

香港基督徒學生福音團契

護教講座系列一：苦難——信仰的盡頭？

第一講 苦難溯源

A) 開場白

這兩次講座主要是從理性的角度探討苦難的意義。

- 1) 理性進路的限制（比喻：流血的病人與血科專家）
 - a) 不要期望即時可解釋所有苦難，苦難問題未必能用理性完全消解。
 - b) 不要期望對現在受苦的你即時帶來安慰。
- 2) 理性探討的用處
 - a) 減低困惑感，扶助動搖的信心，建立穩固的基督徒世界觀。
 - b) 有些苦難源於誤解（例：快樂是唯一價值），明白苦難的真義可減除這種苦難。
Carl Jung: Neurosis is the substitute for legitimate suffering.
 - c) 去除對苦難成因的誤解，免除一些加劇別人痛苦的行動或言論（例：約伯的「安慰者」）。
 - d) 指向面對及克勝苦難的路。
 - e) 回覆未信朋友的質疑。

B) 苦難問題的分析

- 1) 理性層面——苦難似乎是一些否定神存在的証據
 - a) 簡化的推論
 - (甲) 若全能的上帝存在且愛我們，祂必不會讓苦難發生。
 - (乙) 有苦難發生。
 - (丙) 所以，神不存在或神非全能或神並不愛我們！
 - b) 信仰帶來的期望與苦難的經驗不符 ==> 思想的困惑。
- 2) 實存層面
 - a) "神在那裏？" ==> 失去信心，與神疏遠。
 - b) 這麼多不合理的苦難，這個世界在道德層面上不能被接受
(eg. Dostoyevsky's Ivan Karamazov)。 (Q3)
 - c) 苦難 ==> 悲情 ==> "生命的意義何在？"
- 3) 兩大類苦難
 - a) 自然苦難 (Natural Evil)，如地震、疾病。
 - b) 人爲苦難 (Moral Evil)，如謀殺、是非。
- 4) 否定神的全能是一種解決方法，如進程神學 (Process Theology) 的上帝便不能完全控制世界及人類，祂縱想阻止苦難也是有心無力。這種看法不合乎聖經，也有很多哲學困難，不在這裏詳細考慮。

C) 思想鬆土

1) 比較以下的推論：

(甲) 若你愛我，你必不會忘記我的生日（不送我回家、不每日打電話給我等。）

(乙) 你忘記了我的生日！

(丙) 所以，你都不是愛我的！

這推論過程是正確的，（所以不要說女孩子不講邏輯！）男朋友或者會這樣回答：「我不是不愛你，我只是忘記了而矣！」爭議之處正是對「愛」的詮釋。愛與行為的關係在人際關係中已經不簡單，更何況在神與人的關係中！ ==> 神的愛的涵義可能不是我們想像那麼簡單。

2) 打破「海洋公園心態」：我們是否只要求一個宇宙性海洋公園——「去玩、去癲」就滿足了？(Q1)

3) 確認價值的多元性，除了快樂以外，還有很多珍貴的事物：智慧、美麗、創新性、人際關係、群體、愛、憐恤、勇敢、責任、犧牲、悔改、復和、成長、幽默．．．．．。

信仰特別肯定一個美善而高貴的人格崇高價值。

4) 神的愛是聖潔的愛 (Holy Love)，不單付出，也提出嚴格的要求（彼前1:15）。 Love is more than sentimentalism.

5) 總結：現代人的靈魂深受享樂主義 (Hedonism) 洗禮，基督徒也不例外，但這與信仰的角度背道而馳，不更新我們的價值觀，苦難問題絕不可解。

D) 神義論的評價

【神義論 (Theodicy) —— 用來說明苦難，顯神為義的理論。】

1) 奧秘說

a) 苦難與罪惡是上帝的奧秘，非我們的理智可解，聖經並沒有提供理性的答案（參約伯記），卻叫我們去經歷苦難時，以信心去超越，以行動作回應。【暗室之后蔡蘇娟：「不要問神為甚麼，只要問神要你作甚麼。」】

