

編者絮語：

穿透絕望的希望

紀念《被釘十字架的上帝》問世五十週年
(1972–2022)

洪 亮

如何在兼具深度與現實感的基礎之上理解絕望和希望的關係，這個基本問題貫穿了“短暫的二十世紀”，也必將伴隨已邁入後疫情時代的二十一世紀。在出生並成長於二十世紀的世界級基督教思想大家中，莫爾特曼（Jürgen Moltmann, 1926–）對這個問題的響應獨樹一幟，代表了歐洲大陸戰後一代對和平與多邊主義價值的精神探索，它內在的創造力和人道主義價值使其影響力至今不絕。

二十世紀的現代基督教思想史編纂傾向於認為，莫爾特曼的學術貢獻主要體現為他始於1964年的“希望三部曲”和“彌賽亞六部曲”。2016年，莫爾特曼迎來九十華誕，德語學界在不來梅市政廳為其舉辦九十壽辰慶祝會，值此慶祝會之際，德國貴特斯勞出版社正式推出涵蓋這兩個系列的九卷本《莫爾特曼著作集》^①，標誌着莫爾特曼這位當世學術大家在現代基督教思想史中經典化的完成。自上世紀八十年代起，隨着莫爾特曼在歐洲、美國、拉美、非洲、東亞日益獲得認可，漢語學界開始關注其著述。自1985年以來，莫爾特曼本人也數度訪問北京大學、清華大學、中國人民大學和中國社會科學院等重要科研機構，發表學術演講。2010年秋，莫爾

^① Jürgen Moltmann, *Jürgen Moltmann Werke, 9 Bände* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016).

特曼參加“北京論壇”，發表主旨演講“論時代危機中的一種生命文化”^①，闡述宗教恐怖主義敵視生命的虛無主義內核，引發熱烈反響。論壇期間，莫爾特曼受北京大學高等人文研究院邀請，與當代著名新儒家杜維明就天、地、人三個概念展開對談^②。2014年秋，莫爾特曼受中國人民大學邀請，參加以“與莫爾特曼對話”為主題的高峰論壇，與數位資深人文學者就其著述中的核心論題^③展開對談。這些持續而深入的學術交流促進了漢語莫爾特曼研究的發展。2010年之後，漢語學界針對莫爾特曼的研究進入快速發展期，除研究論文不斷湧現之外，目前已有八部論著^④。特別值得一提的是，莫爾特曼對中國古代文化，尤其是道家自然觀保有濃厚興趣，《道德經》中的創生觀對他上世紀70年代的生態思考^⑤有不小的影響。

莫爾特曼一生治學道路的核心方向是終末論，1964年出版的《希望神學：基督教終末論的奠基及其後果研究》^⑥既構成了這條道路的開端，也奠定了莫爾特曼的國際聲望。在這部當時取得巨大成功^⑦的論著中，莫爾

^① 參北京論壇官網報道：<https://news.pku.edu.cn/bjlt2022/ljlt/dbed991990324d3e9dd1a3fcd80dbb45.htm>。

^② 參2010年北京大學新聞網報道：<https://news.pku.edu.cn/ztrd/bjlt2010/1976-187188.htm>。

^③ 這次對談的實錄發表於《基督教文化學刊》，2015年第34輯，第26-59頁和第60-87頁。

^④ 這八部論著分別為：林鴻信：《莫特曼神學研究》，上海：上海人民出版社，2010年；楊華明：《十字架上的盼望：莫爾特曼神學的辯證解讀》，北京：社會科學文獻出版社，2010年；曹靜：《迎向更新的宇宙：莫爾特曼的終末論生態觀》，北京：中國社會科學出版社，2010年；張旭：《上帝死了，神學何為》，北京：中國人民大學出版社，2010年；鄧紹光：《盼望神學：莫特曼》，香港：基道出版社，2014年；郭郁：《莫爾特曼的「希望」範疇》，北京：科學出版社，2016年；區應毓：《莫爾特曼希望神學省思》，北京：中國社會科學出版社，2018年；洪亮：《巴特與莫特曼管窺》，香港：德慧文化，2021年。

^⑤ 【德】莫爾特曼：《莫特曼論中國文化》，鄧肇明、曾念粵譯，香港：基道出版社，2008年。

^⑥ Jürgen Moltmann, *Theologie der Hoffnung. Untersuchungen zur Begründung und zu den Konsequenzen einer christlichen Eschatologie* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016).

^⑦ 這部著作在正式出版後四年之內出了六版，被譯為五國語言。參見莫爾特曼在自傳中的回憶：Jürgen Moltmann, *Weiter Raum. Eine Lebensgeschichte* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2006), 104-105。

特曼基於舊約的出埃及傳統與歐洲近代早期的盟約神學傳統，以不斷開啟歷史實踐視閥的神性應許（*promissio*）以及基督復活對此應許的確證來詮釋啟示概念，為希望提供了一個與啟蒙樂觀主義截然不同的定義：希望並非意欲的投射，而是對絕望的超越，其依據是上帝在歷史場域中的終末性行動。按照莫爾特曼本人的解讀，八年之後出版的《被釘十字架的上帝：基督的十字架作為基督教神學的基礎與批判》強化了希望定義中的現實主義傾向，如果說《希望神學》強調了對絕望的超越，《被釘十字架的上帝》則是聚焦於絕望本身，前者的論述模式是復活節中心論，在後者則是受難日中心論，兩部著作彼此互補。如果我們不被他這個讀者友好型的簡化式解讀所束縛，尊重兩者各自的獨立性，則會發現《被釘十字架的上帝》在一個最關鍵的問題上實現了對《希望神學》的超越：一個以應許不斷開啟歷史境域的“強”上帝形象被一個經歷絕望黑暗的“弱”上帝形象所取代，二十世紀後半葉的基督教思想迎來一種從未得到過深入闡述的獨特的上帝論。公允而言，應許概念誠然擴展出上帝論的將來向度，但難以使其在根本上區別於二十世紀的其他上帝論方案，然而《被釘十字架的上帝》中的“弱”上帝方案卻獨一無二，不同於前人，它融匯了作者的生命體驗、歷史記憶、學識素養和神學想像力，是莫爾特曼在四十六歲之時企及的又一個思想巔峰。上帝論從來是衡量神學品質的標尺，就此而論，《被釘十字架的上帝》比本來已極有份量的《希望神學》更具份量，代表了半個世紀之前世界基督教思想最重要的收穫。

1994年，尚處“試辦期”的漢語督教文化研究所（香港）筆路藍縷，推出《被釘十字架的上帝》的繁體中文譯本^①，譯者為彼時在深圳大學文學院任教的阮煒教授^②，這個中譯本也成為此後影響深遠的大型譯叢“歷代基督教思想學術文庫”現代系列出版的首部漢譯經典。1997

^① 【德】莫爾特曼：《被釘十字架的上帝》，阮煒譯，香港：道風書社，1994年。該譯本的主要翻譯依據是R. A. Wilson和J. Bowden 1974年的英譯本：Jürgen Moltmann, *The Crucified God. The Cross of Christ as the Foundation and Criticism of Christian Theology*, trans. R. A. Wilson & J. Bowden (London: SCM Press, 1974)。

^② 當時參與該書少量章節翻譯工作的還有蔣慶和劉小楓兩位學者。

年，上海三聯書店引進版權，在這個繁體中文版的基礎之上，印行了簡體中文版^①。《被釘十字架的上帝》於是成為漢語學界最早接觸到的莫爾特曼代表作。自1994年以來，漢語基督教文化研究所陸續翻譯並出版了莫爾特曼的多部作品，其中最為重要的九卷本《莫爾特曼著作集》的翻譯工作已經完成。以《被釘十字架的上帝》問世五十周年為契機，漢語基督教文化研究所正着手編纂從德文原文移譯的《被釘十字架的上帝》繁體中文學術版^②，以期為漢語學界提供一個與時俱進的譯本基礎。為紀念《被釘十字架的上帝》問世五十周年，本輯編者特別邀請五位資深學人撰文，從不同角度推進漢語學界對這部二十世紀偉大經典的認識和理解。在介紹這五篇論文之前，編者將對《被釘十字架的上帝》的理論肌理與歷史語境進行簡短梳理。

