

田立克《系統神學》之述介及簡評－中華神學資源探索

徐濟時

引言：

田立克（或譯蒂利希，Paul Johannes Tillich，1886 - 1965，下亦稱田氏）去世達半世紀，但世界各地（包括北美、德國、法國）仍有不少以他命名的學會繼續辦國際學術會議探討他的思想，他晚年任教的哈佛大學亦自 1990 每年或隔年辦 Paul Tillich Lectures 講座，可見他的影響力是一直在世界各地延續下去。¹ 田立克學術地位和聲譽超越學界（兩度貴為時代周刊 *Time* 封面人物），成就可謂「世界級」，及得上同年齡的巴特，田氏的神學路線卻與同出自「德國土壤」神學的巴特大有不同，尤其是他重視回應現世文化的「處境神學」(Theology of Correlation)。這方向與近年推動的「中華神學」也重視文化處境這方面，存在共通點，可作他山之石。筆者先要澄清，在此推介的是田氏的神學方法，不是其神學立場（大師級神學通常備受爭議是西方常態）。

田立克著作等身，以 *The Courage to Be* (1952) 和 *Dynamics of Faith* (1957) 最受平信徒追捧，他晚年將其一生的神學教材，始自上世紀 1924 年在德 Marburg 大學至 1933 年往美後在紐約協和、哈佛和芝加哥三大神學院所教所講，應不少博士生欲專研其神學之呼聲，用上十多年時間整理成畢生代表作、一書三冊的 *Systematic Theology* 《系統神學》(1951 出系 1, 1957 出系 2, 1963 出系 3)。本書所引是 University of Chicago Press (Three volumes in one) 1967 出版的版本，這英文原著頁碼因沿用三冊而有重複，故引用上要分開稱為：V1/系 1、V2/系 2、V3/系 3。本文以此套書作一開步研究，「述介」他獨特的神學方法，而筆者的「簡評」會清楚表明，免生混淆。為忠於原著及方便未能覓得該書的研究者，本文採取直譯或撮譯其內容並附以原文（不用引號以便利閱讀）放在註腳，盼利研究之士掌握第一手資料。

這一套書在首冊的導論(Introduction)，用上長達 70 頁，全面述介他的神學治學方法（並論到神學思想內容）；導論本身已是一精彩學術著作，值得逐一析讀。為免原導論標題排序的數字和字母易生混亂（見下，系 1, xiii），下文只按原文的 1 至 13 點標題（融入 ABD 大標題）的次序來作述評。

1. INTRODUCTION

A. The Point of View (觀點角度，下連 1、 2 一併中譯)

1. Message and Situation

2. Apologetic Theology and the Kerygma

B. The Nature of Systematic Theology (系統神學性質，下連 3 至 7 一併中譯)

¹ 本人於 2021 年 1 月寫了一篇「當代西方神學家的生命問題」有論到田立克，可作本文的延伸閱讀，見於中華神學研究中心網頁 ctrcentre.org 內「研究季報 02 期」。

3. The Theological Circle
4. Two Formal Criteria of Every Theology
5. Theology and Christianity
6. Theology and Philosophy: A Question
7. Theology and Philosophy: An Answer
- C. The Organization of Theology (內容不作獨立處理而分散在幾個標題的註腳中)
- D. The Method and Structure of Systematic Theology (系統神學的方法和建構，下連 8 至 13 一併中譯)
8. The Sources of Systematic Theology
9. Experience and Systematic Theology
10. The Norm of Systematic Theology
11. The Rational Character of Systematic Theology
12. The Method of Correlation
13. The Theological System

值得一提是其導讀前的序言，田氏早已開宗明義表明一點：其神學系統的方法和結構，乃是與哲學的不斷互聯下作出護教觀點。² 從中可理解田氏作為神學家和哲學家（近似其學友海德格爾），將此書對西方神學與互動相成的西方哲學這「有機結合」的學術性處境，作「西方本色」的探究；此書一些英文用字就不屬「保守派」常用，如 *Christian message* 在後者常用是 *Christian faith*、*situation(al)* 在後者常用是 *context(ual)* 作為宣教之用、*being* 在後者則少用、*apologetic* 在後者限用於被動式護教。田氏的用字和辯證思維使其神學往往連西人也感艱深（主因或是哲學訓練不足），華人研究者宜先釐清田氏此書如上述一些字意，且未必適合「照抄」直用於自身本土處境的分析或應用，這在華人學術界引入西方大師級神哲學之際，宜需打下這必要的「學術過渡」根基。

標題 1 觀點角度：信仰與處境 (Message and Situation)

田氏開談就說，神學作為基督教會一項功能，一定要服務好教會兩項基本需要：基督信仰（*Christian message*，田氏把 *message* 和 *faith* 互用，故筆者譯之為信仰或言說）的真理的立場和為後代解釋真理。（系 1, 頁 3）若以當今中國教會的用語來表達，神學就是「每代教會（為其後代）在思考真理」。田氏指出歐洲的神學正統、即美國所稱的基要主義(*fundamentalism*)，在聖經—福音的形態(*biblicistic-evangelical form*)之下，將昨天的神學性真理(*theological truth*)維護成為不可改變的信仰(*eternal truth*)，以此反對今天和後天的神學性真理。基要主義將過去的處境言之為正，提升有限過渡的成為無限恒真的，但就算做到其個人以至社群的「離場」也不能證明其神學有效。³ 筆者認為田氏的批評，未有

² PREFACE: My purpose, and I believe it is a justified purpose, has been to present the method and the structure of a theological system written from an apologetic point of view and carried through in a continuous correlation with philosophy. (V1, p.xi)

³ It elevates something finite and transitory to infinite and eternal validity. (V1, p.3) 田氏進一步批評基要主義倡「分別出來」此種分裂性並不證其神學正確性：The fact that fundamentalist ideas are eagerly grasped in a period of personal or communal disintegration does not prove their theological validity. (V1, p.4)

指出美國一支的基要主義所拒絕的，實是他本人也反對的自由神學；基要主義維護最基本的真理如有關耶穌由童貞女所生、十架代贖、身體復活等（詳參 *The Fundamentals, 1910–1915* 出版），性質上並非「過去的處境」，而是關乎真理的立場。此等信仰內容並非田氏所稱只是「昨天的神學性真理」，而是「天天的真理性真理(truthful truth or eternal truth)」那樣神學有效。