b) 評語

(i) 強處：看到苦難問題歸根到底是實存的問題，及承認理性的限制。

(ii) 問題：但這是否低估了理性的功能，及使理性與信仰分割？動不動訴諸奧秘會使我們懶去用腦（甚或鼓勵反智主義），也使未信的朋友感到我們有自圓其說之嫌。

2) 懲罰說

a) 苦難始於人的墮落，一般來說，我們的苦難是我們犯罪的報應。

b) 批評：

(i) 若我們受苦是因為遺傳下來的原罪，似乎不大公平。

(ii) 若我們受苦是因為我們實際的罪行，那苦難與邪惡應成正比，事實並非如此。

(iii) 不合聖經：約伯是個義人（伯1:8），耶穌的教訓（路13:2-5）。

(iv) 這種思想很易培養一種自義、不體諒、好審判人的心態。

- c) 不過整體來說，苦難仍可視為墮落世界的標誌，對我們發出提醒和警告。
(C.S.Lewis: Suffering is God's megaphone.) 比較痛楚在生物學上的警告機能。

3) 自由意志辯護 (Free will Defense) (Alvin Plantinga)

- a) 苦難很多是人按自己意志自由選擇而造成的，神不用為這些苦難負責任。

b) 批評：

- (i) 有自由意志的人始終是神所造的，為何神容許他們犯罪？
- (ii) 一個自由而從不犯錯的人是邏輯上可能的，神是全能的，為何不做這種人？
- (iii) 人有自由縱是好事，但神為何容讓人濫用自由去傷害他人？

c) 回應：

- (i) 自由本身是一崇高價值，無論是用來作善或作惡。第一，這是人的本質之一，使他與萬物分別出來，而與神相似。第二，我們都不接受完全失去自由及自主的境況 ==> 對自由的肯定。第三，自由是很多重要價值的前設：友誼、愛情、承諾、創作、理性……。
- (ii) 矛盾出現在「神（決定性地）創造一個自由卻從不犯罪的人」這語句上。
- (iii) 人類的哀樂與共 (Solidarity)：「人能互相影響」是很多價值的前設 —— 一個完全孤立的個體能實現甚麼價值呢？但「人能互相影響」+「人有自由意志」 ==> 「人能互相傷害」！神的頻繁干預會危害我們的自由及使人與人的關係成為表面、空洞。

d) 不足：

- (i) 不能解釋自然苦難。
- (ii) 一些很可怕的互相傷害：值嗎？

4) 更高美善辯護 (Higher Good Defense) (John Hick, Keith Yandell)

- a) 神容讓苦難為的是叫世上有更崇高的美善，勇敢、憐恤、責任、英勇的犧牲及抗爭、誠實等價值都以一些苦難為前設。世界並非享樂天堂，而是造靈谷 (Vale of Soul-making)。

b) 批評：

- (i) 有時苦難不能鍛鍊靈魂，反使人墮落、卑下。
- (ii) 神這樣對人是否太嚴格？
- (iii) 我們去加苦難於別人身上，好去鍛鍊他靈魂，這豈不是功勞一件？

c) 回應：

- (i) 塑造靈魂不是「全自動」的，當事人仍是有自由去超越苦難或被苦難征服。我們也沒有資格說某某人是註定不能超越苦難的。
- (ii) 我們感受上是這樣，但神是我們的創造主，祂有一定權利去鍛鍊我們。
- (iii) 自然苦難已夠我們鍛鍊了！另外，一般來說，我們沒有權利去以苦鍛鍊他人：我們智慧有限，能力不足，也不是他們的創造主。（父母對子女則有一點兒這種權。）

5) 其他神義論

- a) 自然秩序 (Natural Order) (Bruce Reichenbach)

- (i) 自然苦難不是神每次造出，而是按自然律發生。

- (ii) 自然秩序有內在價值，也對我們很重要：作心靈與心靈的緩衝區、使認知及行動成為可能、也是科學與藝術的根源。
- b) 知識與責任 (Richard Swinburne)
 - (i) 爲要行使我們對他人的責任，我們要知道甚麼事會帶來快樂或痛苦。
 - (ii) 要獲得這種知識，最終我們要經歷苦難。
- c) 人生的豐富 (The Principle of Plenitude)
 - 苦難很多時成為加添我們生命色彩的回憶。(比喻：一幅美麗油畫的陰暗部份。)

