

(中文翻譯本由第 9 頁開始)

(Please scroll down to page 9 for Chinese translation)

## **REVELATION 21:1-7**

Then I saw a new heaven and a new earth; the first heaven and the first earth had disappeared now, and there was no longer any sea. I saw the holy city, and the new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, as beautiful as a bride all dressed for her husband. Then I heard a loud voice call from the throne, “You see this city? Here God lives among men. He will make his home among them; they shall be his people, and he will be their God; his name is God-with-them. He will wipe away all tears from their eyes; there will be no more death, and no more mourning or sadness. The world of the past has gone.” Then the One sitting on the throne spoke: “Now I am making the whole of creation new” he said. “Write this: that what I am saying is sure and will come true.” And then he said, “It is already done. I am the Alpha and the Omega, the Beginning and the End. I will give water from the well of life free to anybody who is thirsty; it is the rightful inheritance of the one who proves victorious; and I will be his God and he a son to me. (Jerusalem Bible)

## **SERMON**

I am honored to be invited to preach at the inauguration of Francis Yip as Director of the Divinity School of Chung Chi College. I first met Francis in 1995 when he came to Harvard University for a doctorate in theology. He was very much interested in modern European theology, especially Paul Tillich and Jürgen Moltmann and in their interpretation of political society and the relation of the Christian faith and message to that society with its various values and ideologies. Such interests demonstrated our common goals and as a result, I became his faculty and dissertation advisor. The fact that we share the same first name added to our commonality.

Francis reminded me of my own move to the University of Münster in Germany to pursue a doctorate in theology. I was primarily interested in Karl Rahner's theology and especially Johann Baptist Metz, his former assistant and student, who attempted to develop Rahner's theology to society. Though Joseph Ratzinger (who became Pope Benedict XVI) and Walter Kasper, now a Cardinal, were also there, my interest was in Johann Baptist Metz and Karl Rahner. They were then engaged in a dialogue between

the Christian theologians and philosophers of West Germany and the Marxist philosophers of East Germany. At the same time, Jürgen Moltmann's recently published *Theology of Hope* had become a theological best seller and Johann Metz began to propose a political theology in contrast to transcendental and existential approaches.

Although Tillich, Moltmann, and Metz belong to quite different theological traditions, they share a common concern with hope. Our hope carries two important convictions. First, we believe that the world is not what it should be. Second, we believe and hope that the world will become what it should be. The two convictions underlie the Book of Revelation. Using poetic and dramatic narratives that are saturated with visions and sounds, John, the author of the Book of Revelation, constructed an alternative symbolic universe, which expresses the hope about how the world should be. In this alternative world, the injustice, persecution, oppression, dehumanization, suffering, and death that are brought by the demonic aspects of an empire will surely come to an end. The risen Christ, who himself is the King of kings and the Lord of lords, will bring ultimate judgement to the powerful empires. The persecuted and the killed will be vindicated. Injustice, suffering, and dehumanization will be eradicated. Moreover, the author expresses a strong hope that the world will be radically and completely transformed. As Revelation 21, which we've just read, says, there will be a new heaven and a new earth. The New Jerusalem will come down from heaven. Babylon or Rome will no longer exist. God will live among the people.

Like all biblical books, the Book of Revelation was written in specific historical and social contexts. Pax Romana seemed to be able to guarantee peace and prosperity throughout the empire. But it was also a system of domination that brought discrimination, injustice, oppression, and suffering to many people, including Christians in Asia Minor. In a powerful rhetoric, John was keen to point out the demonic aspects of this system of domination and to persuade his audience not to compromise their faith by participating in that system in general and in the imperial cult in particular. In response to a disheartening, if not desperate, social reality, the Book of Revelation offered an alternative vision, with a theological view of power and history from the perspective of the hope that Christ, rather than Caesar, has the final say, and that history, which is in the hands of God, is moving toward the ultimate victory of the Reign of God. It is a hope evident in the late first century of the Christian community that still speaks to the

modern world. And the eschatological outlook has informed centuries of theologians, especially theologians in the 20th century.

