THE COVENANT OF GRACE:
A Biblical Theology Reader

恩典之約:
聖經神學讀本

October 2005

恩典之約：聖經神學讀本
COVENANT OF GRACE: A Biblical Theology Reader

目錄
CONTENTS

聖約思維，聖約生活: 聖經神學之邀
COVENANT THINKING AND LIVING:
AN INVITATION TO BIBLICAL THEOLOGY

I. 聖經神學是什麼？**What is Biblical Theology?**

II. 耶穌基督與舊約聖經 **Jesus Christ and the Old Testament**

III. 舊約聖經的主題 **The Main Theme of the Old Testament: Covenant**

IV. 聖約思維與聖約生活之邀 **Invitation to Covenantal Thinking and Living**

I. 聖經神學是什麼？**What is Biblical Theology?**

1. 聖經神學與聖經研究（解經）不同。
Biblical Theology is not the same as "Biblical studies" (exegesis).
「歸納法查經」是一個很普遍的查經法。
"Inductive Bible Study" is a common way to study the Bible.
通常有三步驟：「觀察」經文所說的；「解釋」經文所教導的；「應用」經文教導我們今天如何生活。
We *observe* what the Bible says; *interpret* what it means; and *apply* what it teaches to our lives.
比較學術性一點：「研經」（解經）所研究的是：這節的意思是什麼？這段，這章的意義是什麼？
On a more academic level, "biblical studies" (exegesis) studies: what does (did) this verse say/mean? What does (did) this passage/chapter mean?
《聖經》注釋，解經講道就是解經所結的果子（不是所有的講道都是解經講道）。
Commentaries and expositions (expository sermons: not all sermons are expository) are its fruits.
聖經神學建立在解經的基礎上，可是，不像解經一樣注重每一節經文所說的。
Biblical Theology builds on the fruit of "Biblical studies" (exegesis), but, unlike exegesis, is not focused on what each verse/passage says.
很多基督勤讀《聖經》，他們注重每一節的意義。我們需要看見一幅「大圖畫」來幫助我們讀《聖經》。聖經神學，就是要我們看見這個宏觀。
Many Christians who diligently study the Bible often only focus on what each verse says. We need a "larger picture" perspective. Biblical Theology provides this.

2. 聖經神學有別於系統神學。

Biblical Theology is not the same as "Systematic Theology."
讓我們來看兩者之間的不同。
Let's see the difference between "Biblical Theology" and "Systematic Theology."
聖經神學問：上帝在啟示歷史和救贖歷史的每一個階段，說了什麼？
Biblical Theology asks: What does God say, at each period in the history of revelation/history of salvation?
系統神學問：整本《聖經》──從創世記到啟示錄－對某一個題目所教導的是什麼？
Systematic Theology asks: What does the entire Bible – from Genesis to Revelation – say about a given topic x?
例如：上帝是誰？人是什麼？基督是誰？祂成就什麼工作？上帝如何拯救人？教會是什麼？
What is God? What is man? Who is Christ? What has he done? How does God save people? What is the church?

聖經神學為系統神學提供豐富資源。
Biblical Theology provides rich material for systematic theology.
系統神學－篤信聖經的，虔誠的，順服主的系統神學－研究「整本《聖經》說什麼？」。這樣的系統神學為聖經神學提供有用的架構。
Systematic Theology – Bible-believing, reverent, obedient study of "What does the entire Bible say about x?"" – provides the framework for Biblical Theology.
我們不是在真空裏研究「上帝在某一階段說了什麼？」。我們對《聖經》的研究並不是中立的。
We don't study "What does God say at any given time?" in a vacuum, as if the study is neutral.
我們對《聖經》的認識，由《聖經》關於自己的宣稱來管治。
Our study of the Bible is guided by what the Bible teaches about itself.

3. 聖經神學是古老的，也是現代新興的一門學問。
Biblical Theology is old; it is relatively new.
上帝在每一個階段所說的話都是重要的。因此，聖經神學是老舊的知識。
What God has said at each period is important; thus Biblical Theology is "old."
可是，作為一門學術性的學問，聖經神學的歷史並不長。
However, Biblical Theology, as an academic discipline, is a relatively new movement.
聖經神學的開山祖：Geerhardus Vos (1862-1949)：普林斯頓神學院教授 (1893-1932)；還有 Herman Ridderbos。Edmund P. Clowney 是 1960-70 年代威敏斯特神學院院長，提倡聖經神學方法。（參 J.I. Packer, *Truth and Power* 一書。）
Some pioneers in Biblical Theology were Geerhardus Vos (1862-1949, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1893-1932; author of *Biblical Theology*) and Herman Ridderbos. Edmund P. Clowney championed Biblical Theology at Westminster Seminary, 1960s-1970s (cf. J.I. Packer, *Truth and Power*.)
Clowney 著有幾本聖經神學的書籍。

Clowney wrote *The Church, Preaching and Biblical Theology, Called to the Ministry, The Unveiled Mystery,* and *Preaching Christ from All of Scripture*. Colleagues:
其他在這方面努力的教授有：
Other professors at Westminster who labored in biblical theology included:
Harvie Conn, Richard Gaffin, O. Palmer Robertson.
其他學院的聖經神學學者：澳洲的莫理昂 Leon Morris，和倫敦聖經學院的
Donald Guthrie。
Other biblical theologians: Leon Morris (Australia), Donald Guthrie (London Bible College).

4. 聖經神學是什麼？
What is Biblical Theology?
聖經神學有兩方面的基本信念：
Biblical Theology rests on two foundations:
(a) 上帝在《聖經》裏所啟示的，都是一貫的，組成一個完整的整體。（我們稱此為「啟示的統一性」。）
All that God has revealed in the Bible forms a unified whole. (Unity in revelation.)
《聖經》不自我矛盾。後來的啟示並不與先前的衝突；後來的會補充、成全、豐富先前的啟示。
The Bible does not contradict itself. The later revelation does not nullify the earlier; the later only supplements, fulfills, enriches the earlier revelation.

(b) 上帝在永恆裏就計劃了要自我啟示，啟示祂救贖的計劃。祂計劃了要在歷史中這樣的自我啟示。
God planned, in eternity, to reveal himself and his plan of salvation; he planned to do this in history.
然後上帝在歷史中的確這樣（具體地）啟示了。巴刻語：「上帝在歷史中告訴我們一些事情。」（我們稱此為「命題式的啟示」。）
Then God revealed himself concretely in history. In the words of J.I. Packer, in history, "God told us things." (We call this "propositional revelation.)
上帝既然這樣啟示了，我們可以分辨一些階段。上帝在歷史中啟示有進展，有先後。（我們稱此為「啟示的進展性」。）
Since God did this, there are periods, there is progression and development. (Progressive revelation.)
聖經神學 – 福音派的，篤信《聖經》的，信仰正統的聖經神學 – 問：既然《聖經》中的啟示是統一的，也是在歷史中有進展性的，那麼，上帝在歷史的不同階段裏啟示了一些什麼事情？
Biblical Theology – evangelical, Bible-believing, orthodox Biblical Theology – asks this question: In light of the unity and the progression in revelation, what has God revealed at various periods in the history of revelation/history of salvation?

聖經神學所研究的一些題目包括：
Examples of what Biblical Theology studies are:

摩西五經裏上帝所立的「約」；
the covenant in the five books of Moses;
舊約中上帝的名字；
the name of God in the Old Testament;
舊約中獻祭的制度；
the sacrificial system in the Old Testament;
舊約中的敬拜（會幕，聖殿，會堂等）；
the worship of God in the Old Testament (tabernacle, temple, synagogue);
在約書亞和士師時期，以色列民的順服和不順服；
Israel's obedience and disobedience in the books of Joshua and Judges and the prophets;
詩篇，箴言，傳道書，約伯記中的「智慧」觀念；
"wisdom" in the Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Job;
舊約中聖靈的工作；
the work of the Holy Spirit in the Old Testament;
先知書中的受苦僕人（彌賽亞）；
the Suffering Servant (Messiah) in the books of the prophets;
以色列亡國和「被擄」的意義；「餘民」的意義；
the meaning of Exile and remnant;
福音書裏的「上帝的國」或「天國」；天國的「已臨」與「未臨」；
the kingdom of God in the gospels; the Kingdom is already here, and not yet here;
新約和舊約上帝對窮人的態度；
God's heart for the "poor" in the Old and New Testaments;
希伯來書裏新舊約的關係；
the relationship between the Old and New Covenant in the Book of Hebrews;
保羅書信中的恩典，信心，行為，律法觀，和彼此的關係；
grace, faith, works and the law in the Epistles of Paul, and their interrelationship;
耶穌，彼得，保羅的受苦觀；
suffering in the teachings of Jesus, Peter and Paul;
保羅書信中的教會觀。
the church in the Epistles of Paul.

5. 為什麼我們可以有信心地研究聖經神學。
Why we can be confident to study Biblical Theology.
我們若相信（一）《聖經》是上帝所默示的，完全無誤（因為上帝是《聖經》的作者）；（二）啟示的統一性；（三）啟示的歷史進展性；（四）上帝永遠不變；（五）上帝對待祂的子民的方法與原則不會改變：聖經時代如是，現在也如是（這一點是很多學者不願意我們認真考慮的），我們便可以有信心地研究聖經神學。
If we believe in (a) the inspiration and inerrancy of the Bible (God is the author), (b) unity in revelation, and (c) progressive revelation, we must believe that (d) God is the same, and (e) the way God deals with his people is always the same: both in Bible

times, and today (scholars often hide this fact from us), we can study biblical theology with confidence.
因為上帝永不改變，祂對待祂子民的方法不改變，所以我們可以放膽地研究《聖經》，我們會找到《聖經》最重要的，貫通前後經文的主題。
Because God is the same, and the way He deals with his people remains the same, we can study the Bible and find out the over-arching theme in the Bible.

上帝在歷史中與祂的子民立了約；上帝堅持祂在約中所應許的！耶穌基督是上帝之約的中保；耶穌基督被稱為「約」本身！（賽 42：6）
God covenants with (commits himself to) his people! Jesus Christ is the mediator of the covenant; indeed, he *is* the covenant (Isaiah 42:6)!

6. 非正統，非福音派的聖經神學：須要有批判（分辨）能力！
Non-evangelical "Biblical Theology," and the need to be critical.
福音派以外另外有一個「聖經神學」運動，在二十世紀中葉興起。
There is an non-orthodox (non-evangelical) movement called "Biblical Theology", which emerged in the middle of the 20th century.

這些神學家受了巴特和布特曼的影響，並不相信《聖經》是上帝默示的，無誤的。
It is inspired by the theology of Karl Barth and Rudolf Bultmann, etc., and does not presume that the Bible is inspired and inerrant.

他們所研究的乃是：上帝的子民在某一時期中相信什麼？他們的信仰和敬拜是怎樣的？
It studies: What did the people of God believe at any given time? What was their faith and worship like?
他們研究聖經的態度乃是：聖經中有很多的神話（不一定是事實）。
They study the Bible often as if it contains myths (not necessarily inspired/inerrant).

所以 20 世紀就有兩個截然不同的「聖經神學運動」。
Thus, there are two very different movements, both called "Biblical Theology."

當我們研究聖經神學的時候，《聖經》是我們研究的對象，研究的內容；可是我們必須知道福音派，正統信仰以外還有所謂的「聖經神學」。後者並不尊重《聖經》是上帝所默示的話語。
Thus: When we study Biblical Theology, we take the Bible as the content/object of our study; but we also must take note of the "Biblical Theology" outside orthodox evangelical circles (the kind which does not honor the Bible as inspired and inerrant).

換言之，聖經神學與每一科神學研究一樣，必須用分辨，批判的態度進行。
In other words, Biblical Theology, like every area of study, is done "critically."

II.　　耶穌基督與舊約聖經的關係
Jesus Christ and the Old Testament

1. 耶穌基督教導門徒認識舊約聖經。
Jesus Christ taught about the Old Testament.

耶穌對舊約的態度是恭敬的。祂說：天地都要廢去，惟有神的話不會廢去。
Our Lord Jesus was reverent to the Old Testament. He said that even heaven and earth may fall away, the Word (the law) of the Lord will not fall away.

耶穌復活之後，兩次教導門徒明白舊約聖經的神學。
After his resurrection, our Lord held two classes on Old Testament biblical theology.

在以馬忤斯的路上，祂教導兩位門徒，舊約聖經（摩西的律法，和先知）都講論祂。
On the road to Emmaus, he taught the 2 disciples that the Old Testament (Moses and the Prophets) spoke about him:

路 24：25-27
25　耶穌對他們說：「無知的人哪，先知所說的一切話，你們的心信得太遲鈍了。 26　基督這樣受害，又進入他的榮耀，豈不是應當的嗎？」 27　於是從摩西和眾先知起，凡經上所指著自己的話都給他們講解明白了。
"He said to them, 'How foolish you are, and how slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken! Did not the Christ have to suffer these things and then enter his glory?' And beginning with Moses and all the Prophets, he explained to them what was said in all the Scriptures concerning himself. " (Luke 24:25-27).

