

# 當代釋經學的危機 第四講

前面三講，讀完了彼得·恩斯的“*Inspiration and Incarnation*”（默示與道成肉身）的第一章。

## 第二章 「舊約和古近東文學」 (*The Old Testament and Ancient Near Eastern Literature*)

現在這第四講我們要來看他在第二章提出了很多舊約時代，古近東的創造和洪水的神話，法律的制度…等等。之後，在第 38 頁開始，他說：

### 「問題在哪裡呢？」 (*What Exactly Is the Problem?*)

「我提出這麼多的古代文獻，問題這在哪裡呢？我選用了這些文獻是因為他們表達了對今天基督徒讀經時所遇到的各種不同的難題。這些的文獻帶來了一些的問題，例如以下三個：」

(So, what is the point of looking at these ancient texts? I chose these texts because they represent different kinds of problems for Christians today who think about their Bible. The impact of these texts leads to questions like these:)

「第一，或者是聖經只是一大堆的故事，是從其他古代的文化湊起來的。」  
(1. Does the Bible, particularly Genesis, report historical fact, or is it just a bunch of stories culled from other ancient cultures?)

「第二，我們相信聖經是神所啟示的，但其他的文化影響了聖經，這是甚麼意思呢？我們能不能夠說聖經是獨特的或特別的？假如聖經是一個這麼受文化所影響的產品，那麼聖經對我們今天還有甚麼適切性、關聯性嗎？」

(2. What does it mean for other cultures to have an influence on the Bible that we believe is revealed by God? Can we say that the Bible is unique or special? If the Bible is such a “culturally conditioned” product, what possible relevance can it have for us today?)

「第三，這是不是意味著教會歷史中，好幾個世紀都有著某一種的聖經論，但是現在有了這些證據之後，就表示教會在歷史上的聖經觀是錯的呢？」

(3. Does this mean that the history of the church, which carried on for many centuries before this evidence came to light, was wrong in how it thought about its Bible?)

「自從古近東的證據面世之後，已有好幾個世代的基督徒在問這些問題。這些問題可以有不同的方法來問，但他們最後的結論就是：」

(These are some of the questions that Christians have been asking for the last several generations since ancient Near Eastern evidence first began coming to light. There are many ways of asking these questions, but they all boil down to this:)

**「聖經仍然是神的話嗎？」**  
**(Is the Bible still the word of God?)**

第一，這些都是新派神學家問的問題。第二，保守派也可以在護教時問這些問題，為了能夠提供一些的答案。但他不是這樣的。他從頭就是提供這些問題，而不是要解答這些問題。我們第一講已經說過，他說是要安慰那些受干擾的基督徒，而事實上，他是為那些平安的基督徒提出干擾。

下面，他把一些的文件歸類：

(Below I group into three headings the ten texts that we looked at above. These three headings reflect the kinds of problems that these texts raise for contemporary Christians and their understanding of the Bible. In this section, we will simply isolate these problems. In the following sections, we will look at how to address them.)

「第一類是創造和洪水：」

(1. Creation and the flood: Enuma Elish, Atrahasis, and Gilgamesh;)

「第二類是民間風俗、律法和箴言：」

(2. Customs, laws, and proverbs: Nuzi documents, Code of Hammurabi, Hittite suzerain treaties, and Instruction of Amenemope;)

「第三類是以色列和她的君王：」

(3. Israel and her kings: Tel Dan Inscription, Siloam Tunnel Inscription, and Mesha Inscription.)

**「第一類是創造和洪水：創世記是神話或歷史？」**

**(Group 1 -- Creation and the Flood: Is Genesis Myth or History? )**

「我這裡不是要把阿卡德這最古代的文獻和聖經去作比較。我不是要做這工作。這已經有很多人做過了。它們並列的背後基礎就是假設我是很懷疑的。我不接受這個觀點，就是說：創世記越像古近東的文件，它就越不是神所默示的。」

(My intention is not to argue precisely where and how the Akkadian texts -- Enuma Elish, Atrahasis, and Gilgamesh -- parallel the biblical accounts. This is done too often, and it is typically done on the basis of an assumption that I very much call into question, namely, that the more Genesis looks like the Akkadian texts, the less inspired it is.)

他還是要維持所謂神的默示的。

「批判性的學者一般都是要把聖經與這些其他文化，(關於創造、洪水)，之間比較像的地方，都推出來。就算這樣做，也超過合理的範圍。他們的結論就是創世記跟其他民族的沒有什麼兩樣。」

(Critical scholars tend to augment the similarities, even going beyond what has been warranted, and draw the general conclusion that Genesis is fundamentally no different from other ancient stories.)

「另一方面，是保守派的學者，特別是比較早期的，一般都是會用一種『選擇性採用證據』的戰略：特別強調一些支持傳統聖經觀的證據，至於對我們傳統聖經論不利的證據就忽略之、減輕它的重要性，或跟他們爭辯。」

(On the other hand, conservative Christian scholars, particularly early on, have tended to employ a strategy of selective engagement of the evidence: highlighting extrabiblical evidence that conforms to or supports traditional views of the Bible, while either ignoring, downplaying, or arguing against evidence to the contrary.)