Theological reflection takes place not in the abstract but in concrete situations, historical contexts, and specific political and economic configurations. I should like to briefly look at three different times. The context of Paul Tillich's theology was located in the beginning of the post-World War I context; Metz and Moltmann theologies began in the 1960's, two decades after World War II; and our context today is perhaps much more difficult to interpret, especially in view of the complexity and interaction among all parts of the world.

Paul Tillich's context was the end of World War I with the devastation of Europe and Germany in particular, the heavy penalties placed upon Germany in treatise at the end of the war, the dire economic situation of Germany, and the incipient and fragile beginnings of democracy in the Weimar Republic of Germany, and the rise of Adolf Hitler and the National Socialist Movement. Paul Tillich has been drafted into the armed services and served as a chaplain in WWI, then after the war became a professor. In 1933, however, after the ascent of Hitler, he was the first German university professor to be placed on leave by the National Socialist regime. The official government documents consist of brief official letters informing him of that they had placed him on leave. No reason or defense or explanation of their action is given. It simply informs him of their action. Obviously, his theology and his critical views were such that the Nazi Government perceived him and theology as a threat.

Paul Tillich was a critical and prophetic theologian in Germany. He regards the period of Weimar Republic—after the WWI and before WWII—as a *kairos*, a time of crisis and opportunity that calls for critique and transformation. He opts for religious socialism and views various aspects of the cultural, political, and economic situation as demonic. His analysis of his contemporary situation differed from the pattern of more well-known analyses. Tillich went beyond the Marxian economic critique of capitalism, the Weberian split of the various institutions of into distinct functional institutions, and the theological criticism of the idolatry present in modern culture. He proposes the notion of the demonic as a structure of evil with an ambiguous union of creativity and destructiveness. It serves his critique of

capitalism and is more developed than the usual reference to capitalism in terms of idolatry. In addition, as Adolf Hitler and his party rose to power in the 1930s, Tillich became critical of his own understanding of the hope and possibility for a theonomous developments in German culture outside of the church. In fact, it became clear that after his dismissal and emigration to the US in 1933, his writings began to make clear that his enthusiasm for the positive revelatory power of culture had dimmed. From his critique and his dismissal, he critically revised his theology. Though a foreigner, he did not directly engage in criticism of concrete politics American political life as he had in Germany or as he did during the war. The United States broadcasts, however, talks he wrote for them that were broadcast to Germany during World War II.

A story was once told to me of an incident, almost as if it were a joke, though it actually makes a serious point. A systematic theologian gave a talk at the Union Theological Seminary in the 1970s as part of a faculty search. The theologian was under consideration for a position in theology. A faculty member, who in fact was a successor to Paul Tillich's chair, asked: him, "Who would object to what you have said in your talk." The theologian answered, "I would think that no one would." That faculty member then turned to a colleague sitting next to him and quietly whispered, "That's exactly what I was afraid of." The importance of theological reflection and religious language to excise a critical function is central to the Christian message.

Today we can ask: Have we compromised the Christian message by reducing its critical edge, thus fitting it nicely into the prevailing culture and mainstream society? To what extent does our theology lead to social and cultural transformation in light of the gospel of God's Rule? I am not just talking about academic theology published in books and journals, but also lived theology expressed in the church's preaching, teaching, and praying.

Tillich died in 1965. Around that time Metz's political theology and Moltmann's theology of hope emerged. I would like to point to some aspects of the context in which their theology was developed.

Both Metz and Moltmann had been toward the very end of WWII been drafted into Hitler's army. Metz was captured as a sixteen-year old and sent as a prisoner of war to the USA to work on a farm. Moltmann was captured and was brought to England as prisoner of war.

