

傅蘭姆：〈范泰爾論上帝的啟示〉

JOHN FRAME: CORNELIUS VAN TIL'S VIEW OF REVELATION

(John Frame, *Cornelius Van Til: An Analysis of His Thought*, Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 1995, pp. 115-129. 林慈信譯。)

我們已經看見，范泰爾的「模擬知識觀」可以總結成兩點：（1）上帝的思維不同於人類的思維，其間的差異是：創造主與被造者之間的天淵之別，兩者需要分辨清楚；（2）人要效法上帝的思維而思維。……現在我們來討論第二點。

As we have seen, Van Til's doctrine of analogical knowledge can be summarized by saying (1) that God's thoughts are distinct from man's, as Creator from creature, and (2) that man is to think God's thoughts after him. We must now explore the second.

效法上帝思維的意思：思維必須服從上帝的啟示 Think God's Thoughts After Him Means: Thinking Must Submit to Revelation

對范泰爾來說，「效法上帝的思維而思維」，首先是指：按照上帝的啟示來思維。在這一章裡，我們要討論上帝的普遍啟示和特殊啟示。下面幾章，我們將探索啟示在知識論中的涵義；我們將從預設、理性、邏輯的角色，以及神學系統等角度來討論。

For Van Til, “thinking God’s thoughts after him” is first of all thinking according to divine revelation. In this chapter, we shall discuss general and special revelation. In the next chapters, we shall explore the implications of revelation for epistemology: the roles of presuppositions, reason and logic, and theological systems.

改革宗傳統的普遍啟示與特殊啟示觀 General Revelation, Special Revelation In the Reformed Tradition

范泰爾的啟示觀，本質上與加爾文和改革宗的傳統大致相同，特別是凱柏（Abraham Kuyper）、巴文克（Herman Bavinck）和華菲德（B.B. Warfield）的神學。上帝所有的創造當中，都有祂的「自然啟示」（或稱「普遍啟示」）在裡面；人身為上帝的形象，當然也不例外。普遍啟示顯明上帝的本性，和祂對人的道德要求（羅 1:18-20、32）。人類犯罪之後，上帝另外又添加了「特殊啟示」，從中賜給人有關恩典的資訊。特殊啟示的媒介有：上帝的親自顯現（*theophany*）（包括上帝兒子的道成肉身）、先知預言、神跡和筆之於書的《聖經》。《聖經》是上帝

的話，它的原稿是無謬的（infallible）、無誤的（inerrant）。（范氏在 IST, 62-158 裡詳細地解釋了他的啟示觀，另參 CA, 23-37; CTK, 25-71; PDS; NS; IW。）

Van Til's view of revelation is essentially that of Calvin and the Reformed tradition, especially including Kuyper, Bavinck, and Warfield. There is "natural" or "general" revelation in all of creation, including man, who is God's image. This revelation indicates God's nature and his moral demands. (Rom. 1:18-20, 32) After man sinned, the message of God's grace was given in additional "special" revelation, communicated through theophany (including the incarnation of the Son of God), prophecy, and miracle, and eventually committed to writing in Scripture. Scripture is God's Word, infallible and inerrant in its original manuscripts. (Van Til's view of revelation is expounded in greatest detail in IST, 62-158. See also CA, 23-37; CTK, 25-71; PDS; NS; IW)

當范泰爾把這些教義應用在知識論和護教學的時候，新的重點和洞見浮現了。接下來，我將把焦點集中在范氏的啟示觀；我認為，這是他的特殊貢獻，能幫助教會思索有關「啟示」的教義。

As Van Til relates these doctrines to his own epistemological and apologetic concerns, however, new emphases and insights emerge. In what follows, I will focus on what I take to be Van Til's distinctive contributions to the church's thinking about revelation.

普遍啟示

GENERAL REVELATION

眾所周知，范泰爾堅持一切的護教見證必須建立在合乎《聖經》的預設上，不可單以「對自然事實嚴謹、中立的論證」為根據。因此，有些人批判他不重視上帝的普遍啟示。

Van Til is known for the view that all apologetic witness must be based on presuppositions drawn from Scripture, rather than on religiously neutral argument from the facts of nature alone. Consequently, critics sometimes fault him for failing to do justice to general revelation.

范泰爾論普遍啟示：必須、權威、足夠、清晰

Van Til on General Revelation: Necessary, Authoritative, Sufficient, Clear

因此我們必須瞭解，范泰爾有一套穩固扎實的普遍啟示觀。在他的著作中，這是最主要的重點。他強調，普遍啟示與《聖經》一樣，為了達成其特殊目標，它是「必須的、有權威性的、足夠的和清晰的」（CA, 30-37; NS, 269-283）。我們將會看見，普遍啟示在范泰爾的護教學中扮演了舉足輕重的角色。因為有了上帝清楚、權威性的普遍啟示，非基督徒才能「知道」上帝（羅 1:21）；但這方面的知識，又正是

非基督徒試圖去壓制的。護教者所訴諸的就是：上帝對非基督徒清楚的自我啟示；非基督徒知道它，但卻壓制它。

It is important, then, to realize that Van Til has a very strong doctrine of general revelation. This is a major emphasis in his writings. He stresses that general revelation, like Scripture, is “necessary, authoritative, sufficient and perspicuous” for its distinctive purposes. (CA, 30-37; NS, 269-283) As we shall see, this revelation plays a central role in his apologetic. It is because of that clear, authoritative general revelation that the unbeliever “knows” God (Rom. 1:21); and it is that revealed knowledge which he seeks to suppress. It is to that clear self-revelation of God to the unbeliever, known but suppressed, that the apologist appeals.

普遍啟示：啟示上帝的永恆預旨 General Revelation Reveals Eternal Decree

如此堅強的普遍啟示觀，來自於改革宗對「上帝的主權」的信念。如果萬事皆因上帝主權的預旨而發生，那麼，所有的事多多少少都會顯明上帝的預旨。因此，「一切被造的實存，都啟示著上帝的本性與旨意。」（CA, 33）范氏解釋道：

Such a strong doctrine of general revelation follows from Van Til’s Reformed view of divine sovereignty. If all things come to pass by God’s sovereign decree, then all things to some extent reveal that decree. Therefore, “All created reality is inherently revelational of the nature and will of God.” (CA, 33) He explains:

這位上帝顯然對被造的宇宙有一個整全、包含萬有的計畫。祂計畫了所有被造存有之間的所有關係。祂從起初就計畫了末了。因此，所有被造的實存實際上都在顯示著這個計畫；也因此，它們的本質是合乎理性的。（CA, 34-35）

This God naturally has an all-comprehensive plan for the created universe. He has planned all the relationships between all the aspects of created being. He has planned the end from the beginning. All created reality therefore actually displays this plan. It is, in consequence, inherently rational. (CA, 34-35)

宇宙具啟示性，因為它是為上帝的榮耀而造； 亞米念主義不承認人性具啟示性 Universe Revelational, Because Created For God’s Glory; Arminians Deny Human Nature Is Revelational

請注意：「如果整個宇宙是為顯明上帝的榮耀而被造—正如《聖經》不斷宣稱的，那麼，除非宇宙是上帝的啟示，它不可能顯明上帝的榮耀。」（IST, 64. 見 110 頁等。范泰爾譴責亞米念神學，因為後者否認人性本身具有啟示性。按照亞米念主

義的看法，由於人的自由意志獨立於上帝的計畫之外，那麼人性就不可能是上帝的啟示、上帝的形象。既然如此，普遍啟示就不足以讓人對罪無可推諉。）

Note also, “If the whole universe was created to show forth the glory of God, as the Scriptures constantly say that it was, then it could not do this unless it was a revelation of God.” (IST, 64. On p. 110... he reproaches Arminian theology because it does not see human nature itself as revelational. Since human free will, on the Arminian understanding, is independent of God’s plan, it cannot be a divine revelation, the image of God. As such, general revelation is insufficient to leave man totally without excuse for sin.)

