A. Course Description
The course introduces the work and thought of some of the important theologians and theological movements of the 20th century. Since the period of the Enlightenment western theologians have been struggling with the conflict between biblical traditions and rationalism. While an emphasis on the former generally acknowledges that reason is a precious gift of God, it shows a fundamentally critical attitude towards the use of reason in theological reflection. In contrast, modern science and human rationality left no place for God and understands human beings as autonomous from God.

The challenge of rationality and of modernity is only one of several challenges that modern theology faces. The course aims at studying some of the major concepts of 20th century theology and how they navigate the challenges of modernity and rationalism.

B. Expected Outcome
Following outcome is expected:

a) The students will gain a general knowledge of the core theological thought of some of the most important theological thinkers of the 20th century.

b) They will read some of the original material of relevant theologians. By studying original texts of important theologians of the 20th century, the students will learn how to analyze, interpret and understand theological texts that are partly difficult to understand.

c) Through the study of different theologians, they will get acquainted with different models of theology and the contexts from which they emerged.

C. Methodology
The sessions consist of two parts: a seminar-style part where the focus is on joint reading, understanding, and analysis of original texts, and a lecture part that introduces key elements of the different theologians more systematically. The seminar sessions towards the end of the term will be dedicated to student presentations. For each session the students will receive a homework and reading assignment sheet.
Lecture and tutorial are usually in English.
D. Course Requirements and Assessment

The reading of weekly assigned texts by important theologians builds the basis for the discussion during the course and for the understanding of the lecture.

Further requirements and assessment scheme: a) Oral participation 20%; b) book review 30%; c) term paper 50%

a) **Regular class participation** and reading of the weekly assignments (20%)

Assessment of tutorial and class participation is based on the following criteria:

- Regularity of attendance and consistence of homework
- Balanced communicative behavior
- Quality of oral contributions
- Originality of thought

b) **Book review** (30%):

The book review should be written about *one original work* out of a list of 20th century theological works. Besides articulating the main theme and important points of the book, students should try to reflect on the significance of the book for his/her present situation.

Length: Max. 2,500 words

Deadline: Oct 30, 2017

Criteria for assessment:

- Content: does the review reflect a good understanding of the book?
- Thought: Does the student critically engage with the thought expressed in the book?
- Form: does the form of the presentation enhance the understanding of the written essay? (Neatness of the paper, good structuring, concise writing, mastering of language and proper use of source material)
- Creativity: Does the form of the presentation show creative dialogue with the theologian? (Additional resource material, creative presentation)

o **Term paper + class presentation** (50%)

The term paper presents *one theological movement* from a list of such movements (different from the review). The paper should offer a survey of the movement, its historical development and origin, key figures, main thrust, and what it reacted against. The paper should also reflect the significance of the described movement for our present context.

The class presentation should be short and explain in short form the relevance of a specific theological movement for the present day context and present day church life.

