

# 編者語

本期文章可分兩組：1. 在中國文化內的宗教研究；2. 布特曼的神學詮釋學。第一組包括施尤禮和黃錫木對馮象譯經的評論，李榭熙對結合歷史檔案和田野調查方法論的探索，冀誠對中國家庭教會面對離婚和再婚問題的思考，以及何偉業分析研究中國伊期蘭採用史料的前設。四篇文章分屬聖經翻譯、教會史、基督宗教倫理及伊斯蘭教的範疇，全都坐落於中國本土文化的宗教研究領域內。第二組包括李麗娟從悖論和辯證探索布特曼的神學，以及鄧紹光從後期海德格的思想解決巴特與布特曼神學詮釋學的衝突，二人都是以布特曼的詮釋學為研究對象。李文把布特曼置於宗教改革傳統之中，鄧文則進一步梳理巴特和布特曼在詮釋學上的差異，兩篇文章可謂彼此緊扣，互相呼應。在此兩組專文之外的，是洪子雲論泰勒對基督教倫理的歷史論證。

施尤禮、黃錫木的〈論馮象的譯經工作〉分別從聖經研究和翻譯歷史，審視馮象的翻本和翻譯策略。作者對馮氏的古典文風深表欣賞。馮氏以文學翻譯為目標，在遣詞用字上較自由，表達亦顯得流暢，然而其譯文不時出現艱澀和罕見的字詞，且經常採用古漢語文風來翻譯，此舉與他認為聖經原文是普羅大眾的語言，沒有學究氣，是寫給文盲者看的說

法，顯得自相矛盾。

比較箴言十六章1至9節的馮象譯本與《和合本》，可見馮氏用詞簡潔，在字義上則是《和合本》較接近原文，不過馮氏的字詞能避免不必要的負面含義。馮氏的翻譯較多變化，較靈活，也較能凸顯中文的味道，容易引起讀者共鳴。馮氏的研習注釋為一些用詞提供解釋，說明近東的文化和生活習俗，為數頗多，不過大都是參考自主流學術界中持批判立場的注釋版聖經。至於抄本注釋，馮氏的依據多來自《耶路撒冷聖經》的抄本注釋，並大量採取《七十士譯本》較通俗化的語句，因而傾向削弱了希伯來古卷的微妙含意，亦危及希伯來文本的完整性。馮氏所參考的版本，反映他忽略了其他古代譯本和其他希伯來文抄本，尤其是死海古卷，他亦誤以為死海古卷是用亞蘭文撰寫的。

從翻譯歷史看，翻譯一般可分直譯和意譯，即以文本對應為焦點。學術上，翻譯策略可分異化翻譯法（*foreignization*）和歸化翻譯法（*domestication*）：前者重視外來文本的異語文化，即正視外來語與當地文化的差異；後者重視符合譯文語言的文化，使文本轉化為適切於當地的文化。前者保留異化元素對當今文化的衝擊，後者令原文受同化，使之符合本土意識形態，可謂文化霸權。馮氏視文本為文學而非聖卷，故傾向歸化式的翻譯。從文化「缺溝」而言，翻譯是由於目標文化所缺少的某些元素，正好是外來文化所擁有的。於此而言，中文聖經的翻譯未能進入整個漢語社會和文化中，只侷促教會一隅，馮氏的譯本卻能填補這缺溝。然而，馮氏的翻譯雖能擴大聖經的閱讀空間，卻把聖經抽離了其信仰群體，把聖經「去信仰化」，亦即使聖經成為一部具文學價值的世界名著而已！施黃兩位的文章對備受推崇的馮象譯本作了外在批判的坦率評價，帶出「一個文本、兩種處理」的課題，內中涉及令人神往的基督教與文化的關