In addition to their experience of the war and of suffering, it was twenty years after the war that their professional careers as university professors became established. The last two decades witnessed the rebuilding of Europe and the European Union but at the same time the Cold War between the Soviet Union and Europe and the United States took place. The influence of Ernst Bloch's *Das Prinzip Hoffnung* upon Moltmann's *Theology of Hope* and upon Metz's political theology signaled the contrasting complexities of the situation. They sought to dialogue with a Marxist philosopher because they saw a certain significance in his thought. Ernst Bloch argues in his writings that Marxism's neglect of the religious dimension of culture and tradition as well as the neglect of natural law and rights has led to an impoverishment of Marxism. When Ernst Bloch was in the West Germany for a lecture the East German regime closed down his offices, jailed his assistants, took over control of the journal. It became obvious that he should not return and should stay in the West. Bloch received a professorial position in West Germany. Toward the end of the sixties, there was the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia to put down democratic tendencies. At the same time, the United States' tragic involvement in Vietnam became clearer as the war and destruction continued.

However, Metz and Moltmann developed as theologians somewhat differently. Metz very cautiously appealed to an eschatological proviso using eschatological critique only as critique, but never as an advocacy for a concrete political party or economic system. He did indeed focus on the question: why did previous generation of theologians talk about theology as much more authentic when it was personal and individualistic rather than political. Yet he also differed from Jürgen Moltmann (as well as from Gustavo Gutiérrez who criticized him for it) in refusing to opt for a specific political party or a specific political program. He refused to opt for socialism as institutional remedy for capitalism. Instead, he turned his attention to emphasizing the importance of the memory of the suffering of innocent victims not only of the biblical prophets and of Jesus, but also the victims of the Shoah. He reminds the Christian church that they did not do enough in the German past. They were neglecting the suffering of the

innocent so central to its biblical past and its Christian faith. Moltmann turned to emphasize the crucified God and the suffering of Jesus as the foundation of a critical Christian theology. In addition, Moltmann focused in a way that Metz did not on the material-economic dimensions of the pathologies of modernity. He underscored that capitalism itself contributed to injustices and ecological contradictions of modernity.

I have described two different contexts, the distinct interpretations of the challenges and evils that one faced. They share a common concern with how the Christian message bears on the world, on politics and economics. Clearly different responses were given. No doubt they are professional theologians, who wrote books and taught students. But most of you who participate in this occasion today are also in the broad sense theologians, who think and talk about God and act in relation to such thinking and talking. Like them, we need to engage with and respond to issues and challenges from the world. But our context might be very different from them. The question is where are we today? What is our situation? What are our challenges? How can we communicate our Christian message to relate to our world and its situation?

Today, it is a difficult situation to even begin to describe. The pandemic has had international impact. Much more on my own country (USA) and England and on many Eastern Asian countries. People in my country ask: what is wrong with the Modern West that it is so inadequate to the crisis of the present pandemic and some East Asian countries have done so well. The USA has had a long-standing opposition to a public health option for all (using the label “socialist” to criticize it in contrast to a healthcare based on private employer insurance). When people lose their jobs because of the pandemic, they lose their employee-based health insurance. Stop-gap measures fall far behind the actual need. In the USA, the inadequacy of the social system has increased to the extent that the New Deal of Roosevelt has been undermined.

Sometimes, there is a tendency to blame capitalism for the evils today. Many in the West think in terms of neo-liberalism, spoken as a mantra that depicts the belief that the economic system, or the market itself, when left alone, can best achieve its goal. Others, more astutely aware of the working of the economy, underscore that the capitalist market economy is not independent of the influences of

concentrated wealth in the hands of the influential few, certain international regulations, international monetary funds and requirements so that what is seen as independent is very much the result of an accumulation of wealth and the economy. At the same time, there are also economies that are in the hands of the state and run to achieve the goals of the state. In short, maintaining that a certain form of economic organization is at fault overlooks other forces determining the situation. The existence of racism, the hostility toward the stranger, and the striving for one's own advantage underlie many of the problems with an equal force. Both come together in economic decisions and political nationalism.