舊約聖經的主題乃是基督的受苦，與祂進入榮耀。
The theme of the Old Testament, in other words, is Christ's sufferings and glory.

後來基督又教導一群門徒舊約聖經的主題真理。
Later Christ taught a group of his disciples about the theme of the Old Testament:

路 24：44-48
44　耶穌對他們說：「這就是我從前與你們同在之時所告訴你們的話說：摩西的律法、先知的書，和詩篇上所記的，凡指著我的話都必須應驗。」 45　於是耶穌開他們的心竅，使他們能明白聖經， 46　又對他們說：「照經上所寫的，基督必受害，第三日從死裡復活， 47　並且人要奉他的名傳悔改、赦罪的道，從耶路撒冷起直傳到萬邦。 48　你們就是這些事的見證。

"He said to them, 'This is what I told you while I was still with you: everything must be fulfilled that is written about me in the Law of Moses, the Prophets an the Psalms.' Then he opened their minds so they could understand the Scriptures. He told them,

'This is what is written: The Christ will suffer and rise from the dead on the third day, and repentance and forgiveness of sins will be preached in his name to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. You are witnesses of these things.'" (Luke 24:44-48)

耶穌開他們的眼睛。『開』一字，與『解釋』，『釋經學』同字根。
Jesus "opened the eyes" of the disciples. The verb "to open" comes from the root, where we get the word "hermeneutics" (the science of interpreting the Bible).

主耶穌教導我們，舊約的主題就是祂自己，祂的苦難，祂的復活（榮耀）。耶穌基督和祂的工作是舊約的主題。
We learn from our Lord Jesus that: the theme of the Old Testament is about him (Christ), about his sufferings (death) and his glories (resurrection/ascension). The person and work of Jesus Christ is the theme of the Old Testament.

注：摩西的律法，先知與『書卷』（詩篇）=舊約聖經的三大部份。
[Note: Moses, Prophets, and Writings (Psalms) = 3 parts of the Old Testament.]

2. 我們研究聖經，是以基督徒的身分；我們不是猶太人！
We study the Bible as followers of Christ, not as Jews/non-Christians.

我們不是猶太人，我們是基督徒。因此，基督徒自然地、放膽地從新約的視角來看舊約聖經。我們從基督已經復活的角度來看舊約！基督已復活，我們要奉祂的名傳悔改赦罪的道，直到萬邦。
We are not Jews; we are Christians. Therefore, Christians don't apologize when we interpret the Old Testament from the perspective of the New Testament, from the vantage point that Christ has risen; repentance in his name is preached to all nations.

很不幸地，一些所謂『福音派』的聖經學者，跟從非福音派的作法，稱舊約為『猶太人的聖經』。
Unfortunately, some "evangelical" scholars now follow the non-evangelical habit of calling the Old Testament "the Jewish Bible."

舊約乃是基督徒的『聖經』的第一部份。我們以基督徒的身分來解釋舊約；我們是已經經歷到基督的救贖大能的信徒。
The Old Testament is part 1 of the Christian Bible – we interpret the Old Testament as Christians, as people who have experienced the power of salvation through Christ.

耶穌說：真正相信祂的信徒，相信舊約為祂作見證。
Jesus says that the true believer believes that the Old Testament testifies about him:

約 5：39-40

39 只是我告訴你們，不要與惡人作對。有人打你的右臉，連左臉也轉過來由

他打； 40 有人想要告你，要拿你的裡衣，連外衣也由他拿去；
"You diligently study the Scriptures because you think that by them you possess eternal life. These are the Scriptures that testify about me, yet you refuse to come to me to have life." (John 5:39-40)

上帝賜舊約聖經給人有什麼目的？三方面的目的:
What is God's purpose in giving us Christians the Old Testament? It does 3 things:
(a) 預備基督的來臨；prepare for the coming of Christ;
(b) 賜人基督的預表；provide types of Christ; and
(c) 預言基督和祂的工作。耶穌基督應驗了舊約聖經的預言。
prophesy and give promises concerning Christ and his work.
Jesus Christ is the fulfillment of the promises and prophecies concerning himself.

III.　　舊約聖經的主題: 上帝立的『約』
The Main Theme of the Old Testament: Covenant

『約』是『舊約聖經神學』的主題。
"Covenant" is the topic of this course on "Old Testament theology."

1. 基督徒相信，我們可以研究《聖經》，找出《聖經》每一段，每一章，每一卷的教導。我們仔細研究舊約《聖經》後，可以發覺舊約的主題乃是；上帝與祂子民所立的『約』。Christians believe that we *can* find out what the Bible says, in a specific verse, paragraph or chapter, and as a whole. After careful study, we can know *the theme of the Old Testament*: *the covenant which God has established with his people.*

2. 『約』這字首先在上帝與挪亞的關係出現（創 9 章）。可是，上帝對挪亞所講的話，指向祂對亞當所說的話（創 1-3）。因此我們可以這樣說: The word "covenant" first appear in God's relationship to Noah. But God's words to Noah refer back to God's words to Adam (Genesis 1-3). Therefore, we can say:
(a) 上帝與挪亞立約（也透過挪亞，與全人類立約）；God made a covenant with Noah (and through Noah, to mankind), and
(b) 上帝與亞當立約（也透過亞當，與全人類立約）。
God made a covenant with Adam (and through Adam, to mankind).

3. 然後上帝與亞伯拉罕立約，又透過亞伯拉罕，與祂所有的後裔立約。新約聖經告訴我們，亞伯拉罕的後裔就是所有相信上帝和上帝恩典的信徒。Then God made a covenant with Abraham (and through Abraham, to all of his descendants: the New Testament tells us that, Abraham's true descendants are all those who, like him, believe in God and His grace).

上帝在創世記 12：1-3 向亞伯拉罕應許了四件事：
Genesis 12:1-3 God made 4 promises to Abraham:
(a) 我必賜福與你；I will bless you,
(b) 我必賜你應許之地；I will give you land,
(c) 我必使你成為大國；I will make you into a great nation,
(d) 地上的萬國都必因你得福。All the nations on earth will be blessed through you.

我們看見上帝在歷史中逐步應驗一切的應許：
We see God fulfilling these promises in history:
(a) 上帝的確在亞伯拉罕一生中賜福給他；
God did bless Abraham during his lifetime,
(b) 上帝將應許之地賜給亞伯拉罕地後裔：430 年後（摩西和約書亞時期）；
    God gave Abraham the land He promised him, 430 years later (during the times
    of Moses and Joshua),
(c) 上帝的確使亞伯拉罕（透過他的後裔）成為大國 – 又多等了幾百年，到大衛
    和所羅門王的時期；God did make Abraham (through his descendants) into a
    great nation, a few more hundred years later (during David and Solomon's time),
(d) 最後，到亞伯拉罕的後裔，耶穌基督來臨的時候，上帝就賜福給萬國了。基
    督來，成就了救贖大工。Finally, God did bless all the nations through
    Abraham (through his descendant, Jesus Christ), when Christ came on earth to
    accomplish salvation.
我們差不多可以說：創 12：1-3 是一個舊約歷史的總綱。
We can almost say that: Genesis 12:1-3 is a succinct, convenient "outline of Old
Testament history", at least the history beginning with the covenant with Abraham.

4. 上帝與摩西立約：透過摩西，與所有以色列人立約。出埃及記 19：5-6。上
帝要作他們的上帝；他們作上帝的子民。God made a covenant with Moses (and
through Moses, to all the people of Israel) – Exodus 19:5-6 – God will be their God;
they will be God's people.

5. 後來上帝與大衛王立約，應許他一個永遠的國度。Later God made a covenant
with David, promising an everlasting kingdom.

6. 在舊約聖經的時期，上帝的先知應許，有一天上帝要與祂的子民立一個新的
約。參：耶利米書 31 章，以西結書 36 章，何西阿書 2 章等等。Throughout the
Old Testament, God (through the prophets) promised that one day he will make a new
covenant with his people (Jeremiah 31, Ezekiel 36, Hosea 2, etc.).

7.『約』的核心是什麼？就是上帝對祂子民所說的：『我要作你們的上帝，你
們要作我的子民。』這就是上帝在《聖經》中說『我愛你』的方式。What is

the essence of the covenant? It is this: God says to his people: "I will be your God, you will be my people." This is God's way of saying, "I love you."

8. 小結：你與上帝的關係是有名字的，叫作『約』。
你若是基督徒的話，這包括了你本人！
To sum up: Your relationship with God has a name: "covenant." If you are a Christian, that includes you.

當你信主的時候，就進入到『約』裏了。
When you became a Christian, you entered into this covenant.

你在上帝面前有三方面的任務：信靠祂；常常悔改；遵行祂的話。
Your obligations in the covenant are: faith, obedience, and repentance.

IV. 聖約思維，聖約生活之邀
An Invitation to Covenantal Thinking and Living

那麼我們應該如何生活，思維，研讀《聖經》，才算是守約者呢？
How should we live, think, believe, and study the Bible as "covenant-keepers"?

1. 用一本好的研讀本《聖經》。更新傳道會的國際版是中文中最有水準的。
Use a good study Bible which gives an introduction to each book of the Bible, e.g. *NIV Study Bible*, or *The Spirit of the Reformation Study Bible*. A solid Bible study guide is: *Search the Scriptures* (IVP).

讀《聖經》的時候，要自問：這段經文主要的信息（意義）是什麼？上帝在這裏講什麼？教導我什麼？試寫出一卷書的大綱；例如；羅馬書 1-8 章；馬太福音 5-7 章；以弗所書 1-3 章；出埃及記 19-24 章，創世記 1-11 章，以賽亞書 40-66 章，箴言 1-9 章，約伯記 38-42 章，腓立比書，約翰一書等。
When you study, ask: What does this paragraph say? What does this book/section of the book say? Write an outline of the book/section (Romans 1-8, Matthew 5-7, John 13-17, Ephesians 1-3, Exodus 19-24, Genesis 1-11, Isaiah 40-66, Proverbs 1-9, Job 38-42, Philippians, I John).

2. 自我檢討：我是否了解《聖經》裏一些重要的字詞？很多時候我們以為了解了，其實呢？例如：犧牲，祭，知識，智慧，順服，信心，權威，聖經，啟示，上帝，約，愛，教會，婚姻，家庭，教育，罪，救贖，天堂，基督等。
Make sure you understand the "big words" in the Bible, which we often assume we understand (but don't): sacrifice, knowledge, wisdom, obedience, faith, authority, Bible, revelation, God, covenant, love, church, marriage, family, teaching/education, sin, redemption, heaven, Christ.

學習使用《聖經新辭典》。好好研究一些重要字眼的意義。Use *The New Bible Dictionary* (English or Chinese). Study these words.

每一個字，每一個觀念在新舊約《聖經》裏都有豐富的意義！好好掌握這些意義；《聖經》就會活起來！

Each word has a rich meaning through the Old and New Testaments! Grasp these major concepts; the Bible will come alive for you.

3. ***上帝與你所建立的關係，稱為『約』。*The word "covenant" is the name God has given to the relationship he established with you.**

當你信主，成為一個基督徒的時候，你就進入到上帝的約了。When you became a Christian, you entered into God's covenant.

基督徒的後代，一出生就在這個約中。
Children of Christian parent(s) enter into this covenant at birth.

你與上帝的關係，由祂來定義，祂保證，祂維持！
Your relationship with God is defined, established, guaranteed, and maintained by God!

上帝必定信實，守著祂的任務。祂呼召我們要信實地遵守我們的任務：就是：信心，悔改，遵行祂的話。
He is always faithful on his part. And he calls us to be faithful on our part – to faith, obedience, and repentance.
我們禱告要有信心！
Pray with faith!

4. 你怎樣衡量，自己與上帝的關係好不好？How do you measure how good your "relationship with God" is?

是否在 20 分鐘靈修之後的感受？在敬拜讚美的唱詩時間之後的感覺？
Whether you feel comfortable (a warm, fuzzy feeling) at the end of a 20-minute Quiet Time? At the end of singing a praise-and-worship song?

是否在於自己的情感好壞？
Whether your emotions are high or low?

你與上帝的關係好壞，是否在於自己的主觀感覺？
Whether your self-perceived spirituality is high or low (depends whether you just had a "mountain-top" experience, such as a retreat or conference)?

是否在乎自己與別人的關係是喜樂或痛苦？

Whether you are experiencing joy in your relationships, or pain?

不是！
No!

我們與上帝的關係是『約』，衡量這關係不在乎自己，不在乎感覺。我們與上帝的關係是以祂為中心的。上帝是信實的，祂在約中所應許的都必成就。
Our relationship (covenant) with God is not self-/feeling-centered; it is God-centered. And God is faithful to all his promises he has given in the covenant.

5. 如何衡量自己在約中與上帝的關係：
   How to measure our "relationship (covenant) with God":

   我是否徹底地遵行上帝的吩咐？
   Do I thoroughly obey his commands?

   我是否全心敬拜祂？
   Do I worship him with all of my heart?

