

## 以经解经 Interpreting Scripture by Scripture

霍顿

如同保罗对提摩太的提醒，“圣经都是神所默示的，于教训、督责、使人归正、教导人学义都是有益的”（提后 3: 16）——全部的圣经，不只是“生命经文”（life verses）。

As Paul reminded Timothy, "All Scripture is inspired by God and is [therefore] useful for teaching, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness" (2 Tim. 3:16)—all Scripture, not just our "life verses."

与此同时，威敏思特信仰告白（Westminster Confession）正确地提醒我们，不是所有的经文都是同样清楚或同等重要的（译按：WCF，第一章，第 7 条）。我们必须在比较清楚的经文的亮光下，来解释比较困难的经文，而且我们是藉着研读经文的各部分来认识整体的意义，也是靠学习经文整体的意义来学习各部分的意义。我们需要拼图的盒顶盖（有整个拼图的图案），也同时需要那些拼图片。

At the same time, the Westminster Confession properly reminds us that not everything in Scripture is equally plain or equally important. We have to interpret the more difficult passages in the light of clearer ones. Scripture interprets Scripture, and we learn the whole meaning of Scripture by studying its parts and its parts by learning the whole. You need the box-top and the puzzle-pieces.

当然，哪些经文是“困难的”，哪些是“清楚的”，哪些是更为重要的，有着许多不同的看法。我认为，我们都同意一件事，就是基督降到阴间的意义，不如祂的道成肉身、祂主动与被动的顺服、祂的复活升天和再来的意义来得清楚，也没有来得那么重要。然而，在其他的一些要点上，就有许多不同意见了。大多数的福音派人士，会把教会治理模式（church government）放在“无关紧要”的类别中。这虽然不是信仰的核心，但是此一观点却严重到足以使改革宗传统在圣公会、长老会和公理会的教会体制中造成分裂。对东正教人士来说，主教制对教会的存在，是最根本的；而罗马天主教则更进一步，坚持罗马的主教才是首要的。

Of course, there is disagreement about which verses are "difficult" and which are "clear," as well as which are more important. I think we'd all agree that the meaning of Christ's descent into hell is less clear and less important than his incarnation, active and passive obedience, resurrection, ascension, and return. Nevertheless, on a host of other points the roads diverge. Most evangelicals would place church government in the "Who Cares?" category. Far from being at the core of the faith, such a view was at least important enough to divide the Reformed tradition over Episcopal, Presbyterian, and Congregational polities. For Eastern Orthodoxy, episcopacy is essential to the very existence of the church, and Rome takes it one step further, insisting on the primacy of the bishop of Rome.

即使论及福音，也有许多相当不同的意见。东正教认为清楚和重要的经文强调人的“神化”（theosis）——一个被模造成基督样式的过程，藉着恩典与自由意志的结合，得到最终的拯救。罗马天主教的传统主张清楚和重要的经文教导的是：在教会中的人，藉着教会对功绩（treasury of merit）的管理，使人与神和好。

Even when it comes to the gospel, there are quite different assumptions at play. Eastern Orthodox churches think that the clear and important passages emphasize theosis—a process of being conformed to Christ-likeness that leads to final salvation through a combination of grace and free will. Roman Catholics have traditionally maintained that the clear and important passages teach the reconciliation of humanity in the church through its management of the treasury of merit.

阿民念认为清楚和重要的经文教导：神的爱，普世的恩典，以及人类绝对的自由意志（libertarian free will）是居于首位的（比其他的属性更重要）。虽然改革宗神学从来没有教导神的主权（预定）要作为一

个“中心教条”（central dogma），即所有其他的教义必须由此推导而出，在标准的阿民念系统中，神的爱和绝对的自由意志的确有这种作用。阿民念者经常会注意到一个僵持不下的局面（a stand-off）：加尔文者把神的主权和预定奉为神明，而他们把神普世的爱和人的自由意志作为规范。“你们有你们的经文，我们有我们的经文”，是经常听到的遁词，这只会削弱信徒对圣经的统一性、前后一致性和可靠性的信心。Arminians think that the clear and important passages teach the primacy of God's love (over other attributes), the universality of grace, and the libertarian free will of human beings. While Reformed theology never teaches God's sovereignty (predestination) as a central dogma from which every other doctrine is deduced, the love of God and a libertarian view of free will do function that way in standard Arminian systems. Arminians often acknowledge a stand-off: Calvinists enshrine God's sovereignty and predestination, while they make God's universal love and human freedom normative. "You have your verses and we have ours," is the oft-heard shrug that can only weaken the believer's confidence in the unity, consistency, and reliability of Scripture.

愿真理显明，我们没有“我们的经文”，他们也没有“他们的经文”；只有上帝有“祂的经文”，也因此，所有这些经文都属于“我们”。如果我们有的只是“我们的经文”，那么，我们并没有真的理解这些经文真正教导的。毕竟，只有圣经能解释圣经，而如果为了维持前后的一致，我们感到不得不只拥抱一些经文而放弃一些经文，我们就还没有真正认识到“我们的经文”。

Truth be told, we don't have "our verses" and they don't have "their verses." God has "his verses," and therefore all of them belong to "us." If we have "our verses," then not even these teach what we think they do. After all, Scripture interprets Scripture, and if we feel compelled to embrace some passages over others in order to maintain consistency, we haven't really understood "our verses."

