MALAYSIAN ASSOCIATION OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS

JOURNAL 2012

M
A
T
S

Edited by : Wilfred J. Samuel

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface

We are pleased to present the Malaysian Association of Theological Schools' Journal of 2012 to the Church in Malaysia and the wider church community in the world. This is the fourth issue of the MATS Journal, and we hope to publish at least one Journal every two years. The essays presented in this Journal are contributions by the faculty members of our member schools, in particular, Malaysian Baptist Theological Seminary, Methodist Theological School, Sabah Theological Seminary and Seminari Teoloji Malaysia.

We hope these essays which encompass biblical, historical, theological and pastoral themes will enrich and deepen our faith, life and ministry, as we reflect on the gospel in relation to the diverse contexts of our church communities. It is also hoped that these efforts will inspire and encourage others to write and further enhance theological education and research within the Malaysian church.

We would like to thank Dr Wilfred Samuel for his outstanding work in editing this edition of the Journal. May the Lord bless these essays for the edification of his body and the work of his kingdom. *Soli Deo gloria.*

Ng Kok Kee
Chairman, MATS (2011-2013)

A Theological Wisdom Model for the Journey of Faith

Elaine Goh Wei Fun

Introduction

Wisdom in its essence is an "ability to cope," an "art of steering," or a "quest for self-understanding and for mastery of the world."[1] This definition makes wisdom more than just a literary corpus; rather it is a human experience that encompasses learning and growing.   Such human experience records a remarkable thematic coherence in biblical wisdom literature, which communicates one's progress of growth: from the danger of committing wrongful acts, through suffering and pain, amidst the disproportions of reality. This paper concurs that the "voices of protest" from Job and Qoheleth should therefore be viewed as an integral and genuine expression of faith, rather than as a rejection of traditional wisdom thought.[2] This paper suggests a theological wisdom model for the journey of faith, by combining three biblical wisdom books, namely Proverbs, the book of Job and the book of Ecclesiastes.   I shall embark on establishing the reasons why these three biblical wisdom books, taken together, should be viewed as *a* theological model.

---

[1] James L. Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998), 9.

[2] See Richard Schultz, "Unity or Diversity in Wisdom Theology? A Canonical and Covenantal Perspective," in *Tyndale Bulletine* 48.2 (1997): 271-306, here 279, 290.

A Theology from Below: Humankind as the Centre of God's Creation

Biblical wisdom literature communicates a theology from below. Wisdom's theological reflection is most apparent in its effort to relate to the phenomenon of the world and humanity.[3] The word for "humanity, human, person," *'ādām*, appears 44 times in Proverbs; another term, *'îš*, which means "man", occurs 90 times in the same book.[4] The word *'ĕnôš*, which means "mortal," often translated as "human", is also remarkably recurrent in the book of Job (e.g. Job 4:17; 10:4; 15:14).[5] In *Ecclesiastes*, *'ādām* is mentioned 48 times, compares to 40 times for *'ĕlōhîm* "God."[6] The frequency of terms depicting humankind informs the reader of a human outlook in these biblical wisdom books. Since the presence of the divine is also evident, it is "humanity in relation to what God has done in the universe" or "a theological anthropology" that matters in the wisdom writing.[7]

In wisdom thought, God's activity coheres with human activity. Wisdom literature contains an enormous amount of

---

[3] Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology Vol 2* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965), 449.

[4] Bruce K. Waltke, *The Book of Proverbs: Chapters 1-15* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2004), 89.

[5] Other occurrences: Job 5:17; 7:17; 9:2; 10:5; 14:19; 25:4, 6; 28:13; 34:6; 36:25. Only in Job 4:17 *'ĕnôš* occurs with a definite article.

[6] Choon-Leong Seow, *Ecclesiastes* (The Anchor Bible. NY: Doubleday, 1997), 54.

[7] Seow, *Ecclesiastes*, 54-55. Seow comments solely from the perspective of Ecclesiastes.

reflection, experience and observation. This inclination is not humanistic but anthropocentric. It signifies a theology from below that starts from a human perspective, a theology that upholds humankind as the crown of God's creation. In this manner, "the fundamental point of orientation" with regard to wisdom books is humankind. [8] To be human is to be responsible for the search for truth that God has set in the created world, and to learn to live in harmony with this truth. As such, biblical wisdom advocates propriety as a way of life: the right time and place for actions or non-actions, speeches or silence. Similarly, the subsistence of the created world depends on appropriate human conduct, especially when suffering persists, injustice abounds, unfairness occurs, and when mystery overwhelms. Human actions indeed have cosmic implications.[9]

An *anthropocentric* theology of wisdom, however, does not clash with the *theocentric* claim of other canonical books such as found in the *Torah,* or in the historical or prophetic books. Both anthropocentric and theocentric perspectives in the Old Testament take different points of departure and are not mutually exclusive. The natural theology implied in wisdom literature begins with humanity; and it supplements the theology of salvation history articulated in other canonical books.[10] Thus anthropocentric and theocentric approaches go hand in hand in constructing Old Testament theology. Wisdom simply articulates a human perspective of godly living.[11] Such an idea

---

[8] Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom,* 10.

[9] Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom,* 11.

[10] Choon-Leong Seow, *Wisdom as Practical Theology* (Guest Lecture; Sabah Theological Seminary, KK, Sabah; 21-25 July 2008).

[11] Hence the sense of a common humanity in wisdom writing should not be claimed as a peculiar product of Yahwism. See John J. Collins,

reflects the "theological dimension of being human," as Childs has argued.[12] This understanding conveys the strong pragmatism of wisdom literature towards concrete and authentic human living.

A Theological Centre: The Fear of the LORD

Michael V. Fox identifies wisdom as the fear of God, which represents both the beginning (Prov 1:7) and the finale of the quest for wisdom (Prov 2:5).[13] Wisdom enables one to discern right from wrong and empowers one to do right, knowing full well that God is present. The "fear of God" means humankind must live in the knowledge of its place in relation to the divine. The fear of God is *provocative*, since the attitude demands justice to be done and reasons given for failure in this sphere. The fear of God is also *transformative*, for humankind acknowledges that sovereignty falls solely to the hand of the deity.

In *Proverbs*, the limitation of human knowledge, as opposed to God's, is clearly acknowledged. Von Rad has pointed out that God is mentioned intentionally in connection with human limitation (Prov 16:1-2, 9; 19:21; 21:24, 30-31).[14] In Job, the fear of God is illustrated intensely through the "theological

---

"Proverbial Wisdom and the Yahwist Vision," in *Semeia* 17 (1980): 1-17, here 13.

[12] Brevard S. Childs, *Old Testament Theology in a Canonical Context* (London: SCM, 1985), 196-203.

[13] Michael V. Fox, "Ideas of Wisdom in Proverbs 1-9," in *Journal of Biblical Literature* 116.4 (1997): 612-633, here 620.

[14] Von Rad, *Wisdom in Israel*, 99.

whistle-blower verse" (Job 6:14),[15] when Job laments that, "one may abandon the fear of Shaddai." The fear of the deity has thus inevitably become the focal attention when faith is in crisis. Qoheleth, on the other hand, brings a God-fearing factor into his rhetoric amidst his skeptically constructed observations (Ecc 3:13-17; 5:1-7, 18-19; 7:13-14; 8:15-9:1; 11:9-12:1; 12:13-14), attempting to offer a pointer toward life's inscrutable reality. Since a mastery of rules and maxims cannot confer absolute certainty, "life retains a mysterious and incalculable element, and it is precisely in this incalculable area that Yahweh is encountered."[16]

The fear of the LORD signifies the beginning of all knowledge and the crowning achievement of wisdom.[17] This fear is part of the essence of Israelite faith. Life's abundant mysteries evoke gratitude and reverence in the author of wisdom.[18] Such reverence is directly linked to other canonical texts. Wisdom encompasses a theological sense of God's involvement and intimate communion. This experience "is not separated from the world, but is in the midst of everyday life with its customary, even petty events."[19] As such, the wisdom experience is a "faith experience."[20] Also, the wisdom corpus is

---

[15] Choon-Leong Seow, "Job: Theology When Theology Fails," *Wisdom as Practical Theology* (Guest Lecture; Sabah Theological Seminary, KK, Sabah), 23 July 2008.

[16] Collins, "Proverbial Wisdom and the Yahwist Vision," here 10.

[17] Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom*, 12.

[18] James L. Crenshaw, "The Acquisition of Knowledge in Israelite Wisdom Literature," in *Word & World* 7.3 (1987): 245-252, here 247.

[19] Roland E. Murphy, *The Tree of Life: An Exploration of Biblical Wisdom Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 125.

[20] Murphy, *The Tree of Life*, 125.

"theological literature," for it witnesses to the LORD and to the world which is willed, governed, and sustained by the LORD.[21]

A Theology that Aims at the Realities of Life

Biblical wisdom literature communicates a theology that aims at the realities of life, a continuous arena that provides basic parameters within which one lives and dies. In the biblical world, a dichotomy between secular and sacred did not exist, for people lived in God's presence.[22] The law and historical credos were designed to construct a subjective view of reality under God's rule; whereas wisdom literature was designed to present a realistic view of human life in God's creation. Therefore, reality is the realm in which a life begins and ends, a generation comes and goes; reality is a sphere of work and rest, a place of rise and fall.

According to wisdom thought, life in reality is walking by calculation rather than by faith (e.g. Prov 24:27; Ecc 9:12).[23] Wisdom pedagogy is sometimes ironic: one can control one's actions but not the consequences of those actions (e.g. Ecc 9:15; 10:8-9; 11:6).[24] Crenshaw points out three ways of acquiring knowledge as described in wisdom literature: firstly, through personal observation of nature and human behaviour: truth is

---

[21] Bruce C. Birch, Walter Brueggemann, Terence Fretheim, David L. Petersen, *A Theological Introduction to the Old Testament* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1999), 376.

[22] Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom,* 14.

[23] John Goldingay, *Theological Diversity and the Authority of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1987), 207.

[24] Fox, "Ideas of Wisdom in Proverbs 1-9," 623.

obtained from human enquiry rather than divine initiative. Secondly, through analogy between creed and reality: as in Ps 73, through one's struggle with faith. Thirdly, through encounter with the Transcendent One: people learn about the truth of reality in personal enlightenment.[25] All three ways of learning are based on "lived experience"[26] that takes place in reality.

Choon-Leong Seow has argued for the place of wisdom literature at the heart of biblical theology. Wisdom, Seow reasons, is about "the life of the present, life here and now," therefore it must not be peripheral when constructing theology. [27] Further, the "mode of faith" in wisdom operates in different interpretive categories and demands its own mode of discourse and reflection.[28] And biblical theology is "both-worldly": it encapsulates an anthropocentric world of reality on earth and a theocentric world of revelation from above.[29] By definition, wisdom is basically a practical life-skill: living morally, making wise decisions, behaving appropriately and exercising common sense. As such, for the people of God, wisdom is the life of worship extended to the home and marketplace.[30] Wisdom offers strategies for living in the here and now; and it takes place amidst the realities of life.

---

[25] Crenshaw, "The Acquisition of Knowledge, 245-252.

[26] Bruce C.Birch, Walter Brueggemann, Terence Fretheim and David L. Petersen, *A Theological Introduction to the Old Testament* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1999), 374.

[27] Seow, *Wisdom*, 21 July 2008.

[28] Birch and others, *A Theological Introduction*, 374.

[29] Seow, *Wisdom*, 25 July 2008.

[30] William Dyrness, *Themes in Old Testament Theology* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1979), 189.

A Theology of Growth in Faith

Theology is concerned with the living faith of God's people. Crenshaw has aptly said of biblical wisdom literature: Proverbs searched for knowledge, Job searched for God's presence, Qoheleth searched for meaning in life.[31] The temporal focus differs in each instance: Proverbs focused on the *past* when God established an order and humans endeavored to live in harmony with that order; Job's *present* suffering increased the urgency of finding relief; while Qoheleth's doubt arose from an inability to discern the *future*.[32] These relenting searches fluctuate, as if swinging on a pendulum between trusting one's ability to grasp hold of existence and a total dependence on God's mercy for survival.[33] The two concepts inspire a sense of tension within wisdom thought. Seow shares this same concern regarding the alleged tension in wisdom thought: it is human confidence tempered with, and balanced by, human limitedness.[34] On the one hand, humans represent God's unique creation; on the other, they are mere mortals. This dilemma of human existence gives rise to a creative tension within wisdom writing, often mistakenly perceived as a conflict of perspectives, or wrongly regarded as wisdom's self-correcting. This paper argues for a theology of growth underlying such a self-contained tension within these biblical wisdom books. The creative tension within biblical wisdom literature is intentional, for the tension signifies engagement with the journey of faith, within a believer in God.

---

[31] Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom,* 50.

[32] Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom,* 50-51.

[33] Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom,* 51.

[34] Seow, *Wisdom*, 21 July 2008.

Proverbs: A Good Disciple

In Proverbs, a disciple learns about the hard and fast rules of godly living. The disciple embarks on a journey of faith by learning proverbial generalizations from wise sayings and admonitions: devotion to the LORD is, at the same time, spurning evil. Compliance to the teaching of Proverbs represents submission the God. A good and teachable disciple, therefore, can easily subscribe to absoluteness and to formulaic certainty. As a beginner in faith, this good disciple exercises his or her discernment, hoping to steer his or her life "safely into harbor, avoiding hazards that brought catastrophe to fools."[35] The disciple represents a good example of a moral agent who believes in rigid retribution, and who reasons from a fundamental premise of practical wisdom.[36] As such, every bad consequence, such as suffering, presumes a prior sin or wrongful behaviour. A fresh believer, therefore, holds fast to God's commandment and lives ethically so as to obtain goodness of life, at the same time avoiding calamity, which represents divine disfavour.

Job: A Questioning Devotee

For Job, practicalities are preferred over the home-schooled theories of Proverbs. A good disciple soon discovers that the

---

[35] James L. Crenshaw, "The Concept of God in Old Testament Wisdom," in *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie,* edited by Leo G. Perdue, Bernard Brandon Scott and William Johnston Wiseman (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1993):1-18, here 6.

[36] Daniel J. Estes, *Handbook on the Wisdom books and Psalms* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 23.

once- learned generalizations are to be questioned when bad experiences or human problems arise. In the book of Job, faith is questioned in the face of righteous suffering. Initial questioning occurs in the prologue of the book of Job, ironically through Satan's enquiry: Job's goodness, which has so impressed God, is merely a ploy to get divine blessing on his life. So the testing of faith begins, prompting "a modern Job" to wonder: "I have learned that God is *good*, but why have I come across a God that is not?" Along the journey of faith, the believer will find God, paradoxically, absent and present: both being equally offensive to a faithful believer. God's absence, represented by Job's silent Divine, demands one's tireless questioning. God's presence, like that of Job's theophany, though sought after, appears confrontational rather than therapeutic. As such, Job's experience signifies a quest for understanding by a faithful follower. This quest for understanding is rather tough, for it is compounded by challenges from other faithful followers. "The friends of Job" become the teachers of Proverbs, who are overly confident of their own teaching.[37] Eventually, the questioning devotee charges God with large-scale injustice encompassing social evil and oppression, just as Job does. This picture of internal struggle, however, does not altogether conceal one's hope that God will eventually come to one's assistance. The personal quest leads to a momentous theophany, where the faithful follower is confronted by God's ultimate questioning of who is really in charge of how to run the world. This personal encounter with God does not, however, provide a single answer to all earlier questionings, but, rather, causes the devotee to retreat from all questioning, and yield in trustful submission to

---

[37] Walter Brueggemann, *Old Testament Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2008), 235.

God, "Now I know that God is *God.*" Nonetheless, undergirding this confession is the virtue of trust.

Qoheleth: A Skeptic Believer

If Proverbs contains confident assertions about the way the world works, "these are rules for life; try them and find that they will work," both Job and Qoheleth appear to respond, "we tried, and they did not work."[38] When a faithful follower moves from Proverbs to Ecclesiastes, he faces a threatened skepticism more provoking than Job's. Ecclesiastes is Job without the theophany.[39] One finds that truth once learned becomes less and less verifiable, but more and more ungraspable. The reality of life becomes exceedingly complex, difficult to calculate and therefore impossible to explain. Since there is a mystery beyond human control, the once dutiful disciple starts to loose his grip on the hard and fast rules, and settles for a less-structured attitude toward reality, without compromising ultimate trust in a Living Presence. A faith journey which has arrived at this stage has cultivated a God-centred worldview, which is essential for finding meaning in life.[40] The tested and mature believer, reflected in Ecclesiastes, challenges new believers to contemplate on the core issues of life and to choose to live in surrender to God (12:1-7). This mature believer restrains himself from making hasty judgments, and keeps a skeptical view on life's happenings. This believer remains a hard -core

---

[38] David A. Hubbard, "The Wisdom Movement and Israel's Covenant Faith," *Tyndale Bulletin* 17 (1966):3-34, here 6; quoted in Goldingay, *Theological Diversity,* 208.

[39] Goldingay, *Theological Diversity,* 209.

[40] Estes, *Handbook on the Wisdom books and Psalms,* 280.

believer in a God who holds the ultimate meaning of life "under the sun." Such a disciple is both skeptic and believer; in a word, a "realist."[41]

Walter Brueggemann sees obedience as the sum of Israelite wisdom: "In the completed traditions of wisdom in the Old Testament, new obedience that takes the world seriously is a powerful dialectic of submissiveness and challenge."[42] Tracing the sapiential conclusion from Proverbs 3:7-8, through Job 28:28 and eventually on to Ecclesiastes 12:13, a believer in God thus embraces Torah obedience while growing in faith.[43] Such obedience demands serious engagement with human life and with the ultimate Living Presence. In this journey of faith and obedience, the God-human relationship is retrospective and two-dimensional. The progression from Proverbs to Job to Ecclesiastes is thus transformative: a believer in God grows from a simple faith to a faith in crisis and on to a renewed faith.

Conclusion

The model I propose upholds a faith journey that involves the people of God facing reality. It is the proposal of a theological model that attempts to reach into the heart of wisdom. The model defends the *unity* of wisdom literature and other canonical books, and a *diversity* within the wisdom books

---

[41] Choon-Leong Seow, "Ecclesiastes: Theology When Everything is Beyond Control," *Wisdom as Practical Theology* (Guest Lecture; Sabah Theological Seminary, KK, Sabah), 24 July 2008

[42] Walter Brueggemann, *Old Testament Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2008), 234.

[43] Brueggemann, *Old Testament Theology*, 236.

13

themselves. The Bible in general and wisdom literature in particular, points to many possible ways of cultivating the ability to live out faith. A person with faith searches for the aptitude to face life's inscrutability, only to find himself the object of God's pursuit.[44] Indeed, it is only when one reaches an endless searching, like that of Job and of Qoheleth, that one can encounter the Creator of Creation and the Master of the uttermost mystery, in total submission. Wisdom literature thus offers a perspective on understanding the divine revelation alongside Sinai revelation and prophetic utterance. Wisdom becomes the revelation of God's instruction, indirectly, through human views. This connection between wisdom and revelation delivers, what Claude Cox calls, *a theology of presence* for wisdom.[45] In my judgment, wisdom literature as a whole is therefore a book of faith, which informs its readers of the struggles and promises that come with faith.

---

[44] I am indebted to Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom,* 51 for this thought.

[45] Claude Cox, "When Torah Embraced Wisdom and Song: Job 28:28, Ecclesiastes 12:13, and Psalm 1:2," in *Restoration Quarterly* 49.2 (2007): 65-74, here 74.

A Critical Review Of The Historical Development Of Ministry Order In The Christian Church

Chong Siaw Fung

Abstract

Church Management is an important factor in the success of the ministry of the Church. The historical development of a 'ministry order' in the Christian Church demonstrates its possible contribution to, and effect of this system of Church administration and . management on, Church Ministry. This article presents a critical review of the 'ministry order' throughout the Apostolic, Patristic, Medieval, Reformation and Post-Reformation Periods of the Christian Church, in an attempt to discover insights which might enhance Church Management initiatives in response to the post-modern challenges of the present day.

After Jesus' ascension, the coming of the promised Holy Spiri (Acts 1:8, 2:2-4) on Pentecost, in Jerusalem sparked the beginning of the ministry of many generations of Christians to fulfil the Great Commission (Mt 28:18-20). The Church grew in Jerusalem (Acts 2:41, 47; 6:7) and Antioch (Acts 11:20-21) and spread quickly across Asia Minor and Europe during the

first century. This growth and development of the Church brought it to a stage where more structured and systematic administration was called for, to support the advancement of its mission. The first such instance can be observed when the Apostles enlisted administrative help towards the care of the believers' general welfare, in Acts 6:1-4. This administrative support enabled the Apostles to focus on their mission-critical tasks, and led to positive growth in the Church (Ac 6:7).

Up to the present day, church management still remains an important factor for the success of the ministry of the Church. In his book, *Becoming a Healthy Church: 10 Characteristics*, Stephen A Macchia acknowledged "wise administration and accountability" as one of the characteristics of a healthy church.[1] In Malaysia, right leadership and church structure(both being elements of church management) are among the proposed responses to the observed trends and challenges of the 21st century.[2]

The Church as an Organisation

Management practices are often associated with organizations – corporate or otherwise. According to G A Cole's definition, an organisation bears the characteristics of being *people-based*, having relatively *structured collaboration*

---

[1] Macchia, Stephen A. Becoming a Healthy Church: 10 Characteristics. (Chinese Edition). pp24, 223-256.

[2] Ho, Daniel K.C., "Into the 21st century: Challenges facing the Church in Malaysia." In Thu, E.Y.; Burfield, D.R.; del Rosario, R.L.; and Chong, T.L. (Eds.). Christian Reflections Within An Emerging Industrialised Society. pp 21-45.

between its members, sharing *common goals*, displaying *interdependence* between members, demonstrating mechanism of *coordination and control* for its operations, with values and practices forming the *culture* and identity of the organisation as a whole. [3] Essentially, an organisation is a social system, formed on the basis of mutual interest among its members, maintained by a commonly accepted value system that moderates ethical treatment within the organisation. [4]

The Greek word *ekklesia* used for "church" denotes an assembly, [5] reflecting the *people-based* nature of the Church. As for sharing *common goals*, the Church is called and redeemed by God for a special purpose, and is entrusted with the mission of being the salt of the earth and light of the world (Mt 5:13-14) and bringing the Good News of salvation to all mankind (Mt 28:18-19). Being described as the body of Christ (1 Co 12:12-27) illustrates the *interdependence* of the members of the Church. The characteristics of *structured collaboration* and *coordination and control* are observed in the Church, as various roles and tasks are defined for believers (Eph 4:11-12; Ro 12:6-8; 1 Ti 3:2-13). The principle of love and humility in leadership (Jn 13:5; Lk 22:26) and ministry dictates the noble *culture* of the life and function of the Church.

The Church exhibits the characteristics of an organisation, but, unlike any political, social or cultural entity, it is more than just a human structure. It is the body of Jesus Christ, drawing life from Christ himself, who instituted and continues its

---

[3] Cole, G.A., Organisational behaviour. pp4-6.
[4] Newstrom, J.W. & Davis, K. Organiational Behavior: Human Behavior at Work. pp11-12.
[5] Zondervan compact Bible dictionary. p 111.

functions.[6] Nevertheless, as an organisation, the Church needs to be managed and administered effectively, in order to achieve its mission.

Functions of Church Management

Although generally considered a secular discipline, some Christian authors have observed that examples of management practices are often found "recorded in the pages of Scripture."[7] On this topic, Mary Go Setiawani commented that administration and management are only tools, and the spiritual nobility of the tool is determined by the user.[8] In support, Wilfred Su extolled Church management practices thus:

Church management is the application of theology, manifesting the essence of theology in a vivid and lively manner. Through planning, organizing, leading, evaluation, and so on, Church management may be the most natural form of the application of practical theology, providing a living showcase of the sacraments, creeds, liturgies, and other affairs of the Church. [9]

The development of modern management theories and practices can be traced to the industrial revolution of the late 16th and early 17th centuries, amidst the vibrant process of

---

[6] Zondervan compact Bible dictionary. p 111.

[7] Anthony, Michael, "Biblical Perspectives of Christian Management," In Anthony, M.J. & Estep, J. Jr. (Eds.), *Management Essentials for Christian Ministries*. p 13.

[8] Setiawani, Mary Go, Christian Administration and Management. p12.

[9] Su, Wilfred W., Management for Effective Church Ministry. p17. (Translated from Chinese).

18

industrialisation in the western societies.[10]   Bartol and Martin defined management as "...the process of achieving organizational goals by engaging in the four major functions of planning, organizing, leading, and controlling." [11]   In this definition, they outlined four general functions of management – planning, organizing, leading, and controlling.

Authors of books on church management such as Setiawani [12] and Xia Zhong-Jian[13] agreed with Bartol and Martin's ideas on management functions, listing planning, organising, leading, and controlling as the functions of church management.   In the context of Church ministry, Setiawani defined Christian administration and management as "...the process of executing church ministry in the most effective manner, through the help of the Holy Spirit with set objectives, plans, methods, efficiency, leading and controlling, in order to achieve outcomes expected by God."[14].

Setiawani's[15] and Xia Zhong-Jian's explanation[16] of these four functions of management is similar:
- *Planning* is the function of determining the process of actions to be taken.
- *Organising* is the function of systematically assigning people to fulfil set objectives.

---

[10] Bartol, Kathryn M. and Martin, David C., Management. p38.
[11] Ibid. p5.
[12] Setiawani, Mary Go,   Op. cit.   p.8
[13] Xia, Zhong-Jian 夏忠堅，教會行政與企業管理   p5.
[14] Setiawani, Mary Go, Christian Administration and Management.   p6 (Translated from Chinese).
[15] Ibid. pp8-9
[16] Xia, Zhong-Jian 夏忠堅，教會行政與企業管理.   pp5-7.

- *Leading* is the function of inducing people to act effectively.
- *Controlling* is the function of ensuring that actions are taken according to plan.

The success of church ministry is affected by the effectiveness of church administration and management, as defined by Setiawani,[14] through the running of these four functions.

The Ministry Order of the Christian Church

Church ministry is essentially the collective service of Christians to fulfil God's purpose. In his article, Meinert Grumm discussed words commonly used for ministry in the Old Testament.[17] After analysing Grumm's work, Tsang concluded that words used for ministry in the Bible refer generally to any form of service offered, and particularly to the work of the Church in accordance to the calling of God.[18] Throughout history, the ministry of the Church has been managed by the organisation of Christians into functional levels, which Tsang referred to as Ministry Order.[19]

---

[17] Grumm, Meinert, "Ministry: The Old Testament Background," Current Theology of Mission, 16, 1989, pp104-107.

[18] Tsang, Rennie L., An Investigation of Renewal of church Ministry. p29.

[19] *Ibid.* p80 By "Ministry Order", Tsang means the structural system or levels by which church ministry is ruled, managed, and administered.

The Apostolic Period (1st Century AD)

Schaff described five ministry offices during the Apostolic Period, namely those of Apostle, Prophet, Evangelist, Presbyter, and Deacon.[20] Each office had a specific role and function,[21] but they may have, simply, been roles and functions of service for God performed with love and humility (Lk 22:25-27),[22] rather than a "position" or "status". The Church at that time may not have operated under a strict administrative system and structure, and the Apostles were most probably helped by groups of believers in ministry, with no clear distinction between ministry offices.[23] In this environment of shared ministry, based on 1 Corinthians 14:26-31, Gordon Fee contended that believers during this period might be participating actively in ministry, even in preaching and teaching.[24]

The Patristic Period (2nd-5th Century AD)

From the "shared ministry" environment of the Apostolic Period, the organisational structure of the Church became more formalised during the Patristic Period.

