

田立克《系統神學》之歷史如何終結—中華神學資源再探索

徐濟時

引言：筆者（下稱本人）曾撰首文〈田立克《系統神學》之述介與簡評 - 中華神學資源探索〉，細論這三冊裝共五部分名著的開書一系列「總介紹」。本人提到會為該書結束的第五部分，另文討論。（參首文的標題 13）因為，這上世紀作品面對二戰後世局動盪，含有對世界終結的獨到神學關注，就是該書的第五部分「歷史與神國」(History and the Kingdom of God)，乃論到生命／生活延展成「人生歷史」的存在上諸問題，和神國予以的答案。第五部分的「神國」作為獨立於該書第一部分方法論的「理性與啟示」(REASON AND REVELATION)、第二部分「存有與父神」(BEING AND GOD)、第三部分「存在與基督」(EXISTENCE AND THE CHRIST)、第四部分「生命與聖靈」(LIFE AND THE SPIRIT)（第二至四部分「三一神學」是全書主體）。¹ 田氏在這最後第五部分提出「歷史」終結於神國全實現、也終於神學全結束，內容豐富，甚值得後人察識。² 本人有需要先行交代，因他這經典有很龐大的分層分點討論，而本文是用探索中華神學的資源為出發點來理解，所以不是作綜合或撮述，而是作合乎己用的選取，然而這亦覆蓋第五部分大多數課題。要關注的是，田氏的母語和思考是德國語文，直至他近五十歲往美國教神學，才轉向英美語文從事學術工作，因此必含「德體英用」如我們「西體中用」的困難問題；這本《系統神學》實披戴當時盛極於西方的「德式神學」，研究者不能忽略、但要超越這方面。本文沿用前文的模式，即是注腳往包括論述的原文（不加引號），以供研究者掌握第一手資料。

田氏為其《系統神學》的第五部分（在第三冊，下稱系 3/V3）先作介紹，稱著作的第二部分論聖父、第三部分論聖子、第四部分論聖靈，皆成終於第五部分，所論的就是延伸第四部分進入生活的層次而成為他解說的「歷史」³，這引申出三方面：聖靈臨在(Spiritual Presence)、神國(Kingdom of God)和永生(Eternal Life)。(297 頁，系 3) 神國處於兩者中間，成為他先要論述的內容，下詳。

第一章：歷史中尋覓神國 (HISTORY AND THE QUEST FOR THE KINGDOM OF GOD)

論到歷史本身的大學問，田氏基於其治史觀，先稱歷史是沒有「裸史」(naked facts)這一回事，因為歷史的發生和從中的解讀是不可分割的。⁴ 歷史的維度(historical dimension)是主觀和客觀

¹第一冊的「總介紹」透露田氏如何作這第五部分的「佈局」：life has a dimension which is called "history." And it is helpful to separate the material dealing with the historical aspect of life from the part dealing with life generally. This corresponds to the fact that the symbol "Kingdom of God" is independent of the trinitarian structure which determines the central parts. **This part of the system must give an analysis of man's historical existence (in unity with the nature of the historical generally) and of the questions implied in the ambiguities of history; and it must give an answer which is the Kingdom of God.** (p.67, V1)

²田氏在本書重視歷史，而筆者的《一國兩制圓宗局》（2018 年）另提出「經文釋義配合後歷史驗證」(exegesis in historical verification) 的方法論（該書 384 頁），以致今後神學開發上，亦能「大用」歷史。

³田氏對「歷史」分作多層次多向度的討論：A theological discussion of history must, in view of its particular question, deal with the structure of historical processes, the logic of historical knowledge, the ambiguities of historical existence, the meaning of the historical movement. **It must also relate all this to the symbol of the Kingdom of God, both in its inner-historical and in its trans historical sense.** (p.298, V3)

⁴ There is no history without factual occurrences, and there is no history without the reception and interpretation

的聯合，每一歷史事件必定包含事實和解釋在其中。⁵

田氏認為，歷史有前歷史(*prehistory*)和後歷史(*post history*)之分，他對前者舉例為亞當活在伊甸樂園，而對後者指涉到烏托邦式（完美的）意念—歷史中人類到達最後階段就是神國實現在地上。⁶ 然而，田氏斷定這一歷史終局，連耶穌也不知道何時來到；如此就容讓人類歷史的未來，開放予當下經驗發展出種種可能性。⁷ 本人認為這一式「神開放歷史觀」與另一式「神主導歷史觀」，構成張力，但不一定相衝，在乎各自推至哪一程度的「極端」。

曾經兩次大戰和冷戰的田氏，有這一番歷史洞見：雖然每個人是在面向社群其他人，從而實現自己這個人；然而在歷史層次方面，群體(*groups*)而非個人(*individuals*)，才是直接的歷史持份者。因為，「個體人」需要擁靠一中心權力令彼此聯成一群體，從而保住自身力量以面對其他相近力量的群體。透過立法施政和武裝力量的權柄(*authority*)、亦透過保住自己擁有權力的工具，雙方在位者以力對力相逢。這就是現代語境下所稱的「國家」互動，因而歷史實是諸國家的歷史(*history of states*)。歷史的影響力，可以透過經濟、文化和宗教的群眾和運動，在一國中或跨國下多方踐現。⁸

這一種像亞伯拉罕蒙召往外的使命，往往各以表徵／象徵形容 (*symbolic expression*)，成為一眾國家的使命意識(*vocational consciousness*)。在古文明大國如中國、印度等，皆有不同形態的表徵存在之。田氏認為其意涵於古希臘就是將希臘人和野蠻人分別出來，於古羅馬就是高舉羅馬法律的優越性，於大英帝國就是臣服其領土子民接受基督教人文主義(*Christian humanism*)及基督教文明(*Christian civilization*)，於俄羅斯就是以正教傳統或馬克思預言救離於西方，於美國就是堅信能勝過舊世界的咒詛而展開新生和實現對外民主宣教(*democratic missionary*)及自由(*liberty*)。
(310-340 頁，系 3)

田氏親歷第一次世界大戰的前線戰事和第二次大戰前納粹的脅迫，餘生「投奔」上述所稱許的民

of factual occurrences by historical consciousness. (p.302, V3) / 田氏稍後專論歷史的解釋時再說：**Every legend, every chronicle, every report of past events, every scholarly historical work, contains interpreted history**..... It includes the selection of facts according to the criterion of importance, the valuation of causal dependences, the image of personal and communal structures, a theory of motivation in individuals, groups, and masses, a social and political philosophy,..... (p.348, V3)

⁵ Human history, as the semantic study of the implications of the term *historia* has shown, is always a union of objective and subjective elements. An "event" is a syndrome (i.e., a running-together) of facts and interpretation. (p.302, V3)

