

# 當代釋經學的危機 第八講

## II. 「從Enns的道成肉身模式來看聖經的默示」(續) (Enns's Incarnational Model for Understanding Biblical Inspiration)

### 1. 「Enns的道成肉身的模式，特別在處理歷史和神話的方面」(續) (Enns's incarnational model in relation to “history” and “myth.”)

我們上一講講到Beale做了一個結論，就是說，Peter Enns是太過讓步給異教神話 (Pagan myth) 的這個觀念，他繼續再引用Peter Enns的話，在第99頁：

Peter Enns說，假如詩篇的耶和華真神與假神比較，而假神至少在讀者的心目中不是真的的話，那這種的比較就沒有力 (lacks punch)。就好像每個人都跟小孩子說，你不要怕黑，上帝是比the Boogey Man大。對我們大人而言，我們當然相信the Boogey Man不是真的；但對小孩子來說，它們是真的。可能上次我們就講到第99頁這個地方。就是說，Peter Enns認為詩篇的作者也是這樣的。他們是把兩個好像讀者認為是真的——一個是假神、一個是耶和華——在作比較。

現在Beale繼續引用兩段Peter Enns的話，這兩段是101頁、102頁，首先101頁：

Enns說：「聖經假如真的要按照以色列人的處境來講話的話，就不是晴天霹靂地告訴以色列人“一神論”(相信宇宙只有一个神的存在)。因為他們的耳朵還沒有準備好聽一神論。我們在出埃及記讀到的，可能不是很令我們滿意，但是對古代世界的人卻剛好相反，或說他們被這古代的世界觀給顛覆了：這個神耶和華…當祂與埃及大能有力的諸神面對面的時候…祂是擊敗它們的(101頁)。」

(What would have spoken to these Israelites—what would have met them where they were—was not a declaration of monotheism (belief that only one God exists), out of the blue. Their ears would not have been prepared to hear that. What we read in Exodus is perhaps less satisfying for us, but it would have set the ancient world on its head: this god Yahweh . . . meets these powerful Egyptian gods . . . and . . . beats them up [p. 101].)

「以色列人在認識神的道路上才起步，好像嬰孩學走路一樣，我們後代的人覺得這是理所當然的。但是在救贖進展的這個時刻，周圍國家的諸神，他們看到的是真的。上帝是怎麼樣來顯示祂絕對的超越牠們(它們)呢？不是宣告那些假神不存在，乃是宣告它們在我面前站不住腳(102頁)。」

(They [Israel] were taking their first baby steps toward a knowledge of God that later generations came to understand and we perhaps take for granted. At this point in the progress of redemption, however, the gods of

the surrounding nations are treated as real. God shows his absolute supremacy over them by declaring not that “they don’t exist” but that “they cannot stand up against me” [p. 102].)

講到這裡，Greg Beale引用完多段Peter Enns的話。

然後Beals繼續講，他說：「我盡可能的、很完整的引用Enns自己的話，因為他的觀點應該是很清楚的被讀者了解。而我嘗試盡量的準確地來敘述他的觀點，雖然我們的篇幅有限，也雖然Peter Enns自己講的話也非常地含糊不清楚。」然後Beale發表自己對Peter Enns的看法，「首先，Peter Enns是利用一種發展歷史的觀點（或進化論的觀點），Enns宣稱在以色列的早期相信有很多神話式的神明它們是真的，但是他們應當只敬拜一位真神耶和華，只是到了後來，以色列才開始有了一神論（就是唯有一位神存在）的信仰。」這是Enns的想法。Beale說：「Enns的這種發展歷史或進化論的觀點，其中一個問題是：假如你說出埃及記時候的以色列人還沒有一神論，他們只能夠明白神可以打敗埃及的神。後來到了君王時期就不同了。但問題是Enns在一些的詩篇裡，也看到這種“非一神論”的觀點，這些肯定是在亞伯拉罕、以撒、雅各、摩西時期之後，肯定是在以色列早期、約書亞、士師時期之後。（比方說，詩篇86篇稱為大衛的禱告）。就是到了詩篇，Enns還是在說，除非以色列人、舊約的作者先假設這些其他的神它們是真的，不然的話，上帝與假神比較就沒有力了（lacks punch）。因此，Enns相信舊約的早期部分是“信奉單一主神”（“henotheism”，就是相信一個神，但不是同時相信祂是唯一的神）。」這是Beale說，Enns相信的。

