

# 當代釋經學的危機 第三講

## 第一章 「立定方向」(續) (Getting Our Bearings)

### 「我用甚麼來面對這個道成肉身的問題」(續) (A Way toward Addressing the Problem: The Incarnational Analogy)

我們在第二講的時候，已經讀到彼得·恩斯 (Peter Enns) 怎麼樣用基督的道成肉身這個模式、類比，來說明聖經又是神的，又是人的。

他說：「既然多年來神學家都認為：基督是神的道跟聖經是神的道是合一的，我就是這樣子在這本書裡面用這觀點，也就是說：聖經完全是人寫的，聖經完全是神的道，要怎麼樣影響我們應該預料聖經是給我們甚麼呢？」

(The long-standing identification between Christ the word and Scripture the word is central to how I think through the issues raised in this book: How does Scripture's full humanity and full divinity affect what we should expect from Scripture?)

下面他又要醜化福音派的立場。因為基督是神，又是人，這件事情至少有兩種異端：一種是基督不是人，是神，像鬼那樣，飄飄然的；另一種是基督是人，是好人，但提昇到成為神了。這是兩種不同的異端的。第一種的異端叫「幻影說」(Docetism)，就是耶穌是個幻想的影子。

「這古代的異端幻影說，基督完全是神，不是只是看起來似乎是人。」  
(“Docetism” 的字根 “dokein” 是 “to seem” 的意思。)(The ancient heresy of Docetism stated that Christ was fully divine and only seemed to be human (the Greek verb *dokein* [“to seem”] is the root of the word *Docetism*.)

「迦克敦會議正確的結論是：假如基督只是看上去是人的話，祂的死和復活就不是真的了。如此，假如他死的話，人的罪就不能赦免了。」  
(The Council of Chalcedon rightly concluded that if Christ only appeared to be human, then the death and resurrection are not real. And, if that is that case, then there is no forgiveness of sins.)

「雖然我的意思不是說，那些不同意我的探討的人是異端，但是這裡是有一個比較的。」  
(Although I am in no way implying that people who do not see things as I do are heretics, there is an analogy to be drawn here.)

「有一些古代的基督徒這樣講基督，這種幻影說的異端，就好像很多基督徒從以往到如今一直繼續在聖經論上犯的錯誤。」

(What some ancient Christians were saying about Christ, the Docetic heresy, is similar to the mistake that other Christians have made (and continue to make) about Scripture.)

甚麼錯誤呢？他是在講我們保守派的。

「聖經是從神而來，聖經的人性的標記只不過是表面好像是而已，你必須把它解釋掉的。」

(It comes from God, and the marks of its humanity are only apparent, to be explained away.)

「當然，沒有福音派的人願意這樣來表達他的立場的。但是假如這種傳統的福音派人士要面對我這本書裡面所提出的三個問題，他們就會顯露出來一個很醜陋的『聖經幻影觀』。」

(Of course, no evangelical would willingly or consciously put it that way. But, when confronted with some of the problems addressed in this book, “scriptural Docetism” rears its head.)

「但是聖經的人性標記是到處都有的，是完全的溶入到聖經自身的本質裡。」

(But the human marks of the Bible are everywhere, thoroughly integrated into the nature of Scripture itself.)

他一點都不提聖經「神性的標記」是溶入到聖經的本身；他只提人性。

「假如你忽略這些的特點，你把它解釋掉，這是多麼的費力，倒不如你好好聽聽這些問題（有關人性的標記），然後從它們中間學習。」

(Ignoring these marks or explaining them away takes at least as much energy as listening to them and learning from them.)

事實上，保守派的福音派學者在聖經的人性方面是有所學習的。但他就是來插一個稻草人。

「聖經的人性這個層面，就是使聖經之所以是聖經，是聖經本質的一部分的。」

(The human dimension of Scripture is, therefore, part of what makes Scripture Scripture.)

「但是就人性的這個層面，卻讓今天讀聖經的基督徒面對問題。因為聖經的人性讓聖經看起來沒有那麼獨特，變得好像不像聖經了，至少不像我們所盼望的聖經那個樣子。」

(But it is precisely this dimension that can create problems for modern

Christian readers. Because it can make the Bible seem less unique, less “Bible-like,” than we might have supposed.)