⁶ The significance of this question lies in its relation to utopian ideas with respect to the future of mankind. The last stage of historical man has been identified with the final stage of fulfillment with the Kingdom of God actualized on earth. (p.307, V3)

⁷ Not even Jesus knows when the end will come..... This leaves **the future of historical mankind open for possibilities derived from present experience.** (p.308, V3)

⁸ the fact that the direct bearers of history are groups rather than individuals, who are only indirect bearers..... They must have a centered power which is able to keep the individuals who belong to it united and which is able to preserve its power in the encounter with similar power groups. In order to fulfill the first condition a history-bearing group must have a central, law giving, administering, and enforcing authority. In order to fulfill the second condition a history-bearing group must have tools to keep itself in power in the encounter with other powers. Both conditions are fulfilled in what is called, in modern terminology, a "state," and in this sense **history is the history of states**..... historical influence can be exercised in many ways by economical, cultural, or religious groups and movements that work within a state or that cut across many states. (p.308-309, V3)

主自由美國。因此，可以理解他會肯定（未擁抱，後詳）美式民主的正面價值，尤其是保障中央式歷史群體（國家）之內「個人以創造性自由決定歷史進程」這方面。⁹ 相對於個人，歷史中連綿出現帝國(empires)這種權力結構(power structure)，就是大歷史下個人或社團無從迴避的悲愴意含。¹⁰

田氏認為有一定意義的是，聖經表達歷史的意思是用上政治性表徵，乃是「神國」而不是「聖靈的生命」或「經濟的豐盛」。這一個指向政治領域的核心元素，為歷史的終極目的帶來充分性象徵。¹¹ 然而，田氏在這方面點到即止，沒有接續解讀下去。他只聚焦詳論「人國」所衍生的歷史矛盾和其中的哲學延伸意義，不贅。（參 313-339 頁，系 3）

田氏指出影響西方和共產主義至大的黑格爾的歷史觀，有不足之處，就是沒有理順「除舊」的一面；田氏指出歷史的偉大在於不斷邁向「立新」，而這種「新」具有含糊性亦成為歷史的悲劇性格。這現象反映在兩代之間，新一代為求「新」，往往無視「舊（建制）」也是推陳（舊）出新 (disregard the creative processes out of which the old has arisen)，才有今天；「舊」的代理人，看得見新一代拆除其曾艱辛取得偉大的創新(creative past)，但看不到他們會成為新一代創新的絆腳石。為此田氏指稱，每一個政治行動必是邁向一些新意，但有別的是，這「新」是為了新（人）或是為了舊（人）。（343 頁，系 3）

這新與舊的歷史衝突，若任何一方視己所求為終極至上，就會進入極度破壞性階段(most destructive stage)。這情況不單在政治方面，在宗教領域更為直接；就是神聖的「舊」和先知的「新」這雙方的衝突，發展至全面毀滅性的宗教戰爭和宗教迫害。¹² 本人深信大半生在歐洲度過的田氏，必由各處歷史遺蹟和國民教育察識世俗和宗教戰爭的深廣禍害，其中最慘烈的「三十年戰爭」（1618-1648）這一場政教混合之戰，使歐洲死去近半男性、戰後德國失去三分二人口，歐洲諸國至此才願去除「政教合一」這舊制度。歷史功課的代價何其大。（拙作《一國兩制圓宗局》240 頁，注 15）

自奧古斯丁解釋的歷史，被定調一個方向：末後的日子，乃是在基督教會的基礎上開展。他使歷史出現這方面的含糊(ambiguity)，導致一種古典的表述：羅馬（天主）教會自命為體現那末世異象中基督在地上千禧年的統治。田氏嚴厲地對待此種自我解讀，評這特點為既屬上帝又屬鬼魔

⁹ democracy is not an absolute political system, but it is the best way discovered so far to guarantee the creative freedom of determining the historical process to everyone within a centered historical group. (p.347,V3)

¹⁰ No individual and no group can avoid the dynamics of history in order to avoid the tragic implications of the greatness of history as it is expressed in the symbol of empire. (P.341, V3) 田氏補充帝國可以出現對個人的「高度控制」或「助長自由」這兩種反向：There are two contradictory tendencies, the one toward a totalitarian control of the life of everyone who belongs to a history-bearing and especially to an imperial group (only the dictatorial elite or the dictator alone is free to act historically), the other toward the personal freedom that fosters creativity. (p.342, V3)

¹¹ It is significant that **the symbol in which the Bible expresses the meaning of history is political**: "Kingdom of God," and not "Life of the Spirit" or "economic abundance." The element of centeredness which characterizes the political realm makes it an adequate symbol for the ultimate aim of history. (p.311, V3)

¹² The struggle between the sacred old and the prophetic new is a central theme of the history of religions..... these conflicts reach an all-surpassing destructiveness in religious wars and persecutions. (p.344, V3)

(both its divine and its demonic traits)。(345 頁，系 3)；他追索出這樣一條路徑：猶太人先作這方面使命的自我解讀，正如在先知文學所見，就是耶和華所建立的統治遍及普世所有國家。¹³ 到了第一世紀基督教開展，這一解讀進至人生全領域(all realms)的神國觀、直至奧古斯丁起教會在帝國支持下的得勢自大。¹⁴

歷史發展到十六世紀宗教改革，正統信義宗(orthodox Lutheranism)出現以下一種田氏稱為的**超越歷史觀(transcendental interpretation of history)**：神國的公義和權力載體的公義，兩者之間分離沒有交集，小教派的烏托邦和加爾文的神權政治的歷史解讀，皆被排斥。企圖以革命改變腐敗的政治系統是違背神旨意，因神仍會護佑保守一切，這足以反映在日後中歐、東歐的封建時期。¹⁵ 但來自這一政教背景的田氏，對此不敢苟同。他認為不該分離 (contrasts) 創造領域和救贖領域而至對立；權力本是受造為美好(created goodness)，並成為生活最基本構成的一個元素。(356 頁，系 3) 他如此總結：「這超越式史觀，將神國表徵為一個不動、超越自然的秩序，只予個人死後進入，大大失去那由聖經表徵的如我們以主禱文祈求那動態權能降臨地上(願祢的國降臨)、以抗衡那滲進教會內和帝國中屬鬼魔的權能。這史觀使神國如此失勢，導致文化被排除於歷史中被拯救行列。」¹⁶

