

# 《現代神學論評》第一章 Chapter I

## 1919 前：康德對當代（20 世紀）神學的重要性 BEFORE 1919 : The Significance of Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) For Contemporary Theology

(Harvie M. Conn, *Contemporary World Theology: A Layman's Guidebook*.  
Nutley, NJ: P&R Publishing, 1974, 1-9. )

(中譯本：簡河培，《現代神學論評》，臺北：基督教改革宗翻譯社。第一章無中譯，謹此提供。)

### 巴特展開神學新紀元：1919 出版《羅馬人書注釋》 THEOLOGY'S NEW ERA: BARTH WRITES ROMANS COMMENTARY, 1919

當代神學，可以說是從瑞士（離德國邊境約 16 英里）一間教會的牧師書房開始的。創始人是一位年青牧師，卡爾·巴特(1886-1968)，他在 25 歲那年(1911)赴該市牧會。這份宣言是歷史上新神學的轉捩點，也是一個新神學時代的首次宣告，它以巴特的《羅馬書釋義》的形式出現。這本書的重要性，將在下一章（注：原著第二章，即中譯本第一章）簡述。

Contemporary theology, in a real sense, was born in the study of a church in Switzerland, about sixteen miles south of the German border. The inaugurator was a young pastor, Karl Barth (1886-1968), who had gone there in 1911, at the age of 25. And the manifesto of this new theological turning-point in history, the initial announcement of a new theological era, came in the form of Barth's commentary on Romans in 1919. What the general significance of that book meant will be sketched in the next chapter of our study.

### 十九與二十世紀神學：差異不大； 神學的哥白尼革命乃從康德（1724-1804）開始 19th & 20th CENT. THEOLOGY: SIMILAR; REVOLUTION BEGAN WITH KANT

我們擬在本章（注：原著的第一章，中譯本漏譯）說明，1919 年後的神學變遷乃屬一個較大的海洋；「現代」（19 世紀）與「當代」（20 世紀）神學的分歧，僅在於一些建立在共同預設的著重點而已。就算很多神學家所說的：巴特在神學家的遊戲場中丟了一個炸彈，也應有更準確的修正：其實巴特在同一遊戲場的一邊，射了一個炮彈到另一邊而已。從這意義上來看，巴特的所謂「哥白尼革命」不是在 1919 年開始，而是由啟蒙運動的哲學家王子－康德(1724-1804)所創始。

In this opening chapter, we are seeking only to show that even the shifts of theological currents since 1919 are part of a larger ocean, and that the difference between “modern” theology and “contemporary” theology is sometimes less a difference and more an emphasis building upon common presuppositions. Even what has so often been referred to as Barth’s dropping a bombshell in the playground of the theologians may be more accurately described as a cannonade on one part of the playground from another part of the same playground. In that sense, Barth’s so-called “Copernican revolution” began not in 1919 but 200 years ago, in the study of the philosopher-prince of the Enlightenment, Immanuel Kant (1724-1804).

**「人類已成熟」：文藝復興、啟蒙的主題；  
康德將現代人理性的自信系統化；理性處理物質，無能處理非物質；  
1784 啟蒙=脫開外在權威；= 理性的自主、自由  
WORLD COMES OF AGE: RENAISSANCE, ENLIGHTENMENT’S  
THEME KANT SYSTEMATIZES MODERN MAN’S CONFIDENCE IN  
REASON REASON DEALS WITH MATTER; CANNOT DEAL WITH  
NON-MATTER; 1784 ENLIGHTENMENT = LIBERATION FROM  
EXTERNAL AUTHORITY, = AUTONOMY, FREEDOM TO THINK**

「世界已經成熟」的觀念，不是潘霍華始創的。它是文藝復興和西方啟蒙運動的主題曲；後者影響了現代文化的每個層面。康德把「現代人對理性掌握物質和所有超物質事物的能力的自信」系統化；因此他的影子伸展到十九與二十世紀。1784 年，康德歸納了啟蒙運動的要求：啟蒙乃是人從自己加在身上的不成熟釋放出來。這種不成熟表現在人依賴外在的權威。因此，「啟蒙」與「自主」成了同義詞。現代人的主題成為：「敢用你自己的理解」，「沒有約束、沒有外在指引而思想的自由」，「從武斷（教條）的睡眠中喚醒」。

