

他們也戀上神國研究（二之二）：Guthrie / Goldsworthy / Perrin(s)

徐濟時

系列序：研究神國（天國），是中華神學之議程和處境之呼喚，乃因中國崛起，中華民族的教會在本國和各國亦壯大，遲早教國兩方出現定位、避位、走位、撞位等難題。因此，我們實須釐清西方教會二千年來解讀的神國（包括應對人國），再在吾等處境尋覓其中之真理，免陷西方教會史常現於本土和宣教區的「神國」與政權「對罵開戰」（在中國一度招致殺教）。此序刪下部分，可從本刊 6-8 期文「戀上神國研究」補看。

本系列務求忠於原著來介紹（引文配以原文供直接理解）近代一批研究神國(Kingdom of God)宗師之餘，本人亦試「由西入中」作神學反思（以另一字體顯示並配註碼以便索引），盼「中華世紀」基督門徒認識此「國度性福音教」、不斷會通轉化更新。在行文上為免混淆作者和筆者，下文會將屬於筆者本人的評議以「本人」表述之。

.....(18)

Norman Perrin(1920-76) 是英美學者，1973 年學術成就登頂，貴為聖經研究最大組織 Society of Biblical Literature 領導人；他專研耶穌的教訓（尤其神國方面），在其名著 *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus*(New York: Harper & Row & London: SCM Press, 1967)，¹ 能超越上一代布特曼對耶穌方面研究，為耶穌的教訓奠下新的理解〔按：本人無意指是「對」的理解〕，引領同代學者不囿於德國學風，這個也影響福音派學者的大潮。Perrin 治學精湛，特此簡述此書，為忠於原著本人多作撮譯，原文放注腳供閱（版本採用 www.religion-online.org 的 2003 年上載版，頁碼據這網上版）：

首先，Perrin 以他對新約時代語文深層的研究指出：「亞蘭文和希臘文是截然不同的語種..... 很多早期（猶裔）基督徒必定說雙語，且亞蘭語強於希臘語，初期教會無疑多是說亞蘭語，而耶穌必然以此語施教。」² 再者，「耶穌教訓雖然不離古猶太教的處境..... 但最獨特之處並非耶穌向當時的人說甚麼的，反是說與別不同的。」³ Perrin 舉一例是耶穌對神的稱呼，與時人大有

¹ 他這方面代表作還有：Norman Perrin, *The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus* (London: SCM Press & Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963)/ Norman Perrin, *Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom: Symbol and Metaphor in New Testament Interpretation* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976)。前者是其博論，後者是其遺作。

² 原文：“We must note that Aramaic and Greek are radically different languages.....many early Christians must have been bilingual and, moreover, more at home in Aramaic than Greek, and that many early Christian congregations were Aramaic speaking.....Jesus certainly taught in Aramaic.”(Perrin 1967: 29) 引自 *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus*, chapter 1: The Reconstruction and Interpretation of the Teaching of Jesus.（下注同此章）

³ “The teaching of Jesus was set in the context of ancient Judaism..... But if we are to seek that which is most characteristic of Jesus, it will be found not in the things which he shares with his contemporaries, but in the things wherein he differs from them.” (Perrin 1967: 31)

不同，如主禱文「我們在天上的父」稱神為 *abba*，這「父」或「我的父」經深入查究得知古猶太敬虔傳統絕不用上的。⁴ 本人認為此書開章設下至要的「耶穌語言」重構(Reconstruction)，令這方面學術探討難上加難，因最前沿的西方聖經研究對新約源頭、耶穌言說的「四福音底本（包括 Q）」只聚焦於希臘文而非亞蘭文，加上耶穌說而不著（像孔子述而不作）和古人記錄師言慣非逐字逐句（有研究這樣形容），皆構成「還原主說」之難；另一難是耶穌所說往往與眾（如法利賽人）不同，這使「以歷史文化釋經」、「以經解經（據原文）」還須加上「辨識主說」與受眾何同何不同，這才是詮釋至要方向。如此既深入又「全面還原」的學術功夫，少有一人之力可及，極其依靠隊工配搭和跨學科研究。這會是未來「耶穌釋經」更高的學術要求。（18A）

Perrin 認為有三大獨特基礎，可作為重建耶穌的教訓範圍，就是比喻、神國教導和主禱文傳統；「比喻」涉及的末世論與「神國」有關，「主禱文」提及的免我們的債與饒恕別人有關。這兩方面（下段起申論）皆有別於古猶太教。他續闡釋，神與父這兩稱謂為猶太教忌用，且「饒恕別人過犯(sin/英多譯 trespasses)」（太六 14-15，是主禱文後續說）在亞蘭文語境只能與在前的禱詞「免我們的債(debt)」有關，而古猶太教沒有如此形式的禱文。⁵