至此，田氏帶領我們進到「以神國答為歷史之意含」的核心討論。在開首提到「歷史」可引申出三方面：聖靈臨在(Spiritual Presence)、神國(Kingdom of God)和永生(Eternal Life)，位處中間的神國既是前者的彰顯，亦是後者的等同。田氏聲稱這雙互性質的神國成為基督教思想一個最重要和最難為的表徵，也成為對政治和教會的絕對主義一個最具評斷的象徵。¹⁷ 他從歷史神學分析出「神國不單在高舉禮儀的兩個大公教會被邊緣化，亦在現今(按：上世紀中段)的社會福音運動、宗教式社會主義下被半陷世俗化，神國這象徵再次失去力量。這情況顯得突異，因為耶穌開始其傳道的信息就是天國近了，而基督教代表性主禱文是祈求神國降臨，神國本是備受重視。」

18

¹³ the Jewish vocational self-interpretation, as given in the prophetic literature, sees such a key in the establishment of the rule of Yahweh over the nations of the world. (p.349, V3)

¹⁴ In terms of the symbol of the Kingdom of God, this means that "Kingdom" includes life in all realms, or that everything that participates in the striving toward the inner aim of history: fulfillment or ultimate sublimation. (p.350, V3)

¹⁵ There is no relation between the justice of the Kingdom of God and the justice of power structures. The two worlds are separated by an unbridgeable gap. Sectarian utopian and Calvinistic theocratic interpretations of history are rejected. **Revolutionary attempts to change a corrupt political system contradict God's will as expressed in his providential action.** (p.355, V3)

¹⁶ 原文： "this view interprets the symbol of the Kingdom of God as a static supranatural order into which individuals enter after their death instead of understanding the symbol, with the biblical writers, as a dynamic power on earth for the coming of which we pray in the Lord's Prayer and which, according to biblical thought, is struggling with the demonic forces which are powerful in churches as well as empires..... it excludes culture as well as nature from the saving processes in history." (p.356, V3)

¹⁷ In the former quality it is manifest through the Spiritual Presence; in the latter it is identical with Eternal Life. **This double quality of the Kingdom of God makes it a most important and most difficult symbol of Christian thought** and even more-one of the most critical for both political and ecclesiastical absolutism. (p.357, V3)

¹⁸原文： "the sacramental emphasis of the two Catholic churches has pushed the symbol aside, and today, after its use (and partial secularization) by the social gospel movement and some forms of religious socialism, the symbol has again lost in power. This is remarkable in view of the fact that the preaching of Jesus started with the message of the 'Kingdom of Heaven at hand' and that Christianity prays for its coming in every Lord's Prayer." (p.357, V3)

有趣的是，田氏分析亞洲宗教中特別是佛教，其中的「涅槃」(Nirvana) 象徵，就能與「神國」這一象徵，構成終極論述的明顯不同性。¹⁹ 本人認為田氏這一種對今生之後的分析，有助中國兩個人數最多的宗教基督教和佛教、加強宗教比較的研究，這對於護教和傳教皆有裨益。

論到神國的含意(connotation)和特性(characteristic)，田氏分為四方面論述：第一是政治性，神國不是實實在在地上的掌權統治，而是一個天上的掌控力量(尤其能勝過比以色列人強大的敵人)，後至兩約時期猶太教與新約，此種神性掌權成為一個轉化的天和地、一個歷史的新時期。²⁰ 神作為「王」不是以憲制性形相出現，而是以至聖至高的質體成為世上政治的掌控中心。(詳參注)
21

第二是社會性，神國展現在和平的領域，而這種社會性與聖潔公義連結起來，作為無條件的道德命令。²² 第三是個人性，神國給予的永遠是歸於個別的人。²³ 第四是宇宙性，保羅神學指向神成為一切的一切(God being all in all)，基督將歷史的掌控歸給神，使歷史達成其終結目的。(358-359 頁，系 3)

以上四方面，論說「神國」在歷史之中(immanent side)和在歷史之上(transcend side)。田氏提出這兩方面特性，詳加發揮在下一章。

第二章：神國在歷史中彰顯 (THE KINGDOM OF GOD WITHIN HISTORY)

田氏重返第五部分第一章開始時提出的「歷史」可引申出三方面，本章才闡釋第一方面「聖靈臨在」(Spiritual Presence，下詳)。他以此補充剛討論完第二方面的神國(Kingdom of God)。至於第三方面的永生(Eternal Life)，在第三章才論到。這個二一三次序是其書寫的佈局。

論到神國中「歷史與靈裏新生命(new being)」，田氏引入西方神學常用的救恩史(Heilsgeschichte)這個德文作出概述。救恩擁抱啟示，啟示指出真理如何在這救恩中彰顯。因此，救恩史也可稱為

¹⁹ there is no other symbol in Christianity which points to the ultimate source of the differences as clearly as the symbol "Kingdom of God," especially when it is contrasted with the symbol "Nirvana." (p.357, V3)

²⁰ 以下是田氏從舊約發展至啟示錄對神國的一個綜合描述："It is Yahweh who wins the battle against enemies infinitely superior in numbers and power to Israel. It is God's holy mountain that, in spite of its geographical insignificance, will be the place to which all nations come to worship..... The peace between the nations includes nature, so that the most hostile species of animals will live peacefully beside each other. This was most impressive in the so-called apocalyptic literature of the intertestamental period..... The earth has become old, and demonic powers have taken possession of it. Wars, disease, and natural catastrophes of a cosmic character will precede the rebirth of all things and the new eon in which God will finally become the ruler of the nations and in which the prophetic hopes will be fulfilled..... The divine mediator is no longer the historical Messiah, but the Son of Man, the Heavenly Man. This interpretation of history was decisive for the New Testament. Inner-historical-political aims within the Roman empire were beyond reach." (p.359-360, V3)

²¹ **The word "king" in this and many other symbolizations of the divine majesty does not introduce a special constitutional form into the symbol material, against which other constitutional forms, such as that of a democracy, must react; for "king" (in contrast to other forms of rule) has since earliest times been a symbol in its own right for the highest and most consecrated center of political control.** (p.358, V3)

²² the social element in the symbol is a permanent reminder that there is no holiness without the holy of what ought to be, the unconditional moral imperative of justice. (p.358, V3)

²³ The transhistorical aim toward which history runs is not the extinction but the fulfillment of humanity in every human individual. (p.358, V3)

神聖史(sacred history)。再者，當那裏有神國的彰顯，那裏就有啟示和救恩。田氏稱這與啟示、救恩連結的神國是：耶穌成為基督進入歷史並成為歷史的中心(center of history)。(362-364 頁，系 3)

