《Journal of Humanities East/West》
Vol. 18, December 1998, pp. 45-64
College of Liberal Arts, National Central University

Scriptures & Classics in a Comparative Model for "Humane Learning"

*Thomas W. Selover**

Outline

Introduction

Ⅰ. Principles of Humane Learning

Ⅱ. Patterns of Humane Learning

Ⅲ. Elaborating Humane Learning: Sung *Jen-hsueh*

Ⅳ. Cross-cultural Examples

Conclusion

*Associate Professor of Religious Studies, University of Saskatchewan

Abstract

Humane learning or *jen-hsueh* indicates learning for which humaneness (*jen*) is the subject, object, goal and process. In developing this concept in a comparative context, the article draws upon Sung period Neo-Confucian roots as well as several contemporary cross-cultural examples.

The role of scriptures and classics, both Eastern and Western, in this learning process is highlighted. The article has four sections; the first two discuss principles and patterns of character education and enculturation, leading to a model for humane learning comprised of three interpenetrating dimensions: 1) Subjective/Personal (*chu-t'i hsing*), 2) Objective/Mutual (*tui-hsiang hsing*) and 3) Critical/Constructive (*chien-she p'i-p'an hsing*). What actually links these three dimensions is the humane quality or developing character of *jen*. Critical awareness of limitations and biases in the classics is a crucial part of humane learning today, but so is creative reflection on the values found in those classics. The third section of the paper elaborates the model with special reference to Sung dynasty Neo-Confucian readings of the Confucian classics, and the process of "savoring the text" (*wan-wei*). "Savoring" is shown to be a transformative engagement with the inherited texts, leading to a keen sense of social and cultural responsibility. The fourth section draws in cross-cultural examples of the dimensions of humane learning from the U.S., Israel and India, with special attention to the teaching of biblical texts and cultural classics such as the writings of Shakespeare. From the perspective developed here, the Confucian classics have a special role to play for general education on Taiwan, not only as core curriculum of a particular culture, but also as providing the model and example of humane learning itself. The model is comparative in two ways. First, it highlights similar educational roles for scriptures and classics across differing cultures, both East and West. Second, it suggests the merits of studying

scriptures and classics from other cultures and traditions as enrichment for humane learning in Taiwan and elsewhere today.

Key words: humane learning, Confucian, cross-cultural, comparative, Neo-Confucian, Sung dynasty, education, humanities, jen, objective, subjective, critical, constructive, role of scriptures and classics, modern West, Shakespeare, Bible, religious and cultural studies

Introduction

The concept of "humane learning" to be developed in this article, along with its Chinese cognate *jen-hsueh* (仁學), is modelled after the Neo-Confucian traditions of *Tao-hsueh*, *Li-hsueh*, and *Hsin-hsueh* (道學，理學，心學). In all of these traditions, Confucian classics or scriptures (*ching* 經) have held a prominent place. The second term *hsueh* (learning) connotes study, development, and growth. The first term thematizes each particular form of learning, according to the object, goal, and character of that learning. Therefore, humane learning or *jen-hsueh* indicates learning for which humaneness (*jen*) is the subject, object, goal and process. In developing this concept in a comparative context, I will draw upon Sung period Neo-Confucian roots as well as several contemporary cross-cultural examples.[1]

As humans, we are thoroughly involved in a learning and growing process to fulfill our humanity. This common human trait accounts for much of the radical diversity of human individuals and cultures. While the first context for this learning is a person's family and neighbors, some kind of formal schooling most often supplements these primary relations. Formal and informal education are cast in cultural terms; they are always specific to a particular cultural tradition. As the anthropologist Clifford Geertz notes, humans are culturally formed: without humans, there would surely be no culture, but the converse is also true: without culture, no humans.[2] This dependency on culture entails that learning is neither a luxury nor an avocation; it is requisite and fundamental for human survival. What is natural to us as humans is culturally formed; it is the learning of becoming human, the way to "*tsuo jen*"(做人).

As education is a given feature of human life everywhere, the issue of a "core curriculum" is a near universal in human culture. Traditionally, the scriptures and classics, either orally or in written form, have been the basis for the core teachings of cultures around the world. In the context of an increasingly global sense of what it means to be human, the question of core curriculum in both its form and content takes on new urgency and excitement.

