神的再连接。从这里也可以找到安教授所强调的儒教特点的线索。

Finally, I want to thank you for reminding us about the question of faith, and especially for your emphasis on reverence. Christianity originated from Judaism. The Jewish faith in God stemmed from the Israelites' abandonment or transcendence of polytheistic beliefs. There was a cultural break, and people had to appeal to faith and also rely on something like a contract. Judaism's historical pedigree contributed to defining the rational and transactional nature of "faith," which must be maintained through conscious control and rational construction, instead of directly nurtured emotions. Therefore, crucial to Judaism is the role of the covenant. As for Christianity, the covenant becomes less important, and the religion came to fully rely on faith instead. This is because they needed to proselytize people of foreign lands. As for the

---

<sup>21</sup> ref

Heaven of Chinese Confucian religion, it has always been the object of the Chinese (*Huaxia*) nation's worship and awe. Its sublimation and transcendence was a natural process. In other words, it has always been in people's hearts, habits, and mores. The real issues are the extent to which you understand it, the ways in which you deepen your relationship with it, and how you make it part of your self-consciousness. That is reverence. A sage has self-awareness, which reveals "intelligence resulting from sincerity" in the *Doctrine of the Mean*; whereas ordinary people need to be taught to be enlightened, which is "sincerity resulting from intelligence."<sup>22</sup> Etymologically speaking, reverence is solemnity, and solemnity means fear and trembling.<sup>23</sup> The Cheng brothers said, "Focusing on the One is called reverence" and "not being distracted is called the One."<sup>24</sup> Master Zhu Xi went a step further saying, "reverence is focusing on the one and not being distracted."<sup>25</sup> Song Dynasty Confucianism was influenced by Chan Buddhism, and therefore, had a tendency of turning inwards, which meant placing inherent reality inside the heart-mind. Some in the Ming Dynasty said that "the One" must refer to *something*. Combining the stanzas "revering the anger of Heaven" and "revering the boundaries of Heaven" from the *Book of Poetry*, we can understand "the One" from the vantage point of Heaven, which in terms of the history and theory of Confucianism is more precise. According to scholarly research, the Chinese character "one, 壹 (yì)" is derived from the character "vase 壺 (hú)," which connotes pregnancy and nourishment. "There is an intermingling of the genial influences of Heaven and Earth and the transformation of the myriad things in life."<sup>26</sup> That is the beginning of the great life of the cosmos and the Great Virtue's life-generativity. As for reverence: "there are three things of which the gentleman stands in awe."<sup>27</sup> For its part, sacrifice expresses reverence with ritual and objects, and awe drives behavior in practice. As Wei Liaoweng pointed out, "benevolence in Confucianism cannot be understood independent of reverence."<sup>28</sup> As Dong Zhongshu once said, "benevolence is the heartmind of Heaven."<sup>29</sup> As Zhu Xi averred, "benevolence is the heartmind with which Heaven and Earth give life to the myriad things."<sup>30</sup> These statements can jointly explain the inherent connection between reverence and benevolence. The purpose and end state of reverence is benevolence. Reverence points to the self-consciousness of virtue and the establishment of one's relationship with the One, or Heaven. The English word "religion" initially meant a re-connection between humanity and the divine. We can find in all this various aspects of Steve's account of Confucian religiosity. .

---

<sup>22</sup> refs

<sup>23</sup> (说文解字).

<sup>24</sup> Collection of the Two Chengs: Selected Words

<sup>25</sup> (Zhu Xi' s notes on Analects, Xue' er)

<sup>26</sup> (The Book of Changes, Ci Xi)

<sup>27</sup> ref

<sup>28</sup> (渠阳集).

<sup>29</sup> (春秋繁露)

<sup>30</sup> (朱子语类)

儒教今天的形态，比如说，天的人格性，可以从精神性讨论。从宗教学上说，神的位格更高，所以不应该用人格性去述指它的 *personality*，用精神性、意志性也许更合适。一般说儒教的神人格性比较弱.....

Distinctive features of Confucian religion today, such as the personification of Heaven, can be discussed in terms of spirituality. From the perspective of religious studies, the status of the divine is superior to our own, so we should not use personification to refer to its "personality." Perhaps "spirituality" and "intentionality" are more suitable. In general, Confucian notions of the personification of divinity are quite weak....

安靖如：我并不觉得人格性比较弱。在宋明儒那里，根本就没有。

STEPHEN ANGLE: I don't think Confucian notions of personification are weak; at least in Neo-Confucianism, there's no hint of it at all!

陈明：宋明儒那里儒教的天都被解构了，成为了太极、天理，只剩下一个心了，当年耶稣会的传教士都感觉到了对先秦儒学的背叛或背离。我认为这种批评是有道理的。上次就讲到，“维天之命，於穆不已”，这是一个以生生为德的生命创造者，意义的根据与归宿。在宋明儒那里全部没有了。刚才你说到麦加、麦地那，这些沙漠的绿洲中，各种族群和文化的边界会更清楚一些，关系也更紧张一些。儒教与犹太教互为参照，对理解儒教和犹太教都会带来很多启发，它们都是原生的。我倾向认为耶和华是祖先神的升格，而这种升格以及犹太教拉比政治权力的掌握，与绿洲之间竞争，与以色列多次被征服有关，王权系统被摧毁，族群的组织只能依托于社会，由宗教来承担社会政治组织的责任。这样一个软性的拉比中心权力结构，反而使它变得生命力和影响力特别顽强、深入。而儒教，在秦汉帝国建立后，就只能作为“元素”嵌入帝国的政治系统里发挥作用了。从比较宗教学的角度看，这是可以讲清楚的。

CHEN MING: In Neo-Confucianism, Heaven was deconstructed and became the Supreme Ultimate, the Heavenly Pattern, and ultimately, the heart-mind. Even the Jesuit missionaries back then sensed a departure from classical Confucianism. I think such criticism makes sense. In another of these dialogues I quoted, "the ordinances of Heaven, how profound and unceasing they are!"<sup>31</sup> Heaven is a creator of life that takes life-generativity as the basis and destination of the world. None of this is left in Neo-Confucianism. You just mentioned Mecca and Medina. In desert oases like these, the boundaries between various ethnicities and cultures were clearer, the relationships more tense. Comparing Confucian religion to Judaism brings forth many features pertaining to each. I'm inclined to think that Jehovah is an ascendance of their ancestral god, and such ascendance has to do with the political power held by Jewish priests and rabbis, the competition within the oases, and the multiple defeats of Israel. The monarchy was destroyed, and the group could only rely on the kind of social

---

<sup>31</sup> (Book of Poetry, Sacrificial odes of Zhou, Chinese Text Project)

solidarity that only religion can provide. That soft, rabbi-centered power structure, however, made the society's vitality and influence especially strong and deep. On the other hand, Confucian religion, since the establishment of the Qin-Han Empire, could only function by being embedded in the imperial political system. This distinction is clear from the perspective of comparative religious studies.

作为一个宗教的儒教问题，是非常学术的。作为公民宗教的儒教的问题则是一个实践性的问题，是一个政治学、社会学的问题。它关涉的是儒家传统在今天应当承担哪些功能又如何承担实现这些功能的问题。这又要回到董仲舒、康有为。董仲舒特别注重政治的价值奠基，康有为则特别注重社会的组织稳定。阿伦特说的政治本身如果只有一个世俗目标，是很容易被替代，也没有说服力的，所以一定要诉诸一个超验的存在。中国作为一个在满清帝国政治遗产基础上建立的共和国，必然也要面对这些问题，社会整合、文化认同，共同善提供等等。事实上这也正是我们今天所面临的社会问题、政治问题和文化问题。

The question of whether and in what ways Confucianism is a religion is an academic topic, whereas Confucianism as a civil religion is a practical question. It has to do with the kinds of functions that the Confucian tradition could perform today and how it will realize those functions. We should go back to Dong Zhongshu and Kang Youwei. Dong particularly stressed the value basis of politics, while Kang focused on the stability of the social organization. Hannah Arendt suggested that, if politics itself has only a secular goal, it is easily replaceable and stops short of any power to persuade. Therefore, politics must appeal to transcendental existence. China must address problems including social integration, cultural identity, the provision of the common good, to which only Confucian civil religion can provide answers.