在啟示和救恩的歷史預備期，惟一有漸進性元素的就是「從未成熟進到成熟」(from immaturity to maturity)，這一種成熟過程其中最為需要的，是舊約彰顯的神國預備基督作為最後啟示的出現。基於此，田氏認為以色列人出埃及這個主題，就是邁向歷史中心的成熟化進程(maturation toward the center)；所有宣教活動也須跟隨舊約的先知式潔淨的宗教察識(religious consciousness)。他隨即舉出這成熟化進程正是今天（按：二戰之後）日本身處的東西相遇，也是現代西方文化在過去五百年發展的主題。本人認為他沒有為此說法提出理據，以日本和西方的歷史解釋他的「成熟」觀、與「出埃及」事件相提並論，如斯歷史解釋頗為天馬行空。(365 頁，系 3)

「神國是耶穌成為基督並成為歷史的中心」這一核心命題（按：在基督宗教頗具一致共識），田氏舉出宗教史中猶太教、回教和佛教逐一比較，觀點獨特，茲引如下：
猶太教視民族出埃及之後，諸先知和末世文學的期望沒有實現（相對基督教認為已經實現於基督），因此「出埃及」之後一直沒有新的歷史中心，對於猶太教未來不再有中心而只有終結。基督教和猶太教對歷史的解釋，就此出現無從跨越的鴻溝。²⁴

早出於基督教的猶太教、後出於基督教的回教，皆難以接受耶穌是基督（教名由此出）且是歷史的中心。此兩教不曾有、不能有另一個中心，可見於下：「穆罕默德成為先知，不會憲構出一個事件從中歷史獲取一個宇宙性確立的意思，因為回教的宇宙普世性仍未從其具體特殊性釋放出來。」²⁵ 「佛教更不是在上述處境之下，因其史觀是屬非歷史性解釋(nonhistorical interpretation of history)。佛陀／佛(Buddha)不是過去和未來的分水嶺人物；他是身蒙光啟而這可發生於過去未來任何時間，他不是一個歷史運動的創始成終者。」²⁶

相對於回佛的創教人物，「耶穌降世且（證）為基督是一個歷史事件，從中歷史變成具有自身的意識和意思。」²⁷ 田氏雖然指基督降世是如四福音所說「到了時候」這一個命定性，但他持定歷史具開放性未來(openness of history toward the future)，而不同意歷史含貫設性設計(consistent design)。(373 頁，系 3) 田氏所言，似是呼應上章開始提出的中央式歷史群體（國家）之內，仍

²⁴ 原文：“The prophetic and apocalyptic expectations of Judaism remain expectations and do not lead to an inner-historical fulfillment as in Christianity. Therefore no new center of history after the Exodus is seen, and the future, center is not center but end. At this point the fundamental and unbridgeable gap between Jewish and Christian interpretations of history appears.” (p.368, V3)

²⁵ 原文：“The appearance of Mohammed as the prophet does not constitute an event in which history receives a meaning which is universally valid. Nor is a universal center of history provided by the foundation of a nation which, in the sense in which the prophets interpreted it, is the “elected” nation. And this is so because its universality has not yet been liberated from its particularity.” (p.368, V3)

²⁶ 原文：“Buddha is not for the Buddhist a dividing line between before and after. He is the decisive example of an embodiment of the Spirit of Illumination which has happened and can happen at any time, but he is not seen in a historical movement which leads to him and is derived from him.” (p.368, V3)

²⁷ 原文：“The appearance of Jesus as the Christ is the historical event in which history becomes aware of itself and its meaning.” (p.368-369, V3)

有空間予「個人以創造性自由決定歷史進程」，意即神掌管的歷史是奇妙地能容個人「改變」的歷史。

田氏接着分述「神國與教會」和「神國與世史」這兩大領域。

田氏曾在第四部分論到教會教義（162-247 頁，378-384 頁，系 3），他在此再說：教會（按：此字複數應指堂會）是神國的代表(representatives) 而合成為一個屬靈社群 (Spiritual Community)，但同時堂會也有其矛盾(paradoxical)一面，就是堂會也可以成為代表鬼魔的國度(churches may even represent the demonic kingdom)。²⁸ 本人認為田氏用字引起驚訝，但實指堂會中人會受試探而犯罪，讓那惡者得逞(如教牧性失德時有發生)。

這方面的矛盾，亦可從教會史不同階段的宗派「自以為是」²⁹ 得見，田氏強調：教會歷史不能等同於神國，但亦不能說沒有將神國彰顯(manifestation)，惟有那教會（堂會）不認耶穌是基督才是止步的基督教會(has ceased to be a manifest Christian church)。但二千年來教會歷史出現的瀆職(profanization)，即世俗化和禮儀化，前者多出現在更正教、後者多出現在天主教，反映出唯我獨尊（自以為是）下對「耶穌是基督」的各自引申和彼此對質。（378-379 頁，系 3）

此外，更正教將神職人員(priest)還俗(layman)，嘗試指出神聖(holy)不是受限於地方、聖秩(orders)和功能，但在這非神聖化做法中，難免使基督教文化步入完全世俗化。田氏慨嘆於早期神學有能力吸納希羅文化的世俗創見，透過斯多亞主義的哲道 (Stoic Logos) 訂定教義，將古代文化成為素材來建立普世教會，這在原則上即包括所有人類文化中創新的正面元素。但現代西方文化中這世俗世界，已從其母體聯合中分裂出來。³⁰ 本人認為田氏這一種歷史觀是隱含「西方中心主

²⁸田氏毫不客氣先後指出教會的失陷：the churches share actively both in the running of historical time toward the aim of history and in the inner-historical struggle of the Kingdom of God against the forces of demonization and profanization that fight against this aim. p.375, vol.3 / (the churches) they are profane and sublime, demonic and divine, in a paradoxical unity. p.377, vol.3 / There is one line of demonization in Christianity, from the first persecution of heretics immediately after the elevation of Christianity to the position of state religion of the Roman empire, through formulas of condemnation in the declarations of the great councils, through wars of extirpation against medieval sects and the principles of the inquisition, through the tyranny of Protestant orthodoxy, the fanaticism of its sects, and the stubbornness of fundamentalism, to the declaration of the infallibility of the pope. (p.381, V3) 本人補充：其實在 1646 年的《威斯敏斯特信仰宣言》第廿五章 論教會的第五點，已稱「天下再純正的教會也難免會有混雜和錯謬。有些教會簡直不是基督的教會，腐敗到一個地步，反倒成為撒但的會堂。」(The purest Churches under heaven are subject both to mixture and error: and some have so degenerated, as to become no Churches of Christ, but synagogues of Satan.)。