The idea of the world coming of age did not originate with Dietrich Bonhoeffer. It was the theme song of the Renaissance and of the Western Enlightenment era, an era that has left its permanent stamp on everything modern. Kant systematized “modern man’s confidence in the power of reason to grapple with material things and its incompetence to deal with anything beyond.” (Colin Brown, *Philosophy and the Christian Faith* (Chicago: Inter-Varsity Press, 1969), p. 91.) And in doing so, he cast a shadow not merely over the nineteenth century but over the twentieth century as well. In 1784, Kant summed up the demands of new Enlightenment when he

defined it as man's emergence from his self-inflicted immaturity. This immaturity is found in man's reliance upon any authority external to himself. Enlightenment and autonomy become identical, and modern man's motto becomes "Dare to use your own understanding," "Freedom to think without sanctions, without direction external to man himself," "Awakening from dogmatic slumber." (Immanuel Kant, "Beantwortung der Frage: Was ist Aufklärung?" Berlinische Monatsschrift, December, 1784, (Gesammelte Schriften, Berlin, VIII, p. 35.)

**康德 = 老撒旦對上帝話語的懷疑；人自己開拓道路**

**KANT = OLD SATAN'S DOUBT OF GOD'S WORD; MAN PURSUES OWN PATH**

基督徒對這種所謂新調子並不陌生。魔鬼在伊甸園已質疑任何在人以外的權威。牠問夏娃：「上帝真的說嗎？」(創 3:1)。牠邀請人追尋「啟蒙」運動的自我釋放之路。牠「提醒」夏娃：上帝知道，你吃的那日，眼睛會明亮，你會像上帝，認識善惡(創 3:5)。不過康德和「現代」的啟蒙精神注入一些新的因素。

The Christian senses a familiar ring of antiquity to this supposedly new sound. Satan had also questioned any authority external to man himself in the garden of Eden. "Indeed, has God said?" he had asked (Gen. 3:1). He also invited man to pursue his own free path of Enlightenment. "God knows," he reminded Eve, "that in the day you eat from it your eyes will be opened and you will be like God, knowing good and evil" (Gen. 3:5). But, with Kant and the Enlightenment spirit of the modern age, there had come some new twists to an old angle.

**1·新的宗教預設(上帝觀，世界觀)：人的「心」是一切思想的出發點**

**NEW RELIGIOUS CATEGORIES TO VIEW GOD & WORLD MAN'S "HEART" = SPRING OF ALL HIS THOUGHTS**

一套新的宗教預設，在塑造現代人的思想。人是上帝的形象，因此必定不斷建立一些範疇(觀念)，依此看待自己、上帝、與世界。從《聖經》所稱的「心」，從人性本身，從這個使人與一切事物與上帝連上關係的「心」，一生的事發出(《箴言》4:23)。人的思想如何，自己的生命也如何(《箴言》23:7)。

There was, and is, a new set of religious presuppositions that mold modern man's thought. Man, as the image of God, is always building categories by which he can view himself, God, and the world. From what the Bible calls man's "heart," from everything that makes him man, from the center that relates him everywhere and always to God, "from it flow the springs of life" (Prov. 4:23). "For as he thinketh in his heart, so is he" (Prov. 23:7).

**古希臘哲學的背約的（偶像化的）規則：「理念」與「物質」對立；  
中古時期神學吸收希臘哲學，建立新的妥協信仰的世界觀：「自然」與「恩典」  
GREEK PHILOSOPHY'S IDOLATROUS RULES: "FORM" VS. "MATTER"  
MEDIEVALS ACCOMMODATE GREEK MODEL, BUILDS NEW  
COMPROMISE: "NATURE" AND "GRACE"**

古希臘世界的「心」有自己的宗教遊戲原則，建立在「形式」與「物質」的矛盾上。中古時期，西方基督教採用了這些非基督教，背約的觀念；基督教信仰作出了新的讓步。結果是另一套遊戲規則，環繞著「自然」與「恩典」的觀念。

The "heart" of the ancient Greek world had built its religious ground rules around the contradictions of form and matter. (For a simple explanation of these religious antinomies, consult Cornelius Van Til, *The Great Debate Today* (Nutley, N.J.: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1971), pp. 179-188.) In the Middle Ages, the West had accommodated those basically non-Christian, covenant-breaking ideas to a new compromise with Christian principles and come up with another set framed around the ideas of nature and grace.