1972年，慕尼黑凱撒出版社印行首版《被釘十字架的上帝》^③。據莫爾特曼在自傳《寬闊之地：一個生命的歷史》^④中回憶，他在1969年的講座“耶穌十字架中的上帝”^⑤中已經概括陳述出此書的基本思想，經過約兩年的擴充修訂，正式出版的《被釘十字架的上帝》引發強烈反響，程度絕不亞於《希望神學》。莫爾特曼一生筆耕不輟，著述等身，然而沒有任何其他作品能像《希望神學》和《被釘十字架的上帝》那樣，引發如此之多的學術討論，以至於這些討論分別被彙編為兩部論文集^⑥！莫爾特曼多次提及，《被釘十字架的上帝》雖然比《希望神學》晚出八年，但對它的醞釀思考卻遠遠在先，因為早在戰後初期步入校園，受教於哥廷根大學的

①【德】莫爾特曼：《被釘十字架的上帝》，阮焯等譯，上海：三聯書店，1997年。

②新譯本的翻譯工作目前已經完成。

③ Jürgen Moltmann, *Der gekreuzigte Gott. Das Kreuz Christi als Grund und Kritik christlicher Theologie* (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag), 1972.

④ Jürgen Moltmann, *Weiter Raum. Eine Lebensgeschichte*, 185.

⑤ Jürgen Moltmann, „Gott im Kreuz Jesu,“ in *Umkehr zur Zukunft* (München: Siebenstern, 1970), 133-147.

⑥ Wolf-Dieter Marsch, hrsg., *Diskussion über die «Theologie der Hoffnung»* (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1967); Michael Welker, hrsg., *Diskussion über Jürgen Moltmanns Buch «Der gekreuzigte Gott»* (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1979).

伊萬德（Hans Joachim Iwand, 1899–1960）之時，莫爾特曼就在這位鍾情於青年路德稱義論的大師的啟發和鼓勵下，萌生構建屬於自己時代的十字架神學^①的意念。

在莫爾特曼求學之時，最具原創性的十字架神學方案已誕生於東亞。日本京都學派思想家北森嘉藏（Kazoh Kitamori, 1916–1998）1946年出版了《上帝之痛的神學》^②，將痛苦視為上帝最內在的本質，強調三一一位格中的父要以子的死為代價，以克服祂對人的怒，父讓子死才是三一之中第一位格與第二位格關係的核心，古典三一論所強調的父生子只是對此的預備。藉助這個思想方案，北森為路德在《海德堡論綱》（1518）中提出的十字架神學（theologia crucis）開闢出了一條全新的詮釋路徑：十字架涉及的不只是受難，更是三一之間的關係建構。二十六年之後，《被釘十字架的上帝》踏足的正是同一條路徑，由於具備《希望神學》奠定的終末論基礎，這條前輩開拓的思想方向最終被莫爾特曼擴展推進至一個更加深廣的境界^③。如果說北森的三一思維重在第一位格主動“大義滅親”，莫爾特曼的三一思維則突出第二位格被動遭受遺棄，思考起點並非父自己的行動，而是子以被棄於十字架為頂點的歷史性差違^④。父的痛不是因為必須克服愛與怒之間的衝突，而是源於主動認同於子遭受的被遺棄，這裏的上帝形象不再是以勇武隱忍的理想武士^⑤為模板的“強”上帝，而是朋霍費爾意義上苦弱無力的“弱”

^① Jürgen Moltmann, *Weiter Raum. Eine Lebensgeschichte*, 50–51.

^② 【日】北森嘉藏：《上帝之痛的神學》，洪亮編，湯愷杰譯，宋軍校，香港：道風書社，2021年。

^③ 關於北森和莫爾特曼之間的差異，可參考編者為《上帝之痛的神學》撰寫的中譯本導言。

^④ 以子的歷史性差違為起點構建三一論，這是莫爾特曼和潘能伯格（Wolfhart Pannenberg）的一致之處，也是他們和巴特在上世紀三十年代發展出的三一論方案之間的根本區別所在，後者的出發點是父的自我啟示。

^⑤ 與這個“強”上帝形象相應，北森在《上帝之痛的神學》中沒有反思過武士道的虛偽性以及日本軍國主義給其他東亞人民帶來的深重災難，在歷史觀這個問題上，莫爾特曼與他有根本差異，針對這一問題的分析可參考編者拙文：《莫爾特曼與北森嘉藏論上帝之痛》，《漢語基督教學術論評》，2019年第28輯，第143–172頁。

上帝^①，二十世紀的上帝論由此掀開具有劃時代意義的嶄新一頁。

就思想源流而言，莫爾特曼偏重黑格爾左派，他和前輩巴特（Karl Barth, 1886–1968）一樣，看重費爾巴哈對“基督教的本質”所做的批判性解構，尤其是他揭示的上帝論與人論之間的對應關聯。《海德堡論綱》是否也蘊含某種特定的人論？正是藉此發問，莫爾特曼與北森分道揚鑣，創造性地把路德對經院哲學認識論的否定轉化為一種關於真實人性的批判理論：衡量何為真實人性的標準並非人類投射的理想自我，而是被釘者的人性（*humanitas*）、虛弱（*infirmitas*）^②和愚拙（*stulticia*）^③。相應於具有悲情（*Pathos*）的受難上帝，人應成為共悲情的人（*homo sympatheticus*），如果說前者的悲情體現了神性本質的豐足與自由，那麼後者的共悲情則揭示出真實人性內在的交互性趨向和以此為前提構建群體自由^④的潛能。在1984–1985年度的吉福德講座（Gifford Lectures）^⑤《創造中的上帝》裏，莫爾特曼更將這一思想線索延伸至對健康與疾病之關係的論述中，指出健康生命的人性活力恰恰體現為對痛苦、疾病、殘障與死亡的接納，並以此自我肯定。否定人類以痛苦和死亡為主要標誌的有限性，這是當前追求人類體能、認知、情緒等增強以至數字永生（*Digital Immortality*）的超人類主義在人性觀上的基本傾向，對於如何判斷並評價這一傾向及其社會倫理後果，莫爾特曼基於《海德堡論綱》的批判性人論足以提供強勁的思想助力。

^① 莫爾特曼對上帝論的這一更新啟發了一大批後現代激進思想家，例如【美】卡普托（John D. Caputo）：《上帝的苦弱》，芮欣譯，台灣：橄欖出版社，2017年。

^② *infirmitas*直譯的意思是醜陋。

^③ 對這個問題的詳細論述可參編者拙文：《海德堡論綱的十字架神學及其當代解讀類型》，《道風：基督教文化評論》，2021年第54期，第239–267頁。

^④ 這一思想成為其日後著名的“社會三一論”的源頭之一，參【德】莫爾特曼：《三一論與上帝國：論上帝的教義》，周偉馳譯，香港：道風書社，2007年。

^⑤ 吉福德講座由吉福德（Adam Lord Gifford, 1820–1887）發起，1888年舉辦首場，至今仍由愛丁堡、格拉斯哥、安聖德魯斯和阿伯丁四所大學合辦，最初旨在推進“自然神學”的研究，然而經過之後百餘年的發展，吉福德講座逐漸演變為人文社科研究領域僅次於諾貝爾獎的學術表彰機制，歷史中受邀者的主講者包括懷特海、阿倫特、喬姆斯基、查爾斯·泰勒等一大批重要思想家。

從歷史語境來看，《被釘十字架的上帝》承載了現代德國以二戰罪責經驗為核心的文化記憶，這是一個帶着“罪責負擔”^①的奧斯威辛同代人對苦難奧秘的追究，其思想關懷並非冷靜抽離的神義論思辨，而是要戰慄探問“奧斯威辛中的上帝或被釘者上帝中的奧斯威辛”^②。這種生存論意義上的緊迫感和切身性為《被釘十字架的上帝》以及《上帝之痛的神學》所共有，也是它們作為一流經典的基本標誌。如何把情的因素注入十字架神學，而不是停留於黑格爾意義上“思辨的受難周五”^③？北森的選擇是借用日本古典歌舞伎曲目中以例如《寺子屋》和《熊谷陣屋》為代表的“悲劇”^④傳統，莫爾特曼則是回歸舊約詩篇中個體性哀告詩（Klagelied）充滿辯證特徵的敬虔結構：以對上帝不在場（“掩面”）的強烈控訴反向表達^⑤與祂聯繫的強度。讀者之所以能對《被釘十字架的上帝》的著名天問“我的上帝，你為何離棄我？”心有戚戚，這要歸功於詩篇所奠定的共鳴基礎。《被釘十字架的上帝》對個體性哀告詩傳統^⑥的開掘和運用，豐富了《希望神學》中佔據主導地位的出埃及傳統，也使得在兩這部著作中都發揮核心理論功能的保羅書信傳統被襯托出更加豐富而深刻的精神面向。以詩寓情，以經辨理，《被釘十字架的上帝》兼顧學科專業性與時代重負的思想整合力足以垂範後世，啟迪後人。

^① Jürgen Moltmann, *Weiter Raum. Eine Lebensgeschichte*, 186.

