

編者語

本刊由今期開始不設主題。今期共收專文七篇，計中文四篇、英文三篇。無獨有偶，黃錫木和余創豪的文章構成微妙的平衡。黃文關注在全球化下「語言死亡」的現象，余文則從文化衝突探索全球化的出路。雖然兩文篇幅較長，可讀性卻甚高，讀者萬勿錯過。

黃錫木的〈聖經翻譯之兩難——全球化背景下少數語種聖經翻譯優先原則的倫理思考〉，探討在全球化與語言保育二者的張力下，聖經翻譯當持守的道德責任。文章從「語言死亡」消失的危機，追溯至殖民化和新殖民主義，並對「他者性」的壓抑。文章列舉了聯合國教科文組織訂定的救亡原則，以抗衡西方「一個世界」的願景。在實踐上，文章列舉一些國家的雙語政策，翻譯作為「文化再造」的行動，以及不翻譯背後傳達的信息和社會含義。聖經翻譯須在少數語言用者和語言作為溝通媒介的兩難中作取捨。文章建議採納聯合國教科文列舉的識別因素作為考慮準則，並指出聖經翻譯所依據的模範譯本會對譯入語造成干擾，左右譯者按該語的文化表達。聖經翻譯的優先次序，背後反映對少數語言的道德選擇，不能不深思。

余創豪的〈文明衝突論的誤解和它對基督徒的挑戰〉內容甚豐。學者從不同角度批判及指責亨廷頓的《文明衝突

論》，余文為亨氏澄清誤解。這疏理過程突出了亨氏理論的重心。余文按此重心提出異議，此舉並沒有全盤否定亨氏的理論，卻把它置於更廣闊的場景，進而識別西方基督教與伊斯蘭文明衝突的原委，並審視薩克比方案的困難。文章邀請讀者以泛科際整合，為全球化和世界主義把脈，一同探索出路。文章的關注正好是這時代的緊迫議題。盼望讀者接受挑戰，為文明的衝突提供解決方案。讀者也可從伊斯蘭文明的角度審視這課題，相信會有助理解，邁向更可行的出路。

雷競業的〈薇依的十字架神學〉引介薇依 (Simone Weil) 以苦難為核心的十字架神學。薇依活在苦難的世代，苦難的經歷成為她生命中的烙印，詩人喬治赫伯 (George Herbert) 題為〈愛〉的詩成為她的啟發，叫她肯定神的本質是愛。創造是愛的表現，也因著愛，神隱藏自己，讓盲目力量和人的自主意志管治世界。盲目的定律和人的「我」帶來苦難，苦難卻能喚醒人看到以「我」為世界中心的虛幻。苦難是神愛的印記。十字架既代表神愛的高峰，也是神隱藏的至極。神進入苦難，與受苦的人同在，亦揭示拯救之途：學效神放棄自己，以愛成全世界。薇依面對苦難，因著個人的屬靈經歷，尋找有別於傳統神學的出路，既與中世紀好些女性密契者遙遙相契，也可視為現今屬靈操練與社會關懷結合的神學反省，甚有參考價值，是值得進深探討的課題。

過去苦難問題多從宗教哲學的角度反省，及至兩次大戰，苦難問題成為神學議程的定項，或作為做神學的切入點，或成為討論罪與惡 (sin and evil) 的一個副題，也有成為整個神學的關注，像薇依的神學、好些後奧斯威辛 (post-Auschwitz) 的猶太神學，以及方興未艾的眾多解放神學。這是一個有待開墾和反省的園地。