Form/Spirit	Grace	Freedom
Matter	Nature	Nature
Ancient Greece	Medieval (Aquinas)	Modern (Kant)

「自然」不是上帝造的世界；還是自主的，是希臘「理念-物質」的新版本；  
「恩典」不是上帝的大能；阿奎那使「自然」「人」從「超自然」、「恩典」釋放

**NATURE = NOT CREATED WORLD UNDER GOD, BUT AUTONOMOUS  
STRUCTURE, "FORM-MATTER" IN NEW DRESS GRACE = NOT  
SOVEREIGN TRANSFORMATION; = PERFECTING FORM AQUINAS  
EMANCIPATED NATURAL MAN FROM SUPERNATURAL GRACE**

這兩個掌管人自我認識的宗教主題：「自然」和「恩典」，都不是根據《聖經》的觀念。「自然」的預設，不是《聖經》所宣告的，順從創造主的被造世界。「自然」乃是一個自主的架構，再次的化裝了古希臘的「形式-物質」觀念，以新的要求修飾。在這次的讓步中，「恩典」也失去了基督教的特質，而成為一個上層建築的限制觀念，而不再指掌主權的上帝徹底改變人生命的作為。中古時期阿奎那的綜合模式，把「自然」的「人」，從「超自然」的「恩典」解放了。

Neither religious theme of nature or grace represented purely biblical ground rules for self-understanding. The presupposition of nature was not the biblical concept of a created world in subjection to its Creator. It was an autonomous sub-structure that put the old Greek ideas of form – matter in a new dress, modified by new demands. In this compromise, grace also lost its distinctively Christian character, and became more a perfecting form of superstructure rather than a radical act of transformation by the sovereign God. The Middle Ages' synthesis of Thomas Aquinas had emancipated natural man from supernatural grace.

康德：不僅妥協，徹底釋放；「自然」與「恩典」徹底的、自覺的分割；人不受任何事控制；自然界 = 數學性，無限的；人在其中實施自主。

康德後的世界觀：偶像化，扭曲《聖經》；因此自我矛盾

**KANT: EMANCIPATION = NOT JUST ACCOMMODATION;  
NATURE/GRACE CONSISTENTLY SEPARATED; NOTHING CONTROLS  
MAN; NATURE = MATHEMATICAL, INFINITE, MAN = AUTONOMOUS  
IN IT; WORLDVIEW TWISTS BIBLE, IDOLATROUS, THUS  
SELF-CONTRADICTORY**

康德與啟蒙運動的精神現在讓人的解放不僅僅是基督教與人本思想的妥協。自然與恩典完全的分開，這分割是一致的，系統的，自覺的，在西方文明是首創。人必將「重生」，成為一個完全自由，自主的位格，從一切控制他思想的因素解放。根據這樣的精神，自然界雖仍從中古時代的綜合模式存留，可是也完全改造了。自然成為一個「宏觀的範圍，在其中人可以行使他的自主。現在自然被解釋為一個無限的範圍，由自主的數學思想來控制。」（參考書籍：參英文。）

Kant and the Enlightenment spirit now made that emancipation more than merely accommodation. For the first time in Western civilization, nature and grace were severed in a consistent, developed, self-conscious form. Man was to be reborn as a completely free and autonomous personality and released from all controls over his thinking. And, in this spirit, even the category of nature, still retained from the medieval synthesis, was transformed. Nature became a “macrocosmic sphere within which human personality could exercise its autonomy. Nature was interpreted as an infinite field to be controlled by autonomous mathematical thought.” (Vincent Brummer, *Transcendental Criticism and Christian Philosophy* (Franeker: T. Wever, 1961), p. 98. A fuller explanation of these themes will be found in Herman Dooyeweerd, *In the Twilight of Western Thought* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1960).)