論到「神的國」含末世之意，Perrin 先指出埃及記 15 章 11 至 13 節的「神領民出埃及之歌」顯為最早的版本，就是神的主權「化作最具體的管治活動這可能形態」(conceived of in the most concrete possible manner, i.e. to his *activity* in ruling) (Perrin 1967: 51)。神的國就是「神的權能表證於神是君王的行事中。它不是神所管的某一地域或社群，甚至不是神的統領或王權這般抽象的意念；它是神作為王的具體活動.....而神權政體(theocracy) 此字亦將其重點錯置別處。英文的 *rule*（管治）或更適合的主動性分詞 *ruling*，或許是最接近神國原意。」⁶ Perrin 聲稱英文 Kingdom 加以大寫來指耶穌所稱希伯來文 *malkuth shamayim*（天國），但非英文常態語意(not in its normal English sense)，反映（譯）詞不達（原）意。(Perrin 1967: 52)

Perrin 說，對猶太拉比而言，這是一永遠的國(an everlasting Kingdom)：神過去、現在和將來是

⁴ "An intensive investigation of the Jewish traditions has shown that to address God as Father is by no means a commonplace of ancient Jewish piety, and that when it does happen the form Abba, 'Father' or 'My Father', is never used." (Perrin 1967: 33)

⁵ "The Lord's Prayer is dissimilar to both the early Church and ancient Judaism in the address to God and in the linking of a petition for forgiveness with a preparedness to forgive (which ancient Judaism does not have in a prayer and which the early Church legalizes, Matt. 6.14), is strongly Aramaic (**the word play 'debt/sin' is possible only in Aramaic**)..... We would argue that any attempt to reconstruct the teaching of Jesus today must build upon the foundations laid by the application of the criterion of dissimilarity in these three areas." (Perrin 1967: 38) 本人很同意主禱文應包含 14，15 兩節「要饒恕別人」才完整，可惜後人加插的「因為國度..... 阿們」，招致提早完禱。

⁶ 原文：“The Kingdom of God is the power of God expressed in deeds; it is that which **God does wherein it becomes evident that he is king**. It is not a place or community ruled by God; it is not even the abstract idea of reign or kingship of God. It is quite concretely **the activity of God as king**. and 'theocracy' puts the emphasis in the wrong place. Perhaps 'rule' or, better, the active participle 'ruling' would come nearest to the original," (Perrin 1967: 52)

王；於耶穌所傳，這是一末世的國(an eschatological Kingdom)、從中他彰顯自己是(末後日子)救贖之王。永遠和末世兩組概念合成內容豐富的神國，其中蘊含很多「神話」和象徵(myths and symbols)。⁷ 此外，Perrin 引德國學者 G. Dalman 的發現：猶太人期待這將來「蒙福的國」(blessed state)，在耶穌時代被猶太人稱為「那日子」(age to come)；耶穌則用「神的國」平衡稱之，替代坊間常用的「那日子」。(Perrin 1967: 56)

論到「主禱文」的內容，專於編修鑑別學(redaction criticism) 的 Perrin 提出一個獨特的源頭說：主禱文開首的「願人都尊祢的名為聖、願祢的國降臨」一段，是採自耶穌應熟悉的猶太會堂禮拜內容的亞蘭禱文中聖頌(Kaddish prayer，下再釋)，被修改成為主禱文版本；對於其相似性，Perrin 提出其理據而聲稱不會是意外巧合。⁸ 另一方面，他指出耶穌將「神」與「國」連結是猶太末世論文學中罕見的，且耶穌常用「來臨」(to come) 這動詞而避用猶太教一批動詞，如聖頌用的 establish (見上注) 及其他用詞⁹，耶穌的教導更避開猶太教將神表述為王(The teaching of Jesusnever speaks of God 'appearing' as king)。Perrin 補充一點，猶太末世文學亦(如舊約)罕有神的國(Kingdom of God) 這組詞。(Perrin 1967: 55) 本人認為如上解耶穌有不少另類用詞，實質上是新約作者行文用的希臘文而非耶穌現場口述的亞蘭文，之間必存在翻譯含差異性問題，不易於「解透」。

Perrin 在該書論「神國」結束部分(第四章)，提出一個哲學上對時間的看法，含某程度「玄學」境界之辯，他聲稱：「我們面對的(耶穌)教訓不是以現代西方的線性時間概念來表達.....不是過去走向將來，而是機遇或場合的當下投身其中，在於主門徒現在此際注入神的真實多於將來才經歷圓滿的真實，這乃是仍未完的現在。」¹⁰ 他提出本人認同為「既玄但真」的神國度