下面他提五方面聖經人性的標記：

「這裡有一些主要集中在舊約聖經的人性標記。這些大部分在這本書都不會提到。我提出來只不過是讓我們找到一個這本書討論的方向：」（Here are some of these human marks of Scripture (focusing mainly on the Old testament). Most of these will not be discussed in the following chapters. I mention them at this juncture only in an effort to orient us to the general discussion:）

「**第一**，聖經是用希伯來文和希臘文寫的，加上一點亞蘭文。這當然是很明顯的，一點神學問題都沒有。但是我們還是會學到一個功課。不論是希伯來文、亞蘭文，或希臘文，都沒有甚麼特別的特點，讓它成為一個傳遞神的話語的管道。」

(1. The Bible was written in Hebrew and Greek (with a little Aramaic). This is stating the obvious and hardly poses a theological problem. Still, there is a lesson to be learned. Neither Hebrew, Aramaic, nor Greek has any special quality about it that makes it somehow specially suited to be the conveyor of God’s word.)

當然，這裡他完全不提到神的護理和掌管。

「以前希伯來文和希臘文可能是用來傳遞神的話的兩種語言，但是今天有了現代語言學的研究，我們不能再採取這種立場了。」

(This may have been thought to be the case at one time, but it is a position that cannot be held in light of modern developments in linguistics.)

就是上帝特別用希伯來文、特別用希臘文。

「我們知道希伯來文只不過是古代閃族的文字之一，它和古代的語言有很多相似之處，例如：亞蘭語、摩押語、以東語、亞捫語、烏加里特語、腓尼基語的文字。」

(We know, for example, that Hebrew is simply one ancient Semitic language that has a lot in common with many other ancient languages, such as Aramaic, Moabite, Edomite, Ammonite, Ugaritic, and Phoenician.)

「所有這些古代的語言，在舊約時期都已經存在，而且它們很多比希伯來文都老得多。」

(All of these ancient languages existed during Old Testament times, and some of them are in fact quite a bit older.)

這裡我們停一停。下面會講到聖經以外的神話、語言等等。提到這些，他一定會強調他們的歷史悠久，是很古老的；提到聖經甚麼時候寫的？一定是會後推，這是現代聖經研究的慣常做法：講到聖經的五經（律法書），一定不承認是摩西

時期摩西寫的，而是主前 1000 年之後、大衛時期之後編成的。他說，「旁邊文化的語文都比聖經古老。」

他說：「這個觀點在希臘文上就更清楚了。直到十九世紀末，有些人認為希臘文是一個獨特的、從天上來的語言，因為新約聖經的風格與當時希臘哲學或史詩（荷馬的《伊利亞特》、《奧德賽》）方面的書非常不一樣。」

(The point is made more clearly in the case of Greek. Until the late nineteenth century some considered the Greek of the New Testament to be a unique, heavenly language. This was thought to be the case because the style of the New Testament was very different from that found in Greek philosophical texts or in Homer's Iliad and Odyssey.)

「所以有些人就下了一個結論，說，新約的希臘文是聖靈的語言，是神所預備的、來傳遞祂的話的。」

(So some concluded that the Greek of the New Testament was a special “Holy Spirit language” prepared by God to convey his word.)

「這個是一個可以維護的立場，（雖然只是推測），但直到考古學家找到一些希臘文的文獻，它的風格是很像新約聖經的，而這些文件不是甚麼官方的文件，不是為大眾寫的。這些只不過一般人講一些平凡的話，從來不期待要傳世千古，例如：一般的信件和契約合同等等。」

(This was a maintainable position (although still conjectural) until archeologists began unearthing documents written in a Greek style similar to the New Testament. And these documents were not concerned with anything official, nor were they meant for public consumption. Rather they were written by everyday, insignificant people about things that were never intended to be handed down through the ages, such as letters and contracts.)

「就算在聖經所用的語言方面，神也表明祂是屬於我們當中的一員。」

(Even in the language of the Bible, God demonstrates that He is “one of us.”)

你看，他都不會提到神在他的護理中特別選用當時一般人使用的文字語言，希伯來文和希臘文。他不是這樣表達的，而是不斷的強調這些語言文字沒有甚麼特別的。

「不論是舊約或是新約，所要講的論點都是一樣的。聖經是用人的語言寫成的。不但如此，且是一般人講話用的通俗用語，這就已經是一個甚麼叫做神道成肉身的例子。」

(For the Old Testament or New Testament, the point is the same. That Bible is written in human language, and in the common tongue at that, is already an example of God “incarnating” himself.)

「祂採用了當時流行的文化習慣，而且為了祂的目的而採用它們。」  
(He adopts the current cultural conventions and uses them for his purpose.)

這裡他就不提到：神怎麼改變它們，或神用的方法是獨特的，或神絕對不會用迦南人敬拜偶像的東西，或神使用的東西是潔淨過的嗎？就是上帝會使當時的文化「聖化」(sanctify)，然後採用的。上帝肯定會用一些墮落的東西、邪惡的方法來寫成聖經的一部分；這裡面的問答，他就不提了。

「這些文字語言不是特別設計來傳遞神的話的，但是上帝知道這些文字語言足以傳達祂的話。」  
(The languages are not specially designed to carry God's word, but God makes those languages adequate to do so.)