(I have quoted Enns as fully as space allows, since his full views should be clearly seen, and my attempt is to present them as accurately as possible within limited space and despite some of Enns’s ambiguity. First, he affirms a developmental view (some would call it “evolutionary”), asserting that early on Israel believed in the reality of many mythical gods but only was to worship the one God, Yahweh, and that it was only later that Israel came to have a monotheistic faith. Part of the problem with Enns’s developmental view is that he sees the same non-monotheistic view expressed in some of the Psalms, all of which were written after the Patriarchal and early Israelite period (e.g. Psalm 86 is presented as “a Prayer of David”). Enns says that unless these other “gods” are “*presumed* to be real,” then the biblical comparisons of God with the other “gods” lacks “punch.” Therefore, he is espousing that early parts of the OT held to henotheism (belief in one god without asserting that this god is the only god.))

現在Beale來質問Enns：「Enns提供的證據是不是必然的結論呢？要解釋聖經怎麼看其他的假神還有其他的可能啊。」這至少有兩方面：第一，「有些的學者認為在異教的偶像的背後是有真正的屬靈的、實質的，不過牠們不是上帝，是與邪靈、魔鬼有關的。（比方在舊約早先的利未記17:7和申命記32:17，舊約早就說偶像背後是有邪靈的。）」這是一個可能，就是說上帝耶和華與其他異教的神來比較，其他的神雖然是偶像，

但背後有邪靈，這是一種解釋的方法。

(Is this a necessary deduction from the evidence that he has presented? There are other viable interpretative options for understanding the biblical view of these other gods. Some scholars see that there are real spiritual realities behind pagan idols but that they are not divine realities but demonic (e.g. the view is testified to early on in the OT that demons were behind idols: Lev 17:7 [on which see BDB 972]; Deut 32:17).)

第二，「其他的可能這樣理解，雖然舊約的作者稱這些假神叫作“神”，“諸神”，有的時候希伯來文用“*ēloh ʾim*”這個字，它們不是神，乃是一個謊話，是騙人的。」

(Others would understand that though the OT writers refer to “gods” (sometimes using the very word *ēloh ʾim* in Hebrew), they are not divine realities at all but a lie or deception.)

Beale說：「這兩種解釋的方法，跟Peter Enns用的方法，同樣是很有力的，但可能更有力，就是不需要去假設這些假神是存在的。」比如，說這些假神是邪靈或謊言，可能更有力。

(Both these alternatives have just as much “punch,” indeed, probably more “punch,” than making the assumption that these “gods” are really divine realities.)

「事實上，在以色列歷史的早期，聖經就很清楚地宣告反對除了以色列的神以外，有任何的神是存在的：比方，當申命記4:28說，以色列人將會事奉一些人手所造的神。講完這句話之後，又講了兩次（4:39，天上地下惟有耶和華他是神，除他以外，再無別神；4:35，惟有耶和華是唯一真正存在的神，除他以外，再無別神）。這申命記的宣告後來在舊約（列王紀下19:18；還有耶利米書2:11和5:7）都被發揮了。」

(In fact, early on in Israel’s history, there are clear statements against the existence of any other gods besides the God of Israel: in the directly following context after the statement in Deut 4:28 that Israel “will serve gods, the work of men’s hands,” twice God is said to be the only truly existing God (Deut 4:39, “the Lord, he is God in heaven above and on the earth below; there is no other”; Deut 4:35, “He is God; there is no other besides him”). This Deuteronomistic affirmation is developed later in the OT (2 Kgs 19:18; Jer 2:11, 5:7).)

