

# 當代釋經學的危機 第五講

從這一講開始，我們要來看，當時在惠頓大學（Wheaton College Graduated School）教書的一位教授，Gregory K. Beale，他對Peter Enns的這本書所寫的一篇書評，〈神話、歷史與默示：對《默示和道成肉身》的一篇評論文章〉（“2006. [Myth, history, and inspiration: A review article of inspiration and incarnation](#). *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, Volume Jun 2006”）。

一般評論文章（review article）會比書評長很多。我們會看這篇文章的一半到三分之二。首先，引言：Beale把Peter Enns所講的要點敘述一次，然後他也作出一些觀察。比方說，Peter Enns在他書裡所提倡的究竟是老東西，還是新東西？…等等。

## I. 引言（Introduction）

「Peter Enns在關於聖經論方面，寫了一本非常刺激人思想的書，也可能是一本很有爭議性的書。學者們和學生們都應該感謝Peter Enns，這麼大膽的嘗試在他的福音派同儕之間，提倡一個傳統福音派學者不維護支持、或新的、或其他的、或另類的默示觀和釋經學。」

（Peter Enns has written a stimulating book on the doctrine of Scripture, which likely will become controversial.<sup>1</sup> Scholars and students alike should be grateful that Enns has boldly ventured to set before his evangelical peers a view of inspiration and hermeneutics that has not traditionally been held by evangelical scholarship.）

然後，Beale就總結了Enns的書的第二、三、四、五章。

「在Peter Enns的引言之後，在第二章，他就把古近東的神話與舊約的創造和文學的記載作了一些平行的比較。然後Peter Enns就說，舊約包含了他所說的神話。（當然，他對神話的定義是有他自己的定義的。）但是我們看到舊約有神話，我們並不需要對舊約是神所默示的事實，有負面的想法。因為，這是上帝遷就祂自己，透過這些神話的記載來傳遞祂的真理的。」

（After his introduction, in chapter 2 he discusses the parallels between ancient Near Eastern myths and accounts in the OT. He says that the OT contains what he defines as “myth” (on which see his definition later below), but, he affirms, this should not have a negative bearing on the OT’s divine inspiration. God accommodates himself to communicate his truth through such mythological biblical accounts.）

「第三章，Enns討論舊約的『分歧性』、『多元性』。他認為他所分析的這些分歧就讓過去『聖經無誤』的教義產生問題了。他主張我們必

須承認舊約有這些分歧，雖然它會在我們『聖經默示論』裡造成緊張的局面。但是這些分歧是上帝話語的一部分。」

(Chapter 3 discusses what Enns calls diversity” in the OT. He believes that the kinds of diversity that he attempts to analyze have posed problems in the past for the doctrine of “inerrancy.” He asserts that this “diversity” must be acknowledged, even though it poses tensions with the inspiration of Scripture. This diversity is part of God’s inspired word.)

「第四章，Enns就說了，新約的作者怎樣解釋舊約的聖經。他說，第二聖殿時期的猶太教，(也就是說，舊約寫完之後的猶太教)，並沒有關心到要從舊約作者的原意來解釋舊約，也不關心要根據上下文和當時的環境來解釋舊約，也不採用我們現代的標準：『文法-歷史解經法』。」

(In chapter 4, Enns shifts to the topic of how the OT is interpreted by NT writers. He contends that Second Temple Judaism was not concerned to interpret the OT according to an author’s intention nor to interpret it contextually nor according to modern standards of “grammatical-historical exegesis.”)

也就是說，新約的作者跟第二聖殿時期的猶太教的領袖們，他們並不關心現代所謂的『文法-歷史解經法』的標準。再來，新約跟舊約之間的第二聖殿猶太教領袖和新約聖經，他們都不採用我們現代的『文法-歷史解經法』。」

「猶太教解釋舊約的大環境是這樣的，也就是新約作者解釋舊約的那個架構必需要看作是社會性的、是人為的建構，所以新約的作者也不關心按照舊約的上下文的環境去解釋舊約。因此，新約的作者是用一種『以基督為目標』的解經學來解釋舊約的，意思就是說，他們有一個以基督為取向的觀點來理解舊約的目的，包括舊約個別經文的意義。這意思就是說：假如第一眼看舊約的時候，是不會讓讀者看到第二頁才能看到的以基督為目標的意義（158頁）。」

(This hermeneutical context of Judaism must be seen as the socially constructed framework of the NT writers’ approach to interpreting the OT, so that they also were not concerned to interpret the OT contextually. Accordingly, they interpreted the OT by a “christotelic hermeneutic,” which means generally that they had a Christ-oriented perspective in understanding the purpose of the OT, including the meaning of specific OT passages. This also means that “the literal (first) reading [of an OT text] will not lead the reader to the christotelic (second) reading” (p. 158).