⁷ 對「神話」和象徵，Perrin 有如下解說：“As time went on and the concept developed, all kinds of pictures and ideas were associated with it, especially in the apocalyptic literature: **the transformation of the earth, the end of history, the resurrection of the dead, and many others** All the particular forms in which we find this expressed are varied attempts to express the essentially inexpressible, and all the **myths and symbols associated with it in the literature are simply being pressed into the service of this attempt.**” (Perrin 1967: 53)

⁸ “In a translation by the present writer of the oldest text as reconstructed by G. Dalman, it runs: **‘Magnified and sanctified be his great name in the world which he has created according to his will. May he establish his kingdom in your lifetime and in your days and in the lifetime of all the house of Israel even speedily and at a near time.’**The parallel between this and the ‘Hallowed be thy name, thy Kingdom come’ of the Lord’s Prayer is so marked that it is difficult to conceive of it as accidental.” (Perrin 1967: 54)

⁹ “Two other ancient prayers, the eleventh of the Eighteen Benedictions, from the period before the destruction of the Temple in AD 70, and the Alenu prayer, probably from the third century AD, both use a form of the verb *mlk*, **‘to reign, be king’**, with God as the subject. In the apocalyptic literature the Kingdom ‘is forever over the nations’ (Ps. Sol. 17.3), **‘shall appear’** (Sib. Orac. 3.46f.; As. Mos. 10.1) or God **‘will raise up his Kingdom’** (Sib. Orac. 3.767), **but it is never referred to as ‘coming’**..... While Jesus is concerned with essentially the same eschatological hope as is found in the ancient prayers and apocalyptic literature, both in preferring **‘Kingdom’ to direct references to God (The expression ‘Kingdom of God’ is in fact surprisingly rare in the apocalyptic literature. See N. Perrin, Kingdom(1963), p. 168.)**” (Perrin 1967: 55)

¹⁰ 原文：“**we are not dealing here with teaching which is couched in terms of a modern western concept of linear time**..... not so much as something which passes from future to past, or past to future, but as opportunity or occasion, as something which is given meaning by that which fills it. So the present time of the disciple is filled with the reality of

本質所含得救概念：「將現在轉化成（屬）神的現在可保證所有將來是（屬）神的將來」(The present that has become God's present guarantees that all futures will be God's future)。(Perrin 1967: 203)

總的來說，本人認為，或因 Perrin 的博士受訓於德國聖經研究最有影響力時期，加上他專攻「耶穌教訓」這英美學者少研究項目，以上說法在日後廣為英語界學者吸納和引用，包括福音派新約學者；但西方福音派受培根主義(Baconism)和科學方法影響頗深（如歸納法查經流行至今），對神國的「既現在又將來」缺乏趨向玄妙境界的思想開發，更遑論應用神國所含不少弔詭之道理。(18B) 此外，Perrin 某些高等批判學（尤專於編修鑑別學）的研究果實，應有待更多學者發掘其正反意涵才作取捨，這會比全然擁抱較為恰當。

Norman Perrin 另一力作，是 56 歲去世時出版的 *Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom: Symbol and Metaphor in New Testament Interpretation* (Fortress Press, 1976 / 版本採用 www.religion-online.org 的 2003 年上載版，頁碼據這網上版)。本書的研究起自 1892 年 Johannes Weiss 出版的 *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes*，¹¹提出耶穌信息與其背景（猶太末世啓示文學）所含**象徵主義(symbolism)**問題，字面意義理解的爭論就延伸至「神的國」〔按：Perrin 1959 年的博士論文 *The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus* 關乎這方面〕。Perrin 認為：「神國的象徵根自古代近東各地流行的（起自蘇默）神話中，神殲惡獸為王，而逢新年慶祝各神更新沃土、使其子民續命。」¹² 以色列有創世記（蛇受咒詛）及特別經歷被神救出埃及，這兩個傳統形成舊約神學那一式救贖史(Salvation History / 德文 *Heilsgeschichte*) 理念，德國舊約學者 Gerhard von

God other than a consummation of the experience of this reality in the future..... **a reality known in terms of Now, but also of Not Yet.**" (Perrin 1967: 202) / 後再補說："It must, lastly, recognize **the inadequacies of a linear concept of time.** Time, in the teaching of Jesus, is something which God fills and fulfills, and it is something which man experiences, rather than something which moves from past to future." (Perrin 1967: 204)