阿民念派的神学家克拉克·宾诺克（Clark Pinnock）和约翰·桑德斯（John Sanders）一个共同的预设前提，就是神所有的属性都不能和祂的爱相比，而且，祂计划要拯救所有的人。事实上，祂把这些要点视为其预设前提或“公理”，所有的释经必须以此来检验（注1）。例如，从阿民念的前提出发，宾诺克为“包容主义”（inclusivism）辩护。包容主义是主张即使人对基督没有完全的信心，只要能对神所给他们的亮光作出回应，人们还是可以得救。他说，“我同意包容主义不是圣经所讨论的中心主题，其证据也不尽理想。但是神的爱这个异象是如此强烈，因此现存的证据对我来说似乎是足够的。”（注2）在这里，宾诺克似乎是承认，他把一个一般性的原则作为法宝，来支持他在释经上相对薄弱的立场。对他来说，盒顶盖比拼图图片要来得重要得多。

Arminian theologians Clark Pinnock and John Sanders share the presupposition that all of God's attributes are subservient to his love and that his purpose is to save every person. In fact, he recognizes that these theses function as presuppositions or "axioms" by which exegesis must be tested. (1) For example, from Arminian premises Pinnock defends "inclusivism": the view that even apart from explicit faith in Christ, people are saved if they respond to the light they have been given. He adds, "I agree that inclusivism is not a central topic of discussion in the Bible and that the evidence for it is less than one would like. But the vision of God's love there is so strong that the existing evidence seems sufficient to me." (2) Here Pinnock seems to admit that a general principle trumps the weak exegetical support of his position. The box-top is more important than the pieces of the puzzle.

对极端加尔文主义者（hyper-Calvinists）来说，神的主权是王牌，可以把所有其他的属性比下去，而预定论经常会使其他经文变得相对不重要，甚至被抵消，即使这些经文似乎是同样清楚而且是同样重要的。例如，虽然圣经同样清楚，也同样强调地教导神藉着福音的外在呼召是普世的，神恩典的爱及于所有生灵，以及宣教的必要性，极端的加尔文主义者却仅仅重复着“郁金香”（TULIP）的经文，而不是认真地把所有圣经的教导融汇到他们的信仰和实践当中。对其他人而言，“归正”意味着要更新变化所有的文化领域——即使这意味着要把救恩的问题（这是改革宗信条的核心）变得相对不重要，甚至不予重视。最

近，有些人主张，“与基督联合”——而不是预定——才是改革宗神学的中心教条（central dogma）。不过，“中心教条”有一个特殊的涵义。这是一条论述，其他的一切都必须由此推导而出，而不是从整本圣经的教导所推论得出的中心教导。

For hyper-Calvinists, God's sovereignty trumps other attributes, and predestination often marginalizes or even cancels out other passages that seem equally clear and important. For example, although Scripture just as clearly and emphatically teaches the universality of God's external call through the gospel, God's gracious care for all creatures, and the missionary imperative, hyper-Calvinists simply repeat the "TULIP" passages instead of seriously incorporating the whole teaching of Scripture into their faith and practice. For others, "Reformed" means transformation of every cultural sphere, even when that means marginalizing or even downplaying the soteriological questions that are at the heart of the Reformed confession. More recently, some argue that "union with Christ," not predestination, is the central dogma of Reformed theology. "Central dogma," however, has a particular meaning. It's a thesis from which everything else is deduced, rather than a central teaching that emerges inductively from the whole teaching of Scripture.

在路德神学的历史中，称义有时是作为一个中心教条，会相对不重视其他清楚且重要的圣经教导，或甚至与圣经的教导相违背。路德呼吁要把圣经中“凡宣讲基督”的经文给予特别的重视。许多自由派的新教徒把此呼吁极端化，就提倡一种“正典中的正典”（canon-within-a-canon）的释经法：我们不需要接受圣经里所讲的一切，只要接受那些传扬基督的经文。即使在认信的路德宗人士当中，我们有时也会看出一种倾向，不只是适当地看重圣经自己对称义的见证，而且是把它当作一个中心教条，所有其他的圣经教导要从这里推导而出。

In the history of Lutheran theology, justification has sometimes functioned as a central dogma that downplays or even contradicts other clear and important teachings of Scripture. Radicalizing Luther's call to privilege in Scripture "whatever preaches Christ," many liberal Protestants advanced a "canon-within-a-canon" hermeneutic. We need not accept everything in Scripture, but only that which proclaims Christ. Even in confessional Lutheranism, one may sometimes discern a tendency not only to give proper weight to the Bible's own testimony to justification, but to treat it as a central dogma from which all other biblical teachings are deduced.

有些保守福音派人士把创造论和字面解经依此方式来对待，而严格的时代论者把圣经主要解读为一系列的关于今日以色列、末日决战（Armageddon），以及字面的千禧年的预测。至少在比较老旧的版本中（即司可福圣经所主导的），七个时代的架构就变成一个框架，所有的经文都被压缩在这个框架之内。

Some conservative evangelicals treat creationism and a literalistic hermeneutic in this manner, with strict dispensationalists reading the Bible primarily as a series of predictions concerning present-day Israel, Armageddon, and a literal millennium. At least in the older version, dominated by the Scofield Study Bible, the seven-dispensation scheme becomes a grid into which all of Scripture is pressed.

### **林与树** The Forest and the Trees

一方面，我们会有见树不见林的危险。有些解经家把圣经当作一本永恒的原则、教义与箴言目录，他们的假设是：只要用同样的话来重述圣经就好了。一位著名的牧师曾经告诉我，“当我讲登山宝训的道的时候，我听起来象是个律法主义者；当我在讲整本加拉太书时，听起来却像个反律法主义者。”虽然这听起来好像是忠于经文——经文怎么说，我就怎么讲——这却是大有问题的。至少有两点理由。首先，这太天真了。没有人是不带着一个预设前提来阅读圣经的。我们都有一些教义的架构。这个教义架构是我们过去多年来，与其他有类似教义背景的信徒一起研读圣经时所获得的。其次，这个假设破坏了圣经是统一的这个信念。耶稣并没有教导律法主义，而保罗也没有教导反律法主义。作为耶稣自己赋予权柄的使徒，并在圣灵的默示下写作，保罗的信息就是基督的信息。如果我们把登山宝训解释为与加拉太书毫不相干（更