²⁹ The Anglican churches are inclined to elevate the first five hundred years of church history to superiority over the other periods and to elevate themselves because of their similarity to the early church to superiority over the other churches. The Roman church attributes unrestricted absoluteness to itself in all periods. The Greek Orthodox churches derive their claim to superiority from the first seven ecumenical councils with which they live in an essentially unbroken tradition. The Protestant churches could make similar claims if they considered the history between the apostolic age and the Reformation as a period in which the church was only latent (as it is in Judaism and paganism). p.378, vol.3 / One thing is obvious: one cannot call church history “sacred history” or a “history of salvation.” Sacred history is in church history but is not limited to it, and sacred history is not only manifest in but also hidden by church history. Nevertheless, church history has one quality which no other history has: since it relates itself in all its periods and appearances to the central manifestation of the Kingdom of God in history, it has in itself the ultimate criterion against itself—the New Being in Jesus as the Christ. (p.381, V3)

³⁰ In so doing, however, it does not escape the tendency to dissolve the holy into the secular and to pave the way for a total secularization of Christian culture, whether it is by moralism, intellectualism, or nationalism..... Early theology was

義」，懷緬西方教會史的優越傳統與其不幸的現代失落，未有指出早期神學的建構過程，顯然受到希臘哲學的影響走向形而上學化，忽略形而下的倫理實踐方面（這批評已有西方近代知名學者提出）。這恰好在田氏他這一套系統神學廣談「形而上」的內容，折射出他的倫理關注欠奉（可參本中心《研究季報》02 期拙文〈當代西方神學家的生命問題〉論到田氏的倫理失守）。神國在人類歷史以至其代表的教會中，確實陷入很多掙扎困難，但神國仍然不失制勝、不斷苦勝。至於「神國與世史」的另一領域，教會史作為神國的代表，也是世界史一部分，甚至存有各式屬世的結構和特徵於其中。³¹ 當教會從政治權力退台，不論天主教或更正教，先遭受其自身的誠信(honesty)審判，才輪到其具甚麼資格審判別人。³²

過去二千年的西方世界史，被教會推動轉化，尤其在人與人的關係帶來最基本改變。田氏聲稱：教會史影響世界史主要在於促成「良心不安」，基督教文明不是神國而是神國在其中的不斷提醒。³³ 本人認為這一分析意義重大，因為神國作為一個人類「上空」的掌控力量，其對世界歷史（包括教會史在其中），是以國度中所有真理不斷提醒世人的良心，不只限於政權的良心。教會（堂會）不適合自我提升至神國的地位來審判世界，其也要、甚至先要被真理審判自己。

至此，田氏進一步論到神國與權力的關係方面。神作為權力的存在本體是所有權力之源。在聖經，權力表徵於上帝、基督或教會皆是豐富的，聖靈則是權力和意涵的動態結合(dynamic unity)。神和神國永恆地施行 (exercise) 這權力。(385 頁，系 3) 他特別指出：政治態勢和政治建制的民主化，雖然有用於抵抗權力中拆毀性意含，但若將神國等同民主的制度，就是完全錯誤。這是很多人的混淆，以致將民主理念提升至直屬於宗教性象徵，以至將它取代神國。因此，眾教會必須判斷(judge)任何政治性行動和理論，這種判斷，對於權力政治(power politics)不應是權力的反對、而應是權力的肯定，甚至是當正義受損時(justice is violated)履行權力的必須。田氏指教會這一種先知祭司式的功能，不是控制政治權力和以神國名義迫出某種具體的解決；在歷史中神國不是在遇上中央性權力體時、例如國家，作出權力的否定。³⁴

able to absorb the secular creation of Hellenistic-Roman culture. Through the Stoic Logos-doctrine, it used the ancient civilization as material for building up the universal church, which in principle includes all positive elements in man's cultural creativity. The question then arises as to why a secular world broke away from this union in modern Western civilization. (p.380, V3)

³¹ The history of the churches shows all the characteristics of the history of the world, that is, all the ambiguities of social self-integration, self-creativity, and self-transcendence. The churches in these respects are the world. They would not exist without structures of power, of growth, of sublimation, and the ambiguities implied in these structures. (p.382, V3)

³² The judgment of a Protestant group against communism may be equally as justified and equally as questionable as that of the Catholic group. But it can have undergone the test of its honesty, this test being that it has first brought judgment against the churches themselves, even in their basic structure; and this is a test which the Roman church would never be able to undergo. (p.383, V3)

³³ the main impact of church history on world history is that it produces an uneasy conscience in those who have received the impact of the New Being but follow the ways of the old being. Christian civilization is not the Kingdom of God, but it is a continuous reminder of it. (p.384, V3)

³⁴ In so far as democratization of political attitudes and institutions serves to resist the destructive implications of power, it is a manifestation of the Kingdom of God in history. But it would be completely wrong to identify democratic institutions with the Kingdom of God in history. This confusion, in the minds of many people, has elevated the idea of democracy to the place of a direct religious symbol and has simply substituted it for the symbol "Kingdom of God."..... churches must judge political actions and theories. Their judgment against power politics should not be a rejection of power but an affirmation of power and even of its compulsory element in cases where justice is violated..... it is not their function to control the political powers and force upon them particular solutions in the name of the Kingdom of God.....

上述論述帶出一些有趣的現象，田氏身為德國信義宗背景的牧師，保持「兩國論」下國家權力的肯定這一想法不出為奇。然而，他面對納粹德國的民主扭曲和壓迫，移居「民主聖地」美國，於上世紀五十年代正值美蘇兩大集團的冷戰形成之際，他貴為美國頂級神學家竟不擁護「民主至上」的意識形態（甚至傾向撥冷水），倒是值得普遍贊成民主的基督徒加以深思。

田氏續說：「眾教會將會失去其屬靈群體的代表性，如果他們以軍事或經濟的武器作為工具來傳播基督的信息……教會應該支持團體或個人代表「神國的和平」，而拒絕參與任何看為必要的權力鬥爭，和願意承受從所屬和得保護的政權而來無可迴避的反應。」³⁵ 田氏此言是否對堅持信仰受到的逼迫、或對宣教史迹的評論、或對美蘇冷戰的回應，他並無說明，誠屬可惜。

田氏將民主和神國採取一種獨特的結合觀：「民主機制的本性，在涉及政治中央與政治成長之間產生的問題，就要嘗試聯結衝突雙方—來自舊的傳統一方和新的革命一方—各持的真理。在力求合一下以合法途徑移除一個政府，若能以成功，就代表神國在歷史中的勝利，因為它戰勝彼此的分裂。」³⁶

對西方教會（按：政教結合的處境）而言，神國在世界歷史的作為，就是對通常站在傳統保守一方的宗教（包括基督教），以先知的精神多予挑戰。當屬靈能力帶來屬靈革命，一方就會轉向另一方。但日後它又會累積成一種保守性，直至下一次的革命再現。這就是神國有韻律地在歷史中作出歷史移動之奇工(This rhythm of the dynamics of history is the way in which the Kingdom of God works in history)。(389-390 頁，系 3)

