

保羅的「聖經神學」： 救贖歷史的進路 補充材料

Pauline Theology: A Redemptive-Historical Approach Supplementary Notes

1031Classroom

保羅的「聖經神學」：救贖歷史的進路

補充材料

目錄

解經與聖經神學	1
糾正關於聖經神學的十二個誤解.....	3
關於「與基督聯合」，與基督同死，同復活的錯誤解釋	4
復活與救贖：方法論的考慮	5
與基督一同復活：是救贖歷史，也是信徒的經驗； 因為信徒「在基督裏」，與基督聯合	19
基督成為賜生命的靈	28
主乃是那靈：哥林多後書 3：17	39
「與基督聯合」的教義面面觀	44

解經與聖經神學

1. 基督徒最起碼的操練是「讀經」 (Bible reading)；讀經的目標是搞清楚：《聖經》說什麼？（不是：我對經文的感受如何？！）
2. 若要對《聖經》認真的學習，必須「研經」 (Bible study, 查經)；目標是搞清楚：每一段《聖經》教導什麼？（例如：歸納法查經。）在靈修生活中查經，至少要準備、使用一本可靠的研讀版《聖經》 (study Bible)。英文有多種，例如最新出版的：Reformation Study Bible (ESV)；或 The Spirit of the Reformation Study Bible (NIV)等。中文首推：更新傳道會出版的《新國際版研讀本聖經》（原著：The NIV Study Bible）。
3. 若條件許可，可進一步作「解經」 (exegesis, Bible interpretation)的研究。解經就是從原文（或讓懂原文的學者，教師們幫助我們）、上下文、歷史背景等解釋經文的意義。歷代以來的解經是建立在一個基本的信念上：《聖經》是上帝默示的話，是無誤的。（不幸今天很多學者已經不再堅持這信念）。
4. 如何解經？「釋經學」 (hermeneutics, principles of Bible interpretation)是解經時要應用的原則。原則沒有「中立」的；不幸許多當代釋經學教科書已不再相信《聖經》的默示，無誤等真理。（見下：解經原則沒有「中立」。）
5. 解經的結果是《聖經》注釋 (Bible commentaries)，這方面的學問統稱為「《聖經》研究」 (biblical studies)。
6. 用解經的方法，遵循釋經學的正确原則來預備講章，結果是「解經講道」 (expository preaching)。這樣的講道事工是 expound(ing) the Scriptures; Bible exposition；有別於「專題講道」；「有感而發」；「時事評論式講道」；或「靈意解經」等。
7. 《聖經》神學 (biblical theology) 是建立在解經的基礎上。《聖經》神學問：上帝在啟示歷史的每一個階段啟示了什麼？透過每一個作者啟示了什麼？
8. 上帝在《聖經》裏啟示的內容分兩大類：上帝說了什麼？上帝作了什麼？即：上帝的作為 (deeds) 和上帝的話語 (words)。上帝的作為解釋上帝的話語；上帝的話語解釋上帝的作為。例如：耶穌的五餅二魚神蹟 + 事後宣稱：我就是生命的糧。耶穌使生下來瞎眼的能看見 + 宣稱：我就是世上的光。除此以外，《聖經》裏有一些話語（特別是保羅的書信），解釋《聖經》裏上帝所說的。因此：「《聖經》神學」在《聖經》裏面就已經存在。不是後人加於聖經以上的猜測。例如：保羅是一位非常出色的思想家，他的思想非常嚴密。因此：除了他所寫下的各項真理（稱義，聖靈的見證，與基督聯合，為主受苦，教會的榮耀等）以外，保羅也解釋他不同的教導（教義）之間的關係。保羅的思想是有系統的，雖然他的書信不以神學（教

- 義)的文體出現，可是他的確是一位「神學家」，意思是：保羅自我解釋他所教導的。
9. 解經的目的是從《聖經》裏面找出聖經的教導：從《聖經》裏面出來，因此解經英文稱為 *exegesis* (*ex* = 「出來」的意思)。錯誤的作法：是把我們自己的想法讀進《聖經》，英文稱此為 *eisegesis*，*eis* 是「進去」的意思。
 10. 將自己的意思讀進《聖經》裏乃意味著：不論用那一段《聖經》，都可以講出自己要講的信息，都可以預備一篇自己心目中要講的講章。因此《聖經》成為只不過扮演襯托的角色而矣。
 11. 沒有一位解釋《聖經》的人是中立的，沒有「神學」(*theology-free*)的。完全「中立」的解經是不可能的。我們要認清楚我們對《聖經》的前提(*presuppositions*)。
 12. 解經與《聖經》神學背後有兩個原則(前提，*presuppositions*)：啟示歷史的漸進性(*progressive revelation*)，和啟示的統一性(*unity of revelation*)。兩者同樣的重要。
 13. 啟示的統一性(或：以經解經，*analogy of Scripture, analogy of faith*)的意思是：我們預先相信，《聖經》是不會自相矛盾的。我們要作的是：解釋《聖經》如何不先後矛盾。
 14. 每一位作者的作品也不可能自相矛盾，每一位都是聖靈默示的。
 15. 有些《聖經》神學學者不是正統的，不是福音派的。他們不相信《聖經》的無誤，只研究某一個《聖經》時代裏，人們相信什麼，如何敬拜上帝(雖然學者認為這些信仰都是神話)。
 16. 正統的《聖經》神學研究學者包括：Geerhardus Vos (1862-1949)，普林斯頓神學院教授(1893-1932)；著有 *Biblical Theology* (中譯：霍志恆，《聖經神學》，天道)；荷蘭學者 Heman Ridderbos，著有 *Paul: An Outline of His Theology*；等等。
 17. Edmund P. Clowney 是 1960-70 年代威敏斯特神學院 (Westminster Theological Seminary, www.wts.edu) 院長，大力提倡《聖經》神學。(參 J.I. Packer, *Truth and Power*，承認 Clowney 的重要性。) Clowney 著有幾本聖經神學的書籍：*The Church, Preaching and Biblical Theology, Called to the Ministry, The Unveiled Mystery, and Preaching Christ from All of Scripture*。其他在這方面努力的教授有：Harvie M. Conn (宣教學)，Richard B. Gaffin, Jr. (新約神學，系統神學)，O. Palmer Robertson (舊約神學)。

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」。

關於「與基督聯合」，與基督同死，同復活的錯誤解釋

- 1 · 天主教，聖禮派的「聯合」：在聖禮中，基督的死的事件重現，重新發生。
- 2 · 基督新教的自由派，受存在主義和巴特的神學的影響：與基督聯合是超事件的經歷。
- 3 · 19世紀福音派：Keswick Convention 留下來的影響：要在基督面前降服，什麼都不作。（參：巴刻，《活在聖靈中》第四章）。
- 4 · 靈意解經：我已經與基督同死，同復活。沒有救贖歷史上的根據。
- 5 · Herman Ridderbos，荷蘭改革宗解經家：基督與在基督裏的人 = 一個整體的人格 (corporate personality)。
有誤導的嫌疑。

正確的解釋

- 1 · 永恆裏的預定。Predestinarian.
- 2 · 救贖歷史的成就，我們與基督同死，同復活。Redemptive-historical.
- 3 · 在基督徒生命的開始（重生）的時候，我們真正的與基督同死，同復活。Existential-experiential.

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

(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，於凱伯拒絕「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 church 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 Kuypers'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 Kuypers. In fact, the stress of the one is precisely the opposite of the other. (1) Kuypers'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 Kuypers, the apostle, along with the other biblical writers, speaks the "stylized, symbolic-aesthetic language of the East." [12] (2) Kuypers 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 Kuypers *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 Kuypers'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 Doctratiek*, 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'être* 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 and 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 from 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：這不可於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：這些結論對完整地理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，好叫能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. Lengersfeld, *Adam und Christus*, Koinonia – Beitrage 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，有幫助我們為「解釋保羅的**難題**」上下定義。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 than 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 his redemptive-historical outlook.

與基督一同復活：是救贖歷史，也是信徒的經驗；
因為信徒「在基督裏」，與基督聯合

[Richard B. Gaffin, Jr., *Resurrection and Redemption: A Study in Paul's Soteriology*.
Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing Co., 1987. pp. 44-52.]

羅馬書 6：3ff. Romans 6:3ff.

與基督同復活 = 是歷史，也是經驗；
雖沒有直說，但從洗禮之意義（參西 2：11-13）可以清楚看出

Our primary interest in this much-discussed passage is to trace its development of the notion of resurrection with Christ as an historical, yet experiential reality. While this idea is not stated quite so explicitly here, it can be seen rather easily against the background of the passages just discussed, particularly Colossians 2:11-13 with its common appeal to the significance of baptism.

第 2 節保羅答問：信徒「已經向罪死了」；這是 6：1-7：6 的基本論點；
犯罪的生活 vs. 「向罪死」是信徒經歷 (*heilsordelijk*, 「救贖秩序」)；
但也有「救贖歷史」(*redemptive-historical*) 層面

To the objection, raised in an interrogatory fashion in 6:1 [Whether this question takes up an actual objection or is rhetorical is a point which need not concern us here.], that the doctrines of grace the apostle has just been developing (cf. esp. 5:12-21) encourage a life of sin, Paul counters, likewise in the form of a question, with the thesis that believers “have died to sin” (v. 2). This thesis supplies the premise fundamental to the rest of the lengthy section (6:1-7:6). [Cf. Murray, *Romans*, 1:213; “Definitive Sanctification,” pp. 6f.] Paul’s primary concern in this passage, then, is *heilsordelijk*, with the matters of existential sinning, a sinful way of life [The verbs “are we to continue” (v. 1) and “shall we live” (v. 2) serve to accent this.] and the believer’s death to the sin in view. 「向罪死」是在信徒人生中發生的事。The death to sin spoken of here has taken place in the life history of the individual believer [Cf. Murray, “Definitive Sanctification,” p. 17.]. At the same time, however, redemptive-historical considerations are also present and play an important role in the argument. This passage, as in the passages already examined, cannot be considered either/or.

第 3 節：洗禮的意義 = 進入基督裏 (**into Christ**)，與基督的位格和工作聯合；
與基督同死，同埋葬；基督向罪死；因此信徒與基督一同向罪死了

Beginning with verse 3 Paul proceeds to expand and validate his thesis that the believer has died to sin by appealing to the significance of baptism (only the basic elements of this appeal need concern us here). 洗禮乃是進入基督裏（參加 3：27）；

洗禮是與基督聯合的記號。Baptism is “into Christ” (cf. Gal. 3:27); that is, baptism signifies union with Christ [cf. Gal. 3:26-28; I Cor. 12:13 with v. 27; Rom. 12:4f.]. This union is understood in a quite concrete manner. 與基督聯合，乃是與祂的彌賽亞工作每一部分聯合。It is union with Christ in all phases of his messianic work and all that he is by virtue of this work. 因此，受洗歸入基督裏的意思是：與祂的死、埋葬聯合。Hence baptism into Christ means union with him in his death (vv. 3, 4a, 5a; cf. “We died with Christ,” v. 8; II Tim. 2:11; “Our old man was crucified with him,” v. 6; Gal. 2:19) and burial (“We were buried with him,” v. 4; cf. Col. 2:12). 保羅在這裏說出他的主題的根據：信徒與基督的死聯合；祂的死是向罪死，因此，信徒也向罪死了。Thus Paul’s central thesis is established: Believers are united with Christ in his death; his death was specifically a death to sin (cf. v. 10); therefore believers here died to sin.