I. Principles of Humane Learning

Our concept of humane learning draws upon understandings of *jen* (仁), often translated into English as benevolence, humanity, etc., that developed during the Sung dynasty Confucian revival, when the Confucian classics (or "scriptures") were being re-read as core curriculum or "curriculum of the core" (*le coeur*, heart/mind). I believe that the Chinese word "*jen*" holds a key to many dimensions of the process of learning to be human, not only in a Chinese context but cross-culturally.

At the linguistic-semantic level, the English "humane learning" and the Chinese "*jen-hsueh*" are mutual translations. According to the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED), "humane" was originally the same word as "human," as is also said of the corresponding terms in Chinese, four-stroke *jen* and two-stroke *jen*.[3] "Humane" is primarily defined as "marked by sympathy with and consideration for the needs and distresses of others; feeling or showing compassion and tenderness towards human beings and the lower animals; kind, benevolent" (OED p. 1345). In addition, the OED gives a further meaning of "humane" as "applied to those branches of study or literature....which tend to humanize or refine, as the ancient classics, rhetoric, and poetry." The double meaning of "humane" is salient for understanding "humane learning" in a comparative or general education context. The English phrase "humane learning" has additional connotations and history, so that the pairing of the Chinese and English phrases produces a kind of "match-ing significance" (*ko-i*).

II. Patterns of Humane Learning

"*Jen-hsueh*" signifies that *jen* is both the content and the form of humane learning. The learning of *jen* as an on-going personal endeavor leads to increased awareness of and sensitivity to the full range of one's human situation, embedded in a network of human relations that cannot exclude anyone, and also in a cosmos of infinite extent and complexity. *Jen* develops and operates in ways that generate a

particular model of learning which is relational to the core. This model comprises three intersecting dimensions: 1) Subjective/Personal (*chu-t'i hsing* 主體性), 2) Objective/Mutual (*tui-hsiang hsing* 對象性)[4] and 3) Critical/Constructive (*chien-she p'i-p'an hsing* 建設批判性). Even though these three dimensions will be outlined separately, in practice they interpenetrate fully.

Subjectivity refers to personal transformative reflection upon the meaning of being human, in both inward and public arenas. As such, it is steeped in the irreducibly personal—learning for oneself. As Prof. de Bary has thoroughly documented, "learning for oneself" (*wei-chi chih hsueh* 爲己之學) was a hallmark of the Neo-Confucian re-reading of the Confucian classics.[5] Value-oriented education means education that stimulates the conscience (*liang-hsin* 良心) as value-center. For this purpose, the scriptures and classics of the tradition have generally provided the most fitting content. Through measuring one's thinking, feeling, and willing (cognitive, affective, volitional activities) against the great milestones in the thought of the tradition, one can find both orientation and standard for humane learning and growth.

Objectivity in humane learning indicates at least two kinds of concerns. The first is awareness of the "objective" situation in which human beings find ourselves, the parameters of experience which are not of our own making and which often resist our choices. The second element is the "object" or "goal" of humane learning to educate for cultural participation or citizenship. This means that there is an "objective" on the part of the socializing and enculturating institutions, especially government and the education system, for each person to be prepared to become an active participant in the particular society, sharing its goals and values. Just as the "subjective" goals of character development involve questions of values education, so the objective goals are also a matter of relation with the value-laden qualities of all things (*wan-wu* 萬物).

As for the critical/constructive dimension, because every cultural tradition lives and develops in history, there must be continuous interchange with each new generation of participants. In order for the tradition to develop and not to stagnate, there must be an ongoing generative and creative interaction, described here as

critical/constructive. It is critical in the sense that it is critically aware of the limitations of received tradition; the process of exposing those limitations is part of humane learning. At the same time, the critical element serves to clear the ground for the possibility of new imaginative construction, new building on the ideals of the past in the direction of the future.

This critical dimension blunts many common criticisms that such a "core curriculum" is geared for "indoctrination" at the expense of critical thinking, or that there is a hidden agenda, or that such a curriculum is inherently boring because it fails to engage students in their own reflection. It is important to note, however, that this dimension is "critical" in both directions, calling the present into question as well as the past. For example, we today can see the gender biases of the classics painfully well, but have difficulty being aware of our modern individualistic biases. As C.S. Lewis has remarked, the great advantage of studying the classics is the light they throw on the cultural assumptions and unexamined biases of the present time.[6]

In what follows, this model of humane learning will first be illustrated in Sung dynasty Confucian thought, and then applied to a wider comparative field. In both cases, focus on the role of scriptures and classics in humane learning provides a touchstone of continuity and norm, while at the same time opening the possibility for meaningful comparison with other cultural traditions.