也就是說，猶太教徒和新約作者，並不是按照舊約作者的原意解釋聖經的，而是在原意上面再加上一個「以基督為取向」的解經法。

「最後第五章，就把上面的第二、三、四章的涵義講出來，整本書，Peter Enns要提出一個『聖經道成肉身』的概念（或教義，或學說）。」

(The final chapter attempts to draw out further implications from the earlier chapters for Enns’s understanding of an “incarnational” doctrine of Scripture.)

「他堅持，既然基督又是完全的神，也是完全的人，所以聖經也是一樣的。因此，我們需要接納聖經的分歧（矛盾）和混亂，就如同我們接納基督人性的所有層面。還有，在這本書的補充片段裡，Peter Enns警告現代的解經者，不要把我們現代的觀點—歷史和科學的精準—放在這本古老的聖經之上。這種從外來式的強加，結果只是讓我們看到聖經裡面的一些問題是不存在的。」

(At various points throughout the book, Enns appeals to this “incarnational” notion, contending that since Christ was fully divine and fully human, then so is Scripture. Accordingly, we need to accept the “diversity” or “messiness” of Scripture, just as we accept all of the aspects of Jesus’ humanity. Also at various points in the book is the warning that modern interpreters should not impose their modern views of history and scientific precision on the ancient text of the Bible. Such a foreign imposition results in seeing problems in the Bible that are really not there.)

他認為，我們從現代期來看聖經的話，你就發覺聖經有矛盾了。但這些問題或矛盾，對聖經的作者而言，不是很急的。

以上是Peter Enns的看法。下面，評論者Beale說：

「這本書的起源和它的強項是來自作者他嘗試去面對一些問題，在這些問題上努力掙扎，想要克服。而這些問題是福音派在建立我們的聖經論之時必須要考慮和反省的。」

(The origin of this book and its strength derive from the author’s attempt to wrestle with problems that evangelicals must reflect upon in formulating their view of a doctrine of Scripture.)

也就是說，Peter Enns所提出的這些問題是存在的。至少在表面上，我們會遇見這些問題。

Beale的觀點：「Enns比起其他的福音派學者是更加的把後現代對福音派的聖經論的涵義抽出來講清楚。」

(Enns has attempted to draw out further the implications of “postmodernism” for an evangelical doctrine of Scripture than most other evangelical scholars to date.)

再說一次，Enns企圖從後現代的角度，更進一步的來看，後現代對福音派的學者的聖經觀是有何涵義？他把這些推論和涵義，給講得很遠很多。

「Enns的論點是新派的（自由派的）和福音派的，對聖經的進入都來自同一個基本的前提或預設：這前提或預設就是無論福音派或新派，我們都認為我們要看真理和錯誤都是採用了現代思維的標準和現代科學的分析。Enns嘗試要給我們一個(世界觀的)代模來看聖經的默示，好超越新派和保守派之間的僵局（14-15頁）。Enns想貢獻一個越來越多人採用的觀點，就是我們現在所需要的是要超越新派和保守派，要找到更好的辦法來處理這些舊約研究所帶來的資料。同時又有一個活潑正

面的聖經觀：『聖經是神的話』（15頁）。」

(He argues that “liberal” and “evangelical” approaches to Scripture both have held the same basic presupposition: that one can discern the difference between truth and error by using modern standards of reasoning and modern scientific analysis. He is proposing a paradigm for understanding scriptural inspiration that goes beyond the “liberal vs. conservative” impasse (pp. 14–15). He wants to “contribute to a growing opinion that what is needed is to move beyond both sides by thinking of better ways to account for some of the data, while at the same time having a vibrant, positive view of Scripture as God’s word” (p. 15).)

Beale說：「Enns為自己訂的這個是一個很巨大的工程。 Enns說我們要超越這著僵局，而他把自己作為一個少數具有平衡和新結合的奇葩，能夠解決這些由來已久的辯論。」

(This, of course, is a monumental task that Enns has set for himself. Enns says we must go beyond this impasse, and he presents himself as one of the few having the balance or the new synthesis that solves these age-old debates.)

「這本書主要是為平信徒寫的，不是為學者寫的；但很明顯的，學者是他寫作對象的第二順位（仍然是為學者寫的）。 Enns說，他的論點並不是很新的；但事實上，Enns所要爭辯的建議是很新的：**Enns要做的是結合新派的學者的研究成果，和福音派的聖經觀。** 那些認為Enns在這方面失敗的人，大概都希望他能寫得更有深度；就算那些與Enns同意的人，也盼望他寫這本書時能更有深度。」

(The book is designed more for the lay person than the scholar but is apparently written with the latter secondarily in mind. Enns says his thesis is not novelty, but, in reality, the main proposal for which he contends throughout is “novel”: he is trying to produce a synthesis of the findings of mainline liberal scholarship and an evangelical view of Scripture. Many who will judge his attempt a failure would probably wish that he had written a book that goes into much more depth, and even those who agree with him would probably wish for the same thing. )