救贖（特殊）啟示預設普遍啟示；

分辨 = 歷史的關鍵

**Redemptive (Special Revelation) Presupposes General Revelation;
Differentiation Key to History**

「建立一個穩固的普遍啟示教義至關重要」的另一個原因是：救贖啟示（特殊啟示、《聖經》）預設了普遍啟示：

A strong doctrine of general revelation is also important because the doctrine of redemptive revelation (special revelation, Scripture) presupposes it:

上帝對人類的自然啟示從起初開始就是盟約性（covenantal）的，祂有意要以自然啟示作為一個平臺，在歷史進程中進行區分的過程（the process of differentiation）。上帝與亞當所立的約是條件性的，在人類對分辨善惡樹採取行動之後，上帝在自然裡面為啟示添加了新的內容。（NS, 267-268. 「分辨」一詞（differentiation）是指上帝的子民在歷史中逐漸被顯明是從墮落的世界中分別出來的，與不被揀選的人不同。在《普遍恩典與福音》一書中有詳細的解釋。）

Being from the outset covenantal in character, the natural revelation of God to man was meant to serve as the playground for the process of differentiation that was to take place in the course of time. The covenant made with Adam was conditional. There would be *additional* revelation of God in nature after the action of man with respect to the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. (NS, 267-268. “Differentiation,” a concept explained at length in CGG, refers to the gradual manifestation in history of the people of God in distinction from the reprobate world.)

墮落後普遍啟示的新內容：上帝的忿怒

After Fall, New Content in General Revelation: God’s Wrath

這個新添的啟示，乃是有關「上帝的忿怒」的啟示（羅 1:18）；但是，「上帝的恩典也與祂的忿怒一起被顯明。」上帝借著彩虹向挪亞顯明祂的普遍恩典，除

此之外，上帝更在基督裡宣告了救贖的恩典。救贖啟示借著先知預言與上帝跡臨到我們。范泰爾解釋：「自然界的力量，永遠都在聽從、服事宇宙中『區分的權柄』的召喚，去完成後者救贖與定罪的工作。這個超自然同時又是自然的啟示，就是舊約《聖經》—尤其是詩篇—所要精心表達的內容。」（NS, 268-269）

That additional revelation was a revelation of wrath (Rom. 1:18), but “together with God’s wrath, his grace is also manifest.” God’s common grace is manifested to Noah through the sign of the rainbow. But beyond this, God proclaims saving grace in Christ. That revelation comes through prophecy and miracle. Van Til explains: “The forces of nature are always at the beck and call of the power of differentiation that works toward redemption and reprobation. It is the idea of a supernatural-natural revelation that comes to such eloquent expression in the Old Testament, and particularly in the Psalms.” (NS, 268-269)

**墮落前、墮落後，人都必須通過
特殊啟示（上帝心意的傳遞）
來理解普遍啟示
Before And After Fall, Man Needs
Special Revelation (Thought-Communication)
To Understand General Revelation**

因此，范泰爾堅持普遍啟示和特殊啟示是一個整體，不應被硬性分割。用范泰爾的話來說，「就算在樂園裡」，人「也必須與超自然啟示的亮光接連，才能正確地去解讀自然。」（DF2, 106; cf. CTK, 29-3. IST, 68, 162, 189.....）人類墮落之後，超自然心意的傳遞—現在的「特殊啟示」—越發成為必須的，因為墮落的人會本能地去歪曲普遍啟示的真理（羅 1:18-32）。

Van Til, therefore, insists that general and special revelation are integrated, rather than sharply distinguished. “Even in paradise,” to use a common Van Tillian phrase, man “could read nature aright only in connection with and in the light of supernatural positive revelation.” (DF2, 106; cf. CTK, 29-3. IST, 68, 162, 189.....) After the Fall, that supernatural thought-communication, now a “special revelation,” became all the more necessary, since fallen man naturally distorted the truth of general revelation (Rom. 1:18-32).

**特殊啟示預設普遍啟示
Special Revelation Presupposes General Revelation**

與此同時，「超自然心意的傳遞」也預設了普遍啟示；所以，沒有普遍啟示，我們就不能理解超自然啟示。因此，自然啟示也具有傳統上被歸於《聖經》的四個屬性；和《聖經》一樣，自然啟示是必須的、權威性的、足夠的和清晰的。

At the same time, supernatural thought-communication also presupposes general revelation and therefore cannot be understood without it. Natural revelation, therefore,

bears the four attributes traditionally ascribed to Scripture. Like Scripture, natural revelation is necessary, authoritative, sufficient, and perspicuous.

1. 普遍啟示的必須性

1. Necessity of General Revelation

普遍啟示是必須的，因為「超自然若要顯明為超自然，自然就必須顯明為自然……宇宙中若要有真正的「例外」，則必須先有常規。」(NS, 269-270) 上帝所賜有關人類生活的誡命，若要作為範例讓人遵守，這條誡命就必須是一個例外（范氏在這裡指的是創世記 2:17，關於分辨善惡樹的誡命）。

General revelation is necessary, because “for the supernatural to appear as supernatural the natural had to appear as really natural. ... There had to be regularity if there was to be a genuine exception.” (NS, 269-270) And God’s commandments concerning particulars of human life (Van Til speaks here of the commandment concerning the tree of knowledge in Gen. 2:17) must, if they are to serve as “examples” for our obedience in other areas, be exceptional.

自然與超自然之間的關係不只是墮落前，也是墮落後的實況。可是墮落之後，兩者之間的關係加入了一個新的特性：「自然必須被顯明是需要救贖的。……《聖經》當中有關醫治的神跡，全都指向萬事萬物的更新。」(NS, 270-271) 因此，必須有一個被罪咒詛的世界，才能顯明上帝救贖的特殊計畫。上帝借著祂救贖性的作為和話語來彰顯這個計畫。

The relation between the natural and the supernatural applies both before and after the Fall. But after the Fall, another distinction enters: “The natural must appear as in need of redemption. ... The Biblical miracles of healing point to the regeneration of all things.” (NS, 270-271.) So, it is necessary to have a world cursed by sin in order to show by contrast the special plan of God’s redemption. That plan is shown both by God’s saving deeds and by his saving words.

