科目摘要
(Blackboard)

簡介:

本課程嘗試指出神學的特殊性及處境性，以致基督宗教的多元性，亦會探討不同神學如何在特定時空下形成。按此了解，神學家並不是在學習別人的神學以應用於當下處境，而是在特定的時間、空間、文化、社會、政治、經濟等現實下去「做」神學，去為當下處境再詮釋基督教信仰傳統。本課程也會按著以上的脈絡，嘗試議論「做」神學之實踐性質。

目標:
1 知識方面:
   1.1 明白神學研究之特殊性及處境性
   1.2 認識神學研究之方法及方法論
   1.3 認識至少四個典型之處境神學
   1.4 最少閱讀一本處境神學的重要著作
2 態度方面:
   2.1 對基督教信仰的開放性持正面態度
   2.2 更關心社會及世界
3 技巧方面:
   3.1 能初步以處境神學之方法分析社會、政治、文化、經典話題

課程內容:
1 定位
   1.1 甚麼是處境神學？
   1.2 信仰（福音）與政治之關係—以聖經詮釋例子
      1.2.1 意識型批判：對意識型態及結構性罪惡之批判：可12:42-44
      1.2.2 天國的政冶含意：天國、天國對被壓迫人的偏愛、對不公平之抗爭
         1.2.2.1 天國裡的人：可13:13-16等
         1.2.2.2 對公平的訴求：約八1-11
         1.2.2.3 天國之介入、耶穌之生死、救恩
      1.2.3 抗爭（resistance）：可1-4之政治建構的策略（後續專論）
      1.2.4 總論：新約聖經對政治（權力）的三種態度
   1.3 信仰（福音）與歷史及文化經驗
      1.3.1 以聖經詮釋的例子
         1.3.1.1 基督教福音的體現：以巴勒斯坦社會為例
         1.3.1.2 另類文化軌跡：以路13-50之女性為例
1.3.2 詮釋學與歷史文化經驗的糾結：以聖經權威為例
1.3.3 基督與文化的關聯類型
1.4 處境神學的歷史沿革
1.5 Stephen B. Bevans 的六個處境神學類型
1.6 從基督宗教進看基督宗教的多元現實

2 處境神學之實例 — 選讀
2.1 拉丁美洲之解放神學
2.2 後殖民神學
2.3 亞洲神學
2.4 香港歷史下的神學沉思
2.5 婦女神學
2.6 歐陸批判神學

3 處境神學—幾個系統神學考慮
3.1 耶穌論/基督論
3.2 上帝論
3.3 罪
3.4 教會論

評分：

1 閱讀報告 (40%) —
1.1 任選以下一本書

* Bevans’, Schreiter’s, and Bergmann’s are good entry points. If you prefer a more difficult one, Pears’ is a good choice. In case you want to focus more on Asian contextual theology, you may read Niles’, Kwan’s, and Chan’s.

1.2 字數 2000以上
1.3 交報告日期：最後一堂之後一星期
1.4 評分準則：請參看附頁

2 在家考試(60%) (評分準則：請參看附頁)

3 重要事項：
3.1 所有作業，必須直接交至 Blackboard 和 Veriguide 網頁，無須呈交紙版或電郵版。
3.2 有關學術著作誠信的要求，適用於本所有作業。請留意中大下開之告示：

請注意大學有關學術著作誠信的政策和規則，及適用於犯規事例的紀律指引和程序。詳情可瀏覽網：http://www.cuhk.edu.hk/policy/academichonesty/。學生遞交作業時，必須連同已簽署的聲明一併提交，表示他們知道有關政策、規則、指引及程序，如冒充他人編寫的，則同組內各學生均須簽署聲明，如作業以電腦製作，內容以文字為主，並經由大學「維誠」(VeriGuide) 系統提交者，學生將作業的電子檔案上載到系統後，便會獲得收據，收據上已列明有關聲明。未有夾附該收據的作業，老師將不予批閱。學生只須提交作業的最終版本。

主要書目：參看「閱讀報告」段

其他參考書目／文章：（請一併參見課堂講義的參考目錄）


關瑞文。 (2014)。 重讀中國本色化神學論述—一個後殖民主義的觀點。 載於陳國權、 周兆真 ( 編 )，《李景雄博士八十五華誕賀壽論文集》 ( 頁 121-144)。 香港：香港信義宗神學院。