E) 苦難引伸的問題

- 1) 一些苦難確是有用(「少少苦楚等於激勵」)，但我們的苦難是否太多了？
 - a) 如何劃清「多」與「太多」的界線？
 - b) 對苦難的承受力很視乎我們的心靈力量和成熟程度：「太多苦難」似非客觀判斷，而是有高度相對性的。
(小孩與成人、千金小姐與在任軍人……)。
 - c) 若100個苦難太多，減到99個便好了嗎？
 - 2) 爲何無辜／善良的人要受不應得的苦？
 - a) 成因：人濫用自由或自然律，這些都不理會受害人的品德，這是以上神義論的自然後果。
 - b) 想像一個痛苦與邪惡(快樂與德行)成正比的世界：人有多大的自由和責任呢？(沒有理由做壞人)人能培養真正的道德感和責任感嗎？
(爲了快樂而做「好人」？ cf. Kant: Unconditional good — duty for duty's sake.)
- 以下價值能實現嗎：爲人／國犧牲、同情…… (Q2)

F) 結論

- 1) 「爲何有苦難？」是可解答的問題，這個世界是信徒可預料的。
- 2) 「爲何有這麼多苦難？」較難答，但也難肯定沒答案。
- 3) 但有一些極端可怕的苦難(如 Auschwitz、六四)似乎不能如上去理解，不是原則上不可以，而是我們感到代價太大了！這問題下次處理。

書目

The Best popular treatment :

C.S.Lewis , *The Problem of Pain*

Peter Kreeft , *Making Sense out of Suffering*

Peter Vardy , *The Puzzle of Evil*

Comments : Lewis is a classic . Kreeft is easy to read . Vardy is a bit pessimistic but has a good emphasis on faith .

A classic for the theologically-minded :

John Hick , *Evil & the Love of God*

For the philosophically-minded :

Michael Peterson , *Evil & the Christian God*

* Good introductory work

Marilyn Adams & Robert Adams , ed . *The Problem of Evil*

* A very good collection of articles, including new ones

For the biblically-minded :

John Wenham , *The Enigma of Evil*

Good pastoral treatment :

Horace O Duke , *Where is God when Bad Things Happen ?*

D.A. Carson , *How Long , O Lord ?*

中文：祈理富，人生三大智慧

梁燕城，苦罪懸謎

唐佑之，苦難神學

楊牧谷，再生情緣

Q2

John Hick:

try to imagine a world which, although not entirely free from pain and suffering, nevertheless contained no unjust and undeserved or excessive and apparently dysteleological misery. Although there would be sufficient hardships and dangers and problems to give spice to life, there would be no utterly destructive and apparently vindictive evil. On the contrary, men's sufferings would always be seen either to be justly deserved punishments or else to serve a constructive purpose of moral training.

In such a world human misery would not evoke deep personal sympathy or call forth organized relief and sacrificial help and service. For it is presupposed in these compassionate reactions both that the suffering is not deserved and that it is *bad* for the sufferer. We do not acknowledge a moral call to sacrificial measures to save a criminal from receiving his just punishment or a patient from receiving the painful treatment that is to cure him. But men and women often act in true compassion and massive generosity and self-giving in the face of unmerited suffering, especially when it comes in such dramatic forms as an earthquake or a mining disaster. It seems, then, that in a world that is to be the scene of compassionate love

and self-giving for others, suffering must fall upon mankind with something of the haphazardness and inequity that we now experience. It must be apparently unmerited, pointless, and incapable of being morally rationalized. For it is precisely this feature of our common human lot that creates sympathy between man and man and evokes the unselfish kindness and goodwill which are among the highest values of personal life. No undeserved need would mean no uncalculating outpouring to meet that need.