田氏認為，美國的基要主義和歐洲的神學正統皆屬於宣講性(Kerygmatic)神學，強調以不能改變的真理應對處境的變動需要，到巴特一支神學也是這種宣講性模式。⁴ 從馬丁路德（對羅馬教廷）以至巴特（對自由神學），二人皆嘗試在聖經和傳統中再發掘出永恆之言說(rediscover the eternal message)，以應對他們時代扭曲的傳統和錯用的聖經。田氏認為二人均未能充分察覺「處境」易再陷入自封為正統(orthodoxy) 且不變的狀態。（系 1, 頁 5）這可引申出他的說法隱含「神學要不斷改革」才是正確方向，正如他採用神學性真理(theological truth) 這含可變空間的觀點。

標題 2 觀點角度：護教神學與宣講 (Apologetic Theology and the Kerygma)

田氏追述「護教」(apologetic)一字的歷史意義，指出初期教會那一式護教，本處於道德高地(high standing)，再後為了回應現代人文主義、自然主義和歷史主義的攻擊而竟手法不遂，淪落至聲名狼藉(disrepute)。他聲稱護教者會假設彼此能有共通點(common ground)，但宣講（神學）家怯於採用「共通點」會拆毀信仰的獨特性；他指出歷代尋出如下共通點：初期的護教士接受道(Logos)、亞歷山大學派接納柏拉圖主義、阿奎那引用亞里士多德、啟蒙運動推出諸式哲學，發展下去生出浪漫主義、黑格爾主義、康德主義、人文主義和自然主義；這些於田氏的理解是含涉處境方面有意義會通(synthesis)，但對應於宣講(神學)家的理解是「尋共通必失守」，尤其自十八世紀開始後者另採不變遷真理觀(immoveable truth)，作出一種田氏認為是投降的宣講—不容處境介入亦不答外界質問(“situation” cannot be entered; no answer to the questions implied in it can be given)。對於此，田氏語重心長呼籲放棄這種具排他性的超越式做法，應以護教神學勇對當代處境的挑戰，給出答案。⁵

筆者對田氏批評的「尋共通必失守」怯懦，在他身後至少美國福音派已檢討並勇作「修正」，就是在保住一套「正統教義」下可容有限會通，尤指在宣教工場面對異文化的處境下使福音「不變質地」植入異地，會通有其需要。探索中的「中華神學」認定會通是可行方向，但應超越「共通點」的限

⁴ the neo-Reformation theology of Barth and his school are outstanding examples of kerygmatic theology. (V1, p.4)

⁵ Kerygmatic theology must give up its exclusive transcendence and take seriously the attempt of apologetic theology to answer the questions put before it by the contemporary situation..... But the continuous toil of those who have tried to find a union, a “synthesis,” has kept theology alive. (V1, p.7)

田氏在 C. THE ORGANIZATION OF THEOLOGY 標題下為護教神學多加解釋，他稱：systematic theology is “answering theology.” It must answer the questions implied in the general human and the special historical situation. (V1, p.31) 此外，華人文化所關注的倫理學，在護教實踐上的定位，田氏亦有其判斷：It was not until the later orthodox period that, under the influence of modern philosophy, ethics was separated from dogmatics. The positive result was a much richer development of theological ethics; the negative result was an unsolved conflict with philosophical ethics. Today..... a trend toward taking theological ethics back into the unity of the system can be seen. This trend has been supported by the neo-orthodox movement’s rejection of an independent theological ethic..... The ethical element (social and personal) is a necessary--and often predominant--element in every theological statement. (V1, p.31) “Systematic theology” embracing apologetics, dogmatics, and ethics, seems to be the most adequate term. (V1, p.32)

制，開墾多元進路作更好的護教。

標題 3 系統神學性質：神學的循環 (The Theological Circle)

對於神學的性質，田氏認為神學具有神秘性先存主導(mystical a priori)，就是神學家會不自覺地「自我導限」於主體的個別經驗、傳統價值和個人委身而憑藉（邏輯）科學那套歸納法和演繹法，做出自以為「客觀」學問，而形成主體性宗教（經驗）和客體性哲學（形而上學）(religious-philosophical circle / the empirical and the metaphysical approaches) 之不斷循環。神學概念，乃是來自意識到要超越（化解）主體和客體之間的劈裂。⁶

田氏進一步認為，人進入了這神學的循環，就要做存在性決定；存在者（神學家）活在其信心的處境，但又不能知透其信心的處境，以致處於一種知和不知之間。⁷ 以上田氏所論及的神學神秘性，明顯出自田氏當代的德國思潮下存在主義，帶有令人不易理解的吊詭性。然而，這一種神學張力能啟導神學工作者自我謙卑，勿自以為對真理有「準確客觀」的認知而陷入自高，尤其對追崇權威或自捧為權威的華人文化，具有積極意義。

標題 4 系統神學性質：神學的兩級標準 (Two Formal Criteria of Every Theology)

田氏至此引入其代表性「終極關懷」(ultimate concern) 神學，他解釋終極關懷是抽象詮釋自馬可福音 12 章 30 節的「盡心盡性盡意盡力愛你的神」(大誡命)，這第一級的宗教關注是達到人對神的全方位極盡性。⁸ 他從反面梳理出此一終極關懷命題，來對比另外被他稱為初步關懷(preliminary concern)之事物，就是：神學不能也不應給予以下事類的斷言(judgements)，如為藝術創作給予美學價值、為物理理論給予科學價值、為藥物醫治或社會重建給予最佳處方、為政治或國際衝突給予解決途徑(the solution of political or international conflicts)等，他指出神學家不是這些「初步關懷」事項的專家。⁹ 田氏沒有明言但應有此意，就是能對萬事萬物（如上述事項）作出最終判定的審斷者，絕不是人自身。

至於神學的次級標準，田氏指出：凡是決定我們的存在或非存在(being or nonbeing)，即是人對自身

⁶ it can be observed that the a priori which directs the induction and the deduction is a type of mystical experience.....The theological concepts of both idealists and naturalists are rooted in a "mystical a priori," an awareness of something that transcends the cleavage between subject and object..... Every understanding of spiritual things(*Geisteswissenschaft*) is circular. (V1, p.9)