第 4 節下：信徒不僅向罪死，乃有新生命的樣式； 首次提到與基督同復活的主題

The latter part of verse 4 expresses for the first time the important positive implication of Paul’s fundamental premise and so brings into view that feature of the passage most germane to our discussion. 嚴格來說，「向罪死」不足形容信徒的生命，因為它只有負面的取向。Strictly speaking, death to sin is not an adequate description of the believer’s existence, because it has only negative force. 信徒與基督的死和埋葬聯合，好叫「我們一舉一動，有新生的樣式，像基督藉著父的榮耀，從死裏復活一樣。」The believer is one united with Christ in his death and burial “in order that as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we too might walk in newness of life.”

與基督的死，埋葬，復活聯合 = 比「向罪死」更為基本；
基督（向罪）死了；信徒既與基督聯合，也（向罪）死了；
基督復活了；信徒既與基督的復活聯合，就已經復活了
因為信徒與基督聯合，因此基督與信徒在「從死裏復活」是合一的，不可分開的

The theme of resurrection with Christ is plain in this clause, especially as one grasps the underlying pattern of thought. 比「信徒已經向罪死了」更基本的乃是：與基督所經歷的每一段都聯合。Really more basic than the thesis that the believer has died to sin is the notion of union with Christ in the various phases of his messianic experience. 因此保羅的思路如下：一方面，正如基督（向罪）死了，信徒因為與基督聯合，也（向罪）死了；另一方面，正如基督已經從死裏復活，因此信徒，因為與基督聯合，也已經從死裏復活了。Hence Paul’s line of reasoning is as follows: On the one hand, as Christ died (to sin), so believers by virtue of union with him in his death have died (to sin); on the other hand, as Christ was raised from the dead, so believers by virtue of union with him in his resurrection have been raised from the dead.

因為基督和信徒的聯合，基督的死與復活的不可分開，因此信徒的死與復活也不可分開。Because of the solidarity between Christ and believers, the inseparability of resurrection from death in the case of the former means their inseparability in the experience of the latter.

4節下沒有用「同復活」一詞；
因為本段要對照的是兩種「生活樣式」(walk) (1, 4節)

That verse 4c does not utilize specifically the vocabulary of resurrection is explained by the controlling question posed in verse 1. “Walking in newness of life” is a more appropriate and much more pointed contrast to “remaining in sin” than “having been raised with Christ.” Nevertheless, as just indicated, resurrection with Christ is the underlying structural consideration. [This correlation between the believer’s new “walk” and his co-resurrection is another indication of affinity with Ephesians 2:1-10; cf. above...]

4節下：與基督同復活不只是在歷史上，而是在信徒生命改變的經歷上；
從基督復活事件到信徒的新生活樣式：聯接點乃是在經歷上與基督同死（向罪死），同復活2；
與基督（在經歷上）同復活 = 新生活樣式之基礎

Verse 4c, then, shows rather graphically that Paul views resurrection with Christ not only in terms of solidarity with him at the time-point of his resurrection but also as part of a decisive transition in the lifetime of the individual believer. If only the former were the case, Paul would be arguing directly from the once-for-all event of Christ’s resurrection to the believer’s new walk, and this would involve an hiatus completely foreign to the controlling interest and structure of thought in the immediate and broader context (6:1-7:6). Paul’s primary and repeated stress is that death with Christ (to sin and to the law) includes an experiential aspect which excludes the possibility of continuing in the bondage and practice of sin. Accordingly, resurrection with Christ likewise involves an existential component. The believer’s continuing walk in newness of life is based upon resurrection with Christ as that has taken place in his actual life history.

「生命」是指「復活的生命」(resurrection-life)；
基督，復活的基督(9)，向上帝活(10)；基督裏彰顯的生命是「復活生命」；
因此信徒既然與基督聯合，向上帝活(11)，必須獻上自己(13)；
因此：4節下有「與基督同復活」的觀念

A further consideration here is that for Paul “life” in the soteriological sense [A nonsoteric usage also occurs; e.g., I Cor. 15:19, 45a.] does not have an indefinite basis and character. Rather it is grounded specifically in the resurrection of Jesus and its manifestation is always an expression of that resurrection. Life for Paul is pointedly resurrection-life. This is plain in the present context. That life which Christ now lives

“to God” (v. 10), he lives as “raised from the dead” (v. 9). Accordingly, by virtue of union with him, as believers reckon themselves dead to sin and alive “to God” (v. 11), they are to present themselves “to God as alive from the dead” (v. 13). The thought of co-resurrection, then, cannot be excluded from verse 4c.

**5 節：「聯合」指「樣式」；（基督、信徒的）死與復活不能分開；
羅 6 用字與弗 2，西 2 不同，可是意思相同：我們已與基督同復活**

Verse 5 explains the bond established in verse 4 between Christ’s resurrection and the believers’ walk in newness of life. [Cf. Ridderbos, *Romeinen*, p. 127; note the conjunction “for” (gar).] “For if we have been united with him in the likeness of his death, we will certainly also be united with him (in the likeness) of his resurrection.” The syntactical difficulties of this statement need not detain us here. The consensus of Protestant interpretation is that: (1) “united with” (sumphutoi) is to be joined directly with “the likeness” (toi homoiwmati) [Roman Catholic interpreters usually read autoi from verse 4a with sumphutoi and take toi homoiwmati as an instrumental dative referring to baptism; cf. Schnackenburg, *Heilsgeschehen*, p. 41 and the literature cited there (n. 131).] and (2) the latter is to be read in verse 5b where ellipsis has occurred [So, e.g. Murray, *Romans*, 1:218f.; Ridderbos, *Romeinen*, pp. 127f.; P. Althaus, *Der Brief an die Roemer*, NTD, 6 (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), p. 62.] The substructure of this one-sentence argument is not difficult to detect. 「這裏基本的思想乃是：基督的死與祂的復活既是不可分開的，從兩者的聯結可以推論：我們若與基督的死聯合，也必與祂的復活聯合。我們在這兩件事上不可能分開，就如在基督身上，死與復活不可能分開一樣。」（慕理，〈羅馬人書注釋〉，1: 218。）“The underlying thought is again the inseparable conjunction of Christ’s death and resurrection, and the inference drawn from this conjunction is that if we are united with Christ in his death we must be also in his resurrection. Disjunction in our case is as impossible as disjunction in his.” [Murray, *Romans*, 1:218. The word used to express union with Christ, the *hapax legomenon* sumphutoi, derives from a root (sumphuomai) meaning to “grow together” (cf. W. Grundmann, *TDNT*, 7:786), and so expresses rather pointedly the notion of solidarity. It would be wrong to read the idea of growth or process into the verse on the basis of this form, as if death with Christ to sin were progressively realized. The pivotal and sustained emphasis in the context on the definitiveness of the breach with sin excludes any such notion. The sole point is “the intimacy of the union involved” (Murray, p. 218). Ridderbos (p. 127) translates with “incorporated”; Grundmann with “belonging together,” “united with.”] While the language here may be different than in Ephesians 2:6 and Colossians 2:12 the basic thought is the same: believers have been raised with Christ. [The future tense in verse 5b has logical force and expresses certainty (cf. Murray, *Romans*, 1:219; Ridderbos, *Romeinen*, p. 129; cf. also zhsomen as the preferred reading in v. 2). W. Thuesing, *Per Christum in Deum. Studien zum verbaeltnis von Christozentrik und Theozentrik in den paulinischen Hauptbriefen*, NA, Nene Folge, 1 [Muenster: Aschendorff, 1965], pp. 139-144) argues at length for a temporal force. In my opinion, however, he does not succeed finally in overcoming what he himself recognizes (p. 141) to be the basic difficulty with this position: how a future indicative (v. 5b) can be made the basis for a present imperative (v. 4c). He appeals to the broader

structure of Paul's theology, principally the bond between (present) righteousness and (future) glory. But in so doing he overlooks one of the more important structural characteristics of the immediate context: life (wherever it be found) is always exponential of the experience of resurrection (cf. esp. v. 13). 本段經文的結構，其中最重要的特點乃是：生命（無論在那裏彰顯）一定是從經歷復活而來 (Gaffin)。

信徒有基督死與復活的「樣式」：與基督聯合，也與基督的死與復活有別

One feature in this verse requires further attention. Believers are joined to the likeness of Christ's death and resurrection. This is an indication that Paul has something more or something other in view than union with Christ at the time-points of his death, burial, and resurrection. 我們不願妥協與基督聯合的觀點，可是「樣式」表達了「有分別」。 Without compromising the strongly-expressed notion of solidarity, "likeness" introduces an element of distinction (cf. Rom. 8:3; Phil. 2:7). ["... distance along with all similarity..." (Ridderbos, *Romeinen*, p. 129); Ridderbos also suggests that this force of *homoiwma* is anticipated by *hwsper* in v. 4 (p. 127). R.C. Tannehill (*Dying and Rising with Christ. A Study in Pauline Theology, Beiheft zur Zeitschrift fuer die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der alteren Kirche*, 32, ed. W. Eltester [Berlin: Toepelmann, 1967], pp. 7-32) argues (pp. 35-39), primarily on the basis of Phil. 2:7, that for Paul *homoiwma* is synonymous with *morphe* and that hence the former expresses identity ("the form of the reality itself in oits outward appearance," p. 35) rather than likeness. Entirely apart from his treatment of the usage in Phil. 2:7 and Rom. 8:3, which, in my opinion, is at least open to question, it is difficult to see how this force fits in Romans 6:5. His conclusion that *homoiwma* is part of the vocabulary of a "theology of metamorphosis" (p. 37) found in Rom. 8:29; II Cor. 3:18; Phil. 3:21 encounters insurmountable problems in this context. In Romans 6:1ff. "dying and rising with Christ" is not a motif expressing the *process* of transformation or gradual conformity to Christ; rather the sustained emphasis is on the definite breach with sin which lies in the believer's past. 「在羅馬書 6: 1ff.與基督同死、同復活並不是指生命改變的過程，或越來越效法基督；保羅要強調的乃是：信徒曾經有過「與罪一刀兩斷」的經歷。」 (Gaffin)] What this additional or discriminating element is emerges in the light of the main emphasis of the context. Believers have died to sin, and this death is an actual experience of believers (v. 2). Accordingly, their resurrection invariably conjoined with this death is likewise understood in an existential fashion (v. 4). Now since *this* death and resurrection is in view, that is, death and resurrection which has taken place in the life history of the believer, the structure of this experience cannot be identical with Christ's. To cite just one difference, the former lacks the somatic aspect which is an essential characteristic of the latter. [Cf. Murray, *Romans*, 1:218. Verse 12 makes this point clear. There Paul says, in effect, to his readers: "the resurrection you have experienced has taken place 'in your mortal body.'"] Apparently, then, Paul is reflecting on these differences in verse 5. And his use of "likeness" confirms rather pointedly that the solidarity with Christ in his resurrection described here is an experience in the life of the individual believer.