   我是否相信祂所應許的？
   Do I trust all his promises?

   我有沒有經常來到十字架面前認罪悔改？
   Do I regularly come to the cross to repent of my sin?

   我心中深處最大的願望，是否要愛祂，服事祂，為祂而活，（若需要的話）為祂捨命？
   Is the deepest desire in my heart to know him, to love him, serve him, live and die for him?

   永恆（天堂）對我來說，是否比今生更重要？
   Is heaven more important to me than this life on earth?

   我心中是否畏懼（敬畏）上帝？
   Do I have a real fear and reverence of God?

   上帝是這樣形容祂所喜悅的心；祂所喜悅的生命，祂願意與我們維持的『關係』。
   This is how God describe the heart he desires, the life we should live, the kind of "relationship with him" we should have.

   （參看：巴刻，《活在聖靈中》；愛德華茲，《宗教情操真偽辯》。）

Cf. J.I. Packer, *Keep In Step with the Spirit*; Jonathan Edwards, *Religious Affections*.

6. 有時候，我們要與上帝重新立約。（尼希米記 9 章）Sometimes we need to "renew our covenant" with God (cf. Nehemiah 9).

7. 生命是嚴肅的；基督的生命是委身的生命。Life is serious, the Christian life is about commitment.

8. 婚姻之約，是與上帝立約的很好比喻（圖畫）。
(The marriage vow is a good picture of covenanting with God. Malachi 2:14.)

9. 『約』就是上帝與你建立的關係`。祂定了這關係，祂也定了約中所有的條件。"Covenant" is the relationship God has established with us, and he has determined all the terms and conditions.

   在約的背後，乃是掌權的主上帝。『約』向我們挑戰，要放棄所有以自己為中心，以人為中心，以感覺為中心的思維與生活。
   Behind the covenant, is the sovereignty of God. "Covenant" challenges us to abandon all self-centered, man-centered, feeling-centered thinking and living.

10. 我們在約中順服、降服的時候，就真正的自由了。When we surrender (in covenant obedience) we are truly free.

11. 清教徒們常被人嘲笑，你們的生活這麼『嚴謹』。一位情教徒回答：『可是，先生，我所服事的上帝，是一位嚴謹的上帝！』The Puritans were ridiculed for being so "precise" (strict about so many details). One Puritan answered: "But sir, I serve a precise God!"

霍志恆《*聖經神學(舊約卷一)—摩西時代的啟示*》香港：天道 **1988**
Geerhardus Vos, *Biblical Theology* **(part 1) 書摘**

第一章 導論

　　「聖經神學」應該被稱為「特別啟示的歷史」，因為它是以歷史研究的手法，探討特別啟示中的真理，怎樣有機地從救贖之前在伊甸園中的簡單特別啟示，發展到新約正典結束之時。

　　「聖經神學」是釋經神學裏的一個分科。它要研究聖經所記載神自我啟示的過程。而啟示行動主要有以下的特性：
1.　啟示的過程是隨著歷史而漸進的
2.　啟示是包含在歷史之內的(彰顯在歷史之內)
3.　歷史過程的有機性，在啟示中也可以見到
4.　啟示的應用性(與事物實體和個人生命的內在經驗交織為一)
　　聖經神學的方法主要是由歷史的發展來決定的，因此就將啟示的過程分成若干時期。而啟示是以「立約」作為開始一個新紀元的記號。

第二章 啟示範疇的劃分

普通啟示(General Revelation)
1.　從自然界來的，是給與一切人類的
2.　存在於罪惡之先，它又與罪惡無關
3.　包括人裏頭的自然界和人外面的自然界
4.　神透過人裏面的宗教意識和道德意識來向人啟示祂自己
5.　但由於罪介入了人類當中，影響了神自然啟示的功效，故需要超然啟示

特別啟示(Special Revelation)或超然啟示(Supernatural Revelation)
1.　是從神超然地特別開啟祂自己而來的，只給予有限的一部份人
2.　主要功用，不是去改正或恢復人對自然界事物的理解能力，而是要使人對真理有一個全新的認識，是關係到人類的救贖
3.　透過神所默示、筆錄的文獻
4.　祂向人啟示祂的本性：在「公義」與「恩典」兩大範疇

救贖性的特別啟示的劃分
1.　救贖前的特別啟示稱為「工作之約」，其後為「恩典之約」
2.　「舊約」是在彌賽亞來臨之前的一段恩典之約的時期；「新約」則是在祂來臨之後直到今日的一段恩典之約的時期
3.　希伯來文的「約」”berith”, 特點是它的不變性、肯定性和永遠有效性
4.　希臘文的「約」”diatheke”, 不是取它「遺囑」的意思，說是古老的意義，含有「憑主權去安排」的意思。

第三章 救贖之前的特別啟示

其中大部份都是象徵性：神用表徵多於說話啟示；那只是一種文學體裁，不是歷史事實的描述。

1. 生命：神用生命樹來教導人認識生命
   --生命是從神而來
   --人在墮落以前並沒有吃過生命樹的果子
   --樂園裏生命樹的果子是神應許賜給那「得勝」吃的
2. 考驗：分別善惡樹的意義
   --神話的解釋法並不可信
   --根據語言學上解釋為「選擇善惡的樹」也未盡完善
   --這棵樹叫「善惡知識樹」，是神所指定用以考驗人的工具，使人在宗教上和道德上的實質得以成熟，享受神最高的福氣
3. 試探與犯罪：用蛇來象徵
   --神對人的考驗被撒但拿來試探人(前者是善意，後者是惡意)
   --蛇象徵撒但狡猾成性，最適合被魔鬼拿來試探人
   --撒但的目的是要使那女人起懷疑之心
   --夏娃開始劃分神的權利和她自己的權利，種下犯罪的禍根
4. 死亡：用身體的解體來象徵
   --人受造時是不死的，但因人犯罪，死亡進入了人裏面
   --死亡的根源在於被趕離開神(失去了神的同在)

第四章 首次救贖性的特別啟示

--人犯罪墮落之後，神就立即向人施行拯救
--祂的公義與恩典一齊臨到墮落了的人
--神宣佈三個咒詛性的刑罰顯明了神的公義
--神咒詛試探者則暗示了祂對人類的恩典
--神對蛇的咒詛藏著勝過蛇和牠的後裔的應許：
1. 整個拯救都是神親自發動的
2. 神的拯救主要是把人對蛇和對神的態度恢復成應有的態度
3. 神說祂的拯救會持續下去；人與蛇的仇恨會一直延伸到女人的後裔和蛇的後裔
4. 神事先講明了女人與蛇要彼此為仇
--在男人的咒詛上，人仍然可以繼續餬口以維生，乃是咒詛中的恩典
--在女人的咒詛上，儘管人要面對死亡的刑罰，人類仍然會緜延後代，這也是神咒詛中的恩典

第五章 挪亞時期的啟示

--這時期啟示的特點：重人類發展歷史；偏向消極
--給人看見，如神任由罪自行發展，它所帶來的後果是不堪想像的

該隱的後代和塞特的後代：
--只強調救贖的延續作用
--分別代表世務與救贖兩方面的發展
--以諾的見證，再次宣告人如果恢復與神的交通，必能蒙拯救脫離死亡
--該隱的後代和塞特的後代通婚，後者自甘與前者的邪惡同化
--神對洪水前的人類加以審判：因在宗教道德上的敗壞
--這時期那種極端邪惡的形容，包括：
1. 罪惡的嚴重性和廣泛性(在地上罪惡很大)
2. 罪惡的內在性(所思想的)
3. 罪惡對良善的絕對排外性(盡都是惡)
4. 罪惡的習慣性和延續性(終日)

洪水之後的啟示：
--比較積極而具有建設性
--神的應許不只限於人類，更是整個世界有關(天虹的記號)
--神給挪亞的啟示：
1. 神獨白的說出祂要把萬物重新組織起來
2. 敘述神制定一些的律例，準備祂的救贖工作—生命的繁殖、保護、維持
3. 神用約的形式，以一個很嚴肅的記號(天虹)來賜下祂的應許

第六章 從挪亞到列祖時期的啟示

挪亞預言他的後代會蒙拯救：
1. 對迦南(含)是一個咒詛，對雅弗和閃卻是一個祝福
2. 基本上是基於道德問題
3. 三個兒子的個性都是代表性，象徵他們後代的民族性
4. 祝福內說明閃族後代要敬拜耶和華
5. 雅弗的後代佔據閃的後代的帳棚，他們卻在那裏遇見閃的神，就是那位救贖和啟示的神

列國誌：
1. 預先提到各國各家各族
2. 閃族的家譜是關於救贖的家譜

語言分歧：
1. 人們建造城塔，目的要成為一個龐大的國家，脫離神而獨立，自取榮耀
2. 神干涉人這個計劃的執行，不只是要針對人傲慢無神的思想，更是忠於祂所應許的

3. 也因為神對人的生命的要求，要各民各國分別負責不同的事奉；其次是與救贖的關連性

神揀選閃族去肩負救贖和啟示的工作：
1. 在心理方面，閃族是特別被動而富接受性的個民族，不大會主動和創作
2. 他們一方面能夠很具體的把啟示接受過來，另一方面又以人所能理解的、抽象地把啟示傳遞出來
3. 閃族的宗教很強調順服，故使閃族執著世界宗教的牛耳
4. 閃族宗教很強調神與敬拜者的個人關係，富有僕人獻身的精神
5. 以色列如此獨特的宗教，唯一合理的解釋是—它出於神超然的啟示
6. 關於神的名字之啟示：指出了神的某一種特性；其次，神的名字本身抽象而具體地代表了祂所要啟示一切關於祂自己的；最後，也代表了真實的神本身

第七章 列祖時期的啟示

列祖的歷史性
1. 舊約的宗教是一個基於史實的宗教，不只是一些聖人的榜樣而已
2. 如果在摩西之前的人物事物都不是真實的歷史記載，神就沒有在史前的時期裏開始救贖工作了
3. 其他如以色列人「自我理想化」和從巴比倫的神話來解釋列祖名字的起源等理論都不能合理的接受

神的顯現
1. 到這時期，聖經首次或多或少地描述神啟示的形式
2. 神向亞伯拉罕啟示的方式：說話，顯現(直譯是耶和華「讓亞伯拉罕看見祂」)，肉眼可見的顯現
3. 其後神直接向人顯現的次數就越來越少，反而透過異象或夢等方法

耶和華的使者
1. 這時期啟示方式常是藉著「耶和華的使者」或「神的使者」
2. 神的使者藉以顯現的形象只是為了當時的需要，當顯現目的達成後就不需要

亞伯拉罕身上的啟示內容與特性
1. 揀選原則
   --神的啟示是逐步透過他所揀選的家族傳遞出來
   --神要透過起初一些狹窄的揀選，最終達成祂普世的目的
   --透過與亞伯拉罕所立的約，神與以色列的關係就建基於神的應許及恩典上
2. 神的恩賜的客觀性
   --一個連於日常生活的、神介入人生活中的宗教
   --也看見啟示性宗教在歷史上的漸進特性，就是神已在過去作工，在今日作

工，並應許將來仍然要作工

--神的作為與祂給列祖的三大應許緊連在一起：蒙揀選的家族會成為一個大國；他們會得到迦南地為產業；他們會成為萬國的祝福

3. 神的應許要超然地應驗

--神應許的特色：就是無論在字句上或行動上都非常強調這些應許之所以應驗是單憑神絕對的能力

--亞伯拉罕被禁止用自己的能力或方法來促使神的應許應驗

神的名字：「全能的神」(El-Shaddai)

1. 神用超然的方法向列祖顯現，這特性顯明在這名字上
2. 因為祂透過超自然的方法，統御自然完成祂的恩典工作，並指令自然界按祂的設計而運作

列祖宗教裏的信

1. 信心的重要，因為它是人對神超自然工作的主觀反應
2. 信心是依據神超自然的能力及恩典而有；是人對更高層或屬靈世界的投身
3. 對亞伯拉罕來說，信心是他與神相交中的主要宗教行動與心態，他整個生平是一個信心的旅程，在當中神逐步地培植及訓練他的信心
4. 如果要緊握神及祂的應許，人要放棄他人為的努力，他不期望從自己得些甚麼；從積極而言，他期望一切所得的，均是從神超自然的介入
5. 在列祖的信仰生活中，信心還有另外的一個作用，就是它將對神應許的態度屬靈化了(來 11:10)
6. 亞伯拉罕信心裡的一神觀，指明人對神的信靠，叫他不會去依靠其他縱然是當時人相信存在的靈界能力

列祖生平中的倫理問題

1. 聖經一方面沒有隱藏列祖的失敗，但同時也對列祖給予相當高的稱許
2. 他們有好客、慷慨、犧牲自我、忠實等美德
3. 亞伯拉罕知道他一生繼續得神的喜愛，他須要有道德的生活
4. 因為倫理既非宗教之外的東西，也不是宗教唯一的內容；倫理是宗教的成果
5. 舊約宗教以割禮為一個表徵；從舊約律法及先知，割禮的道德及屬靈意義展？到新約(西 2:11-13)