係。但願讀者對此有更多思考。

李樹熙的〈結合歷史檔案及田野調查的基督教研究方法學——以潮汕教會為例〉對中國的基督教研究加以反省，文章既融合神學、宣教學、人類學、比較宗教學和歷史學的跨學科研究，亦正視基督教在中國遼闊地域的差異下所展現的不同面貌，並結合歷史檔案和田野調查，以「地方社會觀點」為研究焦點的方法論。作者探索村民如何借助西方傳教士的力量，爭奪地方權力，保留了拜廟的傳統，令教會和當地宗族結構融合，從而構成村民自我身分的認同；此外，教會更進行跨省際的網絡聯繫。作者分別以潮州和汕頭某村為例，審視史料的來源。在他看來，過去的研究單單基於西方傳教士或中國官員的史料，忽略了地方信徒的文字記載，因此須透過田野調查來發掘。這些從信徒角度出發的史料，包括家譜、帳本、曆書、地契、學校教科書和宗教文本，以至教會的受洗和講道記錄、詩歌集、教堂契書、舊教堂的奠基石、信徒的墓碑等。作者還以他第一身的經驗為例，指出當地方言和地理的獨特性，記述他如何取得政治、社會、宗教層層管治單位的許可進行調查，又以不同身分獲得當地人信任的人脈關鍵。訪問對象必須包括非信徒，以便理解信徒與非信徒利益衝突的緊張關係。調查發現當地農民信徒絕非一般人印象中的愚昧農民。他們頗能把握政治氣候，看準機會，以傳統意識和集體行動來進行獨立議程，扮演積極主動的角色，曉得透過社會民間網絡來傳播宗教，不會對外國傳教士唯命是從，是不折不扣的本土化運動。李文展示田野調查可令我們對中國地方教會的印象全面改觀。李氏對方法論的反省和實地考察，對帶著意識形態的文獻研究含義深遠。

冀誠的〈對中國基督徒離婚與再婚之正當理由的思考〉，以家庭教會為背景，從聖經、神學和倫理的角度，審視中國信徒離婚與再婚的問題。文章處理舊約律法和歷史先

例在新約教會的適用性、離婚與再婚的正當理由、相應的國家民事婚姻法，以及牧養上的處理。作者指出聖經是以盟約作為婚姻的基調，見證上帝對其子民永不放棄的愛，因此原則上離婚是上帝恨惡的。律法容許婚姻失責離婚，這理由已被耶穌的「馬太例外」所取代，即人可以因為淫亂或不道德的性行為緣故而離婚，原因在於上述行為違反了二人一體的原則，也就是神設立婚姻的基礎。保羅允許被不信主的配偶遺棄的信徒離婚，可稱「保羅特許」，所處理的是混合婚姻的問題。總的來說，馬太例外和保羅特許是信徒離婚的「唯二」正當理由。目前中國法律有登記離婚和訴訟離婚兩種形式。對於隱瞞婚前性行為、與婚外第三者在「狹義性交」外進行猥褻行為是否構成淫亂，家庭教會須妥善處理。按馬太例外的精神，只有無過錯方可以提出離婚；要是按保羅特許，若不信一方堅決要求離婚，信主的無法挽回，則宜選登記離婚以表示消極同意。在牧養方面，對於沒有正當理由離婚的信徒，教會須提供教牧輔導，協助他們認罪悔改，執行紀律，在一定條件下鼓勵再婚。至於再婚方面，若無過錯方已經去世或再婚，則過錯方在悔改後可再婚，但因著過去犯了淫亂，教會不可為之證婚；若無過錯方仍然活著且沒有再婚，則過錯方不可再婚。教會亦不應讓失婚再婚的信徒再度離婚。婚姻的精神在於其神聖性和恆久性，教會務須防患未然，教牧實踐須以「和好」為目標，盡力挽回婚姻，亦須結合紀律和關懷。冀誠的討論對當今家庭教會面對的問題甚為適切。盼望讀者可加入討論，例如對配偶施以肢體虐待或精神虐待，甚至威脅生命，又或虐待的對象是子女，當如何處理。