⁷ Being inside the circle, he must have made an existential decision; he must be in the situation of faith. But no one can say of himself that he is in the situation of faith.....and Every theologian is committed and alienated; he is always in faith and in doubt; he is inside and outside the theological circle.(V1, p.10)

⁸ The total concern is infinite: no moment of relaxation and rest is possible in the face of a religious concern which is ultimate, unconditional, total, and infinite.....It is the object of total surrender, demanding also the surrender of our subjectivity while we look at it. It is a matter of infinite passion and interest (Kierkegaard), making us its object whenever we try to make it our object. (V1, p.12)

⁹ The theologian as theologian is no expert in any matters of preliminary concern. And, conversely, those who are experts in these matters should not as such claim to be experts in theology.(V1, p.12)

（存在目的和意義）的終極關懷。這不是指向具體特定的內容、象徵或教義，而是保持開放於那個決定我們存在或非存在的內容。¹⁰

上述田氏所稱神學的兩級標準，都不是實質的內容或對象，而是心態這主觀多於客觀的標準，使神學的知性降準，對於日趨學術化的信仰以至神學追求，是進步或是退步，有待神學界深入反思西方所傳承的知識論(epistemology) 對神學發展的影響，才宜判準。

標題 5 系統神學性質：神學與基督教 (Theology and Christianity)

田氏多番表示「神學是對基督信仰的內容做出方法性解釋(methodical interpretation)」。田氏認為神學一字原文是由兩部分組成（神和學科），是對禮儀、象徵和神話的宗教性事物作理性的解釋，基督宗教的神學也不例外。¹¹

然而，基督教神學是建基於以下兩者，同時是絕對實在(concreteness)和絕對普遍(universality)之間的張力；祭司和先知一類神學可以極其應對實在的處境但缺乏普遍（普世）的意義，神秘和形而上一類神學可以極具普遍（普世）性但缺乏實在具體性。¹² 基督教獨特的「道（成肉身）」的教義(Logos doctrine)，則是有份於普遍性（即道）和實體性（即肉身），兩者並存其中。從中顯示基督教神學能稱之為「神學」，乃是它擁有一個最底基礎能無限超越宗教歷史中所有事物的基礎。¹³

筆者佩服田氏的洞悉力，能將基督教神學解讀至「超越」其原出的猶太教（舊約被融入兩約時期而形成）和普世各大宗教。這主動式護教有別中式傳統的被動護教方法、即中國宗教有甚麼基督教也有（me-too-ism，「你有的我亦有」），能開出主動護教方法（「我有的你沒有」）。再者，「聖子下凡」神學能除去「自義優越」的洋教形象，也帶有超越又不冒犯其他宗教的積極意義，值得深究加以發

¹⁰ The second formal criterion of theology does not point to any special content, symbol, or doctrine. It remains formal and, consequently, open for contents which are able to express "that which determines our being or nonbeing." (V1, p.14)

¹¹ Theology is the methodical interpretation of the contents of the Christian faith.....All this is "theo-logy," logos of theos, a rational interpretation of the religious substance of rites, symbols, and myths. Christian theology is no exception.(V1, p.15-16) 田氏在 C. THE ORGANIZATION OF THEOLOGY 為神學相關的科系也逐一定位如下：**Exegesis** and **homiletics** are as theological as systematics.....whether or not it deals with the Christian message as a matter of ultimate concern. (V1,p.28) / in the Christian message **history** is theological and theology is historical. **Historical theology** includes historical research; **systematic theology** includes philosophical discussion. (V1,p.29) / **practical theology** has no less theological standing than theoretical theology.....practical theology can become a bridge between the Christian message and the human situation, generally and specially. It can put new questions before the systematic theologian..... It can preserve the church from traditionalism and dogmatism, and it can induce society to take the church seriously. But it can do all this only if, in unity with historical and systematic theology, it is driven by **the ultimate concern** which is concrete and universal at the same time. (V1,p.33-34)

¹² Christian theology is the theology in so far as it is based on the tension between the absolutely concrete and the absolutely universal. Priestly and prophetic theologies can be very concrete, but they lack universality. Mystical and metaphysical theologies can be very universal, but they lack concrete.(V1,p.16) 田氏為此舉亞流主義這有問題的教義神學作例釋：The half-God Jesus of Arian theology is neither universal enough nor concrete enough to be the basis of Christian theology. (V1,p.17-18)

¹³ Christian theology has a foundation which infinitely transcends the foundations of everything in the history of religion which could be called "theology." (V1,p.18)

揮。

標題 6 系統神學性質：神學與哲學的問(Theology and Philosophy: A Question)

田氏指出神學是與哲學和諸科學(*Wissenschaften*) 大有關係。神學對其他科學知識有關聯且不容對之存有偏見，然而，他更高舉哲學的重要性，認為神學和任何科學之間有關聯也是基於彼此的哲學元素。¹⁴ 按他的分析，哲學是對真實真相的認知(*cognitive approach to reality*)，而這一種具批判性(*critical*) 的認知，是有別於五花八門可被經驗之事物。他舉出欲為真實界提供完滿系統(*present a complete system of reality*) (系 1, 頁 19) 的歷代西方哲思：如哲學家柏拉圖、亞里士多德、黑格爾、萊布尼茲等，另如哲學類型新康德派(哲學成為知識論及倫理學)、具顛覆性邏輯實證論(哲學從傳統本體論轉化為科學邏輯)¹⁵ 等，皆在這認知過程中出現各自衍生的問題。他亦指出以高舉聖經作為解決問題的聖經主義，就算避免用上非聖經性、本體性的字詞，也不能避免在其使用別些哲理性字詞那背後的哲學含意。¹⁶ 因此從田氏看，神學家一定要深究其用字之意涵，至少，也要做到具備批判思考的非創意哲學家。¹⁷