關瑞文。 (2010)。 評 劉 小 楓 的 漢 語 基督 神 學 。 載 於 劉 秋 雪 及 楊 彰 燦 ( 編 ),《現代性.傳統變遷與漢語神學》 ( 上 冊 , 頁 29-41)。 上海：華東師範大學出版社。

最先刊於

關瑞文。 (1996)。 評 劉 小 楓 的 漢 語 基督 神學 。 載 於《漢語神學學刊》 ( 香 港： 漢 語基 督教文化研究所), 4, 220-239。

後再輯錄於

關瑞文。 (2000)。 評 劉 小 楓 的 漢 語 基督 神學 。 載 於《漢語神學學刊》 ( 頁 89-106)。 香港： 漢 語基 督教文化研究所。

關瑞文。 (1999)。 評 劉 小 楓 的 漢 語 基督 神學 。 載 於《基督教文化評論》 ( 9 期 , 頁 241-259)。 貴州： 貴州人民。

關瑞文。 (2009)。 從馬丁路德的思想觀照經濟全球化下的高等教育：以香港為案例。 載 於 陸 新 平 及 尹志偉 ( 編 ),《基督宗教研究》 ( 12 期 , 頁 360-377)。 北京： 宗教文化。

關瑞文。 (2007)。「聖經權威」：一個後批判的觀點。 載 於 劉 龍 光 、 鄭 炳 釗 、 張 修 幺 ( 編 ),《聖經的人生》 ( 頁 251-263)。 香港： 崇基學院神學院。

關瑞文。 (2005)。 仁愛和諧：基督教看家庭。 載 於 周 景 劍 ( 編 ),《香港六宗教領袖座談會 – 宗教信仰與和諧家庭》 ( 頁 11-16)。 香港：香港基督教協進會，香港六宗教領袖座談會。

關瑞文。 (2003)。 社會關懷、宣教、牧養。 劉 龍 光 ( 編 著 ),《愛你的鄰舍—教會社區工作理論與實踐》 ( 頁 101-120)。 台北：校園。

關瑞文。 (2003)。 亞洲神學。 載 於 郭 鴻 標 及 堵 建 偉 ( 編 ),《新世紀的神學議程》 ( 第 2 期 , 頁 385-404)。 香港：香港基督徒學會。

關瑞文。 (2002)。 亞洲神學。 載 於 郭 鴻 標 及 堵 建 偉 ( 編 ),《新世紀的神學議程》 ( 第 1 期 , 頁 229-288)。 香港：香港基督徒學會。

**Journal (Editor)**


**Assessment Rubrics for Book Review:** Please make sure that it is NOT only a reading REPORT, but a critical dialogue between you and the author.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization &amp; Presentation</strong></td>
<td>Review is very well organized, containing an introduction, body paragraphs, and conclusion. Paragraphs contain clear topic sentences, focus on a single issue, are coherent, and organized according to an obvious pattern of argument. Effective use of transitional expressions and other signposts that make the structure of the document clear. Student’s tone and diction enhance the argument being made about the text under review.</td>
<td>Review is well organized, containing an introduction, body paragraphs, and conclusion. All paragraphs contain topic sentences, focus on a single issue and are coherently structured. Some use of transitional expressions and other signposts that make the structure of the document clear. Student’s tone and diction are appropriate for the argument being made about the text under review.</td>
<td>Review has separate introduction, body paragraphs, and conclusion, but connections among these could be improved. Most paragraphs focus on a single topic and are coherently structured. Topic sentences signal structure of argument, but may require more focus. Transitions are present and help connect parts of argument. Student’s tone and diction are occasionally inappropriate for the target audience.</td>
<td>Distinction between introduction, body paragraphs, and conclusion is unclear. Paragraph structure needs improvement (some may be incomplete, or focus on too many issues, or be incoherent). Topic sentences do not effectively signal structure of argument or lack focus / clarity. More transitions are needed to develop argument. Student’s tone and diction are marginal. Paper is much longer or shorter than the assignment requirement.</td>
<td>General structure of review is difficult to follow, and/or student failed to follow the prescribed format. Paragraphs are unfocused, incoherent or require restructuring. Topic sentences are absent or unconnected to the paragraphs that follow. Transitions are absent or used incorrectly. Student’s tone and diction are inappropriate. Paper is unreasonably too long or too short.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weight 20.00%**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weight 20.00%</strong></td>
<td>Critically engage the thesis, ideas, assumptions behind the thesis and ideas, and the concepts advanced by the author. Meaningfully identify the contemporary and practical relevance of the work.</td>
<td>Critically engage the thesis, ideas, and the concepts advanced by the author. Identify the contemporary and practical relevance of the work.</td>
<td>Engage the thesis, ideas, and the concepts advanced by the author. Briefly touch upon the contemporary and practical relevance of the work.</td>
<td>Inadequately and superficially engage the thesis, ideas, and the concepts advanced by the author. Reflection includes mainly student's feelings toward the work and some learnings after reading the work.</td>
<td>Do not engage the thesis, ideas, and the concepts advanced by the author. Simply accept what the author says. Reflection include mainly student's feelings toward the work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Criticality and Reflectiveness | In arguing for or against the work, student remains outstandingly logical, mobilizes relevant evidence to support his/her arguments, connects individual arguments clearly and organically, arrives at conclusions that are logically derived from the arguments, commits no logical fallacies. | In arguing for or against the work, student remains logical, mobilizes evidence to support his/her arguments, tries to connect individual arguments, arrives at conclusions that are logically derived from the arguments, commits only a few logical fallacies. | In evaluating the work, student tries to be logical, to substantiate his/her judgments, arrives at conclusions that are not forcefully argued. | In evaluating the work, student remains assertive, showing only limited awareness of the need to argue for his/her opinions. | In evaluating the work, student remains very assertive without showing an attempt to argue for his/her opinions. |