族長以撒

1. 以撒與亞伯拉罕的生平有很多相同而又強烈對比處
2. 看見神的拯救工作的三個階段：首階段是一個有高度成果的階段，是有創作性的開始。次階段是受苦降卑的階段，是成為較被動的階段。最後是重新得回改造的能力。以撒代表了中間的一個階段
3. 亞伯拉罕獻上以撒，看見了代贖的原則：一個生命代替另一個生命

雅各

1. 生平中的重點是生命的改變，但也同時強調神在當中的作為

2. 個人長遠的揀選
   --是救贖的一個應用：對於救贖工作的成就，人完全沒有任何貢獻
   --神絕對的主權完全不基於人道德的優劣
   --揀選不是一個盲目的命運，而是要達到一個經過心思的目的
3. 在伯特利的異夢
   --這在暗示接受的人正在一個屬靈的低潮中
   --神多次用不同的主觀經驗及管教來改變雅各
   --他驚訝神的救贖性的顯現竟然是與他相隨，甚至在他流離時仍不離他左右
4. 在毘努伊勒的摔跤
   --他求神赦免他的罪，並除去因他的罪所帶來神的不喜悅，而神給他的祝福是一個赦罪的祝福，讓他與神重新建立正常的關係
   --他易名為以色列，象徵著前後的改變(心靈的改變)

第八章 摩西時代的啟示

摩西在舊約啟示中的地位
1. 在五經最早期的記載中，摩西已經在其百姓中被認定是偉大的宗教領袖
2. 在最早期先知著作裏，例如阿摩司及何西阿，他們都承認摩西最高超的地位
3. 摩西成為神初步實現祂對列祖的應許的器皿
4. 他著手組織整個民族，令整個民族團結起來，又帶領以色列到應許的邊界
5. 他站在先知潮流的開端，他的權威延至後繼的諸世代
6. 他被設立來管理神的全家，預表了基督救贖工作中的三個職份

摩西時代啟示的形式
1. 一是給摩西的直接啟示，和透過摩西這個人而作的啟示：親密恆久的相交
2. 另一是不直接經由摩西本人的同期啟示形式：表明神的同在是持久的，不像列祖時期裏，神只是暫時的及轉眼間的顯現
   --雲柱火柱：會幕和聖殿至聖所中的榮耀，是神這榮耀降臨的延續
   --耶和華的使者：在荊棘叢中的火焰裏向摩西顯現…
   --耶和華的名和面：「名字」是在啟示中的神

摩西時代啟示的內容
1. 出埃及：摩西律法的基礎
   --神的啟示與歷史是不可分割的
   --從外族的捆綁裏拯救出來—救贖將人從罪及邪惡這一個客觀真實的領域裏拯救出來
   --脫離罪惡—神不只拯救以色列脫離外在的外邦奴役，神同樣拯救他們脫離內在的屬靈敗壞及罪惡
   --彰顯神的全能—整件事蹟都在強調神的能力
   --彰顯神主權性的救恩—以色列人因敬拜偶像而遭審判，卻得神拯救與憐憫
   --耶和華這個名字—神在救贖中彰顯的主權，和在摩西時期中常用的神的名字

「耶和華」有很大的關連，更是神信實的最大描述

--逾越節—由於這儀式，「滅命者」就「越過了」以色列人的屋門；但這筵席是在獻祭之後，目的是要教導以色列人他們所享有的平安及恩福是基於神所作的救贖

2. 耶和華與以色列之間的約

--首次看到約是一個雙邊同意的條款(雙方的承諾)

--強調以色列人甘願與神聯合

--約書包括耶和華的命令、典章

3. 以色列的組織：神權統治

--宗教上的主權及國家上的王權，在耶和華身上連合起來，以致以色列人的社會生活及宗教生活交織在一起，兩者不可分割

--律法的功用—消極方面用以顯明人各種努力的失敗，目的要將人帶到基督面前；神透過律法，屢次教導以色列人認識祂所做的事，就是祂賜予白白的恩典，來祝福及接納以色列人

4. 十誡：是以後要詳細發揮的整個律法體系的一個概要

--祂將神拯救的作為、人在蒙恩中的聖潔身份，以及人遵從神的旨意的責任，都擺在人的面前

--廣泛的應用—是先頒佈給以色列人而已

--十誡的宗教性質—是一套基督徒倫理、道德生活，是神拯救工作的產品

--頭四誡特別討論人與神之間的關係，後六誡討論人與人之間的關係

--頭三誡又自成一組，要針對異教中最基本的三種罪：就是多神、敬拜偶像、及邪術

--十誡指出人遵守安息日的基本原則，就是在人的生活中必須學像神

5. 禮儀律法：

--是當摩西在西乃山上，神向他啟示的，不是在以色列人中的一個補救方法

--象徵與預表：「象徵」就是一樣帶有宗教意義的事物，以一個可見的形體指出一個屬靈的事實、原則、或關係。它所象徵的事物在當時已經存在，也對當時有意義。而預表的事物有一種預告的作用，它預先指出某些在將來要成就的事情

--在舊約的整個宗教體系裏，會幕是其中一樣最清楚兼具象徵及預表的例子

--神的威嚴與聖潔：神的聖潔就是祂的神性的具體表現，叫祂在地位及尊榮上，都與一切受造物截然不同

--敬拜的地方：人對神的敬拜特別是屬於聖所的事情，尤其是透過其中的三樣陳設來象徵—香壇、陳設餅桌子、燈臺

--基督是會幕的實體：神透過成為肉身的道，在會幕中與人同在，藉以啟示祂的恩典及榮耀

--會幕作為教會的預表：因為教會是復活了的基督的身體

--律法中的獻祭制度：獻祭的禮成為會幕一切禮儀的中心；祭壇就是神的殿，是會幕的一個縮影

--供物、禮物、祭物：每一個祭物都是聖潔的禮物，但不是其中每一樣都可以叫做「祭物」

--獻祭者與祭物的關係

--祭典的幾個步驟：在神所容許的範圍內選取祭牲；獻祭者按手在祭牲的頭上；獻祭者親手宰殺祭牲

--「代贖」的定義：藉著所獻上的祭牲的死亡，代替了獻祭者應得的死亡

--獻祭的種類：先是關於獻祭者在宗教上最差的光景，最後進升到關於他蒙福的情形

--不潔與潔淨：潔淨是指有資格在會幕中敬拜耶和華

--圖騰崇拜、祖宗敬拜、精靈學說，都是不正確的解說潔淨與否問題

慕理，《恩典之約》摘錄
JOHN MURRAY, *THE COVENANT OF GRACE* - Digest

上帝救贖的啟示 = 約的啟示。
God's redemptive revelation = covenant revelation.
自宗教改革以來，一般對「約」的定義：
Usual definition of the term "covenant" (Since Protestant Reformation):
協同，兩個人之間的合同：其中有應許，有條件。
A compact, an agreement between two parties: promise, conditions.

I · 聖經中「約」的用法：The use of the term in Scripture: (pp. 8-12)

強調「上帝的恩典」，和「上帝的應許」：這兩點完全符合聖經。
Emphasis on grace and promise of God is thoroughly in accord with biblical data.

[a] 人與人之間的約 Covenants between men
創 Gen. 21:27, 32 – 亞伯拉罕與亞比米勒 Abraham and Abimelech
創 Gen. 26:28 – 亞比米勒與以撒 Abimelech to Isaac
創 Gen. 31:44 – 拉班與雅各 Laban to Jacob
書 Josh. 9:6, 11, 15 – 基便人與約書亞 Gibeonites to Joshua
撒上 I Sam. 18:3 – 大衛與約拿單 David and Jonathan
撒下 2 Sam. 3:12 – 大衛與押尼珥 David and Abner
撒下 2 Sam. 13:21
撒下 2 Sam. 5:3 – 大衛與以色列眾長老，在希伯崙
David with all elders of Israel at Hebron
王上 I Kings 5:12 – 所羅門與希蘭 Solomon and Hiram

> {1}就算在這些約中，「彼此訂合同」的觀念是至要的，這不等於說，上帝
> 與人所立的約中，「合同」觀念是最重要的。 "Even should it be true that in
> these covenants the idea of mutual compact is central, it does not follow that the
> idea of compact is central in or essential to the covenant relation which God
> constitutes with man."

> {2}七十士本將 berith 譯為 diatheke。 Suntheke 是「合同」的更好譯法。
> 我懷疑，七十士本譯者的思想，不完全被「合同」觀念左右。
> （慕理在這點上不同意 Geerhardus Vos。）
> LXX renders berith diatheke. Suntheke = better translation for "compact." We
> suspect: LXX translators not governed by "mutual agreement." =>Vos.

> {3}「合同」的觀念並不顯著。這裏有「個人親自參與」，和「委身」的觀
> 念。雙方彼此「發誓忠誠」，比「合同」與合同中的條件更顯著。當「發誓

忠誠」最顯著時，協議訂下的條件甚至不出現。所強調的是，一方立約委身
於另一方；至於這次委身是基於哪些條件，卻沒有說出。（頁 10）
"Pact" or contract not in foreground. "There is engagement or commitment
indeed." But "the notion of sworn fidelity is thrust into prominence… rather than
that of contract. It is not the contractual terms that are in prominence so much as
the solemn engagement of one person to another. To such an extent is this the
case that stipulated terms of agreement need not be present at all. It is the giving
of oneself over in the commitment of troth that is emphasized and the specified
conditions as those upon which the engagement or commitment is contingent are
not mentioned." (p. 10)

[b] 人與上帝立的約 Covenants made by man with God
書 Josh. 24:24, 25 – Joshua with the people
王下 2 Kings 11:17 – Jehoiada – between the Lord, king, and people
王下 2 Kings 23:3 – Josiah before the Lord
拉 Ezra 10:3 – Ezra – people with the Lord

在這些經文我們看見：立約者嚴肅的委身，應許忠誠。他們藉著結盟「自我束縛」
(bind themselves)，要按照上帝啟示的旨意向祂忠誠。立約就是嚴肅的發誓，奉獻
自己給上帝，無條件地、毫無保留地委身服事祂。（頁 11）
"What we find in these instances is solemn, promissory commitment to faith or troth on
the part of the people concerned. They bind themselves in bond to be faithful to the Lord
in accordance with His revealed will. The covenant is solemn pledging of devotion to
God, unreserved and unconditional commitment to His service." (p. 11)

[c] 上帝的約。創造，護理。
Divine covenants. Creation and providence.
耶 Jer. 33:20-25 –日、夜的約。 the covenant of the day and of the night.
創 Gen. 8:22 –
上帝是信實的，祂的典章不改變，祂的應許不改變。上帝的典章堅定不移。
Faithfulness of God to His providential ordinances, and to His promise.
Ordinances of God immovably established.

II・洪水之後上帝與挪亞立的約。Post-diluvian Noahic Covenant. (pp. 12-15)
創 Gen. 9:9-17

[1]「由上帝自己構思、設計、決定、成立、確定、安排。」
"Conceived, devised, determined, established, confirmed, dispensed by God Himself."
創 Gen. 9:9, 11, 12, 13, 17

[2] 範圍：涉及人類。（9，10）約運行在不認識這約的人身上；福份臨到他們。
Universal in scope (vv. 9, 10). Operates on behalf of, and dispenses blessings to those
who have no intelligent apprehension of it.

[3] 無條件的。並沒有吩咐。「背約」是不可能的。
Unconditional. No commandment. Breaking covenant is inconceivable.

[4] 強烈的「單方面」性質。人完全沒有參與。（16 節）
Intensely, pervasively monergistic. No human agency whatever. Unilateral (v 16).

[5] 永遠的約（11 節）。永久性＝與上帝單方面立約有密切的關係。
Everlasting. (v. 11) Perpetuity = bound up with its divinely unilateral, monergistic character.

上帝主權的恩典：不是「合同」。
Sovereign grace – not "agreement."

III. 上帝與亞伯拉罕立的約 **The Abrahamic Covenant**. (pp. 16-20)

[1] 應許：自我咒詛的誓約。
Promise: self-maledictory oath.
創 Gen. 15:8-18
    [A] 由上帝執行。上帝經過祭物。
    Divine administration: God passes through the meat.
    [B] 福份的內涵。我要作你們的上帝，你們要作我的子民。
    Essence of blessing: I will be your God, you shall be my people.

[2] 守約與背約。Keeping/breaking covenant.
創 Gen. 17:9, 10, 14.

守約＝必須的，基於信仰關係的親密性和屬靈性。
Keeping = necessary, arising out of intimacy and spirituality of religious relation.

上帝主權地施行恩典。
Sovereign dispensation of grace.

有背約的可能性。那麼，約的永久性是否有條件？
Does the possibility of breaking the covenant imply a conditional perpetuity?
創 Gen. 17:14

不錯：約，必須有人的回應。
There must be response.

創 Gen. 18:17-19
創 Gen. 22:16-18

可是，這些條件不是約的條件。
But these conditions are not conditions of the covenant.

不是說：除非人符合這些條件，不然約不施行。
It is NOT true that, only if conditions are fulfilled, then the covenant would be dispensed.