遭的是以为他们彼此矛盾), 那么, 我们就没有正确地解读此二者。

On one hand, there is the danger of missing the forest for the trees. Treating the Bible as a catalogue of timeless principles, doctrines, and proverbs, some expositors assume that they are just restating the Bible in so many words. A noted pastor once told me, "When I'm preaching through the Sermon on the Mount, I sound like a legalist; when I'm preaching through Galatians, I sound like an antinomian." Although this sounds like fidelity to the text—wherever it leads us—it is problematic for at least two reasons. First, it's naive. No one comes to the Bible without presuppositions. We all have some doctrinal framework we have acquired over years of studying the Bible together with other believers in a similar doctrinal background. Second, this assumption undermines confidence in the unity of Scripture. Jesus did not teach legalism and Paul did not teach antinomianism. As an apostle commissioned with the authority of Jesus himself and writing under the Spirit's inspiration, Paul's message is Christ's message. If we interpret the Sermon on the Mount as something completely unrelated (much less, contradictory) to Galatians, then we haven't gotten either right.

我们许多人是在这样的教会长大的: 牧师会夸口说他花了好几年才把一本书卷讲完。有人说, 这是释经讲道的荣耀。但这是读一个故事的好方法吗? 旧约的历史书和新约的福音书, 为我们提供了一个主要的叙事架构, 在这个架构下, 我们才会理解律法和教义。而书信就只是书信: 是针对一个特定的教会(或一群教会)而写的信件, 在公众崇拜中, 也通常是以这样的形式加以朗读的。当这些信件被完整宣读出来时, 我们会学到很多。不过, 每一周把这些丰富的内容逐渐展示出来, 也是很重要的——但总是要把神的子民带回到基本的论点当中。典型的情况是, 历史书和福音书会有故事情节, 而书信则是一个论证(或一些论证)。但是在这种一节一节的宣讲方式下, 情节和论证都很可能容易失焦, 变成支离破碎的解经。

Many of us were raised in churches where the pastor boasted that it took him years to get through one book. This is the glory of expository preaching, we were told. But is that a good way to read a story? The historical books of the Old Testament and the gospels of the New provide the overarching narrative within which the laws and doctrines make sense. The Epistles are, well, epistles: letters that were addressed to a particular church (or group of churches) and were generally read aloud as such in public worship. We get a lot out of these letters when we hear them read in their entirety, yet it's also important to unpack the rich content week by week—always bringing our people back to the basic argument. Typically, the historical books and the gospels have a storyline and the epistles have an argument (or series of arguments). But in this verse-by-verse approach, both the plot and the arguments can be easily lost to atomistic exegesis.

另一方面, 还有一个危险, 就是把一个正当的——甚至是重要的——圣经主题或教义, 变成一个“中心教条”, 而据此来推导出其余的一切。这是见林不见树。如果第一个观点是专注在拼图片上, 忽略了盒顶盖(更广的圣经和系统神学), 此观点则被一种倾向所害, 就是不看重、甚至是忽视“神的全部计划”(the whole counsel of God; 译按, 见徒 20: 27, 新译本)的一些重要层面。

On the other hand, there is a danger of turning a legitimate—even important—biblical motif or doctrine into a central dogma from which we deduce everything else. This is missing the trees for the forest. If the danger in the first view is to focus on the pieces of the puzzle without the box-top (a broader biblical and systematic theology), this view suffers from a tendency to marginalize or even ignore important aspects of "the whole counsel of God."

圣经是一部正典。虽然, 适切地说来, 因为圣经有许多不同的文体和作者, 散布在许多的时代和地点中, 因此, 她更象是一部图书馆, 而不是一本书, 然而, 圣经有一个内在的统一性。我们不是从外面把这个统一性加在圣经之上。我们并没有把这些拼图片强行拼凑起来, 虽然在我们内心深处也许会以为他们是矛盾的。圣经的内在是统一的, 因为她有一个基本的情节与教导。然而, 启示是紧跟着救赎的, 它与神展

开其计划的历史是同步的。神在不同时期以不同的约来行事。统一性与多样性不可彼此偏废。

Scripture is a canon. Although it is properly said that the Bible is more of a library than a book, because of its diverse genres and authorship spread over many times and places, there is a unity inherent within the Bible. We do not impose this unity on Scripture from without. We do not force the pieces to fit, even though deep down we might think that they are contradictory. Scripture is inherently unified in its basic plot and teachings. And yet revelation follows redemption. It keeps pace with the history of God's unfolding plan. God works differently in various periods with different covenants. Neither the unity nor the diversity is sacrificed to the other.

圣经不只包括许多不同的体裁，她也是由许多不同的作者“多次多方”（来 1: 1）写成的。因为神的默示是有机的默示，而不是机械性的默示，圣经就同时反映出作者的人性，也反映出其神性。加拉太书不只是登山宝训的重新讲述，但是二者都是同一部新约正典的一部分。因此，他们必须一起来加以诠释。

The Bible not only has diverse genres, it was written by diverse human authors "in many times and in many ways" (Heb 1:1). Because inspiration is organic rather than mechanical, Scripture reflects the humanity as well as the divinity of its authorship. Galatians is not just a restatement of the Sermon on the Mount. Yet both are part of the same new covenant canon. Therefore, they have to be interpreted together.