---

[20] Schaff, Philip, "Chapter X. Organization of the Apostolic Church". In Volume 1 First Period: Apostolic Christianity AD 1-100, History of the Christian Church. S60-62.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Tsang, Rennie L., Op. cit. p102.

[23] Marshall, Howard, "The ministry" p14.

[24] Fee, Gordon D., The First Epistle to the Corinthians, The New International Commentary on the New Testament. p696.

Clergy and Laity

One major characteristic of the Church during the Patristic Period is the distinction between clergy and laity. Tertullian (AD 150-230) used the term "sacerdotium"[25] to denote the special position of the clergy in ministry towards God. Clement of Rome (fl 96) introduced the concept of Apostolic Succession, [26]hence the view that clergy were necessary for access to God. [27] Further, Cyprian (AD 200-258) accorded all the duties, responsibilities, and privileges of the Aaronic priesthood to the ministry offices of the Church.[28] Christians holding ministry offices began to be referred to, exclusively, as "clergy," as opposed to "laity" for the general Christian population. The tradition of solemn ordination, or consecration, by which Christians were admitted into the ministry offices or "sacerdotalis" by the "laying on of hands" probably began during this period.[29]

---

[25] Schaff, Philip, "Chapter IV. Organization and Discipline of the Church," In Volume 2 Second Period: Ante-Nicene Christianity AD 100-311(325), History of the Christian Church. S42-43.

[26] Tsang, Rennie L., An Investigation of Renewal of Church Ministry. p121. Apostolic succession presented the bishops as successors of the Apostles, authorized and responsible for the establishment and administration of the Church.

[27] Schaff, Philip. Op. cit. This view is supported by Ignatius of Antioch.

[28] Ibid. On Cyprian's assertions regarding 'sacerdotium', Schaff commented that he may be called "the proper father of the sacerdotal conception of the Christian ministry as a mediating agency between God and the people".

[29] Ibid.

Hierarchy of the Ministry Order

Following the concept of sacerdotium, in Schaff's records, [30] the clergy were classified into two Orders – the *ordines majores* (Major Order) and the *ordines minores* (Minor Order): the *ordines majores* being a divine institution, and many minor offices, the *ordines minores*, ministry offices such as sub-deacon, lector or reader, acolyte, exorcist, precentor, janitor, catechist, interpreter, protobishop, and the like.

Elevation of the Offices of Bishop and Deacon

In the Apostolic Period, Bishop and Presbyter refer to the same office.[31] In the Patristic Period, the office of bishop rose to becoming an office that topped the presbyter, holding the administrative authority of the church.[32] Below presbyters, deacons were gradually entrusted with more duties and responsibilities in service, such as that of "…confidential advisers, sometimes even delegates and vicars of the bishops"[33].

---

[30] Schaff, Philip, "Chapter IV. Organization and Discipline of the Church," In Volume 2 Second Period: Ante-Nicene Christianity AD 100-311(325), History of the Christian Church. S42-43.

[31] Tsang, Rennie L., An Investigation of Renewal of Church Ministry. p100. Supported by 1 Tim 3:1-7; Titus 1:5-9.

[32] Schaff, Philip, Op. cit.

[33] Ibid. Schaff added that the responsibilities quoted here are true "…especially of the 'archdeacon,' who does not appear, however, till the fourth century".

Acceptance of Lay Preachers

During this period, it is interesting to observe that teaching by laymen was permitted as an exception. The Fourth General Council in Carthage (AD 398) prohibited laymen from teaching in the presence of clergymen, implying that this could be done with permission from the clergy.[34] Some of the most notable teachers of this period were laymen or, at most, presbyters.[35]

The Medieval Period (AD 476-1517)

The conversion of the Roman Emperor Constantine paved the way for Christianity to become the Roman state religion in AD 312.[36] This contributed to the significant expansion of the Church, hence its increasingly more complex hierarchical structure.

The Patriarchs and the Papacy

The position of bishops of churches in strategically located metropolises became increasingly more significant, and eventually rose to the office of Archbishop – the bishop of bishops – of their respective vicinities. By the sixth century,

---

[34] Schaff, Philip, "Chapter IV. Organization and Discipline of the Church," In Volume 2 Second Period: Ante-Nicene Christianity AD 100-311(325), History of the Christian Church. S42-43.

[35] Ibid. Schaff named "Hermas, Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Tertullian, Arnobius, and Lactantius".

[36] Tsang, Rennie L., An Investigation of Renewal of Church Ministry. p148.

the Archbishops of five major cities – Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople and Rome – were named as Patriarchs, to overtop the other Archbishops.[37]

The Patriarch of Rome advanced to becoming the Pope in the seventh century,   during the Medieval Period.[38]   With that, the Church began its active participation in state and secular affairs, such as the crowning of Charlemagne (AD.742-814), in AD 800, which inevitably endorsed the power of the Papacy over kings, [39] and the prosperous business ventures of Pope Gregory I (AD 590-604).[40]

Basic and Theological Education

In this period, theological education faced many obstacles – intellectual, religious, social, and political.[41] However, Schaff observed that some of the prominent church fathers and teachers of the fourth century received a secular education, based on classical culture and general scientific knowledge, before studying theology with prominent church teachers or by private learning.[42]   This suggests that basic training in literary, and in scientific knowledge and skills, may have had a positive impact on theological and scriptural learning.

---

[37] Ibid. p149.

[38] Ibid. p158.

[39] Tsang, Rennie L.,   An Investigation of Renewal of Church Ministry. p158.

[40] Ibid. p158.

[41] Schaff, Philip, "Chapter V.   The Hierarchy and Polity of the Church". In Volume 3 Third Period: The Church in Union with the Roman Empire from Constantine the Great to Gregory the Great   AD 311–590, History of the Christian Church.   S48-49.

[42] Ibid.

Democracy and Election

By this time, the clergy had become rigidly distinguished from the laity through special rituals[43] and other special features such as celibacy, sacerdotal vestments, and so on,[44] such that clergy were distinctively above laity.

It is noteworthy, however, that the consent of the people in choosing clergy had not yet been entirely suppressed during this period. During the election of bishops, for instance, the popularity of some bishoporic candidates was instrumental in eventually placing them in the office.[45] The practice of formal voting was still observed, especially when there were three or more candidates before the people.[46] Regrettably, power and political struggle, driven by selfish passion and other worldly corrupting practices, contributed to much abuse of the system of the appointment of clergy, including the democratic process.[47]

The democratic exercise of election vanished entirely from the Church during the Medieval Period. By the eleventh century, the ordination of bishops was entirely in the hands of the clergy, or even princes and rulers. Believers would

---

[43] Ibid.

[44] Ibid.

[45] Schaff, Philip, "Chapter V. The Hierarchy and Polity of the Church". In Volume 3 Third Period: The Church in Union with the Roman Empire from Constantine the Great to Gregory the Great AD 311–590, History of the Christian Church. S48-49. A few of such bishops named include Ambrose of Milan, Martin of Tours, Chrysostom of Constantinople, Damasus of Rome under various circumstances.

[46] Ibid.

[47] Ibid.

eventually have no say over who should, and would, lead the Church.[48]

The Reformation and Post-Reformation (AD 1517 onwards)

The virtue of the "Priesthood of All Believers", strongly upheld by Martin Luther,[49] was finally restored during the Reformation. Luther criticized the sacerdotal concept, and contended that clergymen were merely performing ministerial functions.[50] Although he acknowledged the authority of the ordained clergy to teach and exhort the congregation, he also upheld the right and responsibility of the congregation to call and appoint clergymen.[51]

Regarding teaching and preaching, Luther asserted that all believers are individually responsible for performing the duty of teaching and preaching God's Word to others – believers or non-believers.[52]   John Calvin shared this concern.   Both Luther and Calvin contributed significantly to the establishment of the Biblical Preaching Tradition in the Christian Church.[53]

---

[48] Ibid.   Schaff recorded Chrysostom's lamentation on this matter, "that presbyters, in the choice of a bishop, instead of looking only at spiritual fitness, were led by regard for noble birth, or great wealth, or consanguinity and friendship".

[49] Tsang, Rennie L.,   An Investigation of Renewal of church Ministry. pp165-170.

[50] Ibid. p166.

[51] Tsang, Rennie L., An Investigation of Renewal of Church Ministry. p167.

[52] Ibid. p169.

[53] Ibid. pp173-174.

The reformers promoted the pastoral and teaching offices. The offices of priest and bishop were somewhat abolished, and ordained clergy were generally called Pastor or Preacher[54]. Luther recognized the pastor's symbolic authority over the congregation, especially in the function of teaching and the administration of rites and sacraments under "normal" circumstances. [55] Calvin proposed a fourfold ecclesiastical ministerial order, namely pastor, elder, teacher, and deacon, where Pastor and Elder were commonly addressed as Presbyter.[56]

Subsequently, the administrative structure of the Church developed along various denominational lines, influenced by social, cultural and politico-legal trends through the centuries. Tsang observed four major administrative structures in the evangelical Church today, namely Episcopal, Congregational, Presbyterian, and Independent.[57]

---

[54] Ibid. p174.

[55] Ibid. pp174-175. Members of the congregation may take part to perform these functions when the need arises.

[56] *Ibid.* p175 The Pastor preaches, teaches, and administers rituals and sacraments. The Teaching Elder teaches but does not administer rituals and sacraments. The Ruling Elder administers church affairs and conducts disciplinary procedures. The Teacher (whom Calvin interestingly addresses as "Doctor") studies the Bible and theology, teaches, and trains young believers who have committed themselves to serve God. The Deacon can be male or female, and may be be a specialist in a particular ministry or area of need.

[57] Ibid. pp184-193.

Analysis and Discussion

The development of a systematic knowledge of the discipline of management formally began only in the 16th and 17th centuries.[58] Before that, management practices in the world, and in the Church, were plausibly dependent on arbitrary leadership and societal culture and norms.

During the Apostolic and early Patristic Periods, the leadership of the Apostles was the main thrust of management direction of the Church. Towards the end of the Patristic and early Medieval Periods, the Church was driven by a strong culture of submissiveness to ordained spiritual authority. This would develop later into a state of "monarchical episcopate"[59] in the Papacy.

After Christianity had been instituted as the Roman state religion, the *Pax Romana* contributed to the substantial and steady growth of the Church. This led to increasingly more sophisticated hierarchical church structures. Eventually, all leadership and administrative authority of the Church shifted to the clergy, and laymen would have no place in church leadership and management. In the later Medieval Period, political influences crept into the Church, with rulers and princes attempting to monopolise the influence of the Church to strengthen their political rule.

The virtue of the "Priesthood of All Believers" was revived after the Reformation. Following that, the community of Evangelical Christians established itself amidst the social,

---

[58] Bartol, Kathryn M. and Martin, David C., Management. p.38.
[59] Tsang, Rennie L., An investigation of renewal of church ministry. p.141.

cultural, and politico-legal challenges of its days, and formed denominational institutions with Church administration structures, based on convictions regarding the Biblical principles related to Church governance.

Through all these, the Church had held on to its ethos of collective and consultative decision-making, especially in dealing with doctrinal issues, apologetics, and polemics. Since the Apostolic Period, the Church had often held meetings, or convened Councils, to deliberate on pertinent issues such as the aforementioned.

The above analysis is intended to lead into the following discussion of various recommendations for church management practices in the Church today. This discussion will be presented along two main lines:
- theology of church management, and
- directions for professional Church management practices.

Theology of Church Management

Hwa Yung, in his work entitled *Beyond AD2000: A call to evangelical faithfulness*, exhorted today's evangelical Christians to restore their commitment to the Supremacy of Scripture, since "...the *sola scriptura* principle is the outstanding distinguishing mark of historical evangelicalism" [60].

---

[60] Hwa, Yung, Beyond AD2000: A Call to Evangelical Faithfulness. p13. To his dismay, Hwa Yung observed clear signs of today's evangelicals losing their grip on sound Biblical depths.

In matters of church management, however, the Bible only provides a broad and general description of ministry offices such as overseer, presbyter, and deacon. There are no specific management guidelines regarding structure, policy, procedure, and so on. But one has to acknowledge that the Church, as an organisation, needs to have a systematic approach to management, to ensure that it effectively achieves the purpose of its existence. Awkwardly, some fundamental evangelicals, being conscientiously anti-intellectual[61], are skeptical about practicing management science in the church, regarding it as "secular" and "unspiritual."

Regarding this, Tsang argued that the Church should strive to achieve balance between the awareness of being a spiritual communion with a mission, and the over-readiness to accept the influence of modern and scientific management practices.[62] By constantly and reverently submitting itself to the Spirit of God, the Church should seek to implement professional management practices which are godly and edifying.

A systematic theology of church management is an immediate need. The Church should incorporate Biblical principles, understanding derived from the historical development of the administrative practices of the Church, and the knowledge and discipline of professional management, to develop a theology that would explain and guide the process of professional management practices in the Church. As an

---

[61] Hwa, Yung, Beyond AD2000: A Call to Evangelical Faithfulness. p9. Anti-intellectualism was pointed out as being one weakness of fundamental evangelicalism.

[62] Tsang, Rennie L., An Investigation of Renewal of Church Ministry. p274-280.

example, James Estep proposed a model of a systematic theology of administration, explaining that administrative practices are to be guided by administration theory that is built upon several essential components of theological concern:[63]

- Centred on God: God as Leader,
- Responsive to His Revelation: Scripture as the core document,
- Formation of a distinctive community: the congregation as institutional context,
- Redemptive in purpose: transformation as its mission and motive, and
- Responsive to humanity's needs: humanity as a valued participant.

Further such effort is needed to develop a theological framework for church management, to guide sound and professional management practices in the Church.

Directions For Professional Management Practices in the Church

This section explores possible directions for the implementation of professional management practices in the Church according to the four Church management functions identified earlier – planning, organising, leading and controlling.

---

[63] Estep, James, "A Theology of Administration," In Anthony, M.J. & Estep, J. Jr. (Eds.), Management Essentials for Christian Ministries. p39.

Planning

It has been observed that a culture of collective and consultative decision-making has always been maintained through councils and conferences. This culture should be upheld as regards ministry planning at all levels of the Church.

Mission-Oriented Planning

During earlier periods of the Church, deliberation and decisions on doctrinal issues appeared to be the main topics of concern in councils and conferences. The Church should continue in this spirit of unity towards the fulfilment of the Great Commission entrusted to it by our Lord (Mt 28:18-20), and do so with more systematic planning involving all members of the Church, beyond the boundary of denominations. More thought and actions needs to be put into the work of evangelism and cross-cultural mission, [64] as the focus of all ministry planning, at all levels of the Church – local, denominational and ecumenical.

Professional Strategic Planning

Management practices of the Church, in the past, depended more on the capability and subjective group dynamics of Church leaders than on a systematic discipline of management and

---

[64] Hwa Yung, Beyond AD2000: A Call to Evangelical Faithfulness. pp29-34. In this chapter, Hwa Yung challenges Malaysian evangelicals to leave their comfort zones and take a more active part in cross-cultural mission.

33

administration. Now that knowledge of sound and professional management is available, the Church should seriously study the possibility of applying it, to improve ministry effectiveness.

The Church should clearly and explicitly word its mission statement to have specific relevance at all levels, set specific and measurable goals, formulate and implement strategies and programmes to achieve these goals, [65] and as faithful and conscientious managers of God, dervise systematic plans to evaluate and improve the effectiveness of the programmes implemented.[66]

Organising

The Church had developed from a "shared ministry" model to a state of centralised and authoritarian bureaucracy, before the Reformation took place. Some valuable lessons on organisation can be acquired from this experience.

Centralised and Authoritarian Hierarchical Bureaucracy

From the late Patristic to the Medieval Period, the Church upheld an centralised, authoritarian culture, where believers were expected to be submissive to the authority above them, with the administrative authority of the Church ultimately

---

[65] Tsang, Rennie L., An Investigation of Renewal of Church Ministry. p279.

[66] Simpson, Mark, "Evaluating the Effectiveness of Programs," In Anthony, M.J. & Estep, J. Jr. (Eds.), Management Essentials for Christian Ministries, pp411-420. and Su, Wilfred W., Management for Effective Church Ministry, pp117-145.

centred on the Pope, the supreme leader of the Church in the world.

In such a structure, absolute power is held only by several individuals, running the immense risk of compromising the mission, integrity, and dignity of the Church.   Effective organisation in church management should dwell on the humble submission of church leaders towards God, and a commitment to serve God's people.   The Church should realise the danger of an   extremely   centralised   and   authoritarian,   hierarchical bureaucracy,   and   design   administrative   structures   that   will advocate   the   spiritual   and   social   accountability   of   ministry personnel,   rather   than   the   "authority"   and   "status"   of   ministry office.

Pitfalls of Over-Liberal, Republican, Democratic Practices

Up to the Medieval Period, democratic practices were still observed in the election of bishops, and popularity of candidates could   have   significance   influence   on   decisions   about appointments[67].   After the Reformation, democratic practices in the election of church leaders were common, especially among churches following the congregational tradition.[68]   However, it is noted that republican practices, implemented too liberally, are not faultless.   For instance, the system of appointment of clergy

---

[67] Schaff, Philip, "Chapter V. The Hierarchy and Polity of the Church".   In Volume 3 Third Period: The Church in Union with the Roman Empire from Constantine the Great to Gregory the Great   AD 311–590, History of the Christian Church.   S48-49.

[68] Tsang, Rennie L., An Investigation of Renewal of Church Ministry, p175.

during the Medieval Period was negatively influenced by desire for personal gain and corrupt, worldly practices.[69]

For effective organisation, the Church must acknowledge the importance of disciplined liberty. On the one hand, the Church should uphold the Biblical principle of the "Priesthood of All Believers," allowing all members to participate in determining their leaders; on the other hand, the Church must seek to exercise appropriate control over the process of appointing Church leaders so that the system is not arbitrarily abused.

Objective-Oriented Team-Ministry Structure

This article argues, from history, that an objective-oriented team-ministry structure is more desirable for church management than a centralised authoritarian structure. Just as a flexible, but purpose-driven, structure was maintained by the Church during the Apostolic Period,[70] the Church today should strive to establish a structure that optimises team synergy by continual focus on the mission and purpose of the Church. Dick Iverson lauded the concept of team ministry for church growth, and acknowledged several related benefits, including the following:[71]

- optimum use of various gifts for various ministries,
- improvement of productivity,
- generation of new ideas, and

---

[69] Schaff, Philip, Op. cit.

[70] Marshall, Howard, "The Ministry", p14.

[71] Iverson, Dick, Team Ministry: Putting together a team that makes churches grow, pp51-76.

- checks and balance measures.

Such a ministry-organising model, for example, would allow laymen gifted in teaching to contribute to the teaching ministry, as in the Apostolic and Patristic Periods, [72] and after the Reformation. [73]

Leading

Consideration of the leading function of Church Management, the principle of leading as servants (Lk 22:25-27; Jn 13:1-16), should be undertaken with reverent commitment.

Perfecting Biblical Servant Leadership

Biblical servant leadership is built upon principles of compassion in the process of fulfilling God's purpose (Is 42:2-3), meekness and humility in doing God's will obediently (Php 2:5, 7-8), and a service-oriented attitude in leading (Jn 13:14-15). Even secular authors and researchers in leadership have listed numerous universal qualities related to servant

---

[72] Schaff, Philip, "Chapter IV. Organization and Discipline of the Church," in Volume 2 Second Period: Ante-Nicene Christianity AD 100-311(325), History of the Christian Church. S42-43.

[73] Tsang, Rennie L., An Investigation of Renewal of Church Ministry, pp169, 172. Martin Luther and John Calvin were open to the idea that teaching and preaching ministry is not exclusively for pastoral ministers, but also for all believers.

leadership,[74] and recommended them strongly, as opposed to directional and transactional leadership approaches.

In church management, church leaders must be committed to practicing Biblical servant leadership. Instead of the commanding, dominant and authoritarian leadership style observed in the Church of the Medieval Period, the Church today must dedicate itself, before God, to exercising loving and humble leadership service for God's people, thus perfecting the servant-leadership mandate given by our Lord.

Christian Holiness and Character

In a pastoral bulletin published in Hong Kong, a pastor shared his observation that pastoral workers serving in churches hold grudges against dissenting members, are vindictive, and harbour an intention to hit back.[75] Such behaviour is most unbecoming of servant leaders.

To demonstrate leadership as servanthood, it is necessary for Church leaders to maintain a holy and righteous lifestyle. It is shameful to be reminded of the deplorable moral state of the clergy during the later Medieval Period, known as the Dark

---

[74] Spears, Larry, "Practicing Servant Leadership." The modern concept of Servant Leadership was introduced by Robert Greenleaf in his 1970 essay entitled "The Servant as Leader," in which he coined the terms "servant-leader" and "servant leadership". Since his death in 1990, the concept has been further developed by other writers such as William W George, James Autry, Ken Blanchard, James C Hunter, Ken Jennings, Kent Keith, George SanFacon, and Larry Spears.

[75] Yip, Dai Wai 葉大為, "為教牧把脈處方".

Ages (between the sixth and thirteenth centuries AD), before the *Renaissance*, and this is certainly not the state we want for the Church today. However, as Hwa Yung observes:

> "Yet the sad fact remains that at all levels of church leadership today we find in varying degrees idolatry of money, gross abuse of power of position and office, and even serious sexual sin. Only that some of these are blatant and obvious, others are subtle and often unseen."[76]

Therefore, church leaders should be cautious of temptation, and endeavour to build up holy and righteous character, true to the calling of Christ-like servant leaders.

Professional Qualities and Competence in Leadership

To improve ministry effectiveness, Yip Dai Wai 葉大為 emphasised the importance of professionalism.[77] Professional leadership requires, and can be developed through, formal training and education.

For this reason, Tsang suggested that theological education institutions should consider including modules related to leadership and management skills, to better equip pastoral workers of the future.[78] Pastoral ministers, and church leaders in service, should be provided with such training and education, to improve their leadership and management competence.

---

[76] Hwa, Yung, Beyond AD2000: A Call to Evangelical Faithfulness, p45.

[77] Yip, Dai Wai, Op. cit.

[78] Tsang, Rennie L., An Investigation of Renewal of Church Ministry, p279.

Controlling

The Bible defines various tasks and roles for believers, such as apostle, prophet, evangelist, pastor, teacher, leader, elder, and deacon (Eph 4:11-12; Ro 12:6-8; 1 Ti 3:2-13). These ministry offices can be observed in the Church throughout various historical periods. These levels and functions of ministry should be systematically controlled to ensure that all activities are properly coordinated to achieve overall synergy.

Authority and Responsibility

In the Patristic and Medieval Periods, the hierarchy of offices was so distinct that a high degree of "specialisation of labour" [79] was observed, for example, the highly specific ministry offices of church doorkeeper and gravedigger. [80]

For effective control in church management, a clear definition of authority and responsibilities is essential. [81] Simpson deliberated on the process of preparation of

---

[79] Specialisation of labour is one of the elements of Bureaucratic Management, a school of thought from modern management science, whose main proponent is Max Weber (1864-1920), a German sociologist and political economist. The main thrust of the specialisation of labour is to break down job tasks, and have different personnel focusing on a specific task in order to promote and develop specialised expertise and competence on the job.

[80] Tsang, Rennie L., An Investigation of Renewal of Church Ministry, p148.

[81] Ibid. p279.

comprehensive job description documents for ministry personnel.[82]

The Church should be watchful, however, of being over-anxious about defined of authority and responsibilities. Having job descriptions written within an unyielding framework, revolving around only specific job tasks, would bring the Church back into the trap of centralised bureaucracy and the obsessive "specialisation of labour" of the past.

To promote an objective-oriented team ministry structure, certain degree of flexibility is required, to allow ministry personnel to continually focus on the ultimate purpose of the ministry of the Church. Their job descriptions should not prevent them from providing loving and humble support to other team members, towards the fulfilment of the mission of the Church. The Church must cultivate a culture of being mission-oriented in ministry, yet not being limited by the official structure for doing so. This policy should be made known explicitly, in the job descriptions of all ministry personnel.

Communication and the Dissemination of Information

One of the elements of effective control is communication. In the past, the Church conducted collective and consultative decision-making through councils and conferences. This tradition should be maintained with the support of modern technology, and techniques for the dissemination and sharing of

---

[82] Simpson, Mark, "Preparing Job Descriptions," In Anthony, MJ & Estep, J. Jr. (Eds.), Management Essentials for Christian Ministries, pp174-189.

information.[83] This may include adopting rules and discipline for conducting meetings, with proper recording of minutes of high reference value, so that decisions and actions can be monitored and evaluated progressively, to ensure ministry effectiveness.

Accountability, Supervision, and Evaluation

The authoritarian structure of administration in the late Patristic and Medieval Periods may not have facilitated regular supervisory support (or admonishment), hence weak accountability and evaluation. The clergy, if in error, may not have needed to answer to anyone, or may have conveniently hidden their guilt in the event of a reprimand.

To implement effective control in church mtanagement today, the Church must seek to promote a culture of accountability. All ministry personnel should report to a higher authority, and be accountable to the congregation they serve. The superiors of ministry personnel should be made accountable for supervising the minister concerned, and the congregation served should be allowed to contribute feedback on the performance of the minister concerned. In such an arrangement, the principle of "speaking the truth in love" (Eph 4:15) can be applied in an ,open environment of mutual trust and edification.

In this respect, it is also important to consider a proper system of performance review for all ministry personnel. [84]

---

[83] Tsang, Rennie L., An Investigation of Renewal of Church Ministry, p279.

[84] Estep, James, Conducting Performance Reviews, and Setiawani, Mary Go, Christian Administration and Management, pp150-153.

This is one positive step the Church could take to elicit performance improvement amongst ministry personnel. All ministry personnel serving God should develop an open-minded willingness to accept constructive feedback, through such performance review exercises,[85] for, after all, it is ultimately to the benefit of the Church if their performance is improved.

Disciplinary Procedures

The Bible lays down principles and broad procedures regarding Church discipline (1 Cor 5:5-11; Eph 4:15-16; Gal 6:1; Lk 17:3; Mt 18:15-17). Under the authoritarian structure of the Church in the slate Patristic and Medieval Period, clergy would be responsible for executing Church disciplinary procedures. After the Reformation, this may have been undertaken by the elders, or the congregational council of the Church. For effective control, it is important to have established procedures to systematically administer due process related to discipline.

It is difficult, especially in an Asian context, to implement disciplinary procedures, due to the perception of shame related to discipline.[86] In today's complex conditions, the Church should, perhaps, explicitly define misconduct, in accordance with Biblical teachings, rather than leave it to the subjective judgement of cultural norms. The greatest challenge, perhaps, is to define conduct contributing to abuse of power and position, breach of trust and other similarly subtle offences.

---

[85] Tsang, Rennie L., An Investigation of Renewal of Church Ministry, p279.

[86] Wong, Fong Yang, Discipline or Shame?: The Dynamics of Shame in Church Discipline.

In addition, procedures related to how any accused person should be given the opportunity to explain himself, or herself, before an independent panel, should be established, so that no one may be wrongly accused and disciplined. Thus, with due process defined, the Church should be prepared, when necessary, to exercise its authority to conduct fair and objective inquiry, and take disciplinary action against those concerned.

Most importantly, the Church should be mindful that discipline is closely associated with pastoral care. Wong Fong Yang stressed that even after taking disciplinary action against an unrepentant member, pastoral workers should never cease to visit and exhort him, or her, to repent; and upon his, or her, professed repentance, to reconcile him, or her, to God, and to restore him, or her, publicly to the fellowship of God's people.[87]

Concluding Remarks

Direct and indiscriminate application of Western theories and principles in an Asian context may not be a wise action. Regarding theology, Hwa Yung observed that Western theology tends to be academic and speculative in outlook, and thus may be irrelevant to practical pastoral and missiological ministry in Asia.[88] On mission, for example, Thu En Yu noted the failure of the church to address several local concerns in British Colonial Malaysia, [i] leaving a far-reaching impact on ethnic and religious harmony in the country until long after its independence from British rule.