历史上这些问题无疑是基于儒教资源来应对解决的。汉武帝如此，雍正皇帝如此。以理代天的朱子事实上也是在韩愈揭示的佛教对儒教文化地位的冲击这一所谓道统问题的论语里辛苦工作，维护圣人之教而反击夷狄之法。今天讲中华民族的伟大复兴，它内在的包含着国家国族建构问题的解决。这应该也是大陆新儒学必须去思考的问题。当局如何想、如何做我们不得而知，但作为儒者，从纯粹学者的角度看，儒教的激活或复苏必须解决这么几个问题：一是身份的正当性问题，现在只有五大宗教是合法的——你（指安靖如）太太信的犹太教在中国严格讲其实是不合法的，东正教也是；第二，就是组织系统的问题，孔庙现在博物馆化了，祠堂趋于消亡，民间书院在努力，但举步维艰；第三，是神学理论的问题——这个我们在做的。

Historically, those problems were undoubtedly solved by employing Confucian resources. Emperor Han Wudi did so, and the Yongzheng Emperor of the Qing Dynasty did so as well. In fact, substituting "Pattern" for "Heaven" was Zhu Xi's way of taking up Han Yu's warning of Confucianism's diminishing social status resulting from the challenge of Buddhism. It was the hard work of defending the sage's doctrine and resisting barbarian customs. Nowadays, we talk about the great revival of the Chinese nation. That inherently includes the solution to the problem of constructing

the state and the nation. That is also a problem that Mainland New Confucianism has to consider. We don't know what the authorities think or what they will do. Still, as Confucians, from a purely scholarly perspective, the revival of Confucian religion must resolve the following problems. The first is the legitimacy crisis. The second problem is institutional. Confucian temples have been turned into museums and tourist spots. Private academies are trying, but they face many difficulties. The third is the issue of theological theory, which is what we are doing.

大陆讲宗教的问题，包含了很强的现实关切。

In short, religious issues in Mainland China are undergirded by real concerns.

卢云峰：我是做宗教社会学的，所以对于儒教作为一种宗教和儒教作为一种公民宗教这两个话题也比较感兴趣。

LU Yunfeng: My expertise is in religious sociology. Therefore, I'm interested in both the question of Confucianism as a religion and as a civil religion.

先来谈谈儒教作为一种宗教。首先还是回到陈老师所说的 Confucian as a civil religion。按照我的理解，他是想从从宗教与现代民族国家的建构角度出发来定位儒教。清末民初知识界有三个忧虑和相应的诉求，也就是“保国、保种、保教”，现在看来前面两个成功了，第三个还在路上。所谓保教就是延续儒教的活力，当时康有为试图通过孔教运动来达成，但是未果。即使在今天，保教的问题仍然具有现实意义，就是儒教作为一种文化资源在现代民族国家建构中的作用。亨廷顿曾经提问 who are we? 中文翻译为“谁是美国人？”。同样，我们也会问“谁是中国人？”。比如说，美国可以被称为一个基督教社会，沙特可能是一个伊斯兰教社会，以色列可能是一个犹太教社会，你说咱们中国是个什么样的社会？（问安靖如教授）

Let's start with Confucianism as a religion. First, I still need to begin with Confucianism as a civil religion, which Chen Ming talked about. According to my understanding, he wants to define Confucian religion in terms of the relationship between civil religion and the construction of a modern nation-state. At the turn of the twentieth century, Chinese intellectuals were concerned with preserving the nation, the state, and (Confucian) religion. The first two pursuits have been successful, while the third is still in progress. Preserving the Confucian religion is aimed at extending the life of Confucianism, which has real significance even today, and Kang tried to achieve this through the Confucian Religion Movement. When Samuel Huntington asks, "Who are we?" The Chinese translation reads, "Who are the Americans?" In the same way, we may ask, "Who are the Chinese?" For instance, America may be called a Christian society, Saudi Arabia an Islamic society, and Israel a Jewish society. [To Steve:] What kind of society do you think China is?

安靖如：那么我会说是多元性的吧。

Stephen Angle: Well, I'd say it's diverse.

卢云峰：简单来说就是社会主义社会。

LU Yunfeng: To put it simply, it is a socialist society.

安靖如：我说是具有中国特色的多元性。

Stephen Angle: Perhaps we could say it has diversity with Chinese characteristics.

卢云峰：社会主义社会是一个绝对正确的回答。但是另一方面，我们也应该注意到作为一种文化资源的儒家在民间仍然有生命力。老百姓给孩子做启蒙教育的时候，很多人会让孩子读《三字经》、《千字文》、《弟子规》和《百家姓》。也就是说，从儿童社会化的实践来看，我们所凭借的资源很大程度上还是传统儒家的那套知识与伦理体系，与传统文化有一定的连续性。还有很多例子，比如我的一个穆斯林朋友在迪拜当教授，她告诉我说，那边的华人穆斯林都是用《弟子规》来教孩子，用这个来对孩子作为启蒙教育。从一种文化资源的角度来讲，儒教是有其生命力的。杨庆堃用混合宗教和独立宗教来分析中国社会中的宗教，但是他一直犹豫将儒教明确归于哪一类。在他的分析中，儒教在传统中国具有独立而超然的结构地位，但同时又与家庭、社区、国家混合在一起。瓦哈把儒教视为一种“准宗教”，但是杨庆堃似乎把它视为一种“超宗教”。即使科举制的终结导致儒教之结构性社会地位的衰落，但是它与其它社会制度的混合使得儒教如同百足之虫，死而不僵，只要时机合适一定会卷土重来。儒家的社会土壤还在，比如现在祠堂的复兴都表明儒教在民间的生命力还是很旺盛的。我认为这也是未来能够复兴儒教的一个基础。

LU Yunfeng: Socialist society is certainly the correct answer. However, in another respect, we should be aware that Confucianism as a kind of cultural resource is still nurturing the society as a whole. Many Chinese parents ask their children to read *the Three-Character Classic*, *the Thousand-Character Classic*, *Standards for Disciples* and *the Book of Family Names*, which are all Confucian classics for children. This means that, judging by the practices of education, the resources which we employ are still, to a great extent, the knowledge and ethical systems of traditional Confucianism. There are many other similar examples. For instance, one Muslim friend of mine is working as a professor in Dubai. She told me that Chinese Muslims use *Standards for Disciples* to teach their children in elementary education. As a cultural resource, Confucian teachings have their vitality. Yang Qingkun distinguished between “mixed” and “independent” religions but was unsure about where Confucianism fits in. In his analysis, the Confucian religion of traditional China had an independent and superior status, but it was also simultaneously entangled with family, community, and nation. Wach<sup>32</sup> speaks of Confucianism as a “quasi-religion” while Yang tends to see it as a

“super-religion.” Even though the end of the Civil Service Examinations caused an institutional crisis for Confucianism, Confucianism survived many social upheavals due to its root in social habits and mores. The social basis for Confucianism is still there. For example, the restoration of ancestral halls means that Confucianism is still alive and flourishing among ordinary people. I think that is the social basis for the restoration of the Confucian teachings.

另外一个，我认为儒教从来不是 a religion，它是一个复数形式的，具有各种不同的派别和版本。陈老师属于“公民宗教派”，蒋庆倡导的是“国教版”、“乡村建设派”推动儒教下乡，“读经派”强调儿童的儒家社会化，还有“教派版”比如三一教。当然，在这些差异性的背后具有一致性，就是相信儒教能够因应现代性带来的挑战。

Additionally, I have never understand Confucianism in singular terms. There are only Confucianisms with many different branches and versions. Chen Ming belongs to “the civil religion” group while Jiang Qing pertains to “the national religion” group. There are also groups emphasizing “rural reconstruction” and “Classical Studies” aspects of Confucianism. There are also a folk religion versions of Confucianism, such as the San-yi Teachings popular in Fujian. What unites them all is the belief that Confucian teachings can successfully deal with the challenges of modernity.