^② Jürgen Moltmann, *Der gekreuzigte Gott. Das Kreuz Christi als Grund und Kritik christlicher Theologie* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlag, 1996), 267.

^③ 早在《希望神學》關於“上帝之死”的一個超長註腳裏，莫爾特曼已初步探討了這個問題。參見 Jürgen Moltmann, *Theologie der Hoffnung. Untersuchungen zur Begründung und zu den Konsequenzen einer christlichen Eschatologie*, 152-155.

^④ 【日】北森嘉藏：《上帝之痛的神學》，166-167。北森對歌舞伎“悲劇”的詮釋完全被限制在日本傳統社會的家庭血緣關係（尤以父子關係為核心）之中，無法突破並觸及到因日本侵略而遭受苦難的其他東亞人民的真實“悲劇”，這是《上帝之痛的神學》的一個結構性局限。

^⑤ 相關分析參編者拙文：《與莫爾特曼一起研究巴特》，載《巴特與莫爾特曼管窺》，香港：德慧文化，2021年，第157-161頁。

^⑥ Bernd Janowski, *Konfliktgespräche mit Gott. Eine Anthropologie der Psalmen* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2009), 347-355.

本輯詮釋《被釘十字架的上帝》的五篇論文分為兩組，第一組包含三篇論文，屬文本研究範疇，三位作者分別從三一論、莫爾特曼對朋霍費爾上帝受難觀的發展和莫爾特曼的施密特批判三個角度，深入剖析了《被釘十字架的上帝》的主要思想肌理；第二組包含兩篇論文，屬接受史（Rezeptionsgeschichte）範疇，兩位作者分別介紹了自己繼承並推進《被釘十字架的上帝》的探索性理論方案。

第一組論文的首篇作者為台灣神學研究學院教授林鴻信，上世紀八十年代中後期他負笈德國攻讀博士學位，師從莫爾特曼。在《〈被釘十字架的上帝〉對三一論的貢獻》一文中，林鴻信細緻分析了《被釘十字架的上帝》對內在三一與經世三一之關聯的全新解讀，尤其是莫爾特曼如何藉助三一位格間的交互關係來詮釋十字架和上帝受難，從而對二十世紀的三一論復興做出了獨特且具突破性的貢獻。除此之外，該文從《被釘十字架的上帝》中的三一論入手，梳理了巴特與莫爾特曼在解讀十字架受難意涵上的方向性差異，如果說前者的理論框架是神人二性論，後者的思想焦點則是“一個發生在各各他十字架的事件，亦即聖子之愛與聖父之悲以及從其中聖靈開啟未來、創造生命的事件”，這一事件貫通內在三一與經世三一，兼具超越性和內在性。在林鴻信看來，《被釘十字架的上帝》意味着莫爾特曼“三一神學的啟航”，是其立足於聖經敘事的“三一視角”在上帝論層面的落實，在其之後的思想發展中，這一視角才逐漸擴展至基督論層面以及七十年代初期尚未完善的聖靈論層面。

第二篇論文的作者是香港浸信會神學院基督教思想史（神學與文化）教授鄧紹光，他在博士期間師從聖安德魯斯大學著名莫爾特曼專家包克穆（Richard Bauckham）。他的論文《莫爾特曼〈被釘十字架的上帝〉對〈獄中書簡〉的引用》深刻剖析了兩者在上帝受難問題上的思想勾連。莫爾特曼多次強調朋霍費爾的《獄中書簡》以及遺稿《倫理學》對他的影響，在《被釘十字架的上帝》中更是直接引用其著名論斷“只有受苦的上帝能夠幫助”。以往研究在論及這一問題時往往淺嘗輒止，未能充分解說莫爾特曼究竟如何繼承了朋霍費爾提出的“受苦的上

帝”，如何發展出獨立的進深見解。鄧紹光在論文中首先強調了兩者在回應時代處境和批判傳統上帝觀上的相似性，繼而明確指出，朋霍費爾理解的“受苦的上帝”側重點在“其存有是為他者的”，《被釘十字架的上帝》繼承了“為他者”這個關鍵性思想線索，但又為其增加了終末論維度，從而區別於朋霍費爾僅從道成肉身論說十字架神學的理論進路，將基督作為“在受苦中的為他”推進至作為“我們在盼望中的為他”。

第三篇論文的作者為中國人民大學哲學學院教授張旭，他在二十世紀德語基督教思想史領域治學多年，曾於2008年赴德國圖賓根大學訪學，問學於莫爾特曼。他的論文《新舊政治神學——莫爾特曼與施密特》集中論述了莫爾特曼在《被釘十字架的上帝》第八章中展開的施密特（Carl Schmitt）思想解構。張旭指出，德國天主教思想家佩特森（Erik Peterson）1935年從三一論角度對施密特《政治神學》中政治一神論的著名批判構成現代政治神學史的第一波；《被釘十字架的上帝》提出的“新政治神學”屬於第二波，它一方面延續了第一波的批判旨趣，另一方面整合了第二次世界大戰（尤其是猶太群體）的歷史經驗；第三波以及與之並行的“彌賽亞轉向”源於施密特以及猶太思想家本雅明（Walter Benjamin）的思想脈絡，但其晚近代表德里達和阿甘本都拒絕了“施密特的‘敵友之分’的政治哲學與‘主權者決斷例外狀態’的政治神學”，在涉及他者和苦難等問題的思想取向上反而與《被釘十字架的上帝》相契合。他認為，對於當前正在發展中的政治神學第三波而言，《被釘十字架的上帝》具有深刻的啟發意義和不竭的對話潛力。

第二組論文的兩位作者是莫爾特曼在歐美學界深具影響的兩位學生，一位是海德堡大學資深教授，海德堡大學國際跨學科神學研究中心（FIIT）創始主任韋爾克（Michael Welker），曾主講2019–2020年度吉福德講座，另一位是耶魯大學神學學院亨利·賴特講席教授，耶魯信仰與文化中心創始主任沃弗（Miroslav Volf），即將主講2024–2025年度吉福德講座。

韋爾克的論文《莫爾特曼令人印象深刻的十字架神學——以及一個必要的補充》主要複述了他在其基督論專著《上帝的啟示》（2012）^①中對莫爾特曼十字架神學的批判性反思，側重從三一論角度對之進行深化。該文由三部分組成，第一部分簡要勾勒《被釘十字架的上帝》如何建構與路德的《海德堡論綱》（1518）以及黑格爾的思辨神學的對話關係，第二、三部分陳述韋爾克的十字架神學方案。莫爾特曼在《被釘十字架的上帝》第四章中指出，被釘絕非孤立事件，被釘者在與猶太、羅馬和上帝的三重關係中經歷了三重棄絕，這構成“歷史的十字架”的核心。韋爾克沿着莫爾特曼的這條思想線索，結合巴特的辯證神學（Dialektische Theologie）、晚近新約歷史研究以及德國哲學家、社會學家盧曼（Niklas Luhmann）的系統理論，突出針對“復活節前”之耶穌的“聖經見證的多維度性”以及十字架揭示世界陷入罪之系統圍剿的“啟示之力”，試圖發展出一種不同於《被釘十字架的上帝》的理論方案，如果說莫爾特曼強調上帝在三一之中承擔世界的苦難，韋爾克則在“復活節前”的語境中放大世界在其自我鎖閉中對上帝的拒絕，以及上帝與世界彼此分離的危機。這個新思路深化了莫爾特曼對“歷史的十字架”的論述，具有重要理論價值^②，然而《上帝的啟示》在相關章節中的研究史綜述^③過多，對新方案的論點式勾勒^④過於精簡，未能引起學界應有的關注，讀者可借本期論文一睹韋爾克方案的輪廓。

在論文《被釘者張開的雙臂——論〈排斥與擁抱〉應歸功於〈被釘十字架的上帝〉之處》一文中，沃弗論述了其經典之作《排斥與擁抱：

^① Michael Welker, *Gottes Offenbarung. Christologie* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2012).