2·人的自主更加貫徹：自我評估：人的理性 = 真理的至終準則；

現代思想：唯獨理性能判斷現象界，真理界（薛華沒有看到，沒有挑戰）

**MAN'S AUTONOMY = MORE CONSISTENT; REASON = TRUTH'S  
NORM; MODERN THOUGHT: REASON ALONE JUDGES  
PHENOMENAL, NOUMENAL WORLD (F. SCHAEFFER FAILS TO SEE,  
CHALLENGE THIS)**

以人為中心的自主，在康德的思想更加一致。啟蒙運動的「心」呼籲人的理性完全解放，就是自主的自然界，在其中「事實」的意義完全與上帝脫離關係，因此，事實就成為殘酷的。這種的宗教態度，對人的能力的評估是樂觀的，特別人的理性是最高的權威，是衡量真理的至終準則。理性，唯獨理性，足夠判斷現象世界與真理世界。（很不幸地，薛華雖然是一位加爾文主義的評論者，雖然在很多方面都作出重要的貢獻，可是並沒有看到人用自己理性時的宗教前設，有多麼貫徹的影響力；他也沒有看見人用理性作為至高的審判官是多麼的不足夠。正如有人正確地看出，薛華的護教「假設人必須自己決定，上帝啟示的《聖經》是否真實。」）

There was, and is, a more consistently developed sense of man-centered autonomy. The Enlightenment “heart” had called for an emancipated human freedom, an autonomous nature where fact was severed from its meaning in God, and therefore brutalized. This religious attitude produced a quite high assessment of all of man’s capacities, and especially of human reason as the final authority, the ultimate criterion for truth. Reason and reason alone becomes adequate for judging the world of the phenomenon and the world of the noumenon. (It is a most unfortunate feature of the work of the Calvinistic critic, Francis Schaeffer, that, though helpful in so many areas, he cannot fully see the radical influence of man’s religious presuppositions on his use of the reason nor the inadequacy of the reason as an ultimate judge. Compare *The God Who Is There* (Chicago: Inter-Varsity Press, 1968), pp. 108 ff. As others have well seen, Schaeffer’s whole presentation is oriented “around the assumption that man must decide for himself whether God’s written revelation is true” (John J. Mitchell, “A Critique of F.A. Schaeffer’s *The God Who Is There*,” unpublished paper read before the Student Association of Westminster Theological Seminary, February 1969, p. 5).)

**上帝的「自主」、「自我證實」的啟示 = 被屏棄，人的自的理性掌管一切  
GOD’S “AUTONOMOUS”, SELF-AUTHENTICATING REVELATION =  
OUT, MAN’S “AUTONOMOUS” REASON COMMANDS ALL**

對康德來說，這種「自主」的意思就是，用人的自主理性，來取代基督教的「自主」（主權）的啟示：那位自我證實的上帝，透過《聖經》的自我啟示。康德至終的控制原則，就是「宇宙性的人的理性」。（康德，《理性限制下的宗教》。）

For Kant this autonomy meant the replacing of the Christian concept of

“autonomous” revelation, of the self-authenticating God revealing himself through the Bible, by man’s autonomous reason. In the ultimate sense, it is “universal human reason” which Kant labels as “the supremely commanding principle.” (Immanuel Kant, *Religion Within the Limits of Reason Alone* (Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co., c. 1934), p. 152.)

**真正的宗教，不用《聖經》：人要作什麼賺得救恩**  
**TRUE RELIGION, W/O BIBLE = WHAT WE DO TO DESERVE**  
**SALVATION**

「真正的宗教並不在於認識上帝，或考慮上帝為我們的救贖所成就的作為，而是我們可以作什麼以致配得救…。每人都可以確實知道，完全不須要學習《聖經》。」

“True religion is to consist not in the knowing or considering of what God does or has done for our salvation but in what we must do to become worthy of it … and of its necessity every man can become wholly certain without any Scriptural learning whatever.” (Ibid., p. 123.)

**自主 ⇨ 去神話化：人製造新神話，以獲新的自我認識**  
**AUTONOMY ⇨ DEMYTHOLOGIZATION:**  
**NEW MYTHS FOR SELF-KNOWLEDGE**

這個「理性的自主」觀念，離布特曼的「去神話化」就不遠了：根據布氏，現代人必須製造新的神話，來實現《聖經》對人的自我認識的要求。

It is not far from this concept of rational autonomy to Bultmann's concept of demythologization, where modern man must create new myths to authenticate the Bible's demands for self-understanding.

**自主-> 引致拒絕相信創造，復活是歷史；都是神話**  
**AUTONOMY -> CREATION, RESURRECTION = LEGENDS, NOT**  
**HISTORY**

人自主的理性作啟示的審判官，引致潘能博的理性分析：復活的敘述是傳說；和庫爾曼拒絕接受《創世記》的創造敘述是真實、合理、可信的歷史。

Nor is it very far from autonomous reason as judge over revelation to annenberg's rational analysis of the resurrection narratives as permeated with legends, or Cullmann's refusal to credit the Genesis records of creation as authentic, rationally credible history.