In dealing with the challenges today, we have to carefully negotiate diverse economic, political (representational), power structures that are always intertwined so that one cannot be separated from the other. This is not an easy challenge, but we must take it seriously so that our theological education may cultivate a new generation of clergy, theologians, and lay leaders that understand the complexity of the situation and give prudent and relevant responses in light of the Christian message. I believe that Francis Yip is able to lead a school in this direction. I was impressed by how in his dissertation, he went back to Emile Durkheim and his analysis of society to broaden and enrich his analysis of Tillich. In addition, he underscored what the East had to contribute to the West. The breath and depth of his vision gives me confidence that he will as Director lead the school with an intellectual breath and with the Christian depth of the concern for the suffering of innocent victims and the hope for a new future.

We have been talking about the complexity of the situation and the diversity of responses. But we should not overlook the fact that such diversity of responses are responses in light of the Christian message. Central to our understanding of the Christian vision is the memory of the suffering of the just on earth. This is symbolized in a significant way by the cross of Jesus. Our responses, however diverse, should keep this memory in mind. Moreover, we know that the cross is not the final stage. Beyond the cross comes the resurrection, the resurrection of Jesus as the first fruit of the resurrection of others. This leads us again to the hope and to the belief that the world is not what it should be, and that the world will become what it should be. The heart of the theological vision in these verses of the Book of Revelation is that the new earth will be different from the old earth. God's reign and Christ's presence cannot exist with the dehumanizing powers that devastate the earth and corrupt its living inhabitants. As

Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza wrote in her commentary on Revelation: “The outcries of the persecuted for the enactment of justice and Judgment therefore also rise up on behalf of the earth as God's creation. God's justice and judgment bring not only vindication of those persecuted and murdered but also engender total human well-being and salvation on earth. <sup>1</sup>” The church, together with those who suffer, earnestly hopes for such total well-being and salvation in the Christian vision. And the church, in solidarity with those who suffer, should, in words and deeds, work for the transformation of the world in the hope for the new heaven and the new earth.

Francis Schüssler Fiorenza

Charles Stillman Professor of Roman Catholic Theological Studies

Harvard Divinity School



香港中文大學崇基學院神學院  
葉菁華院長就職崇拜

Inaugural Service of Professor Francis Ching-Wah Yip  
as Director of Divinity School of Chung Chi College

<sup>1</sup> Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *Revelation: Vision of a Just World* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993), p.109f.



## 啟示錄 21 章 1—7 節

我又看見一個新天新地，因為先前的天和先前的地已經過去了，海也不再有了。我又看見聖城，新耶路撒冷由上帝那裏，從天而降，預備好了，就如新娘打扮整齊，等候丈夫。我聽見有大聲音從寶座出來，說：「看哪，上帝的帳幕在人間！他要和他們同住，他們要作他的子民。上帝要親自與他們同在。上帝要擦去他們一切的眼淚；不再有死亡，也不再有悲哀、哭號、痛苦，因為先前的事都過去了。」那位坐在寶座上的說：「看哪，我把一切都更新了！」他又說：「你要寫下來，因為這些話是可信靠的，是真實的。」他又對我說：「成了！我是阿拉法，我是俄梅戛；我是開始，我是終結。我要把生命的泉水白白賜給那口渴的人喝。得勝的要承受這些為業；我要作他的上帝，他要作我的兒子。」(和合本修訂版)

### 證道

受邀為崇基學院神學院葉菁華院長的就職禮證道，我深感榮幸。我早於 1995 年認識菁華，當時他來到哈佛大學修讀神學博士學位。他對現代歐洲神學甚感興趣，尤其田立克 (Paul Tillich) 和莫特曼 (Jürgen Moltmann) 對於政治社會的理解，並基督信仰與社會上各種價值、意識形態的關係。他的研究志趣與我不謀而合，我便成為了他的論文指導老師。另一共通點，就是我們剛好都叫 Francis。