| **Weight 20.00%**  | Argumentativeness | Argumentativeness | Argumentativeness | Argumentativeness | Argumentativeness |
### Assessment Rubrics for Take Home Examination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th><strong>Excellent</strong></th>
<th><strong>Good</strong></th>
<th><strong>Fair</strong></th>
<th><strong>Poor/Inadequate</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction/Thesis (10%)</strong></td>
<td>- exceptional introduction that grabs interest of reader and states topic.</td>
<td>- proficient introduction that is interesting and states topic.</td>
<td>- basic introduction that states topic but lacks interest.</td>
<td>- weak or no introduction of topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- thesis is exceptionally clear, arguable, well-developed, and a definitive statement.</td>
<td>- thesis is clear and arguable statement of position.</td>
<td>- thesis is somewhat clear and arguable.</td>
<td>- paper’s purpose is unclear/thesis is weak or missing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Design /Quality of Information (30%)</strong></td>
<td>- makes in-depth synthesis of thoughtfully connections between what is learned/observed from outside experiences/observations and the topic.</td>
<td>- makes general connections between what is learned/observed from outside experiences/observations and the topic.</td>
<td>- identify some general ideas or issues from outside experiences/observations related to the topic.</td>
<td>- weak to relate the outside experiences/observations and the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- information clearly relates to the thesis.</td>
<td>- information relates to the main topic.</td>
<td>- information relates to the main topic, few details and/or examples are given.</td>
<td>- information has little or nothing to do with the thesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- paper is exceptionally researched and extremely detailed.</td>
<td>- paper is well-researched in detail and from a variety of sources.</td>
<td>- shows a limited variety of sources.</td>
<td>- illogical with little evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support of Thesis/Analysis (30%)</strong></td>
<td>- exceptionally critical, relevant and consistent connections made between evidence and thesis.</td>
<td>- consistent connections made between evidence and thesis</td>
<td>- some connections made between evidence and thesis.</td>
<td>- limited or no connections made between evidence and thesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- excellent analysis.</td>
<td>- good analysis.</td>
<td>- some analysis.</td>
<td>- lack of analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusion (10%)</strong></td>
<td>- excellent summary of topic with concluding ideas that impact reader.</td>
<td>- good summary of topic with clear concluding ideas.</td>
<td>- basic summary of topic with some final concluding ideas.</td>
<td>- lack of summary of topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- introduces no new information.</td>
<td>- introduces no new information.</td>
<td>- introduces no new information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization/Development of Thesis (10%)</strong></td>
<td>- exceptionally clear, logical, mature, and thorough development of thesis with excellent transitions between and within paragraphs.</td>
<td>- clear and logical order that supports thesis with good transitions between and within paragraphs.</td>
<td>- somewhat clear and logical development with basic transitions between and within paragraphs.</td>
<td>- lacks development of ideas with weak or no transitions between and within paragraphs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citation/Bibliography Format (10%)</strong></td>
<td>- conforms to academic rules for formatting and citation of sources are perfect.</td>
<td>- conforms to academic rules for formatting and citation of sources with minor exceptions.</td>
<td>- frequent errors in academic format.</td>
<td>- lack of academic format/numerous errors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>