III. Elaborating Humane Learning: Sung *Jen-hsueh*

A. Subjective/Personal

"Learning for the sake of oneself" means that students are actively engaged in the learning process; they are the "subject" of their own process, in a number of senses. The greater portion of learning is the responsibility of students themselves; as the master teacher Confucius is reported to have said, "If I give out one corner and they don't come back with three corners, then I don't go on."[7] In Neo-Confucian readings of the Confucian classics, personal responsibility for "the other three corners" took the form of a process known as "savoring the text"

(*wan-wei* 玩味). This personal savoring of the Confucian classics was key to the vitality and dynamism of Neo-Confucian humane learning, their reliving of the circle of the Sage.

Humane study of the classics was to be a transformative process; Ch'eng I (1033-1107) remarked, "In reading the *Analects*, if after having studied it, one is still just the same old person as before, that is never to have really studied it."[8] He further promises that when the study of the *Analects* and the *Mencius* is properly carried out, its beneficial effects will transform one's mental and physical composition itself.[9] One's sensitivity and perceptivity becomes such that while reading the text, one responds joyfully with the whole heart/mind and body:

> There are people who have read the *Analects* without having anything happen to them. There are others who are happy after having understood a sentence or two. There are still others who, having read the book, love it. And there are those who, having read it, "unconsciously dance with their hands and feet."[10]

The process of "savoring the text" is a progressive deepening of one's personal engagement with the text, a joyful unity of heart/mind and body.

The records and traces of this savorful reading can be found in the *Lun-yü ching-i* (論語精義, Essential Meanings of the *Analects*, LYCI), compiled by Chu Hsi in 1172.[11] This text is an arrangement of extensive comments on the *Analects* by eleven northern Sung figures: the two Ch'eng brothers, Chang Tsai, Hsieh Liang-tso, Yang Shih, Yu Tso, and five others, compiled under Chu Hsi's auspices. Chu Hsi told his disciples that the LYCI should function as a resource book for their own investigation of things (*ko-wu* 格物).[12] They were not to approach the commentaries with a preconception of which one was right, but rather develop their own perception to find it out for themselves (*tzu-te* 自得).

Thus, savoring the text was a way of cultivating the heart/mind. Likewise, commentary writing was a form of spiritual practice, through give-and-take with the text in the process of writing, and through sharing those comments with like-minded others. Because the emphasis in commentary writing was on the understanding one had gained personally (*hsin chih suo te* 心之所得), it is described

here as "subjective/personal." But of course the commentators were also recounting what they took to be the "objective" significance of the text, and so commentary writing participates in the objective/mutual dimension as well.

B. Objective/Mutual

In traditional Confucian terms, "learning for the sake of oneself " is eminently public (*kung* 公), so that the subjective dimensions of humane learning are intimately connected with the largest arenas of human concern. The objective/mutual dimension of humane learning includes education for responsible participation in society and culture. On this point, it is useful to recall the suggestive cognate relationship of *jen* (人 human) and *jen* (仁 humane) with a third near homophone, *jen* (任 responsibility). As an example of the edifying effect of classical learning in this regard, the local gazetteer of a prefecture that Ch'eng Hao (1032-1085) once governed records that Ch'eng kept on the right side of his official desk the saying, "Regard the people as if [treating] the wounded (*shih-min ju-shang* 視民如傷)."[13] Drawing the connection between this saying and *jen*, the Ch'engs' disciple Yang Shih (1053-1135) remarked:

> A ruler who does not have a *jen* heart/mind will not be adequate to win the people. Therefore [only if] ministers can induce the ruler to "Regard the people as if [treating] the wounded" will the royal Way proceed.[14]

This visceral image of "the wounded" evokes the tender compassion of benevolent rule while at the same time suggesting that the people are parts of the body of state. Though some of these implications need to be re-formulated for democratic society, a humane sense of responsibility remains the fundamental qualification for public service for any ruler, hereditary or elected.