**第六節：舊人與基督同釘十字架；暗示：新人與基督同復活；
人必須與基督同復活，才能作義的奴僕**

在第六節，新人與基督同復活（參西 3： 9-10， 3： 1；弗 4： 22-2 乃是與舊人與基督同釘十字架相對照。In verse 6 the co-resurrection of the new man (cf. Col. 3:9f. with 3:1; Eph. 4:22-24) is the implied contrast to the crucifixion of the old man with Christ. Since this notion of co-crucifixion is clearly correlate with the primary emphasis in the context on the believer’s death with Christ to sin [“Knowing this” indicates that verse 6 is a further development of what precedes, particularly the protasis in verse 5.], it too has an existential reference. 第六節肯定：與基督同釘十字架的結果是，罪身必被滅絕；而「被罪捆綁」必終止。Verse 6 confirms this by anticipating the destruction of “the body of sin” [這裏的意思是「被罪影響，被罪控制的身體」（慕理，《羅馬人書注釋》，1： 220）]The thought is the destruction of the body “as conditioned and controlled by sin” (Murray, *Romans*, 1:220)], and cessation of bondage to sin as direct results of co-crucifixion. 因此，與基督同復活乃是在 6 節下所暗示的「作義的奴僕」（參： 16， 18， 19， 22 節）的先決經驗。It follows, then, that the bondage to righteousness implied in the latter part of the verse (cf. vv. 16, 18, 19, 22) presupposes co-resurrection as an experiential reality. Also, in the parallelism of verse 13, for believers to present their members as instruments of righteousness is for them to present themselves as “alive from the dead.” The thought here, close to that of Colossians 3:1, is fairly paraphrased: present yourselves to God as those who have been raised (existentially) (with Christ; cf. vv. 10f.) from the dead. [Ridderbos maintains that the contrast between the old and new man is to be understood, “not in the first place in the sense of the *ordo salutis*, but in that of the history of redemption; ... not first of all in a personal and ethical sense, but in a redemptive-historical, eschatological sense” (*Paul*, p. 63; cf. *Romeinen*, p. 129). To be sure, the language employed by Paul reflects his redemptive-historical perspective, and Ridderbos apparently does not consider the interests he contrasts mutually exclusive (cf., however, *Paul*, p. 208). 我在上文嘗試證明，在第六節，在整段和其他經文中，保羅主要強調的是「救贖秩序」，是在信徒的個人經歷裏（上帝）所成就的徹底改變。Still, as I have tried to show above, in verse 6, this context as a whole, and others, Paul’s primary emphasis is on the *ordo salutis*, on the radical transition effected in the life history of the individual believer.]

第八節與第五節相應：

與基督同活，必須先與祂同復活：兩者都是經歷上

Similarly in verse 8 living with Christ [The verb “we will live” (*suzhsomen*) is a logical future expressing certainty, although a temporal force is naturally also present (so Murray, *Romans*, 1:203; Ridderbos, *Romeinen*, p. 131).] is difficult to understand other than in an existential sense. The close parallel with verse 5 in structure as well as in thought is apparent, so that in view of the invariable connection between resurrection and life (cf. esp. vv. 9f.), living with Christ as an individual, experiential reality presupposes an inception of that state, a co-resurrection, of the same order.

信徒向罪死了，因為他們先與基督聯合；
信徒與基督聯合，才能在基督的死、埋葬，復活上與祂聯合；洗禮是記號

Before leaving this passage, one point already noted along with several of its implications needs to be stressed. In establishing his central thesis that believers have died to sin, Paul does not argue directly from their involvement in Christ's death. Rather his death is their death because they are united to *him*. Baptism is into his death because baptism is "into Christ Jesus" (v. 3). In other words, union with Christ is the basic conception; only because believers are joined to him as he is by virtue of his death (crucifixion, burial, and resurrection) can they be said to participate in these events, to have died with him, and so forth.

與基督聯合是指信徒經驗上的聯合，
雖然與基督聯合也指創世以前的預定，和救贖歷史上的聯合

Two further sets of observations amplify this point:

[1] 與基督聯合、接連主要是指應驗（救贖秩序）方面的聯合。這個聯合，作成信徒現今的生命，也形容信徒的生命。The union, the being joined to Christ in view here is primarily *experiential* (*heilsordelijk*) in nature. It is a union which is constitutive as well as descriptive of the actual existence of the individual believer. To be sure, the range of the Pauline "in Christ" is much broader than the actual life histories of individual believers. It is eternal in scope. Believers have been chosen "in him before the foundation of the world" (Eph. 1:4; cf. Rom. 8:29). And almost every one of the passages already examined indicate in some way the solidarity of believers with Christ in the past, definitive, historical experiences of the latter. 在創世以前「在基督裏」的預定，和在救贖歷史裏的「在基督裏」，都不能抹煞在經驗上「在基督裏」的獨特性。But neither the predestinarian "in Christ" nor the redemptive-historical "in Christ" eclipse the distinctiveness of the existential "in Christ."

This experiential aspect is present in Romans 6:3ff. wherever crucifixion, death, burial, resurrection, or life with Christ are mentioned. As we have tried to show, these references describe the actual life experience of the individual believer. The distinctness of this conception of experiential union is clearly expressed in Paul's description of baptism as baptism *into* Christ (v. 3). 洗禮是記號與印記，表明受洗者（在應驗上）從與基督隔離，轉移到（在經驗上）與基督聯合。Baptism signifies and seals a transition in the experience of the recipient, a transition from being (existentially) apart from Christ to being (existentially) joined to him. Galatians 3:27 is even more graphic: "Those who have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ" (cf. I Cor. 12:13). ["... the phrase describes the manner of entering upon the state of being-in-Christ. 那些受洗歸入 (into) 基督的人，事後就是在基督裏了。Those who are baptized *into* Christ are those who afterwards are *in* Christ" (E. Best, *One Body in Christ* [London: S.P.C.K., 1955], p. 73).]

與基督聯合是應驗：以弗所書；以前沒有基督，死在罪惡過犯中；經歷了「與基督一同活過來」之後，就被改變了，現在「在基督裏」

Union with Christ as an experiential reality is also distinguished rather clearly in Ephesians 2:12 where Paul says that the Ephesian Christians, chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world (1:4), were “at that time separated (chwrís) from Christ.” “Formerly” (vv. 11, 13) and “at that time” (v. 12) hardly have a different reference than “formerly” in verses 2 and 3. The Christless, alien state described in the immediate context of verse 12 coincides with the “walk” in trespasses and sins mentioned in verses 1ff. Consequently, the transition described in verses 5f. as being made alive with Christ, etc. pivots on being joined to Christ in an existential sense. The variations of the “in Christ” formula used repeatedly to describe the state resultant upon this transition confirm this experiential sense (vv. 6, 7, 10, 13, 15, 22). The transition from being an object of God’s wrath (v. 3) to experiencing his love (v. 4) takes place at the point of being joined (existentially) to Christ.

被呼召乃是被召與基督有份

Similarly, the effectual call of the gospel is a call into personal communion (eis koinwnian) with Christ (I Cor. 1:9). [“Although they had been chosen in Christ before times eternal, yet they were Christless until they were called effectually into the fellowship of God’s Son (I Cor. 1:9)” (Murray, *Redemption: Accomplished and Applied*, p. 205).] And the immediate end of having died to the law through the body of Christ for the purpose of bearing fruit to God is being joined (eis to genesthai) to the resurrected Christ (Rom. 7:4).

經歷與基督聯合 = 保羅救贖論中最基本的觀念，不可與在基督裏被預定，和兩千年前與基督同受難、復活分隔

There is no element in the whole of Paul’s soteriology more basic than this existential union with Christ. To treat it in abstraction from or to the exclusion of the ideas that believers have been chosen eternally in Christ and were contemplated as one with Christ at the time of his sufferings, death and resurrection would of course radically distort Paul’s perspective. The predestinarian, the past historical and the existential “in Christ” are indissolubly connected. The former two, each in its own way, are the basis for and give rise to the latter. But precisely this organic bond, this inseparability, makes equivocation in dealing with Paul’s teaching on union with Christ a subtle danger to which the interpretation of Paul is constantly exposed. Falling upon the Scylla of equivocation may not be so serious an error as shipwreck on the Charybdis of isolation or exclusion; however, the former can hardly fail to produce a confused understanding of Paul. For, as we have seen and will continue to see, in Paul’s soteriology the realization of redemption in the experience of the individual, both in its inception and in its continuation, is based on the *experience* of being joined to Christ.

與基督同死、埋葬、復活是一件事

[2] Reflection on the fundamental role of union with Christ in Romans 6:3ff. not only discloses its primarily experiential force there, but also the (existential) crucifixion, death, burial and resurrection mentioned are not distinct or separate occurrences in the experience of the individual believer. Each is not a separate stage in an *ordo salutis* but an aspect of the single, indivisible event of being joined to Christ experientially. This needs to be kept in view continuously in discussing the idea of being raised with Christ. The latter is always exponential of the experience of incorporation. Romans 7:4 makes this clear: the positive end interposed between having died to the law (as the instrument of sin, v. 13) through the body of Christ and bearing fruit to God (cf. v. 6 with 6:4c) is not being raised with Christ but being joined to him as the one who has been raised.

CHRIST BECAME LIFE-GIVING SPIRIT

[Richard B. Gaffin, Jr., *Resurrection and Redemption: A Study in Paul's Soteriology*, Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1987, pp. 78-92.]

林前 I CORINTHIANS 15:45

耶穌是賜生命的靈：須從上下文理解： 45-49 節； 22 節

Christ = Life-giving Pneuma; See Context: vv. 45-49; vv. 22ff.

Our interest in this verse is the description of Christ, the last Adam, as “lifegiving pneuma” (pneuma zwopoion). However, nowhere in the whole of Paul is a statement more inextricably embedded in both its narrower and broader contexts. In verses 45-49 together with verse 22, “Paul provides us with what is one of the most striking and significant rubrics in all of Scripture.” [2] Compact modes of expression and the density of thought also make it, along with verses 42-44, one of the most difficult. Some considerations, then, needs to be given to this contextual factor.

[2] Murray, *The Imputation of Adam's Sin*, p. 39.

35 節問：復活的形式 (mode)；復活身體的本質

Question (v. 35): Mode of resurrection; Nature of resurrection-body

In verse 35 Paul takes up the question of the mode of the resurrection and the nature of the resurrection body. These questions appear to have been posed by the opponents [3], probably in a derisive fashion. [4] Paul, however, treats them seriously, making of them a single, compound question which structures his discussion to the end of the chapter. Within this section, the unit of verses 42-49 contains the heart of the argument.