廖凱怡的〈基督教藝術神學：思辯式神學的批判和補充〉內容甚豐。文章以視覺藝術為主，指出思辯神學的局

限，並倡議基督教藝術神學與之構成互補作用。思辯神學是以自然科學的真理觀為其典模，屬命題式、邏輯性、認知性和智性的神學取向。第八世紀的聖像之爭，辨明聖像與偶像之別，為聖像提供神學理據。東正教的聖像具禮儀、教育和引發禱告的功能，可為人帶來上帝臨在的可觸感。藝術以人文科學的真理觀為其典模，是對事物（而非關於事物）的、想像性和「轉化為結構」的，與觀賞者產生辯證式的對話關係，在彼此往還中產生視域融合，從而呈現真理。宗教藝術正是藝術真理的最高體現。文章不單綜覽藝術與神學的歷史發展，評價數位代表人物，更從藝術的觀賞者、創作者和藝術品本身的三個層次來看其神學意涵，分別為宗教經驗之源、思考篩選的成果及藝術品內蘊神學，可見藝術神學具開放性、多重神學意涵和多度詮釋空間。故此，視覺式的藝術神學應與智性的思辯神學並舉。廖文開啓了一個期待已久的課題，也鋪陳了探索藝術神學的廣闊空間。

曾思瀚的〈從帝國背景解讀羅馬書〉把羅馬書置於羅馬帝國思維下教會信徒的場景去理解。保羅的行程與羅馬在海上和陸地的管治相關，即藉著軍事和都市化的策略進行殖民化。不過保羅卻以愛和生命轉化的福音，亦即屬靈而非軍事力量來建立上帝的新社群。在當時的社會，賜予恩典意味著不對等的交換恩惠，有權勢的守護者賜恩予他人之後，會期待豐厚的回饋，保羅卻宣告上帝白白賜下恩典，其震撼性可想而知。昔日君王崇拜是用來強制子民效忠君王，錢幣上的皇帝像多帶著拯救者的含義，保羅卻強調耶穌作為第二和末後的亞當，祂才是唯一配得「主」的尊榮。此外，羅馬政府遷移住民的政策，可解開書中猶太元素的疑團。這角度無疑突顯了保羅作為羅馬社會改革者的角色。

關啟文的〈沒有上帝的人權——自然主義能為人權提供基礎嗎？〉指出自然主義的世界觀難以為人權提供堅實的基礎。

文章審視好些世俗自然主義的論點，並評價其不足。自然主義聲稱人是機遇的產物，遂引致人權與掙扎求存的張力。經驗主義的進路甚至無法確立人性的觀念，更遑論為人類提供目的了。事實與價值的二分使學者無法從價值中立的事實，推演出人性的價值。後現代思想把普世道德和普遍人類解構，故自由主義的自我只不過是社會建構的產品。此文與關氏在本刊第43期的文章：〈神學能為人權提供基礎嗎？〉互相呼應，構成一整體，確立基督教世界觀在人權基礎上的地位。

馮子豪的〈對反駁「剖析石頭詭論」的回應〉是一篇再回應的文章。馮氏在本刊第42期討論石頭詭辯的問題，指出邏輯上不能推出上帝不是全能的結論。張國棟在上期（第46期）提出異議，認為馮氏運用的邏輯語句有謬誤。張氏提出另一邏輯語句取代之，並以排中律推出上帝不是全能的結論。問題的核心來自把英語句子轉換成邏輯語句的問題，亦即如何把石頭詭辯的語句轉換成邏輯語句。馮文指出此類轉換有一定困難，因為日常的英語句子往往帶有含混性，缺乏嚴謹的邏輯語義。轉換過程不能純粹安排中律來進行，卻須按整句的語意來轉換，不然會導致不合理的語句。文章分析張氏和馮氏自己如何把石頭詭論從英語句子轉換到邏輯語句，再把邏輯語句轉換成英語句子所產生的含義，從而證明馮氏邏輯語句的合理性。

馮氏和張氏的交流無疑是難能可貴的，不單把石頭詭論的問題加以澄清，更為從英語句子轉換到邏輯語句提供豐富的啟迪。我們期待馮氏和張氏更進一步的交流，以及其他學者加入討論。石頭詭論無疑是個邏輯問題，在邏輯層次處理自有其合理性。不過這問題既涉及上帝，說不定在神學層次上處理可帶來新的亮光。未知讀者有何高見？

鄭順佳

2009年7月20日

Editorial

CGST Journal will not carry any theme starting from the present issue. There are seven articles altogether, four in Chinese and three in English. It so happens that the articles by Simon Wong and Chong Ho Yu form a creative tension. Wong's article concerns with "language death" under globalization, while Yu's piece deals with the clash of civilizations, exploring whether globalization constitutes a possible way out. Although these two articles are somewhat lengthy, they are highly readable. Don't miss them!