¹¹ 英譯是 *Jesus' Proclamation of the Kingdom of God* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, and London: SCM Press, 1971)。原著僅 65 頁，Weiss 卻顛覆了當時主流的德國自由神學，開啓從「猶太歷史（處境）」詮釋耶穌神國信息的新方向，Perrin 節錄該書如下："the Kingdom of God is conceived of as **'the breaking out of an overpowering divine storm which erupts into history to destroy [按：以趕鬼擊毀撒旦的國]and to renew. . . and which man can neither further nor influence.'** **'The disciples were to pray for the coming of the Kingdom, but man could do nothing to establish it. . . . Not even Jesus can bring, establish, or found the Kingdom of God; only God can do so.'**"(Perrin 1976: 72)。然而值得注意，Perrin 指 Weiss 認為耶穌的神國論與後世「無關」："he (Weiss) flatly denied that Jesus' use of Kingdom of God had any significance for the later generation.....he simply decided that Jesus' use, however historically interesting, **was irrelevant to Europe at the end of the nineteenth century**..... Kingdom of God for himself and his contemporaries as **'the Rule of God [which] is the highest Good and the supreme ethical ideal,'**..... **Fundamentally Weiss saw Kingdom of God as a concept** in the message of Jesus, and as a concept which he could not accept. **But I have argued at length that Kingdom of God is not a concept but a symbol, and a symbol evoking a myth.** (Perrin 1976: 73-74)

¹²撮自以下原文："The roots of the symbol Kingdom of God lie in the ancient Near Eastern myth of the kingship of God..... In Babylonia Marduk is king; in Assyria, Asshur; in Ammon, Milhom; in Tyre, Melkart; **in Israel, Yahweh**..... each spring the god renews the fertility of the earth against the threat of his enemies and man's. It was this that was celebrated cultically in an annual New Year festival. In the cultic ritual of this festival the god became king..... his people experienced him as king as he entered once more into their lives." (Perrin 1976: 21-22) 在近東諸古國，神是王者各有其名，於耶和華的描述 Perrin 提出詩篇 47, 93, 96-99。

Rad(1901-71) 再據申命記 26:5b-9 加大發揮 *Heilsgeschichte* 認信(Credo)。(Perrin 1976: 23-24) 西方神學普遍受德國這神學影響至今。

對於「國」之義理，Perrin 先縷述歷史如下：「神國」的盼望本與猶太人歷史密切相關，就是公元前 586 年被擄猶太人歸回故土，後在耶路撒冷得享二百多年太平生活、由大祭司奉神之名管治他們。但公元前 333 年宗主國波斯被希臘的亞歷山大大帝征服，巴勒斯坦重回昔日南北國分裂並各自被外邦勢力統治的局面，猶太人本欲重覓一個小猶太國的期盼，頓成虛幻。直待至公元前 164 年，猶太地在馬加比兄弟領導下取得獨立。然而，百年後羅馬帝國進佔地中海東部，情況再陷嚴峻，如作為神代表的大祭司，竟被迫由羅馬政權任命，導致猶太人的心態更期盼神能夠介入、大加作為。但公元（主後）6 年打後，政情更差，羅馬派總督(procurator)直接管治耶路撒冷。就在公元前後一段政治嚴峻時期，猶太末世啓示文學紛紛期盼神的臨到、戰勝外敵，而如實反映在 66 年和 132 年兩度起義，推翻羅馬在當地管治，冀盼藉此神會介入。這些事件中，「(神)國」這一被高舉的象徵，就是用作表達如斯盼望。(Perrin 1976: 29-32)¹³

Perrin 認為，耶穌在世時同胞有此企盼的表達，是猶太會堂經常使用的一段（亞蘭文）聖頌／祝禱文（*Kaddish prayer*，參上第六段）：「願在你今生的日子中和以色列家的今世，祂建立祂的國(establish his kingdom)，使之速臨。」¹⁴；Perrin 稱耶穌的主禱文開首「兩願」爾國臨、爾旨成(Thy kingdom come, thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven) 乃出自此一聖頌。此說廣被學者引用，備受重視，暫不贅，見後論。

再者，這遺作也是探討釋經學(Hermeneutics)的發展，藉歷史上不同釋讀「神國」的代表性人物，轉入細述始於德人 Joachim Jeremias(1900-1979)¹⁵ 的經典 *The Parables of Jesus*（原德文本 *Die Gleichnisse Jesu* 1947 首版）所回溯的耶穌比喻原意。比喻的重要，是因這一種文體大多作為耶穌講解神國之法，其中涉及釋經史上三方面（注中粗體字）¹⁶ 的解法。這第一方面，Perrin 不斷重提「神國」意即「神是王」（亦見上書），這反映在耶穌趕鬼事工中和主禱文教導

¹³ Perrin 還引以下兩書論「象徵」：Philip Wheelwright, *Metaphor and Reality* (1962)和 Paul Ricoeur, *The Symbolism of Evil* (1969)。「What for Wheelwright is a distinction between a 'steno-symbol' and a 'tensive symbol' is for Ricoeur a distinction between a sign and a 'symbol.'」(Perrin 1976: 35)