---

[87] Ibid. pp75-76.
[88] Hwa, Yung, Mangos or Bananas? The Quest for an Authentic Asian Christian Theology, p9.

44

Knowledge of modern management science originated in th West. It may be relevant and practical to Western culture an inclination, but perhaps not totally so in Asia. Furthermore, t guide its application in the Asian Church using Wester theology may not be the best solution. Therefore, carefi thought is called for, to examine the relevance of managemer theory and principle from the West, on the sound basis of Asia Theology, so that the framework of knowledge can t effectively contextualised for application to the Asian Church.

---

[i] Thu, En Yu, Ethnic identity and consciousness in Sabah. p.39. Thu F Yu observed that the church in Malaysia during the Colonial Era had fail to address issues of indigenisation of Christianity, identification with th general masses, multi-racial sensitivity and economic imbalance.

Towards the Biblical and Original Wesleyan Understanding of the Baptism of/in/with/by the Holy Spirit

Lau Sie Ngiu

This paper was originally presented at the Monthly Faculty Meeting of the Methodist Theological School, Sibu, on 21st April 2010

Introduction

Cecil M. Robeck, Jr. comments,

Ultimately, the Twentieth Century will be evaluated by church historians as the century in which the *Holy Spirit* birthed and nurtured two great movements: one of them formally known as the Ecumenical Movement, the other one...the *Pentecostal/Charismatic Movement.*[1]

Indeed, the rise of Pentecostalism in the twentieth century has resulted in tunprecedented impact all around the world. Even within the Christian Church itself, Pentecostalism has

---

[1] Walter J. Hollenweger, *Pentecostalism: Origins and Developments Worldwide* (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997), p4. Emphasis is mine.

stimulated breathtaking interest in, and the study of, Pneumatology and one of its most controversial issues is none other than the "Baptism of/in/with/by the Holy Spirit."

Actually, there are only seven passages in the New Testament that directly refer to the Baptism of the Holy Spirit: Matthew 3:11; Mark 1:8; Luke 3:16; John 1:33; Acts 1:5, 11:16 and I Corinthians 12:13. In order to acquire a biblical notion of this phrase, therefore, the writer suggests that what it *meant* is what it *means*. In other words, the understanding of John the Baptist, Jesus Christ, Peter the Apostle, and Paul the Apostle on Spirit Baptism matters the most, for they are the characters who originally used the term in their proclamation, teaching or observation.

In this paper, the writer endeavours to put forward, firstly, the biblical understanding of Spirit Baptism, and subsequently, the Wesleyan notion of Spirit Baptism.

Towards the Biblical Understanding of Spirit Baptism:

1. John the Baptist "coined" the term:

John, the herald and forerunner of Jesus Christ, in the account of all the four evangelists, that is, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, rose to being the key person that fulfilled the Isaianic prophecy about preparing the way of the Lord.[2] He proclaimed that God's Dominion, or saving grace, was approaching, or at hand, and furthermore, spoke of the

---

[2] Isaiah 40:3.

47

greater one coming after him, in a way that diminished his own stature as a great prophet, and would "*baptize you* [the people who were waiting expectantly and were *all* wondering in their hearts if John might possibly be the Christ][3] *with the Holy Spirit* and with fire."[4]

Indubitably, John the Baptist proclaimed a coming, remarkable baptism, "in Spirit and fire," which is to be understood in the light of Old Testament teaching and his own immediate context. With regard to the former, the sayings of the prophets Moses, Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Joel would be the most pertinent references, as demonstrated below:

Prophet and Text	Message	Accordingly, "Baptism" with the Spirit and fire is or has to do with:
Moses (Numbers 11:29)	"[Moses said] I wish that *all* the Lord's people were *prophets* and that that the Lord would *put his Spirit on them.*"	putting of the divine Spirit on all the Israelites by the Lord.

---

[3] Luke 3:1.

[4] Matthew 3:11b; Mark 1:8; Luke 3:16; John 1:33. Emphasis is mine. See also: Ben Witherington III, *Smyth and Helwys Bible Commentary: Matthew* (Macon: Smyth & Helwys, 2006), pp 77-78.

Isaiah (44:3)	"[God said] For I will *pour water* on the thirsty land, and streams on the dry ground; I will *pour out my Spirit* on your [Jacob's] offspring, and *my blessing* on your descendants."	watering of thirsty land, that is, the giving of life by the Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel.
Ezekiel (36:26-27; 37:14; 39:29)	"[God said] I will sprinkle clean water on you, and you will be *clean*, I will cleanse you from all your impurities and from all your idols. I will give you a *new heart* and put a *new spirit* in you. I will remove from you your heart of stone and give you a heart of flesh. And I will *put my Spirit in you* and move you to follow my decrees...I will put my Spirit *in* you and you will *live*...I will no longer hide my face from them for I will *pour out my Spirit* on the house of Israel."	sprinkling of clean water, that is, the cleansing, renewing, transforming, and empowering work of the Sovereign Lord; even, an unprecedented indwelling of the Spirit *in* God's people would come to pass.

Joel (2:28-29, 32)	"[God said] I will *pour out my Spirit on all people*. Your sons and daughters will *prophesy*, your old men will dream dreams, your young men will see visions. Even on my servants, both men and women, I will *pour out my Spirit* in those days...And everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved; for on Mount Zion and in Jerusalem there will be *deliverance*."	An out-pouring of the Spirit on all God's people for prophetic empowerment, which would result in deliverance or salvation.

Besides crucial insights from the Old Testament, the understanding of the Jewish people in John's day, particularly with regard to baptism and the Holy Spirit, are also essential. Craig Keener points out that, on the one hand, the image of baptism "connoted two ideas to ancient Jewish hearers: conversion and immersion;" on the other hand, the phrase "Holy Spirit" would be seen by Jewish contemporaries as "God's way to *purify* his people or (far more often) to *empower them to prophecy*."[5] John Nolland

[5] Craig S. Keener, *Gift & Giver: The Holy Spirit for Today* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001), p152. Emphasis is mine.

observes, "At Qumran also the Spirit is spoken of in connection with images of *purgation and refining.*"[6]

By and large, the writer is convinced that John the Baptist proclaimed Spirit Baptism as a coming, unprecedented, indwelling, life-giving, purifying, refining, renewing, transforming, prophetic and empowering work of the Redeemer's Spirit. Such would come to pass through none but the Anointed One of the Sovereign Lord, whose sandals, John remarked, "I am not fit to carry," and the outcome is salvation and deliverance.

2. *Jesus Christ interpreted the term:*

Jesus Christ, whom John the Baptist regarded as *the* sin-bearer[7] and Spirit-Baptizer, clearly interpreted the significance of Spirit Baptism when he commanded his disciples:

> Do not leave Jerusalem, but *wait for the gift my Father promised*, which you have heard me speak about. For John baptized with water, but *in a few days, you will be baptized with the Holy Spirit…*[Y]ou will *receive power when the Holy Spirit comes on you*; and you will *be my witnesses* in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and to the ends of the earth.[8]

---

[6] John Nolland, *Word Biblical Commentary: Luke 1:9-9:20* (Dallas: Word Books, 1989), p153. Emphasis is mine.

[7] John 1:29: "John saw Jesus coming toward him and said, "Look, the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world!"

[8] Acts 1:4, 5, 8. Emphasis is mine.

In light of what happened, literally, "in a few days," that is, later, on the day of Pentecost,[9] it is apparent that Spirit Baptism, according to Jesus Christ himself, is none other than the *giving* of *the* Gift - the *Paraclete* - gratuitously and abundantly, to *all* believers, by the Heavenly Father, because the Son of God had been glorified.[10] Thenceforth, *every* believer shall receive, at conversion,[11] the permanent indwelling of the Spirit; and consequently, in the name of Christ - *the* Bearer, Dispenser, and Definer of the Spirit - complete and full access to *all* the Spirit's grace, gifts and power, which are given for the purpose of world mission. In other words, from the Jerusalem Pentecost onwards, the Spirit who rested upon the incarnated Jesus,[12] is *now* made over to *all* disciples, *along with* the mission on which Jesus himself was engaged. In light of this, Spirit Baptism has actually revealed the truth of *missio Dei*, that is, mission has its origin in God, and the Spirit-born Church is valid and vital for missionary work because the mighty *ruach,* who can transform chaos to cosmos is her source.[13]

---

[9] Acts 2:1-12.

[10] John 7:38-39: "[Jesus said] Whoever *believes* in me, as the Scripture has said, *streams of living water will flow from within* him. By this he meant the Spirit, whom whose who believed in him were later to *receive*. Up to that time the Spirit had not been given since Jesus had not yet been glorified."

[11] John 14:16-17; Acts 2:37-39.

[12] Matthew 3:16: "As soon as Jesus was baptised, he went up out of the water. At that moment heaven was opened, and he saw *the Spirit of God descending like a dove and lighting on him*."

[13] The *ruach* transformed the *chaos* into *cosmos* in the beginning of the world (Genesis 1:1-31). The writer is grateful to Raniero Cantalamessa, whose book *Come, Creator Spirit* has enabled me to see this point. See: Raniero Cantalamessa, *Come, Creator Spirit* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2003), pp23-40.

3. *Peter reflected on the term:*

As the Gospel of Christ spread to the Samaritans and the Gentiles,[14] the apostle Peter, to whom Christ said, "[O]n this rock I will build my church,"[15] understood, experienced and appreciated more, the *universal* significance and benefit of the promise of Spirit Baptism given by the Father through the Son.[16]

Peter prayed for and witnessed the receiving of the Redeemer Spirit by the already-converted Samaritans, with whom Jews had a long-standing antipathy and hostility.[17] The unique withholding of the Spirit, by God, until the apostles came down from Jerusalem to pray, on the one hand was meant to teach the Jewish apostles and believers that God, indeed, so loved the *world* and would pour out his Spirit on *whosoever* believed in Christ, and, on the other hand, was intended for affirming the Samaritan believers that they were indeed incorporated into the new covenant body of Christ. Subsequently, Peter, once more, witnessed the receiving of the Pentecostal Holy Spirit by the Gentiles in Caesarea. This incontrovertible confirmation of God's acceptance of the Gentile believers had caused Peter to reflect, and hence exclaim, "I remembered what the Lord

---

[14] Acts 8:1-25; 10:1-48.

[15] Matthew 16:18-19.

[16] One of the major themes throughout Luke-Acts is the universalization of the gospel - that it is for all people from the last, least, lost to the first, most, and found (cf. Isaiah 52:10; Luke 3:6). See: Ben Witherington, III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary,* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1998), pp68ff., 293.

[17] Acts 8:14-17; John 4:9; Ben Witherington, III, op. cit., p289.

had said, 'John baptized with water. But you will be *baptized with the Holy Spirit.*' So if God gave them the *same gift* he gave us, who believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I to think I could oppose God?"[18]

Therefore, for Peter, by the time he interpreted it before the Jewish circumcised Christians in Jerusalem, Baptism of the Holy Spirit undoubtedly meant the coming of the Holy Spirit on *any* believer, as a *free* gift of God; such is a sign and seal of sonship before God, and *equal* fellowship with all the apostles and other Christians, in the name of Jesus Christ. No wonder, John Chrysostom, in his *Homilies on the Acts of the Apostles*, observed,

> Gentile? What Gentiles now? They were no longer Gentiles, the Truth having come. It is nothing wonderful, he says, if before the act of baptism they received the Spirit: in our own case this same happened. Peter shows that not as the rest were they baptized, but in a much *better way*. This is the reason why the event takes place in this manner, that they [his opponents] may have nothing to say but even in this way may account them [the Gentiles] *equal* with themselves [the Jews].[19]

4. Paul applied the term theologically:

The apostle Paul, emphasizing the importance of unity, in his epistle to the Corinthian Christians, has defined Spirit

---

[18] Acts 10:16-17.

[19] Francis Martin, ed., *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture: Acts* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2006), 140.

Baptism. Writing of the body of Christ, the living organism into which Christians are formed, Paul says that "we *were all baptized by one Spirit into one body* - whether Jews or Greeks, slave or free - and we were all given the one Spirit to drink."[20] Therefore, each individual who believes in Jesus, experiences the baptism of the Holy Spirit, in the sense that the Holy Spirit joins him or her to other believes in the spiritual body of Christ, the covenant community.[21]

5. *Conclusion*

In short, "Baptism of/in/with/by the Holy Spirit," in the writer's view, *meant* (according to John the Baptist, Jesus Christ, Peter, and Paul) and thus *means*: Jesus Christ, through his historical ascension and glorification, *open*s all sinners who repent and believe in his name to a whole new realm of spiritual blessings and possibilities in the Holy Spirit, as the Heavenly Father has promised, that is, to breathe and pour out *the* divine Gift who is the *Giver* of life (*zoe),* grace (*charis*) and all gifts (*charisma*).

In other words, "Baptism of/in/with/by the Holy Spirit" is all about the *gratuitous giving* of the Third Person of the Trinity, by the First Person, through the meritorious redemptive work of the Second Person, to God's people, in an unprecedented manner - universally, internally (with and in believers) and permanently - for world mission and conversion. Such *full access* to, and hence, continual and potential *full experience* of the saving, sanctifying, and

---

[20] 1 Corinthians 12:13.
[21] Lawrence O. Richards, *Expository Dictionary of Bible Words* (Grand Rapids: Regency Reference Library, 1985), 102.

empowering grace of the Third Person of the Trinity, commenced at Pentecost in Jerusalem, in terms of salvation history, but commences in an individual at their personal conversion, which is none other than union with Christ, through the working of the Spirit of Truth in the unfailing love of the Father God.

Toward the Original Wesleyan Understanding of Spirit Baptism:

John Wesley (1703-1791 AD), a powerful evangelist with "practical divinity" who laid the foundation for the Methodist movement in the 18th century, is by no means obscure in his theology of the Baptism of/in/with/by the Holy Spirit. He has, in fact, interpreted this biblical term both theologically and sacramentally.

1. The Wesleyan theological understanding of Spirit Baptism:

John Wesley's theological interpretation of Spirit Baptism may be found in his explanatory notes on Matthew 3:11 where he succinctly states,

He [Jesus Christ] shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire---He shall fill you with the Holy Ghost, inflaming your hearts with that fire of love which many waters cannot quench. And this was done, even with a visible appearance as of fire, on the day of Pentecost.[22]

---

[22] John Wesley, *Explanatory Notes Upon the New Testament* (London: Epworth Press, 2000), p24.

Apparently, the founder of Methodism regarded Spirit Baptism as the risen Jesus' gracious, salvific act of *filling* his believers with the Holy Spirit, so that his followers would have a fervent and steadfast heart of *holy love* for God as well as for their neighbours.

Of course, in order to grasp this theological statement of Spirit Baptism more comprehensively, one needs to have a deeper understanding of Wesley's view on Spirit-filling and Christian love. First, in regard to the filling of the Holy Spirit, Wesley's conviction was that to be filled by the Holy Spirit is none other than to be filled "in *all* His graces,"[23] and "led by the Spirit…into *all* holiness,"[24] so much so that a Spirit-born Christian would *and* is able to "follow His guidance, in *all* our tempers, thoughts, words, and actions,"[25] "pursuing with the whole bent and vigor of my soul *perfect* holiness and eternal glory."[26]

Second, in regard to Christian love, Wesley literally sees it as "*all* inward and outward holiness."[27] In his letter to Mr Walter Churchey on 21 February 1771, he writes,

Entire sanctification, or Christian perfection, is neither more nor less than *pure love*; love expelling sin, and governing both the heart and life of a child of God. The

---

[23] Ibid., p718. Emphasis is mine. Wesley's notes on Ephesians 5:18 show his thoughts clearly: "*But be ye filled by the Spirit* - In all His graces, who gives more pleasure than wine can do."

[24] Ibid., p697. Emphasis is mine. See Wesley's notes on Galatians 5:18.

[25] Ibid., p698. Emphasis is mine. See Wesley's notes on Galatians 5:25.

[26] Ibid., p735. Emphasis is mine. See Wesley's notes on Philippians 3:13.

[27] Ibid., p695. Emphasis is mine. See Wesley's notes on Galatians 5:6.

Refiner's fire purges out *all* that is contrary to love, and that many times by a pleasing smart. Leave all this to Him that does all things well, and that loves you better than you do yourself.[28]

Wesley even declares, in his notes on I Corinthians 13:13, that "*Faith, hope, love* - Are the sum of perfection on earth; love alone is the sum of perfection in heaven."[29]

In light of the aforesaid, no doubt, the founder of Methodism relates Spirit Baptism to the *whole* salvific work of the Almighty God in one's life *after* justification and regeneration. For him, a believer who is undergoing the overwhelming *baptizo*, that is, the filling and inflaming of the Holy Spirit, is not relatively changed (which should have taken place in justification), but *really*, even will be *entirely* changed. In other words, Spirit Baptism efficiently enables those that are born of God to work out their salvation and live out their "privilege," that is, in Wesley's own words,

Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: And he cannot sin, because he is born of God." (Verse 9) But some men will say, "True: Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin *habitually*." *Habitually!* Whence is that? I read it not. It is not written in the Book. God plainly saith, "He doth

---

[28] Thomas Jackson, ed., *The Works of John Wesley Vol. 12* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2007), p432. Emphasis is mine.

[29] John Wesley, *Explanatory Notes Upon the New Testament*, p628.

not commit sin;" and thou addest, *habitually!* Who art thou that mendest the oracles of God?[30]

Indeed, John Wesley had a profound theological interpretation of Spirit Baptism. His sacramental interpretation of the term, however, should also not be overlooked.

2. *The Wesleyan sacramental understanding of Spirit Baptism:*

In John Wesley's notes on I Corinthians 12:13, he wrote,

> *For* [we are all baptized] *by* that *one Spirit*, which we received in baptism, we are all united in one body. *Whether Jews or Gentiles* - who are at the greatest distance from each other by nature. *Whether slaves or freemen* - who are at the greatest distance by law and custom. *We have all drunk of one Spirit* -in that cup, received by faith, we all imbibed *one Spirit*, who first inspired, and still preserves, the life of God in our souls.[31]

Later, as Wesley explicated Titus 3:5, he furthermore correlated baptism with the spiritual new birth: "[S]anctification, expressed by *the laver of regeneration*, (that is, baptism, the thing signified, as well as the outward sign), *and the renewal of the Holy Ghost*; which purifies the

---

[30] Thomas Jackson, ed., *The Works of John Wesley Vol. 5* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2007), p213. Emphasis is Wesley's.
[31] John Wesley, *Explanatory Notes Upon the New Testament*, 623. Emphasis is Wesley's.

soul, as water cleanses the body, and renews it in the whole image of God."[32]

Obviously, Wesley, who remained an Anglican priest until his death, had a sacramental notion with regard to Spirit Baptism. For him, the baptism of/in/with/by the Holy Spirit would come to pass during water baptism, an outward sign of one's new birth, as well as a significant sign that one has been united to the body of Christ. Wesley's conviction was that if a repentant sinner receives the sacrament of baptism by faith, he or she would be baptized by the Third Person of the Trinity and thus be initially sanctified as well as intimately joined with other Christians in oneness.[33]

Thenceforth, the evangelical Anglican priest accentuated, "the *gradual* work of sanctification takes place" through which "we are enabled 'by the Spirit' to 'mortify the deeds of the body,' of our evil nature; and as we are more and more dead to sin, we are more and more alive to God." And, the seasoned pastor underscored, "we

---

[32] Ibid., 802. Emphasis is John's.

[33] John Wesley views the new birth as *initial* sanctification, for it sanctifies a justified person from the *power* or *dominion* of sin. In one of his standard sermons he observes, "Justification implies only a relative, the new birth, a real, change. God in justifying us does something *for* us; in begetting us again, he does the work *in* us. The former changes our outward relation to God, so that of enemies, we become children; by the latter our inmost souls are changed, so that of sinners we become saints. The one restores us to the favor, the other to the image, of God. The one is taking away the guilt, the other the taking away the power, of sin: So that, although they are joined together in point of time, yet are they of wholly distinct natures." See: Thomas Jackson, ed., *The Works of John Wesley Vol. 5*, p224. Emphasis is Wesley's.

wait for the entire sanctification; for a *full salvation* from all our sins - from pride, self-will, anger, unbelief...[I]t means *perfect love*...excluding sin; love filling the heart, taking up the whole capacity of the soul...love 'rejoicing evermore, praying without ceasing, in everything giving thanks."[34]

3. *Conclusion*

In short, Wesley's theological and sacramental interpretations of Spirit Baptism have forwarded a unique Pneumatology. His peculiar views make Spirit Baptism indispensable, and related to *most* parts of the "Scripture *Way* of Salvation"[35]: (1) Spirit Baptism is actualized in the sacrament of water baptism which is undergone by faith, and hence unites a person with the Holy and catholic Church; (2) Spirit Baptism offers instantaneous regenerating grace, which frees a person from the dominion of sin and fills him or her with power over sin, peace, hope and love; (3) Spirit Baptism furthermore grants continuous sanctifying grace to believers, which would enable them to go on from grace to grace, as well as to exercise works of piety and mercy, in holiness and happiness, so as to convert the world; (4) Spirit Baptism will even, instantaneously, destroy the being of sin for and in those who seek Christian perfection (i.e., perfect love) by faith alone, enabling Christians to love God, as well as their neighbours, with all

---

[34] Thomas Jackson, ed., *The Works of John Wesley Vol. 6* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2007), 46. Emphasis is mine.

[35] "The Scripture Way of Salvation" is the title of John Wesley's Standard Sermon 43. See: Thomas Jackson, ed., *The Works of John Wesley Vol. 6*, pp43-54. Emphasis is mine.

their hearts and with all their souls and with all their minds and with all their strength.

In the light of Wesley's great conviction of the overwhelming salvific work that can be done through Spirit Baptism, one would not be surprised, therefore, by the assertion in his notes on Acts 1:5: "Ye [the apostles] shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost---and *so are all true believers, to the end of the world.* But the *extraordinary gifts* of the Holy Ghost also are here promised."[36]

---

[36] John Wesley, *Explanatory Notes Upon the New Testament*, 393. Emphasis is mine. For John Wesley, The extraordinary or the miraculous gifts (*charismata*) of the Holy Ghost include: "1. Casting out devils; 2. Speaking with new tongues; 3. Escaping dangers, in which otherwise they must have perished; 4. Healing the sick; 5. Prophecy, foretelling things to come; 6. Visions; 7. Divine dreams; and, 8. Discerning the spirits." He further points out that, "Some of these appear to have been chiefly designed for the conviction of Jews and Heathens - as the casting out devils and speaking with new tongues; some, chiefly for the benefit of their fellow-Christians - as the healing the sick, foretelling things to come, and the discernment of spirits; and *all*, in order to enable those who either wrought or saw them, to 'run with patience the race set before them,' through all the storms of persecution which the most inveterate prejudice, rage, and malice could raise against them." See: Thomas Jackson, ed., *The Works of John Wesley Vol. 10* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2007), 16. John Wesley is convinced that all the aforementioned extraordinary gifts are just as relevant today as they were in the days of the first apostles. In his sermon, "The More Excellent Way," he writes with a grieving heart that, "We seldom hear of them [the extraordinary gifts] after that fatal period when the Emperor Constantine called himself a Christian; and from a vain imagination of promoting the Christian cause thereby, heaped riches and power and honor upon the Christians in general, but in particular upon the Christian Clergy. From this time they [the extraordinary gifts] almost totally ceased; very few instances of this kind were found. The cause of this was not (as has been vulgarly supposed) 'because there was no more occasion for them,' because all the world was

Conclusion

By and large, the biblical theology of Spirit Baptism - the gratuitous giving of the *Paraclete* by the heavenly Father, through the redemptive work done by the risen Christ, in a universal, internal, and permanent manner, to all believers, for world mission and conversion - is rich, and, the original Wesleyan understanding of Spirit Baptism - both theologically and sacramentally - is profound.

In light of the aforementioned study, the writer would like to suggest that the perception of the Reformed and Pentecostal traditions on Spirit Baptism is probably limited (for the former) and makes Baptism of the Spirit an "elitist doctrine" [37] (for the latter).

The writer's concern is that the Reformed perspective which defines Spirit Baptism as "what happens at one's *initiation into the faith* at the time of conversion," [38] though not denying "this

---

become Christians. This is a miserable mistake; not a twentieth part of it was then nominally Christian. The real cause was, 'the love of many,' almost of all Christians, so called, was 'waxed cold.' The Christians had no more of the Spirit of Christ than the other Heathens. The Son of Man, when he came to examine his Church, could hardly 'find faith upon earth.' This was the real cause why the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost were no longer to be found in the Christian church; because the Christians were turned Heathens again, and had only a dead form left." See: Thomas Jackson, ed., *The Works of John Wesley Vol. 7* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2007), pp26-27.

[37] See: Shane Clifton, "Baptism in Spirit – Elitism Part 2;" available from http://scc.typepad.com/scc_faculty_pentecostal_d/2007/03/baptism_in_spir.html; Internet.

[38] Chad Owen Brand, ed., *Perspectives on Spirit Baptism* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 2004), p31.

same Spirit...also is available to 'fill' believers...[and] produces the 'fruits of the Spirit' in those who walk by faith and obedience,"[39] is not biblical *enough*. For in light of the writer's study, Spirit Baptism is not only about "each believer...automatically placed in the body of Christ and made to drink in the Holy Spirit,"[40] but fundamentally about the radical opening of complete access to and thus the full potential of, deep experiences of the Third Person of the Trinity, as the First Person in the Blessed Trinity has promised in the Old Testament, and the Second Person of the Trinity has made available through his own atoning work and glorification, to *any* believer.

On the other hand, the Pentecostal perspective which defines Spirit Baptism as "(1) an experience that follows conversion [a *point* of entrance into a life of Spirit-empowered witness for Christ], and (2) *evidenced* by speaking in tongues,"[41] in the writer's opinion, has a tendency to make Spirit Baptism an "elitist doctrine." The predominant emphasis on tongues-speaking as *the* normative evidence for being baptized in the Spirit has (perhaps not intentionally) denied and subordinated diverse and profound experiences of the Spirit by various Christian communities in the Church's history. It is admirable and biblical, no doubt, for the Pentecostals to stress the many benefits of Spirit Baptism, particularly for effective witness for Christ, yet the writer would caution them about asserting that "*all* should speak in tongues."[42] The writer would rather accentuate, as Michael J Townsend does, the *euangelion*

---

[39] Ibid., p36.

[40] Ibid.

[41] Ibid., pp55, 78. Emphasis is mine.

[42] Ibid. p89.

of: "*all* can be saved, *all* can be saved by grace through faith, *all* know that they are saved, and *all* may be saved to the uttermost,"[43] through Spirit Baptism, made available by Christ as God the Father promised.

In short, the profundity of the biblical notion of Spirit Baptism, as well as the Wesleyan understanding of the term, needs to be recovered. Let not any limited definition of Spirit Baptism hinder the mighty flowing of the streams of Living Water from within believers. But rather, let the biblical Spirit Baptism define and empower Christian life and movement, in every culture and for every culture in all ages, [44] particularly as Christians wait upon, and move, in the Spirit through faith, obedience, surrender, and even through experiences of brokenness and forgiveness. Indeed, John **3:16** is *euangelion*, but Luke **3:16**: "Christ will [and has and continues to] baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire" is no less good news as well. Such understanding, in the writer's view, is essential for victorious Christian witness and life in the world, before Christ's glorious *parousia*.