Simon Wong's "The Ethical Dimension of Minority Language Bible Translation in the Present Context of Globalization" investigates the moral obligations of Bible translation under the tension between globalization and language preservation. The article starts with pointing out the crisis of "language death," and traces the cause to colonization and neo-colonization with the suppression of "otherness." It lists the remedial principles proposed by UNESCO of the United Nations to resist the Western vision of "One World." The article discusses the "double language policy" advocated by certain countries. It highlights translation as "re-culturation," and draws out the message behind and the implications of "zero translation." Bible

translation must confront the dilemma between minority language and language as a medium of communication. It should pay careful attention to the identifying factors put forward by UNESCO. The article also explores the problems of the practice of employing a model translation, namely, interferences in the target language and inhibition of cultural expression. In the final analysis, the priority in Bible translation reflects the moral choice toward minority language. This is an issue demanding further thought.

Chong Ho Yu's article, "Clash of Civilizations: Its Misconceptions and Its Challenges to Christianity," is also rich in content. While some scholars criticize and rebuke Samuel Huntington's *The Clash of Civilizations* from different perspectives, Yu's article clarifies various misunderstandings. In this process, it identifies the key to Huntington's thesis. Yu also voices his misgivings to the thesis. He has not overturned Huntington's thesis, but places it within a much wider horizon. He then identifies the key to the clash between Western Christian and Islamic civilization, and examines the difficulties of Jonathan Sacks' solution. The article invites the readers to approach globalization and cosmopolitanism via an interdisciplinary approach in order to resolve the conflicts. The article is concerned with a pressing issue of today. It is hoped that the readers accept the challenge. One may also examine the issue from an Islamic perspective. It would surely enable a better understanding, and can forge a practical path forward.

Kin-yip Louie's "The Theology of the Cross in Simone Weil" introduces Simone Weil's theology of the cross centered on suffering. Weil lived in an age of suffering; the experience of suffering left an indelible mark in her life. The poet George Herbert's poem, "Love," revealed to her that the nature of God is love. God creates out of love, and God also hides Godself out of love, leaving blind necessity

and human autonomous will to govern the world. Blind necessity and human “self” bring about suffering. However, suffering is able to awaken the “self” from the illusion of being the center of the world. Suffering is indeed the mark of the love of God. The cross represents both the apex of God’s love and God’s hiddenness. God enters into suffering, in order to be with those who suffer, and to reveal the way of salvation: to imitate God’s abdication of Godself, so as to fulfill the world in love. In face of suffering, with reference to her spiritual experience, Weil looks for an alternative to traditional theology. Her reflection echoes a number of female mystics in the Middle Ages, and can be considered as an integration of spirituality and social concern. It is hoped that these issues can be explored further.

In the past the problem of suffering has been an issue within the field of religious philosophy. The two world wars have made suffering a staple theme, either as an entry point to theologizing, or as a subtopic under sin and evil, or as the central concern of theologizing, such as Simone Weil’s theology, post-Auschwitz Jewish theology, or numerous liberation theologies still on the rise. This is a field that awaits furrowing and reflection.

Rowena Hoi-yea Liu’s “Theology of Christian Art as a Critique and Supplement to Speculative Theologies” is a substantial piece. It focuses on visual art, points out the limitations of speculative theology, and advocates Christian aesthetic theology as its necessary supplement. Speculative theology is based on the paradigm of truth in the natural science. It is propositional, logical, cognitive and intellectual. The iconoclastic controversy in the eighth century distinguishes icon from idol, and has established the theological legitimacy of icons. The icons of Eastern Orthodoxy embrace liturgical, educational and prayful functions, and has brought about the tangibility of the

presence of God. Art depends on the paradigm of human sciences for its conception of truth. It is truth-to (instead of truth-about) things, imaginative truth, and “transformation into structure.” It forms a dialectic conversation with the spectator, resulting in a fusion of horizons, and manifesting truth therein. Religious art constitutes the highest realization of truth. The article surveys the history of the development of the relation between art and theology; it also evaluates several representative figures. Finally, the article investigates the theological conceptions of Christian art from a threefold dimension, namely the spectator, artist, and artwork, identifying them correspondingly as the source of religious experience, the result of reflection and sifting, and theology embodied within the artwork. As such, aesthetic theology is characterized by openness, multiple meaning, and multifarious hermeneutical space. Hence, visual aesthetic theology should go together with mainstream speculative theology. Liu’s article has opened up a long-awaited topic, and has laid out a broad canvass to be filled in.