這是第一點，他說聖經的人性是他的語文。

「**第二**，舊約的世界是一個充滿著廟宇、祭司和獻祭的世界。以色列，不是第一個、也不是最後一個國家，是有一個宗教制度的，就是有廟宇、祭司和獻祭的。這些是當時美索不達米亞世界的近東社會文化的一部分。」

(2. The Old Testament world was a world of temples, priests, and sacrifice. Israel was not the first nation, nor the last, to have a religious system centered on temples, priests, and sacrifices. Such things were woven into the fabric of the ancient societies of the Mesopotamian world.)

第一，是聖經是用人的語言寫成的；第二，當時舊約的世界是有他們的廟宇、祭司和祭祀。

「**第三**，以色列和它周圍的國家都有先知傳遞神對他們人民的旨意的。舊約裡面先知的地位是非常重要的，他們是上帝的代言人（出口），向以色列人和他們的君王講話。但先知這個職分和工作就不是只有以色列才有了，每一個古代社會都有他們的先知和看異象的神人。」

(3. Israel as well as the surrounding nations had prophets that mediated divine will to them. The role of the prophets in the Old Testament is a very important one. They were God's mouthpieces to Israel and the kings. But prophecy was by no means unique to ancient Israel. Every ancient society had prophets and seers.)

「**第四**，以色列的歷史，很長的一段時間是有君王統治他們，而其他的國家也是一樣的。事實上，講到君主、王權，以色列是姍姍來遲了。撒母耳記上 8:5，那時的以色列人要一個王就好像周圍國家的一樣。因此，以色列人是不是模仿它旁邊的民族的政治制度呢？」

(4. Through much of its history, Israel was ruled by kings, as were the nations around it. In fact, when it comes to kingship, Israel was a "Jacob-come-lately." A refrain in 1 Samuel is that the Israelites wanted a king like "all the other nations" (8:5). Was Israel simply mimicking the political structures of the surrounding peoples?)

「**第五**，以色列的**法律**制度也與旁邊國家的法制有很大的相同。假如我們把十誡(神的律法)與其他古代的法典，如巴比倫的漢摩拉比法典，互相比較一下，我們會看到很多明顯地相似點介於摩西律法和那些比它更古老的國家之間。」

(5. Israel 's legal system has some striking similarities with those of surrounding nations. When compared side by side with other ancient legal codes, such as the Babylonian Code of Hammurabi (see chapter 2), one can see significant similarities between the Mosaic law and those of other -- older -- nations.)

所有這些上面所提的例子，有語言、祭司、先知、君王，和律法。

「所有這些的例子(甚至還有更多的)之所以被發現，是藉著這些在十九世紀中期蓬勃發展的語言學、歷史學、考古學研究。」

(All of these examples (and a good many more) have been brought to light by linguistic, historical, and archeological investigations that began to flourish around the middle of the nineteenth century.)

「為甚麼我們今天現代人特別覺得是難題呢？因為學術的研究發現了聖經完全是根據它所寫成的那個古代世界的。」

(In other words, these are problems that are specific to people who live in the modern world, where scholarly investigation demonstrates time and time again that the Bible is firmly situated in the ancient world in which it was produced.)

「道成肉身這個方式為甚麼對我們很有幫助呢？因為它讓我們轉移方向來看，原來聖經是處於文化這個事實。聖經處於文化的這個處境不是要讓我們覺得自己處在很憂傷或很尷尬的情況，這乃是一件正面的事：」

(What is so helpful about the incarnational analogy is that it reorients us to see that the Bible's "situatedness" is not a lamentable or embarrassing situation, but a positive one:)

「**上帝道成肉身的一個必然的後果就是：聖經處處都表示它是多麼地與它的世界，近東社會，連結的。**」

(*That the Bible, at every turn, shows how "connected" it is to its own world is a necessary consequence of God incarnating himself.*)

這句話是標準的。但下面這段話，作者就告訴我們上帝應該怎麼啟示，好像十八世紀的「自然神論」，人很大膽的說話。

「上帝自我啟示的時候，祂一定是向人啟示的，意思就是上帝必須用人能夠明白的方法來講話和做事的。」

(When God reveals himself, he always does so to people, which means that he must speak and act in ways that they will understand.)

他告訴聖經要怎麼做。他說，上帝講話和做事的時候一定要講到人能夠明白。他剛才不是講過神做事是奧秘的，那又怎麼明白呢？當然他這種講法是選擇性的。

「人是受時間限制的，假如上帝要自我啟示的話，祂就會採納了這受到時間或歷史限制的特點。」

(People are time bound, and so God adopts that characteristic if he wishes to reveal himself.)