¹⁴ "Magnified and sanctified be his great name in the world that he has created according to his will. **May he establish his kingdom in your lifetime and in your days and in the lifetime of all the house of Israel, even speedily and at a near time.**" (Perrin 1976: 33)

¹⁵ 早年隨父在耶路撒冷長期生活的信義宗新約學者，專於 textual criticism/original historical context，享譽全球學界，是 Perrin 師隨的博士論文指導。2019 年 Jeremias 曾任教的 Georg-August Universität Göttingen 舉辦紀念他逝世 40 年 Symposium，可見其影響力。華人聖經學者倘若有出自這位先師或其門生，該多引介其說。

¹⁶ "the parables are perhaps the most characteristic form of the speech of Jesus himself. They challenge the hearer to explore the manifold possibilities of the experience of **God as king**, also the parables are **allegorized** and **moralized** in the Christian traditions to a point at which one can live with them and draw helpful lessons from them." (Perrin 1976: 216) 楊牧谷曾發表耶穌比喻之研究（未算深入），但後來者不多見。

中（如求神國降臨、求神免債者須免別人債）。¹⁷ 第二和第三方面可以概括歷史如下，早於奧古斯丁(354-430) 就推廣比喻的寓意解經(allegorical interpretation)、使靈意解法流行達一千五百年之久，到 20 世紀當道的自由神學另採亞里士多德的邏輯學（多於其修辭學）、將耶穌的神國比喻作出道德化(moralized)解讀成為愛、和平、饒恕、喜樂等(as general moral and spiritual instruction)。與此同時，在一批聖經學者推動下，「回到經文的猶太歷史處境」(setting in life) 受到正視，領軍的英人 C. H. Dodd（1935 推出 *The Parables of the Kingdom*）對耶穌的「極端要求」言論，則越過字面意義走向靈活思考和捕捉想像 (to tease the mind into active thought / to catch the imagination) 來寬解之，但避開昔日寓意化帶入神秘 (allegorical mystifications) 的景況。(Perrin 1976: 101-110)

這些德英學術見解到 20 世紀中期，進入北美聖經學界形成「新釋經學」(New Hermeneutic)，引入德國神哲學家海德格爾一種「詩意(poetic)語言」，既非純歷史又非純文學的新理解。¹⁸ 倡導者亦將布特曼所倡的「釋經乃文本與解釋者對話」(hermeneutics as dialogue between text and interpreter) 推上新台階：文本對人的實存而言，乃是「解釋人之主、多於被人解之僕」。基於此等新學說，比喻能向現代人有效講話，按這帶有存在主義色彩新的解釋方法學，乃是透過講員之言(sermon / words) 變作上帝之道(word) 的傳講(preaching)，人之言說變成神之說道。¹⁹

Perrin 語帶批判指出，這樣由耶穌作為終極真相啓示者(as revealer of ultimate reality) 直轉為當今講章(sermon)之模式的釋經，據歷史或文學鑑別學(historical or literary criticism) 的基準實難以成立(hard to justify)，因經文的原讀者即時轉為 20 世紀讀者，實過於急進。(Perrin 1976: 135-36)本人認為，巴特及其新正統神學對道的高舉(Theology of the Word of God) 並解這道化為肉身(incarnate)、文字(written)和宣講(preached) 三範式，後者的講壇宣道，與新釋經學帶存在主義色彩的「講章(sermon)」模式，本質上分別不大。巴特離不開時人觀點，並非獨具「慧眼」。(18C)

¹⁷ "to recognize the Kingdom of God as a reality in the exorcisms, to recognize that the ancient myth of the activity of God as king can now be realized in their experience in various ways..... The Lord's Prayer invites the disciple to pray for the 'coming' of the Kingdom..... 'explorations of fundamental possibilities for the experience of God as king in human life,' and among them is one, 'Forgive us . . . as we herewith forgive . . .,' which clearly intends 'to link the experience of God to the response of man.'" (Perrin 1976: 212)

¹⁸ "The practitioners of the 'new hermeneutic' moved most naturally from New Testament scholarship to philosophy and theology, rather than to literary scholarship. So they sought to understand the impact of the parables of Jesus as a 'language event' or 'God happening'..... Heidegger's model is poetic language..... this dimension of language, a dimension new to us as New Testament scholars.....by means of which the parables may be interpreted both in terms of their historical meaning on the lips of Jesus, and also in terms of their potential meaning for subsequent and different readers and situations, it does seem to me to take some short cuts; the "new hermeneutic" ignores many literary-critical steps along the way that ought most carefully to be explored." (Perrin 1976: 133-34)