**3·徹底的相對主義：休謨的懷疑主義：不能證明任何事物存在。我們僅有五官觀察資料；不可能知道因果關係，上帝等**

**CONSISTENT RELATIVISM; HUME = SKEPTIC, CANNOT PROVE EXISTENCE. WE HAVE SENSE DATA, NO CAUSE/EFFECT, GOD = ELUSIVE**

康德的相對主義，也更加一致。蘇格蘭哲學家休謨（1711-1776）制定了啟蒙時期的知識論問題。休謨的懷疑主義質疑人能否證明任何事，不論是身外物，甚至是自己。因果關係，宇宙的起源（上帝），人有起源等：都不可能知道。我們手上有的，僅是五官得來的資料而已。

There was, and is, a more consistently developed relativism. David Hume, the Scottish philosopher (1711-1776), had formulated for the Enlightenment world the problem of knowledge. His skepticism had questioned whether anyone could prove the existence of anything, either outside oneself or even oneself. Cause and effect, God as Origin, man as originated – all are equally elusive. We have the data of our senses, but nothing beyond that.

**康德：休謨的問題就是答案：制定兩個世界：**

**現象界：理性，五官察覺，認識事物；**

**真理界：假裝上帝，自由，不朽真的存在**

**KANT: HUME'S QUESTION = ANSWER; CREATES TWO WORLD:**

**PHENOMENAL WORLD: REASON/SENSES PERCEIVE, KNOW;**

**NOUMENAL WORLD: ACT AS IF GOD, FREEDOM, IMMORTALITY EXIST**

康德把休謨的知識論問題再推一步，「把問題還給休謨，好像問題就是答案。」康德造了兩個世界：現象世界和真理界，即五官觀察和理性認識的世界，和上帝、自由、不朽的世界。後者是管理人類的觀念，是理性察覺不到的，可是它們若是理性能知道的真實事物，必須在我們生命占一地位。

Kant took from Hume the problem of knowledge and “gave it back as if it were the solution.” (C. Brown, op. cit., p. 96.) He created two worlds – the world of the phenomena and the world of the noumena, the world perceived by reason through the raw material of the senses, and the world of God, freedom and immortality, regulative ideas which cannot be perceived by reason but must have their place in our lives as if they were real objects knowable by reason.



**上帝 = 有限觀念；人需要倫理，因此需要有上帝上帝完全關閉，孤立  
GOD = LIMITED IDEA; MAN NEEDS ETHICS, THUS NEEDS GOD  
DOOR TO GOD = SQUEEZED ALMOST SHUT, GOD/MAN ISOLATED**

這種世界觀的結果的破壞性是非常大的。康的將上帝隔離在一個封閉的角落，與現象界的關係僅是：人在倫理上需要一個上帝的觀念。上帝不是完全被封閉，可是通到祂的道路是那麼的窄，沒有空間給那位「袍子充滿了聖殿」，掌主權的上帝(賽 6:1)。同樣地，人既然不可能認識事物的本身 (things in themselves)，不論是現象界或真理界的事物，他就不可能擠進窄門，認識上帝。上帝從人割離，人從上帝割離。

The effect of all of this was, and is, devastating. God is strait-jacketed by Kant into a sound-proof bulkhead, tied to the phenomenal world only by Kant's umbilical cord of man's need for the idea of God in the world of ethics. The door is not closed altogether on God, but it is so small that there is no room for the sovereign God "whose train fills the temple" (Isa. 6:1) to squeeze through. Similarly, since man cannot actually perceive things as they are in themselves (whether in the phenomenal or the noumenal world), he cannot squeeze through that door to know God. God has been effectively isolated from man and man has been effectively isolated from God.