陈明：我也认为儒教是一个独立的宗教，但是也是多元的，我和你一样，也认为一贯道、三一教、鸾堂等都是儒教，儒教本身是复数的。第二个来说，儒教作为公民宗教是一个篮子，只不过是占的份额多一些。至于我怎么做，真把我给问住了，我除了写文章还有就是教学生了。

CHEN Ming: I also think that Confucian religion is, to use Yang’s terminology, an independent one, though it’s also internally diverse. I agree that all you listed are also Confucian. We have many Confucianisms. Even Confucianism as a civil religion denotes a family that subsumes under it different meanings depending on how interpreters make sense of it.

陈壁生：接下来有请中央党校的赵峰老师。

CHEN Bisheng: Now please welcome Zhao Feng from the Central Party School of the Chinese Communist Party.

赵峰：我说一下与宋明理学的宗教性有关的问题。首先，天的神圣性问题。朱熹的天确实没有意志，也没有人格性，但他并没否定天的主宰性。这和孔子以后神圣信仰的改革有关系。要了解这种改革，至少需要把握以下几点：其一，在朱熹时代，理想的宗教形态是佛教，不是基督教、伊斯兰教。佛教里面没有一个真正个人性的主神，佛有很多，都是象征性的说法。尤其是禅宗，杀佛骂祖便是对佛的个人性的否定。在我看来，宋明理学是升级版的儒家之学。是充分吸取佛教智慧的产物。这就说到了另一点，即其二，儒学在宋代为什么需要升级？按雅斯贝斯的说法，轴心期是理性觉醒

的时期。觉醒后的理性，主要被用来干了两件事，即打造帝国和升级宗教。轴心期过后，所有的帝国在全球性民族大迁徙的冲击下都纷纷崩溃了，接着便出现了全球性的宗教化浪潮，将分崩离析的世界重新整合起来——这是升级后的宗教的贡献。为什么要用觉醒后的理性来升级宗教？我以为，最根本的一点，就是要建构某种理性无法撼动的人类文明的终极根基，即建构某种理性无法解构的神圣信仰。佛教传入中国后之所以能够所向披靡，对本土文化造成空前的冲击，就是因为它是理性打造的升级版宗教，代表了人类文明当时达到的最新高度。所以，到了宋代，儒家必须升级自己的学说以符合人类文明发展的潮流。

其三，儒家升级自己的学说，遵循的是孔子“敬鬼神而远之”的传统路线。至上神的角色是一定要有的，它就是天。天是不是神、有没有个人性并不重要，重要的是，它是理性够不着的终极力量，是神圣性的终极源头。不是说上帝或真主一开口，就说出了一本经。中国的天是一个看不见的神圣力量。天意是要靠人去领会的。“天何言哉？”人必须要自己去领会上帝的意思。这与世界上的其他宗教都不同，但是毫无疑问它也有神圣性。确立了天的终极高度后，理学家就把重心放在了神圣性源头与世俗生活的链接上。链接的方式就是求做圣贤。现在我们把圣贤说成一种道德完人，只有道德狂热，那是很可笑的。离开了神圣性根基，道德是无力的，理性是危险的。所谓变化气质，其实就是一种“极端的转化”。其性质完全是宗教性的，但其内容又完全是世俗性的。儒家要靠人的理性为阶梯，由崇高而入于神圣，而不是靠神秘的启示，来完成由凡入圣的转化。这是中西宗教性文化的不同。儒家经过升级之后成为理学，它的特性是独树一帜的

Zhao Feng: I'll discuss several issues on the religiosity of Neo-Confucianism. First, speaking of the sacredness of Heaven, it's true that Zhu Xi's Heaven did not have intentions or personification. However, he did not deny Heaven's authority. This has to do with the changes of faith in the divine after Confucius. To understand what changed, we need to grasp the following: first, at the time of Zhu Xi, Buddhism was the ideal form of religion, not Christianity nor Islam. There is no personified, chief deity in Buddhism. There are many Buddhas, but they are all symbolic. This is especially true of Chan Buddhism, whose saying "kill the Buddha and insult the ancestors" is a clear denial of personification. As I see it, Neo-Confucianism is an upgraded version of Confucian learning built on the wisdom of Buddhism. From here, we get to the related point: why did Confucianism have to be updated in the Song Dynasty? According to Jaspers, the Axial Period is a time of awakening to rationality, which in turn was employed to establish empires and create religions.<sup>33</sup> After the Axial Period, all empires collapsed under the assault of the world's disparate nationalities, after which followed a new period of reintegration, this time with religion at its heart. Why did ancients employ rationality to create religion? I think it has to do with finding a way to ground the ultimate foundation for human civilization on a divine faith that simple rationality cannot deconstruct. When Buddhism first came to China, it dealt a blow to the native culture partly because of its nature as a

religion grounded in rationality which represented the heights of civilization. Therefore, by the Song Dynasty, Confucianism needed to upgrade itself to catch up with the development of human civilization.

Furthermore, Confucianism upgraded its doctrine in a way that comported with Confucius' original approach of "revering ghosts and spirits but avoiding them." You obviously need to have the paramount divine agent, which is Heaven. Heaven is not God, and it does not matter whether or not it is personified. What matters is that it is an ultimate power that rationality cannot reach and the ultimate origin of divinity. It's not like the biblical God or Allah who opens Their mouth and issues commands. Chinese Heaven is an unseen divine power. The Will of the Heaven depends on human understanding. "What would Heaven say?"<sup>34</sup> People must figure out the will of Heaven by themselves, which preserves a great deal of human agency. Having established the foundational authority of Heaven, Neo-Confucians turned to placing their emphasis on the connection between divinity and secular life in a way that carves out space for the sage. Now we talk about the sage as a moral exemplar who has nothing but moral zeal. This is ridiculous. Without the divine base, morality is powerless and rationality is dangerous. The nature of self-transformation is religious though its content is secular. Confucianism needs to rely on people's rationality as a path, linking nobility to divinity. It does not rely on mysterious revelations to achieve the upgrade from a commoner to a sage. This is the difference between Chinese and Western religious cultures. Confucianism metamorphosed into Neo-Confucianism in a way that is unique.

第二个问题，信仰问题。的确，我们不能照搬西方的信仰概念。你（安靖如教授）刚才说的，主要指信仰的纯洁性和排他性。不排他的信仰就不纯，纯洁的信仰必定排他。这是一种注重形式的信仰，而儒家信仰主要注重内容。按蒂里希的说法，信仰是一种终极关怀，其对象是终极者。至于这个终极者是谁？是上帝、真主，还是佛？儒家认为并不重要，重要的是这个终极者对我们的要求和命令，即天命、天道、天性、天理的内容。关于终极者的意图，儒家没有一个具有绝对权威的标准答案，它需要每个人自己去领悟。各人的领悟必然有偏差，有偏差就需要讨论；讨论可以形成共识，但谁也不能垄断真理。这更符合现代社会的需要，是一种更有现代性的信仰方式。如果说它不是宗教也可以，但一定有宗教性。它一定是未来人类的一种信仰方式的选项，并且在未来很有竞争力。我认为按照儒教的领会方式，是不会有宗教战争的。因为在儒家看来，没有人可以垄断对终极者意图的解释，每个人都必须用全部的生命去独立地领会终极者的召唤。

Next, let me discuss faith. It is true that we cannot simply adopt the Western concept of faith. What Steve just said mainly deals with the purity and exclusivity of faith. A faith that is not exclusive is not pure, and a pure faith must be exclusive. That is a kind of faith that emphasizes the form while Confucian faith focuses on the content.