¹⁹ "the text is not the servant of an understanding of existence which can be derived from it by the hermeneutical process of demythologizing; rather it is 'a master that directs us into the language-character of our existence, in which we exist before God.'..... The text of the parables addresses modern man as do the words of a preacher, upon whose lips the words of a man become the word of God because this is what happens in true preaching." (Perrin 1976: 135)

然而，Perrin 不全然拒絕這解法而曲線引入性質相近之說。最具代表性是美國的 Robert Funk，他對傳統釋經學作出突破，在其 1966 年 *Language, Hermeneutic, and Word of God* 這一章 *The Parable as Metaphor*，定性比喻是「刺激」聽者成參與者，進入應用層次，讓隱喻(metaphor)展現於實事，並不斷成為（今後聽者）實現過程中的敘事(narrative)。²⁰ 對這般賦予比喻一個「開放的」(open-ended) 雙重性踐現，Perrin 認為這非常重要，可讓比喻的未全 (incomplete) 之意拉入「聽受者」的主體性實踐(drawing the listener into it as participant)，令文本蘊含之意不致「被（字面）解盡」(its potentiality of meaning is not to be exhausted)。(Perrin 1976: 143,146)²¹ 再者，Perrin 引入「詩體性隱喻(poetic metaphor)」辯解這「開放性」使後世每代，能透過其存在實踐(participation)「不離地」領悟文本中比喻意指的屬天國度。²² 本人認為西方近二千年釋經學派，一直「搖擺」在原作者、文本、讀者（聽受者／解經者）三者之間孰重孰輕，理論繁多但未臻完善。或許，正確方法論在於尋求三者全面整合，還需加二法：作為默示主角的第四者聖靈被邀導解之法、和「聖經……叫屬神的人……行各樣善事（真理）」（提後三 16）的「知行合一」之法，才算合乎對聖經真知道的五進路。最後之法，更可結合王陽明學說開發本色神學。(18D)

Perrin 更按 Funk 的闡釋，將比喻的含意進一步申論至三方面：明喻（simile：像一如／like, as）、暗喻隱喻（metaphor：是／is）、象徵（symbol：代表／represent）；前兩者的「天國就像」和「天國就是」是普及於前代的理解（Funk 文則開發「暗喻」），²³ 第三者「象徵」則反映在「我若靠著神的靈趕鬼(B)，那麼，神的國就已臨到你們了(A)。」（和修版：太十二 28；路十一 20）耶穌趕鬼「代表」（演繹、表述）神的國已臨即 B represents A（參注解）。²⁴

²⁰ “The chapter begins with Dodd’s definition of the parable…… ‘the application is left imprecise in order to tease the hearer into his own application.’…… the parable is not closed ‘until the listener is drawn into it as a participant.’…… ‘When the metaphor is extended to narrative it is extended to *realistic narrative*, and realistic narrative also functions to draw the listener into it as participant.” (Perrin 1976: 143)

²¹ 這方面引起「比喻意思只一個或可多個的爭論」，上一代英國的 Dodd、德國的 Jeremias 的還原(reduction)理論主張比喻原只一意 (the eschatological *point* of particular historical application)，但據 Funk 的 metaphor 理論，Perrin 認為比喻向不同處境說話時可有多意(the original meaning, determined by historical criticism, is not to be forgotten as the new and different meanings are pursued.)，兩個理論從此在美國出現融合。(Perrin 1976: 146-47)

²² “the(poetic)metaphor may come alive for us ……(it)contains for us ‘a new possibility of world and of language,’ a possibility which opens up for us only after we have ‘participated through the metaphor in its new and alien referential world,’ the world that is God and Kingdom of God.” (Perrin 1976: 176) 值得注意的是，Perrin 於 1973 年任主席的 The Society of Biblical Literature (SBL)，自 1972 年起設立 Seminar on the Parables，參與學者出自美國的有 Perrin, Wilder, Funk, Via, Crossan（組長，力主 poetic metaphor）等，開首研究課題是 A Structuralist Approach to the Parables 而孕育出 structuralism 對比喻作為文本新解法（聚焦研究好撒瑪利亞人比喻）。(Perrin 1976: 177) 對此 Perrin 指出一個問題：structuralist approach 忽略要求「解經者」(demand on the interpreter) 一方有何參與，誠屬不足。(Perrin 1976: 188)

²³ “the Kingdom confronts us through the power of metaphor to produce an impact upon the imagination, to be the bearer of reality, to induce vision.” (Perrin 1976: 144)

²⁴ “In a simile the element of comparison ‘is illustrative,’ but in a metaphor ‘it is creative of meaning (new vision of reality).’……All three involve the element of comparison. If, in a simile, A is like B, and, in a metaphor, A is B, then, in