何偉業的〈海恩波的伊斯蘭研究：重構中國伊斯蘭與基督教關係的背景探索〉關注學者對伊斯蘭研究的資料選取，以及背後牽涉的視角，並對未來中國伊斯蘭和基督教交往的

含義。作者從微觀和宏觀兼備的角度，審視一部廣為學者忽略的重要著作：宣教士海恩波所著的《中國伊斯蘭教：一個被忽視的問題》。作者交代了海恩波家族的宣教背景，以及當時普世宣教運動的歷史因素，追索1910年於愛丁堡舉行的世界宣教會議委員會委托海恩波對中國穆斯林進行研究的過程，力證海恩波的學術地位。海恩波一書的統計數據得到相當高的評價，可惜由於該著作是以基督教宣教為本的戰略性研究，中國穆斯林對之不無異議，質疑海恩波受限於當時西方的政治立場和基督教的宣教取向，其寫作目的並非全然出自對中國本土的關懷，可說是西方帝國主義侵略的幫兇。再者，今天傳媒渲染伊斯蘭恐懼症，又把基督教標籤為右派保守主義霸權，製造封閉的排外思想和亂扣帽子，也令海恩波的研究未受重視。然而《中國回族古籍叢書》編委會雖然不同意海氏的立場，仍以寬廣的胸懷出版此書，肯定其學術價值。無疑如利科爾所提出的，「他者」的鏡像有助促進人對自我的認識和理解。作者期望學術研究可擺脫政治的框框，以致海恩波此等著作得到應有的位置，從而幫助中國基督徒與穆斯林建立彼此尊重、了解的友好關係。何文背後含意深遠，有如木鐸之聲，對現今學術研究敲響警號，實為不可多得。期望日後有更多「政治不正確」的稿件，敢於為真理發聲。

李麗娟的〈布特曼神學中的「悖論」和「辯證」思想〉，就題目而言看似專門的研究，實質上卻是為布特曼的「祛神話化」翻案，把他的神學置於宗教改革的立場，使之立於路德－祈克果的傳統中。作者從詮釋學入手，指出布特曼詮釋的核心在於詢問經文的實在性內涵，從而對詮釋者自身產生真實的理解。經文的實在性並不在經文之中，而是在詮釋的辯證過程之中。聖經詮釋的過程，不離「悖論」和「辯證」兩個概念，這兩個概念亦反映布特曼背後的存在神

學。作者追溯至祁克果的思想：懷疑和相信的辯證過程引發熱情和抉擇。詮釋者與詮釋對象之間的思想衝突，有著無法逾越的鴻溝，這鴻溝構成神學詮釋的悖論，可激發熱情的追求，也可令人全然放棄。跨越神學悖論雙方的關鍵不在知識，乃在信心熱情的一躍，而使之可能的是重生，即上帝賦予人認識祂的始因和條件。因此布特曼認為對耶穌的理解不在於重構歷史上的耶穌，而在於信靠聖經所記載的基督，讓「已經成爲」的事件在信徒生命中不斷地「成爲」。

作爲歷史性和終末性的耶穌事件，是最高的悖論。而且彼岸的神對此岸的人的存在而言，更是此時此在的悖論。當人詮釋或聆聽耶穌的事件，事件也成爲悖論，要求人的「此在」作抉擇，以信心回應，方能理解。悖論於瞬間臨到，也會在人的生命中重複到臨。再者，信徒的存在也是悖論，因爲信徒既出世，也在世。悖論在於有罪的人來到上帝面前，領受祂賜予的恩典／信心，抉擇順服，從此方到達彼方，因而認識神，同時把握自己的真實存在。這是路德「因信稱義」的外在的「義」。就信徒生命而言，上帝的赦罪之恩和啓示使人能與過去的意義史斷開，成爲「新造的人」，由終末性定奪其此在的意義歷史。在辯證神學而言，布特曼與巴特的神學可說異曲同工。巴特強調神的道的絕對客觀性及啓示性，布特曼則強調信徒的抉擇。可見布特曼是站在宗教改革的四個「唯獨」立場來建構他的神學。李文爲平反布特曼甚有貢獻，釋除不少學者對布特曼神學的誤解。

鄧紹光的〈巴特與布特曼的神學解釋學之再思——從晚期海德格切入〉，嘗試梳理巴特和布特曼在神學解釋學上的分歧，並在辯證神學中各安其位。巴特以上帝爲主體，是祂先解釋人，隨後人才以相應於上帝的話解釋聖經。布特曼卻認爲上帝在人解釋聖經中的宣講時作工。前者從上帝的自存性（God's aseity）出發，後者則從爲人的上帝（God for us）