^② 參編者在拙文《海德堡論綱的十字架神學及其當代解讀類型》中對Welker方案的分析和評價。

^③ Michael Welker, *Gottes Offenbarung. Christologie*, 135-172.

^④ Ibid., 172-178.

^⑤ Miroslav Volf, *Exclusion & Embrace. A Theological Exploration of Identity, Otherness, and Reconciliation* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2019).此書的繁體中文版為：【美】沃弗：《擁抱神學》，王湘琪譯，台灣：校園書房出版社，2007。

一種對身份認同、他者與和解的神學探討》^⑤（1996）對《被釘十字架的上帝》的思想繼承。他以十分謙遜的筆調指出，《被釘十字架的上帝》透過三一位格的交互關係來詮釋十字架，這個具有開創性的思想框架為《排斥與擁抱》奠定了一流的神學地基，他的推進工作主要是從兩個方面對莫爾特曼理論焦點的調整：首先，針對變化的時代處境，用“和解”議題取代（而非消解）“解放”議題；其次，《被釘十字架的上帝》對上帝受難的理解主要着眼於他和受害者的休戚與共，較少論及加害者這一面，《排斥與擁抱》則從受害人如何可能像被釘者那樣擁抱加害者這一極其艱難的倫理實踐問題出發，增強了《被釘十字架的上帝》對加害者的神學論述。在沃弗看來，《被釘十字架的上帝》對三一位格交互性的強調具有劃時代的意義，也為他思考身份認同這個《排斥與擁抱》的核心主題指明了方向，身份認同不應以優化的排他為前提，而應充滿動態，成為“具有包容性和擁抱性的身份認同”。《排斥與擁抱》把《被釘十字架的上帝》第七、八章闡述的十字架神學倫理帶到了一個新的理論高度，因而自身也成為一部二十世紀的重要神學經典。

在紀念《被釘十字架的上帝》問世五十周年的專輯論文板塊之外，本期還收錄了其他八篇論文。其中“法浴水風”欄目裏有四篇文章聚焦中國社會科學院葉雋提出的“知識僑易”理論，^①一篇考察了中國本土女修會與中國本土文化融合的努力。“道無常名”欄目中的三篇文章關涉了基督教思想家奧古斯丁和馬丁·路德。

杭州電子科技大學張斐的論文《花之安中國女性書寫中的“知識僑易”》聚焦十九世紀德國傳教士花之安關於中國女性的著述。花之安的“女性書寫”可以視為現代語境中的一種“漢學、人類學、民族學研究的實踐”，另一方面，他的“女性書寫”又預設着顯而易見的歐洲中心論，從中“生成了一條以女性地位論證中國與西方文明等級差距的殖民主義邏輯鏈”。

^① 葉雋：《變創與漸常：僑易學的觀念》，北京：北京大學出版社，2014年。

西安外國語大學溫馨在論文《身份建構·傳教實踐·知識遷移——郭實獵個體僑易路徑與全球性知識僑易》中梳理了德國十九世紀傳教士郭實獵的生平與著述，突出他遊走於東西方之間的“新教開拓冒險精神”和他作為“傳教士、帝國主義者及文化中介者”的多重歷史身份。在作者看來，郭實獵的“個體僑易”在客觀上促進了東西方在知識與文化上的流轉遷移。

上海外國語大學董琳璐在論文《擇——譯——釋——衛禮賢“道”之翻譯與知識僑易路徑》中考察了德國著名漢學家衛禮賢對《道德經》和《易經》的翻譯工作，尤其是他以德文詞彙Sinn來翻譯並詮釋“道”的內在理路。衛禮賢的翻譯實踐與步驟可以用“擇、譯、釋”三個字來概括，它們分別對應着“選擇、轉換和消解三種行為”，是知識僑易現象的重要範例。

澳門大學王雨的論文《李提摩太、數字與晚清的知識僑易》介紹了晚清傳教士李提摩太針對出版以及知識流通網絡的反思。李提摩太在宗教理念上重視知識的時效性，在認識和理解清帝國結構上突出數據和統計學的意義，在作者看來，“正是在知識僑易的過程中，數字上升為李提摩太思考和重構現實世界的重要方式。”

中國人民大學劉賢在《“修文德以來之”——聖女小德蘭與中國本土女修會德來小妹妹會》一文中論述了上世紀二十年代效仿小德蘭的雷鳴遠在河北安國成立的德來小妹妹會，着重考察了其突出克己苦修的會院文化、修道綱領以及努力與中國本土文化融合的“國風化”特質。

在《奧古斯丁創世思想中的“質料”和“形式”——以柏拉圖的“載體”和亞里士多德的“質料”為參考》一文中，寧夏大學馬斌和呂耀軍結合奧古斯丁的《懺悔錄》第12-13卷及其《〈創世紀〉字解》第1卷，展示了這位被視為柏拉圖主義者的古代教父在質形論上可能受到的亞里士多德的影響，同時強調了他突破古代形而上學世界觀的創造論和救贖論特質。

浙江工商大學石敏敏的論文《論奧古斯丁的二次創造觀念》論述了

奧古斯丁圍繞有形宇宙、天使和人的受造而提出的“二次創造論”，作者強調這個理論在創造論和救贖論、終末論之間建立的對應關係，指出由此產生的與柏拉圖主義、新柏拉圖主義以及希臘教父在創造觀上的根本性理論差異。

中國人民大學周施廷的論文《從公開信到教會條例——馬丁路德與宗教改革的信息網格構建及深化踐行》從社會史以及信息傳播角度考察了路德對1521至1533的宗教改革的深刻影響，試圖從他如何運用公開信構建與民眾之間的溝通管道、如何影響新教統治者的政策、以及政策如何進一步制度化這三個方面，回答宗教改革何以從最初的教義辯論發展至後來的社會性改革運動。

總體而言，本輯紀念《被釘十字架的上帝》問世五十周年，甄選的五篇力作從文本內涵以及接受史兩個維度協作展現了這部經典的理論價值和劃時代意義，編者在此向五位資深學人的共同努力表示感謝，也期待這部偉大而深刻的誠意之作在當下的漢語世界激發出更多新的思想探索，豐富不同文化傳統之間平等、開放的精神交流，而這也正是本輯其他八篇論文的根本立意所在。

特邀執行主編簡介：

洪亮，華中科技大學哲學學院教授

Introduction to the guest editor

HONG Liang, Professor, School of Philosophy, Huazhong University of Science and Technology

Email: liangh@hust.edu.cn

Editorial Foreword

Hope that Penetrates Despair*

Commemorating the 50th Anniversary of *The Crucified God* (1972-2022)

HONG Liang

The fundamental question of understanding the relationship between despair and hope with a sense of depth and reality has permeated the “short twentieth century”. It will certainly be present in the twenty-first century in the post-pandemic era. Among the world-class Christian thinkers born and raised in the twentieth century, Jürgen Moltmann’s (1926-) response to this question was unique in representing a spiritual search for peace and multilateral values in the postwar generation in continental Europe, and its inherent creativity and humanitarian values have kept its influence alive to this day.