Further, the systematic elimination of unjust suffering, and the consequent apportioning of suffering to desert, would entail that there would be no doing of the right simply *because* it is right and without any expectation of reward. For the alternative to the present apparently random incidence of misfortune would be that happiness should be the predictable result of virtue, and misery the predictable outcome of wickedness. Under such a régime virtuous action would be immediately rewarded with happiness, and wicked action with misery. What Kant called the good will, which does the right simply and solely because it is right, and of which he said that this is the only intrinsically good thing in the world or out of it,²⁵ would be excluded. For whilst the possibility of the good will by no means precludes that right action shall in fact eventually lead to happiness, and wrong action to misery, it does preclude this happening so certainly, instantly, and manifestly that virtue cannot be separated in experience and thought from its reward, or vice from its punishment. Accordingly a world in which the sinner was promptly struck down by divine vengeance and in which the upright were the immediate recipients of divine reward would be incompatible with that divine purpose of soul-making that we are supposing to lie behind the arrangement of our present world.

Our 'solution', then, to this baffling problem of excessive and undeserved suffering is a frank appeal to the positive value of mystery.

Q1

C. S. Lewis in *The Abolition of Man*:

For the wise men of old, the cardinal problem of human life was how to conform the soul to objective reality, and the solution was wisdom, self-discipline, and virtue. For the modern mind, the cardinal problem is how to subdue reality to the wishes of man, and the solution is a technique.

IVAN:

Q3

I understand, of course, what an upheaval of the universe it will be, when everything in heaven and earth blends in one hymn of praise and everything that lives and has lived cries aloud: "Thou art just, O Lord, for thy ways are revealed." . . . [But] I don't want to cry aloud then. While there is still time, I hasten to protect myself and so I renounce the higher harmony altogether. . . . I would rather be left with the unavenged suffering. . . . Besides, too high a price is asked for such harmony; it's beyond our means to pay so much to enter on it. And so I hasten to give back my entrance ticket, and if I am an honest man I am bound to give it back as soon as possible. And that I am doing. It's not God that I don't accept, Alyosha, only I most respectfully return Him the ticket.³

Q4

During the discussion of the meaning of suffering I asked the whole group whether an ape which is punctured many times in order to develop poliomyelitis serum is able to grasp the meaning of its suffering. Unanimously the group replied, "Of course it would not! For with its limited intelligence it cannot enter the world of man, i.e., that world in which its suffering would be understandable." I then pressed on with the following: "And what about man? Are you sure that the human world is the terminal point in the evolution of the cosmos? Is it not conceivable that there is still another dimension, a world beyond man's world; a world in which the question of an ultimate meaning to man's suffering is answered?"

By its very nature this ultimate meaning exceeds man's limited intellectual capacity. In contrast to those existential writers who declare that man has to stand the ultimate absurdity of being human, it is my contention that man has to stand only his incapacity to grasp the ultimate meaning on intellectual grounds. Man is only called upon to decide between the alternatives of "ultimate absurdity or ultimate meaning" on existential grounds, through the mode of existence which he chooses. In the "How" of existence, I would say, lies the answer to the question for its "Why."

雜記

苦難——

信仰的

盡頭?

Quotations

(P.T.O.)

even in a situation in which man is deprived of both activity and receptivity, he can still fulfill a meaning in his life.

It is precisely when facing such a fate, when being confronted with a hopeless situation, that man is given a last opportunity to fulfill a meaning—to realize even the highest value, to fulfill even the deepest meaning—and that is the meaning of suffering.⁴

Let me summarize. Life can be made meaningful in a three-fold way: first, through what we give to life (in terms of our creative works); second, by what we take from the world (in terms of our experiencing values); and third, through the stand we take toward a fate we no longer can change (an incurable disease, an inoperable cancer, or the like).

Man not only behaves according to what he is, he also becomes what he is according to how he behaves. Man is not a thing among others—things determine each other—but man is ultimately self-determining. What he becomes—within the limits of endowment and environment—he has made himself. In the living laboratories of the concentration camps we watched comrades behaving like swine while others behaved like saints. Man has both these potentialities within himself. Which one he actualizes depends on decision, not on conditions. It is time that this decision quality of human existence be included in our definition of man. Our generation has come to know man as he really is: the being that has invented the gas-chambers of Auschwitz, and also the being who entered those gas-chambers upright, the Lord's Prayer or the Shema Yisrael on his lips.