---

[43] Thomas A. Langford, *Practical Divinity (Volume 1): Theology in the Wesleyan Tradition* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1983), p154.

[44] Ibid. The writer is inspired by E. Stanley Jones' notion: "The freedom of the gospel - in every culture and for every culture."

Theosis: The Deification of Man

Kyle Faircloth

Every good Protestant Christian knows the chief end of man is to glorify God and enjoy him forever.[1] The great Revelation to humankind is that life is not about humankind at all. Nevertheless, God chose people as his special creation that he might glorify himself through them. Most Protestants explain this special work as the sanctifying activity of the Holy Spirit in the life of the believer. An Eastern Orthodox Christian would likely agree with much of the doctrine of sanctification, yet might go on to say that the chief end of man is, "to become god, to attain *theosis*, 'deification' or 'divinization.'"[2] Eastern Orthodox theology explains the special work of God in the believer through the doctrine of *theosis*. As Daniel Clendenin says, "It is not too much to say that the divinization of humanity is the central theme, chief aim, basic purpose, or primary religious ideal of Orthodoxy."[3] The doctrine of *theosis* is a foreign concept to most Protestants, but in Eastern Orthodox theology, it is the central ideology.[4]

---

[1] James R. Boyd, ed., *Westminster Shorter Catechism* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Publication Committee, 1854), 19.

[2] Timothy Ware, *The Orthodox Church* (Baltimore: Penguin, 1963), 236.

[3] Daniel B. Clendenin, *Eastern Orthodox Christianity: A Western Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994), 120.

[4] Robert V. Rakestraw, "Becoming Like God: An Evangelical Doctrine of Theosis," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 40/2 (June 1997) : 257.

Though this doctrine is virtually unknown among Protestant believers, the notion of *theosis* is found scattered throughout many early church writings. For example, Athanasius writes concerning Christ, "For He was made man that we might be made God."[5] Many Protestants categorize phrases such as this one as poetic speech, said more for aesthetic appeal than literal consequence. Orthodoxy, however, interprets these words quite literally.

The purpose of this paper is to compel one to consider God's work through Christ in the lives of believers as seen through the Eastern Orthodox doctrine of *theosis*. Looking more closely at this doctrine will allow Protestant Christians to both affirm and re-examine their own understanding of what it means to be made in the image and likeness of God, to be in Christ, and to partake of the divine nature.

Man Becoming God

How can any Christian, especially the early church fathers, speak in terms of man being deified? The idea of man being a god appeared so offensive to Paul and Barnabas that they tore their clothes in anguish, and this idea was so offensive to God, he caused worms to eat Herod alive (Acts 14, 12). If the chief end of man is to glorify God and enjoy him forever, then is the doctrine of *theosis*, the deification of man, outside the realm of Christian theology? The best way to answer these questions is to begin by explaining what *theosis* is not.

---

[5] Athanasius, *On the Incarnation*, 54.3.

What It Is Not

Eastern Orthodox theologians teach that the activity of humans becoming God is not achieved through human desire or effort. The difference, they say, is between a prideful people seeking to deify themselves, and God taking humbled people and deifying them by his grace. Whereas Paganism gives very human qualities to gods, or divine qualities to humans, *theosis* is the result of the Infinite God uniting with finite humanity through Christ. As Craig Blaising says, "The Pagans are condemned because being men they presume to make gods which like themselves do not endure."[6] *Theosis*, he says, is not to be confused with Pagan mythology.

The Orthodox doctrine of *theosis* is also not pantheism. Orthodox theologians seek to make clear that in the act of deification, man remains man and God remains God. When a person "becomes God," they explain, the person does not lose their humanity.[7] Instead, people "remain creatures while becoming God by grace, as Christ remained God in becoming man by the Incarnation."[8] Orthodox theologians, both of the past and today, are careful to deny any suggestion of pantheism.[9] As concerns the issue of "essence," they deny any dissolution or diffusion of substance on the part of the Divine or human being.

---

[6] Craig A. Blaising, "Deification: An Athanasian View of Spirituality," Paper included in Evangelical Theological Society Papers (Portland: Theological Research Exchange Network, 1988), text-fiche, 12.

[7] Ware, *The Orthodox Church*, 237.

[8] Vladimir Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* (London: James Clarke, 1957), 87.

[9] Daniel B. Clendenin, "Partakers of Divinity: The Orthodox Doctrine of Theosis" *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 37/3 (September 1994) : 373.

Many Orthodox theologians make a great effort to prove that the doctrine of *theosis* does not confuse the Creator with his creation. [10]

Theosis, they explain, is not becoming one with God in the sense that man shares God's essence (*ousia*). Instead, to be one with God is more like "a movement of interpenetration between divinity and humanity; . . . human nature is transfigured [deified] by being permeated with the loving, self-giving action of God."[11] Therefore *theosis* is not something humans attain by their own will, or a dissolving into the essence of God. It also does not mean becoming a god or a deity in contrast to God, nor losing one's selfhood in becoming one with God.

What It Is

Though Protestants might be relieved to learn what *theosis* is not, they may still be surprised to learn what it is. For Eastern Orthodox Christians, deification is more than simple imitation of Christ's example or trying to be *like* God. True, believers are supposed to imitate Christ, they say, but it is through *theosis* that they are enabled to do so—it is God's work within the believer. Man is made in the image and likeness of God and the believer is one with him in Christ through the Holy Spirit. Being in Christ, sharing the divine nature, and being made in the image

---

[10] Philip Edgcumbe Hughes, *The True Image: The Origin and Destiny of Man in Christ* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 281.

[11] Alistair Kee, "Deification," in *The Westminster Dictionary of Christian Spirituality,* ed. Gordon S. Wakefield (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1998), 107.

and likeness of God are viewed quite literally through the lens of *theosis*.

Meister Eckhart, who was a fourteenth-century German mystic and teacher at the University of Paris, says, "Now all creatures have not being, for their being depends on the presence of God. Were God to turn from his creatures for only a moment, they would be annihilated."[12] In other words, without God 'man is' cannot exist. Eckhart later states, "What is in God is God."[13] He is not speaking in terms of pantheism, but that humans have their being and find their existence only in God. Alistair Kee relates this idea to the Father and Son "making their home" in the believer from John 14:23.[14] He goes on to say that "the 'glory' and 'eternal life' [from John 17:5] given to the believer consist precisely in sharing this relationship."[15] The same type of relationship the Son has with the Father is also available to the believer through the Holy Spirit. By being made a child of God through adoption, the believer is given the Holy Spirit through which the powers that belong to Christ are made accessible. The result, says Orthodoxy, is that the redeemed in Christ will be made God.[16]

---

[12] Meister Eckhart "Omne datum optimum" (*Deutsche Predigten*), 171; quoted in Winfried Courduan, "A Hair's Breadth from Pantheism: Meister Eckhart's God-Centered Spirituality," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 37/2 (June 1994) : 265.

[13] Eckhart "Omne datum optimum," 266.

[14] Kee, *The Westminster Dictionary of Christian Spirituality*, 106.

[15] Ibid.

[16] G.L. Bray, "Deification" in *New Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Sinclair B. Ferguson, David F. Wright, J.I. Packer (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1988), 189.

So what is *theosis*? To answer succinctly, Daniel Clendenin accumulates several terms used by the fathers and defines it as:

A transformation, union, participation, partaking, intermingling, elevation, interpenetration, transmutation, commingling, assimilation, reintegration, adoption, recreation. Divinization implies our being intertwined with Christ, an influx of the divine, or the attainment of similitude with God.[17]

In Christ

The doctrine of *theosis* is built primarily on an esoteric interpretation of the Incarnation of Christ. Not only is God able to become flesh, but he does so in order that flesh might become divine. Irenaeus seems to echo this though in his work, *Against Heresies*, when he says, "The Word of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, who did, through His transcendent love, become what we are, that He might bring us to be even what He is Himself."[18] The deification of humanity happens only because of and through the humanness of God. Because Christ became everything humanity is, yet sinless, humanity is now able to become what God is—even sinless.

St. Hilary of Poitiers wrote that only God could become something other than what he was and still not cease to be God.[19] He goes on to say:

---

[17] Clendenin, "Partakers," 374.

[18] Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, Book V Preface.

[19] St. Hilary of Poitiers, *On the Trinity*, IX 4.38.

The Incarnation is summed up in this, that the whole Son, that is, His manhood as well as His divinity, was permitted by the Father's gracious favour to continue in the unity of the Father's nature, and retained not only the powers of the divine nature, but also that nature's self. For the object to be gained was that man might become God.[20]

The whole point of Christ's coming to earth, says Hilary, is "that man might become God." In order for God to deify man, he had to become man, yet not cease to be God. In so doing, man remains man, yet through Christ, becomes God.

Orthodox theologians offer several Scripture references in support of *theosis*. For example Galatians 2:20:[21]

I have been crucified with Christ. It is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me. And the life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me.[22]

Even Protestant theologians commenting on this verse tend to speak in *theosis*-type language. For example, in Martin Luther's commentary on Galatians he says, "Thou art so entirely and nearly joined unto Christ, that he and thou art made as it were one person; . . . for by faith we are so joined together, that we are become one flesh and one bone."[23] Luther shows this

---

[20] Ibid., IX 5.38.
[21] Others are: 1 John 4:16; Col. 1:15-18; 1 Cor. 2:10-14; 15:49; Eph. 3:16-19; 4:13-15; John 17:11, 21-23; Rom. 2:7; 5-7; 2 Tim. 1:10.
[22] All Scripture references come from the English Standard Version, 2011.
[23] Martin Luther, *A Commentary Upon the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians* (Connecticut: Salmon S. Miles, 1837), 163-164.

relationship, this event, as something more than mere fellowship as between friends. It is an intermingling, so closely joined with Christ that believers become one flesh and one bone. John Calvin comments that the believer receives a "secret energy" by being engrafted into Christ's death.[24] Just as the root nourishes the twig, so the Christian survives by the divine nourishment of God. It appears these are not mere metaphors for Luther and Calvin, but are actual events in the lives of believers.

Gregory Palamas, Archbishop of Thessalonica in the fourteenth century, also used the notion of "God's energies" in his teachings. Contrasting God's energies with God's essence Palamas says, "The essence is simple, indivisible, not capable of being shared; the energies are multiple and sharable. Deification is union with the divine acts or operations."[25] The way in which God shares his energies, he says, is through the Holy Spirit. As Georgios Mantzarids says, "The Holy Spirit is everywhere present in both essence and energy; but whereas His essence remains inaccessible and may not be shared, His energy is shared . . . by the saints."[26] To be in Christ, then, means to believe "by faith in the Son of God . . . who gave Himself up for me" and allowing him to live "in me" by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit (John 17). Believers, says the doctrine of *theosis*, are deified because of the incarnation of Christ and through the presence of the Holy Spirit.

---

[24] John Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul to the Galatians and Ephesians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957), 74.

[25] Kee, *The Westminster Dictionary*, 107.

[26] Georgios I. Mantzarids, *The Deification of Man: St. Gregory Palamas and the Orthodox Tradition*, trans. Liadain Sherrard (New York: St. Vladimir's, 1984), 36.

Partakers of The Divine Nature

To be in Christ means to partake of the divine nature, and Orthodox theologians quote 2 Peter 1:4 in support:

By which [God's glory and excellence] he has granted to us his precious and very great promises, so that through them you may become partakers of the divine nature, having escaped from the corruption that is in the world because of sinful desire.

Orthodoxy says that to be partakers means to *actually* possess the divine nature. Protestant theologians on the other hand, are cautious when explaining this verse. For example, Calvin is careful to note that the word "nature," in this verse, does not mean God's essence.[27] Instead, he says the apostle Peter means that "when divested of all the vices of the flesh, we shall be partakers of divine and blessed immortality and glory, so as to be as it were one with God as far as our capacities will allow."[28]

Calvin hesitates to say believers will partake of the divine nature fully while still on earth. Instead, he says partaking of the divine nature will be more fully realized (though still limited) after death. Yet, regarding the resurrection, he does not hesitate in the least when he says, "Let us then mark, that the end of the gospel is, to render us eventually comfortable to God, and, if we may so speak, *to deify us*."[29]

---

[27] John Calvin, *Calvin's Commentaries Volume XXII: Hebrews, 1 Peter, 1 John, James, 2 Peter, Jude* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999), 371.
[28] Ibid.
[29] Calvin, *Calvin's Commentaries*, 371, emphasis mine.

Jesus prays in John 17:22-23a, "The glory that you have given me I have given to them, that they may be one even as we are one, I in them and you in me." The point Orthodox theologians attempt to make is that partaking in the divine nature is more than a simple relationship as with friends. Christ did not merely follow the Father's example but was truly one with the Father. Panayiotis Nellas says that deification is synonymous with Christification. He says that when Paul teaches that the believer is one with Christ, he "is not advocating an external imitation or a simple ethical improvement but a real Christification."[30] The believer is *truly* in Christ and is *truly* able to partake of the divine nature. Henry Scougal sees it as "a real participation of his nature; . . . and they who are endued with it may be said to have *God dwelling in their souls and Christ formed within them.*"[31] According to the doctrine of *theosis*, "Christ formed within" means the Christian does not live his or her own life, but is active by the "secret power" of Christ.[32] In this way, the secret power, or energies, of the Holy Spirit is what allows the believer to be in Christ and partake of the divine nature.

In The Image and Likeness of God

"Then God said, 'Let us make man in our image, after our likeness'" (Gen. 1:26). In a paper delivered to the Evangelical

---

[30] Panayiotis Nellas, *Deification in Christ* (Crestwood: St. Vladimir's, 1997), 39.

[31] Henry Scougal, *The Life of God in the Soul of Man* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1948), 33-34.

[32] Calvin, *Commentaries*, 74.

Theological Society concerning *theosis*, James B. Jordan said that people were created to be a "symbol of God"; their lives are to image God, an active event.[33] Yet, several church fathers were divided on what it means for humans to be in the image and likeness of God.[34]

For example, Irenaeus said humans were made up of flesh, spirit, and soul. The flesh and soul consisted of the image of God, and the spirit was the likeness of God: "But if the Spirit be wanting to the soul, he who is such is indeed . . . an imperfect being, possessing indeed the image [of God] in his formation (*in plasmate*), but not receiving the similitude through the Spirit."[35] Irenaeus believed Adam was perfect because he had both the image and likeness of God.[36] At the fall he was torn in two and lost the likeness, the similitude with God. His conclusion is that Adam, when he rebelled against God, lost the presence of the Spirit. For Irenaeus, then, the Incarnation was the means by which God brought the Spirit back to fallen humanity. Through the Incarnation, people now have the opportunity to regain the likeness of God, through the presence of the Spirit.

---

[33] James B. Jordon, "Some Encouragements toward an Evangelical Doctrine of the Deification of Man," Paper included in Evangelical Theological Society Papers (Portland: Theological Research Exchange Network, 1987), text-fiche, 3.

[34] Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, Book V 6.1; Augustine, *On the Holy Trinity* 7.6.12; 11.5.8; Diadochus of Photice, *On Spiritual Perfection* 4; Origen, *On First Principles* 3.6.;1Clement of Alexandria, *Exhortation to the Greeks*, 10.

[35] Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, Book V 6.1.

[36] Jules Gross, *The Divinization of the Christian According to the Greek Fathers* (Anaheim: A&C, 2002), 124.

Along this same line of thinking, some argue that Adam and Eve were a type of incarnation themselves. James Hastings says, "God intended man to be the incarnation of Himself, for He 'made man in His own image.'"[37] The Word became flesh so that people might regain what was lost. Lossky says, "What man ought to have attained by raising himself up to God, God achieved by descending to man."[38]

In contrast to Irenaeus, Athanasius does not speak in terms of people losing or regaining the likeness or image of God. Instead, when he says, "For He was made man that we might be made God," he means God did something completely new.[39] *Theosis*, he says, is not so much the restoration of something lost, but a completely new event never before seen.[40] Andrew Louth says that "for Athanasius deification no longer meant restoration of our natural state but the realization of a new possibility offered to us by God through the incarnation."[41] In Christ, people are offered something which could never be attained any other way.

What If

There are some who say that Adam and Eve would have gained deification eventually had they only waited. Donald

---

[37] James Hastings, *Great Texts of the Bible: Genesis to Numbers Vol. I* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1976), 63.

[38] Lossky, *The Mystical Theology*, 136.

[39] Athanasius, *On the Incarnation*, 54.3.

[40] 2 Corinthians 5:17; Galatians 6:15.

[41] Andrew Louth, "The Cappadocians," in *The Study of Spirituality*: ed. Cheslyn Jones, Geoffrey Wainwright, Edward Yarnhold (New York: Oxford, 1986), 162.

Winslow states that they "sought to grasp the very thing that was to have been theirs, had they been willing to wait, namely, theōsis."[42] Jordan says that people were like infants (which is why they felt no shame in their nakedness), and although made in the image of God, were to become like God "through a process of growth and maturation."[43] He says that at some point, humans would have been clothed by God deifying them when he was ready.

Such a thesis, however, seems to weaken the argument for *theosis* more than help it. If there is even the most remote possibility that people could have achieved deification on their own, then the doctrine ceases to be Christian. Just as Lossky so wisely points out, "God has foreseen the fall of Adam, and the Son of God was 'the Lamb slain before the ages' in the pre-existent will of the Trinity."[44] To open the possibility of "earning" deification, is to nullify the Incarnation and the gospel message.

East and West

Theosis looks very similar to the Protestant doctrines of justification and sanctification. Where Eastern Orthodox Christians see the process as all of a whole, Protestant Christians see a distinction between justification and sanctification. As J.C. Ryle says, "In justification the word to be addressed to man is

---

[42] Donald F. Winslow, *The Dynamics of Salvation: A Study in Gregory of Nazianzus* (Philadelphia: The Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, Ltd., 1979), 64.

[43] Jordon, "Some Encouragements," 4.

[44] Lossky, *The Mystical Theology*, 137-138.

'believe' - only believe; in sanctification the word must be 'watch, pray, and fight.' What God has divided let us not mingle and confuse."[45] In this way, one does not have to wonder if one has "acquired" enough sanctification to be justified. Speaking on the differences between Lutheranism and Orthodoxy, Ross Aden says, "Once the line was drawn, however finely, everything had to be placed on one side of the line or the other."[46]

Though the apostle Paul uses legal language to teach justification through Christ, the distinction he makes with sanctification seems to show it as the continuation of God's work of salvation from the very beginning. Paul teaches that the one springs naturally from the other as the believer is "created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God prepared beforehand, that we should walk in them" (Eph. 2:10). Essentially Paul says, "You used to do these things, but now that you have been justified, you *do* these things instead." Believers do not win merit, but are created in Christ for good works. Aden goes on to say, "What Lutherans have divided into justification and sanctification, Orthodoxy sees as two aspects of the single process of human transformation into union with the divine life."[47]

The *Philokalia*, the single most important collection of Orthodox writings, says, "We receive salvation by grace and as a divine gift of the Spirit. But to attain the full measure of virtue we need also to possess faith and love, and to struggle to

---

[45] J.C. Ryle, *Holiness: Its Nature, Hindrances, Differences, and Roots* (Moscow: Charles Nolan, 2001), 28.

[46] Ross Aden, "Justification and Sanctification: A Conversation Between Lutheranism and Orthodoxy," *St. Vladimir's Quarterly* 38:1 (1994) : 91.

[47] Ross Aden, "Justification and Sanctification," 99.

exercise our free will with integrity."[48] The difference appears to be what each side stresses. Orthodoxy speaks in terms of a mystical union with God which is bolstered through the sacramental system. There is something sacred and hidden in *theosis* that can only be gained through divine activities. The Protestant view speaks in terms of juridical categories so that through willful humiliation before Christ, believers are justified and begin a life-long process of becoming more *like Christ* through the work of the Holy Spirit.[49] Still, perhaps both Orthodox and Protestant believers will agree that one is justified to God through Christ, and at the same time begin an *actual* process of becoming like God which is finally perfected in the resurrection.

Wayne Grudem says, "Our resurrection bodies will show the fulfillment of God's perfect wisdom in creating us as human beings who are the pinnacle of his creation and the appropriate bearers of his likeness and image."[50] In resurrected form, believers will have heavenly bodies which are immortal and glorious, and they will reign with Christ (1 Cor. 15:48-49; Rom. 2:7; 1 Cor. 15:53-54; 2 Tim. 1:10; Matt. 13:43; Dan. 12:3; 2 Tim. 2:12). Speaking of the resurrected body Paul says, "What is sown is perishable; what is raised is imperishable. It is sown in dishonor; it is raised in glory. It is sown in weakness; it is raised in power. It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. If there is a natural body, there is also a spiritual body." (1 Cor. 15:42-44). He completes this in verse 49 by saying "Just as

---

[48] Macarius of Egypt, "Makarian Homilies 1.1" (Philokalia 3:285); quoted in Clendenin, *Eastern Orthodox Christianity*, 135-136.

[49] Clendenin, *Eastern Orthodox Christianity*, 124.

[50] Wayne Grudem, *Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 831.

we have borne the image of the man of dust, we shall also bear the image of the man of heaven."

Human separation from God was never a natural event but penal, and yet, it is completely wiped away in the resurrected and glorified body.[51] In the glorified body there will be no more tears, no more death, no more mourning, nor pain as the old things pass away (Revelation 21:4). These things can only happen if humans become something more than merely human. In the Incarnation God knew pain, and tears, and mourning, and death. Christ is not merely human, however, and in the resurrection he became the "firstborn from the dead." According to the doctrine of *theosis*, the glorification of believers in the resurrection is the result of an activity which began before death. It is, instead, an actual recreation of the human into the divine.

Critique and Thoughts for Further Study

An initial concern with the Eastern Orthodox doctrine of *theosis* has to do with the term itself. By translating the word literally as "deification" or "becoming God," Orthodox theologians create unnecessary barriers to discussion and, therefore, must put great effort into explaining what *theosis* does not mean. A literal translation of the meaning rather than a of the term itself may help alleviate some of the common concerns of pantheism or changing God's essence. For example, the phrase "becoming like God" not only remains faithful to the meaning of *theosis* but also provides common ground on which the doctrine can be presented to Protestant Christians.

---

[51] John R.W. Stott, *The Cross of Christ* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1986), 65.

81

This same point applies to the use of the phrase "God's energies" or "energy" when speaking of the work of the Holy Spirit. Such impersonal language when referring to the work of the Spirit runs the risk of relegating the Spirit to a kind of cosmic force rather than the third Person of the Trinity. Instead, the biblical metaphor "fruit of the Spirit" is more appropriate when referring to God's work in the life of the believer. As Rakestraw says, "Why use terminology that, at first glance at least, will alienate those unfamiliar with this line of thinking in Christian theology, and thus miss what might be of benefit to them?"[52]

Beyond words and phrases there are deeper issues with which theologians must deal. For instance, if Christians are in the earthly process of "becoming God by grace," how does this coincide with the Orthodox teaching that believers must struggle to exercise their free will with integrity?[53] The Eastern Orthodox Church answers this by appealing to the sacramental system. Believers are "exposed" to the Scriptures as taught by the Church, and thereby strive to live godly lives, but they must also participate in the sacraments.[54] The sacramental aspect, at least, is unacceptable to Protestant theology. In light of *theosis*, however, Protestants can readdress the doctrines of justification, sanctification, and glorification as an inseparable process that is God's work in the believer.

More study should also be given to the understanding of what it means to be made in the image and likeness of God as

---

[52] Rakestraw, "Becoming Like God," 265.

[53] Macarius of Egypt, "Makarian Homilies 1.1" (Philokalia 3:285); quoted in Clendenin, *Eastern Orthodox Christianity*, 135-136.

[54] Ross Aden, "Justification and Sanctification," 108.

regards *theosis*. Is Irenaeus' claim correct, that people retained the image but lost the likeness of God when they sinned? If so, why is the biblical language the reverse of his argument? Romans 8:29 says the believer is being conformed to the *image* of Christ, while James 3:9 says people are made in the *likeness* of God. Calvin certainly saw no difference: "As for myself, before I define the image of God, I would deny that it differs from his likeness."[55] How does this fit with Athanasius' argument that the work of Christ is not about restoring people to what they were before the fall, but is about making them into something completely new?

If Eastern Orthodox theologians wish to use the arguments of Irenaeus and Athanasius, they will, in addition, need to address these issues.

Conclusion

Scripture teaches that believers speak the words of God, serve in the strength of God, think the thoughts of God, and have the mind of Christ (1 Peter 4:11; 1 Corinthians 2:13, 16; 1 Thessalonians 2:13): God's words, God's strength, God's thoughts, Christ's mind. These qualities may be the ways in which believers partake of the divine nature, but what do they mean?

Protestants might answer that this process comes about at the point of justification by faith. Sanctification comes through a growing knowledge of God's revealed Word through the work

---

[55] John Calvin, *Commentaries on the First Book of Moses called Genesis: Vol. I* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999), 93.

of the Holy Spirit. As Luther says, "Christ is the Christ because He achieved our redemption from sin and death for the very purpose that the Holy Spirit should change our old Adam into a new man, so we can die to sin and live to righteousness."[56]

The words of the Bible are God's words; they are his mind and thoughts. By the indwelling of the Holy Spirit believers are able to comprehend this great mystery, and by his strength, and in this way, partake of the divine nature. "Now we have received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit who is from God, that we might understand the things freely given us by God" (1 Corinthians 2:12).

Eastern Orthodox Christians, however, believe there is still something much more mysterious and supramundane involved in this process. They believe that aspects of glorification, the time when the human body is transformed from perishable to imperishable, do not have to wait until the resurrection. As Rakestraw says:

> *Rather than seeing our progressive sanctification as something done for us by God from outside . . . or as something we do from below as we pray to God above, . . . we may take a kind of quantum leap forward by understanding sanctification as the very life and energy of God in us.*[57]

God became man that man might become God. Through Christ God recreates believers, remaking them into his perfect likeness

---

[56] Charles P. Schaum, ed., *Law and Gospel: How to Read and Apply the Bible* (St. Louis: Concordia, 2010), 136.

[57] Ross Aden, "Justification and Sanctification," 267.

and image. "What no eye has seen, nor ear heard, nor the heart of man imagined, what God has prepared for those who love him" (1 Corinthians 2:9).

This article is a brief survey of *theosis,* and Protestant theologians may have additional issues with this doctrine, but by learning more about the Eastern Orthodox view, Protestants can re-evaluate, and be reminded of, just how glorious, how "spiritual," is the work of God in the life of the believer. In Christ, we are truly new creations.

The Inclusiveness and Exclusiveness of the Gospel of Christ in the Light of the Many Asian Spiritualities

Dr. Wilfred J. Samuel

Preamble: Diversity and Plurality - Presupposed Asian Context

Diversity and pluralism in terms of spirituality, race, religion, culture, language, world-view and tradition are characteristic of most Asian countries. In most Asian countries, Christianity continues to remain a minority religion and is required to face challenges of diverse nature, the most demanding of which, would be the need to maintain trans-religious and trans-cultural communication. As Charles Springer from Ohio rightly notes, the "relation between religions is not only an academic concern....Consider the fact that we live in one world."[1] Hence we need to approach the matter at hand (the inclusiveness and exclusiveness of the gospel) with seriousness because we are in want of a response that is pragmatic in its approach, practical in its application and ensues from biblical faith reflection, rather than mere theological articulation for contextual application.

---

[1] Springer, R. Charles. **Christianity and Rival Religions, Philadelphia,** Fortress Press, 1966, p3.