出發。這構成二人對上帝與聖經在關係上之不同理解。在基本立場上，巴特持守上帝已經言說了的思想，強調上帝的話語有別於人的話；布特曼則持守上帝透過聖經對解釋者說話，強調上帝的話語不離人的話語。作者把布特曼連於早期海德格此在（*Dasein*）對存有（*Being*）的解釋，把巴特連於晚期海德格的詩人對存有聆聽。布特曼強調開顯性，巴特則強調隱蔽性，正好與早期和晚期的海德格思想相應。巴特以上帝為全然的祂者，與被造界有無窮的差異，故上帝的話語與人的話語不能等同。這與晚期海德格以存有為自然，具有與無、隱與顯的雙重過程，並以隱為首出性相合。另一方面，布特曼遙契信義宗傳統，以墨蘭頓「認識基督意即認識祂的好處」為綱，即上帝透過聖經向人言說，作用於人。故上帝的話語和人的話語是不即不離的。巴特雖重視上帝話語的隱性，卻不否定其顯性。在存有秩序而言，隱性是優先的。相比之下，布特曼雖重視上帝話語的顯性，卻不否定其隱性。在知識秩序而論，顯性是首出的。可見二人的思想其實彼此相容。

再者，巴特認定解釋者以順服聆聽為首，布特曼則認為解釋者進入成文話語中，在解釋活動中與上帝相遇。這涉及二人對上帝與解釋者的關係的分歧，爭辯焦點在於「先行了解」（*pre-understanding*）的問題。布特曼採納海德格的思想，認為先行了解構成了了解過程的可能性。巴特則反對把先行了解提升至方法論的原則，認為聖經所指向的內容是人無法先行了解的，先行了解把人的先行主體經驗視為基本的解釋原則，無法使人達至相信的順服，畢竟從不信到相信是斷裂的。布特曼的先行理解只是現象學的描述，並不具正規性（*canonizing*），卻是開放的，不是先行判斷（*pre-judgment*）。在解釋的過程中，因著聖靈的工作，人的先行了解可以被轉化，從不信轉入相信，畢竟不信和相信的同是

人與上帝的關係，故具延續性。按此而言，布特曼相應海德格早期此在與存有不離的思想，巴特相應海德格晚期此在與存有有別的思想。海德格的思想轉折，為的是避免此在有可能自我規限存有自身，可是他自始至終關注存有，構成其思想的延續性。此在與存有既不離亦不等同，因此作者認為巴特與布特曼二人的觀點是互相預設的。鄧文展示兩位學者如何以相同的假設為基礎，卻採納不同的起始點和進路，竟可達至看似彼此衝突的立場，細看之下卻有相輔相成之妙。

洪子雲 (Andrew T. W. Hung) 的 “**Charles Taylor’s Historical Argument of Christian Morality**” 分析泰勒的重要著作《自我的來源》 (*Sources of the Self*)，說明泰勒如何在此書以歷史論證的方法，探索近代道德身分的發展，並藉此比較基督教有神論、啓蒙運動的自然主義和浪漫的表達主義。三者的焦點順序分別為上帝、自我負責的理性、「顯現」。泰勒從內在性、肯定平常生活及自然界之善作為內在道德之源三方面來探討。他認為啓蒙的自然主義實質上寄生於基督教價值，例如自然效益主義借用了基督教的仁慈觀，可是其中立性亦去除了實體性倫理評價的空間。浪漫的表達主義嘗試藉藝術把至高或心靈意義呈現出來。現實主義卻顯示自然界缺乏意義性。向著人的內在性進發卻導致自我肯定的危機，所呈現的不是人的自我，而是人經驗的碎片化。創意想像的詩人卻開出了超越的領域，杜斯妥也夫斯基指出唯有人對恩典的回應，願意被上帝無條件的愛轉化，才能對這罪惡充斥的世界加以肯定。世俗主義否定超越性，不想卻危及現代性的成果：對人類生命的肯定。基督教有神論的確能為人性的尊嚴和價值提供更佳的支持。

反對泰勒的學者列舉歷史上發生的宗教迫害和專權，泰勒卻指出無神主義亦不遑多讓。不少學者也指出基督教對西方文化的貢獻，例如提升女性的地位，解放奴隸，提倡民

主、平等、人權、自由等概念。不管是一神論還是多神論，不管是有神論者還是無神論者，都可以是寬容或不寬容的，問題往往出自信念與文化結親，產生暴虐的建制，關鍵在於甚麼源頭能賦予對仁慈和公義的道德投身，以及人是配得如此對待的。基督教正好提供對人尊嚴的肯定以及普遍的愛，威伯福斯和德蘭修女等人對世界的投身便是具體典範。洪文開闢了對泰勒的研究和歷史論證的課題，期望讀者來稿對這兩個課題作更多討論。