「不論是自由派或保守派，他們都相信阿卡德的文獻和聖經是有某一方面的關係的。我們現在不如給這樣的關係下一個定義，這樣我們就會看到這種關係應該會有什麼樣的涵義。本章就是要做這件事情。」

(Regardless, both sides of the debate recognize that there is some relationship between the Akkadian texts and their biblical counterparts. If we can properly define the nature of that relationship, debates about the implications of that relationship will fall into place. Moving toward that goal is largely the point of this chapter.)

「這些阿卡德的文獻提出的問題就是，究竟聖經是不是歷史性的：當這兩個故事看起來是這麼的像的時候，我們如何可以合乎邏輯的說，聖經的故事是真的，阿卡德的故事是假的？」

(The problem raised by these Akkadian texts is whether the biblical stories are historical: how can we say logically that the biblical stories are true and the Akkadian stories are false when they both look so very much alike?)

下面他說，我想今天保守派的不會這樣想。又是插一個稻草人。

他說：「一般的現代學者和在聖經裡受過教育的人，普遍的立場就是古近東的創造和洪水的故事是神話。所以就有人說了，聖經裡的創造故事跟古近東的故事一樣完全是幻想的和不符合歷史的。」

(It is a common position among many modern scholars and biblically educated people that the ancient Near Eastern creation and flood stories are myth. This has led to the suggestion that the biblical story of creation is every bit as fanciful and unhistorical as the ancient Near Eastern stories.)

「那基督徒一聽到有人說，創世記是植根於古代世界的神話的，馬上就發抖、退縮、很不自在了。從某個層面來看，這是可以理解的。當然，假如聖經和福音是真的話，假如真理是跟歷史有關的話，你不可能在聖經一開始的時候就看到聖經搞錯了。很重要的是我們要了解，不是所有的古近東歷史學家都用神話來表示這是不真實的、是捏造出來的、是故事書。」

(Christians recoil from any suggestion that Genesis is in any way embedded in the mythologies of the ancient world. On one level this is understandable. After all, if the Bible and the gospel are true, and if that truth is bound up with historical events, you can't have the beginning of the Bible get it so wrong. It is important to understand, however, that not all historians of the ancient Near East use the word myth simply as shorthand for "untrue," "made-up," "storybook.")

下面很微妙的東西就出來了。我讀大學的時候，就常聽到大家講這些東西的，都是不信的非基督徒講的。這很重要。

「某些的學者可能會這樣看。很多學者用神話這個名詞，是要指向一個更深的東西。我們比較慷慨地給神話一個定義：神話就是一個古代的、前現代的、前科學的方法，以一種講故事的型態，來面對、回答、解決人生宇宙最終的起源和意義等問題。回答：我們是誰？我們從哪裡來？」

(It may include these ideas for some, but many who use the term are trying to get at something deeper. A more generous way of defining myth is that it is an ancient, premodern, prescientific way of addressing questions of ultimate origins and meaning in the form of stories: Who are we? Where do we come from?)

他的意思：不是說，它是捏造的。乃是古代的人在問人生宇宙從哪裡來？甚麼意義？他們就是講故事來回答這些問題。

「古代的民族並不關心當他們形容宇宙的時候是要用科學的觀念。事實上，我們可以講得更強烈一點：古近東的民族根本就沒有這些現代科學研究工具可以任憑他們使用。」

(Ancient peoples were not concerned to describe the universe in scientific terms. In fact, to put the matter more strongly: scientific investigation was not at the disposal of ancient Near Eastern peoples.)

下面，他露了一個馬腳，表示他相信聖經是很後來的，在聖經之前還有很長的歷史。

「想像你是一個美索不達米亞的人，活在亞伯拉罕之前一兩千年。」

(Imagine yourself as a Mesopotamian, living perhaps one thousand to two thousand years before Abraham.)

「你完全跟外界隔絕的，只活在那小小的地方。沒有一堆媒體（像電視、網絡）。你的光源就是來自太陽、月亮、營火，或許已有些燈也不一定。你是一個單純的獵人或牧畜的牧人，每天工作管理，所以可以一天又一天的活下去。而我們今天所生活的一個科學的世界，對那些古代的美索不達米亞人來說，是不可思議的。但是古代的人可能會比我們今天的人有比較多的聯想，因為他們的生活比較簡單和嚴謹，所以他們會問：為甚麼宇宙、人生會是這個樣子呢？一到晚上，太陽去了哪裡呢？或它一開始是怎麼到了那裡，而甚麼使它維持在天上，不會像其他東西被投擲到空中就會掉下來呢？為甚麼有季節（春夏秋冬）的不同呢？為甚麼月亮走過天空？雨水那裡來呢？為甚麼當我需要它的時候，卻是乾旱呢？植物為甚麼從地裡長出來呢？為甚麼有些動物以其他的動物為食呢？這我們所見到的一切的一切又是怎麼的開始呢？當然，不是每個古代人都經歷這種質疑的過程，但是在他們所住的文化裡已經提供了這些答案了。古代人已經寫了很長的故事來回答這些問題，而且在某個層次上來說，這些宇宙的來源是從人無從知道的、但又很有能力的位格來的。」