那麼，個人在歷史中又與神國建立怎樣的關係呢？田氏嘗試糾正一種不少人嚮往的超越式信仰生活，他認為個人把自己從歷史中抽身出來不是一種神國的勝利。因為超越(transcendent)的實在本是在歷史之內(inner-historical)進行超越，就是在參與神國在歷史中的掙扎並從中超越。因為沒有人的命運是不會受歷史狀況影響的，個人命運及歷史要求其作犧牲是與其參與歷史的程度成正比。³⁷ 田氏至終肯定：個人投身參與歷史的存在，就能獲得終極意義。³⁸

the Kingdom of God in history does not imply the denial of power in the encounter of centered political groups, for example, nations. (p.385-386, V3)

³⁵原文：“But certainly it is the way of the churches as representatives of the Spiritual Community. They would lose their representative character if they used military or economic weapons as tools for spreading the message of the Christ…… to represent the “Peace of the Kingdom of God” by refusing to participate in the compulsory element of power struggles and who are willing to bear the unavoidable reactions by the political powers to which they belong and by which they are protected.” (p.388, V3)

³⁶ 原文：“It is the nature of democratic institutions, in relation to questions of political centeredness and of political growth, that they try to unite the truth of the two conflicting sides. The two sides here are the new and the old, represented by revolution and tradition. The possibility of removing a government by legal means is such an attempted union; and in so far as it succeeds it represents a victory of the Kingdom of God in history, because it overcomes the split.” (p.389, V3)

³⁷ **One cannot reach the transcendent Kingdom of God without participating in the struggle of the inner-historical Kingdom of God.** For the transcendent is actual within the inner-historical…… But the more one’s destiny is directly determined by one’s active participation, the more historical sacrifice is demanded. (p.392, V3)

³⁸ The participation of the individual in historical existence has received an ultimate meaning. (p.393, V3)

在這一章，田氏將他主張的「關聯神學」(參前一文的標題 12)，多方聯上政權和民主的層面來解讀，甚為切合近現代處境的需要。我們可從美蘇「舊冷戰」至美中「新冷戰」、香港「九七後」至「一九後」等政經社變遷，藉田氏所言思考華人教會可有的積極見證，在歷史步向新的變遷中開發適切於處境的神學，好將複雜難解的問題帶入神國的層面給予非俗世的答案。

第三章：神國成為歷史之終結目的 (THE KINGDOM OF GOD AS THE END OF HISTORY)

這整套書結束的一章，分三方面討論。第一是歷史之終結或永生(The End of History or Eternal Life)，第二是個人及其永遠（與永恆互通而用）的命運(The Individual Person and His Eternal Destiny)，第三是神國的時間和永恆(The Kingdom of God: Time and Eternity)。

第一方面，田氏論到歷史之終結。他解說此分題原文 the end of history or eternal life 的 end 有兩個向度：finish and aim（完終和目的），帶出內蘊於歷史的終極目的是「永生」(eternal life)。這正好表達神國「超越於和內藏於歷史」(the transcend and the inner-historical)兩方面。神學上綜合稱之為末世論(Eschatology)，就是表述為「那日子」、「末後的事」等。(394-395 頁，系 3) 末世論可包括時間方面理論和實存方面理解兩方面，田氏指出：從時間而言，過去和將來相遇於現在(present)、包含於永恆的「現時」(eternal "now")。但兩者不是被現在吞去，它們有自己的獨立性和不同功能。³⁹ 從實存而言，人類在 20 世紀上半所發生的歷史大災難，和自世紀中段出現的自毀自滅的威脅，由此引發一個對末世全方位的熱烈關注。⁴⁰

田氏對歷史和永恆作出原則性的辨別：永生的「生活」和天國的「國度」是實在和具體的象徵，這有別於其他那些出現於宗教性歷史和對終極(ultimate)的世俗性表達。⁴¹ 歷史活動無論是如何屬靈性的，其中的個人進入屬天的領域(heavenly realm)，皆不再以這些活動在天上的國度發揮貢獻。永生脫離歷史的扭曲而實現其潛藏於正向歷史的一切。⁴² 對於田氏認為屬地的無份於將來屬天的，本人稍有保留，因為「愛」就是永不止息地延續至天上的「生活」，反而知識（神學）止於天上。(林前十三章) 因此我們可以此衡量如何在今生作有永遠應用的投資。

基督教正如世上其他宗教的最後審判，皆是超越個人，指向全宇宙。希臘文審判一字意指分開，充分指向宇宙性審判的特性：分別出好與壞、真與假、被拒絕的與可接納的。⁴³

³⁹ Past and future meet in the present, and both are included in the eternal "now." But they are not swallowed by the present; they have their independent and different functions.(p.395-396, V3)

⁴⁰ It is only the historical catastrophes of the first half of the twentieth century and the threat of man's self-annihilation since the middle of the century that have aroused an often passionate concern for the eschatological problem in its fullness. (p.396, V3)

⁴¹ (eternal)"life" and "kingdom" (of God)are concrete and particular symbols, distinguished from others that have appeared in the history of religion and in secular expressions of the ultimate. (p.396, V3)

⁴² History is, so to speak, the earthly realm out of which individuals are moved into the heavenly realm. Historical activity, however seriously and spiritually performed, does not contribute to the heavenly kingdom.....Eternal Life, then, includes the positive content of history, liberated from its negative distortions and fulfilled in its potentialities. (p.397, V3)

⁴³ The Greek word for judging (*krinein*, to separate) points most adequately to the nature of the universal judgment: it is an act of separating the good from the bad, the true from the false, the accepted ones from the rejected ones. (p.398, V3)

田氏更指出時間與永恆有以下關係：時間是永恆被造成具有有限的狀式，時間歸終於其內在的永恆本身(**time is the form of the created finite, and eternity is the inner aim**) (399 頁, 系 3)；永遠不是事物將來的境況，而是「經常每刻」的現在(**present**)，永遠不單在人之內能被感悟到，更有分於存有整體內的所有存有。⁴⁴

本人認為這一哲理式解讀極需正確了解，因人人活在時間中，往往理解今生來世為兩個階段的時間，亦將永生歸類為來世那段不止的時間。但按田氏有別的分析：「活在永生中」是始於今生（出生），而非來生（死後）。這亦見於耶穌的教導，常將生（**life**）和永生（**eternal life**）互通而用。從這一角度看，「信耶穌得永生」不是等待一個死後階段的永生，而是信主一刻即開始的今生階段的永生；個人活着（未死）信主所得的這「永生」，是有待每個人使這永生「活成今生的豐盛」。（約十 10）