Asia is also unique because, for most, if not all, of its citizens, religion is more than a mere sociological phenomenon or a system of faith adhered to due to heritage. Religion is life. Hence, people are willing to give their lives for the sake of religion when situations demand it. Such religious fervency, be it in Islam, Christianity, Hinduism, Buddhism or Taoism, is a resultant factor generally derived from an understanding of, and respect for, their respective Holy Writs. As a primary element of faith one is taught to hold in deepest respect and honour, that which is handed to us as the Holy Writ, bearing God's revelation. It emanates, too, from a consciousness and conviction that the Divine revelation contained therein, is authentic, authoritative and may not be altered. Asian Christianity would therefore be in agreement with Morris Inch, when he says: "The low view of the Scripture strikes at the heart of the Christian faith – at the person and work of Christ,"[2]

Further, inclusive and exclusive claims are common to all religions in Asia, and therefore need only be presupposed and respected. In each of the Holy Writs of living religions in Asia, one may note there are exclusive claims, which are implicitly noted as UNIQUE claims of truth, offer of love and hope. These are particular claims and particular only to a given religion. On the other hand, inclusive claims are noted as doctrinal precepts, religious values or socio-ethical norms common to many religions (usually helpful for dialogical purposes).

Hence, in its theological articulation and practical application of the gospel truth (the inclusive and exclusive claims of the gospel), the Church needs to take advantage of all

---

[2] Inch, Morris. **Doing Theology Across Cultures**, Grand Rapids, Baker, 1982, p20.

available resources and opportunities, those avenues conducive to expressions of love, peace, justice and solidarity, to enable it to fully realize its objective: namely, communicating the gospel and accomplishing the missional task. We may quote Luther at this point: "Then let it be your chief work to proclaim (the gospel) this publicly and to call everyone into light into which you have been called."[3]

Further, to achieve a perceptive balance in the presentation of the gospel (in agreement with its exclusive and inclusive claims), there, first, needs to be clarity concerning the relationship between the gospel and culture. Second, in order to avoid religious extremism of any nature, and by any length, the Church, amidst other spiritualities, must express it with love, sensitivity, a high level of respect and mutuality. As Bonhoeffer directs us to think: "Christian radicalism, no matter whether it consists in withdrawing from the world, arises from the hatred of creation,"[4] Or in the words of Luther, gospel strength is 'beneficum not dominium' (grace not power). Hence, preaching the inclusiveness and exclusiveness of the gospel constitutes both sharing and caring. Sharing the goodness would certainly require that the Church does not become overwhelmed by the sentiment of emotionalism, that could easily lead to being JUDGMENTAL or DEFENSIVE. Caring, is to speak a language of love and as such, is indispensable to religious co-existence, true expression of the gospel message, and what the Church and the Cross objectively symbolize in Asia: the inclusive and exclusive God of Christianity.

---

[3] Pelikan, Jaroslav (ed) **Luther's Works – The Catholic Epistles (Vol. 30),** St Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1967, p65.

[4] Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. **Ethics,** Macmillan, New York, 1955, p129.

By affirming the legitimacy of diversity and pluralism within the socio-cultural and religious context of Asia, it requires that the Lutheran Church, too, offers a more decisive and practical explanation concerning what is implied and practiced in the context of `the inclusive and exclusive God of Christianity': inclusive in the extent of His love towards His creation (Jn 3:16) and exclusive because He has set clear boundaries for His creation concerning the way in which it could commune with Him (Ex 20:30). Since we note that God is both inclusive and exclusive, it becomes necessary that his followers recognize and apply the inclusive and exclusive principles of the gospel of Christ in the right manner, purpose and context.

The gospel of Christ is inclusive in that it is about sharing salvation and God's love. "The gospel is preaching God's deeds. They are the deeds and works we have often mentioned, namely that by the power of God, Christ has swallowed up death, devoured hell, drunk sin to the dregs, and placed us into eternal life."[5]

The gospel of Christ is exclusive in that we uphold its claims, namely that Jesus is the Incarnate Word, Saviour and Son of God (Jn 17:3).

How To Understand the Inclusive and Exclusive Claims of the Gospel in the Asian Perspective

The gospel of Christ, in the first place, is Truth, and the Truth is about God's offer of grace to all people (Jn 10:10) in

---

[5] Ibid.p.65.

and through Jesus Christ. This is the work of the gospel. The 'proper' task of the gospel is to offer a good message, good tidings or a song to rejoice.[6] In a nutshell, we could summarize the gospel message of John 3:16 in the following manner:

THE INCLUSIVE CLAIM OF THE GOSPEL is that the gift of salvation, offered in and through Christ as a matter of grace, is for all people. The invitation to follow Christ is unambiguously inclusive (1Tim 2: 4).

THE EXCLUSIVE CLAIM OF THE GOSPEL is that it is only through Christ's atonement that anyone may be saved from sin, and inherit eternal life and salvation (Jn 3: 16).

The Gospel is Radically Inclusive and Positive

The gospel, in being radically inclusive, focuses on preaching GRACE and COMFORT: offered by God through Christ.

Universality of Christ – The universality of Christ is confessed and proclaimed with love, irrespective of racial, religious and cultural boundaries. Christ is an open invitation for all. The invitation is offered with love and peace. (Jn 17:13).

Christ is in everyone: that is everyone who accepts His offer of grace and forgiveness. (Jn 11: 21-26).

---

[6] Pelikan, Jaroslav (ed) **Luther's Works: Selections from the Psalms (Vol.12),** St Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1955, p14ff.

Universality of the hope in Christ – Such hope introduces the individual to the mystery of God's kingdom, and its socio-religious and ethical system. The love principle predominates in the expression of this kingdom value system, and people are directed through it to positively infect the world with spiritual values such as peace, love, equality, solidarity and justice (Jn 14:6).

Universality of the knowledge of Christ – Such knowledge could be complemented by general revelation and common grace. People of other faiths could help augment and enhance our understanding concerning spirituality, morality, culture, etc. through knowledge and revelation from their faith.

a) *The Inclusive Gospel*

i) *The gospel is inclusive in its persuasive intercession.*

- Witnessing to God's love involves a quest to be, and become like, Christ in faith, attitude and service.
- The inclusive nature of the gospel draws Christians away from an egocentric ecclesiology and spirituality into an empathetic Christo-centric 'koinonia': a community of service.
- It celebrates the variety, and gifts, found in different spiritualities or cultures, as affirming the generosity and goodness of God.
- It allows for prayer, healing and reconciliation, through dialogue with other spiritualities.
- The gospel is inclusive in its persuasive intercession for solidarity, mutuality and peace in society. Inclusivity of

this nature epitomizes the cross as a symbol of faith, hope and love.

ii) *The gospel is inclusive in its mission.*
It offers a loving call to all (John 3:16)

iii) *The gospel is inclusive in its process of contextualization.* Contextualization or indigenization is the process, or attempt, to make the gospel applicable, understandable and relevant to the given context. In so saying, we affirm that there are inherent positive values and spiritual elements in other spiritualities.

b) *The Exclusive Gospel*

i) Although we reject the "possesio"[17] approach in gospel contextualization, nevertheless we maintain a conscious guard against 'syncretism,'[18] (both assimilative syncretism[19] and accommodative syncretism)[20] of the gospel. This is to maintain that there are elements of the gospel that need to be stated only in biblical terms. By this we also affirm that the gospel is not above the culture, or below the culture, but transforms culture without losing its unique elements.

---

[17]**Possesio** – the gospel possesses the context since there is nothing good in it.

[18] **Syncretism** – all the tenets of the gospel become lost in the process of contextualization.

[19] **Assimilative Syncretism** – the claim that there is no qualitative difference between the Christian gospel and other faiths.

[20] **Accommodative Syncretism** – using non-biblical pointers to describe and determine the content of the Gospel.

ii) Constructs positive and legitimate boundaries through which the supremacy of biblical revelation can be maintained and explained as normative Christian faith and practice. This certainly would safeguard the exclusivity of the gospel, the uniqueness of Christ (Acts 4:12) and the finality of the Word. (1 Tim 2:5)

iii) Requires a perceptive balance in understanding the immanence and transcendence of God in the gospel, He is not part of the created order, nor is the created order a part of God.[21]

Conclusion

In conclusion, I would like to draw attention to the words of Morris, in relation to maintaining the 'inclusive and exclusive' stance within a diverse socio-religious and cultural context. Referring to Paul in the Corinthian context, Morris notes that Paul's reasoning to the Corinthian Church was "that we must not compromise our distinctive as the people of God, that we ought to enjoy God's bounty to the fullest, that we should be sensitive to how our behavior affects others, and at fullest, that we should be aware of how the principles of our particular calling can best be worked out in various cultural settings."[22]

---

[21] Gnanakan, Ken. **Biblical Theology in Asia.** Bangalore, Asia Theological Association, 1995, p56.
[22] Inch, Morris. **Doing Theology Across Cultures**, Grand Rapids, Baker, 1982, p41

Be it with regard to indigenous spirituality or the living faiths of Asia, the praxis of Christianity remains the same: promoting the celebration of humanity, mutual empowerment, reclaiming cultural identity, the struggle for justice, reconciliation etc. through the affirmation of unity in diversity, through the preaching of the gospel of Christ. Therefore the 'neighbourology theology' of Asia is a healthy track for the holistic mission and ministry of the Lutheran Church in Asia: an approach that takes non-church people as neighbours and the fellow creation of God, whom we ought to respect and treat with dignity. Thus, understanding the gospel of Christ, in Asia, requires that we view inclusiveness as a command to love (God and people), and exclusiveness as a command to serve (God and people), that we may witness to Christ, teach the Bible, learn how other spiritualities may complement the gospel, and journey together.

A Reflection from the Book "Christian Worship: Unity in Cultural Diversity"

Elizabeth Enjut Salang

Introduction

This paper will speak generally on how Christian Worship and igneous culture could be merges, to bring about the possibility of undertaking mission in the local context. This is a reflection on the book.

Definition of Worship

- Worship is the heart and pulse of the Christian Church. In worship we celebrate together God's gracious gifts of creation and salvation, and are strengthened to live in response to God's grace. Worship always involves actions, not merely words. To consider worship is to consider music, art, and architecture, as well as liturgy and preaching.[1]

---

[1] Beale G.K., *We Become What We Worship* (Downers Grove, IVP Academic,2008)

- The reality that Christian worship is always celebrated in a given local cultural setting draws our attention to the dynamics between worship and the world's many local cultures.[2]

- Christian worship relates dynamically to culture in at least four ways. First, it is trans-cultural, the same substance for everyone everywhere, beyond culture. Second, it is contextual, varying according to the situation (both nature and culture). Third, it is counter-cultural, challenging what is contrary to the Gospel in a given culture. Fourth, it is cross-cultural, making possible sharing between different local cultures. In all four dynamics, there are helpful principles which can be identified.[3]

Worship as Trans-Cultural

The resurrected Christ whom we worship, and through whom by the power of the Holy Spirit we know the grace of the Triune God, transcends and indeed is beyond all cultures. In the mystery of his resurrection is the source of the trans-cultural nature of Christian worship. Baptism and the Lord's Supper, the sacraments of Christ's death and resurrection, were given by God for the world. There is one Bible, translated into many tongues, and biblical preaching of Christ's death and resurrection has been sent into the world. The fundamental shape of the principal Sunday act of Christian worship, the Lord's Supper, is shared across cultures: the people gather, the

---

[2] LWF,*Christian worship:Unity in Cultural Diversity*(Geneva, Lutheran World Federation,1996), p24

[3] LWF,*Christian Worship*, 24

word of God is preached, the people intercede for the needs of the Church and the world, the Lord's Supper is shared, and the people are sent out into the world for mission. The great story of Christ's birth, death and resurrection, and the sending of the Spirit and our baptism into him, provide the central meanings of the trans-cultural times of the church's year: especially Lent/Easter/Pentecost, Advent/Christmas/Epiphany.[4] The ways in which the shape of the Sunday Eucharist and the church year are expressed vary by culture, but their meaning and fundamental structures are shared around the globe. There is one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism and one Eucharist.[5]

Several specific elements of Christian liturgy are also trans-cultural, e.g. readings from the Bible, the creeds and the Lord's Prayer, and Baptism in the Name of Triune God.[6]

Worship as Contextual

- Jesus whom we worship was born into a specific culture of the world. In the mystery of his incarnation are the model and the mandate for the contextualization of Christian worship. God can be and is encountered in the local cultures of our world. A given culture's values and patterns, insofar as they are consonant with the values of the Gospel, can be used to express the meaning and purpose of Christian worship.

---

[4] LWF,*Christian Worship*, 24-25

[5] LWF,*Christian Worship*, 24-25

[6] LWF,*Christian Worship*, 25

Contextualization is a necessary task for the Church's mission in the world, so that the Gospel can be ever more deeply rooted in diverse local cultures.[7]

• Among the various methods of contextualization, that of dynamic equivalence is particularly useful. It involves re-expressing components of Christian worship with something from local culture that has equal meaning, value and function. Dynamic equivalence goes far beyond mere translation; it involves understanding the fundamental meanings both of elements of worship and of the local culture, and enabling the meanings and actions of worship to be re-expressed in the local language.[8]

For example, instead of using western Christmas trees (pine trees), we might use a 'banana tree', symbolic of 'fruitfulness and blessing'. Iban harvest festivals use home-made 'banana tree' decorations (Ranyai), cakes and soft drinks as symbols of thanksgiving.

• On the side of culture, it is understood that not everything can be integrated into Christian worship: only those elements that are of the same nature within the liturgical order. Elements borrowed from local culture should always undergo critique and purification, which can be achieved through the use of biblical typology.[9]

For example, a woven blanket (Pua Kumbu) may be used as an altar covering, but care needs to be exercised, as the 'Pua

---

[7] LWF,*Christian Worship*, p 25
[8] LWF, *Christian Worship*, p 25-26
[9] LWF, *Christian Worship*, p 26

Kumbu' is a ritual blanket used for religious ceremonies, festivals (Gawai), ceremonies associated with birth, death, healing or "soul searching" and headhunting. It serves as a means of communication between this world and the world of the ancestors, spirits and gods.[10]

Special attention and prayer is necessary, to dedicate it for God's use. If not, those who are still weak may be tempted to fall, as St Paul reminds us in his letter to the believers in Corinth (1Cor 8:9-12)

Worship as Counter-Cultural

Jesus Christ came to transform all people and all cultures, and calls us not to conform to the world, but to be transformed within it (Romans 12:2) In the mystery of His passage from death to eternal life is the model for transformation, and thus for the counter-cultural nature of Christian worship.[11]

Some components of every culture in the world are sinful, dehumanizing and contradictory to the values of the Gospel. From the perspective of the Gospel, they need critique and transformation.[12]

---

[10] Edric Ong, Mystic Iban Textiles of Malaysian Borneo (Malaysia Arts and Crafts Society of Sarawak)

[11] LWF, *Christian Worship*, p27

[12] LWF, *Christian Worship*, p27

Worship as Cross-Cultural

Jesus came to be the Savior of all people. He welcomes the treasures of earthly cultures into the city of God. By virtue of Baptism, there is one church; and one means of living in faithful response to Baptism is to manifest ever more deeply the unity of the church. The sharing of hymns and arts, or other elements of worship, across cultural barriers, helps to enrich the whole church and strengthen the sense of the communion of the church.[13]

Care should be taken that the music, art, architecture, gestures and postures, and other elements of different cultures are understood and respected when they are used by churches elsewhere in the world.[14]

Challenge to the church today

We call on all churches to:
- undertake further efforts related to the trans-cultural, contextual, counter-cultural and cross-cultural nature of Christian Worship.
- recover the centrality of Baptism, Scriptural preaching and the celebration of the Lord's Supper - the principal trans-cultural elements of Christian worship and the signs of Christian unity - as the strong centre of all congregational life and mission, and as the authentic basis of contextualization.

---

[13] LWF, *Christian Worship*, p27
[14] LWF, *Christian Worship*, p27

- give serious attention to exploring local or contextual elements of liturgy, language, posture and gesture, hymnody and other music and musical instruments, art and architecture, for Christian worship, so that their worship may be more truly rooted in the local culture.[15]

---

[15] LWF, *Christian Worship*, p28

從巴別塔的故事剖析
族群與身份的問題

涂恩友

聖經文本的背景

　　創世記前面十一章是關於世界的創造和人類的起源，亦稱為太古史。太古史講述宇宙的起源和上帝與人類的交往。第十二章開始記載上帝與祂的選民，以救贖為主題。太古史敘述罪為人類的普遍現象。這個人類的現象，要在人類的歷史中有意義，就必須經過歷史的橋樑，使太古史與歷史相連。十二章開始講述人類的歷史，以及上帝在歷史中與人類的互動。因此，人類的　歷史與上帝的作為，不能不有所關聯。雖然人類的目標偏離上帝的計劃，在上帝的祝福和監察之下，人類不斷有新的發展和成果。

　　創世記十一章巴別塔的事件，呈現了兩種精神面貌：一是回顧起源事蹟，認為今日世界的課題，太古時期便已存在，因此希望從過去的事件中尋獲現今問題的啟示；另一是前瞻，從太古史與以色列人歷史的關係中，窺探它與現今的連貫性，[1]如此，起源事蹟就有其神學意義了。

　　巴別塔的神學意義，正需朝著以上兩種精神面貌去尋

---

[1] 房志榮，【創世記研究】，臺中：光期出版社，1972，頁 39-40。

找。這事蹟是與第十章閃、含、雅弗之後裔事蹟相連貫，不能分開獨立處理的。 若獨立處理十一章將會重演傳統上多種錯誤的解釋，把單一部族的人看作全人類，他們造城建塔的行動為所有人的作為，又天下人口音本來都是一樣，至建巴別塔時才被變亂的。下面內容要證明這幾種看法是與事實不相符合的。

以色列選民首先在第十章被提及，而他們的歷史活動也就此開始。經文多處述說這個大家庭成員的動向：「雅弗…這些人的後裔，將各國的地土、海島，分開居住，各隨各的方言、宗族立國。」[2] 其次，「這就是含的後裔，各隨他們的宗族、方言、所住的地土、邦國。」[3]，又「這是閃的子孫，各隨他們的宗族、方言、所住的地土、邦國。這些都是挪亞三個兒子的宗族，各隨他們的支派立國，洪水以後，他們在地上分為邦國。」[4] 他們分為邦國，各有自己的方言，聖經內容清楚記載上帝祝福多元群體和多種語言的事實。內容雖未言及他們的先祖，卻與創世記十二章三節下的說法相連接「地上的萬族都要因你得福」，顯示他們是亞伯拉罕的後裔。儘管同是出於亞伯拉罕的後裔，當時已經各有不同的居住地和方言。

第十一章巴別塔事件的開始，內容單單提供了亞伯拉罕其中一個後代起源的資料。經文說：

那時，天下人的口音言語，都是一樣。他們往東

---

[2] 創世記 10:2,5。
[3] 仝上 10:20。
[4] 仝上 10:31-32。

邊遷移的時候，在示拿地遇見一片平原。[5]

　　李熾昌教授在其最近發表的一篇文章裡指出這個部族，　[6]在當時的群体記憶中，他們本有一樣的語言，現已失傳。他們原本來自東邊，從那裡向外遷移。 和合本聖經翻譯「往東邊遷移」與原文不合，希伯來文是「從東方起行」。[7] John Ssasson 從考古學的根據，發現示拿是當時蘇默 (Sumer) 和阿卡得 (Akhad) 之合稱，時為公元前約四千五百年。[8] 示拿平原位於兩河流域，現代譯作 「巴比倫平原」。[9]

　　經文所指的「天下人」，並非指全世界的人類，原文指的只是那地方的人，名為 Ha'aretz。原文說的是這個族群從東邊遷移的事蹟，是他們世代相傳的故事。依照他們的傳統，建造房屋是用磚和石漆，所以故事說，「來罷，我們要作磚，把磚燒透了。他們就拿磚當石頭，又拿石漆當灰泥。」[10] 石頭和灰泥是迦南地的建築材料，有異於兩河流域之蘇默及阿卡得所用的磚和石漆。可見，巴別塔事件的作者是住在迦南地的。有學者認為事件中所指的群体乃蘇默人，他們在公元前 2300 年便失去他們的蘇默語言。當時

---

[5] 創世記 11:1-2。

[6] 李熾昌，【希伯來信仰與迦南宗教：銓釋與傳承】，2002，頁 3。

[7] 現代中文譯本：「他們在東方一帶流浪」。呂振中譯本：「從東邊往前行」。

[8] John Sasson, *From Sumer to Jerusalem, The Forbidden Hypothesis* (Oxford: Intellect Books, 1993), 頁 90-91。

[9] 李熾昌,頁 3。

[10] 創世記 11:4。

阿卡得王 Sargon 征服了兩河流域地帶，阿卡得語便取代了蘇默語，成為當地人們的日常用語。[11] 於是，不難了解事件中的群体為甚麼要「建造一座城和一座塔…免得我們分散在全地上。」[12] 又說耶和華「在那裡變亂他們的口音」。[13] 這裡是回憶百姓被征服後，分散各處，語言也失傳的憂慮。

假如巴別塔事件的群體是蘇默人，那麼他們與閃族的關係得有交待。根據一些學者研究指出，蘇默 (Sumer) 這詞與 Shumer 應該是相同的，因此從語文學觀點來看，Shumer 可能就是閃族人 (Shem)。如是類推，蘇默人即是希伯來人的先祖。[14] 聖經記載，他拉和他的兒子亞伯蘭離開吾珥，到了迦南地的哈蘭，就住在那裡。[15] 事情約發生在公元前約二千年至一千八百年之間。這些蘇默族群自離開吾珥到出埃及，約公元前一千一百五十年期間，興起了猶大宗教的基本信仰和守節。這是傳統的觀點，一些學者持不同的意見，認為蘇默族人繼續承襲祖傳的宗教信仰和文化，免得蘇默人的身份和語言都失傳。[16]

上文的說法把蘇默群体和巴別塔事件銜接起來，考古學家指出，蘇默群体在吾珥地方建造廟宇。廟宇的用途除

---

[11] John Sasson, 頁 93-94。

[12] 創世記 11:4。

[13] 仝上 11:7。

[14] Samuel Noah Kremer, *The Sumerians,* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1963), 頁 298。

[15] 創世記 11:27-32。

[16] John Sasson, 頁 77-78。

了敬神，也是地方的行政中心。蘇默人或阿卡得人的主要廟宇建得異常高聳，這些高塔被稱為茲古拉 (Ziggurats)。約一千年後，當巴別 (Babel) 或巴比倫，成為蘇默和阿卡得首都與文化中心時，巴別的 Ziggurats 即是當地最高的廟或塔。學者認為這就是創世記所說的巴別塔。[17]

Robert Davidson 補充了以上的看法。他說，巴別就是巴比倫 (Babel, Babylon)。[18] 巴別塔的建造材料是磚，「他們彼此商量說，來罷，我們要作磚…他們就拿磚當石頭，又拿石漆當灰泥。」[19] 磚和石漆是米所波大米用的建築材料，不是巴勒斯坦地用的石頭。迦南地多石頭，是為建築材料。[20] 因此巴別塔很可能就是茲古拉 (Ziggurats) 塔，這名是米所波大米教一個神廟附近的大聖塔。考古學家形容它是龐大的建築物，高七層，共二九五呎。 它有「天地基礎的房子」之意，正如耶路撒冷聖殿，是作為神在地上的家，是神與人接近之處。[21]

根據研究所得，記載中的重要詞彙，有因同音同韻而互調應用或錯用。原來巴比倫在談話時慣用 b 和 l 或 p 和 m 的子音，語音上與 b 相近，例如「我們要作磚」，「我們要為自己建造」，「我們變亂」。於是，人作磚，nibenah 和上帝變

---

[17] Ibid,頁 25-26。

[18] Robert Davidson, *Genesis 1-11* (Cambridge: University Press, 1973), 頁 105。

[19] 創世記 11:3。

[20] Robert Davidson, 頁 105。

[21] John C. L. Gibson, 頁 237-38。

亂口音，nabelah 產生混亂。[22]

　　Gordon Wenham 認為巴別塔一事和語音的變亂是不相關的兩回事。Claus Westermann, [23] Rogerson, [24] 和 Davidson [25]的看法也大同小異。Rogerson 指出創世記十章已有言在先「這些人的後裔，將各國的地土、海島、分開居住，各隨各的方言宗族立國。」又「這就是閃的子孫，各隨他們的宗族、方言，所住的地土、邦國。」[26] 這幾位學者都有共同看法，即巴別塔事件以先各族語言已經不同。創世記十一章是記載一個群體由東邊遷移，不是全部族群。後來這個族群喪失了自己的語言，他們因為擔心繼續被分化而興起建塔的計劃，以示身份和權力。語言和建塔雖屬兩項獨立事件，但對蘇默群體來說，卻是相互關聯的。建塔是要為自己留名，是權力的代表。他們要用一種言語去統合其它族群。

　　Gorden Wenham 引用 S.N. Kramer 著作 "Sumaerian Literary Texts in the Ashmolean Museum" 的看法，指出舊約和其他宗教對語言的分歧，持不同的意見。創世記看變亂語言為上帝的懲罰。米所波大米的宗教則視之為 Enlil 和

---

[22] Gordon J. Wengam, *"Genesis 1-15", Word Biblical Commentary*, General ed. David A. Hubbard, (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers， 1987)，Vol. 1，頁 234-235。

[23] Claus Westermann, Trans. John J. Scullion S. J., *Genesis 1-11, A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1984), 頁 556。

[24] J. Rogerson, *Genesis 1-11, Old Testament Guides* (English: JSOT Press, 1994), 頁 75。

[25] Robert Davidson, 頁 105。

[26] 創世記 10:5, 20, 31。

Enki 兩神競爭的後果。聖經對洪水事件的解釋,乃獨一神對人類敗行的審判,異教則認為是眾神要用洪水消滅大地。[27] 另一位學者 B. Alster 對此有相同的觀點。 他說,依照蘇默神話,蘇默神 (Sumerian gods) 因不悅而變亂人的語言,使人不能一起敬拜偉大的 Enli 神,聖經則說是上帝處理人類的無知。以上各種說法有重新斟酌的餘地,因為變亂語言和散居各地二事,並非是上帝的審判,而是對其它群體的釋放。一位阿根延學者 Nestor O. Miguez 有同樣的看法,他評述巴別塔的建造為雙重的剝削行為,上帝的干預為了要釋放其它的族群,作者認為上帝的作為不僅釋放外族,同時也把建造者從自我封閉中釋放出來。Nestor 這樣寫道:

> 一班遊牧民族遷徙到示拿平原,要建立新社會改變生法方式,他們要建一座城、一座塔,去彰顯權力。這是雙重的剝削行為,因為城市造成對周遭鄉區的壓力,而建塔需要大量的勞工,人被強迫為奴隸…因此,上帝下去做釋放的工作。上帝與人合作去克服壓制的行為… 上帝下去變亂他們的語言,是一種釋放行動,阻止獨裁者行為得逞,以便其它的人繼續享有生存、家庭、土地和言語的自由。[28]

---

[27] Gordon J. Wenham, 頁 237。

[28] Nestor O. Miguez, "A Comparative Bible Study of Genesis 10 -11:9, An Approach from the Argentine", Philip L. Wickeri, ed., *Scripture, Community and Mission,* (Hong Kong: Christian Conference of Asia, 2003),頁 160。

Nestor 用釋放來解釋上帝的工作很有意思，也很切合沙巴和馬來西亞的政治處境。沙巴大小族群三十多個，語言各有不同，信仰也各異，聯邦政府却主張以單一語言、宗教、種族去統合全民，即是以信奉回教，講說馬來語的馬來西亞族為目標。這項多重性的剝削行為受到非馬來人的挑戰，也違反民主憲法行為。為此，基督徒當怎樣去詮釋巴別塔的亮光，回應上帝創造和救贖計劃，與祂同工把群體從壓制中釋放出來，過程中也把欺壓者從無知拯救出來。這正是十一章第五節經文：「耶和華降臨要看看世人所建的這城和塔」所要啟示的亮光；上帝下來與人溝通、合作共同進行創造和釋放工作。因此，巴別塔停工了是一件好事，因為它把當時的群體重新帶回神創造的計劃中。上帝賜福多元性群體生活，沙巴和馬來西亞各群體如何參與神的大計劃，彼此守望，求同存異，是巴別塔要帶來的啟迪。