「因此，當摩西在申命記10:17稱耶和華是諸神之上的神（萬神之神），他並不是同意其他異教的神明是存在的。他乃是宣告“耶和華在所有屬靈跟屬天的權能之上，是至高者”。從這角度來看，不必把上帝跟早期以色列人的關係比喻成好像爸爸媽媽跟小孩子講要不要相信the boogey man。」不需要這樣比較。

(Hence, when Moses calls God “the God of gods” in Deut 10:17 he is not assenting to the existence of other deities, but affirming “Yahweh’s supremacy over all spiritual and heavenly powers.” In this light, there is no need to compare God’s relationship with early Israelites to parents who

allow their children to believe in the boogey man.)

「不論我們怎麼看Enns對神話肯定的這個觀點，我們另外要再考慮他所講的歷史或準確的、科學分析的方法。 不要忘記Enns在他的書其他地方說了，我們現代的歷史觀就很像以色列歷史書（在**主前**1000年之後）的聖經作者他們的歷史意識。 因此他好像與現代人寫歷史的方法和科學觀（在前面講過的）做了一個明顯的等同，這是不是要重新再考慮過呢：我們可以這樣看，在舊約聖經包括創世記是在寫歷史，但是我們不需要期待這些作者是用科學準確的方法來寫的。 我認為舊約的作者他們寫歷史的時候就好像我們在理解過去發生的事情。」就是我們為甚麼不可以看舊約的作者他們寫創世、洪水的歷史的時候，他們就是在記錄一些過去所發生的事？「他們所寫的創世、洪水是跟過去的事實直接關聯的，但他們並沒有嚴格的按時間順序排列或現代很精準的科學的方法來作記錄。（就算現代歷史的作者，他們也是這樣，也沒有順序排列，也沒有好像現代的科學方法寫得很精準。）」就是為甚麼不可以？Beale是把這分開來講，他說，你不需要說古代的舊約作者是在寫神話、不是在寫歷史。是的，他們不是在寫神話、是在寫歷史，雖然不是用很精準的方法寫，但是就連今天我們很多人也不是這樣的。「Enns說，古代的人不可能寫歷史的，不可能很充分的寫出真實的事件，因為他們不是現代的歷史家。這是一個錯誤的對立（二分法）。」

(However one evaluates Enns's positive approach to "myth," what should be kept separate is the notion of "history" and "scientific precision." Recall that he acknowledges elsewhere in the book that modern views of history are very comparable to the historical consciousness of Israel's scriptural historians beginning around the tenth century **bc**. Thus, his apparent equation of a modern historiography and modern science in the preceding quotation should be qualified: could there not be "history" as we understand it in the OT, including Genesis, but not an expectation that these same writers would intend to write with scientific precision? I think the answer is that OT writers record history as we would understand it as "events that happened," and which correspond to past reality, but they do not attempt to record in some sort of strict chronological fashion or with so-called modern "scientific precision" (which, of course, are kinds of accepted history writing done even in modern times). To say that ancient people could not narrate history in a way that sufficiently represented actual events of the past because they were not modern historians is a false dichotomy.)