"Objectivity" also includes sensitivity to the more-than-human dimensions of the world. In traditional Confucian terms, this has to do with the *wan-wu* and also with Heaven. To be "objective" in relation to these extra-individual, extra-human realities means recognition that there is a wider state of affairs in which one's humanity finds its place. This is one of the most urgent aspects for humane learning today, as the cultures of the world are increasingly and often painfully

aware of sharing the same "objective" biosphere.

C. Critical/Constructive

Critical/constructive dimensions of humane learning refer to increasing ability to reflect critically upon scriptural and classical traditions, their assumptions and biases, and to contribute to constructive development. Though the Sung *Analects* commentaries collected in the LYCI naturally reflect the world of thought and experience of mid-northern Sung China, they include critical reflections that have wider implications. In their comments on the *Analects*, the Ch'eng disciples do not paraphrase the text, nor gloss difficult characters, nor provide background context. Instead, the authors encourage their readers to think more deeply about the implications of the *Analects* passages, and in doing so often seek to dislodge the obvious or traditional meaning of the text.

The Sung Neo-Confucians' claim to be re-discovering the "authentic transmission" of the Confucian scriptural classics represented a critique of Han and T'ang dynasty scholarship. Later, the Ming dynasty Confucian revival centered on Wang Yang-ming critiqued Chu Hsi's school, and Ch'ing scholarship in turn criticized much of Sung and Ming. At the same time, each of these critical movements maintained connection with the subjective and objective dimensions of humane learning, and so produced new constructive development, for the on-going tradition and for Chinese civilization.

The history of the Confucian tradition in this century has emphasized the critical dimension most strongly, at times to the exclusion of the others. The May Fourth movement and its legacy, as well as Marxist, feminist, anti-gerontocratic, and deconstructionist critiques, have called radically into question any notion of a Confucian core curriculum. Yet to the extent that these critical reflections are also deeply connected to the subjective and objective dimensions of humane learning, they may also help precipitate a new revival. In any case, the study of Confucian classics as core curriculum today cannot ignore these critical dimensions. Genuine humane learning implies re-generation, which is necessarily and unpredictably open-ended.

IV. Cross-cultural Examples

It was suggested at the outset that this model of humane learning, though drawn from Confucian sources, is also applicable in other cultural and religious traditions. Indeed, we have not distinguished between religious traditions and other cultural traditions, nor between "scriptures" and "classics." Whether there would be significant differences in the application of this model is an issue for further discussion at another time. Here, some examples will be given to illustrate the three dimensions of humane learning cross-culturally.

A. Subjective/Personal

The proper place (if any) of Religious Studies in a Liberal Arts or Humanities curriculum has been hotly debated in North American colleges and universities, and these debates are instructive for humane learning in general. On the one hand, the older model of religious education was steeped in the tradition of infallible guides, either the Scripture or the fathers and teachers of the Church. This is contrasted with humanistic education of the renaissance tradition, which self-consciously styles itself in opposition to those older models. The discipline of religious studies, at some times and places, studiously avoids addressing the "subjective" dimensions of personal formation. Everything is taught and learned as someone else's belief and practice. But only a dubious and disjointed sense of objectivity is served by thus distancing oneself from the contents of study, as though one were cataloguing recipes while pretending that one did not eat food. Students do not approach the materials in this pseudo-objective way. Thoughtful and engaged students are always asking the question, "What does this mean for me?" The humane learning model shows how the subjective/personal resonates with both the objective/mutual and critical/constructive dimensions.

The comparative method of religious studies, including both historical comparison between past and present and lateral comparison with other traditions, can offer significant resources for the project of humane learning. According to this model, Confucian scriptures and classics can be fruitfully compared both with the classics of the Greek humanistic and modern secular traditions, and with the

scriptural traditions of biblical and other faiths.

B. Objective/Mutual

Primary arguments for teaching about biblical texts in the North American core curriculum are of the "objective" type, in terms of the culture in which students are being educated to participate. As Jenkinson notes, "No other collection of books has influenced Western culture more than the Old Testament...[therefore] no other collection is more worthy of study in the schools."[15] Echoing the words of Confucius in *Analects* 17:9 with reference to the study of the *Shih ching*, Jenkinson goes on to note that "a study of biblical narratives also helps a student understand the allusions and symbols in thousands of classical and contemporary works of literature...[and] appreciate much of music and art..."[16]

Because the Bible is religiously important to many people in a specific way that makes claims and assumptions about the nature of the Bible, authors who write on the Bible as literature find it necessary to distinguish their approach from the religious.[17] In the wider comparison of scriptures and classics in core curriculum, the special difficulties of handling the Bible would be shared by relatively few texts (the Qur'an would be a similar case).