不錯：「除非人成就這些條件，不然上帝所施的恩典，和祂所設立的關係是沒有意義的。」
"Apart from the fulfillment of these conditions the grace bestowed and the relation established are meaningless."

人守約，是因為上帝設立了約的關係。約本身的存在是守約的前提，人守約不是約存在的條件。
"Keeping the covenant presupposes the covenant relation is established / rather than the condition upon which its establishment is contingent."

一個無條件施恩的約，不是一個能守，能背負的約。
A covenant which yields its blessing indiscriminately is not one that can be kept or broken.

約有獨特性（上帝向某些人立約），因此守約是必需的。
Particularism necessitates keeping covenant.

IV・上帝與摩西立的約。The Mosaic Covenant. (pp. 20-22)

[1] 有守約，成全約的條件：摩西之約不是惟一，獨特的。
Conditional fulfillment = not peculiar to Mosaic covenant.

[2] 上帝拯救：應驗了亞伯拉罕之約。
Deliverance = in fulfillment of Abrahamic covenant.
出 Ex. 2:24
出 Ex. 3:16, 17
出 Ex. 6:4-8
詩 Ps. 40:8-12
詩 Ps. 40:42-45
詩 Ps. 41:45

[3] 約是屬靈的：中心思想。
Spirituality = central.

出 Ex. 6:7
申 Dt. 29:13

頭一次提到「約」字，就提到守約。
Keeping covenant = first reference to covenant.
出 Ex. 19:5, 6

第二次清楚提到「約」：在以色列民應許之後。
Next explicit reference – sequel to promise of people.
出 Ex. 24:7-8

* 出 19：5 – 這節並不證明，人守約，是立約的條件。
* Ex. 19:5 does not prove conditional fulfillment.

* 其實，人守約的時候，約已經存在；約的存在是守約的前提。
* "The covenant is actually presupposed in the keeping of it."

* 約中的條件是：人若遵守約，順服上帝的吩咐，就能享受約中提到的福份。
* "What is conditional upon obedience and keeping of the covenant is the enjoyment of the blessing which the covenant contemplates."

上帝主權地執行這約。
Sovereign administration.

出 Ex. 36:27, 28
利 Lev. 24:8
民 Num. 18:19
民 Num. 25:13
尼 Neh. 13:29

亞伯拉罕之約，和摩西之約：「重點是：順服上帝的聲音，遵守祂的約。」
Both Abraham and Moses: "The keynotes are obeying God's voice and keeping the covenant."

創 Gen. 18:17-19
出 Ex. 19:5-6

因此：摩西之約不是一種新的約。
Therefore: Mosaic covenant = NOT new kind of covenant.

V．上帝與大衛立的約。The Davidic Covenant. (pp. 22-25)

撒下 2 Sam. 7:12-17
詩 Ps. 89:3-4, 26ff, 34
詩 Ps. 132:11ff

最顯著的特性：堅定，穩固，上帝應許不改變。
Most striking feature – security, determinateness, immutability of divine promise.
撒下 2 Sa. 23:5

上帝的應許都集中在彌賽亞身上，耶穌基督成全這些應許。
Promises = Messianic, fulfilled in Christ.
賽 Isa. 42:1, 6
賽 Isa. 49:8
賽 Isa. 55:3-4
上帝賜祂的僕人，作為「約」（中文聖經譯作：「約的中保」）
God gives the servant as a covenant of the people.

瑪 Mal. 3:1 約的使者。Angel of the covenant
賽 Isa. 54:9-10

賽 Isa. 59:21
挪亞之約 = 基本模式。
Noahic covenant = the pattern.

結論 Conclusion:

「從上帝起初向人啟示祂所立的約的時候，我們就發現一個貫徹的觀念，就是：上帝的約，乃是祂主權的施行祂的恩典與應許。「約」不是「合同」，合同並不是約裏最重要的觀念；最重要的是立約者的心意 (disposition)，和立約者施行 (dispensation) 祂的心意。」（頁 31）

"From the beginning of God's disclosures to men in terms of covenant we find a unity of conception which is to the effect that a divine covenant is a sovereign administration of grace and of promise. It is not compact or contract agreement that provides the constitutive or governing idea but that of dispensation in the sense of disposition. …" (p. 31)

「約」是什麼？
簡介三位 **20** 世紀改革宗神學家的模式

新舊約聖經都稱為「約」，不是偶然的。是上帝計劃要啟示的核心主題。
因此：「約」(covenant)是舊約聖經的主題。
「約」也是新約聖經的主題（新約一般稱「約」為「天國」）。
希伯來文：「約」= berit。
希臘文：「約」= diatheke, suntheke。

基督徒：你關心你與上帝的關係嗎？上帝更關心。
因為祂與你的關係是由祂親自設立的。
連關係的名字都是祂所訂的，祂單方面地，主動地設立了這關係。
祂稱這關係為「約」。
人間最密切的關係，不是感情、情欲，乃是獻上自己，立約。
上帝先與我們立約。上帝與我們的關係不是由感情決定的。
祂與我們認同 (he engages himself, identifies himself with us)。
祂願意將自己的名、名聲，設立在祂的子民中間。
「約」的核心意義就是：「我要作你們的上帝，你們要作屬我的子民。」
這種愛的關係是專一的，不可濫交。 (Exclusive, particular love.)
一對男女交換婚約，就是模仿上帝立約。
「約」是上帝以祂的恩典與罪人設立的（指創世記 3 章和其後的約）。
既然祂設立了關係，一定對我們有所要求（律法）。
祂訂下約裏的細節（典章）。
約裏有律法，有恩典。

三位改革宗神學家：
Palmer Robertson
John Murray
Meredith Kline
他們之間有很多方面是同意的，不過每位所強調的不同。

1．羅拔森 (Palmer Robertson)：曾在威敏斯特 (www.wts.edu)，聖約神學院 (www.covenantseminary.edu) 等院校教舊約，已退休，任非洲聖經學院院長。著有 *Christ of the Covenants, Christ of the Prophets, The Genesis of Sex* (www.prpbooks.com), 和 *Covenants* (www.gcp.org)等。

「約」是血盟（盟約），上帝主權的（單方面的）設定。
A covenant is a blood-bond sovereignly administered.
血盟＝有「生死關係」的要素。 A life-and-death bond.

創 15 章：切約 (to cut a covenant)：上帝起了自我咒詛的誓約 (maledictory oath)。若我不守約，願我像這些被切為兩半的動物一樣。以性命發誓。

2・慕理 (John Murray)：已故威敏斯特神學院系統神學教授。*Collected Writings of John Murray* (4 vols., www.banneroftruthtrust.co.uk.)。其羅馬書注釋是經典之作。中文譯作有《再思救贖奇恩》。仔細、敬虔地解經建立系統神學。

慕理在 *The Covenant of Grace* (www.prpbooks.com) 從挪亞的約看「約」。
「約」是單方面設立的，上帝主權的應許恩典。
恩典（不是律法）是約的核心內容。
上帝委身自己 (engages himself)，嚴肅投入關係 (solemnly engages himself)。
因此，慕理不認為「律法」應是「約」的定義的一部份。

3・克蘭 (Meredith G. Kline)：多產，很有創意的舊約學者，曾任教於威敏斯特 (www.wts.edu)，哥頓神學院 (Gordon Conwell Theological Seminary)等。著有： *By Oath Consigned, Treaty of the Great King, Images of the Spirit* 等。

從赫人與他們征服的民族所定的盟約(Hittites' treaties) 看上帝與摩西和以色列人立的約。
注重約的條文，制度 (covenant administration)。
出埃及記，申命記是約文；甚至整本舊約聖經都是一本約的條文 (covenant document)。
約裏有主宰的自我介紹 (self-identification)，歷史序言 (historical prologue)，吩咐與禁止 (sanctions: commands and prohibitions)，遵守與違背的後果 (consequences of obedience and disobedience)，存放約文的安排 (provisions for copies and preservation

律法（上帝所吩咐與禁止）的，當然是約文的一部份。

小結：

Kline 注重律法，制度的整體性。既然是上帝設定的，不由我們摒棄！

Murray 注重上帝親身的介入、投入、發誓 (solemnly engaged himself)，都是恩典 (promise of grace)。

Robertson 注重「血盟」：不只是制度，乃有生死關係。

介紹聖經神學
Introducing Biblical Theology

糾正關於聖經神學的十二個誤解

1・誤：聖經是上帝的話；神學是聖經以外的人為哲學。只查聖經就夠了。
正：聖經是上帝的啟示。聖經中的啟示有上帝的話語和作為；有些啟示（如保羅書信）是對已啟示的事或話作出解釋。這些啟示可稱為教義，神學。聖經裏就有神學（教義）。我們需要認識聖經本身的教義架構，看出字和字、書卷與書卷、觀念與觀念、真理與真理之間的關係：這就是「神學架構」。

2・誤：保羅教導就只是「因信稱義」和如何在教會裏生活和事奉。知道這些就夠了。
正：保羅的教導誠然包括因信稱義（這是羅馬書 1-8 章的主題！）。可是保羅的思想包括一些關於歷史、宇宙、上帝整個計劃的真理：這是聖經中的「歷史觀」，「宇宙觀」，或「末世論」，與「救贖論」同樣重要。

3・誤：末世論只是一些關於未來的事情；與「主再來」的真理是同義詞。
正：末世論包括過去（基督復活，升天），現在（天國彰顯在地上），和未來（主再來，有新天新地，上帝完全掌權）三方面。

4・誤：末世論和救恩（救贖論）是兩回事。最多，末世論（我們未來的盼望）是救贖論（我們的救恩）的最後一部份而已。
正：在保羅的思想中，末世論乃是救贖論的基礎和基本架構。若要正確了解保羅的救贖論，必須了解他的末世論。

5・誤：認識末世論，會使基督徒成為禁欲主義者，進修道院去隱居。
正：正確認識保羅的末世論，會使我們很現實的面對這個世界：我們如何面對自己的最罪，這個充滿罪惡的世界作光作鹽？基督徒是正視現實的。

6・誤：末世論就是講基督徒個人未來的命運。
正：末世論講到全人類、整個宇宙的命運；講一個新的時代 (aion)。
救贖論也是如此：上帝使萬物更新。

7・誤：救贖論（基督救贖的工作）的焦點只是十字架。
正：救贖論的焦點是基督的死（十字架）、復活、升天、聖靈降臨。這四件事其實是一件事，是宇宙歷史中最重要的事。

8・誤：救贖論只是關於基督徒個人的經驗。
正：上帝的救贖工作是「救贖歷史」，是關乎整個宇宙的。

9 · 誤：「來世」只是一個「地方」。來世，是一個空間的觀念。
正：「來世」是空間的觀念（地方），也是時間的觀念（新的時代）。若把
來世只看為「地方」或「境界」的話，很容易墮入「諾斯底主義」。

10 · 誤：未來的世界，只是將來的事。
正：來世（永恆）現在藉著耶穌基督的復活，已經介入了現今，已經開始
了。

11 · 誤：「屬靈人」好像諾斯底主義者，擁有一些秘密的知識或經驗。
正：「屬靈人」是聖靈掌管的人，既屬天，屬來世，也在地上，活在今世。

12 · 誤：「奧秘」是一些新的，秘密的知識（資訊）。
正：新約的「奧秘」主要不是知識、資料，乃是一件事：以前沒有啟示的，
現在啟示了！因此，「奧秘」是一個「公開的秘密」。

介紹聖經神學
Introducing Biblical Theology

<div align="center">

復活與救贖：方法論的考慮
RESURRECTION AND REDEMPTION:
METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

</div>

(Richard B. Gaffin, Jr., *Resurrection and Redemption: A Study in Paul's Soteriology.* [formerly: *The Centrality of the Resurrection*.] Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing, 1987, 19-29.)

霍志恆的《保羅的末世論》的長遠價值，不僅在於它對保羅思想基本因素的豐富、深入分析；更在於書中多次提到作者研究保羅的進路。該書的方法論（或釋經學）的重要性（似乎到目前為止完全被忽略），乃是我們在本章要仔細注意的。

Geerhardus Vos' *Pauline Eschatology* is of abiding value not only for its rich and penetrating analysis of the basic elements of Paul's teaching but also for its variety of instructive statements concerning the *way* he approaches Paul. This methodological or hermeneutical significance of the book, which so far appears to have been entirely overlooked, is that to which we now will give careful attention.