筆者也在這範疇思考多時，就是新約聖經作者(包括新約原「作者」耶穌)和初期教會護教教父，皆使用當時的字詞言說基督信仰，但他們往往將這些字詞原意轉化為或賦予新意，使之成為合乎基督教教義內涵(如使「律法」有別於猶太教的、「道」有別於希臘哲學的)，使之成為實證的「自圓其說」。這一模式，在華人神學工作者面對狹窄的本土處境和廣闊的中華文化，照樣可起步於將承自西方的教義內容的傳統中譯字或西方的近代神學的流行中譯字，試以前人的「轉化為或賦予新意」途徑，引入為己用，而不需不斷理解／跟隨「別人」(仰人鼻息)而沒有了自己的神學迷失。此說也是體現田氏所主張的關聯性神學(即近似其身後在非西方流行的「處境神學」)。筆者於 2020 年 10 月發表的「基督教上帝的教義：中式「三位一體」表述初探」，也嘗朝向神學自建這必然(西方的神學自建早已成實然)的神學方向。

標題 7 系統神學性質：神學與哲學的答 (Theology and Philosophy: An Answer)

哲學和神學探問存有／存在(*being*)的問題，哲學尋問存有本身的結構，神學處理存有對我們的意義。

¹⁴ The point of contact between scientific research and theology lies in the philosophical element of both, the sciences and theology. (V1, p.18)

¹⁵ whether the elimination of almost all traditional philosophical problems by logical positivism is a successful escape from ontology. (V1, P.20)

¹⁶ The attempt of biblicism to avoid nonbiblical, ontological terms is doomed to failure as surely as are the corresponding philosophical attempts..... Biblicism may try to preserve their popular meaning (上文列出這一些概念：time, space, cause, thing, subject, nature, movement, freedom, necessity, life, value, knowledge, experience, being and not-being), but then it ceases to be theology. It must neglect the fact that a philosophical understanding of these categories has influenced ordinary language for many centuries. (V1, p.21)

¹⁷ The theologian must take seriously the meaning of the terms he uses. They must be known to him in the whole depth and breadth of their meaning. Therefore, the systematic theologian must be a philosopher in critical understanding even if not in creative power. (V1, p.21)

神學家的態度不能離開實存性(existential)，他受其生存狀態各方面的入涉；另一方面，神學家在其終極關懷中所獲展示於他的，不是關於普遍的道，而是道成為肉身、在特定歷史事件中那道的彰顯，其中介不是獨立的理性(rational detachment)，而是信仰委身的教會傳統和現相。這道對人而言，就是救恩下的新存有(new being)。此外，每位有創意的哲學家在追求純全的真實(pure reality)時，也有會被其存在處境和終極關懷所塑造、成為隱藏的神學家(hidden theologian)，甚或欠缺理解下向神學家發出「護哲」下責難。(系 1，頁 25)

因此哲學家和神學家難免會彼此對立矛盾，但這不等於哲學和神學互相衝突，然而對於兩者互相結合而成為「基督教哲學」(Christian philosophy)，這一名詞於田氏來說是含混不清的，正如阿奎拿被稱為羅馬天主教的哲學家，在其後數世紀就不再被如此說。事實上到了今天，每種現代哲學，因是出自基督教的土壤而可追溯出基督教文化，就不再有基督教哲學含自身矛盾這情況。¹⁸

以上神學和哲學的問與答兩方面，顯示田氏在這兩個範疇都進行了深入的反思，向自身背景作出反思細問，這是難能可貴的。縱然未必人人同意他所說，甚至未必大有成果，但這是極有意義的嘗試，也提醒華人神學工作者，也應將同樣是內容豐富的中國哲學與基督教神學，進行深層次的會通，避免推動中華文化再復興的人，續誤基督教至今不外是「後洋教」。

標題 8 系統神學的方法和建構：系統神學的資源 (The Sources of Systematic Theology)

田氏認為神學要解釋的基督信仰，共有三大方面：第一是聖經，田氏拒絕巴特領航的新正統派以聖經作為唯一資源，¹⁹ 他作此澄清：沒有教會和每一個基督徒的經驗性參與 (experiencing participation)，聖經信息就不會成為任何人（包括神學家）的信息，因為聖經的記錄包括這相等的事實，就是聖經包含：參與啟示性事件的原初見證人（聖經作者）的受默示和對啟示事實接收性和創意性的回應。²⁰ 田氏所言，對新約來說就是聖經作者和初期教會在接納耶穌為基督之後，以這見證來寫成各卷聖經；就是說，聖經包含這兩方面—原來事件（如耶穌言行）和對原來事件的見證（筆者按：或稱「對原來事件的解釋」如約三 16）。其後的聖經神學家，就是對聖經所載錄的，再作出配合各自處境的「靈實性」釋經(pneumatic-existential interpretation)。²¹

¹⁸ The fact that every modern philosophy has grown on Christian soil and shows traces of the Christian culture in which it lives has nothing to do with the self-contradicting ideas of a "Christian philosophy." (V1, p.28)

¹⁹ we must reject the assertion of neo-orthodox biblicism that the Bible is the *only* source. (V1, p.34)

²⁰ The documentary character of the Bible is identical with the fact that it contains the original witness of those who participated in the revealing events.....The inspiration of the biblical writers is their receptive and creative response to potentially revelatory facts.....Since there is no revelation unless there is someone who receives it as revelation, the act of reception is a part of the event itself. (V1, p.35)

²¹ (Biblical theologian) His exegesis is pneumatic (Spiritual) or, as we would call it today, "existential." He speaks of the results of his philosophical and detached interpretation as matters of ultimate concern to him. He unites philology and devotion in dealing with the biblical texts. (V1, p.33)

第二方面是教會歷史，這歷史甚至早至創寫新約聖經時期。歷史中每一位與經文相遇的人，皆受到過去世代對這段經文的解讀所引導，甚至宗教改革家也是依靠羅馬（天主）教會某些傳統反對羅馬教會另些扭曲。²² 對於田氏當時出自基要派的福音派，他批評福音派聖經主義(Evangelical Biblicism)從過去到現在，皆未有意識到上述方面而在產出其聖經神學(“biblical” theology)，實是靠賴於改教後期的教義性發展(dogmatic developments)。他認為歷史學術界指出美國大部份福音信仰教會的教義上教導，和經文的原來意思，實是存在顯而易見的不同。²³ 筆者認為田氏所批，應指興起並盛行於其一生的「千禧年前派災前被提論」這源自基要派崇信的主再來神學，這「前千」末世論仍至今流行於華人教會。