Beale說：「我現在要再重複和強調：Enns他自己說，從主前1000年開始，歷史就開始像我們今天寫得歷史比較準確（43頁）。」下面Beale就問：「假如主前1000年之後的人可以這樣寫，為甚麼之前的作者就不可以用這種相同的歷史意識來寫呢？」下面這句話，一樣是Beale非常精彩的觀察。他說：「Enns的觀點實在有一點令人困惑的，就是他對舊約裡的神話的定義並沒有包含在符合歷史的核心的、基本上。就是說，Enns從來沒有說，神話是古代人講起源的故事，不過基本上是有歷史根據的、是符合歷史的。Enns沒有說，這個舊約的神話基本上是根據歷史（符合



歷史)就不像古近東的神話,因為他認為創世記的創造和洪水的記載根本就像古近東的神話。(那亞伯拉罕、以撒、雅各的記載呢?出埃及的記載呢?他們都是在君王時期之前,請記得,Enns認為所有的君王時期之前的歷史記載都有這個問題,就是他們都沒有這種“essential historicity”核心裡是根據歷史的,就是與後來的君王時期的歷史寫作是不一樣的。那麼恩斯對亞伯拉罕、以撒、雅各、出埃及摩西等等這些的記載究竟有沒有歷史的核心呢?有的話是很多或很少呢?)」

(I want to repeat and underscore that Enns himself states that beginning with the tenth century bc history “is recorded with a degree of accuracy more in keeping with contemporary standards” (p. 43). If so, why could not earlier writers have written with the same historical awareness? What is particularly troubling about Enns’s view is that he does not include “essential historicity” in his definition of the kind of “myth” contained in the OT (see the above quotations in this respect, e.g., p. 44) in distinction to ANE myth, which is how he categorizes the creation and Flood accounts in Genesis (and also possibly the narratives about Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as well as the event of the Exodus, since they are also pre-monarchic, recalling that all pre-monarchic historical narratives, for Enns, face the problem of “essential historicity” in contrast to monarchic history writing; does he see a historical core to such narratives, and if so, how much or how little?).

意思就是說,假如他說君王時期才有歷史意識的話,那麼不單是創造、洪水了,還有亞伯拉罕、以撒、雅各、摩西、約書亞等是不是都是神話呢?那句話是非同小可的。假如到了主前1000年才有歷史的話,那麼前面的士師時期難道是神話了。好,這是我對Beale的理解。

「假如Enns告訴我們,用怎麼樣的根據來決定舊約哪一些是歷史,哪一些不是歷史,那會對我們很有幫助,因為可能有一些學者比Enns認為有更多的地方聖經作者肯定是用了神話或傳說的。」就是,當Enns說這些是神話時,可能有更多地方也是神話,請問你怎麼去衡量哪些是真的歷史?當然Enns是沒有給我們這個標準。Beale繼續說:「雖然Enns說,在君王時期的歷史是比摩西五經更靠得住,但我們怎麼知道君王時期是比較可靠的呢?可能那個時候也有其他神話的傳統流傳在以色列周圍的民族之間,而又與舊約君王的歷史有很密切的關係,那我們是否又要懷疑君王時期是不是撒母耳記下或列王紀上下的真實性呢?」

(It would be good if Enns could tell us the grounds upon which one can decide what parts of OT history are historically true and which are not, since some scholars may think that there are more places than Enns has pointed out where mythical or legendary material is positively affirmed by biblical writers. Even when he says that the history recorded in the monarchic period of Israel’s time is more reliable than earlier history recorded in the Pentateuch, how can we be sure of that, since there may have been other mythical traditions in circulation that had affinities with significant strands of that monarchic history and which could cast doubt on the veracity of that history?)

「是的，Enns從來沒有**直接說**創世記跟出埃及記的神話記載不是歷史，但是他大部分都是表達了這個的觀點、這個的概念。我現在再重複引用他的話，這些話只要你從Enns書的上下文來看（就不是斷章取義），就是直接在講這些聖經的記載不是歷史，這些聖經的記載就是神話。」

（Thus, it *may be* true that Enns almost never makes the explicit *verbal* statement that the mythical accounts in Genesis and Exodus are not historical, but he more often conveys the concept. Nevertheless, the following quotations (that I repeat), especially when understood in their contexts, are virtually explicit statements that these biblical accounts are not essentially history but myth.）

是甚麼呢？現在他再次引用三段來自Enns書的第53、55、56頁的話。第一段是53頁。