霍氏研究保羅的進路出自他對保羅的信念：保羅「可被稱為基督教末世論之父」（頁 vi），甚至說保羅具有「歷史上最偉大處理基督教資料的建構思想家」之思維（頁 149）。這類語氣的話在書中出現多次。因為使徒保羅的思想「有一種系統性，使他堅決尋求定論的涵義」（頁 60）；也因他的思想具有「高度的教義性和歸納能力」（頁 148），因此我們需要正視保羅的「神學系統」（頁 60），他的「真理系統」，和他「對基督教真理的建構」（頁 148）。保羅「充滿活力的末世論思想，有整合化，為一個緊湊的神學架構的傾向」（頁 61）。解釋保羅的學者們對他的評論一般都有偏差，其中部份理由是因為「保羅身為一位神學思想家，他的思想的嚴謹遠遠超過他們」（頁 149）。[注 1]

Vos' approach to Paul is controlled by his conviction that Paul can "justly be called the father of Christian eschatology" (p. vi) and even that Paul's is "the genius of the greatest constructive mind ever at work on the data of Christianity" (p. 149). Statements with a similar tone can be multiplied. Because the apostle's mind "had by nature a certain systematic bent, which made him pursue with great resoluteness the consequences of given premises" (p. 60), and because it was "highly doctrinal and synthetic" (p. 148), one must think in terms of Paul's "theological system" (p. 60), his "system of truth," his "construction of Christian truth" (p. 148). Paul's "energetic eschatological thinking tended toward consolidation in an orb of compact theological structure" (p. 61). The facile one-sidedness of which all too many of his interpreters have been guilty results in part "because Paul's mind as a theological thinker was far more exacting than theirs …" (p. 149). [1]

[1] Cf. *Biblical Theology*, p. 17: "The Gospel having a precise, doctrinal structure, the doctrinally-gifted Paul was the fit organ for expressing this, because his gifts had been conferred and cultivated in advance with a view to it." (This volume, which first appeared in 1948, is a reworking of class lectures given at Princeton Theological Seminary, prior to Vos's retirement in 1932.)

　　總的來說，這些話給讀者留下深刻的印象，特別是兩個因素：（1）霍氏深深欣賞保羅的獨特性，特別是他身為一個*思想*家的才幹。霍氏在保羅思想的性質方面做了一些反省。（2）霍氏指出保羅和解釋保羅者之間的連續性。兩者都關心「基督教的資料」(data)。基督教對於末世論的反省，以保羅作開始，保羅是「末世論之父」。還有多方面看出，保羅和解釋保羅者的連續性，在於兩者都是從事「神學」。我們若說，霍氏認為使徒保羅和他在經營同一種企業，並不過分。他這樣說的同時，當然沒有妥協聖經的統一性，上帝是聖經的作者和聖經的權威。

　　Taken together, these statements make an unmistakable impression. In particular, two factors stand out. (1) They reflect a deep appreciation of the distinctiveness and individuality of Paul, specifically his capacity as a *thinker*. The nature of Paul's mind is reflected upon in some detail. (2) They show a definite sense of continuity between Paul and his interpreter. Both have a common interest: the "data of Christianity." Christian eschatological reflection has Paul as its initiator, its "father." Moreover, the nature of this continuity, its specifically "theological" character, is indicated in a variety of ways. In short, it is not going too far to say that Vos approaches the apostle as one with whom he is involved in a common theological enterprise. And he does this without any sense of incompatibility with a conviction of the unity and divine origin and authority of Scripture.

　　霍氏的進路，與凱伯拒絕「聖經神學」的說法，成了強烈的對照。[注 2] 這對我們有重要的啟迪，因為凱伯在「神學百科」方面的思想，肯定影響了改革宗神學的方法論，一直到今天。

　　Vos' approach stands in sharp contrast to Abraham Kuyper's rejection of the expression "biblical theology." [2] This contrast is instructive because the latter's work on theological encyclopaedia has had a decisive influence in shaping Reformed theological method, an influence which continues, at least indirectly, to the present.

[2] *Encyclopaedie der Heilige Godgeleerdheid*, 3:166-180.

　　我們或許認為，凱伯反對「聖經神學」，主要是因為一些歷史上的因素：他在回應理性主義的神學，後者明顯地用「聖經神學」的旗幟來反對聖經的權威。這因素固然重要 [注 3]，可是我們若仔細地查究，可以看出有更深的理由。

　　At a first glance Kuyper's objections appear to be primarily historical in character, based on reaction to rationalistic theology which masqueraded its thinly-veiled attacks on the authority of Scripture under the slogan, "biblical theology." This factor certainly is important (3), but close examination shows that his rejection has a much deeper basis.

[3] Ibid., pp. 169f., pp. 401-404.

　　霍志恆反對使用「聖經神學」的最主要原因，乃是他認為聖經是「神學的原料」（*principium theologiae*）的觀念。 聖經本身不是神學，聖經是在神學背後的。[注 4] 聖經的作者不可稱為神學家（頁 176），因為若沒有神學之先的「教義」（dogma），神學是不可能存在的；而教義乃是（有組織的）教會生活的產品。[注 5] 因此霍氏強調聖經與聖經作者們，及教義和教會神學家兩者之間原則上的斷層。聖經本身並不含有教義，聖經乃是教會「建造」教義所用的原料 (material)。[注 6] 聖經的啟示乃用「東方的象徵式，審美式的文筆」寫出的；要當充滿「辯證清晰性」的「西方思想」整理過聖經的材料之後，神學才出現。[注 7]

　　Nothing less than the way in which Kuyper understands Scripture as the *principium theologiae* prohibits his use of the expression "biblical theology." Scripture itself is not theology but underlies it. [4] The biblical writers must not be called theologians (p. 176), because theology is unthinkable apart from previously formed dogmas, and dogma is a product of the life of the (institutional) church. [5] Thus stress is placed exclusively upon the disjunction, the discontinuity in principle, between Scripture and the biblical writers on the one hand, and the dogmas and theologians of the church on the other. The Bible itself contains no dogmas but rather the "material" out of which the church "constructs" dogma. [6] The biblical revelation is given in the "stylized, symbolic-aesthetic language of the East;" only when the "Western mind" with its penchant for "dialectical clarity" goes to work on the biblical material does theology come into being. [7]

[4] *Encyclopaedie der Heilige Godgeleerdheid*, 3;167: "If Holy Scripture is the principium of theology, then theology only *begins* when Holy Scripture is there" (Kuyper's italics).

[5] Ibid., p. 169: "Dogmatics is unthinkable unless dogma has previously formed, and dogma is as such a fruit of the life-process of the *church*" (Kuyper's italics); cf. pp. 395ff.

[6] Ibid.: "There are no dogmas in Holy Scripture, only the material from which the church, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, has to construct dogmas"; p. 404: "… and Scripture does not provide us with dogmas themselves, but with the material from which the chuch has to build dogmas"; cf. pp. 355ff.

[7] Ibid., p. 168: "Revelation is given to us in Holy Scripture, wrapped in the symbolic-aesthetic language of the East. Its content is now transferred out of the oriental world into that western consciousness which attempts to bring the general human consciousness to dialectical clarity; and only where this transition takes place does theology originate"; cf. vol. II, pp. 247f.

　　因此我們必須看出凱伯不單在名稱上，而是在觀念上拒絕「聖經神學」；因為「聖經，教會，教義，神學」[注 8] 的次序，和它們之間的斷層。不錯，他贊成聖經神學的工作內容：關注聖經的歷史性。他哀嘆教義學 *loco probantis*（斷章取義）的研經法，並期望透過「啟示歷史」的研究，對認識聖經有真的進展。[注 9]

　　It is essential to see, then, that in terms of the sequence: Scripture, church, dogma, dogmatics (theology), [8] and because of the way the stress on discontinuity is distributed, Kuyper rejects biblical theology not only in name but in *concept*. To be sure, he does go on to approve the material interest of biblical theology, namely, its concern with the historical character of the Bible. He laments the shortcomings of the *loca probantia*

method of dogmatics in this respect, and looks for real progress in biblical understanding to result from a study of the *historia revelationis.* [9]

[8] Just how determinative and clearly defined this pattern of distinctions is in Kuyper's thinking appears from the fact that it furnishes the designations for three of the four major subdivisions of special encyclopaedia: De Bibliologische, De Ecclesiologische and De Dogmatologische (which includes dogmatics).

[9] *Encyclopaedie*, 3:170ff.

　　上面雖是簡單介紹，可是我們已能看出霍志恆和凱伯在重點和進路上是截然不同的；他們採取了相反的作法。（一）凱伯的作法，好像將所有聖經的作者們「鏟平」來對待。 在「神學百科」的範圍裏完全不考慮他們之間的分別。 其實感覺上，凱伯的進路是朝相反方向的。[注 10] 霍志恆雖然也有考慮到保羅思想的「系統性」和「高度教義性和綜納能力」[注 11]，可是凱伯認為使徒保羅和其他聖經的作者都用「東方象徵式，審美式的文筆」來寫作。[注 12] （二）凱伯只強調聖經作者和後來教會歷史上神學著作之間的斷層。 因此霍氏形容保羅為一位「神學家」，也常提到保羅的「神學系統」，這種表達方法是凱伯*原則上*不容許的。

Even from these brief sketches it is not difficult to recognize a decided difference in emphasis and approach between Vos and Kuyper. In fact, the stress of the one is precisely the opposite of the other. (1) Kuyper's construction is characterized by a "leveling" treatment of the biblical authors. In the sphere of *encyclopaedia* no attempt is made to take into account their respective differences. In fact, it seems there is an implicit tendency in the opposite direction. [10] While Vos thinks in terms of the "systematic bent" and the "highly doctrinal and synthetic" quality of Paul's mind, [11] for Kuyper, the apostle, along with the other biblical writers, speaks the "stylized, symbolic-aesthetic language of the East." [12] (2) Kuyper stresses exclusively the *discontinuity* between the biblical writers and the theological activity of subsequent Christian generations. Accordingly, Vos's description of Paul as a specifically "theological" thinker and his repeated references to the apostle's "theological system" are modes of expression forbidden to Kuyper *in principle*.

[10] Ibid., p. 176: "Certainly each one of these men lived in a religious thought-world, and this thought-world is use din revelation, used even with the individual variations which more than one of them discloses; but in the history of revelation both this religious thought-world and these individual variations do service only as the canvas on which the Holy Spirit embroiders; and not that canvas but the embroidery itself is that which constitutes revelation and with which we should be concerned."

[11] Cf. *Biblical Theology*, p. 16: "The didactic, dialectic mentality of Paul …"

[12] It is difficult to see how anyone who has read the letters of Paul could make such a generalization. Apparently Kuyper's encyclopaedic interests have at this point blinded him to what he himself recognizes elsewhere: "What makes the letters of Paul so difficult is that there the mystical-oriental and western-didactical streams flow into each other" (*Dictaten Docmatiek,* vol. I, part 2, p. 54); "Paul is a more acute thinker than James …" (*Encyclopaedie*, 2:241).

　　這兩種觀念在重要的層面上都水火不相容。哪一個是正確的觀念？凱伯的立場代表了典型改革宗傳統的態度，特別在如何看待保羅的解釋和神學建構的關係上。 可是，有一系列的考慮使我們認為，霍志恆的作法才是對待保羅 -- 一位聖經作者，一位上帝啟示的工具 -- 的正確作法。[注 13]

　　These two points of view are mutually exclusive in key respects. Which, if either, is correct? Kuyper's position may represent the characteristically Reformed attitude, particularly concerning the relationship between the interpretation of Paul and dogmatic formulation. Nevertheless, a variety of considerations points to Vos's approach as the proper way to deal with Paul as a biblical writer, that is, as an instrument of revelation. [13]

[13] In discussing these here, attention for the most part will have to be limited to initiating and sketching lines of argument without fully expanding upon them. Many related questions, in themselves important, must be bypassed completely.

　　聖經的啟示與歷史有關。聖經乃是啟示歷史的記錄，包括聖經自己形成的歷史。 分析這段歷史（這是凱伯所歡迎的）乃顯明啟示是多層面的，包括上帝的作為和話語。 上帝透過救贖（作為）和啟示（話語）來自我啟示：祂透過祂所作的，和祂所說的來啟示。 我們越來越看見兩者之間的有機關係。啟示從來不是孤立的，一定直接或間接與救贖有關。上帝的說話一定與祂的作為有關。 若說救贖乃是上帝賜啟示的原因或目標，這並不過分。[注 14] 我們若認為啟示是可以孤立看待，或啟示只提供自顯真理 (self-evident truths) 的話，結果必然是一種不符合聖經的半諾斯底主義的啟示觀。[注 15] 因此，上帝的啟示必然是祂救贖作為的見證 (authentication) 或解釋 (interpretation)。 通常，救贖的宣稱和救贖的解釋，同一位聖經作者（或同一個啟示的器皿）中都可以找到，不過，通常某一方面比較明顯。[注 16]

　　Biblical revelation has an *historical* interest. Scripture is a record of the history of revelation, which includes its own production. Analysis of this history – analysis welcomed by Kuyper himself – has made increasingly clear that revelation is a differentiated phenomenon, coming as acts or words. God reveals himself both in redemption and revelation, in what he does as well as in what he says. The organic relationship between these two facets has also become more and more evident. Revelation never stands by itself, but is always concerned either explicitly or implicitly with redemptive accomplishment. God's speech is invariably related to his actions. It is not going too far to say that redemption is the *raison d'etre* of revelation.[14] An unbiblical, quasi-gnostic notion of revelation inevitably results when it is considered by itself or as providing self-evident general truths. [15] Consequently, revelation is either authentication or interpretation of God's redemptive action. Usually both description and explanation can be found in a given biblical writer or instrument of revelation, although in each instance one element will be more prominent than the other. [16]

[14] Vos's is still among the best discussions of this and related points (*Biblical Theology*, pp. 14f., 24, 124, 324ff.)