[3] Rather than a flat denial of the future, bodily resurrection of believers the Corinthian heresy may well have been a gnostically motivated “spiritualization” based on a one-sided appeal to Paul’s own teaching in Rom. 6:3ff.; Eph. 2:5f.; Col. 2:12f.; and similar to the error of Hymenaeus and Philetus (“the resurrection has already taken place,” II Tim. 2:17f.); cf. H. Ridderbos, *De pastorale Brieven*, CNT (Kampen: J.H. Kok, 1967), p. 211; J. Jeremias, *Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus*, NTD, 9 (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), p. 50.

[4] “Fool!” (v. 36) indicates the sharpness of Paul’s reply.

42-49 節 = 保羅論據之核心：緊湊之「對比」結構；每個字都與此「對比」有關
vv. 42-49: Heart of Paul's Argument: Careful Antithetical Structure;
Each Clause, Phrase, Word = Controlled by Central Contrast

An essential mark of this unit is it carefully implemented antithetical structure. The semantic function of particular clauses or phrases or even words is decisively controlled by their place in the central contrast running through verses 42-49. All too

frequently the history of interpretation has failed to recognize this. Remembering, then, that our final objective is not the solution of all exegetical difficulties but the explanation of verse 45c, what are the central features in the development of the argument?

42-44 節之對比：信徒死的身體 vs. 信徒的復活身體；
信徒（死前）活在肉體中之狀況；對比之範圍廣泛：兩者之處境、素質
vv. 42-44 Contrast: Believer's Dead body vs. Believer's Resurrection Body;
Somatic Condition of Pre-death Person; Contrast = re. Circumstances and Qualities

The contrast as begun in verses 42f. is between the dead body of the believer and his resurrection body. Although, strictly speaking, the corpse of the believer is in view (the four-fold repetition of “it is sown” [speipetai] makes this clear), implicitly present as well is the somatic condition of the believer prior to physical death. For Paul elsewhere refers believers to their mortal bodies (Rom. 6:12; 8:10f.; II Cor. 4:10f.; cf. here esp. vv. 53f.) and speaks of his own body at the time of writing as a “body of death” (Rom. 7:24). Even at the outset, then, the scope of the contrast is broadened by implication. At any rate, the one body is characterized by perishability, dishonor, and weakness, the other by imperishability, glory, and power. The prepositional phrases indicate circumstances or qualities of the subject rather than the manner in which the action of the verb takes place. [5] Even at these subordinate points of contrast the balanced, antithetical parallelism is carefully maintained.

[5] Grosheide, *I Corinthians*, pp. 384f.

44 節上：總結；屬血氣；屬魂 (psychical)；屬靈
v. 44a = Summary of Preceding. “Natural,” “Psychical,” “Spiritual”

Verse 44a summarizes what precedes. The single terms used to describe in a comprehensive and distinguishing fashion the bodies being contrasted are “natural,” “psychical” (psychikon) and “spiritual,” respectively.

44 節中：論據之轉變：「若」，「那麼」；44 節中本身是一個論點
v. 44b: A Turn in Argument: Apodosis (“if”) + Protasis (“then”);
v. 44b Is Itself an Argument: Argues from Psychical to Spiritual Body

Careful attention to grammar discloses an important turn in the argument at verse 44b. The contrast up to this point carried out by a series of contraposed main clauses is continued instead by joining an apodosis to a protasis (“If there is a psychical body, there is also a spiritual body”). In other words, verse 44b is itself an *argument*. Without destroying the balanced parallelism, the rigid and pointed antithesis of verses 42-44a is suddenly softened. Paul now reasons directly from the psychical body to the spiritual body. The former is made the condition for the latter; the latter is postulated on the basis of the former.

**45 支持 44 中；訴諸舊約：創 2：7；45：第一亞當之被造 vs. 最後亞當之生成；
45 建立 44 中之論點；45 句子構造：45 中、下密切關聯；45 中，45 下之「成為」
v. 45 Supports 44b by Appeal to Scripture: Gen. 2:7
v. 45: Creation of First Adam vs. Becoming of Last Adam
v. 45 Establishes 44b Argument; v 45 Syntax: 45b and 45c = Close Bond – “become”**

Verse 45 supports verse 44b by an appeal to Scripture. “Thus it is written” makes this clear. [6] The particular use of Scripture is itself one of the striking features of this verse, for Paul in citing Genesis 2:7 which mentions only the creation of (the first) Adam, finds there also a reference to the becoming of the last Adam. Two considerations show this: (1) Verse 45 functions to establish the *argument* in verse 44b. This it can do only as the appeal to Scripture covers the entire proposition, not just the protasis. (2) The syntax of verse 45 shows the close bond between 45b and 45c. The two clauses are joined asyndetically, their respective structures are closely parallel, and “become” (egeneto, from the quotation) in the former is plainly to be read in the latter. [7]

[6] So the nearly universal consensus of the commentaries (although the appeal itself has been given a number of differing evaluations). Grosheide’s failure to see this point (which significantly mars his understanding of the passage as a whole) is difficult to explain (*I Cor.*, p. 386). It is true, as he points out, that verse 45 provides an additional thought, but this does not prohibit it from grounding the argument of verse 44b.

[7] Cf. P. Bachmann, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*, ZahnK, 7, 3rd ed. (Leipzig: A Deichert, 1921), p. 466: “In view of how the scriptural proof would only be an incomplete attempt, if the second and really decisive element *ho eschatos* ... *pneuma zwothoioun* were not also intended as a constituent part of the proof; only so also was the close syntactical tie between this and the preceding clause possible.”

保羅使用創 2：7：創意；聖靈默示

Paul’s Annotation of Gen. 2:7 original; Annotation of Scripture Which is Scripture

How Paul arrived at this formulation is difficult to say. Although a certain similarity exists with the paraphrases of the Targums [8], there is no evidence of borrowing. Original with him [9], it is best understood as an annotation of Scripture equated with Scripture itself. [10]

[8] Cf. Weiss, *I Korintherbrief*, p. 373.

[9] This is the interpretative consensus at present. Cf. R. Scroggs, *The Last Adam: A Study in Pauline Anthropology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), p. 86.

[10] Note that already in verse 45b the text of Genesis 2:7 has been modified with the insertions of “first” and “Adam.” E.E. Ellis, among others, sees in this and the verse as a whole an instance of *pesher* quotation (*Paul’s Use of the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957), pp. 143f.)

亞當與基督：代表屬魂、屬靈；「屬魂」與「屬靈」之基本範例

Adam vs. Christ: Psychological vs. Spiritual; Representatives, Primary Exemplifications

As verse 45 grounds the argument of verse 44b, then, the references to the first Adam as “living soul” (psuche zosa) and the last Adam (Christ) as “life-giving pneuma” (pneuma zwopoion) serves to establish a frame of reference for understanding “psychical” (psuchikon) and “spiritual” (pneumatikon), respectively. Whatever may be in view, the two are representatives or primary exemplifications. Adam is ho psuchikos, Christ ho pneumatikos *par excellence*.

保羅之視野擴大：從身體-> 亞當，基督全人 -> 亞當（因為創造）

Paul Broad's Perspective: Bodies -> Persons -> Adam by Virtue of Creation

The trend of Paul's argument and his broadened perspectives on the resurrection of the body now begin to emerge. The contrast initiated between bodies has been expanded to include whole, living persons, persons who represent others. Moreover, on the one side, where the corpse of the believer was the point of departure, the scope has been expanded to include the person of Adam by virtue of *creation*.

44 節中：論點 = 先驗？不 44b = A Fortiori Argument? No

Recognizing this expansion facilitates understanding verse 44b as an argument. At first glance, Paul's reasoning is apparently *a fortiori*: if there is a psychical body characterized by corruption, dishonor, weakness, then all the more must there be a spiritual – powerful, glorified, incorruptible – body. [11] A major difficulty with this view, however, is that death and the qualities of the psychical body in verses 42f. are for Paul always the result of sin (Rom. 5:12; 6:16, 21, 23; cf. Rom. 1:32; 8:6, 13; I Cor. 15:56; Gal. 6:8); and where he argues *a fortiori* from sin and condemnation to grace and salvation the form he regularly employs is: “if ... much more ...” (ei ... pollw mallon ..., Rom. 5:15, 17; cf. II Cor. 3:7f., 9, 11). Moreover, apparently all *a fortiori* arguments in Paul involving a protasis with ei have this form (or its equivalent) in the apodosis (cf. Rom. 5:10; 11:12). Paul's usage elsewhere, then, favors taking verse 44b as not containing a disqualifying element in the protasis and so as reasoning *directly* from the psychical body to the spiritual body.

[11] Where attention is paid to verse 44b as an argument, this in some form is the explanation almost always given; so Grosheide, *I Cor.*, p. 385; Bachman, *I. Kor.*, p. 466; Charles Hodge, *An Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956), p. 348.

44 節中：屬魂 = 墮落前的身體；

45 訴諸亞當被造；44 中之論點 + 45 引用創 2: 7 -> 44 節中屬魂 = 墮落前身體

44b “Psychical” = Pre-fall Body; v. 45 Appeals to Creation of Adam;

(a) v. 44b Argument + (b) v. 45 Use of Gen. 2:7 -> 44b Psychical = Pre-fall Body

This conclusion, however, is apparently faced with an insuperable difficulty of its own. How can Paul say that the resurrection body with its attributes may be predicated on the basis of the body placed in the tomb with its attributes? Is Paul saying that death and life are so related synthetically that the latter can be directly inferred from the former? Such a notion is in flat contradiction with Paul's uniform teaching elsewhere. Romans 5:12-21 demonstrates clearly that life and death are no more capable of being positively correlated and postulated from each other than are righteousness and sin (cf. Rom. 6:20-23; 8:2, 6; II Cor. 2:15f.).

A way out of this dilemma, which at the same time does justice to the requirements of the text, is to recognize that "psychical" in verse 44b has a significantly broader reference than in verse 44a. The psychical body of verse 44b is the prefall, creation body, to which the characteristics (corruption, dishonor, weakness) of the psychical body of verse 44a do not belong. [12] This inference is supported by Paul's appeal in verse 45 to the creation of Adam. In fact, these two factors – the argument of verse 44b and the use of Genesis 2:7 in verse 45 – together enforce the view that the psychical body of verse 44b is the prefall body. [13]

[12] It will not do, while recognizing that the creation body is in view in verse 44b, to extend to it the depreciatory predicates of verse 42f. Paul teaches too plainly elsewhere (Rom. 5:12f.) that these things result not from Adam's creation but from his disobedience. Cf. Althaus, *Der Brief an die Roemer*, p. 88.

[13] Grosheide's argument (*I Cor.*, p. 386) that not man in general but Adam as an individual is in view in verse 45, besides missing the connection with verse 44b, fails to do justice to the fact that Paul always treats Adam (and Christ) as corporate, representative persons.