2. 普遍啟示的權威性

2. Authority of General Revelation

普遍啟示是具有權威性的。福音派人士有時天真地以為《聖經》比自然啟示更具權威性，但這不是《聖經》的教導。雖然《聖經》是上帝所書寫的惟一啟示，在啟示的體系裡扮演了獨特的角色，但是它的權威性並不比上帝借著自然所賜下的啟示更高或更低。因為，兩種啟示都來自上帝——雖然一個是例外的，一個是常規性的。因此范泰爾說：

General revelation is also authoritative. Evangelicals sometimes think naively that Scripture has more authority than natural revelation. But that is not the teaching of Scripture. Although Scripture has a unique role to play in the organism of revelation, as the only divinely authored written revelation, it is no more or less authoritative than

God's word through nature, for both revelations, exceptional and ordinary, come from God. So, Van Til says,

上帝向人所發出的「例外性」聲音，它的權威性只不過說明了上帝也透過自然界發出權威的聲音。... 因此人的科學研究方法必須是順服上帝的。（NS, 272-273）

The voice of authority as it came to man in this exceptional manner was to be but illustrative of the fact that, in and through the things of nature, there spoke the self-same voice of God's command. ... Man's scientific procedure was accordingly to be marked by the attitude of obedience to God. (NS, 272-273)

就算是我們的罪也具啟示性，因為罪是「反常」的。（NS, 275）

Even our sins are “revelational, that is, in their very abnormality.” (NS, 275)

3. 普遍啟示的足夠性

3. Sufficiency of General Revelation

普遍啟示本身足以達成它的歷史目的，也就是提供「超自然的救贖與啟示」一個適當的背景（平台）。雖然它本身並不足以傳遞上帝救贖應許的恩典，可是，這並不是它的目的。（NS, 275-276）

General revelation is sufficient for its historical purpose, which is, of course, to provide a proper background for supernatural redemption and revelation. It is not sufficient to communicate God's saving promises of grace, but that was not its purpose. (NS, 275-276)

4. 普遍啟示的清晰性

4. Perspicuity (Clarity) of General Revelation

普遍啟示是清晰的（perspicuous）。雖然上帝不能被透知，而且世界已經受了咒詛，但是世界卻依然清楚地顯示了上帝（羅 1:18-21）。普遍啟示本身雖然是清晰的，卻沒有被罪人正確地理解：「因為一個事實若是事實，它必須具啟示性。因此，罪人接受上帝的自然啟示，並不比接受上帝在《聖經》中的啟示更為容易。」（NS, 280）

Finally, general revelation is perspicuous, or clear. Although God is incomprehensible, and the world is cursed, nevertheless the world reveals God clearly (Rom. 1:18-21). Although clear in itself, general revelation is not properly understood by sinful man: “For any fact to be a fact at all, it must be a revelational fact. It is accordingly no easier for sinners to accept God's revelation in nature than to accept God's revelation in Scripture.” (NS, 280)

總結

Summary

總結來說，普遍啟示和特殊啟示的必須性、權威性、足夠性和清晰性都是同等的。特殊啟示的獨特性，不是在於它更具權威性（或更必須、更足夠、更清晰），而是在於，它是為了一些獨特的目的而被賜下：（1）引導人正確地解釋普遍啟示；（2）在人類墮落後，糾正人對普遍啟示的歪曲；（3）將上帝在基督裡的救贖應許帶給我們，而這個資訊無法藉由普遍啟示得知。

To summarize, general and special revelation are equally necessary, authoritative, sufficient, and perspicuous. The uniqueness of special revelation is not that it is more authoritative (or more of the other attributes) than natural revelation. Rather, special revelation is unique because it is given for distinct purposes: (1) to guide our interpretation of general revelation, (2) after the Fall, to correct our sinful distortions of general revelation, and (3) to bring us God's promise of salvation through Christ, a message not available through general revelation.

視角主義 PERSPECTIVALISM

三面區分；九個範疇 Three-fold Distinction; Nine Categories

范泰爾在《系統神學入門》中，發展了他對普遍啟示和特殊啟示的整合理念。有趣的是，他在這裡放棄傳統普遍啟示與特殊啟示的二分法，而使用三分法來論述「啟示」：從上帝而來的啟示、從自然界而來的啟示和從人自身而來的啟示。（這讓我們想起加爾文在《基督教要義》的卷首說道，我們對自己的認識和對上帝的認識是不能分開的，這兩種知識彼此互相需要；不過，加爾文並不知道哪一種知識較為「優先」。）

Van Til develops in *An Introduction to Systematic Theology* his ideas on the integration of general and special revelation. Interestingly, at this point he resorts to a threefold, rather than a twofold, distinction: instead of the traditional general-special distinction, he refers to revelation from God, from nature, and from self. (This is reminiscent of the first page of Calvin's *Institutes*, in which he declares the inseparability of our knowledge of self from our knowledge of God. Calvin says that each is involved in the other, and he does not know which "comes first.")

他將這三方面的啟示來源與另外一組的三種啟示－關於上帝的啟示、關於自然界的啟示和關於人自己的啟示－結合，共得出九個範疇：從自然界、人自身和上帝所得知的有關自然界的啟示；從三種同樣來源所得知的有關人自己的啟示；和從三種同樣來源所得知的有關上帝的啟示。（也許是開玩笑，也許是非常認真的，范泰爾賦予每一種關係一個專用頭銜，就像凱伯的人類知識大全。例如：來自自然界有關於自然界的啟示，就是物理；來自人自身有關於自然界的啟示，就是心理物理。（《系統神學入門》，頁 64-65 圖表。）

Relating these to another triad, that of revelation about God, about nature, and about self, he ends up with nine categories: revelation about nature from nature, self, and God; revelation about self from the same three sources; and revelation about God from the same three sources. (Perhaps somewhat tongue in cheek (but perhaps not), Van Til gives to each relationship a technical title, in the manner of Kuyper's *Encyclopedia*. For example, revelation about nature from nature is physics, and revelation about nature from self is psycho-physics. The whole chart is in IST, 64-65.)

啟示與知識相互依賴 Interdependence of Revelation and Knowledge

范泰爾論證道：上述三種來源，全都涉及有關任何事物的知識；更重要的是，范氏堅持，九種關係裡每一方面的關係，都必須從「基督教有神論」的角度去理解。（我曾在《認識神的知識論》一書中闡述「視角主義」，范泰爾這方面的洞見，是「視角主義」的一個重要來源－傅蘭姆。）比方說，當我們從自然界去理解有關

自然界的啟示時，我們必須認清自然界是上帝創造、掌管的，因此所有的事實都由定律管理，所有的定律都與事實有關。（參本書第五章「三位一體論」，我在當中解釋了范泰爾的三一神論對這個預設所提供的理論基礎。）事實之所以是事實，定律之所以是定律，都是因為上帝的緣故。離開上帝的永恆計畫，事實與定律之間不可能存在甚麼有用的關係。

He argues that all three sources are involved in the knowledge of any object: but, more important, he argues that each relationship must be understood from a Christian-theistic perspective. (These insights of Van Til's are one major source (together with others) of the "perspectivalism" expounded in my DKG – John Frame.) As we understand revelation about nature from nature, for example, it is important that we recognize that nature is created and governed by God; therefore, all facts are governed by laws, and all laws are related to facts. (Cf. chapter 5 of this volume, "The Trinity," in which I describe the rationale for this proposition in Van Til's doctrine of the Trinity.) And both facts and laws are what they are because of God. Apart from his plan, they could not exist in "fruitful relation" to one another.