---

34

According to Tillich, the object of faith is the ultimate.<sup>35</sup> Who or what is this ultimate being, then? Is it God, Allah, or the Buddha? Confucianism does not think it's important. What is important is the ultimate's authority over us, which manifests itself in the Heavenly Mandate, the Heavenly Way, and the Heavenly Pattern. As for the intention of the ultimate, Confucianism does not have a definitive answer. People's understandings must be different, and we need to discuss when differences emerge. We may arrive at a consensus through discussion, but no one can monopolize the truth. I think that Confucian religion is such that it precludes religious conflicts. From a Confucian perspective, no one could monopolize the explanation of the intention of the ultimate. Everyone must use their entire life to independently understand its call.

最后，谈谈我对公民宗教重建的一点感想。我当时批评陈明谈宗教，我说我没有听到你的宗教味道。宗教味道不是逻辑推理出来的。宗教一定是有宗教的灵性、关怀。这个儒家历来是有的。我们把神圣性变成了世俗的道德性，这很可笑。乐天、畏天、敬天，都是有神圣意味的。我们谈孔颜乐处，如果没有对神圣力量的亲切体会，就没法真正理解。我们谈“战战兢兢”，如果没有对神圣力量的由衷敬畏，也就没有资格去谈。我想说，儒学从来都是很深厚的。我们现在搞儒学研究的人，受了西方的影响，主要是启蒙主义的影响，理性至上，蔑视宗教。即便谈宗教，也是神道设教式地谈，功能主义地谈。按照马克斯·韦伯的术语来说，我们已经把祛魅化当成了常态，而忘了人类文明如果没有对神圣力量的敬畏就是一盘散沙，是立不住的。

Finally, I have some thoughts on civil religion. I once criticized Chen Ming for lacking "religious flavor." You cannot get the religious flavor through logical reasoning. A religion must have religious spirituality and transcendental concern, whose sacredness would be lost if we follow the path of civil religion. To obey Heaven, to be in awe of Heaven, and to revere Heaven all have sacred connotations. We mentioned "the happy place for Confucius and Yan Yuan," but we cannot understand it without firsthand experience. We talked about "fear and trembling," but we cannot even come close to it without reverence for sacred power. Many today studying Confucianism are influenced by the West, mainly by Enlightenment legacies. We prioritize Enlightenment rationality and belittle religion. Even when we touch on religion, we care about the way in which the divine can be used instrumentally to educate the people. In Max Weber's terms, we have taken secularity as the norm. We forget that, without divinity, human civilization cannot but fall apart.

儒家在选择和确认人类如何面对这个理性没法把握的终极者的方式时，是很有艺术性的。儒学升级后的一两千年来，这种信仰方式总体运作良好。它跨过时代的变迁，延续下来了；它甚至在我们激烈地反叛传统、拥抱西方文明时，仍在默默支撑着我们，只是我们不自觉而已。我们有这么好的资源，却视而不见。今天我们说儒学好的时候，却没有对神圣性的体悟，因而谈来谈去都是外围，无法契入其内核。这就是我要批评陈明的地方。我们现在面临的最紧要的使命，不再是为儒学辩护，而是要完成对儒学

---

35

的第二次升级。儒学的第二次升级，必须要研究透西方，使其与当今时代的文明成果结合起来。就像当初的理学家一样，把佛教研究透了，才能完成其创造性的工作。在我看来，这才是我们最重要的工作。儒学复兴有很多事要做，所有的事都是重要的，唯独这个升级工作是我们学者必须做的，别人无法替代，它才是当今儒学建设的真正的痛点所在。

Confucianism has always been pliable in choosing and affirming ways of life that are not at the whim of rationality. It worked through the times of change and survived. It is even silently supporting us while we fiercely rebel against the tradition and embrace Western civilization. We have such good resources, but we ignore them. Today, people have lost sight of Confucianism's sacredness. Therefore, we come around it but cannot get to the core. This is where Chen Ming's account really turns controversial. The most urgent task that we face today is not so much its defense as its renewal. We need to thoroughly study Western civilization the same way Neo-Confucians deeply immersed themselves in Buddhism. The renewal of Confucianism opens up many opportunities, but only scholars can make theoretical contributions. That is where our jobs lie.

王庆新：我补充一点。我们儒家现在要做的就是面对西方基督教的挑战。我知道在坐的很多都是做经学，如果拿经学和基督教神学来比较可能是一个有意思的角度。

WANG Qingxin: I want to add another point. What Confucianism now has to do is face the challenge of Christianity. Many speakers present today are working on Confucian classics. It is perhaps worthwhile to compare Confucian classics to Christian theology and see what comes up.

安靖如：我不是说中国的儒者应该闭眼不看西方的东西，我想赵老师说的要好好地看以后，弄出来自己的东西。这是可以的。但是假如都是按照西方来的范畴，这就会让人觉得所有概念、所有理论家都是西方的，这就很奇怪。因为西方有它的特殊性的历史，所以有一些概念特别被重视，其中之一就是信仰。这个背景不需要现在展开。在儒家那里当然有很多信仰，但是和普通的信仰比较像。儒家所说的“信”和“我信这是一个杯子”中的“信”的含义比较接近，这一点和基督教中的信仰不一样。所以，关于是不是先要吸收西方的东西？这个是必要的，但是也要超越西方，其过程也必须想到不照搬西方的范畴。还有一点，赵老师讨论天没有人格性等等，所以不像宗教，那么我觉得这个可能还是把宗教限定在了西方的概念。我认为朱熹学说中的天的宗教性很浓，但是他说主宰之类的东西和西方很不一样。不能说基督教理解神的方式比儒家高，甚至可能是相反的。当然这个还可以继续讨论。

Stephen Angle: I'm not saying that Chinese Confucians should turn a blind eye to the Western civilization. Zhao Feng said that we need to look around and create our own things, which is great. However, if we do everything by Western categories, that makes people think that all concepts and theorists are still Western. That is strange. Given the West's unique history, some concepts are especially prioritized. One of

them is faith. I don't need to expand on it now. Of course, there are many "beliefs" in Confucianism, but they are akin to folk beliefs. The word "believe" (*xin*) in Confucianism translates into, say, the sense in which "I believe this is a cup." This is not the same as Christian faith. Do we need to go over Western categories first? That is a necessary step, but we must go beyond the West. We must understand that we are not simply copy-pasting Western categories. Zhao Feng said that Heaven does not have a personality and so on, and, therefore, it does not resemble a religion. I think this is still defining religion in Western terms. Heaven in Zhu Xi's work, for example, has strong religiosity, but his ideas of religious authority are very different from those of the West. One can't say that Christianity has a superior understanding of God than Confucianism does--it could even be the opposite. Of course, that is up for debate.

陈明：很高兴赵峰关注儒家宗教的问题，还提醒大家读西方神学。我们刚才谈到宗教的时候，是一个比较宗教学的维度，这不仅仅是一个西方神学的问题，还要涉及宗教历史、人类学、发生学的一个考量。所以这一点我觉得没问题。但是我要说，你说今天的第二次升级，除了阅读西方的，我们还可以从一个知识的生产的角度来说，所有的知识性生产都不是一个书斋里面的逻辑推演，而是对现有的重要问题的一个应对，实践性的应对，这是一个更重要的方面。所以你刚才说我一个功能主义的理解反而是肤浅，错！因为对问题的解决，正好是你这个系统要承担什么功能，正是其功能的承担才证明这个理论是有价值的，这是一个很正确的进路。

CHEN Ming: I'm very glad that Zhao Feng is paying attention to the issue of the Confucian religion and reminding us to read Western theology, but he must be aware that any renewal of Confucianism is a response to pressing issues at the present, which reveals its practical nature. You said that my functionalist understanding of Confucianism is shallow. How misguided that is! That an approach can render Confucianism functionally essential to the real world speaks volumes about its value. Your approach cannot be exempted from the test of its functional value, either.