Sam Tsang’s “Talking Back to the Empire: An Imperialistic Background for *Romans*” treats *The Letter to the Romans* as an epistle addressed to members of the church with the imperial background of Rome. Paul’s travels are related to Rome’s dominance over both the land and sea, through its military and urbanization strategies of colonialism. But Paul presses for an alternative conquest through the gospel of love and life-transformation. It is a spiritual conquest, rather than a political one, that builds up God’s new society. In place of grace which means un asymmetric exchange of favors, where a powerful patron grants grace or favor with the expectation of a heavy return, Paul puts forward the shocking notion of free grace. Where imperial cult enforces loyalty and coins often showed the

emperor as a “savior,” Paul emphasizes that only Jesus, as the second and last Adam, deserves the honor of “lord.” The Roman policy of moving inhabitants around also explains the Jewish elements in the epistle. Seen in this light, Paul’s role as a reformer to the Roman society stands out clearly.

Kai-man Kwan’s “Human Rights without God: Can Naturalism Provide a Foundation for Human Rights?” puts forward the thesis that it is notoriously difficult to establish a solid foundation for human rights within a naturalist worldview. The article examines a wide spectrum of secular naturalistic arguments and finds them wanting. Naturalism claims that human beings are products of chance. As such, there would be a tension between human rights and the struggle for survival. The empiricist approach cannot ascertain the idea of human nature, not to mention an end for human race. The fact-value dichotomy makes it impossible to derive the value of human nature from value-free facts. Postmodern thought deconstructs universal morality and universal humanity. The liberal self becomes no more than a product of social construction. This article should be read in conjunction with another article in the *CGST Journal*, no. 43, “Can Christian Theology Provide a Foundation for Human Rights?” The two together forms a whole, establishing the status of Christian worldview for the foundation of human rights.

Tze-ho Fung’s “A Response to the Refutation of the Paper, ‘A Logical Analysis of the Stone Paradox with First-Order Logic’”, is a second round response to the discussion on stone paradox. Fung discusses the Stone Paradox in *CGST Journal*, no. 42, and points out that one cannot logically arrive at the conclusion that God is not omnipotent. Cheung Kwok Tung refutes Fung’s argument in the preceding issue (no. 46), and finds fault with Fung’s logical formulation. Cheung puts forward an alternate formulation, and comes

to the conclusion that is based on the law of excluded middle: God is not omnipotent. The core problem arises from translating English sentences into logical statements, or specifically, how to translate the stone paradox sentences into logical statements. Fung points out that the translation is never an easy task because ordinary English sentences are often ambiguous, lacking strict logical semantics. Translation cannot proceed purely from the law of excluded middle, but should attend to the sense of the entire sentence; otherwise one could arrive at an invalid formulation. The article analyzes the translation of both Cheung and Fung himself, from ordinary English sentences to logical statements, and re-translate them back into ordinary English sentences, so as to discuss the validity and invalidity of the translation. In this way Fung proves that his formulation makes sense while Cheung's is invalid.

The exchange between Fung and Cheung is highly valuable. It gives clarity not only to the stone paradox, but also sheds light onto the translation of ordinary English sentences into logical statements. It is hoped that there will be further exchange between Fung and Cheung, with other scholars participating in the discussion as well. The stone paradox is indeed a logical problem, and treating it on the logical level is well justified. However, it also involves God. Would dealing with it on the theological level shed new light on the problem? I wonder if our readers have any thought on this.

Kevin S. K. Cheng
July 20, 2009