認識上帝是必須的（優先的必須） Need for Knowledge of God (Prior Need)

范泰爾避開了傳統的經驗主義和先驗主義：「與定律分離的事實」和「與事實分離的定律」同樣沒有意義。若上帝沒有將事實和定律有意義地互相連接，知識不可能存在。因此我們看見，對范泰爾來說，就算在思想「來自自然界關於自然界的啟示」時，關於上帝的知識（認識上帝）也是我們必須同時思想的。（IST, 65-66.）

Van Til eschews both traditional empiricism and traditional apriorism: facts apart from laws and vice versa are equally meaningless. Without God to relate the facts and laws intelligibly to one another, knowledge is impossible. Thus we see that for Van Til, the knowledge of God enters even into our consideration of "revelation about nature from nature." (IST, 65-66)

宗教與科學不可分開 Religion and Science Inseparable

「從人自身而來關於自然界的啟示」也很重要；因為，透過比較自然界和自己，我們可以學習到許多有關自然的知識。可是，要正確地進行這樣的比較和學習，就必須具備合乎《聖經》的自我觀念（人論）。（IST, 66-67.）因此，「從上帝而來關於自然界的啟示」至為關鍵。是上帝透過自然啟示和特殊啟示告訴我們，世界乃是被創造、被咒詛的。因此，我們不可以分割（compartmentalize）宗教和科學。「就算在樂園裡」，上帝也要求人在祂所說的話語的亮光中去研究自然。（IST, 67-68）

"Revelation about nature from self" is also important, since we learn much about nature by comparing it with ourselves. But to do this properly, we must have a biblical concept of the self. (IST, 66-67.) "Revelation about nature from God," therefore, is

crucial. It is God who tells us, both in natural and special revelation, that the world is created and cursed. We may not, therefore, compartmentalize religion and science. “Even in paradise,” God expected man to study nature in the light of his spoken word. (IST, 67-68)

普遍啟示，墮落後還是清晰的

Perspicuity of General Revelation After Fall

在《系統神學入門》接下來的三章中（第7-9章），范泰爾討論到人類的墮落對「上帝有關自然界、人和祂自己的啟示」有何影響。我們會在本書的第三部分—知識的倫理—討論這方面的問題。大體說來，上帝的啟示仍然保持清晰。雖然它反映出神對大地的咒詛，雖然人的不義會歪曲真理，可是，人依然可以從自然啟示中有所學習。

In the next three chapters of *An Introduction to Systematic Theology* (7-9), Van Til discusses the effects of the Fall upon God’s revelation about nature, man, and God. We shall consider this material in Part Three, “The Ethics of Knowledge.” In general, the revelation remains clear, although it reflects the curse on the earth, and although man sinfully distorts the truth, he learns from it.

「惟獨《聖經》」與《聖經》以外的知識

Sola Scriptura and Extrabiblical Knowledge

無疑地，范泰爾堅信傳統基督新教的「惟獨聖經」原則，即：只有《聖經》才是人類思想與生活的無上權威。在下一章裡面，我們將會看到《聖經》乃是范氏的「預設」。儘管如此，范泰爾的「惟獨聖經」觀不是機械式的，彷彿我們可以單用《聖經》來發展知識，完全不必使用我們的理性或感知。他瞭解到，在人類所認識的每一點知識中，都同時存在著有關上帝的知識、有關世界的知識和有關人自己的知識。我們不可能認識一樣事物，除非我們將它與其它的事物或我們自己連系起來；我們不能正確地認識上帝，除非我們知道祂是這個世界的創造主，也是我們的創造主與救贖主；我們不可能認識《聖經》，除非我們將《聖經》與我們自己和我們的經驗世界連系起來。普遍啟示和特殊啟示一定是合作共事的，雖然後者無疑是我們理解前者的終極準則。

Certainly, Van Til believed in *sola Scriptura* in the traditional Protestant sense: that only Scripture serves as the supreme authority for human thought and life. We shall see in the next chapter how Scripture was Van Til’s “presupposition.” Nevertheless, Van Til did not hold a mechanical view of *sola Scriptura*, as if we could develop our knowledge from Scripture alone, without any use of our own reason or senses. He understood that in any instance of knowledge, there is simultaneous knowledge of God, the world, and the self. We cannot know one thing without relating it to other things and to ourselves. We cannot know God rightly unless we know him as Creator of the world and as our own Creator-Redeemer. We cannot know Scripture without relating it to ourselves and to the world of our experience. General and special revelation always

work together, though certainly the latter must provide the ultimate criteria for understanding the former.

普遍啟示與特殊啟示：

成為整體；互為界線觀念

**General Revelation and Special Revelation:
Forms One Whole, Mutual “Limiting Concepts”**

我們應該特別注意，在這個思維架構裡面，從自然界而來的啟示和從人而來的啟示，並沒有與來自上帝的啟示隔離。就算是從自然界而來關於自然界的啟示，也必須以合乎《聖經》的角度去理解。誠然，自然界、人和上帝都必須在它們彼此的參照下（in light of one another）被理解。「就算在神學本身—來自上帝關於上帝的啟示—的範疇內」范泰爾說，「從『自我反省』和『思想被造世界』所得關於上帝的知識，不能人為的與得自『上帝直接傳遞（啟示）的』關於上帝的知識隨便分開。」（IST, 67-68.）另外，請注意：

We should note especially that in this scheme, revelation from nature and revelation from man are not isolated from revelation from God. Even revelation about nature from nature must be understood in a scriptural way. Indeed, nature, man, and God must all be understood in the light of one another. Even in “theology proper,” the “revelation about God from God,” said Van Til, “we cannot artificially separate the knowledge of God that man received or could receive by his reflection on man and the created universe in general, and the knowledge of God that man received from God by direct communication.” (IST, 67-68) Note also:

「上帝親自直接啟示的知識」和「上帝以自然的方式向人啟示的知識」，兩者共同形成了一個真理系統。上帝對宇宙有一個整體的計畫，包括祂的自然啟示和超自然啟示。因此，我們必須認識到：每一種啟示都隱含著另一種啟示，它們是彼此的界線觀念（limiting concepts）。（IST, 74）

What God did actually reveal directly, and what God revealed naturally to man, together form one system of truth. God had one comprehensive plan with respect to the universe inclusive of his natural and his supernatural revelation. It is of great importance that the various aspects of revelation be regarded as implying one another. They are limiting concepts of one another. (IST, 74)

傅蘭姆：相互依賴=視角主義

Interdependence = Perspectivalism (Frame)

當范泰爾在上面所引用的話中說，「自然啟示和超自然啟示是彼此的界線觀念（limiting concepts）」時，我相信他的意思是：沒有不與特殊啟示摻雜的「純」自然啟示；也沒有不與自然啟示摻雜的「純」特殊啟示。「界線觀念」Limiting concept 是康得和他之後的哲學家所使用的術語。數學中的「無限」（infinity）是一個「界線觀念」limiting concept，因為，雖然我們能在計算中有意義地使用這個概念，世

上卻沒有真正在數量上是「無限」的事物。界線觀念（limiting concepts）用在分析事物時非常有用，可是它們並非代表了甚麼真正存在的事物。關於范泰爾如何使用這觀念，請參看第 13 章「類比系統」。自然（啟示）必須在超自然（啟示）的光照中來理解；而超自然（特殊啟示）也必須以自然為背景去理解它。若少了彼此作為彼此的背景（處境，context），兩者都不可能起到「啟示」的作用。

When Van Til says in the above quotation that natural and supernatural revelation are “limiting concepts of one another,” I believe that he means that there is no purely natural revelation or purely supernatural revelation without admixture of the other. (“Limiting concept” is a term used by Immanuel Kant and later philosophers. Mathematical infinity is a limiting concept, because although we can use the concept meaningfully in calculations, there are no actually infinite quantities of objects in the world. Limiting concepts are useful for analytic purposes, but they do not literally represent something that exists. See chap. 13, “The Analogical System,” for more on Van Til’s use of this concept.) The natural must be understood in the light of the supernatural, and the supernatural must be understood against the “backdrop” of the natural. Apart from these contexts, they do not actually function as revelation.