綜合來說並值得再提，Perrin 身處德國的批判學流行的時代，所以他重視將經文解釋納入高等鑑別學（或稱高等批判學）和低等鑑別學（或稱低等批判學）來處理；他也受美國興起的新釋經學(New Hermeneutic) 影響，將那來自哲學如上解的 Language event²⁵ (*Sprachereignis*) 引進並轉化，應用在比喻的經文，反映那段時期流行的結構主義文學理論下「文本能自說」的治學方法。²⁶

基於上述象徵學說的興起，Perrin 去世前幾年才改變其思想為「神國不是概念而是象徵」：耶穌主要信息「神的國」是一個象徵／符號多於一個概念 (a symbol rather than a conception)，前者意含比後者（概念）豐富；²⁷ 他亦強調這象徵喚起神話 (a symbol evoking a myth)，以致不必執著字面（如神國比喻中字詞）的意義來解讀，可隨時代變遷予以不同的意義。²⁸ 眾所皆知，布特曼宣揚聖經充斥神話而需「去神話化」(*Entmythologisierung/demythologization*)，Perrin 解釋神話於布氏指科學時期之前宇宙觀(prescientific cosmology) 如 寓意（解經）神話

symbolic language, B represents A 'If I by the finger of God cast out demons, then the Kingdom of God has come,' then we have symbolic language: in some way **the exorcisms represent the Kingdom of God.**" (Perrin 1976: 144-45)

²⁵ 此詞出自 1920 年代哥倫比亞大學的 *Journal of Philosophy*，由德國新約學者 Ernest Fuchs 推廣至北美而形成 New Hermeneutic，使（耶穌）語言主動進涉個人存在而產生事件化(eventualized)，而經文(text)不再是被動地「被人解」而能主動「出擊」改變人，帶有當時流行的存在主義色彩。

²⁶ 正如他說：“Most recently we have seen **the American attempts to let the word pictures and stories speak for themselves**, using the tools of historical criticism to recreate the circumstances of their first telling and of literary criticism to understand their natural function as language in the new setting of a modern interpretation.” (Perrin 1976: 217) / “In reviewing the history of the interpretation of the parables to reach a point at which the texts are able to speak for themselves. **Textual criticism, historical criticism, literary criticism — this last certainly now to be understood as including structuralist criticism are all needed in the attempt to make it possible for the texts to speak for themselves.**” (Perrin 1976: 218)

²⁷ “But I now want to argue that such language is imprecise. **“Kingdom of God” is not an idea or a conception, it is a symbol. As a symbol it can represent or evoke a whole range or series of conceptions or ideas**, but it only becomes a conception or idea if it constantly represents or evokes that one conception or idea,” (Perrin 1976: 38)

²⁸ “a symbol having meaning for people in cultural continuity with ancient Israel and **its myth of God acting as king**, a cultural continuity in which Jesus certainly stood.” (Perrin 1976: 214) 然而，Perrin 也引 Alan Watts 解讀：“Myth is to be defined as a complex of stories — **some no doubt fact, and some fantasy** — which, for various reasons, human beings regard as demonstrations of the inner meaning of the universe and of human life.” (Perrin 1976: 27) 。因此，Perrin 不離布特曼影子(Bultmannian understanding of the eschatology of Jesus)而如此說：“In my SBL Presidential Address I expressed the hermeneutical option which challenges me personally as the responsibility to explore ‘the manifold ways in which the experience of God can become an existential reality to man’ and **to understand Kingdom of God not as ‘a single identifiable event which every man experiences at the same time,’ but as something ‘which every man experiences in his own time,’** Since I would be fully prepared to argue that ‘activity of God’ and an ‘event which every man experiences’ is **ultimately mythological language to be taken seriously but not necessarily literally**,..... What I am concerned to claim is that a valid hermeneutics to be applied to Jesus’ proclamation of the Kingdom of God must take seriously and deal most carefully with the elements of **symbol and myth** in that proclamation.” (Perrin 1976: 215-216) / “Jesus addressed his parables to people who fully accepted the **myth** and so his parables were effective forms of proclamation of the Kingdom.....becomes an *interpretation* of the Kingdom: the hearers are challenged to recognize the reality that is mediated by the **myth in terms of the concrete actuality of the everyday.**” (Perrin 1976: 219) 本人認為耶穌的比喻既然涉及深廣的古猶太生活文化，以此契入作理解，實為必需，然而德國當時身處希特勒的反猶太氛圍，或構成學術上德國學者探索猶太元素的禁忌和阻力。