菁華令我想起自己當年到德國明斯特大學攻讀神學博士的決定。我主要關注拉納 (Karl Rahner) 和他的前助手兼學生默茨 (Johann Baptist Metz) 的神學，尤其是默茨如何進一步發展拉納神學對社會的重要性。雖然拉辛格 (Joseph Ratzinger, 即後來的教宗本篤十六世) 及卡斯培樞機 (Walter Kasper) 當時也在明斯特，但我還是對默茨及拉納比較感興趣。其時一眾西德基督教神學家及哲學家與東德馬克思哲學家的對話，他倆亦參與其中。同一時期，莫特曼新出版的《盼望神學》成為暢銷神學著作，默茨開始提出一種不同於超驗及存有進路的政治神學。

雖然田立克、莫特曼、默茨分別來自不同神學傳統，但他們三位都尤其關注盼望。我們的盼望意味著兩個重要信念：一、我們認為當前世界並非其應然的模樣；二、我們相信世界會成為其應然的模樣。這兩個信念，正正就是《啟示錄》的底蘊。透過詩意又具戲劇性、充斥著異象和聲響的敘事，作者約翰構建出一個另類意義世界，來表述對於世界應然的盼望。在此另類意義世界中，一切帝國魔魅所帶來的不公、迫害、壓制、非人化、痛苦、死亡，通通都要終結。復活的基督，萬王之王、萬主之主，要親自審判所有強國。受迫害殘殺者，要得平反。不公、痛苦、非人化，將被根除。作者展現出一種堅定不移的盼望，深信世界將要徹底、完全地轉化。正如剛才讀到的《啟示錄》21 章所言，我們將要迎來一個新天新地。新耶路撒冷要從天而降。不再有巴比倫，亦不再有羅馬。上帝要和祂的子民同住。

香  
葉

Inaugural Service for Professor Francis Ching-Wah Yip of Divinity  
School of Chung Chi College  
The Chinese University of Hong Kong

如同其他聖經書卷，《啟示錄》乃成書於特定的歷史及社會處境。羅馬治世（Pax Romana）表面上為帝國上下帶來繁榮安定，但同時亦是令很多人陷於歧視、不公、壓迫、痛苦的支配體系，包括當時小亞細亞的基督徒。約翰有力地指出此支配體系的魔魅之處，規勸讀者切勿背棄信仰、同流合污，尤其別參與當時的君主崇拜。面對令人灰心喪氣的社會現實，《啟示錄》描畫了另類的景象作為回應：從神學角度看權勢歷史，深信最終掌權的乃是基督、而非凱撒；歷史掌管在上主手中，上帝國終將得勝。如此盼望，既見於第一世紀末的基督徒群體，亦迴盪於當今世界。這樣的終末景象，啟發著一代又一代神學家，尤其一眾二十世紀神學家。

神學反省不在憑空高談，而在具體的情境、歷史、政治、經濟格局之中發生。我想就此概覽三個時期：田立克的神學，坐落於第一次世界大戰後的處境；默茨及莫特曼的神學始於 1960 年代，二戰結束二十多年後；要詮釋我們今天的處境毫不容易，難在當前世界處處互動頻繁、環環相扣。

田立克做神學時，正面對一戰結束後滿目瘡痍的歐洲，《凡爾賽條約》對德國的重罰，百業蕭條的國內經濟，威瑪共和伊始未穩的民主制度，以及希特拉與國家社會主義運動的興起。田立克一戰時被徵召入伍，擔任隨軍牧師，戰後成為了一名教授。1933 年希特拉得勢後，田立克成了國家社會主義政權下第一位「被休假」的德國大學教授。當時的政府公文只得官腔的片言隻字，通知他已被安排休假，完全沒有提供任何理據解釋，而只是告知有關決定。田立克的神學及其批判觀點，顯然使當時的納粹政府視他為威脅。