当我们这样作的时候，我们就会更丰富地发现它们各自真实的意义。在加拉太书中，保罗是说到律法（西乃山）之约和应许（亚伯拉罕）之约的不同；前者是透过预表和影子来指向基督，而后者已经在基督里成全，祂是那应许的后裔，世上的万国都在祂里面获得祝福。而在登山宝训中，耶稣是在宣布一个政权的改变，旧约的神治政体（old covenant theocracy，包括其对外邦人的圣战）让步给一个新的社会——此社会属于得赦免和蒙福的后裔，他们会为了基督的缘故，遭受迫害，并爱他们的仇敌。耶稣和保罗同样都在吸引我们到同一个恩典的天国实体中，虽然耶稣是作为这个国度的开创者，而保罗是作为一个使徒，在这个神在历史中展开的计划中，探索其结果。

When we do this, we discover more richly what each actually means. In Galatians, Paul is talking about the difference between the covenant of law (Sinai) that points forward to Christ by types and shadows, and the Abrahamic covenant of promise that is realized in Christ as the seed in whom all the nations are blessed. In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus is announcing a regime change, as the old covenant theocracy (including its holy wars) gives way to a new society of forgiven and blessed heirs who endure persecution and love their enemies for Christ's sake. Jesus and Paul are drawing us into exactly the same reality of the kingdom of grace, though Jesus does so as its inaugurator and Paul does so as an apostle, exploring the ramifications within the unfolding plan of God in history.

### **躁动不安与归正：预定论/神的主权**

Restless and Reformed: Predestination/God's Sovereignty

既然“中心教条”的理论打乱了传统，我就开始我自己的传统吧。理查·穆勒（Richard Muller）和其他学者已经有系统地驳斥了一个观念，就是预定论是改革宗神学的中心教条。事实上，这些历史神学家证明了在改革宗系统中，没有一条教义具有此种的功能。

Since the "central dogma" thesis cuts across traditions, I might as well start with my own. Richard Muller and other scholars have systematically dismantled the idea that predestination operates as a central dogma in Reformed theology. In fact, these historical theologians demonstrate that no doctrine functions like that in the Reformed system.

19 世纪的历史神学特别受到“大概念”（Great Idea）之思维的吸引：要找出一个中心的教条，这个系统中其他的东西都要从这个教条推导而出，来加以解释，并与敌对的系统加以对比。当然，在释经与争论的场合中，加尔文是为奥古斯丁的神的主权和预定的教义辩护的。不过，这个强调，很难被视为是一个

中心教义，然后推导出整个系统，特别是在他对基督信仰的摘要（日内瓦要理问答）中，加尔文甚至没有提及这个教义。虽然如此，神的主权和预定仍然变成一种解释或批评加尔文和改革宗神学的方式（无论来自友人和敌人都一样）。对照之下，整个路德宗的系统据称都是从神称罪人为义这个教义而作出推论的。Nineteenth-century historical theology was especially drawn to the "Great Idea" approach: locating a central dogma from which everything else in the system could be deduced, explained, and contrasted with rival systems. Of course, Calvin defended an Augustinian doctrine of God's sovereignty and predestination when exegetical and polemical occasion required. This emphasis, however, can hardly be considered a central dogma from which the whole system is deduced, especially when it is not even mentioned in his summary of the Christian faith (the Geneva Catechism). Nevertheless, God's sovereignty and predestination became a way of explaining or criticizing Calvin and Reformed theology, by friend and foe alike. By contrast, the entire Lutheran system was allegedly deduced from the doctrine of the justification of the ungodly.

上帝主权的恩典吞没了我们整个的地平线。它改变了一切。我们能理解，这真是一个全新的发现。我们开始明白我们以往所忽略的经文。这是一个范式的转移（paradigm shift）。但这恰恰是我们需要小心的地方：一个范式可以从一个对经文的新鲜解读自然地得出，也可以是从外面强加在圣经之上。例如，如果我们从小就相信救恩是靠个人的自由意志来决定，预定则重述了神的自由。神有自由拣选人，有自由定人的罪。但是这仅仅是因为神掌主权吗？当然不是。这是对神的主权的教导，一种近乎武断的描绘。不！在圣经中，我们学到，上帝有自由拣选祂要拣选的人，也有自由定其余的人有罪——因为所有的人都配受定罪。换句话说，上帝的主权不能与祂的公平和公义——或者与任何其他属性，包括祂的爱——分开。正如我们不能用一节经文或一段表列的经节来抵消其余的经文，我们也不能把上帝的一个属性奉为至高，超过其他属性。崇拜上帝的一个属性，而不崇拜上帝自己，是真正的危险。

Especially in cases of fresh discovery, it's understandable that God's sovereign grace swallows our whole horizon. It changes everything. We begin to see passages we had overlooked before. It's a paradigm shift. But that's exactly why we have to be careful at just that point: a paradigm can arise naturally from a fresh reading of Scripture or it can be imposed upon Scripture from without. For example, if one has been raised to believe that salvation depends on the individual's free will, predestination reasserts God's freedom. God is free to elect and to condemn. But is this merely because God is sovereign? Of course not. There is a kind of teaching of the sovereignty of God that is close to an arbitrary portrait. No, in Scripture we learn that God is free to elect whom he will and to condemn the rest because everyone deserves condemnation. In other words, God's sovereignty cannot be separated from his justice and righteousness—or from any other attribute, including his love. Just as we can't use one passage or list of verses to cancel out others in Scripture, we cannot enshrine one attribute of God above others. There is a real danger in worshipping an attribute rather than God himself.