The "objective" importance of biblical materials is also related to the teaching context, such that they take on particular urgency in the State of Israel. Ya'acov Iram notes that the study of the Bible, as well as Hebrew language and Jewish history, is emphasized in the "general trend" of Israeli education which aims at "...Jewish knowledge and values, education for citizenship...and universal human values."[18] An added objective/mutual benefit of such education can be a "...sense of kinship with Jews outside Israel and of continuity with the Jewish religious past."[19]

Like Israel, India also is a state with a long cultural and religious identity that is challenged by forces in the present world. There, as elsewhere, the tendency has been to rely on educational models developed in the modern West. In the process, there has a been a profound disjuncture with the cultural resources of the Indian tradition. Recalling that the "objective" dimensions of humane learning also

include the heritage in which one stands, it seems that a more self-conscious study of the classic texts of Hindu tradition would be quite beneficial in the Indian situation. As Kim Sebaly points out, one of the difficulties standing in the way of fully developing an Indian classical core curriculum is" ...the narrow definitions accorded the meaning of religion and the many traditions through which religious experience occurs."[20] If the classic Hindu texts are treated as resources for humane learning in the sense developed here, they can have a positive role in Indian education; however, such a role will require attention to the critical/constructive dimension of humane learning as well.

C. Critical/Constructive

Though not "religious" classics per se, and certainly not "scripture," the writings of Shakespeare have canonical status in the teaching of English literature and culture. The arguments made for the centrality of his writings go beyond the specifically literary; Shakespeare has something fundamental to do with the formation of true English character. Since English departments in the U.S., for example, are typically responsible for whatever reflection on values is found in the high school curriculum, enculturation in Shakespeare is surely identifiable as humane learning.

As is the case in other cultural traditions, effective use of Shakespeare in a core curriculum of humane learning can be hampered by the taken-for-granted status of the text. Thus recent curricular work emphasizes critical/constructive dimensions, de-privileging the text in order that it can trigger humane learning more effectively.[21] In *Shakespeare in the Classroom: What's the Matter?* Susan Leach focuses on practical suggestions for engaging students in critical reflection:

> In order to avoid collusion in the negative gender and race perspectives which appear to be operating in the Shakespeare texts (and it needs to be remembered that disregarding them is tantamount to agreeing with them), we need to be able to recognize these perspectives, to have our own strategies for confronting them, and some developed classroom practices for working on them.[22]

Leach points out that recognizing such biased perspectives in the Shakespeare

text is not enough, nor even the main point. Just as important is the ability to recognize and constructively deal with biased attitudes in the classroom itself. As Anthony Adams notes, "The key-note throughout is on bringing Shakespeare to life for the present, to release it from a kind of embalmment that has often afflicted it in the past."[23]

This same critical/constructive emphasis is also present in dealing with biblical texts in a Bible-as-literature format in the modern English department classroom. On the Bible, there is more critical/constructive scholarship than one could ever possibly present. However, as in Shakespeare studies, the key point is that the traditional text be "restored to the crucible" of the students' own humane learning in the present. The same can be said, of course, for study of Confucian texts; the challenge of humane learning is to keep all three dimensions properly interpenetrating.

Scriptures and classics powerfully shape the personal and collective sensibilities of members of a culture, not only "who I am" but "who we are." At the same time, they represent the "objective" situation, the prerequisites for effective participation as an educated member of the culture. The tradition that scripturalizes and classicizes these texts lends its weight of "objective" authority--not as a burden from the distant past, but as a testimony to the human development which the texts have induced and inspired. For this reason, scriptures and classics as core curriculum for humane learning are studied not only for personal edification but also as part of a cultural survival kit. From the viewpoint of the cultural elite who are responsible for educational institutions and from the perspective of the individual him and herself, the critical/constructive dimension of humane learning becomes absolutely crucial.

Conclusion

By way of conclusion, I would like to point out two significant consequences of this model of humane learning for general education in Taiwan. The first is that education in the Confucian classics can play a major role in general education if it is designed according to this model of humane learning. Second, the study of other

traditions' scriptures and classics, when presented according to the same model, can also have a significant role in humane learning in the context of Taiwan and elsewhere. Let me elaborate.