鄭順佳

2010年1月18日

# Editorial

The articles in this issue roughly fall into two groups, namely religious studies within Chinese culture, and the theological hermeneutics of Rudolf Bultmann. The former group includes Daniel See and Simon Wong's evaluation of the translation work of Feng Xiang, Joseph Lee's reflection on the methodology of integrative study on archival research and fieldwork, Cheng Ji's reflection on the problem of divorce and remarriage faced by the house churches in China, and Ho Wai-Yip's analysis of the use of historical archive on the study of Chinese Islam. These four articles deal with issues in the areas of Bible translation, church history, Christian ethics, and Islamic studies; they are all religious research located within Chinese culture. The latter group includes Christine Lee's study of Bultmann's hermeneutics from his conception of paradox and dialectic, as well as Andres Tang's resolution of the conflict of theological hermeneutics of Karl Barth and Rudolf Bultmann from the thought of later Heidegger. Both authors focus on Bultmann's theological hermeneutics. Lee's article places Bultmann within the Reformation tradition, while Tang proceeds to resolve the conflict between Barth and Bultmann on hermeneutics. Both articles constitute a tightly-knitted

unit. The only article outside these two groups is Andrew Hung's analysis and discussion of Charles Taylor's historical argument of Christian morality.

**Daniel See and Simon Wong's "A Study on Feng Xiang's Translation in Relation to the Phenomena of Chinese Bible Translation"** examines Feng Xiang's version from the dual perspectives of Biblical study and history of translation. See and Wong appreciate the classical style of Feng. Feng aims at a literary translation, thus his wordings are imaginative and his style is fluid. However, difficult and rare words pop up here and there in his translation, and he often resorts to archaic idioms. This is somewhat inconsistent with his claim that the Bible was originally written in everyday language, intended for the illiterate, and not for the scholars.

Comparing Feng's translation and the Chinese Union Bible of Proverbs 16: 1–9, it is observed that Feng uses considerably less words. The Chinese Union Bible is closer to the original language, but Feng's wording avoids unnecessary negative connotations. Feng's translation is more multifaceted and lively, and it brings out the distinctiveness of the Chinese language, and carries more resonances among Chinese readers. Feng's commentaries provide numerous helpful aid for clarifying the meanings of words, and the culture and customs of the ancient Orient. But these are mainly taken from several mainstream study bibles written from a critical stance. Feng relies mainly on *The Jerusalem Bible* for textual matters, and has often adopted the vulgar expressions of the Septuagint, therefore he tends to flatten out the nuances in the ancient Hebrew manuscripts. He ignores other ancient manuscripts and translations, especially the Dead Sea Scrolls. He was mistaken in thinking that the Dead Sea Scrolls were written

in Aramaic.

From a historical perspective, past translations are usually classified into literal and dynamic equivalence translations. The focus is on the relationship between original and translated texts. Academically, translation strategy can also be divided into foreignization and domestication. The former emphasizes the foreign language of external texts, having an eye on the difference between foreign language and local culture. The latter emphasizes assimilation to the translated language, transforming the text to fit local culture. The former preserves the impact of foreign elements on contemporary culture; the latter domesticates the original text in order to fit its contemporary ideology, comprising a form of cultural hegemony. Since Feng regards the original text as literature rather than Holy Writings, he tends to employ a domesticating translation. From the viewpoint of cultural gap, translation occurs because there are certain elements which the target language lacks. Owing to their foreign elements, Chinese translations of the Bible have not entered into the mainstream Chinese society and culture, but their usage is restricted to the church. Feng's translation is able to fill in this gap. However, while his translation extends the potential audience of the Bible, it also divorces the Bible from its believing community, "de-faithing" the Bible, and it reduces the Bible to merely a valuable piece of literature! See and Wong's article offers external criticism of Feng's highly-acclaimed work in a candid fashion. It brings out the issue of "one text, two approaches." This is an intriguing phenomenon that calls for further discussion on the relation between Christianity and culture.