让预定变成一个“中心教条”，基督教就无法与伊斯兰教无异。我曾经见过并听过一些极端加尔文主义者的演讲，高举神的主权而不曾提到耶稣基督。然而加尔文说，只有在基督里我们才能找到我们的拣选。我也听过一些演说，把神定罪的行动说成是与祂拯救的行动相等。然而，这是忽略了圣经清楚的教导，即祂从整个被定罪的人类当中，拣选一些人使他们得救。许多经文赞美上帝的慈爱，祂拣选的恩典。但是上帝唯独在选民的救恩上受到赞美，而没有在非选民的定罪上受到赞美。这就是为什么多特信经（1618-19）——“加尔文五要点”的出处——确认“改革宗教会全心憎恶”（“Reformed churches detest with their whole heart）这个观点，说上帝在定罪人的事上，所涉入的程度与祂在救恩的事上涉入的一样深。当我们以预定或神的主权成为基础，在其上建造出一栋神学系统的摩天大楼，其结果就是我们把一些经文挑选出来，让它们的地位高过其他的经文。这就成了“正典中的正典”。这是改革宗正统所绝不允许的事。

When predestination is made the central dogma, Christianity becomes indistinguishable from Islam. I've seen and heard a few hyper-Calvinist presentations that extolled the sovereignty of God

without ever mentioning Jesus Christ. And yet Calvin said that it is only in Christ that we find our election. I have also heard presentations in which God's activity in condemnation was treated as equivalent to his activity in salvation. This, however, ignores the clear biblical teaching that has chosen some to be saved from the mass of condemned humanity. There are lots of passages that celebrate God's mercy in electing grace. But God is praised as directly and solely responsible for the salvation of the elect, not as directly and solely responsible for the condemnation of the nonelect. That is why the Canons of the Synod of Dort (1618-19)—from which we get the so-called "five points of Calvinism"—affirm that "Reformed churches detest with their whole heart" the view that God is as involved in damnation as he is in salvation. When predestination or the sovereignty of God is made the foundation on which we build a skyscraper of a theological system, we end up picking out some passages of Scripture to stand over others in judgment. It becomes a canon within a canon. This is something Reformed orthodoxy never allowed.

然而，批判者不这样以为是情有可原的。首先，目前的趋势是把改革宗神学贬低为只是加尔文主义五要点。有时候，这会给人一种印象，就是只要相信预定论，就是改革宗。当然，这就会使得汤玛斯·阿奎拿（Thomas Aquinas）归正的程度变得和史普罗（R. C. Sproul）一样了！不过，这“五要点”本身是多特信条的总结，而多特信条比起这个总结要丰富并完整得多。尚且，多特信条是欧陆的改革宗基督徒（包括来自英国教会的代表）所撰写的，是作为对阿民念主义的反驳。此信条和比利时信仰告白、海德堡要理问答一起，是作为改革宗信仰与实践之仅次于圣经的标准。威敏思特标准（译按：即威敏思特信仰告白，大、小要理问答等三份文件）也认信同样的信仰。无论何时，当神全部的计划被简化成几个“基要真理”时，我们就失去这些教义的丰富性与深度。再者，当这些教义从更大的信仰系统与实践被孤立出来的时候，它们就很容易落入片面强调的陷阱中。

Critics, however, may be forgiven for thinking otherwise. First, there is a growing tendency right now to reduce Reformed theology to the five points of Calvinism. Sometimes the impression is given that anyone who believes in predestination is Reformed. Of course, that would make Thomas Aquinas as Reformed as R. C. Sproul! However, these "five points" are themselves a summary of the Canons of Dort, which are much richer and fuller than that summary. Furthermore, the Canons were drawn up by Reformed Christians on the Continent (with representatives from the Church of England) as a refutation of Arminianism. They serve along with the Belgic Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism as a standard for Reformed faith and practice, subordinate to Scripture. The Westminster Standards confess the same faith. Whenever the whole council of God is reduced to a few "fundamentals," we lose the richness and depth of those very doctrines. Furthermore, when these doctrines are isolated from the broader system of faith and practice, they yield easily to one-sided emphases.

第二，批评者经常把加尔文主义描绘成极端加尔文主义。而且，很不幸地，他们实际上会接触到体现出这种讽刺的人。对初信的人来说，走极端一直是一种诱惑。有很多流行的版本，的确把神的主权或预定变成经文的中心。当然，我们必须在圣经的亮光下来解释圣经。对一些人来说，把这类经文和同样清楚的关于神无条件的拣选的经文一起并排来看，真的会令人困惑。不过，问题出在我们。默示“全部圣经”的圣灵，使用各种不同的声音或不同的圣经作者——每个人有他自己的性格，风格，或甚至信念——但仍然教导一个统一的信息。上帝的确知道如何“多次多方”，且没有矛盾地和我们沟通。因此，我们必须小心，不要把圣经的教导变得很单调，好像它只是在教导一个真理，或甚至只集中在一个真理上。与此同时，我们必须很小心，不要让多样性变成互相矛盾。

Second, critics often paint Calvinism as hyper-Calvinism. And, unfortunately, they may actually encounter people who embody this caricature. Falling into extremes is always a temptation for new converts. There are popular versions on the ground that do make God's sovereignty or predestination the center of Scripture. Of course, we have to interpret Scripture in the light

of Scripture. It may be confusing for some people to read verses like this alongside other equally clear passages concerning God's unconditional election. The problem, however, lies with us. The Spirit who inspired "all Scripture" employs the richly diverse voices of different biblical writers--each with his own personality, style, and even beliefs--while nevertheless teaching a unified message. God indeed knows how to communicate "in many times and in many ways," yet without contradiction. So we must beware of flattening out biblical teaching, as if it taught only one truth or even concentrated on one truth. At the same time, we have to be careful not to turn diversity into contradiction.

最近我们也经常看到，加尔文主义的新手们已经开始领悟到这点，就是古典改革宗对“与基督联合”的强调是非常丰富的。也许这才是改革宗的中心教条，而不是预定论。在所有的人中，戈马克斯·贝尔（Max Goebel）和马蒂斯·施奈肯伯格（Matthias Schneckenburger, 1804-48）在这方面是特别成功的。他们定义改革宗的基督教信仰特别拥护与基督联合，而路德宗则强调法理上的称义（forensic justification）（注3）。有时候，这会成为当代的改革宗学者批判或重新评估“救赎次序”（ordo salutis）的理由。Just as often these days, neophyte Calvinists have begun to realize the wealth of classical Reformed emphasis on union with Christ. Perhaps this, rather than predestination, is the central dogma. Among others, such as Max Goebel, Matthias Schneckenburger (1804-48) was particularly successful in defining Reformed Christianity as the champion of union with Christ over and against the Lutheran emphasis on forensic justification. (3) This is sometimes used to critique or reevaluate the ordo salutis by contemporary Reformed thinkers.