我在其它的拙作中（《認識神的知識論》，中華展望翻譯，原著：Doctrine of the Knowledge of God）把這個觀念稱為「視角主義」（perspectivalism）。意思是說：人類所有的知識，都同時是關於自己的知識、關於世界的知識和關於上帝的知識。若少了其它兩個範疇，一個範疇的知識不可能是足夠的。若不認識上帝，我們不可能正確地認識自己，其它方面的關係也是如此。因此，「對自我的認識」實在是三方面的知識：自我認識、認識世界和認識上帝，只不過焦點集中在自己而已。在這重意義上，自我認識成了透視「自己、世界和上帝」這個三元體系（triad）的一個視角（perspective）。

I have elsewhere described this sort of view as “perspectivalism.” (In DKG, throughout.) That is, all human knowledge is simultaneous knowledge of self, world, and God. Knowledge of one area cannot be adequate without knowledge of the other two. One cannot know the self rightly without knowing God, and similarly with the other relationships. Therefore, “self-knowledge” is really a knowledge of all three areas – self, world, and God, with a focus or emphasis on the self. Self-knowledge in this case becomes a perspective on the entire triad.

兩者必須分辨：我們需要神學嗎？

Do Distinguish the Two: Do We Need Theology?

在之前那段引文的脈絡下，范泰爾的確說過，自然神學和超自然神學依然必須「分辨清楚：這個分辨是不同『內容』的分辨。若能在這裡分辨清楚，就能說明我們認清：罪進入世界之後，人透過自然神學與理性神學的方法，能怎樣認識上帝？甚麼是必須留給『神學』去處理的？」（IST, 74）

Van Til does say in the context of the last quotation that natural and supernatural theology must nevertheless be “kept distinct.: The distinctness is a distinctness of content: “If we keep them distinct at this place, it will help us when we come to the question of what can, now that sin has entered the world, still be known of God by the process of natural and rational theology, and what must be reserved for theology proper.” (IST, 74)

我相信范泰爾在這裡只是簡單的作了一個傳統上的區分是：自然神學是傳遞上帝的本性與忿怒，啟示神學則在傳遞福音。因此，自然啟示與特殊啟示在內容上有所不同。可是，若要正確地去瞭解、應用任何一種啟示，則必須透過另外一方。我們不應該誤解范泰爾的視角主義，以為上帝在兩種啟示中的資訊完全一樣；范泰爾要我們認清每一種啟示的獨特本質，和上帝所有的啟示之間的相互依賴性。其實，啟示與被造的宇宙一樣，都是三一真神的表彰。

Here I believe Van Til is simply making the traditional distinction between natural theology as communicating God’s nature and wrath, and revealed theology, as communicating the gospel. Natural and special revelation, therefore, differ in content. But to understand and to apply each one properly, we need the other. Van Til’s perspectivalism must not be taken in a leveling way so that all God’s messages become identical. Rather, it calls us to recognize both the integrity of each revelation and the interdependence of all God’s revelations. For revelation is, after all, like creation, a manifestation of the divine Trinity.

特殊啟示 SPECIAL REVELATION

特殊啟示掌管所有的知識 Special Revelation Rules Over All Knowledge

范泰爾的三重視角架構，出現在他討論普遍啟示的一系列篇章裡。可是，正如我們所見，這個架構本身包含了特殊啟示。「來自上帝有關自然界、人和上帝的啟示」除了普遍啟示之外，當然也包括了特殊啟示：的確，所有範疇都需要來自《聖經》亮光的解釋。所以我們已經看到范泰爾特殊啟示觀裡最重要的一點：特殊啟示必須管治人類知識的所有其它層面。

Van Til's threefold perspectival scheme appears in a series of chapters devoted to the topic of general revelation. As we have seen, however, this scheme includes special revelation within its purview. "Revelation by God about nature, man, and God" is a category that certainly includes special, as well as general, revelation: indeed, all the categories require interpretation in the light of Scripture. So we have already seen some of what is most important in Van Til's view of special revelation: that it must rule all other aspects of human knowledge.

雖然如此，范泰爾也進一步將注意力的焦點更多放在特殊啟示—特別是《聖經》—上。現在讓我們來注意這方面的討論。

Nevertheless, Van Til does go on to give more focused attention to special revelation, and particularly to Scripture. We must now give attention to that discussion.

特殊啟示的必須性：人的罪性 The Need for Special Revelation: Man's Sin

特殊啟示的必須性「不在於上帝創造人類時所給他的普遍啟示有任何缺欠。」(IST, 110.) 按照它的目的來看，普遍啟示是全然足夠的；當時如此，現在也如此。更準確的來說，特殊啟示的必須性來自人的罪性（而不是人的有限性。范泰爾如此強調）。有關上帝恩典的資訊不能在自然界裡被發現。此外，特殊啟示是必需的，它要糾正身為罪人的我們，對普遍啟示的扭曲。(IST, 111-112)

The necessity of special revelation "does not lie in any defect in the general revelation that God gave to man when he created him." (IST, 110) General revelation was, and still is, fully adequate for its purpose. Rather, the need for special revelation is found in man's sin (not, Van Til emphasizes, in his finitude.) The message of grace is not found in nature. In addition, special revelation is necessary to correct our sinful distortion of general revelation. (IST, 111-112)

特殊啟示：上帝的話語、作為、臨在 Special Revelation: God's Words, Deeds, Presence

特殊啟示不僅包括聖靈默示的文字，還包括上帝啟示性的作為。范泰爾視《聖經》裡上帝的顯現、先知預言和神跡為一個整體：上帝救贖性的臨在、救贖性的話語和救贖性的作為。（傅蘭姆：參見拙著《認識神的知識論》講述的三個範疇：準則性、處境性及存在性。）每一種啟示的方式（mode）都預設了另外兩種方式。上帝的話語解釋祂的作為；而上帝的話語和作為，則賦予祂的顯現（上帝住在人間）以重要意義。（IST, 119）這種對救贖性作為的強調，使我們不至墮進「假理性主義」之中。（IST, 130）我們的需要不僅僅是資料的缺乏；我們所需要的，是人性的改變。

Special revelation consists not only of inspired words, but also of revelatory deeds. Van Til sees an organic relation in Scripture between theophany, prophecy, and miracle: God's saving presence, saving words, and saving deeds. (Cf. the categories "normative," "situational," and "existential in my DKG – John Fame.) Each mode of revelation presupposes the other two. God's words interpret his deeds, and both "give significance to God's dwelling with man (theophany)." (IST, 119.) The emphasis on saving deeds keep us from "false intellectualism;" (IST, 130) our need is not a mere lack of information, but a need for personal change.

「上帝的話語與祂的作為同工；上帝的作為與祂的話語同工。」（IST, 131）透過這兩種形式，上帝親自來到我們中間，拯救我們脫離罪惡。在不瞭解所有三種啟示方式的情況下，我們不可能認識其中任何一種方式－這又是另一種視角性（perspectival）的關係。

"The words corroborate the deeds and the deeds corroborate the words." (IST, 131) And in the two, God himself comes to us to save us from our sin. We cannot know one form of revelation without knowing all of them – another "perspectival" relationship.