挪亞的家族，閃含雅弗本為一家

第十章經文以五個段落敘述挪亞的家族：
第一段： 第一節，「挪亞的後代記在下面…」。
第二段： 第二至第五節，「雅弗的兒子是…」，記錄了七個兒子和七個孫子。
第三段： 第六至第二十節，「含的兒子是…」，記錄了四個兒子 、二十四個孫子和兩個曾孫。

第四段：　第二十一至第三十一節，「閃是希伯子孫之祖，他
　　　　　也生了兒子⋯」，記錄了五個兒子和二十一個後
　　　　　裔。
第五段：　第三十二節，「這些都是挪亞三個兒子的宗族⋯洪
　　　　　水以後，他們在地上分為邦國。」

　　　這裡記錄閃含雅弗的兒孫後裔共七十人，顯然不是全
數，因為第五節的「這些人的後裔」沒有明文記錄是誰。
學者們以為七十對以色列人乃為完全數，代表了整個群体，
有團結合一的意思。其他經文，如創世記四十六章二十七
節「雅各家來到埃及的共有七十人」；又如出埃及記一章五
節「凡從雅各而生的共有七十人」。這些七十之數，都象徵
完全或整數。[29]

　　　第十章講述人類的太古史，記載人類之始於三大宗族，
分別是閃、含、雅弗的後裔。這三個群体承襲了第九章挪
亞給他們的祝福和咒詛。「挪亞醒了酒，知道小兒子含向他
所作的事，就說，迦南當受咒詛，必給他弟兄作奴僕的奴
僕。又說，耶和華閃的上帝，是應當稱頌的，願迦南作閃
的奴僕。願上帝使雅弗擴張，使他住在閃的帳篷裡，又願
迦南作他的奴僕。」[30]是否因為挪亞的咒詛令含的後裔承受
不同的際遇而引起嫉妒和紛爭，成為巴別塔事件的導火線
呢？這又是神意法和救恩史的神學問題。在第十章似乎看
不見上帝偏待某一個族群的蛛絲馬跡，因為他們都「各隨

---

[29] Therence E. Fretheim, "The Book of Genesis", *The New Interpreter's Bible,* con. Leander E. Keck, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994), 頁 409 。
[30] 創世記 9:24-27。

他們的支派立國，在地上分為邦國。」，各人有自己所住的土地，沒有依賴他人和奴役他人的事。作者特別強調含的孫子，寧錄「在耶和華面前是個英勇的獵戶」，證明上帝一樣祝福含的後裔。Therence E. Fratheim 也不以為閃的家族有帶來整體的分化，相反的，經文作者強調的是，大家都重視群體的共同點過於相異之處。[31] 巴別塔事件的作者回憶說，這個家族的分散是自閃族從東邊遷移到示拿開始的。

上面兩段文字顯示，人類的起源本是一家。他們分散居住，是上帝的旨意和祝福，為要他們「生養眾多，遍滿地面，治理那地」，[32] 到了第十一章，事件情節朝著反方向發展，那時百姓怕分散，大家要在一起互相守望。這種改變的原因何在？這正是巴別塔事件所要帶出來的討論。

經文結構和事件內容

Gordon Wenham 把十一章的前面九節經文分成五幕，加上序幕，一共七部份。

第一節：序幕。

第二節：第一幕，人往東邊遷移。

第三至第四節：第二幕，人要建造一座城和一座塔。

第五節：第三幕，耶和華降臨視察。

第六至第七節：第四幕，耶和華要變亂人的口音。

第八節：第五幕，人分散在全地，造城停工。

---

[31] Therence E. Fretheim, 頁 409。
[32] 創世記 1:28。

第九節：閉幕，巴別的意思。

事件以「那時，天下人的口音言語，都是一樣。」拉開序幕。「天下」並非指全人類，上文說過，這裡乃是指一個特別的群体。

第一幕，那些人往東邊遷移。「往東邊」是聖經習慣的講法。創世記三章二十四節、四章十六節都說「東邊」。他們住在「示拿的平原」，示拿是蘇默和阿卡得的合稱，位於米所波大米的大平原。有關群體本來在東邊，所以正確的說法應是「從東邊遷移」。

第二幕，當閃族後裔來到蘇默地之後，並沒有發現城和塔。它們計劃用磚和石漆建造一座城和一座塔，目的是要為自己留名，以現代的話來說即是要為自己豎立身份。他們渴望有自己的文化特徵，好讓族群名字留傳後代。他們的做法帶來失敗的後果。上面已談過若干詞彙在應用上的混亂。「我們要做磚」和「我們要為自己建造」與「變亂」或 "Babel" 因音韻相似，可能交互使用；結果，做磚和建造的行動成為「愚昧」的行動。

這一族人的行動之所以失敗，不在於他們尋求身份的動機之錯，問題乃是他們的計劃與上帝的旨意相左。他們要獨居，不肯與其他人群合作，甚至要壓制其他群體，而上帝的創造計劃卻是要人類「生養眾多，遍滿地面，治理這地」，[33] 即是人類要守望相助，彼此為他人的「看守者」。

第三幕，上帝降臨視察人所建造的，是整個故事情節

---

[33] 創世記 1:28。

的轉換點。上帝的干預扭轉了族群的歷史。上帝變亂了他們的口音,「他們就停工了」。平行的局面發生在第八章第一節,「上帝記念挪亞⋯叫風吹地⋯」,洪水便消落。上帝干預,使人類在進行中的歷史臨崖改弦。上帝降臨擾亂人的計劃,上帝的計劃與人的語言意念相衝,「我們要做磚」和「我們變亂它」產生互調混淆的現象。[34] 解釋了上帝在歷史中與人互動的現象,時有混亂和調整。

　　第四幕,閃族的後裔出自一個族群,事實上有一樣的言語,因蘇默族的言語在主前二千三百年前才被阿卡得言語所取代。[35] 這樣看來,言語的變亂和巴別塔的建造是不相聯的兩件事,因他們的言語早已不相通。作者在此回憶起那個群體的過去,認為族群喪失語言的事件是上帝對他們行為驕傲、自大的懲罰。作者把該群體過去的經驗,附會聯貫到巴別塔事上,藉之解釋百姓要為自己建城和高塔,以自己的能力去挑戰上帝的權能,上帝於是變亂人的口音,造塔一事乃為無知的行動。上文說過,人類做磚,為自己建造,收的是混亂的後果。因此,為自己計劃反成了愚昧的行為,nabelah 變成 nebalah。

　　第五幕,閃的後裔開始講不同的語言,彼此不能溝通,於是分散各地。對這一個族群而言,這是痛苦的回憶。當阿卡得語言成為官方語言時,蘇默語言便被取代並消失了,他們不再像過去,團結在同一語言之下。考古學家指出他

---

[34] Gordon J. Wenham, 頁 236。

[35] John Sasson, 頁 92。

們的城在主前約二千年被毀，他們從蘇默被分散，「耶和華使他們從那裡分散在全地」。從此，他們失去城市、言語和身份。經文所指的是該族群在過去的一段歷史，因為這是族群意識中一次沉重的傷痕，因而被記錄下來。[36]

閉幕，解釋巴別就是變亂的意思。 Babel 就是Babylon。 看來整個事件的中心是要解釋巴別的含義，它隱藏著兩個極重要的意思：第一、讓猶大人回憶他們列祖的事蹟，了解他們是如何從困局中把握住自己的身份；第二、啟迪世人，耶和華不祝福種族或宗教主義，祂要的是多元化和求同存異。因此，人與人之間當拆掉中間的藩籬。

經文結構的序幕和閉幕文句，很巧合地把事件的起因和結局連接起來。另一個可以把整個事件，陳明得更令人明白的方法，是把經文主要的詞彙平行排列如下表：

第一節：一樣言語	第六節：一樣的民
第二節：在那裡	第七節：在那裡言語彼此不通
第三節：彼此商量	第八節：停工不造那城
第四節：建造一座城揚名免得我們分散在全地	第九節：那城名叫巴別,他們分散在全地

以上的排列，左邊是人的說話和計劃，右邊是上帝的說話和行動。第五節是關鍵經文，並沒有置入其中。甚麼時候把中心經文放在其中，就看見上帝與人類的互動和交

---

[36] 仝上, 頁 93。

流。「耶和華降臨要看看世人所建的這城和塔。」 這句話不能解釋為負面的監視，而是應該被了解為上帝在歷史中與人的交通，給予人的啟迪。歷史中有很多神與人交涉、對話的記載，上帝與人合作，共同創造人類社會互動的文化。人若驕傲自大，一意孤行，則神必監察。

綜合以上的分析和研究，特別是考古學的發現，巴別塔事件陳述了以下幾項事實：

1. 閃和他的後裔從東邊遷移至蘇默和阿卡得地區；
2. 閃族群體用磚和石漆建房屋，那是蘇默族人用的建築材料；
3. 閃族人首先在蘇默和阿卡得建塔，稱為 Ziggurats；
4. 閃族人應該與蘇默同屬一族，Sumer 即是 Shumer；
5. 閃族人被分散在全地上；
6. 閃族群体在尋找失去了的言語和身份。

John Sasson 認為，閃族人就是蘇默人的發現若是屬實，那麼巴別塔的事件就是蘇默人的事蹟。如此，聖經便是在提醒希伯來人，他們的祖先不僅僅是遷移至蘇默，他們同時也就是蘇默人。[37]

閃含雅弗的後裔和巴別塔兩事件的平行性問題

Gordon Wenham 批評第十章和第十一章的事蹟，多有不協調的地方。兩章書卷呈現給讀者兩種不同的宗族和語言的版本。首先是「洪水」和「巴別塔」意思的不平行：

---

[37] John Sasson, 頁 94, 107。

「洪水以後，他們都生了兒子」和「洪水以後，他們在地上分為邦國」以及「耶和華…使眾人分散在全地上，所以那城名叫巴別」。[38] 此外，還有「變亂」、「建造」和「地土」等詞，都被作者在兩個故事中交替互補的使用，這實際上是互不協調的，下一段舉例說明之。

聖經作者在第十章向讀者呈現一幅祥和的圖畫。閃含雅弗的後裔相安無事，極為融洽地生活在不同的地方，給人「他們本為一家人」的印象，彼此間維繫著兄弟情誼，遵守神「遍滿全地」的吩咐。但是十一章卻出現不同的局面，在那裡，人為自己尋找身份和權力，要建一座通天塔，抗拒散居他地。表面上看來，那是一幅極不調和的畫面，其實裡面在描述一個群體的辛酸歷史。前面已從考古學的觀點解釋並交待這個矛盾的問題。

從創世記一章至十一章，許多事件都循環式的重複著以上不平行的現象。幾乎所有的事件都是以正面開始、負面結束。首先是宇宙的起源，上帝看創造物都是好的，但很快就是人的墮落和該隱的故事，這些事把大局破壞了。人的壽數延續久長，馬土撒拉甚至活到九百六十九歲。[39] 後來因「上帝的兒子們看見人的女子美貌，就隨意挑選，娶來為妻。」[40] 因而招來洪水的除滅。洪水之後，上帝與挪亞立約「不再因人的緣故咒詛地」，[41] 無奈又因醉酒的挪亞

---

[38] 創世記 10:1, 32; 11:9。

[39] 創世記 5:1-32。

[40] 仝上 6:1-5。

[41] 仝上 8:21。

給小兒子含的咒詛而破壞。[42]

　　為甚麼會有這種不平行的現象呢？Gordon Wenham 的解釋包括了下列三個理由：

　　　　第一、聖經對閃含雅弗的後裔的記錄，僅僅是抽樣式的，并未涵蓋七十個人的全部歷史事蹟，而且七十人是否確定的數字又是另一個問題。譬如對雅弗後裔就只有第十章二至五節的描述，之後，就甚少提及他們的歷史。當作者記述含的後裔時，卻又包括一些外邦人在內，好像是巴比倫人、埃及人和迦南人。人類學家及語文學家卻把他們納入閃族之內。 Claus Westermann 有不同的解釋，他認為迦南乃一廣義名稱，指一群住在約旦平原和沿海地帶的族人，他們包括非利士人，後稱巴勒斯坦人。聖經把這些人歸入含族，是根據遠古的傳統。[43] 最後是對第三個宗族閃族的記載。 出乎意料的卻出現了約坍，[44] 約坍屬阿拉伯人，還有在二十五章三節將示巴的後代亞書族也包括在內。 Claus Westermann 在這裡也有不同的看法，他認為希伯的兩個兒子可能代表北面和南面兩個閃族群體，又或者法勒只是一個地方的名字。二十六至三十節說約坍有十三個兒子，但只是部族名

[42] 仝上 9:24-25。

[43] Claus Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 頁 511 。

[44] 創世記 10:26。

稱，並非人名。[45]

　　根據這些資料，種族和語言似乎不是第十章在編訂以色列族系時的主要原則。

第二、作者呈現了一位全能和威嚴的創造神。　根據第十章，人類雖然很自愛，仍然不能逃脫神的審判。　平行的記載在第一章到第十一章重複的出現。其實，作者只是站在舊約的世界觀來回憶太古史的故事。

第三、創世記一至十一章的故事是以敘事詩，而不是神話式的神學思想來表達，敘事詩的體裁比較含蓄，不像神學文句的直率。[46]

　　在創世記十章和十一章的記載中，並沒有太多的平行點。問題出現在前面的經文裡，不但聖經作者對世界觀的看法不一致，就是現代學者對救恩史的觀點也不一樣。Claus Westermann 認為，各人的觀點「在乎他們對聖經族群的了解，是根據救恩史的神學，還是神學角度來看世界歷史的運作。」[47] 前者持定以色列為唯一上帝的選民，上帝應許亞伯拉罕給地上萬族的祝福，必須通過這一個族群才能傳承至其餘世人。後者的世界觀則完全不同，他們看以色列只是上帝所創造的人類的一份子。上帝賦予全人類一樣的恩典與慈愛，歷史成功與失敗的責任在於人。

---

[45] Claus Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 頁 526。

[46] Gordon Wenham, 頁 242-245。

[47] Claus Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 頁 528。

創造蘊藏著合一與分散的意義

　　巴別塔事件重要的主題之一，是關乎合一與分散的課題。當時人類擔心被分散，他們期望壯大自己的聲勢，揚名他族，想方設法，建高塔以自立旌旗。他們說「來罷，我們要建造一座城，塔頂通天，為要傳揚我們的名，免得我們分散在全地上。」[48] 人類要建一座塔，塔頂通天，喻意要比同上帝的能力。這與創世記第三章的情形類似。第三章的亞當和夏娃吃了分別善惡樹的果子，希望「眼睛明亮，如同上帝。」[49] 因此，

　　　　「耶和華說，看哪，他們成為一樣的子民，都是
　　　　一樣的言語，如今既作起這事來，以後他們要作
　　　　的事，就沒有不成就的了。我們下去，在那裡變
　　　　亂他們的口音，使他們的語言彼此不通。於是耶
　　　　和華使他們從那裡分散在全地上。他們就停工不
　　　　造那城了。」[50]

　　這段經文的傳統解釋是指人的驕傲、自大，因違背神的旨意，被神懲罰，分散在各處。其實，分散全地是神所祝福的，也是祂的旨意。因此，分散不是懲罰。這事件所帶出的提醒，是要人排除狹窄的種族思想和地域主義。

　　人類要藉物質揚名，顯耀自己，一方面既為尋求突破

---

[48] 創世記 11:4。
[49] 仝上 3:5。
[50] 仝上 11:6-8。

自我疆界，一方面又擔心不安全。　　高城喻意超越周遭環境，有團結內部，監視外力，甚至向其他族群揚武耀威，顯示自己的權勢的含義。他們懼怕再度遷徙，又排斥不同語言和種族的群體，不肯與宗教、文化、風俗習慣相異的人共處。驕傲和焦慮的複雜心態，使人固步自封，繼續活在自我為中心的小圈子裡。這種自我和排他的態度，與上帝創造的計劃相違背。上帝於是分散他們，使他們封閉的族群觀向外疆界敞開，這是一種釋放的行動。

　　　Walter Brueggemann 對於團結合一的課題有兩種獨到的看法。第一、是神計劃內的行動；第二、是違背上帝旨意的人的作為。[51] 他認為，神的計劃是要人類散居各處，以成全祂的創造旨意，「要生養眾多，遍滿地面，治理這地…。」[52] 創世記十章有提到散居乃是神所祝福的，「挪亞三個兒子的宗族，各隨他們的支派立國。洪水以後，他們在地上分為邦國。」[53] 這樣看來，第十一章裡的擔心被分散，顯然不合乎上帝創造的本意。人類自己的計劃是要自立門戶，按自己的好惡，去建造單元的宗族社會。因此，他們抗拒分散，拒絕與不同的族群合居。他們看分散和與異族同住為一懲罰。　　這觀念與以西結先知的看法正好相反。以西結認為分散是合一的前奏，是上帝的計劃，要使百姓歸回。因此，順從遷徙的安排是帶著應許的祝福，而

---

[51] Walter Brueggemann, *Genesis, A Bible Comentary for Teaching and Preaching* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 173), 頁 98-99。

[52] 創世記 1:28。

[53] 同上 10:32。

不是懲罰。耶和華如此說：

「我雖將以色列全家遷移到列國中，將他們分散在列邦內，我還要在他們所到的列邦，暫作他們的聖所…我必從萬民中招聚你們，從分散的列國內聚集你們，又要將以色列地賜給你們…他們要作我的子民，我要作他們的上帝。」[54]

Brueggemann 指出，創造物的相合、相融，是創造者的目的。　神要人類遍滿地面，成就他契約中的應許，「我與你們，和你們的後裔立約… 凡從方舟裡出來的活物立約，凡有血肉的，不再被洪水滅絕，也不再有洪水毀壞地了。」[55] 上帝的旨意是不要人類各自築起籬笆，作自我保護，忘記上帝的掌管；祂也不要人類彼此侵犯，忽略了彼此相屬的關係。

巴別塔事件對現代基督教的啟迪

這事件啟迪了教會看重聖經多元化神學在多元社會的發展需要。它也幫助教會了解上帝的創造計劃是包容性，而非單元性的。因此，我們應該為多元種族的社會祝福和歡呼，儼若為宇宙所有美麗的創造物歡呼一樣。

巴別塔建造者擬重建族群的身份，這原是無可厚非的。可惜的是，在一個多元化的社會裡，猶大人忽略了與其他族群建立共同身份的重要性。上帝要他們在計劃中重整錯

---

[54] 以西結書 11:16-20。
[55] 創世記 9:9-17。

誤的觀念，因此把他們分散在全地是一種祝福，雖然百姓需要時間去明瞭和學習上帝的計劃。　今日，世人並沒有從巴別塔的事件學習到其中的功課，上帝的偉大的創造計劃，繼續被狹窄的單元主義思想所破壞。

　　合一 (Unity) 和團結 (Solidality) 是常被人混淆的兩個局面。教會或群體誤把內部的合一當作是團結。其實，團結 (Solidarity) 有更廣的含意，它是包含性的，具求同存異 (Unity in diversity) 的意思。各族群和宗教信仰團結在上帝豐富的創造中，從中尋求公平正義的融洽社會，是上帝的祝福。可惜，因著人的自私和驕傲而排斥異己，結果祝福變成審判。不是上帝要懲罰人，是人類自己落在彼此對敵和分裂中，自尋禍患。「當一個群體願意去關懷整個社體，又欣賞和接納彼此間的差異和多樣化時，合一就真的實現了。」[56]

　　今日教會因怕被分化、世俗化、多元化，於是為自己建造城牆，以求自保並自鳴清高。　不正確的信仰神學和自我身份，儼若一股聖化的力量或魔力，阻擋教會道成肉身，進到人群中。教會的身份就是耶穌留下的標誌：毛巾和十字架，那是服侍、犧牲和團結。十字架正是包容和團結的意思。

　　語言多樣化，通曉多種語言肯定是一種祝福。不同文化和不同語言幫助世人進一步認識和了解對方。沙巴有三十多種大小不同的族群，語言自然也多樣化，這是沙巴人

---

[56] Therence E. Fratheim，頁 414。

的祝福，要以開明的態度去接受這份禮物，學習使用它就是珍惜它的最好方法。

　　創造和巴別塔的記載就像一面鏡子，反映現今社會人類矛盾的心態。在多元種族的沙巴社會裡，族群與宗教的身份、自大與不安的心態，潛伏在社會經濟、政治組織、教育文化的每一個層面，慢慢突顯其醜陋的頭角，孕育成兩極化的負面文化。聖經多元化神學是具體處境的啟迪和指路標。

　　教會急不容緩的責任，是要開拓族群對宗族、種族和權力的狹隘意識觀，防止種族危機、社會危機的更趨白熱化。　猶大人曾有極端的宗教和種族主義心態，以致上帝要一而再的管教和釋放他們。　基督教神學要做釋放的工作，重建上帝創造觀，　「各從其類」卻在上帝裡「合而為一」的觀念，幫助人群從小文化轉化到大文化，啟動人與人之間互動的契機，在求同存異的進程中，謀求和諧共處的社會。

──────────────────

評閱：Dunn, James D. G. *New Testament Theology: An Introduction*. Library of Biblical Theology. Nashville: Abingdon, 2009

劉聰賜

　　此書 *New Testament Theology* 是 Library of Biblical Theology 系列的第三冊。前兩冊為 Walter Brueggemann 所著的 *Old Testament Theology : An Introduction*（2008）及 Leo G. Perdue, Robert Morgan 和 Benjamin D. Sommer 合著的 *Biblical Theology : Introducing the Conversation*（2009）。這套叢書的目的是要為聖經時代的描述性信仰與現今時代的規範性信仰進行掛鈎，讓「聖經」與「神學」得以調和共處。作者 James D.G. Dunn 在新約學術界的威望已是無可爭議，尤以其在 1982 年所提出的「保羅新觀」（The New Perspective on Paul）著稱。此書不祇呈現出 Dunn 的「新約神學」，其中更是融合了他的主要代表性思想，除了「保羅新觀」，還有「合一性和多元性」、「耶穌新觀」、「低基督論」等。事實上，在本書面世前三年，Dunn 已將其「新約神學」的基本框架發表在 *The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Studies* 的其中一篇文章。[1] 此書在同樣的框架中提出更詳盡清楚的討論和說明，也提供更多的細節和例子。

---

[1] James D.G. Dunn, "New Testament Theology," in *The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Studies*, edited by J.W. Rogerson and Judith M. Lieu (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 698-715。

當然，Dunn 還有更大的雄心，在引言部分，他聲稱此書的寫作目的乃爲引起讀者對所論述之課題的興趣，之後他將陸續出版更多書籍，針對每一課題來詳盡論述。

本書共分六章。前兩章陳明定義和方法論，後四章討論四個不同的主題：上帝的神學、救恩的神學、上帝的教會、倫理的實踐。從這目錄來看，Dunn 似乎采取共時性進路（synchronic approach），但其實他乃結合共時性進路和歷時性進路（diachronic approach），因爲這些主題的討論都深深植根于歷史之中。然而，Dunn 不祇關心歷史問題，也關心信仰問題。他聲稱，對于新約神學，他所關注的是其產生的過程。他視新約神學爲「活的」和「動的」；是新約作者跟信仰和生活問題的掙扎成果。這也是新約聖經被寫下來和繼續保存下來的原因。 他稱這過程爲「做神學」（theologizing），并建議從之來看新約神學，因爲其同時兼顧歷史層面和持續衝擊和建立基督徒信心的信仰層面。

第一章首先處理「什麼是新約神學？」，當中所討論的課題包括新約神學和系統神學的關系及發展；接著，在論及「聖經」的定義時，Dunn 指出，對新約作者來說，他們的「聖經」就是希伯來聖經，即基督徒的舊約聖經。所以，在做新約神學時，不能不注意新舊約之間的連續性和間斷性的問題。就連續性而言，新舊約有共同貫穿的主題，因此這些主題的定義，必須先從舊約來理解；就間斷性而言，新約進一步賦予更新或全面的定義。再者，他談及新約正典的問題，特別強調新約正典成形的過程正是新

約神學的表達——「活的」和「動的」。當然還有「合一性和多元性」的問題。新約神學不是由「一個神學」（theology），而是「多個神學」(theologies) 所構成。 他聲稱這些多元性的合一因素就祇是新約本身。值得留意的是，他改變了之前在 *Unity and Diversity* [2] 一書的立場，即認爲第一世紀基督教的合一因素是作爲人和作爲高升者的耶穌。然而，在此書他却因爲新約中所呈現的耶穌面貌極其多元而改變立場。最後，他提出保羅就是一位「做新約神學」的最好典範。

在第二章，Dunn 提出奠定新約神學的三大因素：舊約聖經、耶穌基督的啓示和聖靈帶來的領悟和啓示。 前二者說明新約神學與舊約聖經的連續性和間斷性的關系，即歷史面向，後者強調信仰面向——聖靈在做新約神學的角色。他指出，在啓蒙運動的影響下，我們不應該忘記，經驗和情感層面在早期基督教的開始，包括自我認知、對社會的評論，做神學等是不可或缺的一環。因此，他強調做神學必須包含理性和情感，正如一個音樂會，不祇是技術專業的呈現，也必須抓住聽衆的情感。當然，對于這第三個因素，我們不禁要問 Dunn 如何看待聖靈對聖經作者的啓示和對之後信徒的光照？二者是否平起平坐？又或許當 Dunn 說「做新約神學」時，他的着重點是方法論而不是內容？

---

[2] James D.G. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Enquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity* (London: SCM, 2006)。

接下來，從第三章到第六章，Dunn 處理新約神學的四大主題。這四大主題主要分爲兩大部分來討論，即從舊約傳承的神學和新約的神學。　第一個主題是「上帝的神學」。Dunn 指出，新約從舊約所傳承的上帝觀包括創造和審判的神、獨一的神、以色列的神、超越和臨在的神、天使式的中介者和上帝的智慧/道。來到新約，這個上帝觀因爲基督事件而產生了衝擊。Dunn 從第一代信徒所給予耶穌的稱號（老師和先知、彌賽亞、人子、上帝的兒子、主、上帝的智慧/道）和對耶穌的敬拜來討論耶穌與獨一神觀的關系。他認爲這些稱號和行動都無法證明第一世紀的信徒已經打破了獨一神觀的框架，把耶穌提升至與上帝同等。當然，Dunn 有留意到馬太福音 28:19、哥林多前書 12:4-6、哥林多後書 13:14 相當明顯的三一神觀，不過他認爲這些經文祇是對三一神觀的預示和事後覺悟；但這樣的解釋似乎有點牽強。

　　第二個主題是「救恩的神學」。Dunn 指出，新約從舊約所傳承的救恩觀包括上帝是救主、上帝的主動性、上帝的信實、贖罪的管道和將來的盼望，而新約的救恩觀則包括實現末世論、新的約、神聖空間與贖罪、救恩的多元圖像和救恩的盼望。當然，Dunn 在這裏所呈現的救恩框架就是 E.P. Sanders 所提出的猶太教新觀——「恩約守法主義」（covenantal nomism）。[3]作爲救主的上帝，他主動揀選以色列民成爲他的恩約子民；作爲信實的上帝，他在這個恩

---

[3] 參 E.P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (London: SCM, 1977)。