**20 世紀神學主題：上帝被孤立在真理界；  
上帝 = 完全他者，「歷史」與「歷史」對立；歷史的耶穌與宣講的基督；  
《聖經》的人性；啟示 = 神人相遇；上帝 / 真理並不與世界接觸；  
末世有（真理界的）盼望，可是歷史並不會結束  
20th CENT. THEOLOGY'S THEME: GOD = ISOLATED TO NOUMENA  
GOD = WHOLLY OTHER; HISTORIE VS. GESCHICHTE;  
HISTORICAL JESUS VS. KERYGMA'S CHRIST; BIBLE = HUMAN;  
REVELATION = ENCOUNTER; GOD/NOUMENA ISN'T IN WORLD;  
HOPE W/O END TO HISTORY**

上帝被隔離到真理界，乃是當代（20 世紀）神學的普遍主題。存在主義的「自由」比以前更加重要；巴特早期著作稱上帝為「完全的他者」(the Wholly Other)，「不能好像事物（客體 object）一樣被解釋的」；這些都使上帝更加被隔離。而新正統神學分辨「歷史」(Historie) 和「歷史」(Geschichte)，布特曼分辨「歷史的耶穌」與「宣講（信息）的基督」，或用康德的詞彙，「現象界的耶穌」和「真理界的基督」，都是隔離上帝的重現。

This isolation of God into the noumenal world is a favorite theme of contemporary theology. It is reinforced by existentialism's increased emphasis on freedom, and appears, in modified form, in Barth's early writing on God as "the wholly Other," as the one who "cannot be explained, as an object can." It

reproduces itself in the neo-orthodox division between Historie and Geschichte, in Bultmann's distinctions between the "historical Jesus" and "the kerygmatic Christ," or, to use Kant's language, the phenomenal Jesus and the noumenal Christ.

這種對上帝啟示的相對主義，帶來從「人性」看《聖經》；巴特對啟示的新的定義：啟示是「神與人的相遇」，真理界僅僅接觸現象界，而沒有進入。莫特曼的「希望神學」完全懷疑現象界歷史是否將在末世結束；但又說到真理界的未來。

Its relativism regarding the divine origin of revelation leads to a new stress on the "humanity" of the Bible, and a new Barthian definition of revelation itself as "the divine-human encounter," the noumenal touching the phenomenal but not entering. It produces in Moltmann a "theology of hope," completely skeptical about any eschatological end to phenomenal history, yet still able to speak of a noumenal future.

#### **4·歷史批判方法論：人的自主必須保存**

#### **HISTORICAL-CRITICAL METHOD: MUST KEEP MAN'S AUTONOMY**

所謂「歷史 - 批判方法論」，現在被建立起來。啟蒙運動已經呼籲人從任何一套基督教傳統信仰釋放出來，完全自主，也呼籲一種批判性的方法論，就是與這種自覺的自主完全一致的方法。檢視過去的時候，歷史家必須同時是自主的。就算是研究《聖經》的文獻，也必須嚴謹保存人的自主。

There was, and is, the establishment of the so-called historical-critical method. The Enlightenment had called for autonomy from any traditional sets of Christian belief. It also called for a critical methodology that would also be fully consistent with this self-conscious autonomy. In the investigation of the past, the historian must also be autonomous. Even with regard to the biblical documents, this autonomy must be strictly preserved.

**方法論自主，凌駕在《聖經》文本之上；等於屏棄《聖經》的默示**

**自然神論的宇宙；上帝不可能介入，行神跡，向人啟示**

**METHOD = AUTONOMOUS OVER BIBLE'S TEXT; INSPIRATION = OUT**

**DEISTIC WORLD: GOD CAN'T ENTER, DO MIRACLE, REVEAL HIMSELF**

這種自主、凌駕《聖經》之上的方法論，有它自己一套的假設；今天，歷史 - 批判方法還費盡九牛二虎之力來維護它們。(我很感激威敏斯特神學院的葛理

齊博士 Dr. Richard B. Gaffin, Jr. 在 1971 年秋天的課程上教導學生注意下文的分析。) 這種方法論，等於放棄相信上帝逐字默示《聖經》。一種自然神論的自然觀和神觀(譯注：即上帝創造宇宙之後就不再介入，任憑宇宙安按照自然定律運作)是啟蒙運動不可或缺的部分，不可能接受上帝超自然地介入創造，作自我啟示。

This autonomy of method over against biblical text makes certain assumptions still ruthlessly guarded by the historical-critical method. (I am most indebted to Dr. Richard B. Gaffin of Westminster Theological Seminary for drawing the attention of his students to the following material during class sessions in the fall of 1971.) It means an abandonment of the doctrine of verbal inspiration. The deistic concept of nature and God which was part of the spawning process of the Enlightenment found no place for a divinely intervention of God into creation through any supernatural, revelatory manner.