《聖經》 SCRIPTURE

《聖經》的觀念， Idea of Scripture, Message of Scripture: Inseparable

范泰爾這樣評價凱伯與巴文克的聖經觀：「他們的觀點何等基要！何等寬廣！他們說，《聖經》的觀念（idea of Scripture）永遠不可與《聖經》的資訊分開！」（JA, 8; 參 CTK, 31, 33, 范泰爾在該處說到，「《聖經》事實」和「《聖經》內容」兩個觀念的相輔相成性（interdependence）。）「分開」（separation）在神學裡面是一個微妙的觀念，有人曾用這個「觀念與資訊」的關係來批評正統的聖經觀。例如：有人會說，因為《聖經》的資訊關乎救贖，因此《聖經》的無誤性應該局限於

狹義性的救贖範圍；這樣，我們就可以容許《聖經》在論及其它事物時出現錯誤。可是范泰爾討論在這些問題時，卻對「《聖經》的觀念」（*idea of Scripture*）和「《聖經》的資訊」持有不同的看法。對范氏來說，《聖經》的資訊是上帝所賜予人恩典的話語；這位上帝是一位完全掌權、並以絕對權威說話的上帝。如果《聖經》就是這「話語」，那麼它必定傳遞了上帝至高的權威，因此在任何事物的記載上都應無謬無誤。范泰爾支持華爾非德的聖經觀：

Speaking of Kuyper's and Bavinck's views of Scripture, Van Til remarks, "How basic and how broad was their view! The *idea* of Scripture, they said, must never be separated from its *message*." (JA, 8; cf. CTK, 31, 33, where Van Til speaks of the "interdependence of the *idea* of the *fact* and the *content* of Scripture.") "Separation" is a tricky word in theology, and some have used this idea-message relationship to criticize orthodox views of Scripture. For example, the claim is sometimes made that because the message of Scripture deals with salvation, the idea of Scripture must limit inerrancy to matters of salvation narrowly defined, thus allowing for errors when Scripture speaks of other things. Van Til, however, comes to these questions with a different concept of both the idea and the message of Scripture. The message of Scripture, for Van Til, is a message of grace from a God who is absolutely sovereign and speaks with absolute authority. If Scripture is this Word, then it must convey his ultimate authority and therefore be inerrant in all matters. Van Til describes Warfield with approval as holding that

古典基督教「《聖經》無誤默示」的教義與「上帝主權」的教義有著密切的關係。上帝若不能在對人啟示自己時掌主權，祂就不可能在指揮人類—有理性靈魂的人—的時候掌主權。上帝若在「存有」的領域中掌主權，那麼祂當然也在知識的範圍裡掌主權。（IW, 3.）

The classical doctrine of the infallible inspiration of Scripture was involved in the doctrine of divine sovereignty. God could not be sovereign in his disposition of rational human beings if he were not also sovereign in his revelation of himself to them. If God is sovereign in the realm of being, he is surely also sovereign in the realm of knowledge. (IW, 3.)

我們是從《聖經》來認識這位元掌主權的上帝—這是《聖經》資訊的一部份。可是，當我們認識這樣一位元上帝的時候，我們會意識到，「這樣的一位上帝必須自我表明；這樣的一位上帝也會指明宇宙中所有事實的真相。借著指明宇宙中的所有事實，祂就為這些事實建立彼此間的相互關係。」（CK, 28.參：IW, 1）

We learn of this sovereign God from Scripture; this is part of its message. But when we learn of such a God, we realize that "such a God *must* identify himself. Such a God ... identifies all the facts of the universe. In identifying all the facts of the universe he sets these facts in relation to one another." (CK, 28. Cf. IW, 1)

因此，上帝的話—將祂自己權威性的救贖應許賜給了人—必須是自證的。《聖經》就是這話，並不需要除它之外的引證來證實它；這樣的證實是不可能的，除非這個外來的證實願意服在《聖經》的解釋與評估之下。（參范泰爾在 RP, 37 頁的論據。）

Thus, a word of God, giving his own authoritative promise of redemption, must be self-attesting. Scripture, as that Word, needs no corroboration from any source outside itself; and no such corroboration is possible, unless the other source is already subject to the interpretation and evaluation of Scripture. (Cf. Van Til's argument in RP, p. 37)

《聖經》若是自我見證的，那麼它必具有傳統的屬性：必需性、權威性、清晰性和足夠性。范泰爾對這些屬性的解釋如下：

If Scripture is self-attesting, then it bears the traditional attributes – necessity, authority, perspicuity, and sufficiency – which Van Til expounds as follows:

上帝默示了《聖經》，是祂筆之於書的話語；因為若任憑罪人自由發展下去，他們「必定會曲解上帝救贖的作為」（IST, 133）。因此《聖經》是必需的，以致於上帝救贖的資訊能夠：「（1）歷代保存，（2）傳到地極，（3）客觀地向人傳講，（4）在《聖經》裡面見證它的真實性。」（IST, 134）

God inspired Scripture as his written Word, because sinful man, if left on his own, “would be sure to misinterpret” (IST, 133) the saving deeds of God. Thus, there was the necessity for Scripture, so that God's saving message “(1) might remain through the ages, (2) might reach all mankind, (3) might be offered to men objectively, and (4) might have the testimony of its truthfulness within itself.” (IST, 134)

《聖經》也帶有權威，因為它在本質上就是上帝的話語，必然要向人類所宣稱的自主性發出挑戰。上帝的話必然傳達上帝的絕對權威—這是上帝的宣稱，宣告上帝在人身上的主權。

Scripture also has authority, because, of its very nature, it must challenge man's claim to autonomy. It must convey God's claim to absolute authority – his lordship over man.

《聖經》的清晰性是指：不需要「人間的解釋者介入《聖經》和它的受眾之間」。（IST, 135）教會的教師或許能在理解《聖經》方面給予我們有用的輔助；可是羅馬天主教卻錯誤的宣稱：「任何教會的信眾都不可以直接為自己解釋《聖經》。」（IST, 135）否認《聖經》的清晰性，就等於否認《聖經》的權威；因為，如果人間的教導權威對「正確的使用《聖經》」來說是必須的，那麼，這位人間權威就成了教會的最高權威。

The perspicuity of Scripture means that there is no “necessity for human interpreters to intervene between Scripture and those to whom Scripture comes.” (IST, 135)

Teachers of the church may give us useful assistance in understanding Scripture, but Roman Catholic theology is wrong to claim that “no ordinary member of the Church may interpret Scripture for himself directly.” (IST, 135) To deny the clarity of Scripture is to deny its authority, for if a human teaching authority is necessary for the proper use of Scripture, then that human authority becomes the ultimate authority in the church.

因此，人的意見不可加在《聖經》之上，成為與《聖經》地位同等的權威。換言之，《聖經》是足夠的。范泰爾說，宗教改革的領袖們相信《聖經》的足夠性，「因而特別反對所有的宗派主義（sectarianism）；相信《聖經》的清晰性，因而反對教權主義（clericalism）；相信《聖經》的必需性，因而反對理性主義；相信《聖經》的權威性，因而反對人的自主性。」（IST, 136）范泰爾以他特有的角度繼續說道：

Thus, no human opinion may be added to Scripture as an authority coordinate with Scripture. In other words, Scripture has sufficiency. The Reformers, says Van Til, thought of sufficiency “particularly in opposition to all manner of *sectarianism*, as they thought of perspicuity chiefly in opposition to *clericalism*, as they thought of necessity in opposition to *rationalism*, and as they thought of authority in opposition to *autonomy*.” (IST, 136.) Characteristically, he adds:

這些要點全都相互重迭、彼此包含，這是適當的。《聖經》四項屬性的重要性彼此相等，因為若缺少一樣，我們就會失去全部。問題的癥結在於：一個絕對真確的解釋，進入了一個充滿著錯誤解釋的世界裡。（IST, 136）

All these matters overlap and are involved in one another, and it is well to see that they do. The four attributes of Scripture are equally important because, if we did not have them all, we would have none. The whole matter centers about an absolutely true interpretation that came into a world full of false interpretation. (IST, 136)

所以這四項屬性也是「視角」！

The four attributes, too, are “perspectives.”