Viktor Frankl, *Man's Search for Meaning*

Q5

We cannot, however, rationally decide whether to side with Ivan Karamazov or not. Is the suffering of the weak, the suffering of the innocent and the cries of the afflicted worth whatever God intends for creation? Is the Christian claim that individuals are free to enter into a love relationship with God which will continue after death worth the tears of the children in Auschwitz? There are two approaches:

1. That of Ivan which says, "No, it is not worth it." This approach leads, ultimately, to despair. Ivan rebels and has no hope for the future — suicide is the only way forward. As Camus recognized, with the

death of God everything becomes permissible and Ivan's approach led eventually to Stalin and Hitler's death camps. Human beings became the only yardstick for right and wrong, they end in believing in nothing, and the consequences of this have been all too clear.

2. That of Job, which says, "I cannot see how it is worth it and I am horrified and appalled by the suffering of the innocents and will set out to combat it as God has told me to do. I cannot understand how God could allow such suffering but in the end I rest on trust in God — a trust that cannot understand." Vardy, p.165.

Q6

Quotes from William Temple; *Christus Veritas*:

"Cross and Resurrection together give us Tragedy transmuted into triumph as the key to the interpretation of the world. The analogy of Tragedy recalls the supreme illustration of the alterability of values. In any Drama, and pre-eminently in Tragedy, the value of the opening scenes is affected by what follows. The past as fact is fixed... but its value is not fixed. A man who commits a sin is to all eternity the man who committed that sin, but the value of the sin is one thing if he remains hard and impenitent, and quite another thing if he repents." (p.271f)

"A world into which evil has come can never again be a world innocent of all evil; but it may become a world in which evil has been overcome of good — a nobler world than one always innocent... The Love of God makes evil a contributory cause of that perfection; and this is the Atonement ... It tells us that sacrifice is the root principle of Reality..." (p.272)

"So God vindicates His Own Deity. Only such a God can be the God of the world we know. For the Name of God signifies the union of perfect goodness and absolute power. We should have to deny the one or the other if we could not believe in God as revealed in the Cross and Resurrection of Jesus." (p.273)

香港基督徒學生福音團契

護教講座系列一：苦難——信仰的盡頭？

第二講 天問

A) 不可救贖的苦罪？

1) 上一講我指出不少苦罪其實是可以理解的，但我也承認某些極端的苦罪表面上不可解：

- a) 我們想不到這些苦難有何作用 (Apparently Gratuitous Evil)。
- b) 有些人感到這些苦難絕對不能用任何事物 (過去、現在及將來去補償、救贖 (Apparently Unredeemable Evil)。如 Ivan Karamazov (Q3)。任何用理性去解釋這些苦難的嘗試都有合理化 (justify) 這些苦難之嫌，是對受難者的不敬。(甚或是 Obscene !)

2) 初步回應

- a) 感情上我很認同這個立場，面對慘絕人寰的苦難，多言多語的確使人反感，很多時保持緘默，著實行動是最佳回應。
- b) 但理性上這種看法也不是沒商榷餘地：
 - i) 我接受這看法中的一些元素：Auschwitz 等是絕對的惡 (Absolute Evil)。這是我們道德直覺可知道的。
 - ii) 但絕對的惡未必不可救贖，因一罪惡能否補贖 (redeemed) 要視乎很多因素：將來 (甚或死後) 發生的事、受難者將來的經驗、假若這苦難不發生世界會怎樣等等，這些因素牽涉很多經驗、歷史、末世的事實，我們的道德直覺能百分百掌握所有這些事實嗎？所以我們不要混淆「絕對的惡」與「不能救贖的惡」，不要將對前者的肯定感轉移到後者，面對這麼複雜的世界及人類歷史，我們是否應保存一份謙卑呢？
 - iii) 如 Auschwitz，過了四十多年我們可看得清楚一點這件事的影響，第一，在二十世紀科學主義、相對主義等思潮大行其道，人類有跌入虛無主義深淵的危機，Auschwitz 使人類重拾對絕對善惡的信念；第二，二次大戰的暴行直接促使聯合國、世界人權宣言等的出現，「人權」本是一道德概念，不同國家有很不同的理解，不是 Auschwitz 等事件直接衝激全球政要的心靈，對人權的尊重不可能成為國際政治舞台的共識 (至少名義上)，這對人類文明的進步相信有長遠的影響，也可能免除了無數人民受暴政殺害。別外，在集中營最極端的情況下也可顯出人性的光輝——參 Viktor Frankl 的反省 (Q4)。
 - iv) 六四：是中國能突破性地推行經改的背景原因，帶來中國人較深刻的反省與覺醒……中國政府在「人權外交」的攻勢下已開始接受「人權」的語言——雖然有不同了解。
- c) 小結：以上提出的說法不可完全作實，只是具體地說明事件的複雜性，最後我們最好承認有些苦難不可解，但這有甚麼涵義呢？是否信仰就不合理了嗎？