任文利：我接着赵峰兄和安先生的信仰问题谈一谈。安先生说，儒家很少在学理上讨论信，或者信仰的问题，不会像基督教神学那样专门讨论，或者像基督教那样一切都建立在信仰的基础之上。我认为这一点很有道理，但是说儒学完全没有，也不一定。您（安靖如）刚才举了一个例子，佛家的《大乘起信论》。其实儒家，宋明理学，包括阳明后学，他们也有人专门讨论信的问题。比如罗近溪，他在诠释孟子“有诸己之谓信”的时候，信就是信仰，包括对于人、对于天、乃至对于人性善的信仰、信念。罗近溪曾举了一个例子说明“信”的力量，一个人生了很严重的病，如果神医来告诉他说你没事，他会去相信，而且那很严重的病也似乎就好了。这是我想补充的一点，就传统儒家主流来讲，可能专门讨论信的问题确实比较少，但不能说没有。

REN Wenli: I will continue Zhao Feng and Steve's discussion of faith. Steve said that Confucianism rarely engages with matters of faith, or at least does not engage with them in ways that Christian theology does, which I believe makes sense. However, if we say that there is absolutely no discussion of faith in Confucianism, that is not

necessarily true. Steve just mentioned an example of faith, *Awakening Faith of Mahayana*. Something similar can be found in Confucianism and Neo-Confucianism including Wang Yangming's work. For example, Luo Jinxi interpreted Mencius' "having [goodness] in the self" as faith in the people, Heaven, the inherent goodness of human nature. Luo Jinxi gave an example to explain the power of faith. A person has fallen gravely ill. If a fine doctor tells him that he is okay, he will believe it, and the illness will seemingly disappear. That is one point that I would like to make. In traditional mainstream Confucianism, discussions on faith itself may be relatively rare, but one cannot say there are none.

下面我转到陈明兄的“公民宗教”问题上来，之前赵峰兄对你的一个批评我觉得倒是一不一定有道理，说你好像是完全功能主义的。其实你今天讲的从公民宗教到 a religion 这个问题，更多地涉及到宗教本身的问题，而不完全是功能主义的，功能主义的讲法，如你所言，更多地是出于策略性的考虑。我在写《儒教作为“国民宗教”的向度考察》那篇文章的时候，也注意到了你的一些变化。陈明兄说我提出来了“国民宗教”说，其实我不是想提出一个什么新的概念，其实还是想澄清一些问题吧。如果说是用英文来说，国民宗教和公民宗教可能还是一个词，就是 civil religion。civil religion，这个英文词汇，是否也可以像干春松、秋风兄所强调的，翻译为“文教”？我们用不同的中文词汇指称它时，可能关注的面向还是不太一样，从翻译的方面来说，弹性确实比较大。陈明兄讲公民宗教，是从他关注的政治问题入手。

Now I will turn to Chen Ming's civil religion. Zhao Feng's charge that Chen Ming is completely functionalist may be too farfetched. What you discussed today has more to do with religion per se, which is not completely functionalist. The functionalist claims, as you said, are strategic. When I wrote the article "A Directed Examination of Confucian Religion as a National-Civil Religion," I also noticed some of your changes. Yes, I have proposed what I call "national-civil religion," but I did not intend to introduce a new concept but clarify some issues. If we say it in English, my national-civil religion may still be "civil religion." Can this English term, "civil religion," also be translated into the "cultural doctrine" that Gan Chunsong and Qiu Feng emphasized? When we refer to it with different Chinese words, perhaps we are focusing on different aspects of it. In terms of translation, there is a lot of flexibility. Chen Ming's overwhelming concern is with politics and political order.

我为什么说陈明兄讲得很有道理？就在于他刚才反驳赵峰兄的时候说宗教问题是一个实践问题，首先不是一个书斋问题，这一点特别重要。我在思考这个问题的时候，也是从儒教在现实中的可能存在形态的角度来考虑的。比如康有为、蒋庆先生的国教说，他们两个受基督教的这样的一个参照物的影响很大。或者说，他们在这个过程中都有一个很大的建构性的、创造性的成分在里面。可能刚才安先生的一个质疑很有道理，就是当你拿一个东西作为参照的时候，可能慢慢地就失去了自性，就完全变成了另外一个东西。

Why did I say what Chen Ming suggested makes sense? His point, as he just said in response to Zhang Feng, that religion is a practical issue rather than a completely academic issue, is really crucial. I then come to wonder what forms Confucianism may take in reality. For instance, Kang Youwei and Jiang Qing's theories on national religion are greatly influenced by Christianity. Despite their creativity, what Steve just said perhaps makes sense. When you use something as a reference, you lose yourself and become something else.

我之所以提出国民宗教这个概念，可能和刚才卢云峰先生说的相似，首先考虑的是儒教作为现实存在的形态问题。就是说儒教在今天还能不能作为中国人普遍的一种信仰对象，还是一个普遍的价值基础？这一点很重要。我认为现实基础上，这种可能性还是存在的。虽然近百年以来遭受种种冲击，但是儒教作为国人的一个普遍的社会价值基础还是存在的。比如祠堂的问题，《人民日报》之前发过一篇文章，说家就是中国人的教堂，他说的很动情，实际上进一步落实下来，我们可以说祠堂就是中国人的教堂。当然，这个教堂、道场还有很多，比如陈明兄说的文庙、书院等等，都是儒教“游魂”之所托的多元物质性载体。中国人的“家”的观念，对于祖先信仰的链条，也回答了人之所以不朽的问题，生死的问题，这些东西在中国人的观念里，还是根深蒂固。

The reason I proposed the concept of the national-civil religion is, as Yunfeng just said, it is pragmatic as I'm considering ways in which Confucian teachings could exist in reality. Can Confucianism exist as a universal object of faith among the Chinese today? Or can it be a universal basis of values? I tend to believe that there's a realist possibility that it can. Although Confucianism has gone through ups and downs in the past century, it still exists as a basis of common social values for the Chinese. The ancestral hall widespread in villages is an example. One article in *People's Daily* suggested that family is the church of the Chinese. Of course, there are many such "churches" or religious centers such as Confucian temples and academies, all of which Chen Ming has just touched on. These are the diverse physical embodiments of Confucian religion's "soul." The ideas of family and ancestral reverence also bear on fundamental issues of life and death, which are still deep-rooted in the minds of the Chinese.

再比如节日的问题，我的老师蒙培元先生说，春节就是中国人的宗教节日。其实你再回头来看一下，中国传统的节日，几乎没有不是宗教节日的——从除夕、清明、中秋乃至冬至等等。而这个宗教节日，和风俗、习俗又紧密联系在一起，和作为公民宗教、国民宗教的儒教都是息息相关的。比如我们看一些历史上的风俗，一个节日的风俗，和今天相比并没有太大的差别。我们翻翻比宋代的、明代的方志，他们怎么过春节的，怎么过清明节的？

和今天相比较，差别很细微，包括地方上的差异，有但是很细微，普遍价值、核心价值还是在那儿。比如各地的方志里经常见到除夕的一个重要习俗，拜罢天地拜祖宗。我会疑惑，它的仪式是怎样的？有一次讲课的时候，和一个来自山东农村的学生聊，她们老家至今还保留这样的风俗。仪式嘛，就是在除夕把祖宗牌位请到庭院当中行祭礼，这就是拜罢天地拜祖宗。我媳妇是客家人，他们现在还祭祖，除了祠堂里的

祭祀之外，也有一些简单的祭祖的仪式，就是什么都没有，一个供桌摆到院子里边，插上香烛，摆上供品，行礼，朗朗乾坤，就这样祭祀天地祖先。今天我们的学者们还在争论谁有资格来祭天的问题的时候，实际上无论是历史上，还是今天，除了天子之外，老百姓也在祭天，除了天地君亲师的牌位之外，老百姓也有自己的仪轨。