Twentieth-century compilers of modern Christian thought tend to see Moltmann’s scholarly contributions primarily reflected in his “Trilogy of Hope” and six volumes on “Messianic Theology”, which began in 1964. In 2016, Moltmann celebrated his ninetieth birthday, and the German-speaking academic community held an event for him at the Bremen City Hall. On this occasion, the German publishing house Gütersloher Verlagshaus officially launched a nine-volume collection of Moltmann’s writings covering both series,^① which marks the classicization of Moltmann, a living academic giant in the history of modern Christian thought. Since the 1980s, as Moltmann

* This translation is supported by Science Foundation of Beijing Language and Culture University (Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities), Project No.: 17ZDJ09. [本翻譯成果受北京語言大學校級項目資助（中央高校基本科研業務費專項資金），項目號：17ZDJ09。]

^① Jürgen Moltmann, *Jürgen Moltmann Werke, 9 Bände* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016).

gained increasing recognition in Europe, the United States, Latin America, Africa, and East Asia, the Chinese academic community gradually began to pay attention to his writings. Since 1985 Moltmann himself has visited important research institutions such as Peking University, Tsinghua University, Renmin University of China, and the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences to deliver lectures. In the fall of 2010, Moltmann gave a keynote speech at the Beijing Forum, “On a Culture of Life in the Crisis of the Age”, which elaborated on the nihilistic core of religious terrorism against life and provoked enthusiastic responses.^① During the forum, Moltmann was invited by the Institute for Advanced Humanistic Studies of Peking University to have a dialogue with the famous contemporary Confucian scholar Tu Weiming on the three concepts of heaven, earth, and man.^② In the fall of 2014, Moltmann was invited by Renmin University of China to participate in a summit forum on the theme of “Dialogue with Moltmann”, where he had a dialogue with renowned scholars of digital humanities on the core topics of his writings.^③ Since 2010, research on Moltmann in the Chinese academia has been developing rapidly. Eight monographs and a steady flow of research papers have been published.^④ In particular, Moltmann is strongly interested in ancient Chinese culture, especially in the Taoist view of nature. The concept of creation in *Tao Te Ching* strongly influenced his ecological thinking in the 1970s.^⑤

^① See the official website of Beijing Forum: <https://news.pku.edu.cn/bjlt2022/ljlt/dbed991990324d3e9dd1a3fcd80dbb45.htm>.

^② See the 2010 Peking University News website: <https://news.pku.edu.cn/ztrd/bjlt2010/1976-187188.htm>.

^③ A transcript of this conversation was published in the *Journal for the Study of Christian Culture*, Vol. 34, no.2 (2015): 26-59; 60-87.

^④ The eight treatises are: Hong-Hsin Lin, *Studies in Moltmann's Theology* (Shanghai: Shanghai People's Publishing House, 2010); YANG Huaming, *Hope on the Cross: A Dialectical Interpretation of Moltmann's Theology* (Beijing: Social Sciences Academic Press, 2010); CAO Jing, *Towards a Renewed Universe: Moltmann's Eschatological Ecology* (Beijing: China Social Sciences Press, 2010); ZHANG Xu, *God is Dead, then What About Theology* (Beijing: China Renmin University Press, 2010); DENG Shaoguang, *Theology and Hope: on Moltmann* (Hong Kong: Ji Dao Press, 2014); GUO Yu, *Moltmann's Scope of "Hope"* (Beijing: Science Press, 2016); OU Yingyu, *Moltmann's Theological Reflections on Hope* (Beijing: China Social Sciences Press, 2018); HONG Liang, “Studying Barth with Moltmann,” in *Six Studies in the Theology of Karl Barth and Jürgen Moltmann* (Hong Kong: VW Link, 2021), 157-161..

^⑤ Jürgen Moltmann, *Moltmann on Chinese Culture*, trans. DENG Zhaoming and ZENG Nianyu, (Hong Kong: Kido Press, 2008).

The ultimate direction of Moltmann's lifelong path has been eschatology. The publication of *Theology of Hope* (1964) constituted the beginning of this path and the establishment of Moltmann's international reputation.^① In this hugely successful treatise,^② Moltmann, building on the Exodus tradition of the Old Testament and the early modern European tradition of covenant theology, interprets the concept of revelation in terms of divine promise (*promissio*), which continues to open the horizon of historical practice, and the confirmation of this promise by the resurrection of Christ, offering a definition of hope that is distinct from Enlightenment optimism: hope is not a projection of desire, but a transcendence of despair, based on the final act of God in the historical field. *The Crucified God: The Cross of Christ as the Foundation and Criticism of Christian Theology*, published eight years later, reinforces the realist tendency of the definition of hope, according to Moltmann's reading, and if *The Theology of Hope* emphasizes transcending despair, *The Crucified God* focuses on despair itself, the former case in an Easter-centric mode of exposition, while the latter case in a Good Friday-centric mode. The two works complement each other. If we are not bound by his reader-friendly simplistic reading and respect the integrity of each, we find that *The Crucified God* goes beyond the *Theology of Hope* on one of the most crucial issues: the "strong" image of a God who opens up the realm of history with his promises is replaced by a "weak" image of a God who experiences the darkness of despair. In all fairness, the concept of "promise" does extend the dimension of the future for the doctrine of God. Still, it hardly distinguishes it from other doctrinal proposals of the twentieth century. However, the "weak" God proposal in *The Crucified God* is unique and different from its predecessors. It is another pinnacle of thought that Moltmann reached at forty-six. The doctrine of God has always been the yardstick of theological quality. In this respect, *The Crucified God* carries more weight than the already substantial *Theology of Hope*, representing the most important achievement of global Christian thought half a century ago.

^① Jürgen Moltmann, *Theologie der Hoffnung. Untersuchungen zur Begründung und zu den Konsequenzen einer christlichen Eschatologie* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016).

^② This work has six editions within four years of its official publication, and was translated into five languages. Cf. Jürgen Moltmann, *Weiter Raum. Eine Lebensgeschichte* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2006), 104-105.

In 1994, the Institute of Sino-Christian Studies (Hong Kong), which was still in its “infancy”, published *The Crucified God* in traditional Chinese,^① translated by Professor Ruan Wei, who was then teaching at the Faculty of Arts of Shenzhen University. This translation project has since become a multi-volume and influential series. It also became the first Chinese translation in the influential modern series, the “Academic Library of Christian Thought through the Ages”.^② In 1997, Shanghai SDX Joint Publishing Company purchased the copyright and printed a simplified Chinese version based on the traditional Chinese version.^③ This translation of *The Crucified God* became the first exposure to Moltmann’s work for Chinese academia. Since 1994, the Institute of Sino-Christian Studies has translated and published several of Moltmann’s works, and the most important one, the nine-volume Collected Works of Moltmann, has been completed. Taking the fiftieth anniversary of *The Crucified God* as an opportunity, the Institute is working to compile a critical edition of *The Crucified God* in traditional Chinese, translated from the German original, to provide an up-to-date text for Chinese scholars.^④ To commemorate the anniversary, the editors of this collection have invited five renowned scholars to contribute essays to advance the knowledge and understanding of this great twentieth-century classic from different perspectives in the Chinese academic community. Before presenting these five essays, I, as the guest editor, will give a short overview of *The Crucified God*’s theoretical texture and historical context.

In 1972, the first edition of *The Crucified God* was printed by Kaiser Verlag in Munich.^⑤ In *A Broad Place: An Autobiography*,^⑥ Moltmann recalls

^① Jürgen Moltmann, *The Crucified God*, trans. RUAN Wei (Hong Kong: Logos and Pneuma Press, 1994). The translation is based primarily on R. A. Wilson and J. Bowden’s 1974 English translation: Jürgen Moltmann, *The Crucified God, The Cross of Christ as the Foundation and Criticism of Christian Theology*, trans. R. A. Wilson & J. Bowden, (London: SCM Press, 1974).

^② Jiang Qing and Liu Xiaofeng were also involved in the translation of a few chapters of the book.

^③ Jürgen Moltmann, *The Crucified God*, trans. RUAN Wei (Hong Kong: Logos and Pneuma Press, 1994).