約關系中履行他的責任，保護他們，拯救他們，且供應他們的需要。同時，在這個恩約中，他預備了贖罪的管道，讓他子民得以持續與他維持恩約關系。

　　第三個主題是「上帝的教會」。 在這裏，Dunn 討論了四個從舊約傳承的神學，即以色列的揀選、分別、狂熱和祝福、猶太人的黨派、以色列的終末盼望。 來到新約時代，基督事件和聖靈降臨對以色列的揀選帶來了相當大的衝擊， Dunn 所談論的七個課題包括以色列的修復、耶穌、外邦人和‘罪人’、‘甚至是給外邦人’、以色列宣教使命的完成、基督的身體、以色列被取代或重新定義？、一個或兩個約？。這其中所涉及的問題相當棘手：第一代基督徒如何看待教會與以色列的關系？教會是否取代了以色列？還是以色列被重新定義？Dunn 認爲以色列乃被重新定義，而非被取代。他提出的原因是，馬太福音 27:25、約翰福音 8:44 和希伯來書 8:13 的經文都祇是反映了以色列内部的激烈爭論。耶穌由始至終忠于猶太教、雅各書和彼得前書的收信人都是散居的十二支派，和保羅在羅馬書 9-11 章的論述，尤其提到上帝并沒有將以色列這棵橄欖樹連根拔起，以色列仍是原樹，外邦基督徒祇不過是被接到原樹的野橄欖枝；再者羅馬書 11:25-26 也説，等到外邦人的數目添滿了，以色列全家都要得救。當然，這樣的解釋所引發的問題是，這是否説明上帝會因着他對以色列原初的揀選而拯救他們（兩個約，而非一個約）？若是，這又如何跟信仰基督作爲唯一得救的條件協調呢？Dunn 所提供的答案是「上帝的憐憫」。在這課題上，或許 Dunn 忽視了羅馬書

11:23 所説的「他們若不是長久不信，仍要被接上」。換言之，祇有最終悔改歸信基督的猶太人才會得救。再者，難道橄欖樹身就必須是得救的主體？在創世記第 12 章，當上帝與亞伯拉罕立約時，他豈不是說「地上的萬族都要*因你得福*」嗎？以色列人是完成上帝救恩計劃的中介者，而不是主體。若是這樣，若將橄欖樹作爲舊約傳承的代表是否會更加適當？

　　最後一個主題是「倫理的實踐」。在這課題上，Dunn 指出，新約從舊約所傳承的倫理觀包括先有恩典，後有律法、以色列的律法、隔離的墙、生活方式和得生命的途徑. 至于新約本書，Dunn 所談論的課題包括耶穌和哈拉卡（*halakah*）、保羅是否違犯律法？基督徒是否被期待滿足律法的要求？及按照行爲的審判。在此，Dunn 強調舊約中的以色列民遵行律法不是爲要得生命，而是作爲上帝子民的生活方式。接著，来到新約時代，Dunn 認爲耶穌談論律法的重點不是廢留的問題，而是詮釋的問題；而保羅也從来沒有抨擊律法本身，而是律法之工，即那些將猶太人和外邦人區分開来的身份標志。當然，這也就是典型的保羅新觀點。更重要的是，從「恩約守法主義」来看，Dunn 指出，救恩是一個過程，信徒乃持續被拯救。然而，信徒往往在論述救恩時，祇着重「恩約」，忽略了「守法」。他認爲信徒固然是因着上帝的恩典得以跨入救恩的門檻，但在這條行在救恩的旅途上，在聖靈裏遵行上帝的旨意，也是末世得救的重要因素。　同時，他提出非常重要的提醒，當我們談論一個課題時，要讓所有的經文都有機會「發

言」，而不是選擇性地來檢閱。如此我們就會發現信徒的屬靈生命不應祇停留在得救的那一刻，而是必須戰戰兢兢活在聖靈的引導下，直到最後的審判。

　　總括來說，Dunn 的 *New Testament Theology* 一書以159 頁扼要道出了新約神學的精華。全文展現了作者一貫以來的書寫風格：構思嚴謹、條理清晰、段落分明。本書非常值得推薦，尤其作爲神學院新約神學的教科書。一方面，它呈現了 Dunn 的主要思想，另一方面，它也提出許多挑戰性問題供讀者進一步思想和評論。可惜的是，其所提供的不是腳注（footnotes），而是位于全文之後的尾注（endnotes），這對神學生或研究者來說相當不方便。若出版社願意考慮作出修訂，對喜好研究的人來說，肯定是大喜訊。

羅馬帝國的君王崇拜

劉聰賜

引言：

    羅馬帝國的君王崇拜不是一個新鮮課題。不過，由于過去的新約研究皆沒有強烈意識到新約聖經與羅馬社會政治處境的密切關系；因此，當它們之間的關系開始受到關注和肯定時，羅馬帝國的君王崇拜才逐漸成爲新約學術界的熱門話題。[1] 近 25 年來，許多相關的文章和書籍如雨後春筍陸續刊登和出版。2005 年第 27 期第 3 冊的 *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 以 "君王崇拜和新約聖經" 爲主題；2010 年第 8 期第 2 冊的 *Currents in Biblical Research* 也有兩篇相關的文章；[2] 2010 年第 36 期第 4 冊的 *Religious Studies Review* 也刊登了 David J. Lull 爲那些有關 "保羅與帝國" 之關系的書籍所作的書評。[3] 甚至，Lily R. Taylor 在

---

[1] David G. Horrell, "Introduction," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 27 (2005): 251-255, here 251.

[2] Michael Naylor, "The Roman Imperial Cult and Revelation," 207-239; James B. Rives, "Graeco-Roman Religion in the Roman Empire: Old Assumptions and New Approaches," 240-299.

[3] David J. Lull, "Review Essays: *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International/New York & London: Continuum, 1997)," *Religious Studies Review* 36 (2010): 251-262.

1931 年出版的 *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor* 和 Louis M. Sweet 在 1919 年出版的 *Roman Emperor Worship* 也相繼在 2000 年和 2007-2010 年重新印刷。[4] 不過，可惜的是，在漢語著作方面，要找到談論羅馬帝國君王崇拜的著作猶如海裏撈針，更不用說那些從君王崇拜來探討新約經文之著作了。[5] 基于此，本文章嘗試簡略介紹新約時期羅馬帝國的君王崇拜，期待可以爲漢語界提供多一份參考資料。

君王崇拜的定義

傳統上，君王崇拜（Imperial Cult (s) 或 Emperor Worship）指的是向羅馬君王/凱撒，包括其皇室家族成員（在世和已故），獻上神明般的敬仰和膜拜；包括爲他建造廟宇和祭壇、設立祭司制度和膜拜儀式、向他祈禱和獻祭、賦予他各種與宗教神明有關的稱號、進行各種競技比

---

[4] Lily R. Taylor, *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor* (Middleton: American Philological Association, 1931; Reprinted, New York: Scholars, 2000); Louis M. Sweet, *Roman Emperor Worship* (Boston: Gorham 1919; Reprinted 2007, 2009, 2010).

[5] 前找到的資料有許光福：〝基督十架與帝國政治，〞《大馬華人教會與政治研討會論文集：十字架與政權》（吉隆坡：文橋，2010），頁 47-79；黃錫木、孫寶玲、張略：《新約歷史與宗教文化導論》（聖經導論叢書；香港：基道，2002），頁 201-205；曾思瀚、吳瑩宜：《啓示錄的刻畫研究：英雄、女性與國度的故事》（香港：基道，2009）。多數書籍祇有一、兩段的簡略介紹，如騰慕理（Merrill C. Tenney）：《新約綜覽》（中譯；香港：宣道，1976），頁 66 等。

賽、慶典和節期等。[6] 不過，在 1998 年，M. Beard、J. North 和 Simon R.F. Price 提出君王崇拜的定義應該進一步擴充包括那些 "爲" 君王的尊榮或 "代表" 君王向神明所獻上的膜拜。[7] 當然，這其中所涉及的問題就是究竟君王被視爲神明還是凡人；Price 指出，君王的身份介于神明和凡人之間，有時被視爲神明，有時被視爲凡人，也因此膜拜者有時是 "向" 君王獻祭，有時是 "爲" 君王獻祭。[8] Steven J. Friesen 則指出這兩種的獻祭其實是一體的兩面，其要講述的是君王與人民之間在不同處境中的關系，而非本體論的問題。[9] 再者，Ittai Gradel 指出，神性的絕對性是希羅世界的哲學理論，而不是膜拜者的理念；對膜拜者而言，神性取決于膜拜行動，也就是說，神性是相對的。[10] 既然膜拜者本身對敬拜對象的神性和人性沒有作出清楚的劃分，這也

---

[6] Naylor, "Roman," 208; Phillip A. Harland, "Emperor Worship," in *The New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. 2: D-H, edited by Katharine Doob Sakenfeld (Nashville: Abingdon, 2007), 255-257, here 255; Donald L. Jones, "Roman Imperial Cult," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol. 5: O-Sh, edited by David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 806-809, here 806.

[7] M. Beard, J. North and Simon R.F. Price, *Religions of Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 350.

[8] Simon R.F. Price, *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 231-233.

[9] Steven J. Friesen, *Twice Neokoros: Ephesus, Asia and the Cult of the Flavian Emperors* (Leiden: Brill, 1993), 146-152.

[10] Ittai Gradel, *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), 202.

自然不是規限君王崇拜之定義的關鍵。故此，君王崇拜的定義應該包括任何與尊崇君王有關的行動。[11]

君王崇拜的背景

羅馬帝國的君王崇拜并不始于羅馬。[12] 可是，它却是羅馬帝國發展最迅速的宗教。[13] Everett Ferguson 指出其主要思想背景可以追溯至三大根源，即"東方"世界、希臘思想和傳統城神崇拜。[14]

"東方"世界指的是埃及，和亞述、巴比倫及波斯。自公元前 25 至 24 世紀，埃及的第五王朝開始，埃及人已經普遍相信，他們的法老（包括之後的多利米王朝的統治者）之所以是君王是因為他是道成肉身之太陽神的兒子；對于亞述、巴比倫和波斯帝國來說，君王是眾神所選立來完成特殊神聖任務的僕人。他是眾神官方的大使，在人民面前代表眾神來治理他們。也就是說，他是受指派來完成任務的神，即一位功能上的神。

---

[11] 這也是 Duncan Fishwick, "A Critical Assessment: On the Imperial Cult in Religions of Rome," *Religious Studies and Theology* 28 (2009): 129-174, here 130-131 的立場。

[12] 黃錫木、孫寶玲、張略：《新約歷史》，頁 201。

[13] 賴特（N.T. Wright）：《保羅神學嶄新觀》（中譯；香港：天道，2008），頁 101；Justin K. Hardin, *Galatians and the Imperial Cult: A Critical Analysis of the First-Century Social Context of Paul's Letter* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 23。

[14] 以下的資料都取自 Everett Ferguson, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity* (3rd edition; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003; 1st edition, 1987), 200-203。

希臘思想沒有如 "東方" 思想那樣將人和神清楚劃分。 在希臘思想中，眾神是人類中的佼佼者，一方面是"神"，另一方面又是"人"，并且可以生出"人"的後裔。同時，他們相信"人"的生命中都有某些神性，也因此可以因爲卓越或 "過剩" 的成就、德行或貢獻而變成神；他們的民族英雄就是重要的例子。他們也沒有將對"人"的敬仰和尊崇與對"神"的膜拜作出清楚區分，甚至也會因爲某"人"的拯救行動而向他獻祭；Lysander 就是第一位于公元前 404 年被希臘人當着神明來祭拜的"人"，包括爲他建造祭壇、向他獻祭、唱頌歌等。[15]

　　傳統城神崇拜，在希臘和羅馬是最深入民心的宗教信仰。它是指不同城市的人民各供奉和膜拜他們的守護神；而這守護神也同時就是該城市的符號。在希臘時期，城市的統治者也常常被視爲其城市的符號，也因此成爲了人們膜拜的對象。

君王崇拜的發展

　　羅馬共和國在公元前 119 年和公元前 31 年相繼占領了希臘和埃及；也因此，"君王崇拜"隨着"登上"了羅馬

---

[15] Martin Percival Charlesworth, "Some Observations on Ruler-Cult Especially in Rome," *Harvard Theological Review* 25 (1935): 5-44, here 11; 更多資料，參 Hans-Josef Klauck, *The Religious Context of Early Christianity: A Guide to Graeco-Roman Religions* (English Translation; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000), 253-255.

帝國的版圖。[16] 當然，希臘和埃及所組成的是羅馬帝國東面的領土。至于羅馬帝國的西面，雖然也開始汲取這方面的文化，但并不是照單全收，羅馬人民基本上都認爲向 "活人" 屈身敬拜是充滿耻辱的奴才式奉承。[17] 故此，在西羅馬帝國，人民通常 "代表" 君王獻祭，而非 "向" 君王獻祭；人民也不會 "向" 君王祈禱、宣誓和還願。[18] 簡單來說，東羅馬帝國的君王崇拜以在位的君王爲焦點，而西羅馬帝國則强調神化已故君王，奉他爲神明來膜拜。[19]

猶流·凱撒（Julius Caesar）是羅馬共和國于公元前 1 世紀的一位將軍。當他成功平定叛亂，并于公元前 49 年成爲元老院的 "獨裁者" 之後，他積極改革羅馬共和制度，并成功帶給人民 "最公平、最仁慈、最開明的政局"。[20] 在這樣的背景之下，羅馬帝國的君王崇拜從此馳騁前進。

當然，首先啓動引擎的是東羅馬帝國的人民。他們不祇稱猶流·凱撒爲 "神"，也尊他爲 "神"。公元前 49 年，在以弗所的一個碑文刻有以下文字：

---

[16] Jo-Ann Shelton, *As the Romans Did: A Sourcebook in Roman Social History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988).

[17] Ferguson, *Backgrounds*, 207-208; Martin Karrer, "Emperor Worship," in *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*, vol. E-I, edited by Erwin Fahlbusch and others (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 86-87, here 86; Charlesworth, "Observations," 17-18.

[18] D. E. Aune, "Emperors, Roman," in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne, Ralph P. Martin and Daniel G. Reid (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1993), 233-235, here 234-235.

[19] 參 Naylor, "Roman," 212-213 提供更多有關羅馬帝國不同區域的君王崇拜資料。

[20] 黃錫木、孫寶玲、張略：《新約歷史》，頁 44-46。

在亞細亞的諸城及群眾尊崇猶流，該猶之子 —— 凱撒、最高的祭司（Pontifex Maximus）、皇帝（Imperator）及執政者，是戰神和愛神的後裔，神明以人形式顯現，是全人類及生命的普世救主（Saviour）。[21]

另一個在 Demetrias 同時間的碑文更直接稱猶流‧凱撒為"皇帝、神"（Imperato，god）。[22] 再者，公元前 45 年，他們將 Quirinus 廟宇中的一尊雕像獻給他，并注明是"獻給百戰百勝的神"（To the invincible god）。[23] 此外，他也有屬于自己的廟宇——Jupiter Julius，和自己的祭司——Mark Antony。[24] 七月的名稱——July 也以他的名字來命名。[25] 猶流‧凱撒自己也將羅馬歷法改為陽歷，稱為猶流歷法（Julian Calendar），即現今多數國家所使用的日歷；一年 365 天，分為 12 個月，每四年有一次閏年。[26]

至于西羅馬帝國，在猶流‧凱撒離世之後兩年，元老院正式借由一個聖化祭典封他為眾神明之一，名為"神明猶流"（*Divus Julius*）；當然，眾百姓也在兩年前，他的養子奧古斯都（Augustus）所舉辦的一個尊崇猶流‧凱撒的競賽中，看到一顆慧星在第 11 個小時出現，并且點亮了天空 7 天之久；對他們來說，這就是他的靈魂進到不朽壞的境界

---

[21] 見 Klauck, *Religious*, 290。中譯取自許光福："基督十架，"頁 49。

[22] 見 Klauck, *Religious*, 291。

[23] 見 Klauck, *Religious*, 291 和 Ferguson, *Backgrounds*, 208。

[24] 見 Klauck, *Religious*, 291 和 Ferguson, *Backgrounds*, 208。

[25] Klauck, *Religious*, 291。

[26] 黃錫木、孫寶玲、張略：《新約歷史》，頁 46。

的證據。[27] 也因此，奧古斯都在其羅馬城的雕像的冠冕上加上了一顆星星。[28] 羅馬的修辭學家西賽羅（Cicero）在一次的演說中，就將神明猶流與羅馬首神朱庇特（Jupiter），戰神（Mars）和 Quirinus 并列。[29] 元老院也在羅馬城爲他建造廟宇，用作置放神明猶流的銅雕像；并且設立祭司和祭祀制度。[30] 在廟宇尚未竣工之前，此雕像先被放在愛神 Genetrix 的廟宇中；這也成爲了日後奧古斯都自稱是愛神的後代的重要淵源。[31] 最後，奧古斯都在公元前 29 年從戰場凱旋歸來後完成了獻殿儀式。[32] 猶流·凱撒被封爲神自此成爲已故羅馬君王被封爲神的濫觴；當然，暴君或罪深惡極的君王，以及那些生前自稱爲 " 神 " （Deus）者，即該猶（Gaius）和多米田（Domitian）都被排除在外。[33]

羅馬帝國的君王崇拜在奧古斯都統治時期達到頂峰期。元老院爲尊崇奧古斯都而開始了一個節慶——The *Augustalia*；其中包括一些名爲 *Augustalia* 的游戲。[34] 公元

---

[27] 見 Klauck, *Religious*, 293; Ferguson, *Backgrounds*, 208; Zsuzsanna Várhelyi, "Imperial Cult, Roman," in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Greece and Rome*, vol. 4, edited by Michael Gagarin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 54-57, here 55。

[28] Justin, *Galatians*, 28.

[29] 見 Klauck, *Religious*, 291 和黄錫木、孫寶玲、張略：《新約歷史》，頁 201-202。

[30] 見 Hardin, *Galatians*, 26。

[31] 見 Hardin, *Galatians*, 26, n.15。

[32] 見 Hardin, *Galatians*, 26 和 Klauck, *Religious*, 293。

[33] 見 Klauck, *Religious*, 293 和黄錫木、孫寶玲、張略：《新約歷史》，頁 202。

[34] Ferguson, *Backgrounds*, 208。

前 8 年，八月的名稱——August 以他的名字來命名。[35] 當
然，作爲神明猶流的養子，奧古斯都自然被稱爲 "神的兒
子"（divus filius）。[36]

根據 Dio Cassius 的記載，公元前 29 年，奧古斯都時期
的君王崇拜有三種不同的制度： 第一、西羅馬帝國： 君
王崇拜是英雄崇拜，一個好君王死後會得到如神明般的榮
譽，他們的廟宇稱爲 heroon，即英雄的廟宇；[37] 第二、東羅
馬帝國——以弗所和尼西亞的羅馬人：奧古斯都容許他們
在以弗所爲 Dea Roma 和 Divus Julius 建造神聖區；[38] 第三、
東羅馬帝國——別迦摩和 Nicomedia 的希臘人：奧古斯都容
許他們在別迦摩爲他本身和女神羅馬建造神聖區。[39]

在東羅馬帝國，公元前 9 年，以弗所鄰近的普令
（Priene）的一塊碑文稱奧古斯都是羅馬人民的救主和全世
界的施恩者：

> 眷顧之女神預備了人類生命最完備的終結者——奧古
> 斯都；她爲全人類的益處厚賜卓越于他，使他成爲我
> 們及我們的後裔的救主(sōtēr) ——他是止息戰爭并使
> 萬事和平 (eirēnēn) 有序的救主；這凱撒的顯現
> (epifanein)超越了一切過往福音(euangelia)帶來的盼望，

---

[35] Ferguson, *Backgrounds*, 208.

[36] Ferguson, *Backgrounds*, 208.

[37] Steven J. Friesen, *Imperial Cults and the Apocalypse of John: Reading Revelation in Ruins* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 26.

[38] Friesen, *Imperial*, 26.

[39] Friesen, *Imperial*, 26.

其所施的恩惠不但前無古人，更是後無來者；對全世界而言，此神明的誕辰日子即是好消息的開始。[40]

一個 Coan 的詔書也聲稱奧古斯都是："凱撒君王，神的兒子，*sebastos* 神明，他所施予全人類的恩惠甚至超越了 Olympian 眾神明"。[41] 此外，在 Mytilene 的一個碑文（公元前 27 年和公元前 11 年之間）如此記載：Mytilene 人派送一位大使到奧古斯都那裏，請求他的準許，讓他們爲他設立公開祭典，包括每個月定期以獻祭來慶祝他的誕辰、舉辦運動競賽、將一部分的公共基金用作飼養獻祭之動物的用途；同時，他們也要求將這些內容刻在碑文上，并竪立在叙利亞的安提阿、別迦摩、Tarraco 等，甚至在奧古斯都的住家和羅馬城的國會大廈。奧古斯都接受了這些建議。[42]再者，大馬士革的尼哥拉（Nicolaus）——與奧古斯都同時代的傳記作家的回憶片段指出：眾百姓稱他爲奧古斯都，

---

[40] 中譯取自許光福："基督十架，" 頁 50。這裏所出現的字眼——"救主"、"和平"、"顯現"和"福音"與新約作者用來形容耶穌基督的字眼顯然是一樣的，這其中的關系已經備受矚目，參湯姆・賴特（Tom Wright）：《再思保羅神學爭議：保羅真的創立了基督教？》（中譯；臺北：校園，2000 年）；Oakes, *Philippians*, 139-140, 160; Graham N. Stanton, *Jesus and Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 30-32; Lance Byron Richey, *Roman Imperial Ideology and the Gospel of John* (Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2007); Richard A. Horsley, "Introduction," in *The Shadow of Empire*, edited by Richard A. Horsley (Louisville: John Knox Press, 2008), 1-8, here 7。

[41] 見 Price, *Rituals*, 55。

[42] 見 Justin, *Galatians*, 27；Friesen, *Imperial*, 27。

也因而在各處各地設立廟宇和祭祀制度來尊崇他，以報答他向他們所施予的恩德和恩惠。[43]

在西羅馬帝國，尤指羅馬城，在位的奧古斯都從來沒有被 "神化"，而是有 "如神" 的地位；他曾受頒一個必須借由元老院多數票方可頒授，稱作 *Caelestes honores* 的神聖榮譽。[44] 人民膜拜的不是奧古斯都本人，而是他的引路神（genius）和內住的神聖力量（numen）。[45] 同時，他也被稱爲 "主"（*kurios*），即眾神明所委托來統治羅馬帝國最有能力和最偉大的那一位。[46] 此外，由于羅馬人傾向神化和崇拜一些具道德含義的抽象觀念，如信實（fides）、 和平（pax）、榮譽（honor） 、羞恥感（pudor）、 能力（virtus）、公義（Iustitia）等，奧古斯都因此吸納它們來治國，使它們成爲君王崇拜的附屬——勝利（Victoria）、和諧（Concordia）、寬容（Clementia）、和平奧古斯都（Pax Augusta）；并聲稱惟有透過他這位最高祭司，神與人之間的中保，國家和人民方能 "與眾神明和好"（Pax Deorum），使這些 "道德" 重回世間。[47] 公元前 17 年的 Secular Games 就是歡慶這些 "小宗教" 所帶來的新時代。

---

[43] 見 Justin, *Galatians*, 27。

[44] Ferguson, *Backgrounds*, 209。

[45] Klauck, *Religious*, 299。

[46] 見許光福： "基督十架，" 頁 62。

[47] 見 Klauck, *Religious*, 299；許光福： "基督十架，" 頁 65。

[48] 再者，公元前 30 年，元老院下令全國人民在所有的公眾和個人宴會開始前向奧古斯都的引路神舉杯澆奠酒。[49]

君王崇拜的表達形式[50]

　　君王崇拜有各形各色的表達形式，包括君王的廟宇、雕像和祭壇；碑文和錢幣上的圖騰和文字；時間計算法；各種與君王有關的日子；詩詞內容等。

A. 廟宇、雕像和祭壇

　　　　在東羅馬帝國，那些獻給奧古斯都的廟宇到處可見。按照 Price 保守的計算，從公元前 30 年至公元 250 年，小亞細亞共有不少過 77 間的廟宇。[51]這些廟宇的地點尤其顯著，舉例來說，雅典的一間獻給奧古斯都的廟宇竟然位于其宗教中心衛城（Acropolis）的巴特農神殿（Parthenon）的隔壁。[52] 此外，Lesbos 島上的 Eresus 城的三間廟宇，各獻給 Livia、奧古斯都的後代和奧古斯都本身；其中獻給奧古斯都後代的廟宇位于民眾會堂最顯著的

---

[48] 見 Klauck, *Religious*, 299；許光福：＂基督十架，＂頁 54。

[49] Edwin M. Yamauchi, *The World of the First Christians* (Herts: Lion, 1981), 125; 許光福：＂基督十架，＂ 頁 54。

[50] 主要根據 Justin, *Galatians*, 28-38。

[51] Price, *Rituals*, 59; xxiii (map); 249-274 (catalogue)。另參 Justin, *Galatians*, 30。

[52] 見 Justin, *Galatians*, 30。

地點，及獻給奧古斯都的廟宇位于市區的港口。[53] 再者，希律在＂海岸上的該撒利亞＂（Caesarea Maritima）雄偉壯觀的沿海廟宇中就有兩個龐大的女神羅馬和奧古斯都的雕像。[54]

　　至于西羅馬帝國，羅馬城中有兩座顯著的建築物，即戰神廟和奧古斯都和平祭壇。戰神廟是奧古斯為感謝戰神 Ultor（意即復仇者）幫助他于公元前 42 年在腓立比成功為猶流▪凱撒復仇而建立的廟宇；當中有三個雕像，分別是愛神、戰神和神明猶流的雕像，而大堂正中就豎立着奧古斯都坐在四祇馬所拉着的戰車上的雕像——＂表達他是英雄及諸神的中心，是具有無比軍事力量的戰士，也是大地之父（Pater Patriae）＂。[55] 奧古斯都和平祭壇（Ara Pacis），位于戰爭之田野（Field of War）；目的是取代已經關閉的＂亞奴斯之門＂（Janua Foris），[56] 宣告奧古斯都帶來羅馬升平/奧古斯都升平。[57] 這個＂祭壇四邊的雕刻突出奧古斯都身穿祭司長袍，帶領家人游行獻祭；每邊另嵌上的圖像

---

[53] 見 Justin, *Galatians*, 30。

[54] 見 Justin, *Galatians*, 30。

[55] 許光福：＂基督十架，＂頁 53；Kong-Hock Hii, *Contesting the Ideology of the Empire: Paul's Theological Politics in Romans, with Preliminary Implications for Chinese Christian Communities in Malaysia* (Unpublished Ph.D Dissertation; Evanston: Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary, 2007), 30。

[56] Klauck, *Religious*, 299。

[57] 見 Hii, *Contesting*, 30 的評論。

是一種神學注解，叙述了：艾伊納斯帶來'敬虔'、戰神止息'戰爭'、女神羅馬帶來'勝利'，以及豐饒系于'和平'"。[58] 正如許光福所説："這兩座'建築物'除了宣揚帝國之下的和平與豐裕，也宣稱奧古斯都恢復了羅馬人祖先的崇高道德理想（mos maiorum）"。[59]

除了廟宇之外，各城市還有許多其他君王的祭壇和雕像。至公元前 7 年，羅馬家庭祭壇所喜愛的神明—拉列斯（Lares）被改名爲拉列斯奧古斯都（Lares Augusti）。米利都（Miletus）市議會的庭院設有一個鋪張的奧古斯都祭壇。各城市最顯著之處都竪立着君王的雕像；這些雕像不祇非常高大，顯而易見，而且都有標準的羅馬雕像的"體型"。因此，在哥林多城和撒摩島極可能可以看到著名的奧古斯都的 capite velato 模型，即蒙着頭的奧古斯都虔誠地向神明奠酒——羅馬公民的最佳模範。[60] 再者，各城市的羅馬浴池、戲院和露天劇場是進行與君王崇拜有關的獻祭儀式和各種慶典經常被使用的地點，而它們的構造也都是以偉大的奧古

---

[58] 引自許光福："基督十架，"頁 54。更多有關奧古斯都和平祭壇的資料，見 Karl Galinsky, *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 141-154。

[59] 許光福："基督十架，"頁 54。

[60] 見 Justin, *Galatians*, 30。這個 *capite velato* 與哥林多前書第 11 章蒙頭的問題有沒有關系？

斯都作爲題材，其中戲院臺後面的柱廊正面就有奧古斯都的雕像（scaenae frons）。[61]

B. 碑文和錢幣

　　各城市的重要地區都豎立著稱頌奧古斯都的碑文，單單在雅典的民眾會堂（agora）就已經發現了 13 個碑文。[62] 除了碑文之外，羅馬人民所使用的錢幣也宣告奧古斯都的偉大。

　　在東羅馬帝國的別迦摩，其銀幣 cistophorus（公元前 20-18 年）有三種不同的圖像。不過，它們都有相同的一面，即奧古斯都的半身像，另一面則是凱旋門、戰神的圓形廟宇或獻給女神羅馬或奧古斯都的廟宇。[63] 另外，在以弗所鑄造的銀幣 cistophorus（公元前 28 年）一面印著 "IMP (erator) CAESAR DIVI F(ilius) CO(n)S(ul) VI LIBERTATIS P(opuli) R(omani) VINDEX"，意即凱撒君王，神的兒子，第六任的執政官，羅馬人民的自由之保護者。[64] 另一面則是一個人化的"和平"（Pax）手裏拿著一個象徵平安與和諧的手杖（caduceus）[65]，

---

[61] 見 Justin, *Galatians*, 30。

[62] 見 Justin, *Galatians*, 28。

[63] Friesen, *Imperial*, 29.