**Joseph Tse-Hei Lee's "Integrating Archival Research and Fieldwork in the Study of Christianity in Chaozhou and Shantou"** reflects on the study of

Christianity in China. It utilizes inter-disciplinary methods from theology, missiology, anthropology, comparative religion and historiography, and it attends to local differences within the vast geographical span of China. Moreover, it combines research in archival records with fieldwork, focusing on the issue of “local social perspective.” Lee investigates how villagers take advantage of missionary power to fight for local power, how they preserve tradition of temple worship, and fuses the church and local familial tradition, forming their self-identity. Moreover, the church establishes trans-provincial network. His case studies include a village in Chaozhou and another in Shantou. He examines all the available documents. Relying on records from Western missionaries and Chinese officials is inadequate. Written records from local believers must be examined, and they have to be unearthed through fieldwork. Such materials as genealogies, accounting records, calendars, land contracts, teaching materials in schools, religious texts, as well as baptismal and sermon records, song books, church building contracts, foundation stones of old churches, and gravestones of believers etc all reflect the perspective of local believers. Lee also shares his first-hand experience, identifying the importance of knowing the local dialect and topography, obtaining approval from political, social and religious institutions, as well as utilizing different identities to establish a trusting relationship with the locals. The research should include interviewing nonbelievers, so that conflicts of interest between believers and nonbelievers can be identified. Lee’s research reveals that local peasants can take advantage of the political atmosphere, identifying the opportunity, relying on traditions and collective action to pursue their independent agenda. They play an active role and learn to spread their religion through civil network. They are not

puppets of foreign missionaries, showing that their Christianity is an indigenous movement. Contrary to popular opinion, they are not “foolish peasants.” Lee’s article shows how fieldwork can revolutionize our conception of local churches in China. Such methodological reflection and field study is a much needed corrective to other archival researches laden with ideology.

**Cheng Ji’s “Reflections on the Legitimate Grounds for Divorce and Remarriage among Chinese Christians”** reflects on the issue of divorce and remarriage from biblical, theological and ethical point of view, within the context of China’s house churches. The article considers the applicability of Old Testament law and precedent cases to the New Testament Church, the proper reasons for divorce and remarriage, China’s present marriage laws, and pastoral challenges in China. The author points out that the Bible takes a covenantal view on marriage, testifying to the unforsaking love of God to the Israelites. Hence, in principle, God hates divorce. It is true that the OT law permits divorce based on marital neglect. This permission has been replaced by the “Matthean Exception” of Jesus, whereby divorce is permitted on account of adultery because it violates the principle of two-become-one, the foundation for the institution of marriage. Paul’s permission of divorce for believers deserted by unbelieving spouse, also known as “Pauline Privilege,” tackles the problem of mixed marriage. In general, we can say that Matthean Exception and Pauline Privilege are the only two proper justifications for divorce. At present China has two forms of divorce: by registration and by litigation. The church has to decide whether unrevealed pre-marital sex and indecent sexual behavior outside the narrow sense of sexual intercourse constitute adultery. According to Matthean Exception, only the innocent party can demand divorce. According to Pauline

Privilege, if the unbelieving spouse insists on divorce, and every effort of the believer to save the marriage has failed, the believer should passively agree to a divorce by registration. In terms of pastoral care, for believers who have divorced without proper reason, the church should provide pastoral counseling, enabling them to repent. The church should also exercise church discipline, and encourage them to remarry under appropriate circumstances. As to remarriage, if the innocent party has remarried or passed away, the guilty party can remarry after repentance, but due to the previous adultery, the church should not perform the wedding ceremony. If the innocent party is still alive and has not remarried, the guilty party cannot remarry. The church should not allow the divorcee who has remarried to divorce again. The spirit of marriage lies in its sacredness and permanence. The church should be on guard against marriage breakdown, and have “reconciliation” as its goal, trying its best to salvage the marriage, incorporating discipline with pastoral care. Ji’s discussion is highly relevant to the problems faced by the house churches of today. Hopefully, readers will further the discussion by exploring, for example, how to handle cases involving physical or mental abuse by their spouses, or even life-threatening situations, or the case of child abuse.

**Ho Wai-Yip’s “Marshall Broomhall’s Islamic Studies: A Note on the Reconstruction of China’s Christian-Muslim Relations in the Modern Context”** examines how scholars select their materials for Islamic studies, the perspective behind the selection, and the implications for the future interaction between Muslims and Christians in China. Ho employs both micro and macro perspectives to examine a much neglected writing: *Islam in China: A Neglected Problem* by Marshall Broomhall. Ho gives an account of the missionary background of