Length: 5,000 to 6,000 words in English

Deadline: 15 Dec 2017

o **Grading**

The grading follows the general grading policy of the CUHK outlined below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thesis</strong></td>
<td>A clear statement of what is being proposed or argued in the paper.</td>
<td>The thesis is easily detectable after reading the paper, but it is not presented in a single and clear statement.</td>
<td>The thesis is present, but a reader must work hard to reconstruct from the entire paper.</td>
<td>There is no thesis or central argument/proposal to tie the paper together, or the thesis is unclear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arguments</strong></td>
<td>Each reason, support, or argument to follow the thesis is made clear, thorough, relevant and convincing. Proper references are consistently made to the text in question (biblical and/or a textbook) to show why the proposed thesis is valid.</td>
<td>Arguments made to support the thesis are clear, but less thorough, relevant, and/or convincing. References are often made to the text in question (biblical and/or a textbook) to show why the proposed thesis is valid, but this is done not as consistently.</td>
<td>Arguments made to support the thesis are acceptable but sketchy or their relevance unclear. Some references are made to the text in question (biblical and/or a textbook) to show why the proposed thesis is valid.</td>
<td>Arguments to support the thesis are missing, irrelevant, or not convincing. The paper makes lots of claims or assertions that are not substantiated. There are few or no references to the text in question (biblical and/or a textbook) to show why the proposed thesis is valid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counter-Arguments</strong></td>
<td>The paper acknowledges, anticipates, and accounts for conflicting evidence, counter-examples, counter-arguments, and/or opposing positions, even ones that are not obvious or not yet been made in writings of others.</td>
<td>The paper acknowledges and accounts for obvious conflicting evidence, counter-examples, counter-arguments, and/or opposing positions.</td>
<td>The paper acknowledges and accounts for a few obvious conflicting evidence, counter-examples, and counter-arguments, but miss other obvious opposing positions. Or the paper acknowledges counter-arguments without accounting for them.</td>
<td>No awareness or acknowledgment of conflicting evidence, counter-examples, counter-arguments, or opposing positions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The paper’s flow, from one paragraph to another, is consistently sensible, logical, and always with clear transitions. The movement from introduction to the body and then the conclusion is easy to follow and coherent.</td>
<td>The paper’s flow, from one paragraph to another, is largely sensible and logical. Transitions are mostly appropriate. The movement from introduction to the body and then the conclusion is distinguishable if not easy to follow.</td>
<td>There are signs of sensible and logical organization, but these are mixed with abrupt or illogical shifts and ineffective flow of ideas. The movement from introduction to the body and then the conclusion is not clearly distinguishable.</td>
<td>The paper does not flow well in terms of organization or for the argument of the thesis. Transitions from paragraph to paragraph or from one idea to the next are missing. The movement from introduction to the body and then the conclusion is non-existent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>The paper is written in complete and grammatically correct sentences. Word choice is precise; definitions are provided if and when needed. Paper has been spell-checked, proofread, and contains no errors.</td>
<td>The paper is written in complete sentence and grammatically correct sentences. Word choice is understandable, definitions are generally (though not always) provided if and when needed. Paper has been spell-checked, proofread, and contains only a few errors.</td>
<td>The paper contains some incomplete or grammatically incorrect sentences. Word choice is imprecise, at times not understandable, and/or not defined when needed. Not clear if the paper has been spell-checked and proofread because of the number of errors present.</td>
<td>The paper is written with many incomplete or grammatically incorrect sentences. Word choice is not understandable and definition of particular terms or words is not given even when needed. The paper has clearly not been spell-checked or proofread, and hence contains an excessive number of errors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Notes to indicate sources of information are given whenever they are needed. Both notes and bibliography use consistent and academically acceptable format.</td>
<td>Notes to indicate sources of information are generally given when they are needed. Notes and bibliography are generally but not always consistent or conform to required academic standard.</td>
<td>Sources of information are not consistently documented. If they are, format is inconsistent or does not conform to required academic standard.</td>
<td>Source materials are used without documentation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For submission of assignments, please follow the following rule:
1. Upload your assignment on the Blackboard website. **Only word-format is allowed. PDF is regarded as non-submission.**
2. At the same time also upload a soft copy of the completed assignment to the plagiarism detection engine VeriGuide, at the URL: [https://veriguide2.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/cuhk/](https://veriguide2.cse.cuhk.edu.hk/cuhk/)
3. The system will issue a receipt which also contains a declaration of honesty, which is the same as that in [http://www.cuhk.edu.hk/policy/academichonesty/p10.htm](http://www.cuhk.edu.hk/policy/academichonesty/p10.htm). The declaration should be uploaded in pdf to the blackboard system.

### E. Handbooks and Reference Literature
- **Baum, Gregory** (ed.): *The Twentieth Century. A Theological Overview*, Maryknoll, New York, 1999


Schwarz, Hans: *Theology in a Global Context. The Last Two Hundred Years* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005)

Smith, David L.: *A Handbook of Contemporary Theology* (Wheaton: Bridgepoint, 1992) (strongly evangelical perspective, very judgmental)


*In bold the books that are most recommended for reading parallel to the course.*

In Chinese

- 福特編: 《現代神學家：二十世紀基督教神學導論》。董江陽、陳佐人譯。香港：道風書社，2005。
- 郭鴻標、堵建偉編: 《新世紀的神學議程》。上下冊。沈宣仁審訂。香港：基督徒學會，2002-2003。
- 卓新平，《當代西方新教神學》（上海：三聯，2006）。