B) 為何有些苦難不可解?

1) 以下論証似乎是我們假設了的:

- a) 每一苦難 E, 若神有充足的道德理由 (R) 容讓 E 發生, 我們應知道這 R。
- b) 有一些苦難的 R 我們不知道。
- c) 所以, 神沒有充足理由容讓這些苦難發生 ==> 神不義!

簡評: 我接受前題 (b), 但有好的理由接受前題 (a) 嗎? 我們是全知的嗎?

2) 懷疑前題 (a) 的理據

- a) 我們已看到善惡之間有千絲萬縷的關係, 牽涉到複雜的世界秩序及歷史發展, 我們的智慧能掌握的很有限, 若神存在, 祂的智慧、計劃、眼界是否我們可完全測度的呢?
- b) 我們有証據顯出這世界是由一超越的心靈創造的 (參上半年的講座), 例: 電腦專家在山洞內發現外星人的超級電腦。
- c) 很多苦難起初都是很難理解的, 但更多的經驗、反省及探討往往揭示出人意料的 answer, 使我們更深明白善惡的意義, 是否很有可能今天我們解不通的苦難明天卻可明瞭呢?
- d) 時間的因素: 一件事物的價值是可變的 —— 視乎未來如何 (參塞翁得馬、失馬的故事), 但我們今天只見到人類歷史的一小部份, 也不能知道死後生命如何, 如何能肯定將來的歷史或神的作為不能轉化「不可救贖」的罪惡?

3) 奧秘的道德價值 (John Hick)

- a) Cudworth: "it is in itself fit, that there should be somewhere a doubtful & cloudy state of things, for the better exercise of virtue & faith."
- b) 想像一個每個苦難都可理解的世界 (懲罰或造靈), 這些苦難可促使我們的悲憫及無私的援助嗎? (Q2)

4) 小結:

- a) 從理性和道德的角度看, 我們都可預期有些苦難是不可解的。
- b) 如果我們有其他理由相信神的存在, 我們可合理地相信有一天神會讓我們全明白, 今天的「不明白」不用成為信心的絆腳石。
- c) 我的進路不同於反智地訴諸奧秘, 我先指出很多苦難可解, 而其他不可解的與可解的沒有本質的分別, 所以原則上可解, 再具體陳明接受「奧秘」的理由。

C) 有神論世界觀是對善惡的最佳說明

1) 世界觀比較進路

- a) 能提供對人生宇宙最圓滿說明的世界觀便是最合理的信仰。
- b) 但每個世界觀都有不能解釋的事物 ==> 最合理的世界觀不用鉅細無遺地說明所有事件, 只要說明得最多, 不可解的最少, 便可勝出了。

- c) 世界觀亦有實用功能，一個好的世界觀亦應提供實踐之路及面對苦難之法。

2) 苦難經驗所指向的真理

- a) 美善與邪惡有絕對的分別。
- b) 人心靈對邪惡有強烈的不接納、忿怒。
- c) 人的道德心有終極公義的訴求(誓不低頭的陸國榮)。
- d) 苦難彰顯人對意義的追尋。
- e) 有時人能透過信仰、愛、對意義的肯定超越苦難問題：如何解釋這些經驗？