這個論證總體的重點是：如果《聖經》自證是上帝的話，信徒與上帝的啟示之間就「不能混入人的解釋」。 (IST, 136) 有人可能會在這一點上提出異議：人的解釋不是總會混雜在《聖經》的研究中嗎？正如范泰爾也意識到的，在研究《聖經》的過程中，我們必須使用自己的感知與理性。范泰爾在這裡肯定會提出他對普遍啟示和特殊啟示「視角式」的分析：在解釋《聖經》的工作上，我們的理性、感知和方法都必須遵從《聖經》。（若有人提出循環論證的問題，請參看本書第10章，第22章。）范泰爾所反對的「混雜」，按我（傅蘭姆）的判斷，不是指服在《聖經》管理下的理性，而是指自我標榜為終極權威，並且叛逆地曲解真理的理性。

The overall argument here is that if Scripture is the self-attesting Word of God, there must be “no admixture of human interpretation” standing between the believer and the revelation. (IST, 136) It might be objected at this point that an “admixture of human

interpretation” always does intervene in our study of Scripture, since, as Van Til recognizes, we must use our own senses and reason in that process. Here, Van Til would doubtless refer to his perspectival analysis of general and special revelation: in the work of Bible interpretation, our reasons, senses, and methods must themselves be brought into conformity to Scripture. (For the issue of circularity which arises here, see chaps. 10 and 22) The “admixture” to which Van Til objects, in my judgment, is not an admixture in which human reason is governed by Scripture, but one in which that reason asserts its own ultimacy and rebelliously distorts the truth.

那麼，就算是信徒在研讀《聖經》，不也同樣會有一些罪性的歪曲嗎？是的。不過，信徒研讀《聖經》的目標，是想要瞭解《聖經》本身的教導。即使我們是使用自己的能力來解釋《聖經》，《聖經》卻永遠站在我們之上，不斷向我們罪性的歪曲提出挑戰。《聖經》必須是上帝純粹、自證的話，本身毫無罪性的歪曲，才能對我們發出這樣的挑戰。

Is there not some sinful distortion even in the believer’s study of Scripture? Yes. But the goal of the believer’s study is to understand the teaching of the Word itself. Although we use our own faculties to interpret Scripture, it always stands over against us, challenging our sinful distortions. And to do that, Scripture itself must be God’s pure, self-attesting Word, itself free from sinful distortion.

范泰爾在回應 A.E. Taylor 的時候討論了這問題，後者對正統基督教聖經觀的基本異議是：「領受權威性資訊的人，若在領受的過程中有建設性作為，那麼就不可能有絕對權威的存在。」(IST, 139) 可是，這項異議對人類心智中「詮釋的功能」所作的假設是：

Van Til discusses this issue in dealing with A.E. Taylor, whose objections to the orthodox view of Scripture amounts to this: “There can be no authority which is absolute, if the one who receives the message of authority is, in any way, constructive in the *reception of it.*” (IST, 139, I am not clear as to why the last three words are emphasized – John Frame.) This objection assumes, however, that the interpretive activity of the human mind is

獨立於上帝心意之外的解釋行為。人若以這樣的錯誤假設為起點，當然不可能想像上帝在人之上的絕對權威；除非，人的心智活動完全停止。(IST, 139)

Something is independent of the interpretive activity of the divine mind. And if one starts with such a false assumption it is but to be expected that one cannot think of the absolute authority of God over man unless man’s mental activity is brought to a complete standstill. (IST, 139)

可是，根據基督教的信仰立場，上帝創造人類心智時，並沒有要它獨立於上帝之外。我會這麼解釋：當人的心智否定了自己的自主性，轉而效法上帝的思維去思

維（模擬性思維）時，它就能盡職的把解釋工作做到最好。罪若進入信徒的思想裡，他和聖靈要勝過的是這「罪」，而非其它。

On a Christian basis, however, the human mind was not made to be independent of the divine. I would paraphrase: the human mind does its best job of interpreting when it denies its own autonomy and “thinks analogically.” If sin enters into the believer's thought, it is sin that he and the Holy Spirit are overcoming.

《聖經》的原本 THE AUTOGRAPH

我將不會處理范泰爾對「羅馬天主教的聖經觀」和「假神秘主義」的回應，他的立場頗為傳統（IST, 140-145）。我也不會討論范氏有關「《聖經》是完全（逐字）默示而成」的論證（也很傳統）。（IST, 148-158）

I will not deal with Van Til's rather traditional responses to the views of Scripture of Roman Catholicism and “false mysticism,” (IST, 140-145) or with his scriptural argument, also traditional, for plenary inspiration. (IST, 148-158)

可是范泰爾對《聖經》原本（*autographa*）的看法，會與我們的討論有關係。傳統的改革宗神學立場認為，「《聖經》無謬誤」（*infallibility*）是指上帝直接默示的原本，而不是泛指每一本抄本。有許多人抗議說，假如真是這樣，那麼今天我們手上的《聖經》就不是無謬誤的了（*infallible*）。《聖經》原本既然已經失傳，實際上我們就沒有無謬誤的文本；那麼，我們的立場與自由派神學又有甚麼兩樣？我們手上的《聖經》也只不過是「基本上可靠」（*reasonably reliable*），而不是「無謬無誤」的，不是嗎？

His discussion of the “*autographa*” is, however, of some interest to us. Traditional Reformed theology has argued that the infallibility of Scripture pertains strictly, not to every copy of Scripture, but to the autographs, the original manuscripts, which God directly inspired. Many have objected that if that is true, our present copies of Scripture are not infallible. And since the original manuscripts are lost, we have in fact no infallible text, and our position is no different from that of liberalism. Are we not, then, left with a Bible that is not infallible but only “reasonably reliable”?

范泰爾用一條稍微被水淹沒的橋來說明他的回應：

To answer this objection, Van Til employs the illustration of a bridge covered somewhat by a flooding river:

只要水底下的根基穩固，把車開在幾寸深的水上，相對來說還算容易。但是，若相信「《聖經》『大致可靠』（*general trustworthiness*），而不是『無謬誤地默示』（*infallible inspiration*）」就等於是在說：「我們車底下有沒有穩固的根基並不重要，因為無論如何我們都必須把車從水裡開過去。」但是我們已經看見，人需要絕

對權威性的解釋。因此，《聖經》的原本若不是無謬誤地默示，那麼人的解釋在某方面將會站在上帝的解釋之上。也就是說，《聖經》中所宣稱的事實和對這些事實的解釋是否為真？人終歸沒有把握。（IST, 153）

We can drive with comparative ease in water that is a few inches deep as long as we have a solid bottom under the water. What the idea of general trustworthiness without infallible inspiration does in effect is to say that it really makes no difference whether there is a solid bottom under us, inasmuch as we have to drive through water in any case. But we have seen that man needs absolutely authoritative interpretation. Hence, if the autograph were not infallibly inspired, it would mean that at some point human interpretation would stand above divine interpretation. It would mean that men were, after all, not certain that the facts and the interpretations given to the facts in Scripture are true. (IST, 153)

在《基督教知識論》（*A Christian Theory of Knowledge*）一書中，范泰爾訴諸上帝的主權來回應這個問題：

In *A Christian Theory of Knowledge*, Van Til responds to the same issue by appealing to divine sovereignty:

除非人類的歷史是由上帝掌管，否則人類歷史中就沒有「合理的可靠」（*reasonably reliable*）方法可以辨認出上帝的話。...獨立於《聖經》之外的思索，不可能得出這樣一個有關上帝的理念。...這位上帝必須介紹祂自己的身分（*identify himself*）。……相信這樣的一位上帝、持守這樣的歷史觀，必須先預設無謬誤的《聖經》；相信無謬誤的《聖經》，也必須預設上帝是掌主權的上帝，歷史是由上帝掌管。（CTK, 28; cf. IW, 44）

There would be no *reasonably reliable* method of identifying the Word of God in human history unless human history itself is controlled by God. ...It is impossible to attain the idea of such a God by speculation independently of Scripture. ... Such a God *must* identify himself. ... Such a view of God and human history is both presupposed by, and in turn presupposes, the idea of the infallible Bible. (CTK, 28; cf. IW, 44)

《基督教知識論》裡的這段話很具啟發性，但是卻有幾分晦澀難懂。不過這兩段話的要旨乃是：除非上帝在時間、空間裡曾經賜下無謬誤的啟示，而且這個啟示原則上可以為人所認識（例如：透過文本批判）；否則，我們就不可能接近上帝純粹的話語；更不可能對救恩、甚至對任何事物有把握。誠然，若沒有上帝無謬誤的話語，我們就會知道《聖經》中的上帝並不存在。因為，《聖經》中的上帝確確實實是一位用權威向我們說話的上帝；這是上帝曉諭祂僕人的唯一方式。

The passage in *A Christian Theory of Knowledge* is suggestive, but somewhat obscure. The upshot of these two passages, however, is that unless the infallible revelation has been given somewhere in space and time, and thus is accessible in principle to human knowledge (e.g., by textual criticism), then we have no access to the

pure Word of God. And without that, there can be no certainty about salvation, or, for that matter, about anything else. Indeed, without such a Word, we would know that the biblical God does not exist. For the biblical God is one, who does address us authoritatively, that is the only way in which the Lord can address his servants.

因此，若沒有這樣無謬誤的話語，就沒有上帝。若沒有上帝，就沒有所謂「合理的可靠」的事物。沒了上帝，萬物就是偶然與混沌。

Therefore, if there is no such Word, there is no God. And if there is no God, there is no such thing as “reasonable reliability.” Without God, all is chance, chaos.

《聖經》的範圍 THE SCOPE OF SCRIPTURE

如果（一位掌權的）上帝確實存在，並且借著祂無謬誤的話語啟示了自己，那麼，宇宙中所有的意義與可知性（intelligibility）都來自祂。祂的話——《聖經》——和宇宙中所有的意義都會有關連。這裡的意思是：《聖經》的啟示範圍是宇宙性的，雖然「有限無謬論者」和其它人士不願承認。《聖經》「論及萬事」（speaks of everything）。范泰爾解釋道：

If that God does exist, revealing himself by his infallible Word, then all meaning and intelligibility in the universe is due to him. And his Word, Scripture, is relevant to all meaning in the universe. This means, contrary to “limited inerrantists” and others, that the scope of Scripture is universal. It “speaks of everything.” Van Til explains:

我們的意思不是說《聖經》直接論及了足球比賽、原子...等事物；不過我們堅持，《聖經》直接或間接地論及了萬事。《聖經》不只向我們啟示了基督和祂的救贖大工，也告訴我們上帝是怎樣的一位上帝、宇宙從那裡來。《聖經》不只寫下歷史，也給我們一套歷史哲學。不但如此，《聖經》在這些問題上所提供的資料，也被編織成一個不可分割的整體。除非你拒絕《聖經》是上帝的話，否則你不可能把《聖經》中所謂「宗教」和「道德」的教導，與其它方面——例如：物質的宇宙——的教導分開。（DF2, 8）

We do not mean that it speaks of football games, of atoms, etc., directly, but we do mean that it speaks of everything either directly or indirectly. It tells us not only of the Christ and his work but it also tells us who God is and whence the universe has come. It gives us a philosophy of history as well as history. Moreover, the information on these subjects is woven into an inextricable whole. It is only if you reject the Bible as the Word of God that you can separate its so-called religious and moral instruction from what it says, e.g., about the physical universe. (DF2, 8)

《聖經》「屹立在我們面前，有如一道光，使得被造宇宙中所有的事實，都必須根據它來解釋。」（DF2, 107; 參 CA, 23-29）

The Bible “stands before us as the light in terms of which all the facts of the created universe must be interpreted.” (DF2, 107; cf. CA, 23-29)

正如我前文指出的，很多神學家基於自己對《聖經》資訊本質的看法，而試圖證明《聖經》的範圍只限於狹窄的所謂「宗教關懷」。范泰爾在這方面對教會作出了巨大的貢獻。他重新思想《聖經》資訊的本質，並且得出結論：當《聖經》的資訊被正確理解時，我們就必定會在上帝的話語裡，看到一個沒有範圍限制的資訊；同時也會看見《聖經》是終極的權威。范泰爾的結論誠然是正確的。

As I indicated at the beginning of this section, many theologians tried to show, based on the nature of Scripture’s message, that the scope of Scripture is limited to certain areas of narrowly religious concern. Van Til has done the church a great service here: he has rethought the nature of Scripture’s message and has concluded, rightly, that when that message is properly understood, it will require us to find in God's Word a message of unlimited scope, together with ultimate authority.

因此范泰爾釋放了凱伯的偉大異象：將人生的一切範圍服在基督的統管之下。（參林前 10:31；林後 10:5。）畢竟，《聖經》確實論及了心理學、邏輯、數學、歷史、科學、藝術、政治、經濟……等，而不是只講論狹義的神學課題。很不幸的是，許多凱伯的跟隨者認為，《聖經》的範圍相當狹窄，因此我們改革社會的希望，基本上必須忽略《聖經》的教導—雖然《聖經》能激勵我們朝著正確的方向前進。相反地，范泰爾卻揭開了《聖經》的偉大能力，不只使人們重生，還教導他們如何改變社會與文化。

Thus Van Til unleashes the great vision of Kuyper, to bring all areas of human life under the sway of Christ. (See I Cor. 10:31; 2 Cor. 10:5) Scripture does, after all, talk about psychology, logic, mathematics, history, science, art, philosophy, politics, economics, etc., as well as the narrowly theological disciplines. Many of Kuyper's followers have unfortunately argued that Scripture has a narrow scope and that our desire to reform society must therefore largely ignore the teachings of the Bible, although Scripture may motivate us in a useful direction. Van Til, on the contrary, opens up the great power of Scripture, not only to regenerate people, but also to instruct them for social and cultural change.

這並不意味著范泰爾是一位狹隘的聖經主義者。我們已經看見，對范泰爾來說，上帝的啟示是一個有機體，特殊啟示和普遍啟示必須連在一起理解。我們也看到，范泰爾不相信人的解釋可以相對化上帝話語的權柄。確切地說，上帝呼召我們使用我們最好的恩賜，去將祂的話語應用在一切事物上；祂也應許，若我們致力於謙卑的服在《聖經》—這《聖經》是我們試圖去應用的—之下，這樣的努力必定會結實累累。

This does not mean that Van Til is a narrow Biblicist. We have seen that for Van Til, revelation is an organism that special and general revelation must be taken together. Van Til, as we have seen, does not believe that the presence of human interpretation

relativizes the authority of the Word of God. Rather, God calls us to apply our best gifts toward applying his Word to all matters, and he promises that such efforts, humbly subject to that very Word we seek to apply, will be fruitful.