F. **Course Schedule (13 weeks)**

6 Sept 2017 Introduction to the course

Modernity and Modern Culture – Modernity and Beyond

Background of 20th Century Theology: The Liberal Theology of the 19th Century
13 Sept 2017  Neo-Orthodox Reaction to Modernity: Karl Barth and the Theology of Crisis
20 Sept 2017  Karl Barth (continue)
27 Sept 2017  Existentialist Theology: Rudolf Bultmann
4 Oct 2017  Radical Incarnational Theology: Dietrich Bonhoeffer
11 Oct 2017  Correlation: Paul Tillich
18 Oct 2017  Secular Ecumenism: Harvey Cox
25 Oct 2017  History and Eschatology: Moltmann
1 Nov 2017  Liberation Theology: Gutierrez
8 Nov 2017  Feminist Theology: Rosemary Radford Ruether
15 Nov 2017  Hermeneutic Theology: Paul Ricoeur
Student presentations
22 Nov 2017  Postliberal and Postmodern Theology and Outlook
Student presentations
29 Nov 2017  Make up time
Student presentations

G. Suggestions for Book Review and Term Paper

I. Theological Works for Book Review: (suggestions)

1. Karl Barth, *The Word of God and the Word of Man*
2. Paul Tillich, *Theology of Culture*《文化神學》or *The Courage to Be*
3. Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Discipleship*
5. Gerhard Ebeling, *The Nature of Faith*
6. Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Revelation as History*
7. Gustavo Gutierrez, *A Theology of Liberation*
8. Jon Sobrino, *Jesus the Liberator*
9. Jürgen Moltmann, *Experiences in Theology*《神學思想的經驗》or *Theology of Hope*
10. Harvey Cox, *The Secular City or The Feast of Fools*
12. Dorothee Sölle, *Thinking about God or Christ the Representative. An Essay in Theology after the ‘Death of God’*
13. Rosemary Radford Ruether, *Sexism and God-Talk or Gaia and God*
14. Mary Daly, *Beyond God the Father*
15. Stanley Hauerwas, *A Community of Character*
17. Paul Ricoeur, *The Conflict of Interpretations: Essays in Hermeneutics*

II. **Theological Movements for Term Paper** (suggestions)

a) Dialectical theology  
b) Existential theology  
c) Ecological theology  
d) Ecumenical theology  
e) Feminist theology  
f) ‘God is dead’-theology  
g) Hermeneutical theology  
h) Liberation theology  
i) Postliberal theology  
j) Postmodern theology  
k) Process theology  
l) Theology after Auschwitz  
m) Theology of Hope  
n) Aesthetic theology  
o) Narrative theology
Attention is drawn to University policy and regulations on honesty in academic work, and to the disciplinary guidelines and procedures applicable to breaches of such policy and regulations. Details may be found at http://www.cuhk.edu.hk/policy/academichonesty/.

With each assignment, students will be required to submit a signed declaration that they are aware of these policies, regulations, guidelines and procedures.

- In the case of group projects, all students of the same group should be asked to sign the declaration, each of whom is responsible and liable to disciplinary actions should there be any plagiarized contents in the group project, irrespective of whether he/she has signed the declaration and whether he/she has contributed directly or indirectly to the plagiarized contents.

- For assignments in the form of a computer-generated document that is principally text-based and submitted via VeriGuide, the statement, in the form of a receipt, will be issued by the system upon students’ uploading of the soft copy of the assignment.

Assignments without the properly signed declaration will not be graded by teachers.

Only the final version of the assignment should be submitted via VeriGuide.

The submission of a piece of work, or a part of a piece of work, for more than one purpose (e.g. to satisfy the requirements in two different courses) without declaration to this effect shall be regarded as having committed undeclared multiple submission. It is common and acceptable to reuse a turn of phrase or a sentence or two from one’s own work; but wholesale reuse is problematic. In any case, agreement from the course teacher(s) concerned should be obtained prior to the submission of the piece of work.