^④ The new translation is now complete.

^⑤ Jürgen Moltmann, *Der gekreuzigte Gott. Das Kreuz Christi als Grund und Kritik christlicher Theologie* (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1972).

^⑥ Jürgen Moltmann, *Weiter Raum. Eine Lebensgeschichte*, 185.

that he had already outlined the basic ideas of the book in his 1969 lecture, "Jesus: God on the Cross". After about two years of development and revision, the official publication of *The Crucified God* generated a response as strong as that of *Theology of Hope*.^① Moltmann has written extensively throughout his life, yet no other works have spurred as much scholarly discussion as *The Theology of Hope* or *The Crucified God*, so much so that these discussions have been compiled in two separate volumes of essays.^② Moltmann mentions several times that although *The Crucified God* came out eight years after *Theology of Hope*, it was conceived well before. As early as the postwar years, when he went to university and was taught by Hans Joachim Iwand (1899-1960) at the University of Göttingen, Moltmann was inspired and encouraged by this mentor, who was fond of the doctrine of justification of the young Luther, to construct a theology of the Cross for his own time.^③

The most original theological program of the Cross originated in East Asia when Moltmann was still a university student. The Japanese Kyoto School thinker Kazoh Kitamori (1916-1998) published *The Theology of the Pain of God* in 1946,^④ which regarded suffering as the innermost essence of God and emphasized that the Father in the Trinity had to overcome His wrath against men at the cost of Son's death. Moreover, the Father letting the Son die was the core of the relationship between the First and Second Persons in the Trinity. In fact, traditional Trinitarian theology's emphasis on the Father begetting the Son was only a preparation for this. With this thought, Kitamori opens up a new interpretive path for the theology of the Cross (*theologia crucis*) proposed by Luther in the Heidelberg Disputation (1518): the Cross involves not only crucifixion but also the construction of the relationship between the Trinity. Twenty-six years later, *The Crucified God* treads the same path. With the eschatological foundation laid by *Theology of Hope*, this

^① Jürgen Moltmann, "Gott im Kreuz Jesu," in *Umkehr zur Zukunft* (München: Siebenstern, 1970), 133-147.

^② Wolf-Dieter Marsch, hrsg., *Diskussion über die «Theologie der Hoffnung»* (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1967); Michael Welker hrsg., *Diskussion über Jürgen Moltmanns Buch «Der gekreuzigte Gott»* (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1979).

^③ Jürgen Moltmann, *Weiter Raum. Eine Lebensgeschichte*, 50-51.

^④ Kazoh Kitamori, *The Theology of the Pain of God*, ed. HONG Liang, trans. TANG Kaijie & SONG Jun (Hong Kong: Logos and Pneuma Press, 2021).

direction of thought pioneered by its predecessors is eventually expanded by Moltmann at a much deeper level.^① If Kitamori's thinking on the Trinity focuses on the active "sacrifice of the son" of the first person, Moltmann's thinking about the Trinity highlights the passive forsaking of the second person, starting not with the Father's own action, but with the historical mission of the Son being forsaken on the Cross.^② The Father's pain is not due to the need to overcome the conflict between love and anger but to the active identification with the forsaken Son. The image of God here is no longer a "strong" God in the sense of an ideally brave and stoic samurai^③ but a "weak" God in Bonhoeffer's suffering and powerlessness.^④ The twentieth century has thus turned an epoch-making page in the doctrine of God.

Regarding intellectual origin, Moltmann leans to the Hegelian left and, like his predecessor Karl Barth (1886-1968), values Feuerbach's critical deconstruction of the "Essence of Christianity," especially the correspondence he reveals between the doctrine of God and anthropology. Does the Heidelberg Disputation also imply a particular anthropology? It was with this question that Moltmann parted ways with Kitamori and creatively transformed Luther's rejection of the epistemology of scholastic philosophy into a critical theory of true humanity: the measure of true humanity is not the ideal "self" projected by humans, but the humanity (*humanitas*), infirmity (*infirmitas*), and folly (*stulticia*) of the crucified.^⑤ Corresponding

^① For a discussion of the differences between Kitamori and Moltmann, see my introduction to the Chinese translation of *The Theology of the Pain of God*.

^② Constructing the Trinity from the historical mission of the Son is the point of agreement between Moltmann and Wolfhart Pannenberg, and the fundamental difference between them and the Trinity proposal developed by Barth in the 1930s, which started from the self-revelation of the Father.

^③ In contrast to this image of a "strong" God, Kitamori does not reflect on the hypocrisy of Bushido and the horrid disasters that Japanese militarism brought to other East Asian peoples in his *Theology of the Pain of God*. On the issue of historical perspective, Moltmann differs fundamentally from him, and an analysis of this issue can be found in my article "Moltmann and Kazoh Kitamori on the Pain of God," *Sino-Christian Studies*, vol. 28 (2019): 143-172.

^④ This update of Moltmann's doctrine of God has inspired a large number of postmodern radical thinkers, such as John D., *The Weakness of God: A Theology of the Event*, trans. RUI Xin, (Taiwan: Olive Press, 2017).

^⑤ For a more detailed discussion of this issue, see my article, "The Theology of the Cross in the Heidelberg Disputation and its Contemporary Interpretations," *Logos and Pneuma: Chinese Journal of Theology*, vol. 54 (2021): 239-267.

to the suffering (*pathos*) God, humankind should become “sympathetic human” (*homo sympatheticus*). If *pathos* embodies the fullness and freedom of the divine essence, sympathy reveals the inherent interactive tendency of true human nature and the potential to construct collective freedom on this premise.^① In his 1984-1985 Gifford Lectures,^② “God in Creation”, Moltmann extends this line of thought to a discussion of the relationship between health and illness, noting that the human vitality of the healthy life is embodied in a self-affirming acceptance of suffering, illness, disability, and death. The denial of human finitude, marked mainly by suffering and death, is the basic tendency of transhumanism, which pursues human physical, cognitive, and emotional enhancement and digital immortality in its view of human nature. For judging and evaluating this tendency and its socio-ethical consequences, Moltmann’s critical anthropology based on the Heidelberg Disputation is sufficient to provide a strong intellectual boost.

From the historical context, *The Crucified God* carries the cultural memory of modern Germany centered on the experience of guilt after World War II. It investigates the mystery of suffering by a contemporary of Auschwitz who carries the “burden of guilt”.^③ Its existential concern is not a dispassionate and detached speculation on theodicy but rather to ask with trepidation about “God in Auschwitz, or Auschwitz in God the Crucified”.^④ This sense of urgency and tangibility in the existential sense is shared by *The Crucified God* and *Theology of the Pain of God*, and is the essential mark of their status as first-rate classics. How can we infuse the theology of the Cross with an element of emotion instead of remaining in the Hegelian sense of a “speculative

^① This idea became one of the sources of his later famous “Social Trinity,” see Jürgen Moltmann, *The Trinity and the Kingdom of God: On the Doctrine of God*, trans. ZHOU Weichi (Hong Kong: Logos and Pneuma Press, 2007).

^② The Gifford Lectures, initiated by Adam, Lord Gifford (1820-1887), were first held in 1888 and are still held at the universities of Edinburgh, Glasgow, St. Andrews, and Aberdeen. Initially designed to advance the study of “natural theology,” the Gifford Lectures have evolved over the following hundred years into an academic recognition, second only to the Nobel Prize in the field of humanities and social sciences, with speakers such as Whitehead, Arendt, Chomsky, Charles Taylor, and a number of other important thinkers.

^③ Jürgen Moltmann, *Weiter Raum. Eine Lebensgeschichte*, 186.

^④ Jürgen Moltmann, *Der gekreuzigte Gott Das Kreuz Christi als Grund und Kritik christlicher Theologie* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlag, 1996), 267.