Neo-Confucian humane learning was based on several common understandings that shaped its dynamics. First among these was that the ancient Confucian texts are profoundly meaningful and provide a reliable guide for living; there was a traditional continuity of ideals and of special texts. The key to coming to a direct apprehension of the "original meaning" of those texts was to savor them in reflective practice, perceiving those meanings and guides as directly applicable to one's own learning to be fully human. Further, a common Confucian understanding was that the significant methods and meanings embodied in these texts are both discoverable and shareable, and that group study with an accomplished teacher is the most direct way to unfold these meanings. The classic encounters between Confucius and Mencius and their disciples reverberated in their present lives, including the developing qualities of their own characters, the like-minded community engaged in learning, and the whole order of the cosmos. This sense of discovery and excitement would be the aim of studying the Confucian classics as core curriculum in Taiwan today.

Each of the dimensions of humane learning should be represented in a curricular approach to the Confucian classics. The subjective/personal dimension can be represented through reflection papers or autobiographical compositions in dialogue with the classic texts. The objective/mutual dimension can be represented through citizenship education that emphasizes the role the Confucian classics have played in forming and sustaining the cultural sensibilities of East Asian civilization. The critical/constructive dimension can be represented by historical-critical studies, placing the Confucian classics in the context of other texts of the same historical period. In this way, there would be enhancement of critical awareness of the social conditions, including gender assumptions and class divisions, which underlay, shaped and informed these texts when they were written, and as they have been cherished and re-interpreted throughout the history of the tradition until today. At the same time, the constructive emphasis would be on the activity of discerning meanings and models on behalf of one's own generation.

On the second point, I would like to suggest that a comparative consideration of the scriptures and classics informing other world cultures can augment humane learning or general education in Taiwan and elsewhere. At a time when the scriptural and classical heritage of various parts of the world is increasingly held in common, humane learning for world citizenship must include a wide-ranging introduction to this heritage. By including scriptures and classics from other traditions, this model answers some pluralist objections to the idea of a "core curriculum." Comparative studies demonstrate the commonality of the problems and prospects of humane learning in various parts of the world. Critical awareness of other accounts of basic human nature and human community will highlight the distinctive assumptions of the Chinese classics and guage them with respect to other views.

Finally, the model proposed here is comparative in two senses: it highlights similar educational roles for scriptures and classics across differing cultures, and it also suggests the merits of comparative study of scriptures and classics for humane learning today.

Notes

1. This article grows out of a presentation at the Third International Conference on the General Education: Chinese Classics as Core Curriculum (Taipei, May 1998). I would like to gratefully acknowledge the helpful comments of the participants in that conference, particularly its convenor, Prof. Huang Chun-chieh. I am also grateful for the many comments of the journal's anonymous reviewers, one of whom pointed out grammatical difficulties in the phrase "humane learning." While, recognizing those difficulties, I prefer to see them as fruitful ambiguities. I also acknowledge a debt to the well-known essay "Jen-hsueh" by T'an Ssu-t'ung, to *Exposition of the Principle* (New York: HSA Publications, 1996), and to the intellectual guidance of Prof. Tu Wei-ming.

2. See Clifford Geertz, "The Impact of the Concept of Culture on the Concept of Man," *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), 33-55.

3. Even after the two words "humane" and "human" became differentiated, their meanings were and are closely interrelated; in 1841 Trench wrote, "It is just in man to be merciful...to be humane is human." *Parables* viii (1877 edition), p. 159, cited in OED p. 1345. This recalls the Confucian definition, found in both *Chung-yung* and *Mencius*: "*Jen* is [the distinguishing characteristic of being] human." (*jen-che jen yeh*) *Chung-yung* 20; see also *Mencius* 7B16, "'*Jen*' means 'human.'"

4. I designate "objective" here as *tui-hsiang hsing* rather than *k'o-t'i hsing* or *k'o-kuan hsing* (客體性 or 客觀性) in order to emphasize the mutual responsiveness of human beings toward that in relation to which we become human, our fellow humans in wider society and the cosmos of all things.

5. See Wm. Theodore de Bary, *Learning for One's Self : Essays on the Individual in Neo-Confucian Thought* (New York : Columbia University Press, 1991).

6. See C.S. Lewis, *The Allegory of Love: a Study in Medieval Tradition*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1973, c1938), especially the first chapter.