田氏認為可以歷史這兩方面入手來解經：教會歷史中從「終極關懷」(參標題 4)而出的任何創見(就如聖經作者以此寫出經書)，和教會歷史提供的所有資料包括用上歷代希臘羅馬德國和現代的觀念。²⁴ 筆者認為田氏所說過於理想，因為教會歷史中有哪些資源屬於「終極關懷」而出的「正料」，是後人需要有深厚學術和深度靈性才能辨識出來，且會為此爭議不絕，就如宗教改革確立的「因信稱義」導致「行為」(包括決志行為)在救贖神學的定位，就反身影響更正教會相關的神學立場且爭議不休。然而，二千年來教會歷史確有一些明顯的失敗(如煽動信徒組十字軍東征、迫害「再改革」的重洗派、乘帝國侵人之便傳教、教牧將蓄奴合理化等)，可照顯對相關經文的錯解誤讀，但是閱讀教會史宜需加上社會科學的分析判斷，這複雜過田氏重視的哲學概念的澄清會通，如斯以史解經之路不易行但仍需行。

第三方面是宗教和文化的歷史，這是更廣闊的資源如語言運用、個人性和社會性的遭遇等，對系統神學皆具決定性影響。田氏稱這方面為「文化神學」，就是嘗試分析神學背後所有文化表達，發現某一哲學、政治制度、藝術風格、倫理／社會規套的基礎下作出終極關懷；這項工作是分析性多於綜合性、歷史性多於系統性，是預備系統神學家做學問的前期功夫。²⁵ 筆者認為這方面關注，在宣教的环境更為複雜，因為不單要認清自己的文化(免混入為所傳福音的內容)，也要辨識異地別國的文化(包括其背後各種宗教元素)，這是重視宣教的福音派，必要處理好的基礎。這方面在昔日西方來華宣教被視為傳洋教，反證這文化神學的功夫不足，極待在今天中國處於另一處境下加以改善。

²² Even the Reformers were dependent on the Roman tradition against which they protested. They directed special elements of the ecclesiastical tradition against others in order to fight the distortion which had affected the whole tradition, but they did not and could not jump out of the tradition into the situation of Matthew and Paul. (V1, p.36-37)

²³ Through historical scholarship the difference between the dogmatic teaching of most American evangelistic churches and the original meaning of the biblical texts can easily be shown. (V1, p.37)

²⁴ the biblical writings in so far as their witness to what is really ultimate concern is also a conditioned expression of their own spirituality. Therefore, it is able to use all the materials provided by church history. It can make use of Greek and Roman and German and modern concepts in interpreting the biblical message; it can make use of the decisions of sectarian protests against official theology; but it is not bound to any of these concepts and decisions. (V1, p.37)

²⁵ what I like to call a “theology of culture”, which is the attempt to analyze the theology behind all cultural expressions, to discover the ultimate concern in the ground of a philosophy, a political system, an artistic style, a set of ethical or social principles. This task is analytic rather than synthetic, historical rather than systematic. It is a preparation for the work of the systematic theologian. (V1, p.39)

標題 9 系統神學的方法和建構：經驗與系統神學 (Experience and Systematic Theology)

田氏先指出宗教經驗在歷史的發展上，先有奧古斯丁—法蘭西斯一支重視神秘經驗，後有阿奎拿—Duns Scotus 一支轉向分析性的分拆，繼後的敬虔主義、循道主義和福音主義皆高舉經驗，且能在啟蒙理性運動下繼續存留。他亦為同背景的 19 世紀初信義會神學家士來馬赫(Schleiermacher, 1768-1834)辯護，指出他的名言「絕對依靠的感覺」這經驗乃是回歸到奧古斯丁—法蘭西斯傳統那種徹底地向至高者作主觀無條件委身。²⁶ 他批評新正統神學對經驗過於憂慮而完全自隔於士來馬赫的方法，以致否定後者前後達二百年的神學發展。²⁷

其次，這（宗教性）經驗與科學無關，尤其無關乎邏輯實證論所指的肯定或否定。神學不是科學那種經驗的客體（對象），也不是從（科學）觀察找到那類經驗的結果，而是在人降服和參與的行動中被發現。²⁸ 神學作為一式經驗，來自接受(receives)而非生出(produce)。（系 1，頁 46）

從神學而言，神秘經驗是否和啓示有關（筆者想到上代華人擁抱靈裡經驗作為釋經亮光）？這重要問題，對改教家來說，經驗不是啟示的源頭，聖靈不會在經文上給予新的啟示，聖靈能力的經歷不提供新事物；但福音派中狂熱主義則認為聖靈同在會引入新的啟示。²⁹ 田氏揣摩：聖靈曾以聖父的靈（舊約）和聖子的靈（新約）行事，到第三時期的現今仍行事，但是否帶來什麼開放性神學改變呢？³⁰ 田氏對「經驗可以帶來甚麼情狀的改變」，沒有明確答案，只是提出不適宜走向全新改變或全無改變兩個極端。³¹ 無論如何，他明確說到聖靈能力入住(Spiritual power in him)是個人所有宗教經驗的源頭。只有人的靈和屬神的靈聯合為一，人的經驗才有啟示性能。³² 有趣的是，田氏在協和任教期間，是該校教授中唯一前赴比他年輕 32 年 Billy Graham 的奮興會。

²⁶ When he (Schleiermacher) defined religion as the “feeling of absolute dependence,” “feeling” meant the immediate awareness of something unconditional in the sense of the Augustinian-Franciscan tradition. This tradition was mediated to him religiously by his Moravian education, philosophically by Spinoza and Schelling.....“Dependence” in Schleiermacher’s definition, was, on the Christian level, “teleological” dependence.....excludes a pantheistic and deterministic interpretation of the experience of the unconditional. (V1, p.41-42)

²⁷ (neo-orthodox theology) it detached itself completely from Schleiermacher’s method, consequently denying the theological development of the last two hundred years (one hundred before and one hundred after Schleiermacher). (V1, p.41) / Against this conception neo-orthodoxy turns back to the Reformers(see footnote29), and evangelical biblicism turns back to the Reformation sects. Both deny that a religious experience which goes beyond the Christian circle can be a source of systematic theology; and neo-orthodoxy denies that experience can become a source of systematic theology at all. (V1, p.45)