也就是說，Peter Enns有很多東西沒有講清楚，沒有交代清楚。下面，Beale在他的書評裡面，會指出很多Peter Enns沒有交代清楚的部分。

「這本短短的書有很多事情要評論的。特別是頭三章，Enns在很多畫面都是非常含糊、模稜兩可的，他留給讀者自己把那些點給串連起來，好知道他的觀點是甚麼。所以，我們這篇的書評不單單是要總結和評價（檢討）Enns的觀點，還要把這Enns沒有交代清楚的地方，一點一點的連起來。因此，我引用Enns的文字是很長很長的，好叫Enns的讀者們可以更好的去評論他的觀點，也能夠穿越他含糊、模稜兩可的表達。」

(There is much to comment on in this short book. At some points, especially in the first three chapters, Enns is ambiguous, and the reader is left to “connect the dots” to determine what is his view. This review article is an attempt not only to summarize and evaluate his explicit views



but also to “connect the dots” in the way I think Enns does in areas where he is not as explicit. Thus, I quote Enns sometimes at length in order to let readers better assess his views and to try to cut through the ambiguity.)

( This review will focus primarily on the bulk of the book, which is on the OT (chs. 2–3), as well as part of the concluding chapter (ch. 5). The chapter on “The Old Testament in the New” (ch. 4) I have reviewed for another journal, since the issues on that subject are of a different nature than the OT discussion, though still as stimulating and controversial. )

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

現在我們來到書評的第二大段，特別是Enns的書的第二章，就是「從道成肉身來看聖經的默示」。而這一大段又分成三小段。第一小段是最長的，大概用了七八頁。1. Enns的道成肉身的模式，怎麼處理歷史和神話的方面 (Enns’s incarnational model in relation to “history” and “myth.”)。2. Enns的道成肉身的模式，怎麼處理所謂客觀的歷史寫作 (The question of recording “objective” history in relation to the incarnational model.)。3. Enns的道成肉身的模式，與耶穌基督道成肉身的關係 (Enns’s incarnational model in relation to Jesus’ incarnation.)。第二、三小段比較短。

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

「這本書的主題，就是Enns的上帝遷就觀：上帝在默示聖經的時候祂低就人。聖經是很有人的味道的，就是神如何來到祂的子民之間，向他們講話，是用一個非常人性化的方法。多次，Enns把這上帝的遷就與基督的道成肉身作比較：正如基督是神也是人，所以聖經也是一樣的 (17頁，同樣的在18、67、111、167-68頁)。從這道成肉身的模式，Enns就發展出他的觀點，就是：上帝啟示祂自己的意思就是祂遷就自己 (109，參110頁)。Enns說，聖經裡神的話，也同時是人的話，這是完全對的。但這對Enns來說，這是甚麼意思呢？意思就是福音派以前不夠正視聖經裡的分歧 (或矛盾)。」

(Perhaps the overarching theme of the book is Enns’s conception of divine accommodation in the process of scriptural inspiration. Scripture is very human, which means that God meets his people in a very human way in his word. This is repeatedly compared to Christ’s incarnation: “as Christ is both God and human, so is the Bible” (p. 17; likewise pp. 18, 67, 111, 167–68). It is out of the incarnational analogy that Enns develops his view that “for God to reveal himself means that he accommodates himself” (p. 109; cf. p. 110). Enns is certainly right to underscore that the divine word in Scripture is also a human word. What this means, in particular, for Enns is that much more “diversity” in the Bible should be recognized by evangelicals than has been typically the case in the past.)

就是神遷就人，就表示我們必須承認聖經裡面有很多的分歧或矛盾。

「特別的例子就是，他說他特別關心保守派沒有好好地承認古近東的創造和洪水的故事與聖經的類比，特別是巴比倫的創造神話和蘇美人的洪水神話與聖經相似的地方（26-27頁）。 Enns說，這些的發現對福音派神學教義上的涵義還沒有被好好的面對。 例如：他說，假如舊約與它古代的世界有這麼多相同的地方，在風俗習慣和風土人情上，『我們要從甚麼意義上來說，聖經是神的啟示呢？』（31頁）。 不過他承認，這些發現都是考古學家在19世紀發現的，事實上福音派的學者們，自從19世紀初，就已經在反省，這些考古學家的發現對我們福音派的涵義。」

( In particular, he is concerned that conservatives have not sufficiently recognized ANE parallels with the Bible, particularly the parallels with the Babylonian myth of creation and the Sumerian myth of the cataclysmic flood (pp. 26–27). Enns says that “the doctrinal implications of these discoveries have not yet been fully worked out in evangelical theology” (p. 25). For example, he says that if the OT has so much in common with the ancient world and its customs and practices, “in what sense can we speak of it as revelation?” (p. 31). But, as he acknowledges, these discoveries were made in the nineteenth century, and evangelical scholars have been reflecting on their doctrinal implications ever since the early nineteen hundreds. )

所以，Enns是過分的低看了福音派。事實上福音派是有在這方面作出努力的。這方面Beale講了很多。

下一講我們來看Beale告訴我們：學者們對這些古近東的與聖經的相似作出了什麼樣的五個觀點。這些Enns都不處理的，都不交代的，都不告訴他的讀者們。