Good Friday”?^① Kitamori’s choice is to borrow from the “tragic”^② tradition represented in the classical Japanese kabuki repertoire by, for example, *Terako-ya* and *Kumagaya Jinya*, while Moltmann returns to the dialectical, pious structure of the individual laments (*Klagelied*) of Psalms in the Old Testament: the intensity of the connection with God is expressed in reverse by a strong indictment of His absence (“hiding his face”).^③ The reader can relate to the famous heavenly question in *The Crucified God*, “My God, why hast thou forsaken me?” thanks to the foundation of empathy laid by Psalms. Using and exploring the individualistic poetic tradition of lamentation^④ in *The Crucified God* enriches the Exodus tradition that dominates *Theology of Hope* and sheds a richer and more profoundly spiritual light on the Pauline epistolary tradition. This plays a central theoretical function in both works. With its poetic verses to convey emotion and scriptural references to discern doctrine, *The Crucified God* has the power to balance the rigor of the discipline with the burden of the times to inspire and enlighten future generations.

The five essays interpreting *The Crucified God* in this collection are divided into two groups. The first group comprises three essays of textual studies. Three authors analyze the main theoretical texture of *The Crucified God* from three perspectives: the Trinity, Moltmann’s development of Dietrich Bonhoeffer’s view of the crucifixion, and Moltmann’s critique of Schmitt. The second group is two essays on reception history (*Rezeptionsgeschichte*). The two authors present their exploratory theoretical proposals for inheriting and advancing the ideas in *The Crucified God*.

The first author of the first set of papers is Hong-Hsin Lin, a professor at the Taiwan Graduate School of Theology, who studied for his doctorate

^① Moltmann has preliminarily explored this issue in a very long footnote on the “death of God” in *Theology of Hope*, 152-155.

^② Jürgen Moltmann, *Theology of the Pain of God*, 166-167. Kitamori’s interpretation of the “tragedy” of *Kabuki* is completely confined to the family ties of traditional Japanese society (especially the relationship between father and son), and cannot break through and touch the real “tragedy” of the other East Asian people who suffered from the Japanese invasion.

^③ For a related analysis, see the editors’ article “Studying Barth with Moltmann,” in *A Closer Look at Barth and Moltmann* (Hong Kong: VW Link, 2021), 157-161.

^④ Bernd Janowski, *Konfliktgespräche mit Gott. Eine Anthropologie der Psalmen*, (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2009), 347-355.

in Germany in the mid-to-late 1980s with Moltmann. In his article “The Contributions of *The Crucified God* to the Doctrine of Trinity”, Prof. Lin analyzes in detail the new interpretation of the connection between the imminent and the economic Trinity in *The Crucified God*, and especially how Moltmann interprets the Cross and God’s crucifixion through the interaction of the three persons, thus making a unique and groundbreaking contribution to the revival of Trinitarianism in the twentieth century. In addition to this, the article compares the directional differences between Barth and Moltmann in interpreting the meaning of the crucifixion, starting from the Trinity in *The Crucified God*. While the former’s theoretical framework is the two natures of divinity and humanity, the latter’s thought focuses on “an event that took place at the cross of Calvary, that is, the love of the Son and the sorrow of the Father and from which the Holy Spirit ushers in the future and imbues life,” which is a transcendent and immanent event that connects the immanent and economic Trinity. In Lin’s view, *The Crucified God* represents the “beginning of Moltmann’s theology of Trinity” and the implementation of his “Trinitarian perspective” based on the biblical narrative at the level of the doctrine of God, which was only gradually extended to the Christological level in his subsequent intellectual development, and then to the unpolished dimension of the Holy Spirit in the early 1970s.

The author of the second paper is Andres S. K. Tang, Professor of History of Christian Thought (Theology and Culture) at Hong Kong Baptist Theological Seminary, who studied during his doctoral studies with Richard Bauckham, a leading Moltmann expert at the University of St. Andrews. His article, “Moltmann’s Quotation of *Letters and Papers from Prison* in *The Crucified God*”, provides insight into the intellectual connections between the two on the question of the suffering of God. Moltmann repeatedly emphasizes the influence of Dietrich Bonhoeffer’s *Letters from Prison* and his posthumous *Ethics*. In *The Crucified God* he directly quotes Bonhoeffer’s famous assertion that “only a suffering God can help”. Previous studies have been superficial in addressing this issue, failing to fully explain how Moltmann inherited the “suffering God” proposed by Dietrich Bonhoeffer and how he developed an independent and deeper insight. In his paper, Tang Siu Kwang first emphasizes the similarity between the two in responding to the situation of the times and in critiquing the traditional view of God. Then

he clearly points out that Bonhoeffer's understanding of the "suffering God" focuses on "his being for the Other", while *The Crucified God* inherits the key ideological clue of "for the Other", but adds an eschatological dimension to it. Thus, he distinguishes it from Bonhoeffer's theoretical progression of the theology of the Cross, which only deals with the incarnation. Furthermore, he advances Christ as "being in suffering for the Other" to "us for the Other in hope".

The author of the third article is professor Zhang Xu from the School of Philosophy of Renmin University of China, who has studied for many years in the history of twentieth-century German-language Christian thought and visited the University of Tübingen in Germany in 2008, where he studied with Moltmann. His article, "On the New and Old Political Theology: Jürgen Moltmann and Carl Schmitt", focuses on Moltmann's deconstruction of Karl Schmitt's thought in chapter 8 of *The Crucified God*. Prof. Zhang Xu points out that the famous critique of political monotheism in Schmitt's Political Theology by the German Catholic thinker Erik Peterson in 1935 from a Trinitarian perspective constitutes the first wave in the history of modern political theology, while the "new political theology" proposed by *The Crucified God* is part of the second wave. On the one hand, it continues the critical interest of the first wave. On the other hand, it integrates the historical experience of the Second World War (especially of the Jewish community). The third wave and its parallel "messianic turn" originate from the thoughts of Schmitt and the Jewish thinker Walter Benjamin, but its recent representatives Derrida and Agamben both Derrida and Agamben rejected "Schmitt's political philosophy of 'friend and foe' and the political theology of 'sovereign decision of the state of exception'". Their ideological orientation in relation to issues of the Other and suffering is instead similar to that of *The Crucified God*. Prof. Zhang argues that *The Crucified God* has a profoundly instructive and inexhaustible dialogical potential for the third wave of political theology that is currently developing.

The authors of the second set of papers are two of Moltmann's most influential students in European and American academia: Michael Welker, senior professor of theology at the University of Heidelberg, who delivered the 2019-2020 Gifford Lectures, and Miroslav Volf, Henry Wright Professor at Yale Divinity School, who will deliver the 2024-2025 Gifford Lectures.

Welker's paper "Jurgen Moltmann's Impressive Theology of the Cross: and A Necessary Addition" mainly reviews his critical reflections on Moltmann's theology of the Cross in his monograph, *God the Revealed: Christology* (2012), deepening it from a trinitarian angle.^① The essay consists of three parts, the first briefly outlining how *The Crucified God* is constructed in dialogue with Luther's Heidelberg Disputation (1518) and Hegel's dialectic theology. The second and the third parts states Welker's theological scheme of the Cross. In chapter 4 of *The Crucified God*, Moltmann argues that the crucifixion was not an isolated event but that the crucified one experienced a threefold forsaking in a threefold relationship with Judea, Rome, and God, which constitutes the core of the "historical Cross". Following this line of thought of Moltmann, Welker combines Barth's *Dialektische Theologie*, modern New Testament historical studies, and the systematic theories of the German philosopher and sociologist Niklas Luhmann, highlighting the "multidimensionality of the biblical witness" to the "pre-Easter" Jesus and the "revelatory power" of the Cross in revealing the world under systematic siege of sin in an attempt to develop a different theoretical scheme from that of *The Crucified God*. While Moltmann emphasizes the suffering of the world in the Trinity, Welker magnifies in the "pre-Easter" context the world's rejection of God in its self-imposed isolation and the crisis of separation between God and the world. This new idea deepens Moltmann's discussion of the "historical Cross" and has important theoretical value.^② However, *God the Revealed* presents a lengthy overview of previous research in some chapters, and the argumentative outline of the "new scheme"^③ in the same chapters is too brief to attract the due attention of the academic community.^④

In his essay "The Open Arms of the Crucified: On the Debt *Exclusion and Embrace* Owes to *The Crucified God*", Volf discusses the intellectual inheritance of his classic *Exclusion and Embrace: A Theological Exploration of Identity, Otherness, and Reconciliation* (1996)^① from *The Crucified God*.