²⁸ the object of theology (namely, our ultimate concern and its concrete expressions) is not an object within the whole of scientific experience. It cannot be discovered by detached observation or by conclusions derived from such observation. It can be found only in acts of surrender and participation. Second, it cannot be tested by scientific methods of verification. (V1, p.44)

²⁹ For the Reformers experience was not a source of revelation. The divine Spirit testifies in us to the biblical message. No new revelations are given by the Spirit. Nothing new is mediated by the experience of the Spiritual power in us. Evangelical enthusiasm, on the other hand, derived new revelations from the presence of the Spirit. (V1, p.45)

³⁰ Being open for new experiences which might even pass beyond the confines of Christian experience is now the proper attitude of the theologian.....“Open experience” is the source of systematic theology. (V1, p.45)

³¹ Two extremes must be avoided in this procedure: the influence of the medium, the experience of the theologian, should not be so small that the result is a repetition instead of a transformation, and it should not be so large that the result is a new production instead of a transformation. (V1, p.46)

³² Only if his spirit and the divine Spirit in him were one could his experience have revealing character. (V1, p. 46)

值得注意的是，他這方面討論的用詞不用 Holy Spirit，只用大楷的 Spirit 或 divine Spirit。對於（聖）靈的能力，筆者認為田氏反對新正統神學過於貶抑僵化（是否屬實有待確定），亦反對自由神學過於自由放任（以致其他宗教也能分享這能力）；他沒有明確評論當時的靈恩運動現象和福音信仰立場，但確有可供後兩者引入發揮的重要論點。

標題 10 系統神學的方法和建構：系統神學的標準（The Norm of Systematic Theology）

田氏將標準分為兩方面：物質(material side) 的信條(creed)，和正式(formal side) 的威權等級即主教、大公會議和教宗，教會以此守護這標準不受異端歪曲。³³

田氏稱教宗擁有的決定威權到天特會議後，導致聖經在希羅教會後期的教義發展上影響力式微。宗教改革反對（天主）教會一套威權，並突破上述物質性（信條）的羅馬（教會）系統，改以「因信稱義」和聖經（尤其是保羅的信息）兩方面互相托靠，而加爾文主義則以預定論取代稱義觀，並強調聖經權威來自文本上理解。³⁴

他認為這標準在教會歷史中，隨時代以不同預表(analogous Norms)出現；這演繹到了這時期更正教的表述，就是舊約和新約中神國的先知式信息。³⁵神的國這方面華人教會也不忽略，但缺乏深入和多面探討。

田氏高舉出自聖經的教會性系統神學，將聖經、教會和神學三者緊密相連。³⁶ 他稱其系統神學的標準是有別於一眾改教家和現代自由神學，如下：物質性標準(creed)於今天的系統神學，就是新存有的「耶穌為基督」是我們的終極關懷(the New Being in Jesus as the Christ as our ultimate concern)，此標準用於系統神學的所有來源。³⁷ 這相對於路得以基督或因信稱義這一信息，視為聖經書卷應按此

³³ On the formal side the church established a hierarchy of authorities-bishops, councils, the pope-who were supposed to safeguard the norm against heretical distortions.(V1, p. 47)田氏更在 C. THE ORGANIZATION OF THEOLOGY 標題下，進一步為早期教會以教義政權化回應哲理式異端而產生的問題，作此闡釋：the word (Dogmata)received another meaning in the history of Christian thought. The function of the creeds as a protection against destructive heresies was considered a demonic enemy of the message of Christ. With the complete union of church and state after Constantine, the doctrinal laws of the church also became civil laws of the state, and the heretic was considered a criminal.(V1, p.32)

³⁴ Luther broke through the Roman system in the power of the material norm which, following Paul, he called “justification through faith” and with the authority of the biblical (especially the Pauline) message. Justification and Bible in mutual interdependence were the norms of the Lutheran Reformation. In Calvinism justification was more and more replaced by predestination, and the mutuality of the material and the formal norms was weakened by a more literalistic understanding of biblical authority. (V1, p.47)

³⁵ for recent Protestantism it has been the prophetic message of the Kingdom of God in the Old and New Testaments. (V1, p.48)

³⁶ the church is the “home” of systematic theology. (V1, p.48)；有趣的是，思路慎密的田氏提出一個疑似的循環論證（斜體字）作支持：The Bible can be called the norm of systematic theology only because the norm is derived from the Bible. But it is derived from it in an encounter of the church with the biblical message. (V1, p.50)

³⁷ the material norm of systematic theology today is the New Being in Jesus as the Christ as our ultimate concern. This norm is the criterion for the use of all the sources of systematic theology. (V1, p.50)

解釋和衡量的標準。³⁸

論到聖經本身在神學上發展，田氏有這樣「超然」的觀察：舊約從不是直接標準，而是用新約作其衡量；新約又不是全體各具平等性影響，保羅的影響性在後使徒時期幾乎消失而由約翰取代；到了教會史中，保羅的信息待至奧古斯丁的保守派振興和眾改教家的起動革命才再次突顯；符類福音之強過保羅和約翰書信，是待至現代的更正教主義；近期則出現舊約的先知解讀(the Old Testament in a prophetic interpretation)，蓋過一切甚至新約。³⁹

至於聖經正典的形成，田氏稱（聖）靈創造正典，教會的定立正典其實不具直接規範（甚至歷史常顯出其錯失）。至於系統神學本身，只是由教會和教內個人受其存在處境影響而作出的神學解釋。（系 1, 頁 51-52）他聲稱：聖經主義和正統信仰嘗試提出一種「無任何條件的」（絕對）神學，實是違反新正統運動所提出的田氏認同的正確、不能取代的第一原則「神在天人在地」，就算人是系統神學家也不例外。⁴⁰筆者對「神在天人在地」這一類宏大敘述(mega-narrative)，不會有異議，但會質疑其應用往往不受約束，被神學家各自發揮而變成各說各話，甚至互相攻擊。具有哲學思維和歷史識見的田氏，能作出上述弘大的討論及高強的綜合（因他不喜作註而難知其論點有多少引別人之見），確是保守派學者的他山之石，但其立論能否證成試金石，要待後人作出更多學術驗證，不宜跟風盲從。

標題 11 系統神學的方法和建構：系統神學的理性形格 (The Rational Character of Systematic Theology)