**德國理想(唯心)主義：上帝不可介入世界！上帝的話 vs. 《聖經》**  
**GERMAN IDEALISM: GOD CAN'T INTERVENE! "WORD OF GOD" VS. BIBLE**

德國的理想主義(譯注：即唯心主義，或浪漫主義)嚴謹地跟循這種「上帝不介入」的原則。結果，「上帝的話」和《聖經》變成兩碼事。

German idealism follows this non-intervention policy most severely. It means also the introduction of distinction and discontinuity between the Word of God on the one hand and the Bible on the other.

**《聖經》有錯誤；研究《聖經》如研究任何人寫的书一樣**  
**《聖經》批判 = 自然主義(不相信超自然)；**  
**巴特(所謂「保守」派)與布特曼，田立克(激進派) = 相同；**  
**G.C. Berkouwer (荷蘭改革宗神學家)向歷史批判方法論讓步**  
**BIBLE CONTAINS ERRORS; STUDY BIBLE JUST LIKE ANY HUMAN BOOK; BIBLICAL CRITICISM = NATURALISTIC; BARTH (CONSERVATIVE) & BULTMANN, TILlich (RADICAL) = SAME; BERKOUWER (REFORMED) COMPROMISES TO HIST.-CRIT. METHOD**

與此同時，當代神學假設《聖經》是含有錯誤的。《聖經》像任何歷史文獻一樣，該受歷史 — 批判方法的檢視。就像任何歷史文獻一樣，《聖經》必定有錯誤的介入。這種對《聖經》的態度，到今天還是自然主義(譯注：即不相信超自然)的《聖經》批判的特點之一，不論是比較保守的版本(如：柯爾曼和潘能博)，或比較激進的(如：田力克，羅賓遜，與「世俗神學」派等)。

And coupled with this is the methodological presumption that there are errors in the Bible. As the proper object of historical method, the Bible is to be treated like any other set of documents from the past. And like any other document, it is subject to the intrusion of error. This approach to the Bible remains today one of the distinguishing features of naturalistic criticism, whether in its more conservative form (as exemplified by men like Oscar Cullmann and Wolfhart Pannenberg) or in its more radical expressions (among men like Tillich, John Robinson, and the secular theologians).

巴特與布特曼之間雖然有爭辯，可是他們都保存這種方法論。自然主義的神學家們可能激烈辯論（而這些激烈的辯論不容忽視），可是他們都繼承了啟蒙運動的遺產，他們都在同一個方法論架構裡辯論。（而這種歷史－批判方法論，在荷蘭的改革宗神學界也流行起來。如：G.C. Berkouwer 具說服力的批判，似乎承認了這種方法論的合法性。範泰爾作出了檢討。）

Barth and Bultmann, despite all the internecine debate, remain at one in their retention of this methodology. The sharp debates heard between contemporary naturalistic theologians today – and one should not under-emphasize their sharpness – are still carried on within basically the same methodological framework which the Enlightenment has left us as their heritage. (The usefulness of the historical-critical method seems to be becoming popular even in hitherto Reformed circles in the Netherlands. Note the cogent criticism of what seems to be a recognition of the validity of its presuppositions in G.C. Berkouwer's new attitudes as cited by C. Van Til, *The Sovereignty of Grace* (Nutley, N.J.: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing CO., 1969).)

**5·「歷史」與「信仰」對立：Lessing 不能作信心跳躍；但：不需要跳躍！  
基督教的真理並不在於歷史事實；只在於真理能藉愛改變生命  
Lessing 的比喻：三個宗教，起源已經找不到；將來一天 ⇨ 世界大同宗教：  
愛**

**HISTORY VS. FAITH: LESSING: CAN'T LEAP IN FAITH; BUT: NO NEED!  
CHRISTIANITY'S TRUTH DOESN'T DEPEND ON HISTORICAL FACTS;  
DEPENDS ON TRUTH TRANSFORMING LIFE THRU LOVE  
LESSING'S PARABLE: 3 RELIGIONS: ONE DAY⇨ ONE RELIGION OF  
LOVE**