Take holidays for example. My teacher, Meng Peiyuan, said that the Spring Festival is a religious festival for the Chinese. In fact, if you look at traditional Chinese festivals, say, the Chinese New Year's Eve, the Qingming Festival, the Mid-Autumn Festival, and even the Winter Solstice Festival, practically none of them are non-religious. These religious holidays are closely tied to our habits and mores, and they are also closely related to Confucian religion as a civil religion. Local chronicles from the Song and Ming Dynasties suggest that how ancients back then celebrated the Spring Festival and the Qingming Festival is not so different from how we go about celebration today. For example, in local chronicles from all over the place we usually see one important custom of worshiping Heaven, Earth and ancestors during the Lunar New Year's Eve. I wondered how exactly people go about worshiping. Then, one day in class, I talked to a student from a rural area of Shandong. The ritual, she said, is placing the ancestors' memorial tablets in the courtyard on the eve of the Lunar New Year and performing sacrificial rites. My wife is Hakka, and they still offer sacrifices to their ancestors. Apart from the sacrifices in ancestral halls, there are also some simple rites for making sacrifices to the ancestors. It's nothing more than placing an altar in the yard, placing candles and tributes on it, and bowing. This is how they make sacrifices to Heaven, Earth, and their ancestors. While we scholars are debating who is qualified to make sacrifices to Heaven, it doesn't really matter. Aside from the memorial tablets of Heaven and Earth, the ruler, the parents, and the master, the common people also have their own specific rituals to perform.

我们在今天思考儒教作为“一个宗教”的存在状态的时候，更切实一点说，可能是“百姓日用而不知”这样一个形态。比如说你问到中国人的宗教信仰是什么的时候，好像大多数是没有——“合法的”反正就是所谓的五大宗教嘛。事实上，知道和不知道还是有很大的不同的。从“不知”到“知”，我们可以做这样一种工作，就是使人有一种自觉，自觉到我们的宗教信仰就是儒教。这一点如果还不能做到的话，似乎问题也不大，孔子也讲，“民可使由之，不可使知之”，一时权宜而言，没有自觉也没有问题，还可以从礼仪、仪轨方面入手，制礼作乐，使人们在日常生活乃至临大事时，不至于无所措手足。当然这里须面对现代化、城市化这样的时代与境遇的变迁，我还是相信，无论是说作为国民宗教还是公民宗教，儒教大有可为，尚足以支撑我们的宗教信仰

Today, the way Confucianism lives on the mind of the Chinese today is tacit and implicit—people act on it without being aware that they're acting on it. If you ask Chinese what their religious beliefs are, most would answer that they have none. We can make them self-conscious and recognize that their religious belief is Confucianism. If this doesn't work, we can work on rituals and music that help people cope with challenges in their daily lives or important events. Of course, Confucian rituals should

be flexible enough to answer to modernization and urbanization. Still, I believe that Confucian religion, whether as a national-civil religion or a civil religion, has an enormous role to play.

王庆新：我想回应一下安老师有关儒家是不是宗教的问题，以及它与基督教的关系问题。这个问题很重要。我不是很同意安老师的观点。我赞同秦家懿的解释，儒家思想也就是儒教与基督教有一定的相似性，也就是儒家不仅有内在超越信仰也有外在超越信仰。其实不只是秦家懿，近代以来很多西方学者都认为儒家是类似于基督教的宗教。利玛窦说儒家思想没有超越信仰，是为了让基督教统摄儒家。莱布尼茨运用了耶稣会对儒教的同样记录，却得出了与利玛窦完全相反的观点。他认为儒教与基督教非常相似，都是一神论都是有外在超越。十九世纪的英国汉学家 James Legge 也是认为儒教是有超越信仰的。已故的哈佛著名汉学家 Benjamin Schwarz (史华慈)也持类似观点。他认为儒家的天与基督教犹太教的上帝都是外在于自然世界的，是宇宙万物的创造者。

WANG QINGXIN: I would like to respond to Steve's take on Confucianism as a religion and its relationship to Christianity. Those questions are important but I don't really agree with Steve's views. I agree with Julia Ching's interpretation, that Confucian thought, or, perhaps, Confucian religion, has some similarities with Christianity. Confucianism does not only include internal but external transcendental faith. In fact, aside from Julia Chin, many modern Western scholars thought that Confucianism was a religion similar to Christianity. Matteo Ricci said there was no transcendental faith in Confucianism in order for Christianity to rule over Confucianism. Leibniz used the same records written by the Society of Jesus on Confucian teachings, but had views that completely contradict Matteo Ricci's. He thought that Confucianism was very similar to Christianity. Both are monotheistic religions, and both include the idea of external transcendence. Nineteenth century British Sinologist James Legge also thought that Confucianism has transcendental faith. The late and famous Harvard Sinologist Benjamin Schwartz also shared similar views. He thought that Confucian Heaven and Christian God all existed externally in the natural world and were the creators of the myriad things in the universe.

他在《古代中国的思想世界》一书中说了这几点：1. 西方历史上的斯多葛哲学家，犹太教士，基督教圣徒也和孔子一样，认为他们肩负着上帝或天赋予的神圣使命，他们手中掌握着神圣的道德伦理法则来拯救处于水深火热和礼崩乐坏的劳苦大众。2. 孔子相信天道曾经显现在三代，但后来消失。孔子认为他负有将天道再次呈现于人世间的神圣使命。3. 天的灵觉 (spirit of Heaven) 是呈现于自然界中的各种规律规则，与《圣经·创世记》的上帝的区别不能夸大。虽然天不说话，而上帝经常说话。4. 孟子的“存心尽性以事天”的事天指的是完成上天赋予的神圣使命，不只是比喻，而是与基督教说的完成上帝的使命的意思接近。

In his book *The World of Thought in Ancient China*, Schwartz made the following points<sup>36</sup>:

1. Many Stoic philosophers, Jewish priests, and Christian saints were like Confucius. They thought they had special missions bestowed upon them by Heaven or God and appealed to divine moral or ethical principles to save the suffering the common people from the abyss of misery and from the disintegration of society and its mores;

2. Confucius believed that the Heavenly Way has manifested itself during the reign of the "Three Dynasties" but then disappeared; he thought that he had taken up the divine mission of making the Heavenly Way manifest in the human world once more;

3. The spirit of Heaven manifests itself in the various rules and principles of Nature with little difference from the God of *Genesis* although Heaven does not speak while God does frequently;

4. The phrase "serving Heaven" in Mencius' "preserving the heart-mind and fully manifesting the nature to serve Heaven"<sup>37</sup> means completing the divine mission endowed by Heaven--this is not merely an analogy but is rather close to the Christian idea of fulfilling the mission bestowed by God.

而牟宗三受佛教起信论的影响很大，重新建构阳明心学，认为朱熹是儒家的歧出。他对儒学贡献很大，但是他的学说有很大的缺点，即没有外在超越的神，只有内在超越，即无限心。但是他没有宇宙论和超越性本体论，就不能说明人的无限心从哪里而来的，与那个赋予人的无限心的造物主是什么关系，也不能回答人的无限心在肉体死亡后去哪里，即不能安顿人心。也没有很好回答人的恶性从哪里来，以及自由无限心按照什么规则朗现。如果自由无限心随时朗现，那就是余英时所批评的，牟宗三的自由无限心认为人人都可以是上帝，这是一个很让人张狂的说法，所以有阳明后学的弊病。与现实也不符合，因为我们知道，现实世界中小人太多，不要说上帝，即使君子都很少。而朱熹理学有宇宙论和超越性本体论，即理气论，解释人与天理的关系。并且有气禀论来解释人性善和人性恶的条件。并且认为人死后的魂魄继续存在。他的理论要比陆王心学更胜一筹，所以能持续八百年就不足为奇了。

On the other hand, Mou Zongsan was greatly influenced by *the Awakening of Faith* in Buddhism. He reconstructed Wang Yangming's theory and argued that Zhu Xi's account defied Confucians before him. He made great contributions to Confucianism, but his work has a major disadvantage. According to Mou, there is no transcendental external god but only the internal transcendence called "the infinite heart." However, he does not have a cosmology or transcendental ontology, and therefore cannot explain whence comes the infinite heart-mind, the kind of relationship it has with the creator who bestowed humans with the infinite heart-mind, nor can he explain whither goes the infinite heart after the death of the flesh. Therefore, he cannot help