系統神學不是對基督教信息作過去歷史的整理，而是詮釋與當下處境（當前歷史）相關的基督教信息。這亦涉及神學中理性的角色。田氏對信仰下理性角色另有看法，舉例稱護教學崇尚的「以理性論證神存在」是錯誤的神學，他作一番存在主義式解釋：理性是在其終極關懷下被信心內容所抓，而非理性抓實信心。⁴¹顯而易見，田氏的信心與理性觀有別於科學界那一式信心與理性。

田氏辯說，其理性觀點是與傳統的神學和新正統神學一致，就是同時二分出沉醉理性如全然融入神

³⁸ He gave a material norm according to which the biblical books should be interpreted and evaluated, namely, the message of Christ or of justification through faith. (V1, p.50)

³⁹ The Old Testament was never directly normative. It was measured by the New Testament, and the New Testament was never equally influential in all its parts. Paul's influence almost disappeared in the post-apostolic period. John took his place.....Pauline reactions occurred again and again, in a conservative way in Augustine and in a revolutionary way in the Reformers. The predominance of the Synoptic Gospels over against Paul and John characterizes modern Protestantism; and in recent times the Old Testament in a prophetic interpretation has overshadowed even the New Testament. (V1, p.50)田氏更在 C. THE ORGANIZATION OF THEOLOGY 標題下，進一步為聖經研究在歷史上發展作此詮釋：There is much non-theological research in the biblical disciplines…… The influence of nonbiblical religions and cultures on Bible and church history is too obvious to be denied (cf., for instance, the intertestamental period). (V1, p.29)

⁴⁰ The attempts of biblicism and orthodoxy to create an "unconditioned" theology contradict the correct and indispensable first principle of the neo-orthodox movement that "God is in heaven and man is on earth"-even if man is a systematic theologian. (V1, p.52)

⁴¹ Reason is overpowered, invaded, shaken by the ultimate concern. Reason does not produce an object of ultimate concern by logical procedures, as a mistaken theology tried to in its "arguments for the existence of God." The contents of faith grasp reason. (V1, p.53) 田氏這一式信心觀，學者視為帶有祁克果所倡「信心之跳躍」色彩。

國度狀態而得和技術理性。⁴² 他進一步提述三項理性原則，如下：

第一是語意方面理性(semantic rationality)：田氏讚揚（中世紀）經院主義能做到神學和哲學上有一個清晰的語言環境，⁴³ 對比之下，現代神學就充斥含混不清的概念。然而，他亦澄清所指的不是一種如數學般清晰的等比式語言，因為文字發揮力量在屬靈的「實際上」乃在其隱含之意(connotations)。⁴⁴ 他提出這原則下每一字詞的所有含意，應該彼此相繫而圍繞在一種可控意思中。⁴⁵ 解釋基督信仰內容的字詞要有兩方面關注，就是語意上清晰和存在下純全(semantic clarity and existential purity)（系 1，頁 55），後者明顯涉及存在主義的詮釋而含有「主觀性」，但他沒有多加說明。

第二是邏輯理性(logical rationality)：在哲學的和神學的抗辯(protests) 上，神學如哲學和一般科學依靠形式邏輯(formal logic)；神學更需要辯證式 (affirmation and negation) 思考，但這不是與形式邏輯有衝突；辯證是按實存於事理態勢的「正與反」(follows the movement of thought or the movement of reality through yes and no)，挪用邏輯性字詞來描述之。⁴⁶ 田氏舉「三位一體」教義為例，這不是確認邏輯上視為荒謬的「三是一、一是三」這方面，而是指向神的自在活態是「永恆地自我分離又自我回歸」這方面。⁴⁷ 他再舉出道成肉身、救贖和稱義等亦屬同類，這些看似相悖(paradox) 的屬靈事件，實是超越所有人間期望和可能下，闖入經驗界或真實界的處境（但又非出自其中之玄妙）。⁴⁸ 田氏作結稱宗教上和神學上的悖論，不違反邏輯。悖論自含其中邏輯。⁴⁹

第三是方法上理性(methodological rationality)：系統神學是作為一個整理神學的方法，但系統經常有幾方面被攻擊，第一是系統和演繹系統(deductive system)的混亂，田氏稱各學科中只有數學是屬於演繹、神學方面除了 Raimundus Lullus 很少人用到演繹系統；第二是系統具封閉性，進一步研究易受其限制；第三則是流於主觀感性，令人誤以為系統阻礙交流。田氏認為，系統位於大全(summa，如阿奎那《神學大全》)和論文(essay)之間；大全處理所有問題而盛行於中世紀，論文處理一個問題而流行於現代。田氏認為在今天靈性生活的胡混(chaos)和建構大全的不可能性之下，系統這模式顯得有需要。(系 1，頁 58-59)

⁴² This formulation is a matter of personal and communal religious experience It is simultaneously received by ecstatic reason(後解此類理性得自 if man were living in a complete theonomy, that is, in the fullness of the Kingdom of God) and conceived through technical reason. Traditional and neo-orthodox theologies do not differ at this point. (V1, p.54)

⁴³ The glory of scholasticism was that it had become a semantic clearing-house for theology as well as for philosophy. (V1, p.54)

⁴⁴ The power of words denoting spiritual realities lies in their connotations. (V1, P.54)

⁴⁵ The principle of semantic rationality involves the demand that all connotations of a word should consciously be related to each other and centered around a controlling meaning. (V1, p.55)

⁴⁶ there is no real conflict between dialectics and formal logic. Dialectics follows the movement of thought or the movement of reality through yes and no, but it describes it in logically correct terms. (V1, p.56)

⁴⁷ The doctrine of the Trinity does not affirm the logical nonsense that three is one and one is three; it describes in dialectical terms the inner movement of the divine life as an eternal separation from itself and return to itself.p.56

⁴⁸ Incarnation, redemption, justification, etc., are implied in this paradoxical event. It is not a logical contradiction which makes it a paradox but the fact that it transcends all human expectations and possibilities. It breaks into the context of experience or reality, but it cannot be derived from it. (V1, p.57)

⁴⁹ Paradox in religion and theology does not conflict with the principle of logical rationality. Paradox has its logical place. (V1, p.57)