永生也是等同於神國的實現，這意思是永生是宇宙中心沒有化去(**dissolve**)的個體中心的「生活」，是不含糊不崩解的愛的生命(**the unambiguous and non-fragmentary life of love**)。(401-402 頁, 系 3) 永生就是道德的完終，因為生活在宇宙的和完滿的愛下，已優先於律法所要求的道德了。⁴⁵ 永生也是宗教的完終，因為「天上的耶路撒冷」不再是殿（代表宗教），而是神所住的城。⁴⁶ 第二方面「個人及其永遠命運」，歷代所關注的「自由意志與獲得永生」之間的問題，田氏以另一個角度來梳釋，他聲稱：命運是由每一個人自己決定的，因為每一暫時性事物皆含有一目的性關聯至永遠，而只有人能感悟到這一種永遠性，此種感悟就給他有自由去違抗它所帶來的「永生」這一命運。這就取決於他如何作出決定：他可以放棄，但不會至於全棄；他可以實現，但不能全實現。⁴⁷ 田氏這番言論，反映其辯證思維，就是人能違背神但不至最壞，人能順從神但不達最好；所以沒有最壞的惡人，也沒有最好的聖徒。人永遠有反向變改的可能性，就像逼迫教會的掃羅，變為建立教會的保羅。

對於那一種論到個人命運是永遠被定罪或永遠被救贖，田氏認為最有問題的是**雙重預定論**（某派）教義，它有如鬼魔般含意：它引入一種個人與上帝永遠（從始至終）的割裂。⁴⁸

田氏認為，萬物至終合一於神的愛和神的國這一教義，取去以地獄作為「永遠定罪」的象徵。這

⁴⁴ our understanding of time and eternity: **The eternal is not a future state of things. It is always present, not only in man (who is aware of it), but also in everything that has being within the whole of being.**(p.400, V3)

⁴⁵ Eternal Life is the end of morality. For there is no ought to be in it which, at the same time, is not..... we call Eternal Life the life of universal and perfect love. For love does what law demands before it is demanded. (p.402, V3)

⁴⁶ the end of history is the end of religion. In biblical terminology this is expressed in the description of the "Heavenly Jerusalem" as a city in which there is no temple because God lives there. (p.403, V3)

⁴⁷ Everything temporal has a "teleological" relation to the eternal, but man alone is aware of it; and this awareness gives him the freedom to turn against it.....every human being turns against his *telos*, against Eternal Life..... The *telos* of man as an individual is determined by the decisions he makes in existence on the basis of the potentialities given to him by destiny. **He can waste his potentialities, though not completely, and he can fulfill them, though not totally.** (p.406, V3)

⁴⁸ the traditional solution which described the eternal destiny of the individual either as being everlastingly condemned or as being everlastingly saved. The most questionable form of this idea, **the doctrine of double predestination, has demonic implications: it introduces an eternal split into God himself.** (p.407, V3)

教義沒有取去末日神審判含有定罪一面的嚴重性(the seriousness of condemning side of the divine judgement)。(408 頁，系 3) 每個人皆有走向全善與全惡兩特性，人的不完美和唯靠神恩的拯救這教義，引領我們歸向（上帝主權下）**雙重預定的教義**，或前往（人類不自主下）**共性本質化的教義（universal essentialization**，請先看本注和下注，才看以下評論）。⁴⁹ 對於後者「共性本質化」顯為田氏在下文給予「個人及其永遠命運」作答案，本人認為田氏解說中將犯罪的個人責任性推向社會責任性，縱有其合理性，但留有空間予邏輯推論下去成為寬待個人罪責的所謂普救論。這就與他在上文強調的神末日會嚴厲地審判罪，構成難以解困的矛盾（或二律背反）。然而，田氏在這關鍵問題上語焉不詳、立場不表。

對於個人進入永生，基督教用不朽(immortality)和復活 (resurrection) 作為永生之外兩個常用字。復活是聖經的用字，但不朽是取自柏拉圖所稱「(靈)魂的不朽」。在很早期的基督神學，「不朽」一字已經用上，而在大範圍的基督教思想中，不朽（按：死後無體而活的柏拉圖式迷信）已取代了復活的象徵。(409 頁，系 3) 誠言，本人認為對華人教會來說，受苦的神學在佈道上和栽培上都較受重視，而復活的神學就相對簡化和較少應用在信仰成長方面的栽培，復活大能作為生命更新的動力備受忽略，誠屬可惜。「感恩主代死」加「經歷主復活」，是缺一不可的雙面救贖神學。

不朽的傳統用法是以片語表述為「(靈)魂的不朽」(immortality of the soul)，如此就引入魂、體的二元主義。田氏認為這違背了基督教概念的靈是包括存有(being)的各個層級，和不配合聖經用「身體復活」的象徵。⁵⁰ 言下之意，這可指「靈」包括「魂」和「體」，近似一元論的人觀。基於原本的(靈)魂不朽思想是有迷信、不符合基督教的成分，但基督教神學仍勇於使用為末世性想像。田氏認為在「永生」的教導上，要慎防「不朽」那原本迷信含義。⁵¹本人認為，田氏提及形塑西方神學鼻祖奧古斯丁其背後的柏拉圖，後者的「靈魂不朽說」在中世紀前已被引進神學而居為「正統」、對永生方面真理佔有權威性解釋。田氏揭示此說含有迷信（即迷信正統化），對華人往往「迷信」正統權威---只能守不能改，帶來啓迪。

對於身體復活，田氏認為《使徒信經》的「我信身體復活」原是「肉體」(flesh)用詞，含有誤導

⁴⁹ The doctrine of the ambiguity of all human goodness and of the dependence of salvation on the divine grace alone either leads us back to the doctrine of double predestination or leads us forward to **the doctrine of universal essentialization** (If we use the term “**essentialization**,” we can say that man’s psychological, spiritual, and social being is implied in his bodily being-and this in unity with the essences of everything else that has being. p.413, V3)..... The total being, including the conscious and unconscious sides of every individual, is largely determined by the social conditions which he is influenced by upon entering existence. **The individual grows only in interdependence with social situations..... The question and the answer are possible only if one understands essentialization or elevation of the positive into Eternal Life as a matter of universal participation..... Whoever condemns anyone to eternal death condemns himself, because his essence and that of the other cannot be absolutely separated.** (p.408-409, V3)

⁵⁰ the term is traditionally used in the phrase “immortality of the soul.” This produces a further problem for its use in Christian thought: it introduces a dualism between soul and body, contradicting the Christian concept of Spirit, which includes all dimensions of being; and it is incompatible with the symbol “resurrection of the body..... **The meaning of the “immortality of the soul” then would involve the power of essentialization. And in Plato’s late doctrine of the world-soul, the idea of immortality in the sense of universal essentialization seems to be implied.**” (p.410, vol.3)