---

<sup>36</sup>

<sup>37</sup>

assuage people's heart-mind. Besides, he has no good answer for where villainy comes from and cannot explain the rules with which the free and infinite heart-mind manifests. If Mou holds the free and infinite heart-mind to manifest itself all the time, that is exactly where it is subject to Yu Yingshi's critique. Mou's free and infinite heart-mind suggests that everyone can be God, and that is an overly flattering statement. Therefore, it has the disadvantages of Wang Yangming's works. It is inconsistent with the reality, too, since we know that there are many petty people in the real world. Even cultivated persons are hard to find, to say nothing of God. Nevertheless, Zhu Xi's doctrine has a cosmology and a transcendental ontology, which is the theory of the Pattern and Vital Essence. It explains the relationship between people and the Heavenly Pattern. Also, there is the theory of manifestation of Vital Essence to explain the conditions for distinguishing good from bad human nature. Moreover, he thought that the soul continues to exist after death. His theory is better than Lu and Wang's study of the heart-mind, so it is not surprising that his doctrine lasted for eight-hundred years.

我从小是在传统的儒家氛围中长大的，经常和我奶奶和父母去老家的祠堂祭祖，祭祀祖先神。读书阶段又受正统的马列思想的无神论教育。我大学毕业后到了美国学习生活了十来年，又受到西方文明的影响，周末有时去基督教教会。我后来又到新加坡和香港住了十几年，能理解他们所经历了内心的矛盾和挣扎。新加坡的华人占人口的绝大多数，他们生长在崇拜祖先神的儒家环境里，但他们必须在基督教、儒教还有伊斯兰教之间做选择，或者融合与沟通，他们需要选择一个他们内心和社会环境所能接受的信仰。香港也一样的。所以我们说很多香港人特别是新加坡人都是黄皮白心，其实这是他们面临着中西文明的冲突和融合的环境。将来中国的开放力度会更大，中国人面临的西方文明和伊斯兰文明的挑战会更大；即使现在我们国家的大西北，也面临着同样的问题。我一个从西北来的学生说宁夏的回教徒非常厉害，汉人在那里生存比较困难。新疆也有类似的冲突。所以我很赞同陈明关于重构中国国族的提法。

I grew up in a traditional Confucian environment. I used to go back to the ancestral hall in my hometown and make sacrifices to the ancestors with my parents. At school, I was educated in an orthodox, atheistic Marxist way. After my graduation from college, I went to study and live in the United States for over ten years. Back then, I was influenced by Western civilization. Sometimes, I went to the Christian church on weekends. I then went to Singapore and Hong Kong, living there for over ten years. Therefore, I can understand the internal conflicts and struggles that they have been through. In Singapore, ethnic Chinese comprise the vast majority of the population. They grow up in a Confucian environment that venerates the ancestral spirits but nevertheless need to choose from Christianity, Confucianism, and Islam, or they choose to blend and intermingle. They need to choose a faith that both their heart-minds and the social environment can accept. It is the same in Hong Kong, which is why many say Hong Kongers and (even more so) Singaporeans are "bananas" — yellow skin with "white" spirits. They face an environment where the Chinese and the Western civilizations clash and meld. In the future, China will be even more open,

and the Chinese will face even more challenges from Western and Islamic civilizations. Even now, in the north-west of China, people are facing challenges from Islam. One student of mine from the Northwest said that Muslims are very powerful in Ningxia and that it is difficult for Han Chinese to live there. There are similar conflicts in Xinjiang. Therefore, I strongly agree with Chen Ming's proposal of re-constructing the Chinese nation.

我们现在面临着基督教文明和伊斯兰文明的双重挑战，这些挑战不仅对我们的边疆都有很大的压力，并且这些压力在扩散。所以需要建构一个新的国族内涵来应对西方文明的挑战。这个国族不仅是要应对和包容以西方价值观为主的现代文明价值如民主自由平等世俗价值，还必须应对和包容基督教信仰和伊斯兰信仰。也就是说新国族的内涵既需要应对和包容现代世俗性的普世价值而且更需要应对或包容西方宗教。也就是我们需要一个宗教，而不只是陈明常说的公民宗教。这个宗教需要海纳百川，需要我们从神学教义上，消化基督教、伊斯兰神学，而这个宗教就是儒教，也就是两千多年来绝大多数中国人所赖以生存的宗教。就像朱熹那个时代那样，需要重新建构儒家以化解佛教的挑战。这样的新国族内涵能够更好地帮助我们化解所面临的国内外的压力和矛盾。

Now, we are facing a twofold challenge from Christianity and Islam. This challenge is not only adding great pressure to our borderlands but spreading all across the Chinese society. Therefore, we need to establish a new kind of national identity to combat the challenge from Western civilization. This nation answers to and tolerates not only modern secular cultural values that mainly esteems Western values, such as democracy, freedom and reality, but also Christian and Islamic beliefs. This means that this new nationality must respond to and tolerate modern secular universal values *and* different religions. In other words, we need a religion, not just the civil religion that Chen Ming usually talks about. This religion needs to use all available avenues, requires us to theologically embrace and digest Christianity and Islam. This religion is Confucianism, the religion upon which most Chinese have relied for their very survival for over two-thousand years. It's just like Zhu Xi's time, when Confucians needed to reconstruct Confucianism to resolve the challenge from Buddhism. Such a new national identity can effectively help us to resolve these pressures and conflicts from both inside and outside China.

我们现在面临的挑战和当年朱熹面对佛教挑战的情况很像。我们不能关起门来造一个新的儒家出来，而完全不考虑外部的情况。老百姓面临着很多选择，基督教、佛教、伊斯兰教，一贯道民间宗教等，老百姓面临的是一个自由的信仰市场，老百姓每个人都有理性，都有自己的判断。如果儒家的义理能够被重新建构，我想绝大多数的中国人自然会认同和选择儒教的，毕竟大多数中国人仍然生活在儒家传统氛围内，都知道孝敬父母尊师重教。

The challenge that we now face is very similar to that faced by Zhu Xi back in his times. We cannot just close our doors and brood over a new Confucianism without

considering challenges from without. Ordinary people face many choices from Christianity, Buddhism, Islam, folk religions like the Yi-guan religion. They are facing a “free market” of faith. Each person acts on one’s own judgments. If Confucian principles can be reconstructed, I think most Chinese will naturally identify with and choose the Confucian teachings. After all, most Chinese are still deeply soaked in Confucian habits and mores. They are filial to their parents and take education seriously.

陈壁生：下面请北京大学哲学系的干春松教授发言。

CHEN BISHENG: Next, let’s invite Gan Chunsong from the Department of Philosophy, Peking University.

干春松：我先从王老师说的受刺激开始。我们最早看到陈焕章给梁启超写的信中，陈焕章就说他在哥伦比亚上学的时候就受了刺激，西方人说中国人无神论啊，没有宗教啊，他就跟梁启超说咱们要不要也弄个宗教什么的。这个很有意思。本来，儒家文化崇尚生活理性，不语怪力乱神，百姓日用而不知，怎么就突然有了宗教的需求？这一切的背景就在基督教到中国传教之后，先是西方传教士内部开始争论，中国人的敬天法祖到底是不是宗教，这成为明末清初礼仪之争的核心关切。后来，中国人自己也受刺激了，怎么我们有没有宗教，没有信仰，我们过的是什么日子啊。这一次则是因为强大的西方给我们的军事和经济上的刺激。这才有了那么多的关于宗教的争论，这个争论包括学术性的问题，就是我们究竟有没有信仰，有没有宗教。很多的争论的焦点在于儒家是不是一个宗教。

GAN CHUNSONG: I’ll start with what Qingxin called “being triggered.” In the exchange of letters between Chen Huanzhang and Liang Qichao, Chen said that he was triggered when he studied at Columbia. The Westerners believed that the Chinese were atheists. He asked Liang, “Well, should we rustle up a religion?” This is very interesting. In ancient times, Confucian culture was deeply pragmatic and said nothing about spiritual beings. Folk religions were just a façade of Chinese society that played no primary role. How could there suddenly be a need for religion? After Christianity came to China, Western missionaries were the first to debate whether the Chinese veneration of Heaven and emulation of the ancestors can be considered a practice of religion. This became the core concern in the debate on ritual that occurred in the late Ming/early Qing. Afterwards, the Chinese themselves were also triggered. “Why do we not have religion, why do we not have faith? What sort of life have we been living?” This of course also had to do with the military and economic presence of Western powers in China. We now face many religious controversies including questions on whether Chinese culture has faith and religion. The crux of the matter hinges on whether Confucianism, the driving force of Chinese culture, is a religion.