当然，如果圣经中有任何的“中心教条”，非基督莫属。不过，即使是基督的位格和工作，其功用也不是用来作为“中心教条”的。圣经的确是以基督的位格和工作为中心的，但若说是以此为中心教条，还是大不相同的。中心教条是指一个论点，所有其他的论点都要从这里作出推论。这个教条甚至可能是合乎圣经的。但是当它的作用是作为中心教条，它就会扭曲，而不是照亮其他的经文。

Surely, if there is any central dogma in Scripture, it is Christ. However, not even Christ's person and work function as a central dogma. There is an important difference between the centrality of Christ's person and work in Scripture and a central dogma. A central dogma is a thesis from which everything else is deduced. Such a dogma may even be biblical. But when it functions as a central dogma, it distorts instead of illuminating everything around it.

改革宗的释经法并不是以预定、神的主权、称义或与基督联合为起点的。其系统是从圣经而来的，而不是强加在圣经身上的。不过，它也不是假装只是解释个别的经文，而不去考虑圣经自己对其更广的许多主题的说明。我们相信，有三个释经学（诠释）主题，是从经文本身很自然地产生出来的：律法与福音的区别，以基督为中心的救赎历史释经，以及圣约的结构。

Reformed exegesis does not start with predestination, the sovereignty of God, justification, or union with Christ. Its system arises from Scripture rather than being imposed upon Scripture. It does not, however, pretend merely to interpret individual passages apart from an account of the Bible's own broader motifs. There are three hermeneutical (interpretive) motifs that we believe arise naturally from the Scriptures themselves: a law-gospel distinction, redemptive-historical exegesis centering on Christ, and a covenantal scheme.

### 律法与福音 Law and Gospel

当我们把律法和福音当作一个中心教条，所有的讲道——不管是哪一段经文——听起来都会是一个样子。不知道为什么，讲道必须符合这样的窠臼：“这是你为何会失败”，以及“基督就是这样拯救你”。就讲道而言，这未必是最糟糕的，但这本身并不是在阐释经文。

When law and gospel function as a central dogma, every sermon--regardless of the passage--sounds the same. Somehow, the sermon has to conform to "Here's how you've blown it" and "Here's how Christ saves you." As preaching goes, this may not be the worst thing in the world, but it is



not itself an exposition of Scripture.

改教家认同这点，就是把律法和福音作出区分是很重要的。对任何一段经文，牧师或圣经的读者必须把这个基本区分牢记在心。然而，我们所要阐释的，是这段经文。我们不是在解释律法和福音的类别，而是在这个重要区分的亮光下来解释圣经。

The Reformers affirmed the importance of distinguishing between law and gospel. It is one of those basic distinctions that a preacher or reader of Scripture must bear in mind when coming to any passage. Nevertheless, it is the passage that must be interpreted. We are not exegeting the categories of law and gospel but the Scriptures in the light of that important distinction.

在路德宗和改革宗的信条中，律法的第三个作用（引导信徒）同样受到肯定。经文呼召我们要智慧，过一个感恩的生活。我们的讲道和圣经阅读，不应该因此而感到困惑、难堪。虽然我们的担心是合理的，就是许多的吩咐（imperatives）会导致自义或绝望，但有时候，给这些吩咐加上千百种的限制条件，就扼杀了这些吩咐。最近，我在家庭读经的时间中，把箴言从头到尾读过了一遍。虽然有时候在有些地方，基督被拟人化成为智慧，但是箴言书中许多地方只是日常生活中的智慧。我们必须小心，不要对某种形式的化约主义（把圣经当作一本日常原则的手册）作出过度的反应，结果是变成另一种的化约主义（忽略日常生活的智慧）。虽然我们必须要恰当地区分律法和福音，要知道它们各自有不同的作用，然而，我们仍然需要聆听从神口里所出的一切话。

The third use of the law (to guide believers) is affirmed in the Lutheran as well as Reformed confessions. Our preaching and reading of Scripture should not be embarrassed by the calls in Scripture to wise and grateful living. Sometimes imperatives die the death of a thousand qualifications, worried as we understandably are that imperatives can lead to self-righteousness or despair. I've been reading through Proverbs in family devotions, and while there are remarkable places where Christ is personified as Wisdom, a lot of the book is simply wisdom for daily living. We have to beware of overreacting against one form of reductionism (using the Bible as a handbook for daily principles), only to fall into another form (ignoring its wisdom for daily living). Always bearing the proper distinction between law and gospel, aware that each does different things, we nevertheless need to listen to every word that comes from the mouth of God.

#### **救赎历史诠释法 Redemptive-Historical Interpretation**

这也适用于要在所有经文中寻求基督。这在改革宗和路德宗的圈子内，已经变成一种咒语（mantra）。威尔翰·尼塞尔（Wilhelm Niesel）留意到：

The same can be said of looking for Christ in all the Scriptures. This has become something of a mantra in Reformed as well as in Lutheran circles. Wilhelm Niesel observes:

改革宗神学，和路德宗一样，知道是那来自圣经的神的道在对我们说话，在我们里面生发信心，而这个道就是基督自己。但是这并不是我们能控制的经验，以为我们只要能读圣经，并查验看它是否能“阐明基督”。加尔文阅读整本圣经，期望在当中找到基督（注4）。再次，当它成为释经的焦点，而不是诠释的眼镜，这个健康的强调也会被扭曲。

Reformed theology, just like Lutheran, knows that it is God's Word which addresses us from the Bible and produces faith and that this Word is Christ himself. But this address does not become an experience within our control on the basis of which we can read through the Bible and test whether it "sets forth Christ." Calvin read the whole Bible expecting to find Christ there. (4) Again, this healthy emphasis can become a distortion when it is the focus of exegesis rather than an interpretive lens.