保羅為何擴大對比到墮落前身體？因為亞當的身體是預表 (type)；
創造時，亞當的身體已指向更高的身體（存在秩序）

**Why Paul expands Contrast to Pre-fall Body: Because Adam's Body Was "Type";
A Higher Body (Order) = in View Even When Adam's Body Was Created**

Why does Paul, when asked about the nature of the resurrection body and after beginning to contrast the believer's dead body with his resurrection body, suddenly expand the comparison to include the creation body? Apparently his interest is to show that from the beginning, prior to the fall, a higher or different kind of body than the body of Adam, the psychical body, is in view. Adam, by virtue of creation (not because of sin), anticipates and points to another, higher form of somatic existence. The principle of typology enunciated in Romans 5:14 is present here, albeit somewhat differently: the creation body of Adam is "a type of the one to come." This suggestion of typology helps to illumine the use of Genesis 2:7 in verse 45, especially the addition in 45c. [14]

[14] This is the position of Vos (*Eschatology*, pp. 169f., n. 19) which appears to be unique with him: "The proper solution seems to be as follows: the Apostle was intent upon showing that in the plan of God from the outset provision was made for a higher kind of body (as pertaining to a higher state of existence generally). From the abnormal body of sin no inference could be drawn to that effect. The abnormal and the eschatological are not so logically correlated that the one can be postulated from the other. But the world of creation and the world to come *are* thus correlated, the one pointing forward to the other; on the principle of typology the first Adam prefigures the last Adam, the psychical body the

pneumatic body (cp. Rom. v. 14)... The quotation proves this, because the ‘psychical’ as such is typical of the pneumatic, the first creation of the second, the world that now is (if conceived without sin) of the aeon to come.” Identical views are expressed much earlier in “Eschatology and the Spirit,” p. 232, n. 28.

45 節：對照 = 亞當（墮落前）與基督，代表範圍 = 存在秩序 (orders of existence) ；

46 節：保羅介紹這視野：廣泛之對照；時間上先後次序；

含蓋了宇宙歷史之全部；兩個原則先後掌權的歷史

45 Contrast -> Persons of (pre-fall) Adam and Christ (2 Representatives),

Scope -> Broader: 2 Environments, 2 Orders of Existence

v. 46: Paul Introduces This Horizon: Contrast = In More General terms;

Two Orders of Existence – Temporal Sequence; Covers All History;

Successive Reign of 2 Comprehensive Principles in History

If at verse 45 the contrast has been expanded to include the persons of Adam (prior to the fall) and Christ as representative of others, then its scope is really even broader; it includes the environments of which Adam and Christ in their respective (bodily) existences are necessarily exponential. That Paul actually introduces such an extended horizon emerges in verse 46. Whatever may be the reason that Paul here momentarily departs from his parallel structure [15], the contrast is not blunted but continued in significantly more general terms, and “psychical” and “spiritual” now describe two comprehensive states of affairs, two orders of existence contrasted temporally. The one follows upon the other and together they encompass the whole of history. Verse 46 is a compressed overview of history. As the era of the first Adam, the psychical order is the preeschatological aeon, the incomplete, transitory, and provisional world-age. As the era of the last Adam, the pneumatic order is the eschatological aeon, the complete, definitive, and final world-age. “to pneumatikon and to psuchikon in verse 46 are generally expressions, after which it would be a mistake to supply soma; they designate the successive reign of two comprehensive principles in history, two successive world-orders, a first and a second creation, beginning each with an Adam of its own.” [16] The perspective from which Paul views the believer’s resurrection, then, is nothing less than cosmic.

[15] The usual view that Paul is giving a pointed refutation of a Philonic exegesis of genesis 1 and 2 is rejected by Scroggs, *Last Adam*, pp. 87f.

[16] Vos, “Eschatology and the Spirit,” p. 23. To read “body” in this verse (so Grosheide, *I Cor.*, p. 387 and Bachman, *I. Kor.*, p. 469) misses the basic trend of the argument.

47-49：「屬地」 vs. 「屬天」；亞當屬地；先屬地，後屬天；45，47 = 兩種狀態
47-49 “Earth” vs. “Heaven”；First Earthly, Then Heavenly; 45-47: 2 Orders / States

While verses 47-49 resume the balanced, antithetical parallelism, the contrast, up to this point expressed by psuche and pneuma, with their adjectives, is continued instead by the pair “earth-heaven” (gh-ouranos) and related adjectives. Although these two sets of terms are not synonymous, they are plainly correlative here and have the same frame

of reference. This introduction of expressly cosmological language makes explicit the comprehensive dimensions of the contrast.

Verse 47 closely parallels verse 45 by contrasting Adam and Christ, the difference being that now the one is “from earth, earthly,” the other “from heaven.” These prepositional phrases (ek ghs, ekx ouranou) are predicates and have qualitative force. [17] The latter no more refers to the coming of Christ out of the state of preexistence at his incarnation [18] than the former means that preexistent Adam “came” out of the earth of creation. Besides, such a notion applied to Christ would contradict the principle just laid down in verse 46: not first the pneumatic, but first the psychical then the pneumatic. [19] The parallelism also excludes the notion that “from heaven” refers to the second coming. [20] This qualitative interpretation [21] is confirmed in verses 48 and 49 by the application of the adjective “heavenly” (arising from the use of the prepositional phrase) to believers as well as Christ. It can hardly mean that the former have come out of heaven. [22] Verses 45 and 47 describe states resulting from a becoming that for Adam took place at his creation, for Christ at a point yet to be determined. *Whether or in what condition Christ existed prior to that point is here outside Paul’s scope.*

[17] So Deissner, *Auferstehungshoffnung und Pneumagedanke bei Paulus*, p. 43; Vos, *Eschatology*, pp. 167f.; Ridderbos, *Paul*, p. 76, n. 110; cf. N. Turner, *Syntax*, J.H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. 3 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963), p. 260; M. Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, Scripta pontificii institute Biblici, 114 (Rome, 1963), pp. 45f.

[18] The view of Hodge (*I Cor.*, p. 352) and Grosheide (*I Cor.*, p. 388).

[19] Cf. Vos, *Eschatology*, p. 168.

[20] A reference to the second advent is found, e.g., by Bachman, *I. Kor.*, p. 469 and Robertson-Plummer, *I Cor.*, p. 374; cf. Weiss, *I. Kor.*, p. 376.

[21] choikos (v. 47a), which has no parallel in verse 47b, is redundant, emphasizing the qualitative force of the preceding phrase and so of the corresponding phrase in the second half of the verse as well. Weiss (*I. Kor.*, p. 376) suggests a reflection here of the language of genesis 2:7a in the Septuagint: choun apo ths ghs.

[22] Cf. Vos, *Eschatology*, pp. 167f., n. 18. A similar adjectival use of “from heaven” is found in II Cor. 5:2; cf. Mark 11:30.

48, 49 節：亞當與基督：不只個人的對照；為首 = Constitutive Primacy：
屬地的人，有屬地亞當的形象；屬天的人，有屬天的基督的形象；
49 下答 35：復活的形式與身體因與基督 – 最後亞當，屬天者，賜生命之靈 – 聯合
48, 49: Adam and Christ: Primacy = Constitutive;
Earthly Ones are Earthly as They in Solidarity with Earthly One Bear His Image;
Heavenly Ones are Heavenly as They in Union with Heavenly One Bear His Image
49b Answers v. 35: Mode of Resurrection & Nature of Resurrection Body:
Re. Union with Christ, Last Adam, Heavenly one, Life-giving Pneuma

Verses 48 and 49 make plain that Adam and Christ are being compared not simply as individuals. Associated with Adam as *the* earthly one (ho choikos) are those of

the earthly order; associated with Christ as *the* heavenly one (ho epouranios) are those of the heavenly order. Moreover, not only their representative capacity but also the *constitutive* nature of their primacy is prominent here. “The earthly ones” are such only as they in solidarity with “the earthly one” bear his image; “the heavenly ones” are such only as they in union with “the heavenly one” bear his image. Verse 49b both brings to a climax the contrast begun in verse 42 and expresses the focal consideration in answer to the questions in verse 35: the mode of the resurrection and the nature of the resurrection body are to be explained in terms of union with Christ, the last Adam, as the heavenly one, the life-giving pneuma. [23]

[23] The proximate reference of “the image of the heavenly” is the “spiritual body” of verse 44. Certainly, however, it brings into view more broadly the incorruptible, glorious, powerful character of personal existence in the pneumatic, heavenly order.

亞當與基督對照：整體、完全相反；為首，為代表；

代表 2 個生存秩序，世代，宇宙時代，不同的創造：先、後，含蓋宇宙歷史

Summary: Adam/Christ = Living Soul vs. Life-giving Pneuma:

Comprehensive, Exclusive Contrast; Heads, Representing, Constituting 2 Orders, 2 Aeons, 2 World-periods, 2 Creations; Successive, Span Entire Flow of Time

Our findings to this point may be summarized as follows: The contrast between Adam and Christ as living soul and life-giving pneuma, respectively, is not only pointed but also comprehensive and exclusive. They are in view not only as individuals but primarily as heads representing and constituting the existence of others, and hence as representatives of two contrasting orders of life, two aeons, two world-periods, in a word, two creations – the one psychical and earthly, the other, pneumatic and heavenly. Moreover, as the one follows the other, they together span the flow of time. The order of Adam is first (cf. *prwtos*, v. 45); there is none before him. The order of Christ is second (cf. *deuteros*, v. 47); there is none between Adam and Christ. The order of Christ is last (cf. *eschatos*, v. 45); there is none after Christ. He is the eschatological man; his is the eschatological order. [24]

[24] See Murray, *Imputation*, p. 39; cf. Ridderbos (*Paul*, p. 60f.) on verse 22: “Adam and Christ here stand over against each other as the two great figures at the entrance of two worlds, two aeons, two ‘creations,’ the old and the new; and in their actions and fate lies the decision for all who belong to them, because they are comprehended in them and thus are reckoned either to death or to life.”

保羅書信中 **pneuma** 指聖靈的工作 **In Paul, pneuma = Work of the Holy Spirit**

With this preparatory spadework completed we can now concentrate on the description of Christ as life-giving pneuma in verse 45c. (1) What is the specific reference of pneuma? (2) When did he become life-giving pneuma?

(1) The first question is answered in the light of the correlation between pneuma and the adjective “spiritual” (*pneumatikon*, vv. 44b, 46), an especially close correlation in view of the overall structure of the passage and the function of verse 45 in providing

proof for verse 44b. In Paul's usage, with the exception of Ephesians 6:12, pneumatikos always has specific reference to the activity of the Holy Spirit (e.g., Rom. 1:11; 7:14; I Cor. 12:1; 14:1; Gal. 6:1; Eph. 1:3; 5:19; Col. 1:9). This is particularly apparent in I Corinthians 2:13-15, the only other place where Paul contrasts pneumatikos with psuchikos. The main emphasis of the immediate context (vv. 10ff.) is the Spirit's function in revelation (cf. v. 4), and repeated reference is made to his person (v. 10 [twice]; vv. 11, 12, 13, 14). The contrast, then, underscores the indispensability of the Spirit's activity. The phrase at the end of verse 13 (pneumatikois pneumatika sugkrinontes), whatever its precise meaning, refers to those things and that activity distinguishing the teaching ministry of the Spirit. Accordingly, the "natural man" (psuchikos anthrwpos) is unable to receive "the things of the Spirit of God" because he lacks the corresponding faculty of discerning "spiritually" (pneumatikws) requisite for understanding them (v. 14). In contrast, "the spiritual man" (ho pneumatikos), since he is qualified by the Spirit, possesses such discernment (v. 15; cf. v. 12). All four occurrences in verses 13-15 of "spiritual(ly)" plainly refer to the activity of the Holy Spirit.