^① Michael Welker, *Gottes Offenbarung. Christologie* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag), 2012.

^② See my analysis and evaluation of Welker's proposal in his article "The Theology of the Cross in the Heidelberg Syllogism and its Contemporary Interpretations."

^③ Michael Welker, *Gottes Offenbarung*, 135-172.

^④ *Ibid.*, 172-178.

He points out with great humility that *The Crucified God* interprets the Cross through the interrelationship of the three persons, a seminal intellectual framework that lays the first-rate theological groundwork for *Exclusion and Embrace*, and that his work advances the theoretical focus of Moltmann in two main ways: first, by replacing (not dissolving) the topic of “liberation” with that of “reconciliation”, in response to the changing conditions of the times. Second, whereas *The Crucified God*’s understanding of God’s suffering focuses on God’s solidarity with the victim and less on the perpetrator, *Exclusion and Embrace* begins with the extremely difficult ethical and practical question of how it is possible for the victim to embrace the perpetrator in the same way as the crucified one, thus augmenting the theological discourse on the evil-doer. In Volf’s view, the emphasis on the interactivity of the three persons in *The Crucified God* is epoch-making and points the way for him to consider identity as the central theme of *Exclusion and Embrace*, which should not be premised on rigid exclusion but should be dynamic, as well as “inclusive and embracing”. *Exclusion and Embrace* takes the theological ethics of the Cross, as outlined in chapters 7 and 8 of *The Crucified God*, to a new theoretical level and thus becomes a major theological classic of the twentieth century in its own right.

In addition to the section commemorating the 50th anniversary of *The Crucified God*, eight other essays are also included in this volume. Four of the articles in the section “Fa Yu Shui Feng” focus on the theory of “Qiao-Yi” proposed by Ye Jun of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences,^② and one examines the efforts of local Chinese Women Catholic Congregation to indigenize their faith with local Chinese culture. The section “Dao Wu Chang Ming” includes three articles on St. Augustine and Martin Luther.

Zhang Fei, a lecturer at Hangzhou Dianzi University, is the author of the article “‘Knowledge Qiao-Yi’ in Ernst Faber’s Writings about Chinese Women”, which focuses on the writings of the nineteenth-century German missionary

^① Miroslav Volf, *Exclusion & Embrace. A Theological Exploration of Identity, Otherness, and Reconciliation* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2019). the traditional Chinese version of this book is *Embracing Theology*, trans. WANG Xiangqi (Taiwan: Campus Evangelical Fellowship Press, 2007).

^② YE Jun, *Change, Creation and Gradual Change: The Concept of Qiaoyi* (Beijing: Peking University Press, 2014).

Ernst Faber on Chinese women. In her view, Ernst Faber's "women's writing" can be seen as a "practice of Sinology, anthropology, and ethnography" in the modern context. On the other hand, his "women's writing" presupposes an obvious Eurocentrism, from which "a colonialist logical chain is generated to justify the hierarchical gap between Chinese and Western civilizations in terms of women's status".

In the paper "Identity Construction, Missionary Practice, and Knowledge Transfer: Carl Gützlaff's Individual Path of Qiao-Yi and the Qiao-Yi of Global Knowledge," Wen Xin, Associate Professor of the School of European Studies at Xi'an International Studies University provides a general overview of the life and writings of Karl Gützlaff, a German missionary in the 19th century, highlighting his "Protestant pioneering and adventurous spirit" and his multiple historical identities as "missionary, imperialist and cultural mediator" as he traveled between East and West. In the author's view, Gützlaff's "individual Qiaoyi" can be said to have contributed to the intellectual and cultural communication between East and West.

In the paper "Selecting, Translating, and Interpreting: The Translation of Richard Wilhelm's 'Tao' and the Path of Knowledge Qiao-Yi", Dong Linlu, a lecturer of Shanghai International Studies University, examines the translation of the *Tao Te Ching* and the *I Ching* by the famous German sinologist Richard Wilhelm, in particular his rationale in the translation and interpretation of the Tao with the German word Sinn. According to her, Richard Wilhelm's translation practices and procedures can be summarized by the words "select, translate, and interpret," which correspond to the "three acts of selection, transformation, and dissolution," and are important examples of the phenomenon of knowledge Qiao-Yi.

The paper "Timothy Richard, Numbers, and the Knowledge Qiao-Yi in the Late Qing Dynasty" by Wang Yu, Research Assistant Professor of the University of Macau, introduces the reflections of Timothy Richard, a missionary in the late Qing Dynasty, on publishing and knowledge circulation networks. Timothy Richard values the timeliness of knowledge in his religious philosophy, and highlights the significance of data and statistics in recognizing and understanding the structure of the Qing Empire. In the author's view, "it is in the process of intellectual Qiao-Yi that numbers came to be an important way for Timothy Richard to think about and reconstruct the real world."

In the article “‘Cultivate Civil Culture and Virtue to Attract People’: St. Thérèse of Lisieux and Little Sisters of St. Theresa of the Child Jesus, an Indigenized Woman Catholic Congregation in China”, Liu Xian, associate professor of Renmin University of China, discusses the Little Sisters of St. Theresa of the Child Jesus founded by Father Frédéric-Vincent Lebbe in the 1920s in Hebei Province, following the example of St. Thérèse of Lisieux. The author examines the self-subduing ascetic precepts of the order, the guiding principles of their devotional practices, and the endeavor to integrate faith with Chinese culture.

Based on a close reading of Books 12-13 of Augustine’s *Confessions* and Book 1 of *The Literal Meaning of Genesis*, Associate Professor Ma Bin and Professor Lv Yaojun from Ningxia University contribute their thought in the article “‘Matter’ and ‘Form’ in Augustine’s Creation Thought: With Reference to Plato’s ‘Hypodochē’ and St. Augustine’s ‘Hyle’”. The authors try to show the possible Aristotelian influence on the theory of Material and Form of Augustine, who was considered a Platonist. At the same time, the authors highlight Augustine’s unique contribution to break through classical metaphysical worldview with his treatises on creation and redemption.

The paper “On St. Augustine’s Thought on Twofold-Creation” by Shi Minmin, professor of Zhejiang Gongshang University, discusses Augustine’s “Twofold-Creation Theory” on the visible universe, angels, and the creation of human beings. The author emphasizes the this theory’s corresponding relation with theories of creation, redemption and eschatology, pointing out the fundamental theoretical differences between this theory and Platonism, Neoplatonism, and the Greek Fathers in their view of creation.

Chow Szeting, Associate Professor of Renmin University of China, in his paper “From Open Letters to Church Ordinance: The Construction and Application of Information Network by Martin Luther during the Reformation”, examines the profound influence of Luther on the Reformation from 1521 to 1533 from the perspectives of social history and information dissemination. It seeks to answer the question of how the Reformation developed from an initial doctrinal debate to a social reform movement by looking at how Luther used the Open Letters to build a channel of communication with the people, how he influenced the policies of the Protestant rulers, and how the policies were further institutionalized.

In sum, to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of *The Crucified God*, we have selected five outstanding papers for this volume. They demonstrate collaboratively the theoretical value and landmark significance of the classic, both from textual content and reception history. As the editor, I would like to express my gratitude to the five senior scholars for their joint efforts, and hope that this remarkable, profound and sincere work will stimulate more new intellectual explorations in the Chinese-speaking world, and enrich equal and open spiritual exchanges among different cultural traditions. This is also the purpose of the other eight essays in this volume.

特邀執行主編簡介：

洪亮，華科技大學哲學學院教授

Introduction to the guest editor

HONG Liang, Professor, School of Philosophy, Huazhong University of Science and Technology

Email: liangh@hust.edu.cn

譯者簡介

柳博贊，北京語言大學高級翻譯學院副教授

Introduction to the translator

LIU Boyun, Associate Professor, School of Translation and Interpreting, Beijing Language and Culture University.

Email: boyunliu.pku@gmail.com