(allegorical myth) (Perrin 1976: 79, 83) [本人按：德國的這個聖經研究術語「神話」，不必然以傳統中國的神話那種「神化」來理解，所以不宜望文生義]。論到以「神話」梳解經文，他不認同布特曼的「存在(existential) 抉擇」只重當今應用那極端解經法，²⁹正如他也不認同另一極端「社會福音」的倡議者美國的 Rauschenbusch (饒申布士) 對福音的解法，但他也坦承學術上闡釋神國之難。³⁰

在歷史的長河中，拉丁思維的奧古斯丁沿用當時主流的寓意式解經法而主宰其後中世紀釋經學，今天寓意解經普遍為人詬病，但從 Perrin 來看是可予理解而不予狠批。³¹ 西方早已放下寓意式解經 (福音派尤甚)，但存在主義式釋經學也如前者含主觀元素，Perrin 重視的是：讓文本自行說話 (allow a text to speak) 和與文本對話(dialogue with the text)。(Perrin 1976: 220)，但未見他談及聖靈作為「原作者」在其中 (包括與文本對話中) 扮演的角色。再者，比喻的特殊性可如何擴充至普遍性和現代性，Perrin 承認自己沒有答案，因還原歷史的進路亦少探討現今。³² Perrin 為這本探討神國和耶穌比喻方面遺作如此作結：「我未嘗在此研究確立某一釋經理論，只確認留意文本 (經文版本)、歷史和文學的因素和釋經目的中，解經者欣然地與文本彼此對話。」³³

本人認為：毫無疑問，Perrin 這兩本經典的精深討論及其最後力倡的「神國是象徵」，意涵深廣，是為他山之石。³⁴ 西方釋經學發展尤其上世紀至今不求「客觀性」，有別於華人解經上力

²⁹ "(Bultmann's hermeneutics) not developed in connection with the parables but certainly applicable to them." (Perrin 1976: 153) / "For Bultmann the myth is dead and the symbolic language, archaic; he, therefore, sought a means of translating the myth as an 'expression of life,' and found it in the hermeneutics of 'demythologizing.'" (Perrin 1976: 215)

³⁰ Perrin 如此表述："The basic problem of all hermeneutics of the Kingdom of God is **the problem of the myth** which that symbol evokes. Here the interpreter works in the context of **the possibility represented at the one extreme by a Rauschenbusch or the possibility represented at the other extreme by a Bultmann**, or that interpreter works in the context of some other possibility from the spectrum lying within the boundaries established by those two extremes." (Perrin 1976: 219) 然而，理論歸理論，提出來不難，現實卻是困難重重，正如他誠實地說："Indeed the hermeneutical enterprise is even more complex than our discussion has indicated because obviously **myths become meaningless and metaphors die or become dormant in response to sociological and cultural factors.**" (Perrin 1976: 220)

³¹ "The speculative theological use of the symbol by Augustine a so involved literary features in that Augustine was reading the New Testament texts as allegories and Kingdom of God had become for him a speculative cipher to which **he could give any meaning demanded by his overall theological system.**" (Perrin 1976: 214) / "Augustine's interpretation of both Kingdom of God and the parables of Jesus **was necessarily conditioned by the cultural dominance of allegory.**" (Perrin 1976: 220)

³² "how important the universal element is over against the particular or occasional, and vice versa. I have no answer to this question, The severely historical approach threatens to leave the parables speaking to their past historical situation but with nothing to say to the present." (Perrin 1976: 152)

³³ 原文："It is not my claim that any specific hermeneutical theory has been developed in these studies, except in the very general sense that any valid hermeneutics must clearly pay careful attention to textual, historical, and literary factors, and that the aim of any hermeneutics must be to make possible the moment in which the interpreter enters into dialogue with the text by reading it appreciatively." (Perrin 1976: 220)

³⁴ 豐富福音派所解讀的神國："kingdom of God as the universal, eternal sovereignty of God and Israel as a theocracy eschatological-historical tensions will fall within these parameters (e.g., **already-not yet; fulfillment-consummation; promise-fulfillment; realistic-futuristic; this age-the age to come.**)" from H. Leroy Metts, "The Kingdom

求「正確不變性」(少有如 Perrin 晚後隨學風改稱神國是象徵不是概念); 對應華人「讀經」傳承, 西方釋經的各種方法學(methodologies)不宜被視為具凌駕性, 至少應配合東西方歷代「敬虔解經者(非指神秘主義)」的所謂生命讀經, 才較為全面恰當。本書提出的只是「純釋經學理」的比拼較量, 欠缺探討釋經學也是聖靈引導和行道體驗的生命學問(參 18D)。再者, 本人認同他嘗試將神國的比喻從古時帶進今天(方法上縱或引向不著邊際), 在解讀上確有此需要以使天國成為「在地教會」更落實的使命和生活。(18E)