有时候我们会对圣经的多样性感到不知所措，对利未记或以斯帖记是否与马太福音或罗马书怎么会有关系感到怀疑。那条把所有的叙事、律法和智慧，预言、诗歌、吩咐与劝勉连在一起的那条线究竟是什么？从创世记到启示录，的确有一个统一的信息，就是基督，祂把所有的线索结合在一起。当我们根据其情节来阅读圣经时，事情就变得井然有序了。隐藏在所有故事、智慧、诗歌和预言后面的，是基督的奥秘

和祂救赎工作的展开。

Sometimes we are bewildered by the diversity of the Bible, wondering how Leviticus or Esther bears any relation to the Gospel of Matthew or to Romans. What is the thread that pulls together all of the narratives, laws and wisdom, prophecy, poetry, instruction and exhortation? There really is a unifying message from Genesis to Revelation, and it is Christ who brings all of the threads together. When we read the Bible in the light of its plot, things begin to fall into place. Behind every story, piece of wisdom, hymn, exhortation, and prophecy is the unfolding mystery of Christ and his redemptive work.

耶稣自己告诉我们如何去阅读圣经——全部的圣经。神把圣经托付给法利赛人。对他们的跟随者来说，他们对圣经的诠释是满有权威的。然而，对他们来说，圣经主要只是一个关于西乃山的故事：以色列人与神立约，要遵守所有的诫命。它不是陪衬的情节——如同保罗所描述的，引我们到基督那里的“师傅”——而是主角。当弥赛亚最后真的到来，祂要把罗马人赶出去，重新建立犹太人的神权政治。以赛亚只是达到目的的手段，不是——如保罗对基督的称呼——“律法的总结”（the end of the law。译按，参罗 10:4）。

Jesus himself told us how to read the Bible—all of it. The Pharisees were the guardians of the Bible. For their followers, they were its authoritative interpreters. Yet for them the Bible was primarily a story about Sinai: the covenant that Israel pledged to fulfill all of the commands of his law. It was not the subplot—the “schoolmaster” leading to Christ, as Paul described—but the main thing. When the Messiah finally arrived, he would drive out the Romans and reinstitute the Jewish theocracy. The Messiah was a means to an end, not—as Paul called Christ—“the end of the law.”

耶稣自己告诉那些宗教领袖，“你们查考圣经，因你们以为内中有永生；给我作见证的就是这经。然而，你们不肯到我这里来得生命。”（约 5: 39-40）耶稣教导祂的门徒要根据应许与应验来阅读整本圣经（就当时来说，是指旧约圣经），而祂自己是主角（路 24: 25-27; 44-45）。无论他们把一些经文记得多牢，或他们多快能回想起以色列历史的关键时刻，在耶稣没有向他们解释，圣经就是关于祂的故事之前，圣经对他们来说，完全是一个奥秘。

Jesus himself told the religious leaders, “You search the scriptures, because you think that in them you have eternal life; and it is they that bear witness about me, yet you refuse to come to me that you may have life” (John 5:39). Jesus taught his disciples to read the whole Bible (at that point, the Old Testament) in terms of promise and fulfillment, with himself as the central character (Luke 24:25-27; 44-45). No matter how well they had memorized certain Bible verses or how quickly they could recall key moments in Israel’s history, the Bible was a mystery to them before Jesus explained it as his story.

基督是把圣经启示所有各种不同的股绳，结合在一起的那条线绳。离开基督，圣经的情节就会散落一地，混杂着许多人物，不相干的故事，令人费解的律法，以及令人困惑的诸多预言。门徒们最后似乎明白了耶稣所说的，因为福音透过他们的见证，从耶路撒冷传播到异教的世界。即使是曾三次否认基督的彼得，之后也能够以使徒的身份写到：

Christ is the thread that weaves together all of the various strands of biblical revelation. Apart from him, the plot falls apart into a jumble of characters, unrelated stories, inexplicable laws, and confusing prophecies. The disciples finally seemed to understand this point, since the gospel went from Jerusalem to the Gentile world through their witness. Even Peter, who had denied Christ three times, was able later to write as an apostle:

“论到这救恩，那预先说你们要得恩典的众先知早已详细的寻求考察，就是考察在他们心里基督的灵，预先证明基督受苦难，后来得荣耀，是指着什么时候，并怎样的时候。他们得了启示，知道他们所传讲的一切事，不是为自己，乃是为你们。那靠着从天上差来的圣灵传福音给你们的人，现

在将这些事报给你们；天使也愿意详细察看这些事。”（彼前 1：10-12）

Concerning this salvation, the prophets who prophesied about the grace that was to be yours searched and inquired carefully, inquiring what person or time the Spirit of Christ in them was indicating when he predicted the sufferings of Christ and the subsequent glories. It was revealed to them that they were serving not themselves but you, in the things that have now been announced to you through those who preached the good news to you by the Holy Spirit sent from heaven, things into which angels long to look. (1 Pet. 1:10-12)

神永世的儿子在创世故事的一开始，就已经存在（约 1：1-3；西 1：15-20）。祂是为以色列人的罪在旷野被击打的磐石（林前 10：4）。而在圣经最后的书卷中，祂也是神最后的话，说道：“不要惧怕！我是首先的，我是末后的，又是那存活的；我曾死过，现在又活了，直活到永永远远；并且拿着死亡和阴间的钥匙”（启 1：17-18）。在天上的景象中，只有羔羊能展开包含所有历史启示的书卷：“他们唱新歌，说：你配拿书卷，配揭开七印；因为你曾被杀，用自己的血从各族、各方、各民、各国中买了人来，叫他们归于神，又叫他们成为国民，作祭司归于神，在地上执掌王权。”而所有在天上的人俯伏在羔羊面前，向祂敬拜（启 5：9-14）。这是神的好消息的目标。