這種方法論帶來的後果乃是，歷史與信仰徹底的分開。萊辛（1729-1781）在啟蒙運動時期已經發表這看法，稱它為「醜陋的，寬闊的鴻溝」，他說自己沒有能力跳躍，越過。可是萊辛也說，這種（信心的）跳躍是不必的。宗教的真實性，基督教的合理性，並不靠歷史偶發事件的真實性，而在於它的教義的真實性。任何宗教真正的價值，不靠歷史，而靠它能否以愛改變生命。

The result of this methodology was, and is, a radical separation between history and faith. G.E. Lessing (1729-1781) had formulated that separation during the

Enlightenment times as an “ugly, broad ditch” which he himself said he was incapable of jumping. But such a leap, Lessing also said, was unnecessary. The truth of religion and of rational Christianity does not depend upon the accidents of history’s truths but upon the truth of its teaching. (G.E. Lessing, *Theological Writings* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1956), pp. 51-56.) The true worth of any religion does not depend on history, he said, but on its capacity to transform life through love.

萊辛著名的故事就說明了這個鴻溝。故事是這樣說的：古時有一隻戒指，它能使擁有它的人被上帝所愛，又被人所愛。這只戒指一代一代的傳下去，直到有一位父親，有三個兒子，每一個都是他所親愛的。為了解決這難題，他作了兩隻複製品，然後每一個兒子都得到一隻戒指。他死後，每一個兒子都宣稱自己的戒指是原本的。可是，正如宗教一樣，原本已經追尋不到了。歷史的研究是派不上用場的。可是一個智慧的法官勸導每一個兒子，行事為人就好像自己的戒指是真的，而用愛心的行為證明。因此，至終誰擁有原本，無關重要。這三個兒子代表猶太教，基督教和回教。有一天，這三大宗教將自我超越，成為一個世界性的，愛的宗教。

Lessing’s famous parable of the three rings emphasizes this disjunction sharply. Brown has summarized it this way: “There was once an ancient ring which had the power to bestow upon its owner the gift of being loved by God and man. This was passed on down many generations until it came into the possession of a father who had three sons equally dear to him. To resolve the dilemma, he had two replicas made and gave a ring to each son. After his death all three claimed to possess the true ring. But, as with religion, the original cannot be traced. Historical investigation is of no avail. But a wise judge counsels each son to behave as if he had the true ring and prove it by deeds of love. Thus in the end it will not matter who had the original. The three sons represent Judaism, Christianity and Islam. One day they will transcend themselves and become united in a universal religion of love.” (C. Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 89.)

## **20 世紀神學家：歷史與信仰分割**

### **20th CENT. THEOLOGIANS: HISTORY VS. FAITH DISJOINTED**

下面數章裡，歷史與信仰的分隔會不斷出現；就像萊辛，現代的神學家會說，雖然基督教的歷史基督多多少少不可被接納，可是基督教的教義卻多多少少能被接納。

Repeatedly in the chapters that follow, this disjunction between history and faith will be recognized and repeatedly, in the same manner as Lessing, the modern theologian will say that though the recorded history of Christianity may not be accepted to greater or lesser degree, the teaching of Christianity may be accepted to greater or lesser degree.

巴特會這樣維持這種歷史與新仰的斷層：伊甸園裡究竟有沒有那條蛇並不重要，重要的是蛇說了什麼。布特曼會屏棄福音書的記錄，它們的歷史可靠性值得懷疑；可是，會接受它們幫助我們得到「存在性」的自我認識(existential self-understanding)。莫特曼痛斥經典基督教的末世論（即：教會期待復活的基督在歷史中臨），可是同時說，教會是未來去向的。羅賓遜會拒絕相信天堂是一個「在上面那裡」的地方；可是又堅持生命有一個新的層面，就是「深層的存有」(being in depth)；和上帝是「存有的根基」(ground of Being)。

Barth will retain it as he discards the question of whether the snake in the garden of Eden spoke as of lesser importance than what the snake said. Bultmann will retain it as he repudiates the gospel records as historically dubious productions on the one hand, and embraces them for their existential understanding of the self, on the other hand. Moltmann will retain it as he scorns the classic Christian notion of eschatology as the church waiting for the future of the risen Lord in history and yet speaks of the church oriented to the future. John Robinson will retain it as he rejects the idea of heaven as a “place up there” and yet insists on a new dimension to life as “being in depth” and God as “the ground of being.”