Bloomhall's family. He also locates Broomhall's study within the context of the World's Missionary Conference of 1910, held within an even broader context of the World Missionary Movement of that time. Broomhall was assigned by the committee to engage in a study on the Muslims, confirming Broomhall's academic competence. The statistical data in Bloomhall's book has been highly acclaimed. However, the book, being written from the perspective of missionary strategy, has been criticized by Chinese Muslims. Motivated by the Western political stance and a Christian missionary orientation, the purpose of the book supposedly does not reflect a genuine concern of China. It has been seen as an aid to Western imperialism. Moreover, the media today propagates Islamophobia and equates Christianity with the hegemony of the conservative right. This creates an atmosphere of xenophobia and arbitrary pigeonholing. Although the committee of the Series on Ancient Writings of the Hui Minority in China disagrees with Bloomhall's position, they nevertheless affirm its academic value and publish this book in a gesture of inclusiveness. Indeed, according to Ricoeur, the mirror of "the other" can enrich the knowledge and understanding of oneself. Ho hopes that academic study can break through political biases, so that writings such as Bloomhall's can have their appropriate place in fostering mutual respect, understanding, and friendship between Chinese Christians and Muslims. Ho's article is highly significant, and it serves as a timely reminder to current academic research. It is hoped that we can have more "politically incorrect" articles daring to speak out the truth.

**Christine Lee's " 'Paradox' and 'Dialectic' in the Theology of R. Bultmann"** looks like a highly specialized study, but in fact it is a justification of Bultmann's "demythologization," placing his theology within the stance

of the Reformation, in continuity with the Luther-Kierkegaard tradition. Starting from hermeneutics, Lee identifies Bultmann's central concern as an inquiry into the reality of the biblical passage, and thereby reaching an understanding of the reality of the interpreter. For him, the reality of the biblical passage does not reside within the passage, but within a dialectical process of interpretation. The process of biblical interpretation hinges on the concepts of "paradox" and "dialectic." Lee traces the origin of Bultmann's idea back to Kierkegaard's thought — namely the dialectical process of doubt and faith that evokes passion and decision. The conflict of thought between the interpreter and the object of interpretation constitutes an unbridgeable gulf, forming a paradox of theological hermeneutics. This situation may incite one to inquire with passion, or to give up altogether. The key to traversing the two sides of the paradox lies not in knowledge, but in a passionate leap of faith. Regeneration makes this possible. In other words, it is God who provides the initial cause and the condition for our knowledge of the Godself. Therefore Bultmann thinks that understanding Jesus does not depend on a reconstruction of the historical Jesus, but in faith in the biblical Christ. This leap turns the event which "has become" into an event which is continuously "becoming" in the life of the Christian.

The Jesus event is both historical and eschatological, and that is the supreme paradox. For the God on the other side and humans existing on this side, it is a here-and-now paradox. When one interprets or listens to the Jesus event, the event also becomes a paradox, demanding the human *Dasein* to decide and to respond with faith in order to understand. The paradox comes in a split second, and it will repeatedly come again and again in the life of the person. Moreover, the existence of the believer, being both other-worldly and this-worldly, also comprises a paradox. The

paradox is that the sinful human can stand before God, receiving God's grace/faith. He decides to obey, and is transferred from this side to that side. As a result, he comes to know God, and simultaneously to grasp one's own reality of existence. This is precisely Luther's alien "righteousness" in his doctrine of "justification by faith." In the believer's life, God's forgiving grace and revelation enables one to break with the historical meaning (*Geschichte*) of the past, to become a "new person," and let one's historical meaning be determined by the eschatological. From the perspective of dialectical theology, the theologies of Bultmann and Barth are quite similar. While Barth puts his emphasis on the absolute objectivity and revelatory character of the Word of God, Bultmann underlines the decision of the believer. Therefore, Bultmann constructs his theology firmly upon the foundation of the four *sola* of the Reformation. Lee's article contributes substantially to an understanding of Bultmann's thought, and removes much of the misconception to Bultmann's theology