God's eternal Son is present at the beginning of the story at creation (John 1:1-3; Col. 1:15-20). He is the Rock struck in the wilderness for Israel's sins (1 Cor. 10:4). And in the Bible's closing book he is God's last Word, too: "Fear not, I am the first and the last, and the living one. I died, and behold I am alive forever more, and I have the keys of Death and Hades" (Rev. 1:17-18). In the heavenly scene, only the Lamb was able to open the scroll containing the revelation of all of history: "And they sang a new song, saying, 'Worthy are you to take the scroll and to open its seals, for you were slain, and by your blood you ransomed people for God from every tribe and language and people and nation, and you have made them a kingdom and priests to our God, and they shall reign on the earth.'" And everyone in heaven fell down before the Lamb in worship (Rev. 5:9-14). That is the goal of God's good news.

我们有许多人都是在一些不太知道如何处理旧约——除了找到一些道德榜样以外：“要勇于作个但以理”——的教会长大的。只有当我们在围绕着基督的救赎情节的展开中来阅读圣经，那些不相干的书卷，才会变成一部合一的正典。不过，正如律法与福音，救赎历史的思路也有时会把所有的讲道变成同样的讲道。无论经文是什么，信息基本上总是创造、堕落、救赎，以及国度的成全。可笑的是，此救赎历史讲道法的最重要的目标反而无法达成，因为这样的讲道并没有引导信徒明白这段经文如何嵌合在神更辽阔的、神在基督里的目的的历史当中。

Many of us were raised in churches that didn't quite know what to do with the Old Testament, except perhaps to find moral examples: "Dare to be a Daniel!" When we read the Bible in the light of the unfolding plot of redemption around Christ, otherwise unrelated books become a unified canon. Nevertheless, as with law and gospel, a redemptive-historical approach can sometimes turn every sermon into the same sermon. Regardless of the passage, the message is basically creation, fall, redemption, and consummation. Ironically, the very goal of redemptive-historical preaching is not met, because believers are not led to see how this passage fits within the broader history of God's purposes in Christ.

### **圣约结构** Covenantal Scheme

改革宗神学就是圣约神学。神在基督了展开的目的，是在圣约的关系中实现的。此外，古典的改革宗神学在圣经中辨识出三个主要的圣约：

1) 救赎之约 (the covenant of redemption), 这是三位一体的神与基督在永恒中所立的约，基督要作为选民的中保；

2) 工作之约 (the covenant of works), 这是与亚当所立的约，亚当要作为全人类的约的代表；

3) 恩典之约 (the covenant of grace), 这是与信徒和他们的儿女在基督里所立的约, 基督要作为末后的亚当。

Reformed theology is covenant theology. God's unfolding purposes in Christ are realized in a covenantal relationship. Furthermore, classic Reformed theology discerns in Scripture three overarching covenants: the covenant of redemption, made in eternity between the persons of the Godhead with Christ as the mediator of the elect; the covenant of works, made with Adam as the federal representative of humanity; and the covenant of grace, made with believers and their children in Christ as the last Adam.

再次, 这个圣约神学可以从圣经里读出来的, 也可以是强加在圣经上的。在主要的改革宗神学系统中, 这些圣约构成其结构。我们不会经常看到一栋建筑的结构——其支持的框架与樑柱。同样, 这些圣约在所有的经文中也不总是很清楚的。为了能守约地解释圣经, 我们不需要把所有的讲道都变成圣约神学的演讲。如同律法和福音之间的区分, 以及救赎历史的诠释法, 圣经的圣约神学也是我们从圣经中读出来的, 也是我们作为讲员、听众和所有经文的读者所带着的前提。但是我们必须聆听每一段经文, 不只是不断重复着圣约神学。

Once again, this covenant theology can be read out of the Scriptures or it can be imposed upon the Scriptures. In the major Reformed systems, these covenants form the architecture. We don't always see the architecture of a building--its supporting framework and columns. Similarly, these covenants are not always explicit in every passage. We need not turn every sermon into a covenant theology lecture in order to interpret the Scriptures covenantally. As with the distinction between law-and-gospel and redemptive-historical interpretation, the Bible's covenant theology is something that we read out of Scripture and bring with us as preachers, hearers, and readers of each text. But we must hear each text, not just repetitions of covenant theology.

因此, 没有“正典中的正典”这回事——全部的圣经都是神所默示的, 因此是有益的 (也就是说, 是具有正典的权威的), 可以规范教会的信仰与实践。我们同时需要拼图的盒顶盖和拼图片, 同时需要森林和树木。事实上, 是拼图片构成了拼图, 树木构成了森林。我们需要找回我们的信心: 是神藉著祂的灵和祂的儿子默示了这些经文。这些经文的内容是以基督为中心的, 祂是各个部分的主, 也是整本圣经的主。There is therefore no "canon within a canon"--all Scripture is God-breathed and therefore useful (that is, canonical) for norming the church's faith and practice. We need the box-top and the pieces, the forest and the trees. In fact, it's the pieces that make up the puzzle and the trees that make up the forest. We need to recover our confidence that the Father who inspired these texts by his Spirit, with his Son as its central content, is Lord of the parts and of the whole.

---

1 Clark Pinnock, "Overcoming Misgivings about Evangelical Inclusivism," *Southern Baptist Journal of Theology*, vol. 2, no. 2 (Summer 1998), 33-34.

2 Pinnock, 35.

3 Matthias Schneckenburger, *Vergleichende Darstellung des lutherischen und reformirten Lehrbegriffs*, ed. Eduard G& #252;der, 2 vols. (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1855).

4 Wilhelm Niesel, *Reformed Symbolics: A Comparison of Catholicism, Orthodoxy, and Protestantism*, trans. David Lewis (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1962), 229.