7. *Analects* 7:8, Brooks and Brooks translation, *The Original Analects* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), p. 40.

8. *Erh-Ch'eng i-shu* 19, *Erh-Ch'eng chi* (ECC) edition, p. 261, modification of Wing-tsit Chan's translation of *Chin-ssu lu* (CSL) 3/30 in Chan, *Reflections on Things at Hand* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967), p. 100.

9. ECC p. 279, partially included at CSL 3/36; see translation by Wing-tsit Chan p. 103.

10. ECC, p. 261, modified from Chan's translation of CSL 3/38; Chan, p. 103. The closing phrase is cited from the "Great Preface" to the *Shih ching*.

11. The full name of the compilation, encompassing both the *Analects* and the *Mencius*, is *Kuo-ch'ao chu lao hsien-sheng Lun-Meng Ching-i* (國朝諸老先生論孟精義, Essential Meanings of the *Analects* and *Mencius* [by] the Old Masters of our Dynasty); see *Chu-tzu Yi-shu* (Surviving Works of Master Chu) edition.

12. *Chu-tzu yü-lei* (Classified Conversations of Master Chu, CTYL) 19, p. 441 in the Chung-hua shu-chu edition, 1986. The *Analects* text and the various commentaries upon it were much discussed between Chu Hsi and his disciples, and many of these

conversations are included in the CTYL 20-50.

13. The saying is found in the *Tso chuan*, fourth month of the first year of Duke Ai (494 BCE) and also in *Mencius* 4B20. The local gazetteer is [*Kuang-hsu*] *Fu-kou hsien-chih*, 5/32a. The significance of this saying in Ch'eng Hao's practice is discussed by his disciple Hsieh Liang-tso in *Shang-ts'ai yü-lu*.

14. *Kuei-shan hsien-sheng yü-lu*, 1/23b.

15. Edward B. Jenkinson, in *Teaching the Old Testament in English Classes* (Indiana University Press, 1973), xi.

16. Ibid.

17. John B. Gabel, et. al., *The Bible as Literature: An Introduction*, third edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 3.

18. Ya'acov Iram, "Judaism, Education and National Identity" in *World Religions and Educational Practice*, edited by Witold Tulasiewicz and Cho-Yee To (London: Cassell, 1993), p. 61.

19. Ibid., p. 66.

20. Kim P. Sebaly, "Provision for Hinduism in Modern Education," in *World Religions and Educational Practice*, p. 45.

21. See for example, the articles in *Shakespeare in the Changing Curriculum*, edited by Lesley Aers and Nigel Wheale (London and New York: Routledge, 1991).

22. Susan Leach, *Shakespeare in the Classroom: What's the Matter?* (Open University Press, 1992), p. 72.

23. In Leach, p. ix.

「仁學」比較模式中的經書與經典

Thomas W. Selover*

摘　要

仁學指的是以仁爲主體、對象、目標與過程的學習。爲從比較的觀點來發展這種觀念，本文將援引宋朝的新儒學以及幾個當代跨文化的範例。

東西方的經書與經典作品在這種學習過程中甚受重視。本文將從以下四部份來闡釋：前二部份討論人格教育與文化養成的原則與模式，以提出仁學觀念中三個相互聯系的方面：1. 主體性，2. 對象性，3. 建設批評性。此三面向的關連性就在於人性或是人格發展。現今的仁學必須對於經典的侷限性與偏見有所認知，但是同時也必須對於其所具有的價值有建設性的反思。論文第三部份將對於宋代新儒學對於儒學經典的閱讀有詳細討論，尤其是其中所謂的「玩味」過程。「玩味」表達的是深讀古籍，進而對於社會與文化責任能有深刻認識。第四部份將提出美國、以色列與印度在仁學方

*加拿大沙卡奇溫大學宗教學副教授
本篇摘要由中央大學英文系林文淇教授翻譯

面跨文化的範例，尤其是關於聖經與經典文學的教學，例如：莎士比亞。同樣地，儒家經典在台灣的通識教育亦扮演著特殊的重要角色，不僅是作爲一個文化的核心課程，而且是提供仁學本身典範與實例。這樣的模式從二方面說來是一種比較的模式。首先，它標榜經書與經 典在東西不同文化間相似的教育功能。其次，它指出研究其他文化與傳統中的經書與經典，對台灣及其他國家而言在現今都是對仁學極有助益。