田立克在德國是一位具批判及先知性的神學家。他認為一戰後、二戰前出現的威瑪共和（Weimar Republic）是個時機（*kairos*），當中既有危、亦有機，正是批判及轉化的時候。他提倡宗教社會主義，指出文化、政治、經濟形勢的魔魅性質。他對當時處境的分析，有別於一些主流觀點，如：從馬克思經濟學批判資本主義、以功能性區分各種機構的韋伯式分類、對現代文化中偶像崇拜的神學批判。田立克提出，「魔魅」（the demonic）作為一種「惡的結構」（structure of evil），含混地結合了創造力和破壞力。田立克以魔魅概念對資本主義的批判，比一般以偶像崇拜切入的批判更為完善。1930 年代，隨著希特拉及其政黨得勢，田立克不得不重新審視他過往對盼望的理解，以及在教會以外的德國文化達至神律的可能。事實上，自 1933 年他被革職而移居美國後，他的著作中對文化作為積極啟示的可能，已不復昔日熱情。在美期間，他沒有直接評論過任何美國政事，不似在德國時的勤諫論政，或二戰時為德國受眾所寫的廣播。

我曾聽說一件被當作笑話的佚事，但其中頗有道理。1970 年代，一位系統神學家在紐約協和神學院講學，作為申請神學教席的其中一關。在場一位教員，亦即田立克神學講座教席之繼任人，當時問道：「誰會反對你剛才所講的內容？」那位神學家答曰：「應該沒有人會反對。」教員聽罷，便向身旁一位同事耳語：「我最擔心的莫過於此。」神學反省以及宗教語言的批判功能，可謂基督教信息的重中之重。

今天我們要問：我們有否為了迎合主流文化及社會，而貶抑基督教信息的批判特性？我們的神學，有否按上帝國的福音，帶來文化及社群的轉化？我指的不只是書本及期刊中的學術神學，亦包括活現於教會講道、教導、禱告中的神學。

田立克於 1965 年辭世。差不多同一時期，出現了默茨的政治神學及莫特曼的盼望神學。接下來我想談談他們發展出這些神學的處境。

默茨和莫特曼都在二戰尾聲時，被徵召加入希特拉的軍隊。默茨十六歲時被虜為戰俘，帶到美國一個農場工作。莫特曼亦淪為戰俘，被帶到英國。

經歷過戰事之苦，他們成為大學教授，已是戰後二十年的事。這兩個世紀之間，歐洲和歐盟忙於戰後重建，蘇聯、歐洲、美國之間的冷戰持續。莫特曼的《盼望神學》和默茨的政治神學，皆深受布洛赫（Ernst Bloch）《希望的原理》影響，這反映了其時處境之複雜，使他們轉向與一位馬克思哲學家對話。布洛赫在著作中提出，馬克思主義對文化及傳統之宗教面向、自然法則與人權的忽視，乃其衰退的主因。一次布洛赫到西德講學時，東德政權趁機取締了他的辦公室，把他的助手們關起來，並接管了他的學術期刊。布洛赫顯然不該回去，後來便留在西德，並獲得教席。60 年代末，俄羅斯入侵捷克斯洛伐克以打壓民主化勢頭。另一邊廂，隨著越戰持續，美國的軍事介入顯得日益悲劇。

默茨和莫特曼的神學發展卻頗為不同。默茨神學中的終末前提，乃採終末作為一種批判，而非用以提倡任何政黨或經濟制度。他主要關注的問題是：為甚麼上一代的神學家，會認為個人的神學比政治的神學來得更加正宗？他與莫特曼相異之處（同時亦是與古鐵熱（Gustavo Gutiérrez）不同之處，後者批評他這一點），在於他拒絕推舉任何政黨或政治綱領，不認同社會主義是對應資本主義的制度良方。他轉而強調記念無辜受難者的重要，不單是一眾聖經先知和耶穌，亦包括納粹大屠殺中的受難者。默茨提醒當時的基督教會，他們在過去這段德國歷史中袖手旁觀。無辜者的受難，乃聖經以至基督信仰的核心，他們卻對此無動於衷。莫特曼則強調被釘十字架的上帝以及耶穌的受難，從而發展出他的批判神學。此外，莫特曼亦比默茨更關注現代性中物質及經濟層面的問題，認為資本主義造成了現代性中的種種不公及生態矛盾。