3) 自然主義 (Naturalism)

- a) 主張：自然界(物質)是終極，心靈及精神現象是緩慢進化的產品。
- b) 自然主義 + 道德實在論 (Moral Realism)：很難解釋善惡絕對分別的根基何在 ==> 內在矛盾/張力。
- c) 自然主義 + 相對主義 ==> 否定善惡的分別，而人對公義及意義的追求只是幻像，人的苦難超越也沒終極意義！(Q5)
- d) 為何人的心靈會如此進化？道德忿怒對生存的掙扎有何裨益？

4) 泛神論 (Pantheism)

- a) 主張：萬物最終是合一的，不可分彼此 —— 道、Brahman、Absolute Mind.....。
- b) 德克蘭修女與希特拉其實同屬一超越心靈？有點難以置信。這是所有一元論 (Monism) 的通病：使善惡的界線模糊。
- c) 但極端的二元論 (Dualism) 在理性及道德層面下都難以接受：違反 The Principle of Simplicity 及「正義終必得勝」的道德直覺。

5) 有神論 (Theism)

- a) 神的全善、聖潔成為善惡的絕對尺度。
- b) 人照著神的形像被造 ==> 人對意義、公義的渴求反映人深心對完美者的追尋，而人的自我超越能力源於神的普遍恩典 (Common Grace)。
- c) 有神論不單能解釋這等經驗，也確保生命最終不是荒謬及公義必得彰顯，為克勝苦難的實踐提供盼望及動力。在自然主義及泛神論的世界觀內，這等實踐有終極意義嗎？

D) 面對實存困惑

1) 態度

- a) 信：實存困惑視為信心的試煉。
- b) 望：現世不是歷史舞台的最後一幕，冤屈的將會得以申張、受傷的會得到醫治、未完成人生發展的將有新的機會，而邪惡亦會被消滅，這些盼望不應成為消極的藉口，而是我們在世奮鬥的動力，使我們在「絕境」也不至絕望。
- c) 愛：苦難是對我們愛心的挑戰，在面對真正苦難時我們才真正明白我們不

曉得、也沒能力去愛，這驅使我們謙卑去尋求愛的根源 —— 去仰望十字架。

2) 十架神學

- a) 十架是一個以行動表達的訊息：苦難縱使不能明白，但最終是有意義的，例：藥王之子中了鶴頂紅。
- b) 容易受傷的上帝、苦戀的上帝 (A vulnerable & suffering God, cf. Moltmann's Crucified God)。
- c) 基督與世人的苦難認同 (Cry of Dereliction)，臨在受難者身上 (太25的綿羊山羊寓言；賽53)。
- d) 生命的深層原則：大死大生的吊詭 (約12:24-26；太16:24)。
- e) 復活 ==> 苦難最終必被克勝，神並沒有真正離棄似乎被祂離棄的人。(Q6)

3) 行動

- a) 以尊嚴及信心經歷苦難 (來11 —— 如同雲彩的見證人)。
- b) 與受苦的人認同，這亦是背十字架跟隨主的意義。
- c) 付諸行動，幫助人減低痛苦，去除引致痛苦的根源 (如社會制度 —— Wilberforce, Bishop Tutu 等榜樣)。不要讓宗教真的成為人民的鴉片。

新書預告

苦難的盡頭——耶利米哀歌的啓示

A Biblical Approach to Personal Suffering

原著／蓋華德 Walter C. Kaiser, Jr. (美國Brandeis大學博士，為三一福音神學院教務主任兼舊約教授，著作甚豐，包括《舊約神學探討》、《舊約倫理探討》(中華福音神學院出版)、《享受生命：傳道書的信息》(學生福音團契出版)等。

翻譯／詹維明

出版／學生福音團契出版社

本書為每一位正經歷苦難或與憂傷者同行的人提供：

1. 方向——在黑暗中有前行的軌跡
2. 喉舌——讓我們徹底處理憂傷
3. 指南——教導受苦者怎樣禱告和為甚麼事情祈求
4. 焦點——集中於神的信實和祂是我們的分

原價：42元

即場訂購價：32元