保羅書信用法 -> 44 , 46 pneuma 指聖靈的工作 ; 45 指聖靈自己
From Pauline use -> I Cor. 15:44, 46 pneuma = Work of the Spirit
I Cor. 15:45 pneuma = Person of the Holy Spirit

Paul's usage elsewhere, then, favors taking "spiritual" in verses 44 and 46 as a reference to the work of the Holy Spirit. This conclusion is supported in the context by its use in verse 44 to describe the resurrection body. As such it sums up the predicates in verses 42f.: incorruption, glory, and power. These according to Paul are always elements in the closely-knit conceptual network whose core is "Spirit." [25] They are only found where the Holy Spirit is at work.

[25] See above, pp. 69f.

A combination of factors outside verse 45 inevitably points to pneuma as a specific reference to the person of the Holy Spirit. This conclusion is confirmed by the attributive qualifier "life-giving" (zwopoion). Without reintroducing what has already been said about the inseparable bond between the Spirit and life, uses of this verb (zwopoiew) elsewhere show unquestionably that the Spirit is in view here. God will "give life" to the mortal bodies of believers "through his Spirit" (Rom. 8:11). Even more decisively, II Corinthians 3:6 asserts, with the ring of a general principle: "The Spirit gives life" (cf. John 6:63; I Peter 3:18). [26]

[26] The conclusion that the Holy Spirit is in view in verse 45c, although held by Calvin (*The First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, trans. J.W. Fraser [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1960], pp. 338f.), is at variance with the standard Reformed commentaries. The position of Grosheide is puzzling. He recognizes that "spiritual" refers to the work of the Spirit. Yet he denies that the noun has reference to his person, maintaining at the same time that Christ does give life through the Spirit (*I Cor.*, p. 387). The view of Hodge is more consistent but even less true to Paul. He understands both noun and adjective as referring to the "principle of rational life" (*I Cor.*, p. 348), "rational and immortal soul" (p. 350), in contrast to "soul" understood as the "principle of animal life" (p. 348). Whether the latter, either in its usage in this passage or in Genesis 2:7, can be restricted in such a fashion is highly doubtful. Hodge's

discussion as a whole shows that the analogy of Paul's usage and the structure of his teaching have been obscured by the controlling influence of what "has ever been a fundamental principle of Christian anthropology," namely, that "the Bible recognizes in man only two subjects or distinct separable substances, the soul and body" (p. 348).

基督成為靈：不是位格上，是工作上；基督被聖靈充滿，充滿聖靈的能力，基督的工作 = 聖靈的工作；基督（為靈）賜生命 Christ as Spirit makes alive Christ Became Spirit – Not ontologically; Identity = Economical, Functional; Christ experienced Complete Spirit-endowment, That Christ (as Spirit) makes alive

Verse 45c, then, teaches that Christ became life-giving Spirit. From the context where Paul's perspective, although broad, remains entirely within the sphere of the historical, this identification is plainly not ontological, as if he were here obliterating the personal distinction between Christ and the Spirit. Such a view would be a too-flagrant contradiction of his uniform teaching elsewhere. [27] Rather, the oneness expressed has in view a conjunction between Christ (as the last *Adam*) and the Spirit dating from a point still to be determined. Christ (as *incarnate*) experiences a spiritual qualification and transformation so thorough and an endowment with the Spirit so complete that as a result they can now be equated. This unprecedented possession of the Spirit and the accompanying change in Christ result in a unity so close that not only can it be said simply that the Spirit makes alive, but also that Christ *as Spirit* makes alive. Specifically, this identity is economic or functional, in terms of their activity, and there is no need to discover "more" than this. [28]

[27] See above, pp. 71-73.

[28] Versteeg (*Christus en de Geest*, esp. pp. 381-389, cf. pp. 91, 412) prefers the term "eschatological" to describe this unity. The comment of N.A. Hamilton (*The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul*, p. 15) is unwarranted and certainly not supported by his own exegesis: "Here we see the Spirit and Christ identified in a remarkably intimate way which goes beyond all dynamic explanations."

基督什麼時候成為賜生命的靈？復活的時候

When Did Christ become Life-giving Spirit? At His Resurrection

(2) If Christ *became* life-giving Spirit, *when* did that take place? One may be inclined to say that the overall emphasis of the chapter makes it apparent that the answer is Christ's resurrection. However, representative Reformed exegesis favors the incarnation [29], and so an effort must be made to settle the issue.

[29] So Hodge, *I Cor.*, pp. 350 ff.; Grosheide, *I Cor.*, p. 387; cf. the indefinite comment of L. Morris, *the First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*, The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries, ed. R.V.G. Tasker (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1958), p. 229: "Some see a reference to the incarnation, others to the resurrection or the second advent. But Paul is not specific."

This can be done most easily by referring to verses 20-22. The close affinity of verse 22 with verse 45 is obvious: both contain not only the same explicit contrast

between Adam and Christ but also on the Christological side the same verbal idea – “making alive.” Earlier we noted the sequence of amplification in these verses [30]: Verse 21 expands on verse 20 and verse 22, in turn, on verse 21. Consequently, the “making alive” of all in Christ (the resurrection of the dead through him, v. 21) is here grounded specifically in his resurrection and, by inference, what he is by virtue of that resurrection (v. 20) [31]. An integral connection exists between Christ as firstfruits and Christ as life-giving Spirit. In fact, because Christ’s resurrection is the indispensable foundation for others to share in resurrection life, he functions as life-giving Spirit only on the basis of his resurrection, only in his resurrected state. Specifically the resurrected Christ is the life-giving Spirit. The plain implication, then, is that the last Adam became life-giving Spirit at his resurrection.

[30] See above, p. 36.

[31] The perfect tense of the verb in verse 20 confirms this inference.

This conclusion is reinforced by the functioning of the “firstfruits” principle in the immediate context of verse 45. As already noted, verse 45 at the very least introduces Christ, the last Adam, as the model spiritual man. His fuller significance as life-giving inevitably involves that he is the primary exemplification of the spiritual existence which he communicates to the rest of the harvest. Now since the (bodily) spiritual existence of believers begins at their resurrection (v. 44), in view of the solidarity involved, Christ’s spiritual existence, his becoming life-giving Spirit, dates from the resurrection.

To argue this point at length only serves to obscure it. It is neither by virtue of his preexistence or because of his incarnation that the last Adam is life-giving Spirit. The final word in this connection has been spoken by Deissner:

As a matter of fact, it would have made no sense to construct the argumentation in chapter 15 on the resurrection of Christ, if Christ were already qualified as the giver of life by virtue of his origin or by virtue of his capacity as preexistent heavenly man.[32]

[32] *Auferstehungshoffnung*, p. 40; cf. Herman, *Kyrios und Pneuma*, pp. 61f.; Guntermann, *Eschatologie*, p. 174; F. Buechsel, *Der Geist Gottes im Neuen Testament* (Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1926), p. 406; J. Jervell, *Imago Dei. Gen. 1,26f. im Spaetjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen* (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960), p. 268.

主乃是那靈：哥林多後書 3: 17
THE LORD IS THE SPIRIT: II CORINTHIANS 3:17

[Richard B. Gaffin, Jr., *Resurrection and Redemption: A Study in Pauline Soteriology*.
 Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1978, 1987. pp. 92-97.]

從林前 15: 45 理解林後 3: 17: 主 = 靈是指什麼？基於什麼？

Understand II Cor. 3:17 from I Cor. 15:45:

What is Nature of “Lord”’s Identification with “Spirit”? On What is This Based?

“The Lord is the pneuma.” Differences in the understanding of this statement are perennial. Our concern here is to examine it briefly against the background of I Corinthians 15:45 in order to determine how the two statements are related. This can be done by answering two questions: What is the nature of this identification, and on what is it based?

從上下文理解：保羅辯護自己的使徒職份

Must Understand Context: Paul Defends His Apostleship

(1) No small degree of the difficulty with this verse comes from the failure to appreciate adequately its integral place in the context. It is not an “incidental remark.” Such an assessment improperly isolates this statement with its admittedly general tone, investing it with an indefiniteness which, in turn, gives rise to all kinds of uncontrolled speculation. What is the function of verse 17 in the context?

信徒是「基督的推薦信」= 理解上下文的關鍵；服事 / 僕人的詞匯

Believers as “Letters of Christ” = Key to Understand Context;

Vocabulary of Minister/Ministry

In the section 3:1—4:6, Paul is intent on the defense of his personal integrity and apostleship. This is apparent in the opening verses of chapter 3. Paul does not commend himself nor does he need letters of commendation (v. 1), because the Corinthian believers themselves are such a letter (v. 2). In particular, the notion that they are “a letter of Christ ministered to by us” (v. 3) is a key to understanding not only the immediate but broader context. For its amplification influences the discussion to the end of the section. This can be seen provisionally in the recurrence of the vocabulary for ministry (here the verb diakonew) throughout. In verse 6 Paul identifies himself as a “minister” (diakonos) of the new covenant, and the verses immediately following (7-11) unfold around the fundamental contrast between the two “ministries” (diakonia). The occurrence of the same noun in 4:1 is an indication that Paul is still thinking in terms of this contrast at that point.

薦信由永生上帝的靈寫：基督與聖靈在救贖事工上有關連

**Letter Written by Spirit of living God:
Christ and Spirit Related in Redemptive Activity**

The letter mentioned in verse 3 is further described as written not with ink but “with the Spirit of the living God.” Apparently no one disputes that this refers to the Holy Spirit. This being the case, two important observations follow: (1) At this juncture, pivotal for the passage as a whole, Christ and the Holy Spirit are closely conjoined in terms of redemptive activity. (2) In view here is a contrast which on the one side the Spirit has a distinguishing role.

**6 節補充 3 節的對照：兩處都指聖靈；
聖靈賜生命（保羅書信其它經節）**

**Verse 6 Expands Contrast in v. 3: Both Refer to Holy Spirit;
Spirit Gives Life (Elsewhere in Paul)**

This second observation is important for determining the references in verse 6. For, while the contrast here has a broader, explicitly covenantal scope, it can hardly be other than an expansion of the contrast already introduced in verse 3. Therefore, the two occurrences of *pneuma* refer specifically to the Holy Spirit. In view of the inseparable tie between Spirit and life, this conclusion is confirmed by the generalization at the end of the verse: “the *pneuma* gives life” (cf. Rom. 8:2, 6, 10; 7:6 with 6:4; I Cor. 15:45).