(There is virtually no communication with those outside your immediate location. There are no mass media. The light you have is from the sun, moon, campfire, and perhaps lamps. You are a simple hunter or herder, working each day so you can live another. The scientific world in which we live and that we take so much for granted was inconceivable to ancient Mesopotamians. But ancient peoples, perhaps more contemplative than we are today, owing to the simplicity and rigor of their lives, wonder how it is that things are the way they are. Where does the sun go at night -- or how did it get up there to begin with, and what keeps it from falling down like everything else does that gets tossed up in the air? Why are there seasons? Why does the moon move across the sky? Where does rain come from, and why does it seem to not be there when we need it most? Why do things grow out of the ground? Why do some animals feed off others? How did all we see around us begin? Of course, not everyone went through this questioning process, but they lived within traditions that had already provided some answers. Ancient peoples composed lengthy stories to address these types of questions, and on some level the cause was attributed to unknown, powerful figures.)

一講到古代的故事，馬上就變得很舊。這是偏見。

他說：「我們不知道這些古代神明的故事是從何開始的？但他們是有開始的。我的觀點是上帝的印記在祂的創造上是這麼的重和強，就算他們沒有認識真神，古代的人還是知道：他們從哪裡來，那問題是要從人以外去找的。在這方面，他們應該要作我們的老師才對。所以他們就講了一些故事來回答人生宇宙最終極的意義的問題。而其中一個方法就是講一個創造的故事。但這導致了今天基督徒和他們手中的聖經有了一個很大的問題。假如古近東的故事是神話（我定義這神話的方法是前科學的人用故事講宇宙的起源），而聖經的故事又跟這些神話很像，這就逼我們去作比較，也就是我們是不是應該用神話的觀念來理解

創世記呢？」

(It is impossible to know when the stories of the gods arose, but they did. I like to think that the imprint of God is so strong on his creation that, even apart from any knowledge of the true God, ancient peoples just knew that how and why they were here can be explained only by looking outside themselves. (They could teach modern people a thing or two!) So, stories were made up that aimed at answering questions of ultimate meaning. And one way of getting at these kinds of questions was by telling stories about the creation. But this leads to a big problem for Christians today and their Bible. If the ancient Near Eastern stories are myth (defined in this way as prescientific stories of origins), and since the biblical stories are similar enough to these stories to invite comparison, does this indicate that myth is the proper category for understanding Genesis?)

「在還沒有發現這些阿卡德人的故事之前，我們能不理睬這個問題，但現在就不行不予理睬了。」

(Before the discovery of the Akkadian stories, one could quite safely steer clear of such a question, but this is no longer the case.)

他的目的是要把學者的發現放在一個很權威的位置。

「我們住在一個現代的世界，我們知道世界是怎麼運作的。我們不明白古代人的想法，我們也不覺得我們需要去明白它們。現在我來給大家一個提示：我們這個討論是要走到甚麼地步？我們期待聖經是要達到甚麼樣的標準？聖經看似是一本古近東的文件檔案、不是一本現代的書。所以，舊約的故事究竟是不是這些早期的故事，是不是要用現代寫歷史的調查方法和科學的精準的標準來判斷？而這些標準是古代人所不曾知道的。」

(We live in a modern world where we have certain expectations of how the world works. We neither understand the ancient ways—nor feel that we need to. To give a hint of where this discussion is going, it is worth asking what standards we can reasonably expect of the Bible, seeing that it is an ancient Near Eastern document and not a modern one. Are the early stories in the Old Testament to be judged on the basis of standards of modern historical inquiry and scientific precision, things that ancient peoples were not at all aware of?)

「有沒有可能上帝容許祂的話，是按照以色列人能夠明白的標準，而臨到他們呢？還是我們今天現代科學的標準是普世性的，所以我們期待這些前現代的文化也應該明白？」(Is it not likely that God would have allowed his word to come to the ancient Israelites according to standards they understood, or are modern standards of truth and error so universal that we should expect premodern cultures to have understood them?)

好，上面這句話又是稻草人。或者他提出一個問題說：上帝不是跟著我們今天所認為的無誤的標準。至少他矛頭是指著聖經無誤。這裡問的是兩個問題：第

一個是，舊約的故事是不是要按照現在的標準來衡量呢？第二個，還是上帝是用古代人能明白的標準呢？

「我覺得前者的立場是更適合於解決問題。至於後者往往是現代思想家的一個隱含的假設，無論是保守派和自由派的基督徒，但後者都是目光短淺，應該被質疑的。總之，聖經是按照它的文化處境來理解的。」

(The former position is, I feel, better suited for solving the problem. The latter is often an implicit assumption of modern thinkers, both conservative and liberal Christians, but it is somewhat myopic and should be called into question. What the Bible is must be understood in light of the cultural context in which it was given.)

就是說，不要用現代的標準來衡量：「聖經是否無誤，是否準確，或是否虛構」。總之，你說他虛構也不對，無誤也不對。那只是古代人講話的方法，他們形容宇宙的來源是用講故事的方法。