以上是兩個不同的處境，以及各自對其中的挑戰與邪惡的詮釋。他們兩位都關注基督教信息對世界、政治、經濟的影響，而交出了截然不同的回應。他們固然是神學專家，既著書亦教學。但今天在座的每一位，廣義上其實都是神學家，同樣都思想及言說上帝，並實踐所思所言。然而，我們的處境與他們的處境大不相同。要問的是：我們今天身在何地？處於甚麼境況？面對甚麼挑戰？該如何闡述基督教信息，以對應我們今天的世界及處境？

今天處境之複雜，光是描述也難以著手。這場疫症的影響，各國無一倖免，我所在的美國及英國皆首當其衝，東亞各地也不例外。我國人民不禁要問：現代西方到底出了甚麼問題，竟在今次危機中如此抗疫不力，遠不及某些東亞國家？美國向來反對全民醫療保障（往

往被批評為「社會主義」，而倚賴以私人僱主保險為基礎的醫療保障）。當人們在疫情期間失業，他們的僱員保險亦隨之失效，政府的臨時補救措施根本無法應付實際需要。美國社會制度日見不足，連「羅斯福新政」（the New Deal of Roosevelt）的成效也被削弱。

有時候，人們傾向把目前的所有問題都歸咎於資本主義。在西方，很多人督信新自由主義，相信經濟制度或市場本身只要不受干預，就能達至目標。其他對經濟操作比較敏銳的，會強調資本主義市場經濟並沒有大家以為的獨立，很大程度上是經濟制度與財富累積的結果，離不開集中在一小撮人手中的財富、某些國際條例、國際貨幣基金組織及規定等的影響。同時，有些經濟體系由國家掌控，以國家目的為本。簡而言之，若將某種經濟制度視為問題所在，顯然是忽略了其他影響處境的因素。種族歧視、對外來者的敵意、自身利益最大化，亦同樣是問題所在。這些都左右著經濟決定與政治國族主義。

要處理今日的挑戰，我們必須留心各種經濟、政治（代議制）、權力結構如何環環相扣。這絕非易事，但我們必須認真面對，以致我們的神學教育能好好培育新一代的教牧、神學人、信徒領袖，成為能夠掌握複雜處境、按基督信仰適切回應的識見之士。我深信菁華能夠帶領神學院朝這方向努力。我仍然記得他如何在博士論文中，以涂爾幹（Emile Durkheim）的社會分析來擴展、豐富他對田立克的分析，並提出東方對西方的貢獻。我對他的深遠目光有信心，相信他定能以淵海博學、基督信仰對無辜受難者的深念、對嶄新未來的盼望，作為院長帶領神學院。

我們一直在談論處境之複雜以及回應之多元，但同時亦應謹記，這些回應皆基於基督教信息。基督教願景的核心，乃對於地上義人受苦的記憶，耶穌的十架正是此重要的象徵。無論我們的回應如何有別，都不應忘卻這一點。再者，我們知道十架不是終局。十架之後是耶穌的復活，耶穌的復活預示著其他人的復活。這再次提醒我們要盼望並相信，世界並非其應然的模樣，世界將要成為其應然的模樣。這幾節《啟示錄》經文所描繪的神學景象，關鍵在於新天新地將有別於舊有世界。上帝的掌權以及基督的臨在，無法與摧毀天地眾生的非人化權勢共存。正如費許妮莎（Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza）在她的《啟示錄》注釋中寫道：「受迫害者對公義審判的呼求，同時也是代表上主創造的大地的呼求。上主的公義與審判，不單意味著受迫害殘殺者能得平反伸冤，而是全地眾生的整全得救。<sup>1</sup>」教會與受苦者，一同懇切盼望著這基督教願景中的整全與救贖。教會應當與受苦者團結一起，以言以行，努力轉化世界，期盼新天新地的來臨。

費法蘭（Francis Schüssler Fiorenza）  
哈佛大學神學院

Inaugural Service for Professor Francis Ching-Wah Yip  
as Director of Divinity School of Chung Chi College  
The Chinese University of Hong Kong  
(中文翻譯：彭淑怡)

<sup>1</sup> Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *Revelation: Vision of a Just World* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993), p.109f.