[15] Ibid., p. 24: "Revelation is so interwoven with redemption that, unless allowed to consider the latter, it would be suspended in the air."

[16] The basic structure of the New Testament canon reflects this distinction: gospels(attestation)/ epistles (interpretation). That this pattern is *intentional* or *constitutive* is confirmed by the shape of Marcion's canon: edited Gospel of Luke / the Epistles of Paul with the exception of the pastorals. (For a brief presentation of the evidence favoring the position that Marcion's canon is molded according to the church's and not vice versa, cf. T. Zahn, *Grundriss der Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* (Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1904), pp. 28f. The recent recovery of the *Gospel of Truth* in extant form strengthens this position.) As indicated above, the distinction between attestation an interpretation may not be applied in a rigid fashion, as if the Gospels contain no interpretation and the Epistles no authentication. Such a construction would obviously fail to do justice to the teaching of Jesus. Still, the fundamental perspective from which the New Testament is an organic whole (i.e., canon) is that Jesus (including his teaching) and the apostles (particularly their letters) are related as "the great fact to be expounded" and "the subsequent interpretation of this fact" (Vos, *Biblical Theology*, pp. 324f.).

　　　　毫無疑問地，在保羅的作品中「解釋」層面比較典型。他在講道與書信中的關注，差不多全是解釋「救贖歷史」：救贖歷史在基督的死和復活上達到了高峰。保羅認為基督在啟示歷史中的地位，是受到某一個「救贖歷史處境」的影響。這是對了解保羅的思想是非常重要的視角。我們必須體會這一點和它所帶來的涵義，才能看清他在啟示上所扮演的角色的重要性。

　　　　In the case of Paul, there is no doubt that the aspect of interpretation is more characteristic. The almost exclusive concern of his writing and preaching is expounding, "exegeting" the history of redemption as it has reached its climax in the death and resurrection of Christ. In Paul's perspective, Christ's place in the history of revelation is conditioned by and exponential of a specific redemptive-historical context. This is a decisively important perspective for understanding Paul. Only as it is appreciated together with its implications does the real significance of his revelatory functions become apparent.

　　　　其中一項涵義與我們的討論有關。從救贖歷史的角度看，今天的信徒和保羅是處於同一個處境。[注 17] 我們與保羅一樣，回顧基督的死、復活、升天，我們也與他一同等待上帝的兒子從天降臨（帖前 1：10）；後者乃是救贖歷史剩下還未成就的事。於保羅經驗中，那「已然」和「未然」之間的張力，也是今天信徒們的經歷。

　　　　One of these implications especially concerns us at this point. From the perspective of the history of redemption believers today are in the same situation as was Paul. [17] Together with him they look back upon the climactic events of Christ's death, resurrection, and ascension, while together with him they "wait for his Son from heaven" (I Thes. 1:10), the one event in that history which is still outstanding. The same tension between "already" and "not yet" which marked Paul's experience characterizes the life of the believer today.

[17] Ibid., p. 325f.: "Still we know full well that we ourselves live just as much in the New Testament as did Peter and Paul and John." In the same context Vos makes the perceptive and highly suggestive observation that the seeming disproportion between the chronological extent of

the Old Testament and that of the New Testament "arises form viewing the new revelation too much by itself, and not sufficiently as *introductory* and *basic* to the large period following" (p. 325f., my italics).

　　因此我們清楚看見保羅和解釋保羅者的連續性。兩者是處於同一個「救贖歷史」的位置（直譯：他們有同一「救贖歷史指數」）。不單如此，因著上帝救贖作為和啟示話語之間的關係，換言之，因為聖經的焦點乃是救贖歷史，所以我們與保羅在「神學」上的連續性也是明顯的。我們的前提是：神學應該建立在聖經的文本上；而聖經解釋是一門歷史學科，同時為神學提供了準則。　這樣說來，保羅的關注若是解釋救贖歷史的話，那麼若要解釋保羅的思想，必須有同樣的關注：從我們共有的救贖歷史處境上入手。　神學，不論它的範圍和最後形態，必須效法保羅，抱著「解釋救贖歷史」的基本關懷。而救贖歷史乃是信徒生命的本質。「神學」必須解釋那歷代隱藏不言、現今顯明的「奧秘」（羅 16：25-26）。　總言之，「神學」在觀念上，必須受「救贖歷史」影響。　神學的本質，就是解釋救贖歷史。　因此，保羅與解釋保羅者之間必然有「神學上」的連續性。

　　Thus the continuity between Paul and his interpreters is clear. Specifically, they are related in terms of a common redemptive-historical index. Moreover, in view of the correlation between redemptive act and revelatory word, that is, Scripture's own focus on the history of redemption, the pointedly *theological* nature of this continuity is also apparent. This follows on the assumption that theology ought to be based on the text of Scripture, that as an historical discipline biblical exegesis is likewise theologically normative. Thus if Paul's interest is interpreting the history of redemption, then the interpretation of Paul necessarily has the same interest, carried out in a common redemptive-historical context. Theology, whatever may be its scope and final shape, can have no more basic interest than to follow in Paul's footsteps by explaining and interpreting the redemptive-historical tension which characterizes the believer's existence, by expounding and elucidating "the mystery which has been kept secret for long ages past, but now is manifested …" (Rom. 16:25f.). In a word, the concept of theology is redemptive-historically conditioned. The essence of theology is interpretation of the history of redemption. Consequently, a theological continuity necessarily exists between Paul and his interpreters.

　　「聖經神學」一般的定義，乃是回顧上帝在歷史上的救贖和啟示作為：從一個後來、與先前不同的角度，即從一個不同的救贖歷史處境來看的。這絕對是舊約聖經神學的正確定義。　對新約聖經神學而言，於「啟示的進展」的關注是明顯的；可是新約聖經神學的特點乃是，如前文所說，今天的解經者雖與保羅和其他新約作者是處於不同的文化歷史處境，可是在原則上（從救贖歷史原則來看）與保羅和新約作者們乃處於同一個處境，從事同一項解釋計劃。[注 18]

　　Biblical theology is generally viewed as a survey of the progression of the redemptive-revelatory activity of God in history, carried out from a later and basically (i.e., redemptive-historically) different vantage point. This, most properly, is a description of Old Testament biblical theology. To be sure, concern with the progress of revelation is not lacking in New Testament biblical theology, but what distinguishes it is the fact that, in the manner noted above, the exegete, despite every cultural and temporal dissimilarity, stands in principle (i.e., in terms of the history of redemption) in the same

situation as the writers of the New Testament and, therefore, is involved with Paul (and the other letter writers) in a common interpretative enterprise. [18]

[18] This difference in program between Old Testament biblical theology and New Testament biblical theology is already intimated by B.B. Warfield, "The Person of Christ," *Biblical Doctrines* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1929), p. 176: "In its fundamental teaching, the New Testament lends itself, therefore, more readily to what is called dogmatic than to what is called genetic treatment…" This observation is especially germane to the writings of Paul.

　　我們可以從另外一個角度來看。我們可以觀察保羅在上帝啟示計劃中的功能：這不可與他身為使徒的職份分開。換言之，保羅身為一位上帝啟示的器皿，就同時是一位教會的僕人了。這樣說來，上帝藉著他所賜的，默示的、無誤的啟示，也同時就是教會的權威性教導和信仰（教義），因此，我們可以稱它為保羅的「神學」。

　　This line of thought may be put somewhat differently by observing that Paul's function in the economy of revelation cannot be divorced from his office and functioning as apostle. In other words, his activity as an instrument of revelation is qualified *ecclesiastically*. This, in turn, means that the inspired, infallible revelation given through him is at the same time the authoritative teaching and opinion (= dogma) of the church, and that, one may speak of his theology.

　　我們在本文介紹的方法論考慮，至少有一部份與新約研究（特別是書信研究）很有關係。我們特別要強調對保羅研究的適用性。這些考慮提供了一個視角，使我們能正確面對他書信的獨特性。 特別要說明的是：我們要面對保羅教導裏的教訓 (didactic) 或教義 (doctrinal) 的特性，而同時又必須認清，我們與保羅的「救贖歷史關懷」是一樣的；我們與保羅的「救贖歷史處境」也是一樣的。保羅書信裏的論據，其思想往往是緊密的，這是常識，特別是在改革宗圈子裏。[注 19] 可是若要更深一層體會這個「教義性」與「系統化」的興味，則必須意識到一些「救贖歷史」的因素。有這樣的認識，才有足夠理由用「保羅神學」這名詞。 我們可以說，聖經，神學的原料，本身就包含神學；至少在保羅思想上來說；或者更恰當地說：我們的神學和它的原料（聖經）之間的連續性，很多時候是非常「神學性」的。因此，凱伯的次序至少需要補充。認識新約作者和後來解釋新約者之間的斷層，需要由兩者之間的（教會與神學上，和救贖歷史上的）連續性來補充。[注 20]

　　At least some of the methodological considerations already introduced have relevance for the study of the entire New Testament, particularly the Epistles. Here, however, their applicability for Pauline studies needs to be stressed. They provide the perspective for properly viewing his writings in their distinctiveness. Specifically, the pervasively didactic or doctrinal nature of Paul's teaching ought to be approached while recognizing a common redemptive-historical interest and a common redemptive-historical situation. The at times closely-reasoned character of Paul's letters hardly needs to be argued, particularly where Reformed scholarship is concerned. [19] But an awareness of the redemptive-historical factors involved is necessary to appreciate the deeper significance of this doctrinal quality and systematic interest. This awareness provides the warrant for speaking of Paul's theology in the proper sense of the word. At

least with respect to Paul, then, it is in order to say that the *principium theologiae*, Scripture, itself contains theology or, perhaps better, that the nature of the continuity between our theology and its *principium* (the Bible) is at points distinctly theological. Kuyper's sequence, therefore, is at least subject to supplementation. Recognition of the discontinuity between the New Testament and its subsequent interpretation in the church needs to be balanced by recognizing the (ecclesiastical-theological, redemptive-historical) continuity between them.[20]

[19] Cf., e.g. Warfield (*Biblical Doctrines*, p. 176), who refers to Paul as "the most didactic of the New Testament writers." One may assume that even Kuyper would not take exception to this statement.

[20] There is no need to read out of the argument developed to this point any unbiblical qualifications or relativizing of the perfections of Scripture (necessity, authority, clarity, sufficiency!). An analogy from differential calculus may help to make the basic points clear. Redemptive events constitute a function(f), the authentication and interpretation of the New Testament its first derivative (f') and the interpretation of the later church its second derivative(f "). F', to be sure, is of a different order than f ", since the former, the infallible verbal revelation (Scripture) which has God as its primary author, is the basis (*principium*) of the latter. But both, as derivatives, have a common *interpretative* reference to f. Indeed, it may be said that at its level (characterized by fallibility and tentativeness) f " "goes beyond" f ' by seeking to make more explicit the structure implicit in the latter.

In the above discussion, the redemptive-historical distinction between canonical and noncanonical, between the apostolic and postapostolic periods, is *not* being overlooked or obliterated. Rather, stress is being placed on some implications of the fact that in "church" "apostolic" and "postapostolic" have their common (redemptive-historical) denominator.

　　我們到目前的討論，在衛護霍志恆對保羅的進路。我們嘗試說明：（一）保羅的解釋者需要以和保羅站在同一個救贖歷史處境，抱著同一個救贖歷史關懷來研究他。（二）從這個角度來看保羅，必須公允地處理保羅的教義關懷，就是他身為卓越的思想家之獨特性。這樣的連續性表達出來，就是說：保羅是一位神學家。這個基本的出發點，提出一些重要的結論：這些結論對完整地了解保羅的信息是非常重要的。

　　So far our discussion has tried to vindicate and develop Geerhardus Vos's approach to Paul by showing (1) that Paul's interpreters ought to deal with him as they stand with him in the same redemptive-historical context and so share a common interpretative interest, and (2) that in this light they are to do justice to his doctrinal interest, his distinctiveness as a thinker. This stress on continuity may be expressed by viewing Paul as a theologian. This fundamental point of departure gives rise to several conclusions essential to a comprehensive understanding of his preaching.