「我們能夠用更重的語氣再說：**啟示有一點很重要的本質，聖經在它的環境中不是獨特的。**」

**(We can put this even a bit more strongly: It is essential to the very nature of revelation that the Bible is not unique to its environment.)**

再一次，聖經身為啟示的本質，必須讓它與周圍的文化有很多相似的地方。

「聖經的人性對於它之所以是聖經是必須的。」

(The human dimension of Scripture is essential to its being Scripture.)

很驚人的。他是要改革、革命的，但他把他的立場套用在一些讀經有難題的基督徒身上。所以彼得·恩斯 (Peter Enns) 說：

「這是一個適當的、必須的開始點，用來看聖經和我們在這本書所要討論的問題。」

(This, I argue, is the proper starting point for looking at the relationship between the Bible and the issues we will discuss in this book.)

「聖經是這麼容易的處在它古代歷史的處境裡，這對很多現代的讀經者是一個難題。有人就做結論：聖經只不過是另一本人寫的古籍而已。另外方面是保守派的回應，他們為了減低聖經人性標記的重要性，就只好把聖經相對於古代世界的獨特性突出或高舉。」

(That the Bible is so easily situated in its ancient context is a source of difficulty for many modern readers. A conclusion some draw is that the Bible is, therefore, merely just like any other ancient book. On the other hand, the conservative reaction tends toward minimizing some of the more challenging of these human marks of Scripture, thus accenting its uniqueness over against the ancient world.)

「我所要提議的是，以上的兩種做法都不採取。聖經毫無疑問地有人性的標記，這不等於說：『這是人寫的，就不是神的話』。假如你是這樣看的話，我可以這樣問你：『你期待上帝是怎麼講話的？你以為上帝是完全脫離古代世界的文化處境講話的嗎？假如是的話，那誰會明白他講甚麼？』」

(What I propose, however, is an approach that accepts neither alternative as offering the final word. That the Bible bears an unmistakable human stamp does not lead to the necessary conclusion that it is merely the words

of humans rather than the word of God. To those who hold such a position the question might be asked, “How else would you have expected God to speak? In ways wholly disconnected to the ancient world? Who would have understood him?”)

這是彼得·恩斯（Peter Enns）對保守派的挑戰。

「那些覺得這些人性的標記弄髒了聖經，就不再是完美的神的話，我會說，假如你不會（也不應該）用這樣的話來描述耶穌的話，你就不要這樣想聖經。基督和祂的話都是不折不扣的有人性的。事實上，就是因為上帝差派祂的兒子來成為人來表達祂的愛的。那我說，聖經的人性是一個禮物而不是一個難題，並不過分。當然，這樣說並不解決所有的難題，但是這個是面對問題的起點。」

（And to those who fear the human stamp as somehow dirtying the Bible, marring its perfect divine quality, I say, “If you wouldn’t say that about Jesus (and you shouldn’t), don’t think that way about the Bible. Both Christ and his word are human through and through.” In fact, it is precisely by having the Son become human that God demonstrates his great love. Is it so much of a stretch, then, to say that the human nature of Scripture is likewise a gift rather than a problem? Of course, simply saying this does not make the issues float away, but it is the proper way to begin addressing those issues.）

最後他會這樣說的：「現在我們要看這些證據，就是過去一百五十年學者們所提出的，不論是自由派和保守派。」

「諷刺的是，在我看來，自由派和保守派都犯同樣的錯誤。他們都認為配得神的話的頭銜看起來會不同於我們真正擁有的。有人強調，這人性的標記使他們完全。其他的人則希望人性的標記不要像他們一樣這麼明顯的宣告。他們有著相似的意見：當聖經看起來是這麼的通俗，以致人類可辨認的時候，即使它被稱作神的話，也是毫無價值的。但是，當神說話，祂必定是要用一種我們可以理解的方式說話。」

（It is somewhat ironic, it seems to me, that both liberals and conservatives make the same error. They both assume that something worthy of the title word of God would look different from what we actually have. The one accents the human marks and makes them absolute. The other wishes the human marks were not as pronounced as they were. They share a similar opinion that nothing worthy of being called God’s word would look so common, so human, so recognizable. But, when God speaks, he speaks in ways we would understand.）

他說：「現在提出這些證據和難題不是要決定『聖經是不是神的話？』，乃是要看『聖經怎樣是神的話』。」

（With this in mind, we can now look at some of the evidence that has been part of the scholarly conversation for several generations, not to determine whether the Bible is God’s word, but to see more clearly how it is God’s word.）



就是說，聖經是不是一個不合乎我們寫歷史的標準的、很準確的一本書，或神的話是不是一本不合乎現代人報導的準確的標準，或神的話是不是包含了神話…等等。