在中国历史上，儒家是不是一个宗教并不是一个问题，因为有了基督教与中国绅士民众之间的冲突，近代所有人在讨论儒家宗教性的时候，有意无意的就会受到基督教的影响，或者说你就会以基督教的模式去衡量儒家思想。

Whether Confucianism is a religion had never been an issue before the dawn of the modern era. Partly because of the powerful discourse of Christianity and its challenge to the Chinese society, we moderns are subconsciously subscribing to the Christian way of thinking when we think of the relationship between Confucianism and religion.

接下来就是要提第二个问题，这是第一个问题的升级版，包括刚才陈明说的公民宗教也好，国民宗教也好，这里面就是要考虑一个问题：即现在这一轮的儒学或者儒教的复兴，究竟是宗教的复兴，还是生活方式的复兴，还是一个政治秩序的复兴。换句话说，提倡公民宗教是要解决我们的信仰的问题还是要解决政治认同的问题。如果不了解这个，可能不能理解公民宗教问题的实质。我关注康有为的孔教问题很早，这个问题很麻烦，我把它分为三个阶段，戊戌变法之前是一个阶段，孔教模仿基督教，回应基督教冲突；第二个阶段就是戊戌变法之后，流亡时期，他用这个人道教和神道教之间的分野；第三就是民国之后国教论的这个思想。其实他每个阶段的孔教设想的功能不太一样。按其实质：教化、认同、生活方式，他的孔教都设想中都包括。我们现在倘若要讨论儒家的宗教性问题时讨论这一点很重要。

Next, whether we consider Confucianism a civil religion, like Chen Ming suggests, or a national-civil religion, we must ask what this wave of Confucian (religious or otherwise) revivalism reviving. Is it the revival of a religion, a lifestyle, or a political system? In other words, are we trying to solve the problem of faith or the problem of political identification by proposing a civil religion? If we don't know the answer to this, we may not be able to understand the essence of civil religion. I turned to Kang's Confucian religion quite long ago. I divide his thinking into three stages. The time before the Hundred Days Reform is the first stage when Confucianism modelled itself on Christianity in response to the challenge from Christianity. The second stage is after the Hundred Days Reform or the time of exile, when he appealed to the categories of human religion and divine religion like Buddhist humanism and Shinto. The third stage is his idea of national religion after the founding of the Republic of China. In fact, the way Kang appreciate the nature and scope of Confucian religion differed at every stage though he consistently believed in the importance of Confucian education, self-identification and Confucian lifestyles.

接下来的一个问题就是安老师的，我很感动他读了我的书。一个就是说我确实承认康有为包括宪政、国教的努力都失败了，这个都要承认。但是这个不是我们的关注点，我们说不以成败论英雄，而是以他提出的问题来看，就是看他试图解决的问题到现在有没有被解决，这是我最关注的一个问题。就是康有为提出了一系列的问题，也提出了自己的方案，当然确实他失败了，但如果问题依然存在，就说明这些问题是何等重要。

Next is Steve's question. I'm flattered that he read my book. I did admit that Kang's efforts, including constitutional governance and national religion, all failed. We have to admit this defeat. However, it's not success or failure that make a hero but the questions he asked. Whether the problems he tried to address have been successfully solved today should be the focal point of us all.

不管怎么说现在需要一个判教的工作，还是要有的，就是你的理论到底在哪。包括民主、科学、哲学问题都可以谈，但你最后的一个标准是什么。不能有个人读《三字经》就算是儒家了吧。康有为包括章太炎他们是面对了西方的冲击，他试图从经典出发来解决问题，但是我们看到的他们试图解决的问题不但没把经学的权威树立起来，反而把它瓦解掉了。所以现在的问题就是两个，第一，它是不是就是死定了。他们都搞不定，是不是那一条路，就是再用经典解释中国现代的问题，包括中国人的价值基础什么的都是不可能了。

Anyway, what should be included and excluded from the canon still matters. We can talk about democracy, science, philosophy, and so on, but we need to know by what standards we think of their relationship to Confucianism. We cannot count somebody as Confucian if they only read the *Three-Character Classic*.<sup>38</sup> People like Kang and Zhang Taiyan were facing the challenges from the West and attempted to address the problems through the classics. However, their solutions never established the authority of the Confucian texts but rather served to destroy it. We are left with two subsequent problems. First, is classical Confucianism at a dead end? To what extent can we still go back to Confucian texts in order to address problems facing the nation and ordinary Chinese today?

再有一个，就是他们那条路错了，壁生说章太炎那条路有问题，我们说康有为那条路也有问题。我们一方面说经典不能没有，没有经典就不用谈儒学了。另一方面就是说我们又认为站在经学的立场上能不能有一个把它整活的方法。这个其实是个难题，三千年未有之变局摆在这里，看上去都没办法了。康有为那些人，我不是说他是一个埋葬者，他那条路看上去走不通，那么我们能否有新的路？我认为，在我目力所见我认为没有。那些似乎说，斩钉截铁说有了解办法的，那些人我都认为靠不住。

We may also say that Kang and Zhang were misguided. Bisheng thinks that Zhang's approach was problematic, isn't the same true of Kang's? But still, we don't think that we dispense with the classics altogether. We cannot talk about Confucianism without the classics. Those working on classics are seriously considering whether this whole commentary tradition can be revived. We are facing a crisis unprecedented in the three-thousand years' history of China. I don't think there's a way forward *within* the commentary tradition and I am always suspicious of those who say that they have a straightforward solution.

---

38

陈明：我提一个技术的角度。刚才您说不要从“信”的角度去讲，为什么这是一个西方人的问题，这个和宗教的类型有关系，这个包括基督教、犹太教的神人关系，他是启示宗教。死后能复活，这个神迹必须相信这个东西。神和经验中间是对立的，紧张的，所以特别强调信。我们中国不用这个词，但是他也要有一个天人沟通的概念，是什么呢，“格物”。在物上体认，体会上天生生之德，体会万物一体之仁。就是把内在于心的天性、与天的内在关系唤醒、激活。

CHEN MING: Let me raise a technical issue. Steve, you said just now that we should not be approaching Confucianism from the perspective of faith to avoid Western-centrism. What I say is that whether the idea of faith is Western-centric depends on the meaning of the term and how it relates to different religious traditions. Faith points to the relationship between humans and God in Christianity and Judaism, which is a form of revelation. You need to believe that death and resurrection wait in the end. God and empiricism are diametrically opposed to one another, which is why faith is heavily stressed. We don't need that in China, but we still need to build up a channel of communication between Heaven and humanity. Where is that channel? It lies in "grasping the nature of things." We realize and experience the life-generativity of Heaven and its virtues as well as the benevolence of the ten-thousand things' being one through materiality. The point is to act on the Heavenly nature that exists inside the heart-mind and our internal relationship with Heaven.

陈壁生：儒教确实是我们今天讨论儒学在现代的一个方向性问题，谢谢各位老师参与今天的讨论。

CHEN BISHENG: Confucian religion, in a sense, speaks to the direction in which we want Confucianism to go. Thank you all for participating in today's discussion.