對照：不是書寫的法律與沒有書寫的；
不是外在和內在的法律（法律與福音）；
對照 = 歷史性：約在不同時期的執行（安排）：舊與新的秩序

**Contrast: Not between Written and Unwritten Code;
Not External vs. Internal Code (Law and Gospel);
Contrast = Historical: between Covenant Administrations:
Old Order vs. New Order**

The wider perspective expressed in this verse makes clearer the nature of this contrast in which the Spirit figures so prominently. It is certainly not based on the “‘Marcionite’ antithesis” between a written and an unwritten code. Nor is it fundamentally an antithesis between the law as eternally and internally written, that is, between law and gospel. Rather it is pointedly *historical* in character. For it is a contrast between covenants, a contrast between successive phases in the history of redemption, between the old order and the new in which the latter is distinguished by the work of the Spirit. Verse 6 strengthens the first observation made above on verse 3, namely, that in the context Paul’s interest in the Spirit (and Christ) is historical, that is, in terms of contrasting covenantal administration (*diathkh*).

7-11 節：聖靈在新約 vs. 摩西在舊約；生命，義，榮耀 vs. 死，定罪，無榮耀；

歷史對照秩序到 4: 1

**Vv. 7-11: Holy Spirit in New Covenant vs. Moses in Old Covenant;
Contrast is Historical, to 4:1**

Verses 7-11, with their antithetically parallel structure, clearly develop the contrast outlined in verse 6. So far as personal exponents are concerned, the Spirit is associated with the new covenant in contrast with Moses and the old. The former covenant as the ministry of the Spirit is a ministry of life and righteousness; the latter, a ministry of death and condemnation (vv. 7-9). The glory of the new outshines that of the old as if the latter had none (vv. 10f.). Again, note that this (historical) concern with ministries (and covenants) is still in Paul's mind in 4:1.

12 節起：繼續對照：舊約為什麼帶來死與定罪：

帕子在以色列人心中；新約有效性：以色列轉向主時，帕子除去

**12ff. Continues Contrast: Why Old Covenant Brings Death:
Veil Lies Over Israelites' Hearts;
New Covenant's Efficacy = Removal of Veil in Christ**

Although they do not display the same antithetical parallelism, verses 12ff. continue to contrast. On the one hand, they explain why the old covenant, the ministry of Moses, the reading of the law, was a ministry of condemnation and death – because of the hardened minds of the sons of Israel (v. 14), because a veil lies over their hearts (v. 15). On the other hand, the ground for the efficacy of the new covenant is indicated: the veil is removed in Christ (v. 14), taken away, when Israel turns to the Lord (v. 16).

小結：3-6 節聖靈與摩西對照；12 節起：基督與摩西對照；

問題：為什麼從「靈」而來的榮耀，生命，義 = 從「主」基督而來？

**3-6 Contrast: Spirit vs. Moses; 12ff. Contrast: Christ vs. Moses:
Question: Why “Glory, Righteousness, Life” of Spirit = from “the Lord”?**

Summarizing the central features of our survey, the redemptive-historical contrast intimated in verse 3 and defined broadly in terms of the old and new covenants (v. 6) is developed in verses 7ff., where the superiority and surpassing glory of the new order are expressed personally by the contrast between the Spirit and Moses. At verse 12, however, a shift takes place. Now the superiority and efficacy of the new are indicated by the personal contrast between Christ and Moses. This shift, then, prompts the question: if the surpassing glory, life, and righteousness of the new covenant result from its being a ministry of the *Spirit*, how can they be attributed in effect to *Christ*, to the Lord? What warrants this shift?

17 節上「主乃是（那）靈」回答問題：

從新的約的有效性、救贖的作為來看，基督與靈是「合一」的

17a “Lord Is Spirit” Answers:

Christ & Spirit = One in New Covenant’s Efficacy, in Redemptive Activity

The integral function of verse 17a in the context is to provide the answer to this question, i.e., because the Lord is the Spirit. Paul makes the preceding shift from the Spirit to Christ, because *in terms of the efficacy of the new covenant*, they are one. The conjunction between Christ and the Spirit already indicated in verse 3 (and so, continually in the background) is here made most explicit and intimate: in terms of their redemptive activity, they are identified.

17 上 = 本段的關鍵；整段有歷史取向；「主乃是那靈」不是指本體上的等同；因基督被聖靈改變，兩者的救贖功能合一；基督成為賜生命的靈

17a = Integral to Passage; Passage = History-Oriented;

“Lord is Spirit” is Not Ontological Identification;

Spirit Transformed Christ; thus Redemptive Function of Both = One;

Christ Became Life-Giving Spirit

In view of the integral place of verse 17a in this passage with its pervasive historical orientation, it is clearly unwarranted to understand this equation ontologically. By the same token the elements of thought found in I Corinthians 15:45 are present here: an integration in the exercise of redemptive functions expressed as oneness, and a oneness, in turn, resting on a pneumatic transformation of Christ’s person so thorough that he and the Spirit are identified. The Lord is the Spirit because he *became* life-giving Spirit.

17 下，18 支持「救贖工作的等同」看法：

「主的靈」表示：「主」與「靈」不同；兩者賜自由

17b, 18 Supports Interpreting “Lord is Spirit” re. Economy/Function:

“Spirit of the Lord” Expresses Distinction; Both Give Freedom

Verses 17b and 18 substantiate this economic interpretation. “The Spirit of the Lord” (17b) expresses a distinction showing that the equation just made is not intended in an absolute, ontological sense. And the mention of freedom clearly maintains the functional tone. Along with glory, righteousness, and life, it is one of the blessings of the new covenant closely associated with the work of the Spirit (Rom. 8:2, cf. Gal. 4:21-5:1; 5:13 with 5:16ff.). Similarly, the transformation of believers described in verse 18 (cf. the removal of the veil, vv. 14, 16) takes place *apo kuriou pneumatos*. However exactly the two nouns in this phrase are to be related, they bring into view a close conjunction between Christ and the Spirit in the work of redemption, a conjunction explained by the equation of verse 17a.

什麼時候成為？基督復活的時候成為賜生命的靈，因此那時主「是」靈

When? At Christ's Resurrection He Became Life-Giving Spirit; Now He IS Spirit

(2) On what is this functional identification in verse 17 based? If this oneness has a redemptive-historical character, when does it begin? This question can only be answered in the light of the affinity with I Corinthians 15:45 already noted. Both verses are pivotal in contrasts where a redemptive-historical outlook is determinative, functioning to explain the dynamic in the realization of the final order, the new creation. Seen in their respective contexts, I Corinthians 15:4c and II Corinthians 3:17a are closely correlative so that it is difficult to evade the conclusion that the identification expressed in the latter dates from Jesus' resurrection. Because at his resurrection he became life-giving Spirit, now he is the Spirit.

上下文支持結論：生命，義，自由從主而來；主乃是（那）靈；
林前 15：42 起：這些福份都是末後亞當復活，成為賜生命的靈時所賜的
**Support:Context: Life, Righteousness, Freedom = from the Lord, Who Is the Spirit;
I Cor. 15:42f.: Benefits from Last Adam Made Life-giving Spirit at Resurrection**

This conclusion is confirmed in the immediate context. The new covenant glory emphasized throughout (vv. 7-11, esp. 10, 11, 18; 4:4, 6) and its concomitants – life, righteousness, and liberty, derive from the Lord, who is the Spirit (vv. 17f.; 4:4-6). Now I Corinthians 15:42ff. show clearly that the bestowal of these benefits depends on the last Adam as he has been invested with glory and made life-giving Spirit at the resurrection. Accordingly, while the resurrection is not mentioned explicitly, 3:1—4:6 is an extended witness to the dependence of the blessings given under the new covenant on the glorified and living Christ, that is, the Christ who is what he is by virtue of resurrection.

結論：從本體論，系統神學角度觀點解釋，忽略救贖歷史角度的解釋
Conclusion: Dogmatic (Systematic Theology) View Obscures Redemptive History

Conclusion. The centrality of the historical factor in I Corinthians 15:45 and II Corinthians 3:17 needs to be emphasized especially in view of the abiding tendency to read Paul in terms of dogmatic conceptions which, although in themselves biblical, obscure this point. The identity affirmed in these verses is not an aspect of the eternal, ontological relationship between Christ and the Spirit. It is not “an identity of essence and power” (Hodge). Rather it is a being one which is based on a *becoming* one, a oneness of the Spirit and the last Adam (the *incarnate* Son) dating from his resurrection. It is a functional, dynamic identity. Consequently, the unity of Christ and the Spirit in saving activity is not to be delineated exclusively in terms of their common divinity and eternity. Where this is not appreciated, the historical character of redemption so basic for Paul is seriously undercut. An ontological interest has a definite place in Paul's Christology, as we shall presently see, but to read these verses primarily in terms of that interest results in an impoverished understanding of his soteriology as a whole.

「與基督聯合」的教義面面觀
PERSPECTIVES ON THE
DOCTRINE OF UNION WITH CHRIST

導論 Introduction

(a) 有些基督徒一想到「與基督聯合」，腦裡情不自禁地浮現一個私人、甜蜜、神秘的靈命境界，好像一些福音派的詩歌描述的：「在花園裡」與基督同步，共話；耶穌是最甜蜜的名字，等等。

Sometimes, Christians conceive of “union with Christ” only in terms of a private, sweet, spiritual, mystical relationship – many of evangelical “gospel songs” express this sentiment, e.g. “I come to the garden alone”, “Jesus is the sweetest name I know”, etc. It is an image of a very ideal condition of our walk with God.

(b) 有些基督徒把「與基督聯合」(union with Christ) 和「與基督相交」(communion with Christ) 混為一談。後者(communion – 這裡不是指聖餐) 可以指個人的禱告，默想上帝的話，在基督徒的品格上操練等；不等於「與基督聯合」。Other Christians confuse “union with Christ” with “communion” – “communion” is related to our regular exercises of personal devotion to and intimacy with Christ, in prayer, meditation on God’s Word, discipline in Christian character, etc. “Communion” is not the same as “union.”

(c) 對上面所指的基督徒來說，把「與基督聯合」說成是一項「教義」，可能很不習慣。「與基督聯合的教義」聽起來，是否太過學術性？

For these Christians, it may be a little difficult to approach “union with Christ” as a theological subject matter. The “theology” or “doctrine” of union with Christ may sound a little too academic.

請忍耐一下，讓我們思考：「與基督聯合」的教義，須從幾個不同角度理解。

I ask that these Christians be patient with us as we explore the different perspectives we should keep in mind as we think about our union with Christ.

1. 永恆的角度：神的預旨 ETERNAL PERSPECTIVE: GOD’S DECREE

我們與基督的聯合(關係)是建立在上帝永恆的計劃(預旨)裡。上帝在永恆裡，在創世之前，「在基督裡」揀選了我們；意思是，上帝在永恆裡已經計劃，使我們與基督聯合。(弗 1：3-4) 上帝的預旨，是我們與基督聯合的基礎。

The foundation for our union (relationship) with Christ is the fact that, in eternity, God has decreed to choose/elect us (his elect people) “in Christ”, that is, “in union with Christ” (Ephesians 1:3-4). God has planned in eternity to unite us with Christ.