⁵¹ it would be wise in teaching and preaching to use the term “Eternal Life” and to speak of “immortality” only if superstitious connotations can be prevented. (p.412, V3)

成分。⁵² 他指出：「復活促成而成的是「靈性身體」(Spiritual body)才是惟一具有意義的答案，並由此引申兩方面：永生中自我的意識不會失去，因為那不是無身分區別式永活；神國既是宇宙展現的愛，個人化就不會除去，因為擁有個人性才能參與這愛.....復活不是從舊體另造出新體，而是舊體從死亡再生的轉化。」⁵³

田氏在這方面最後提出永生和永死的對立概念，因為出於那永恆存有的受造者竟會成為永遠的失去者，是彼此矛盾的概念。這種「在永恆中永死」(death away from eternity)充滿各教會的講壇，並成為官方教義，這方面在歷史上可大分為兩派的思路。一派是奧古斯丁、阿奎那和加爾文(Augustine, Thomas and Calvin)，另一派是俄利根、蘇西尼和士來馬赫(Origen, Socinus and Schleiermacher)。田氏分析兩派之外，也評論更正教所放棄的煉獄教義。因篇幅所限，不贅，有興趣者可參第三冊 415 至 419 頁。

第三方面是「神國：時間和永恆」。田氏一再強調「其永恆觀不是沒有時間或無盡時間，亦不是否定或繼續今生暫時的成為永遠的。」⁵⁴

從歷史的發展看時間的動態(the movement of time)，奧古斯丁將柏拉圖的時間循環性(circular character)改為直線向前的動態，從創造作開始到轉化所有暫時的邁向終結。田氏視這一觀點對神國作為歷史的目的是可能的和需要的。⁵⁵ 但他認為仍有不足，提出以曲線(curve)從上走向下再升向上，而曲線的底部是「存在之現在」(existential now)。時間之結束不是在過去或在未來一個明確的時刻，而是如神的創造每刻皆是前進過程，其中包含創造和完成、開始和結束。⁵⁶

如此，就要將永遠生命(eternal life)連上「神生命」(divine life)，才能為時間、永恆作有意義的討論。按田氏解說，神是永遠的，在神本身不存在有沒有時間或無盡時間等時間問題；「神是永遠的」這命題，表述神是永恆地活著(living)。永生就是生活在永遠／永恆、生活在神的裏面(life in the eternal, life in God)。這表達以下觀念：所有暫時的從永恆而來亦回歸到永恆。(420 頁，系 3) 田氏指稱使徒保羅同有此觀念，可將此象徵名之為末世性「泛(萬有)在神內論」(eschatological

⁵² The phrase in the Apostles' Creed is "resurrection of the flesh," that is, of that which characterizes the body in contrast to the spirit, the body in its perishable character. But the phrase is so misleading that in any liturgical form it should be replaced by "resurrection of the body" and interpreted by the Pauline symbol "Spiritual body." (p.412, V3)

⁵³ 原文： "The only meaningful answer here, as in the assertion of a Spiritual body, is in the form of two negative statements. The first is that the self-conscious self cannot be excluded from Eternal Life. Since Eternal Life is life and not undifferentiated identity and since the Kingdom of God is the universal actualization of love, the element of individualization cannot be eliminated or the element of participation would also disappear..... resurrection is not the creation of another reality over against the old reality but is the transformation of the old reality, arising out of its death." (p.413-414, V3)

⁵⁴ 原文： "We have rejected the understanding of eternity as timelessness and as endless time. Neither the denial nor the continuation of temporality constitutes the eternal." (p.419, V3)

⁵⁵ Augustine took a tremendous step when he rejected the analogy of the circle for the movement of time and replaced it by a straight line, beginning with the creation of the temporal and ending with the transformation of everything temporal. This idea not only was possible in the Christian view of the Kingdom of God as the aim of history but was demanded by it. (p.419-420, V3)

⁵⁶ But the end of time is not conceived in terms of a definite moment either in the past or in the future. Beginning from and ending in the eternal are not matters of a determinable moment in physical time but rather a process going on in every moment, as does the divine creation. There is always creation and consummation, beginning and end. (p.420, V3)

pan-en-theism) (按：田氏挪用此字似有意與「泛神論」分別出來)。⁵⁷

田氏在全書結語嘗試為神辯護，稱神不是一位隨己意創造、任己意拯救那般無情地申張主權的神。相反，創造是由愛驅使，神愛得以實現是唯有透過他者擁有自由來拒絕或選擇這愛。神驅動每一個生命的存在邁向實現化和本質化(actualization and essentialization)。因為宇宙中，永恆的層面就是屬神的生活本身，乃是充滿神的祝福。⁵⁸

以上討論「今生之後」(life hereafter)的末世性種種象徵，是為使人在死後的屬神生活，滿有榮耀和祝福的意義。此為全書結語。

小結：雖然田氏全書和第五部分「歷史與神國」所論及的多不是原創性，不少是承繼其上代德國神哲學的討論，但他能造出綜合前人之見和加以轉化，使其學理升上新台阶和具備解釋力，自圓其說、自成一理。他否定不少自由神學(Liberal Theology)之說而靠近福音信仰，縱然偏向以哲學「包裝」福音神學(Evangelical Theology)，但其中對歷史邁向終極的各方面探討和解說，為後學打開不少新門路，是田氏最珍貴貢獻！

⁵⁷ it agrees with the Pauline vision that in ultimate fulfillment God shall be everything in (or for) everything. One could call this symbol “eschatological pan-en-theism.” 田氏意識到這個「in-ness」引發的問題而作三方面補述：The first meaning of “in” in the phrase “in God” is that it is the “in” of creative origin. It points to the presence of everything that has being in the divine ground of being, a presence that is in the form of potentiality (in a classical formulation, this is understood as the presence of the essences or eternal images or ideas of everything created in the divine mind). The second meaning of “in” is that it is the “in” of ontological dependence. Here, the “in” points to the inability of anything finite to be without the supporting power of the permanent divine creativity even in the state of estrangement and despair. The third meaning of “in” is that it is the “in” of ultimate fulfillment, the state of essentialization of all creatures. (p.421, V3)

⁵⁸ the eternal act of creation is driven by a love which finds fulfillment only through the other one who has the freedom to reject and to accept love. God, so to speak, drives toward the actualization and essentialization of everything that has being. For the eternal dimension of what happens in the universe is the Divine Life itself. It is the content of the divine blessedness. (p.422, V3)