**Andres S. K. Tang's "Rethinking of the Theological Hermeneutics of Karl Barth and Rudolf Bultmann: From the Perspective of the Later Heidegger"** attempts to resolve the conflict between the theological hermeneutics of Karl Barth and Rudolf Bultmann, and to locate them harmoniously within dialectical theology. For Barth, God is the Subject. God has to interpret humans first, and then humans follow God's Word by interpreting Scripture. For Bultmann, God works simultaneously when humans interpret the kerygma in Scripture. The former starts from God's aseity while the latter from "God for us." This constitutes their different conception of the relation between God and Scripture. Fundamentally, Barth holds that God has spoken and God's Word is different from human words. On the other hand, Bultmann holds that God speaks through Scripture to

the interpreter, emphasizing that the Word of God is inseparable from human words. Tang relates Bultmann's thought to the early Heidegger, underlining *Dasein's* interpretation of Being. He correlates Barth's thought with the later Heidegger, like the poet listening to Being. Bultmann puts his finger on manifestation while Barth puts his on latency. Barth sees God as the Wholly Other, having an infinite qualitative difference with the created world. Therefore God's Word and human words are never identical. This accords with the thought of later Heidegger, conceiving Being as Nature and as the dual process of both being and nothing, manifestation and latency, with priority given to latency. Bultmann corresponds to the Lutheran tradition, epitomized by Malenchthon's motto, "to know Christ is to know his benefits." In other words, God speaks through the Scripture to humans, generating its effect on humans. Thus God's Word and human words are not separable. Although Barth focuses on the hiddenness of God's Word, he does not deny its revealedness. Latency has priority in the ontological order. Similarly, although Bultmann focuses on the revealedness of God's Word, he does not deny its hiddenness. Manifestation comes first in the epistemological order. The thoughts of both are therefore compatible.

Moreover, Barth considers the obedience of the interpreter as primary in the process of interpretation, while Bultmann sees the interpreter entering into the written word, encountering God in the activity of interpretation. This involves their different views on the relation between God and the interpreter. The point of contention lies in the issue of "pre-understanding." Bultmann adopts Heidegger's thought, and conceives pre-understanding as constituting the possibility of understanding. Barth objects to raising pre-understanding to the level of methodological principle. He believes that the content to which Scripture points to eludes

human pre-understanding. Pre-understanding gives precedence to human subjective experience as a fundamental hermeneutical principle; but human subjective experience cannot lead us to obedience of faith. Faith and unfaith are discontinuous. Bultmann's pre-understanding is mere phenomenological description; it carries no canonizing connotation. It is open and does not constitute a pre-judgment. Tang's article serves well to illustrate how two scholars, based on the same assumptions, but starting at different ends and approaching from different perspectives, can result in apparently conflicting positions. On closer examination they complement each other.

**Andrew T. W. Hung's "Charles Taylor's Historical Argument of Christian Morality"** furnishes an analysis of a magnificent writing of Charles Taylor's *Sources of the Self*. Employing historical argumentation, the book explores the development of the modern moral self by comparing Christian theistic tradition, Enlightenment naturalism, and Romantic expressivism. The focus of these three traditions are correspondingly God, self-responsible reason, and "epiphany." Taylor discusses the three traditions in terms of inwardness, affirmation of ordinary life and goodness of nature. For him, Enlightenment naturalism is parasitic upon Judeo-Christian values. For example, natural utilitarianism adopts the Christian concept of benevolence. But Enlightenment's neutrality has eliminated the space for substantial ethical evaluation. Romantic expressivism attempts to discover the apex of human spirit through art. Realism reveals that Nature is devoid of meaning. Penetrating into human inwardness, we find not the self but the fragmentation of human experiences. The result is a crisis of self-affirmation. Poets of creative imagination opens up a transcendent realm, Dostoyevsky points out that one can affirm this sin-ridden world only by responding to grace and

by willing to be transformed by God's unconditional love. Secularism rejects transcendence, but then it endangers the fruit of modernity, namely an affirmation of human life. Christian theism can provide better support for human dignity and worth.

Opposing scholars list religious oppression and tyranny in history as counter-evidence. Taylor points out that these tragedies happened also under atheism. Many scholars also points out the contribution of Christianity to Western culture in areas such as the status of women, the abolition of slavery, and in concepts such as democracy, equality, human rights, and freedom. Monotheism or polytheism, theism or atheism, can all be tolerant or non-tolerant. The crux of the problem lies in a marriage between beliefs and culture, resulting in tyrannical institutions. The question hinges on which source can motivates us in the moral engagement of benevolence and justice, and justifies humans as worthy to be so treated. Christian theism indeed offers such a source, affirming human dignity and universal agape love, as exemplified by Wilberforce and Mother Teresa. Hung's article has opened up a discussion on both Charles Taylor and the importance of historical argumentation. Readers are encouraged to further the discussion on these issues.

Kevin S. K. Cheng  
2010. 1. 18