　　（一）視保羅為神學家的意思是，任何的神學百科或其它架構，都不可妥協保羅在他書信中發展他的思想的處境，與後來教會發展教義的處境的關聯性；兩者不可說成無可比較的 (incommensurable)。 比方說，從救贖歷史的角度來看，保羅的救贖論架構可以與改革宗神學的救贖論架構比較和對照。換言之，比較廣義的方

法論涵義乃是：聖經神學和系統神學不可隨意地，人為地分開。 聖經神學的關懷，乃是以歷史過程來看上帝的啟示。 因此，它一定注意到每一個聖經作者，和他們的作品的特點。這樣作的果效，最重要的不是強調聖經的「人性」。知道聖經的人性，本身並無價值。 相反地，因為注意到這些人是上帝啟示的器皿，因此能更仔細地認識上帝的啟示，好叫人更清楚看出啟示的結果 (product，即聖經) 的架構：這就是系統神學的關懷。[注 21]

(1) To approach Paul as a theologian means that no encyclopaedic structure or set of distinctions may be allowed to make the situation in which he developed the teaching of his epistles incommensurable in principle with the various contexts in which the later church has hammered out her doctrines. In terms of the history of redemption, for instance, the structure of Paul's soteriological teaching may be contrasted and compared with the structure of Reformed soteriology. In other words, to state the broader methodological implication, biblical theology and systematic theology may not be arbitrarily and artificially separated. The proper interest of the former is revelation as an *historical process*. Inevitably, then, it draws attention to the distinguishing characteristics and peculiarities of what the respective biblical authors have written. The significant gain, however, is not that the "humanness" of the Bible is thereby underscored. In and of itself this is of no value. Rather, because attention is on the human instrumentality in giving revelation, God's activity is made more specific and so the *structure* of that revelation as *product*, the proper concern of dogmatics, comes into sharper focus. [21]

[21] In view of this consideration, an "incursion" of biblical theology (concern with revelation *qua* process) into the domain of systematic theology (concern with revelation *qua* product) is both inevitable and necessary. In need of at least qualification is the customary Reformed attempt to distinguish the two disciplines with respect to *method*. Cf. J. Murray, "Systematic Theology. Second Article," *WTJ*, 26 (1963-64): 33: "The difference is merely one of method. Biblical theology deals with the data of special revelation from the standpoint of its history; systematic theology deals with the same in its totality as a finished product."; Vos, *Biblical Theology*, p. 13: "Biblical Theology deals with revelation as a divine activity, not as the finished product of that activity." However, Murray, toward the end of the article just quoted, makes the following observation: "But systematic theology ill fail of its task to the extent to which it discards its rootage in biblical theology as properly conceived and developed. It might seem that an undue limitation is placed upon systematic theology by requiring that the exegesis with which it is so intimately concerned should be regulated by the principle of biblical theology. And it might seem contrary to the canon so important to both exegesis and systematics, namely, the analogy of Scripture. These appearances do not correspond to reality. The fact is that only when systematic theology is rooted in biblical theology does it exemplify its true function and achieve its purposes" (pp. 45f.). For a fuller discussion of this relationship, see my "Systematic Theology and Biblical Theology," *WTJ*, 38, 3 (Spring 1976): 281-299.

聖經神學和系統神學的共同興趣，在保羅研究方面特別明顯。身為一位神學家，保羅的書信與講章若透露了一個「思想架構」，那麼一個以解經為本的神學的形態，應盡量反映出那個架構 [注 22]，特別在救贖論方面，因為保羅的思想在救贖論方面尤其突出。 若在一般的「作神學」活動中，保羅，作為啟示的器皿，與他的解釋者不同，因為保羅為後世神學家提供了上帝默示、無誤的基礎 （來源，

principium）的一部分，那麼保羅的解釋者應該不只關心保羅著作的內容，即其中的個別觀念，還須注意保羅如何處理這些觀念，即保羅如何建立一個思想架構。

This mutual interest of biblical theology and systematic theology is especially prominent in the study of Paul. If as a theologian his letters and preaching disclose a structure of thought, then it follows that the shape an exegetically-based theology takes should reflect that structure as explicitly as possible, [22] especially in the locus of soteriology where Pauline material inevitably figures so prominently. If, in the common activity of theologizing, Paul, as apostle and instrument of revelation, is distinguished from his interpreters by providing part of the inspired and indispensable foundation (the *principium*) for subsequent theological activity, it follows that his interpreters should be concerned not only with the material, the particular conceptions found in Paul, but also with the *way* in which Paul himself handles this material and structures the various conceptions.

[22] Cf. M. Kline, *By Oath Consigned* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968), p. 29: "Surely it does not become systematic theology to unravel what has been synthesized to a degree even in the Scriptures. Systematic theology ought rather to weave together the related strands yet more systematically."

若我們效法凱伯，說聖經只提供神學的「材料」，而教會用這些材料來建立教義的話，那麼斷章取義式的方法是必然、很難克服的。不論我們如何抗議，我們若堅持神學百科之間的分辨，就很難看到保羅的歸納原則；自然而然地，我們會用上一些保羅思想中沒有的歸納原則。聖經必須決定神學的方法，而不只是神學的內容。[注 23]

As long as one continues with Kuyper to speak of the Bible as providing the "material" out of which the church "constructs" dogmas and develops a dogmatics, it is difficult to see how the *loca probantia* method is really and effectively overcome, despite insistence to the contrary. As long as one operates with his encyclopaedic distinctions, the synthesizing principles employed by Paul will at best be only obscurely perceived and so, almost inevitably, replaced either implicitly or explicitly by others foreign to him. Scripture must determine not only the content but also the *method* of theology. [23]

[23] Cf. P. Lengsfeld, *Adam und Christus*, Koinonia – Beitraege zur oekumenischen Spiritualitaet und Theologie, 9, ed. T. Sartory (Essen: Ludgerus-Verlag, 1965), p. 22: "Scripture is also canon for the task of dogmatics (not only for its content)."

（二）視保羅為一位神學家，能幫助我們為「解釋保羅的***難題***」下定義。從起初，基督教會在解釋保羅上就感到困難；彼得自己也作了見證。他承認，保羅書信中有些難明白的地方，有些人曲解，自找沉淪（彼後 3：16）。這段經文不單告訴我們「解釋保羅」是老舊的問題；還指出，解釋保羅的問題，是在聖經正典中已經出現的難題。

(2) To approach Paul as a theologian helps to define the *problem* of Pauline interpretation. From the very beginning the church has had its difficulties with Paul's writings, as Peter himself verifies. He acknowledges that they contain "some things which are hard to understand" and alludes to the disastrous consequences resulting from

their misuse in certain quarters (II Peter 3:16). This statement not only attests the antiquity of the problem of Pauline interpretation; it also gives to that problem, one may say, *canonical* proportions.

解釋保羅有一段的歷史；都充滿著創意，可是罕見真正有深度的理解。學者們沒有深入探討，只不過借題（甚至離題）發揮。有深度的研究太少了。[注 24]可是，理解保羅的困難不只在於學者們的不同缺欠。這裏還有一個解釋保羅的「真正」難處。

The history of Pauline interpretation has been characterized by an excess of ingenuity and a dearth of real penetration. Interpretation has tended to take exploratory outings when it should have been digging deeper. Only too seldom has it gone deep enough. [24] However, it is not only the variety of defects on the interpreters' side which has so often barred the way to a deepened understanding of Paul. Rather, involved here as well is the "proper" problem of Pauline interpretation.

[24] Albert Schweitzer's verdict on nineteenth century "historical-critical" study of Paul has a wider range of application in this respect: "The study of Paulinism has nothing very brilliant to show for itself in the way of scientific achievement. Learning has been lavishly expended upon it, but thought and reflection have been to seek" (*Paul and His Interpreters*, trans. W. Montgomery [London: Adam and Charles Black, 1912], p. 237).

解釋保羅真正的困難在於保羅的作品中，流露一位神學天才的思想：他傾向於教導教義；不過，通常在處理實際教會問題和情況時寫出教義。換言之，理解保羅的真正難處是因為：他是一位神學家，嚴謹、有系統的思想家；而要認識他卻必須透過他的書信和講章記錄。他寫的顯然不是神學論文；可是也不是一些臨時的發表、彼此無關的論述，也不是一大堆毫無系統的觀念。他的作品中反映出一個架構。保羅書信可以與冰山一角比較。 在水平線上的只不過是下面冰山的一小部份，而真正的整體是在水底下。 [注 25] 表面所看到的與實體相差甚遠。實在說，有些觀念雖然不在多處經文直接出現，可是讀者經過反省後會發現，這些其實是保羅最基本、最重要的思路。這種情況令研究保羅，特別是要全面了解他的思想，特別充滿著困難。

The real difficulty for interpretation lies in the fact that in Paul's writings we encounter a thinker of constructive genius, with a dogmatic bent, but only as he directs himself to specific situations and questions, only as he expresses himself in "occasional" fashion. In short, the true problem in understanding Paul is that he is a theologian, a careful and systematic thinker, accessible only through pastoral letters and records of his sermons. His writings are obviously not doctrinal treatises; but neither do they consist in a variety of unrelated, *ad hoc* formulations or in an unsystematic multiplication of conceptions. They reflect a structure of thought. The Pauline epistles may be aptly compared to the visible portion of an iceberg. What juts above the surface is but a small fraction of what remains submerged. The true proportions of the whole lie hidden beneath the surface. [25] The contours of what can be seen at a first glance may also prove deceptive. Put less pictorially, that conception or line of thought having relatively little explicit textual support, on reflection may prove to be of the most basic, constitutive

significance.　This state of affairs makes the interpretation of Paul, particularly a comprehensive attempt, an inherently difficult and precarious undertaking.

[25] Cf. Warfield, *Biblical Doctrines*, p. 175, where he speaks of the conception of Christ's person "which lies on – or, if we prefer to say so, beneath – the pages of the New Testament."

　　　（三）因此，視保羅為一位神學家能幫助我們看清楚，「解釋保羅的*任務*」是什麼。最好還是跟霍志恆的說法。「我們的任務就是找出上帝所啟示、使徒保羅所宣講的福音之思想架構… 我們必須盡我們所能，去揭露保羅不同視角所織成的教義思想整體。」[注 26] 對保羅的解釋，最重要的是細心留意背後的架構。 我們在保羅的寫作和講道中遇見有超越建構才能的思想，有著非同凡響的歸納能力；簡直是「天才」（又套用霍氏的話）。[注 27] 解釋保羅時若忽略這一點，必定看不到他教導的長闊高深。解釋保羅者必須意識到救贖歷史，像保羅一樣意識到末世已經臨到自己（林前 10：11）；必須立志將保羅的話背後的結構整理清楚，即越來越清楚地反射「那從不同觀念濃縮成的核心所發射出來的光輝」（霍志恆語）。[注 28]

　　　(3) Consequently, to approach Paul as a theologian helps to pinpoint the fundamental *task* of Pauline interpretation.　Here we can hardly do better tan formulate with Vos.　"Our task consists of ascertaining the perspective of thought in the revealed Gospel delivered by the Apostle. …　It is the subtle weaving of these threads of perspective into the doctrinal fabric of thought as a whole that we must endeavor, so far as possible, to unravel." [26]　The interpretation of Paul above all involves careful attention to underlying structure.　In his writings and preaching we encounter a mind of unusual constructive energy with an unparalleled capacity for synthetic thinking, in a word (again with Vos) a "master-mind." [27]　Interpretation which fails to reckon with this fact obscures both the breadth and the depth of his teaching.　With a sense of redemptive history, with an understanding of himself as one, together with Paul. "upon whom the ends of the ages have come" (I Cor. 10:11), the interpreter ought to be intent on articulating the structure of thought reflected in his statements, on an ever-clearer refraction of what Vos has described as that "luminosity radiating from the core of condensed ideas." [28]

[26] *Eschatology*, p. 44.

[27] Ibid., p. vi.　Without approving his conception of Paul's mysticism, well worth repeating in this connection is the statement of Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, trans. W. Montgomery (New York: Henry Holt, 1931), p. 139: "And how totally wrong those are who refuse to admit that Paul was a logical thinker, and proclaim as the highest outcome of their wisdom the discovery that he has no system! For he is a logical thinker and his mysticism is a complete system."　Cf. E. Kaesemann, New Testament Questions of Today, trans. W. J. Montague (Philadelphia: Fortress Pres, 1969), p. 177: "But Paul's theology is always carefully thought out: the last adjective one could apply to it would be 'naïve.'"

[28] *Eschatology,* p. 302.

　　（四）最後，稱保羅為神學家的意思就是，他最重要的關懷乃是解釋救贖歷史。我們從觀察整個聖經啟示的架構中看見保羅書信的地位而得到這個結論。而這個問題早在本書引言中就提到了。 保羅對「救贖歷史」的關懷，如何提供「救贖次序」（譯者注：「救贖次序」是指聖靈如何將基督成就了的救恩，施行在人的生命中）是另外的問題；要回答這個問題必須謹慎查考經文本身。 可是：我們可以堅持一個研經原則（雖然需要用經文事實證明）： 保羅處理「救贖次序」，即救贖的施行，一定被他的「救贖歷史」視角所左右。

　　(4) Finally, to speak of Paul as a theologian means pointedly that his governing interest lies in explicating the history of redemption. This conclusion, based on general observations respecting the place of Paul's letters within the structure of biblical revelation, already decides the issue raised in the introduction. *How* this concern of Paul with the *historia salutis* also provides for an *ordo salutis* is a separate question, one which can only be answered by a careful examination of the text. However, it may be maintained here as a working principle, subject to further verification, that whatever treatment Paul gives to the application of salvation to the individual believer is controlled by h