注：每次新約《聖經》用「在基督裡」這詞，我們可以理解為：「既然我們與基督聯合」，或「與基督聯合」。「在基督裡」是一個意義豐富的詞彙。

Note: Every time the New Testament uses the phrase “in Christ,” we can safely assume that it means: “as we are united with Christ,” “in union with Christ,” etc. It is a rich phrase heavily loaded with doctrinal/spiritual meaning.

2. (救贖) 歷史的角度：救恩的成就

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE: ACCOMPLISHMENT OF REDEMPTION

上帝既然在永恆裡預旨我們與基督聯合，就在歷史(時空)裡執行(implement)了。上帝在歷史中成就(accomplish)了救贖－藉基督道成肉身、一生、十字架上的死、復活、升天。基督的工作(這些歷史事實)是上帝(從舊約到新約)救贖歷史的高潮。God’s eternal decree concerning our union with Christ, is implemented – salvation is accomplished – by the historical facts of Christ’s incarnation, life, death, resurrection and ascension. These historical facts are the climax of all that God has accomplished in the history of redemption (from OT to NT).

這些歷史事實同樣是建立我們與基督聯合的基礎。保羅說，基督若沒有從死裡復活，我們的信仰是枉然的(林前 15 章)。當然我們不是靠著相信這些事實得救(我們信的是主耶穌!)，可是我們的信仰/救恩，不能缺少這些成就救恩的歷史事實。The historical facts of Christ’s accomplishment of salvation also form a “foundation” for our union with Christ. Paul says that if Christ was not risen physically, our faith is in vain (I Cor. 15:1-20; 21ff.). Now of course, our faith/trust does not rely on these historical facts alone (we trust in Christ!); but without these facts of Christ accomplishing redemption, we will not have true salvation. Our salvation depends on these facts.

兩千年前耶穌基督死和復活時，上帝看我們是在基督裏：我們與祂同死，同復活。Two thousand years ago when Jesus died and rose from the dead, God reckoned (treated) us as “in Christ”: therefore we did die with Christ, and did rise with Christ.

3. 聖經神學的角度：約裡的聯合 **BIBLICAL-THEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE: COVENANTAL/FEDERAL UNION**

耶穌基督在歷史上成就的救贖事件，不只是一些「孤存的事實」。這些事實有上帝親自在《聖經》裡，事先(舊約，新約)和事後(新約)的解釋。我們認識這些事實，都是一些帶有上帝解釋的事實。若要理解基督的位格(祂是誰)和工作(祂成就了什麼)的教義，必須從「上帝如何對待祂的選民」的角度來看。

The historical facts of Christ’s work (incarnation, life, death, resurrection, ascension) are not “brute facts”. They are pre-interpreted (OT and NT) and post-interpreted (NT) by God in Scripture. So we come to know and understand these historical facts as pre-interpreted facts (pre-interpreted by God). In Scripture, the doctrine of the person and work of Christ is couched in the context of God’s dealings with his people.

在舊約《聖經》裡，上帝與祂選民的关系，上帝如何對待他們，都要從「約」(covenant) 的角度來看。「約」是上帝與選民關係的主題。新約《聖經》裡，主耶穌宣講祂與祂來要救贖的人(選民) 建立的關係；祂以「天國」(kingdom) 為主題。
In the Old Testament, “covenant” was the main theme of God’s relationship with his chosen people. In the New Testament, “kingdom” was the main theme of Christ’s proclamation concerning his relationship with the people he came to save.

無論是「約」或「天國」，上帝如何對待祂的選民？上帝以聖潔與公義；不過最明顯的，是以恩典。因此這救贖工作之「約」在神學上被稱為「恩典之約」。
Whether in the “covenant” or in the “kingdom”, how does God deal with his people? In holiness and in righteousness, of course; but most evidently, God deals with them in grace. Therefore, this covenant in God’s redemptive plan is called “the covenant of grace” by theologians.

在舊約裡，上帝向祂的選民說：「你們要作我的子民，我要作你們的上帝。」這就是上帝在舊約裡表達「我愛你」的說法。(出 19：5-6，彼前 2：9)。
在新約裡，耶穌基督向祂的門徒(選民) 說：「我必永遠與你們同在」，「我在你裡面，你在我裡面」－這樣，耶穌說「我愛你」。
In the Old Testament, God’s pronouncement of grace and love is made when he says, “You shall be my people, I shall be your God.” This is God’s Old-Testament-way of saying, “I love you.” (Exodus 19:5-6; I Peter 2:9).
In the New Testament, Jesus says “I love you” with statements like: “I shall be with you always,” “I in you, you in me,” etc.

上帝的「約」的中心是祂的恩典/愛。上帝的約是表現祂的愛/恩典的形式。
The heart of the covenant is God’s grace/love. The form of God’s grace is the covenant.

在恩典之約裡，主耶穌基督是祂選民的頭，也是他們的代表。耶穌基督是祂的選民的「約中之元首與代表」(federal/covenant head and representative)。藉著祂的順服，耶穌的選民得到豐富的恩典，被稱為義，永遠在生命中作王(羅 5：15-21)。
In the covenant of grace, Jesus Christ is the head of his people. Jesus is the representative of his people. Jesus Christ, in other words, is the federal (covenant) head and representative of his people. By his obedience, his people receive grace (which abounds to many), are justified, and live (as kings) forever (Romans 5:15-21).

我們可是說，下列名詞大體上是同義詞：

We consider the following to be rough equivalents:

舊約的「約」 = 新約的「天國」

OT “covenant people” = NT “kingdom”

「約」 = 「律法與福音」 = 「福音」 = 「恩典之約」

“Covenant” = “law and gospel” = “gospel” = “covenant of grace”

因此我們與基督的聯合是「約中的聯合」。我們須了解神所設立「恩典之約」的條件，才能理解我們與基督的聯合。神親自，單方面訂了「約」的所有條件。

Therefore, our union with Christ is that of “covenantal union.” We cannot understand our union with Christ without understanding the terms and conditions of the covenant, all of which were sovereignly and unilaterally laid down by God himself.

「約」這觀念幫助我們了解，神單方面，主權的計劃。不過「約」同時有「人的責任」方面的條件。「約」能幫助我們理解我們與基督的關係，既是個人的，也是群體的 – 當我們與基督聯合時，我們也同時與基督的子民/身體，教會聯合。“Covenant” allows us to understand both the unilateral, sovereign designs of God, and the human responsibility which God requires of us. It helps us understand that our relationship with Christ is both individual/personal and corporate – as we are united with Christ, we are also united with his people, his body the Church.

4. 聖靈的工作的角度：屬靈的聯合，奧秘的聯合

THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT: SPIRITUAL/MYSTICAL UNION

在人的實際經歷中將我們與基督聯合的，是聖靈的工作。聖靈重生(再生)我們，以致我們能進入上帝的國度裡。聖靈賜給我們悔改和信心；這都是祂給的恩賜。聖靈是賜兒子名份的靈；聖靈與我們的心靈作證，我們是神的兒子。因此我們與基督的聯合是一個屬靈的聯合。「屬靈」的意思就是，「是聖靈作成的」。

It is specifically the Holy Spirit who unites us with Christ in human experience. The Spirit re-births (regenerates) us, so that we can enter the kingdom of God. The Spirit grants us the gifts (graces) of repentance and faith. The Spirit is the Spirit of adoption, testifying in our hearts and with our hearts, that we are children of God. Etc. Therefore, our “union with Christ” is a “spiritual union.” The word “spiritual” refers to the fact that it is the Holy Spirit’s work which brings about the union.

除此以外，「屬靈」的意思是，我們與基督的聯合不僅是肉體/物質上的聯合。我們不須爬上木架，再釘自己在十字架上(每年在拉丁美洲，菲律賓等地都有人這樣作!)。我們與基督的關係，有聖靈的印記；聖靈親自作為印記。

“Spiritual” also means that our union with Christ is not a mere “physical” union. We do not have to climb onto a wooden cross and hang there for 6 hours, in order to feel more intimate with Jesus (every year, some devout Catholic believers in Latin America and the Philippines do do that!). Our relationship with Christ is “sealed” by the sealing of the Holy Spirit. Indeed, the Holy Spirit IS our seal and pledge.

5. 與基督聯合的核心意義

THE CORE MEANING OF UNION WITH CHRIST

與基督聯合的核心意義，就是在基督裡，與基督同死。在基督裡，與基督同復活。The core meaning of “union with Christ,” is to die with Christ in Christ, and to rise from the dead with Christ in Christ.

6. 奧秘的聯合，真實的聯合，個人(親自)的聯合 MYSTICAL/REAL/PERSONAL/INDIVIDUAL UNION

我們與基督的關係雖是「屬靈」的，可是的確是真實的關係/聯合。不是想像出來的；不是由感情「製造」(硬逼)出來的！聖靈賜給上帝選民祂自己的洗禮；聖靈使我們與基督聯合；這是事實！我們與基督的聯合是千真萬確的事實。

Even though our relationship is “spiritual,” it is very real. It is not imaginary, it is not a relationship produced by our feelings. It is a fact that, the Holy Spirit baptizes God’s elect people, and unites them with Christ. Our union with Christ is very real.

我們與基督的聯合，在我們的經驗中是一個奧秘的，非常個人的，真實的聯合。

「奧秘」的意思是：當我們降服我們的理性在聖靈的掌管之下認識神大能的奇妙的恩典大工；當我們降服我們的心與意志，終生信靠，順服，敬拜，愛神的時—還有很多事情，是我們不可能理解的。這叫「奧秘」。

It is experienced as a mystical, personal, real union. “Mystical” means “mysterious” – after we surrender our reason to the Holy Spirit’s control, and try to understand God’s powerful, wonderful, gracious work for us and in us, after we surrender our will and heart to trust, obey, worship and love God all our lives, there is still much which we do not understand.

「神學就是讚美學」。奧秘催使我們詫異，在神面前降服，敬拜。

“Theology is doxology.” (Edmund P. Clowney, former president, Westminster Seminary.) Mystery drives us to worship God in awe and wonder.

可是，我們必須提防不要墮進神秘主義裡。奧秘與神秘主義大不相同。

「神秘主義」的意思是：要認識神/耶穌基督，必須繞過理性(早期遠志明著作：理性是原罪，因此人必須從理性中被拯救出來)，或繞過我們的理性，心與意志 = 繞過「魂」(倪柝聲，李常受)，只以直覺與上帝交通。在這種的理解中，信心裡沒有知，情，意(是「空」了知，情，意的信心)。這不是《聖經》宣講的基督教!

However, we must guard against mysticism. “Mystery” and “mysticism” are totally different. “Mysticism” means: in order to know God, we must bypass our minds (Yuan Zhiming: reason is original sin; original sin consists of reason; we must be saved from our reason), or bypass our minds, hearts and wills (Watchman Nee, Witness Lee) and use our intuition. Faith, then, is exclusively a matter of intuition: faith excludes the use of the mind, emotions and will. Faith is devoid of mind, emotions and will.

This is not Christianity according to the Bible!