標題 12 系統神學的方法和建構：關聯方法 (The Method of Correlation)

系統和方法彼此互為決定。田氏釐清方法的使用賴於研究對象且必不充足，更不宜像政治上「帝國主義」般強推某個方法；系統神學使用的是關聯方法，關聯法透過實存問題和神學回答的互靠相依，來解釋基督信仰的內容。⁵⁰ 學術界普遍稱田氏的神學為「關聯神學」(Theology of Correlation)。這方法的進路是：系統神學分析人類處境中呈現的存在問題(existential questions)，然後以基督信息的符號(symbols，詳釋於系 1，頁 238-247)展示對此等問題的答案(theological answers)；為人類處境進行分析在今天的表達詞彙就是「存在性」(existential)，這種分析的出現比存在主義更早，早至人類反思自己，乃是以各種概念表達，作為哲學的開始。⁵¹ 田氏舉出，加爾文在他的《教義學》一開始就表達這方面，就是人的卑微(man's misery)和神的榮耀(God's glory)這一存在性（而非教義性）神人互動的關聯兩方面，證示關聯法的合理和需要。他認為神學家就像哲學家對人的存在作分析，將分析材料與從基督信仰(Christian faith)而出的神學概念互聯起來(to correlate)。(系 1，頁 63)

標題 13 系統神學的方法和建構：神學系統 (The Theological System)

按上述關聯法的進路，田氏開出他這一本系統神學的神學系統（系 1，頁 66-68），共五部分(parts)。首部分是本書思辯方法的詮釋（即本文所論），第二、三、四部分是田氏所稱系統神學的主體內容(main body)，第五部分是本書對人生的終極關懷（神國實現）。而且，每一部分的標題探討一組配對的兩個項目(sections)，就是他以其關聯法尋出的配對：以存在處境生發的問題（前項），配神學的回答（後項）。⁵²

配對兩方的關聯就是，第一部分是理性與啟示(Reason and Revelation)：人的認知性理性及這有限理

⁵⁰ no method can claim to be adequate for every subject. Methodological imperialism is as dangerous as political imperialism.....The method of correlation explains the contents of the Christian faith through existential questions and theological answers in mutual interdependence. (V1, p.60) 田氏認為這些問和答在「教內」聖經受歷史批判方法威脅而顯得嚴峻：the threat coming from the historical-critical method of biblical research have subjected Protestant theology to the necessity of a positive revision of its whole tradition. And this can be done only through systematic construction.(V3, p.7)

⁵¹ In using the method of correlation, systematic theology proceeds in the following way: it makes an analysis of the human situation out of which the existential questions arise, and it demonstrates that the symbols used in the Christian message are the answers to these questions, The analysis of the human situation is done in terms which today are called "existential." Such analyses are much older than existentialism; they are, indeed, as old as man's thinking about himself, and they have been expressed in various kinds of conceptualization since the beginning of philosophy. (V1, p.62) 田氏早於標題 2 已提到此法：("method of correlation") It tries to correlate the questions implied in the situation with the answers implied in the message..... It correlates questions and answers, situation and message, human existence and divine manifestation. (V1, p.8) 至於「基督信息的符號」的意思，被田氏形容為：attempt to interpret the symbols of faith through expressions of our own culture. The result of this is the three volumes of Systematic Theology. (V3, p.5)

⁵² One could think of a section which mediates between the two main sections by interpreting historical, sociological, and psychological materials in the light of both the existential questions and the theological answers..... In each of the five parts of the system which are derived from the structure of existence in correlation with the structure of the Christian message, the two sections are correlated in the following ways. (V1, p.66)

性的真象澄清和啟示。⁵³ 第二部分是存有與父神(Being and God)：人的元質性(essential nature)和本出的神。第三部分是存在與聖基督(Existence and Christ)：人的存在相斥(existential self-estrangement)和基督。第四部分是生命和聖靈(Life and the Spirit)：抽象的生命存在特徵所顯示諸般的扭曲生活和聖靈。第五部分是歷史與神國(History and the Kingdom of God)：生命／生活延展成人生歷史的存在上諸貌相諸問題和神國予以答案（神國作為獨立於第二至四部分的三一神），田氏以「歷史終結於神國」作為神學的結束。⁵⁴

全文小結：本文未有進入全書主部分，就導論中相關課題進深探討田氏的神學思想，因觸及的題目和字詞不少是華人讀者「陌生的」，更因他的「關聯神學」往往廣涉存在主義哲學那些獨特分析(existential analysis engaging ontology) 和大量西方古今（歷史）神學兼哲學的課題，又浸潤於學者判斷其學於上一兩代的 Schelling 和祁克果(Kierkegaard) 的辯證思維(dialectics)，加上他甚少引註其他學者之言而難以追溯其學思出處。因此，缺乏上述背景的華人研究者，難免未能「讀通」此一巨著，⁵⁵ 只要從中得到啟迪已足夠矣。

筆者除了以上簡論這三冊書的開宗導論，亦會為其結束的第五部分「歷史與神國」另文討論，以配合筆者正在撰寫一本以神國為主題的書。

⁵³ the concept of reason (and Reason) must be clarified before statements can be made the doctrine of revelation must be dealt with at the very beginning, because revelation is presupposed in all parts of the system as the ultimate source of the contents of the Christian faith. (V1, p.67-68)

⁵⁴ the symbol "Kingdom of God" is independent of the trinitarian structure which determines the central parts. This part of the system must give an analysis of man's historical existence (in unity with the nature of the historical generally) and of the questions implied in the ambiguities of history; and it must give an answer which is the Kingdom of God. (V1, p.67)

⁵⁵ 同期美國的頂級神學家 H. Richard Niebuhr 如此稱譽此書： "the reading of *Systematic Theology* can be a great voyage of discovery into a rich and deep, and inclusive and yet elaborated, vision and understanding of human life in the presence of the mystery of God." (H. Richard Niebuhr, Union Seminary Quarterly Review, review included on back cover of *Systematic Theology*, Vol. 3) 美國形而上學學會主席 John H. Randall, Jr. 推舉此書是： "beyond doubt the richest, most suggestive, and most challenging philosophical theology our day has produced." (John H. Randall, Jr., Union Seminary Quarterly Review, review included on back cover of *Systematic Theology*, Vol. 1)