[64] 見 Justin, *Galatians*, 28-29。

[65] Caduceus 是希臘神話故事中 Hermes 所拿的手杖。

站在象徵亞細亞的一個籃子（cista mystica）[66] 旁邊；這整個圖像被放在桂冠中，象徵 "和平" 是透過君王的軍事力量而獲得的。[67] 要留意的是，在奧古斯都之前，錢幣是從來沒有出現過 "活人" 的畫像，而在奧古斯都時代，至少有 189 個地區的錢幣出現了他的畫像。[68]

至于西羅馬帝國，其人民所使用的錢幣一面印着奧古斯都神化或與眾神明結盟以徵服仇敵的圖像，另一面則印着他的封號，最普遍的是 "凱撒，神的兒子 "（Caesar, *Divi Filius*）。[69] 此外，有一些錢幣也加上了象徵奧古斯都時代充滿盼望的 "猶流‧凱撒的星星"（*sidus Iulium*）。[70] 當然，這個星星的圖像不祇出現在錢幣上，也出現在印章或戒指上。[71] 再者，已故君王的聖化祭典的圖像也常常出現在錢幣或其他藝術作品上。在聖化祭典上，一個證人會在元老院集會中站起來，并宣誓自己已經看到已故君王的靈魂從柴堆中升到天上；這個圖像

---

[66] *Cista mystica* 是一個在開始祭拜酒神（Bacchus/Dionysus）裝着神聖的蛇的籃子。

[67] 見 Justin, *Galatians*, 29。

[68] Justin, *Galatians*, 30.

[69] 許光福："基督十架，" 頁 54。

[70] Justin, *Galatians*, 28. 這個 "猶流‧凱撒的星星" 與馬太福音 2:1-12 所記載的耶穌降生的故事有沒有關系？Justin, *Galatians*, 28, n.29 聲稱他的下一個研究將是從政治性角度來探討此課題。

[71] 見 Justin, *Galatians*, 28-29。

也可以是一祇老鷹從火焰中飛出來，衝上天空。值得注意的是，不祇是已故君王本身，包括其皇室成員的升天圖像也常常是錢幣或其他藝術作品的素材。[72]

C. 時間計算法

　　公元前 29 年，亞細亞的省議會決定頒發冠冕給爲奧古斯都帶來最高榮譽的人。得勝者 Paullus Fabius Maximus 省長（proconsul）的建議是將奧古斯都的誕辰吉日，即 9 月 23 日定爲一年的開始。[73] 公元前 9 年，普令的那塊碑文，在頌贊奧古斯都爲救主，帶來超越過往福音的盼望，是前無古人、後無來者的施惠者和其誕辰就是好消息的開始之後，隨着就記載 "Paullus Fabius Maximus……爲奧古斯都創作了一個榮譽，即將他的誕辰吉日定爲一年的開始，但至今却不爲希臘人所知……因此，亞細亞的希臘人決定所有的城市都以 9 月 23 日，即奧古斯都的誕辰作爲一年的開始。" [74] 這個命令後來被刻在石碑上，并置放在各大城市的君王聖所中。[75]

---

[72] Klauck, *Religious*, 293-294.

[73] 見 Justin, *Galatians*, 32。

[74] 見 Justin, *Galatians*, 32-33。

[75] 見 Justin, *Galatians*, 33。

D. 各種與君王有關的日子

　　奧古斯都時期的日歷，不祇標出一般公眾假期,也標出所有跟君王及其皇族成員有關的日子。公元 4-14 年，Cumae 的意大利日歷就標有奧古斯都的誕辰、他的皇族成員—提比留（Tiberius）、他兒子 Drusus 和 Germanicus 的生日，還有所有跟奧古斯都有關的日期，以及神明猶流的誕辰：

8 月 19 日	奧古斯都首次擔任執政官
9 月 3 日	馬庫斯·萊皮達斯投降奧古斯都
9 月 23 日	奧古斯都的誕辰
10 月 7 日	Drusus 的誕辰
10 月 18 日	奧古斯都穿上 *toga virilise* [76]
11 月 16 日	提比留的誕辰
12 月 15 日	Fortuna Redux [77]祭壇的奉獻日
1 月 7 日	奧古斯都拿起 *fasces* [78]的日子
1 月 15 日	奧古斯都受頒 "奧古斯都" 之稱號
1 月 30 日	奧古斯都和平祭壇的奉獻日
3 月 6 日	奧古斯都受選為最高祭司
4 月 14 日	奧古斯都首次打勝仗
4 月 15 日	奧古斯都首次受擁立為皇帝

---

[76] *Toga viliris*（*toga alba* 或 *toga pura*）是多數羅馬男士在達到法定年齡之後，在正式場合所穿的長袍；而第一次穿上它是歡慶一個男孩長大成人的重要項目之一。

[77] 歡慶奧古斯都在公元前 19 年從 Parthia 凱撒歸來。

[78] *Fasces* 直譯是 "捆"，指的是中間有一個斧頭刀的一捆木棍；象徵能力和權柄。

5 月 12 日　　戰神 Ultor 的廟宇的奉獻日

5 月 24 日　　Germanicus 的誕辰

7 月 12 日　　神明猶流的誕辰

E. 詩詞內容

　　維吉爾（Virgil）在其詩集 Eclogues（公元前 38 年）中提到奧古斯都是帶來和平的神；還有，根據某女巫的預言，一個小孩會帶來黃金時代，那時大地將出產豐富的水果、動物不停繁殖，牛兒不懼怕巨獅，而當這小孩長大成人後，大地要獲得最後的更新；這個小孩就是奧古斯都。[79] 此外，Horace 在奧古斯都的指示下，爲羅馬城在公元前 17 年歡慶黃金時代的來臨之盛會所寫下的頌詞——Carmen Saeculare 中的幾個主題，都與奧古斯都在那盛會中所主持的幾項莊嚴的儀式有關；再者，其也暗示黃金時代所帶來的豐衣足食都是奧古斯都在道德和社會層面的革新結果。[80] 當然，這個黃金時代也就是羅馬人的 "福音"。

F. 迎接君王到訪的慶典[81]

　　君王到訪某城市被稱作 parousia 或 adventus。這對該城市來說是一個重大盛會。在君王未到訪之

---

[79] 見 Justin, *Galatians*, 34-35。

[80] 見 Justin, *Galatians*, 36。

[81] Klauck, *Religious*, 320.

前，居民會為該城市布置一番。在君王到訪當日，一個由居民首領帶隊的隊伍會在城牆外，在特定的時間，拿着君王的 *fasces*（或 cortége）莊嚴等候君王的到來；參與者則拿着橄欖樹枝和棕樹枝、蠟燭和香一同等候。當君王來到時，君王和隊伍會在莊嚴的氣氛下彼此問候，并且一起前往城內。這個君王到訪慶典也包括君王和城市首領的會談，當然，城市首領會在這個會談裏抓緊時機向君王提出重要緊急的要求。此外，這個慶典還有獻祭、各種尊崇君王的競賽等活動。

小結：顯然，君王崇拜透過各種不同的表達形式，滲透人民生活的每一個層面——廟宇、雕像、祭壇、祭司、祭祀、禱告、宣誓、君王與神明的聯系與宗教生活密不可分；碑文、錢幣、時間計算法等更是日常生活所不能不接觸的；最後，那些與君王有關的日子、宴會等構成了人民生活中的特別事件。當然，對君王崇拜而言，重要的不是表面上的形式表達，而是深層部分的意識形態。

君王崇拜的意識形態

有關君王崇拜的意識形態的討論，在 1984 年前，學術界基本上將宗教和政治作出清楚的劃分；君王崇拜是屬于"政治"的範疇，其"宗教性"祇不過是其"政治意圖"

的包裝而已。[82] 在 1984 年，Price 的 *Rituals and Power* 爲學術界帶來了劃時代的貢獻；Price 指出，我們不能將君王崇拜區分爲 " 宗教 " 範疇與 " 政治 " 範疇，這是基督徒帶着有色眼鏡的詮釋；在古希臘羅馬文化中， " 宗教 " 和 " 政治 " 從來都是一體的兩面。[83] 因此，我們應該從一個更廣大的宗教處境來理解君王崇拜——宗教即政治，祭典爲權力。

宗教即政治

表面上，羅馬君王讓東羅馬帝國和西羅馬帝國各自發展自己的 " 君王崇拜 " ； 但實際上，不論是在東羅馬帝國或西羅馬帝國，不論羅馬君王是明示或暗示自己擁有 " 神 " 的地位， " 君王崇拜 " 都是羅馬君王用來傳遞帝國主義，要人民銘記自己活在羅馬帝國政權之下的工具。更清楚的說， " 君王崇拜 " 就是要藉着將羅馬帝國的最高政治和宗教權力集合在君王一人身上，來達到全民絕對效忠和團結的目的。這兩種不同的君王形象——最高統治者和最高祭司，在奧古斯都的兩個雕像中，一個是軍事家，一個是穿着 *toga viliris* 的祭司，完全表露出來。因此，正如 Pekáry 所説的，君王的肖像不旨在代表君王或表達君王的

---

[82] 見 Naylor, "Roman," 209-210。

[83] Price, *Rituals*, 7-22; 234-248; Beard, North and Price, *Religions*, 369-362; Paul Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* (English Translation; Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1988), 299-302.

151

"無所不在"，而是作爲各族人民、群體、政治和社會機構向君王表達團結一致，和對他忠誠到底的標志。[84]

　　當然，"羅馬升平" 是羅馬帝國爲要傳播帝國主義，讓人民"主動" 和 "自願" 參與君王崇拜的重要政治口號。這個口號不斷提醒人民，他們正領受和享受着羅馬帝國所賜予的各種恩惠和恩德，包括軍事、政治、經濟、法律、文化、宗教等各層面。[85]正如 Elliott 所說："羅馬教導她的子民要歡慶奧古斯都太平爲羅馬所帶來的和平秩序，就如歡慶那黃金時代的來臨一樣"。[86] 再者，一位羅馬編年史家 Velleius Pagerculus 如此描繪奧古斯都太平："當奧古斯都從戰爭凱撒歸來後，20 年的内戰結束了，外來的侵略平息了，人民重享和平，軍人可以休息了； 法律維護正義，法庭重新"執政"，元老院重獲尊嚴…，農作物有豐收，宗教受敬重，人民不再憂慮，過着自由自在的生活"。[87] 因此作爲受惠者，羅馬人民應該以感恩的心來回報施恩者，絕對效忠羅馬帝國，降服在她的政權之下。君王崇拜的成功就在于其不采取從上而下强行推廣的策略；該猶和多米田駕崩後，元老院都拒絕奉他們爲神明。 在亞細亞省，君王崇拜多是由地方官員、領袖和富户策劃推

---

[84] 見 Klauck, *Religious*, 317。

[85] 留意 Klaus Wengst, *Pax Romana and the Peace of Jesus Christ* (London: SCM), 7-54 所說，羅馬升平是透過血腥的暴力行動和軍事力量所得到的。

[86] 見 Hii, *Contesting*, 97 取自 Neil Elliott, *Liberating Paul: The Justice of God and the Politics of the Apostle* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1994), 184-185。

[87] 見 Hii, *Contesting*, 97 取自 Elliott, *Liberating*, 187。

行，其目的不單純是“感恩”，更是“諂媚”；而隨之而來的是各種生活和經濟上的利益。[88] 不過，若受惠者沒有給予施恩者合理的回報，施恩者則會采取“報復”行動。舉例來說，提比留奪取 Cyzicus 城市的自由的原因之一就是該城市的居民無法完成爲奧古斯都神明建造廟宇的工作。[89] 所以，一言以蔽之，君王崇拜采納或利用“施恩者和受惠者”的關系框架，結合政治和宗教，來贏取和強迫人民絕對的效忠。

要留意的是，君王崇拜的推行可説是深入民間，其不僅未停留在元老院和亞細亞省議會的官方階層，更是滲透市議會、個人團體和家庭生活中。[90] 除了因爲君王和人民有着“施恩者和受惠者”的關系之外，另一原因是，君王崇拜所鼓吹的不是惟“君王”獨尊，而是將君王與希臘人和羅馬人一直以來所供奉的神明聯系在一起，同受人民膜拜.舉例來説，在以弗所城的亞底米女神崇拜中，君王肖像扮演着重要的角色，且被置放在亞底米神廟的門廊那裏。[91] 在獻祭事宜上，人民不祇向神明獻祭，同時也“向”和“爲”君王獻祭——他們向君王祈求自身的平安，但轉向神明祈求君王的平安。不過，值得留意的是，在革老丟時期，以弗所城的君王崇拜受歡迎的程度甚至超越了亞底米

---

[88] 孫寶玲：《啓示錄：萬有之主》（明道研經叢書 66；香港：明道，2007），頁 21。

[89] 見 Hardin, *Galatians*, 42。

[90] 詳細資料，參 Harland, "Emperor," 255-256。

[91] Price, *Rituals*, 189.

女神。在當時的建城藍圖中，奧古斯都廟宇不祇位于城市中心，更是位于亞底米女神廟宇上面的廣場，而不是下面的平原。[92] 因此，這個帶有政治意圖的君王崇拜明顯也是人民宗教生活的一部分。

　　此外，對羅馬人民來說，君王崇拜也是身份的依附和認同。 作爲最高祭司的君王，他會親自選立其廟宇的宗教祭司，當選的通常是那些在政治上對他忠誠的家人、賣胄和盟友等，或在其他領域獲得非凡成就的人； 要留意的是，女性也有機會成爲祭司。[93] 因此，這些祭司不祇有特殊的身份和地位，在經濟和社會生活方面，也享有許多利益。各個省份也不斷向君王爭取要爲他建造廟宇，因爲這代表着一種榮譽和寵幸；市議會也常常爲着得到推行和贊助君王崇拜的權利而爭論不休；就是個人本身，也會爲自己來爭取這種社會身份的認可。 在 Chios 的一個石碑上如此記載：一個本地公民成立了一個財團來贊助每四年舉行一次的君王崇拜之節慶，[94] 而其子孫必須有份參與在此慶典的列伍中。顯然，這裏所說的身份依附和認同也就是＂榮譽和耻辱＂的思想模式。

　　所以，總括來說，羅馬帝國的君王崇拜即透過＂施恩者和受惠者＂和＂榮譽和耻辱＂的思想模式，及人民對宗教的意識和委身來達到政教合一，建立一群絕對效忠羅馬帝國霸權主義的人民。

---

[92] 見 Hardin, *Galatians*, 43。

[93] Klauck, *Religious*, 318.

[94] Hardin, *Galatians*, 42; Price, *Rituals*, 62.

祭典爲權力[95]

　　君王崇拜透過許多不同表達形式的祭典來傳遞帝國主義.這些祭典的目的是要藉着各種看得見的象徵物來高舉和肯定君王作爲最高祭司和統治者的身份和地位。[96] 根據 D. Sperber，祭典本身是一種有別于語義性知識，即有關 "組別 "的知識（Semantic Knowledge）[97]和廣泛性知識，即有關 "世界" 的知識（Encyclopaedic Knowledge）和象徵性知識（Symbolic Knowledge）[98]。這個象徵性知識爲那些不屬于語義性知識和廣泛性知識的觀念提供了生存的空間。[99] 因此， "有血有肉的君王是神的兒子" 不再是荒謬的概念，而是真實可信的。 正如人類學家 Clifford Geertz 所説的：

> 祭典......傳遞宗教概念是真實、宗教指引是正確的信念。在禮儀的形式中神聖象徵在人們心中所引發的情緒和動力（ethos）以及它們爲人們所陳述有關存在的道理（世界觀）的概念，在此相遇并彼此强化。 在祭典中，"活在的世界" (the world as lived) 和 "想象的世

---

[95] 這部分的主要思路和内容取自許光福 : "基督十架， " 頁 52。

[96] Price, *Rituals*, 7-8.

[97] 例子 : 所有的兒子都是男的。

[98] 例子 : 約翰是西庇太的兒子。

[99] 見 Price, *Rituals*, 8-9。

界" (the world as imagined) 藉由象徵的形式，融化爲一體,成了同一世界。[100]

再者，祭典所要傳達的象徵性知識不是個人性的知識，而是群體性的知識。也就是說，祭典所要創造的不是個人性經驗，而是群體性的公開經驗；[101] 而君王崇拜所要創造的這個群體性的公開經驗，就是君王是人民集體的代表；而當全民參與在這個祭典中，高舉君王至高的身份和地位時，這個象徵性知識也就成爲了全民的共同世界觀。更重要的是，正如 Catherine Bell 所説的，君王崇拜祭典所支持的社會價值和形式是合乎世界自然秩序的，也因此，君王崇拜的祭典所 "生產" 的不是祇會高喊效忠口號的人民，而是願意付諸行動的全人投入；由此可見，君王崇拜的祭典比強壓行動更有能力讓人心服口服，遵循羅馬帝國的秩序，活在其強權之下。[102]

君王崇拜與新約研究

至今，新約學術界越來越意識到羅馬帝國的君王崇拜對理解新約聖經的重要性。 因此，在論述了君王崇拜的

---

[100] 許光福：" 基督十架，" 頁 52 譯自 Clifford Geertz, "Religion as a Cultural Syatem," in *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays by Clifford Geertz* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), 112。

[101] Price, *Rituals*, 9-11。

[102] 許光福：" 基督十架，" 頁 52 取自 Catherine Bell, *Rituals: Perspectives and Dimensions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 135。

定義、背景、發展、表達形式、意識形態之後，我們有必要在結束這篇文章之前，爲一些有關君王崇拜和新約聖經的近代研究作簡短的介紹。 在這個部分，我們除了簡介君王崇拜與新約研究的發展和一些相關著作，也簡述其中一個近代研究成果。

發展和著作

早在 1910 年，Adolf Deissmann 在其著作 *Light from the Ancient East* 中，已經提出 " 新約聖經是一本君王時代的書 " 。[103] 他對照 " 基督與凱撒 " ，并指出許多保羅所使用的 " 基督崇拜 " 的詞匯與羅馬帝國的 " 君王崇拜 " 的詞匯是一樣的。[104] 他將它們之間的 " 具爭議性的平行 " （Polemical Parallelism）解釋爲保羅的用詞碰巧與君王崇拜的用詞相似或一樣。[105] 他認爲，保羅并不關心當時君王崇拜的政治問題，因爲這些問題對其所處的社會階層來說遙不可及。[106] 之後，因著學術界把焦點放在更正教的教義問題上，以及把宗教規限在屬靈層面上， " 基督和凱撒 " 的政治面向與新約詮釋之關系暫時被忽略了。一直到學術界開始意識和接受社會科學評鑒方法對研讀聖經的重要性之

---

[103] Adolf Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East: The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World* (4th edition; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1978; 1st edition, 1910), 344.

[104] Deissmann, *Light*, 346.

[105] Deissmann, *Light*, 346.

[106] Deissmann, *Light*, 339-340.

後，整個研究趨勢轉而關注保羅與猶太教的關系，跟着保羅與羅馬帝國的關系。

自此，許多相關研究相繼發表和出版，包括君王崇拜（或羅馬帝國）與某書卷的關系，或與某段經文的關系。當中，有關羅馬書的研究有 Neil Elliott, *The Arrogance of Nations: Reading Romans in the Shadow of Empire* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2010); Hii Kong Hock, *Contesting the Ideology of the Empire: Paul's Theological Politics in Romans, with Preliminary Implications for Chinese Christian Communities in Malaysia* (Unpublished Ph.D Dissertation; Evanston: Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary, 2007)等；有關加拉太書的研究有 Justin K. Hardin, *Galatians and the Imperial Cult: A Critical Analysis of the First-Century Social Context of Paul's Letter* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008); Brigitte Kahl, "Reading Galatians and Empire at the Great Altar of Pergamon," *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 59 (2005): 21-43 等；有關腓立比書的研究有 Peter S.Oakes, *Philippians: From People to Letter* (Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001); Carolyn Osiek, *Philippians, Philemon* (Abingdon New Testament Commentaries; Nashville: Abingdon, 2000)等；有關哥林多前書的研究有 Richard A. Horsley, *1 Corinthians* (Abingdon New Testament Commentaries; Nashville: Abingdon, 1998)等；有關馬太福音的研究有 Warren Carter, *Matthew and Empire: Initial Explorations* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2001)等；有關約翰福音的研究有 Lance Byron

158

Richey, *Roman Imperial Ideology and the Gospel of John* (Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 43; Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2007)等；有關啟示錄的研究有 J. Nelson Kraybill, *Imperial Cult and Commerce in John's apocalypse* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996); Steven J. Friesen, *Imperial Cults and the Apocalypse of John: Reading Revelation in the Ruins* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001); 曾思瀚、吳瑩宜：《啟示錄的刻畫研究：英雄、女性與國度的故事》（香港：基道，2009）等。

例子：加拉太書與君王崇拜

Hardin 在其 *Galatians and the Imperial Cult* 一書中以羅馬帝國的君王崇拜作為背景來理解加拉太教會的危機和保羅的論點。他選擇了加拉太書 6:12-13 和 4:10 來探討之。

加拉太書 6:12-13
"那些想要炫耀外表的人才勉強你們受割禮，無非是怕自己為基督的十字架受迫害。他們那些受割禮的，連自己也不守律法；他們要你們受割禮，不過是要拿你們的肉體誇口。"（和合本修訂版）

對 Hardin 而言，這兩節經文所講述的"敵對者"的動機是重建加拉太教會危機的最重要線索之一。他認為這些"敵對者"是加拉太教會的猶太基督徒。他們被保羅指控要藉著勉強加拉太教會中的外邦人受割禮來炫耀外表，以

159

免自己爲基督受迫害。這裏出現兩個問題：一、爲什麼加拉太教會中的外邦人受割禮就可以讓 "敵對者" 免受迫害？二、誰要迫害 "敵對者" ？

　　Bruce W. Winter 認爲，迫害者是地方政府，若加拉太教會的外邦人沒有受割禮，地方政府會因爲加拉太信徒群體沒有參與君王崇拜而迫害他們；但若他們受割禮，地方政府會誤以爲他們是享有 "合法宗教" （*Religio Licita*）特權的猶太群體，因此不需要參與君王崇拜，也不會因沒有參與君王崇拜而受迫害。[107] 不過，從 T. Rajak 和 M.P. Ben Zeev 的研究，[108] 　 Hardin 質疑 Winter 的基本假設； 他提出，羅馬帝國的猶太人沒有受賦予不需要參與君王崇拜的特權。 事實上，他們也不需要這個特權，因爲他們都非常樂意尊崇君王，甚至是以羅馬人和希臘人同樣的方式來尊崇君王。[109] 　 耶路撒冷的猶太人每日在聖殿中爲君王來獻祭。 　散居的猶太人透過繳交聖殿稅來表達他們對君王的效忠，因爲其中一部分的聖殿稅就是用作獻祭之用途；再者，在亞歷山太的一所猶太會堂也發現那些獻給該猶的盾、鍍金冠、碑文等；另外，也有證據顯示，在羅馬城有一所獻給奧古斯都的猶太會堂，猶太會堂也是猶太人公開表明效忠君王的場所；不過，Hardin 強調，雖然猶太人積

---

[107] Hardin, *Galatians*, 90-91.

[108] 見 Hardin, *Galatians*, 103, n. 82。

[109] Hardin, *Galatians*, 109.

極參與 " 君王崇拜 " , 但這并不意味着他們對猶太信仰不忠, 反之他們仍然忠于猶太律法和敬拜獨一上帝。[110]

在這樣的前提之下, Hardin 指出, 拒絕參與君王崇拜的加拉太教會, 一方面不屬于參與君王崇拜的猶太群體, 另一方面也不屬于參與君王崇拜的外邦群體 ; 因此, " 敵對者 " 希望加拉太教會的外邦人受割禮, 好讓地方政府以爲加拉太教會是猶太群體的一份子, 如此他們不祇可以免受地方政府, 也可以免受猶太群體的迫害。[111]

加拉太書 4:10

" 你們竟又謹守日子、月份、節期、年份… " (和合本修訂版)

除了加拉太書 6:12-13, 對 Hardin 而言, 加拉太書 4:10 是理解加拉太教會危機的另一重要綫索。這裏要回答的問題是, 究竟 " 日子、月份、節期、年份 " 是指向哪一個宗教的日歷? Hardin 不接受傳統的意見, 即認爲是指猶太日歷 ; [112] 反之, 他認爲它們是指向 " 君王崇拜的日歷 " 。 " 日子 " 是指君王和其皇室成員的誕辰吉日 ; " 月份 " 可以是指以猶流·凱撒命名的七月份和以奧古斯都命名的八月份, 或指猶流歷法 ; " 節期 " 是指連續幾天爲尊崇君王所舉行的宴會或慶典 ; " 年份 " 則是指 *Res Gestae Divi*

---

[110] Hardin, *Galatians*, 102-109.
[111] Hardin, *Galatians*, 110-114.
[112] Hardin, *Galatians*, 118-121 提供詳細原因。

Augustus [113] （The Deeds of the Divine Augustus） 中所説的，
人民每五年都會爲奧古斯都的健康向神明宣誓，同時也舉
行競技比賽。不過，事實上，這個爲君王求健康的慶典常
常是每年都進行的。[114]　　這個解釋也與加拉太書 4:8 "但
從前不認識上帝的時候，你們是給那些本來不是上帝的神
明作奴隸" 的論述吻合。其中所説的 "本來不是上帝的神
明" 就是指君王，因爲君王本來不是神明，而是因爲人民
的膜拜或聖化祭典而成爲神明。[115]

　　接下來的問題是，這個 4:8-10 的君王崇拜日歷之解釋
如何與其上下文處境 4:1-11 相調和？　Justin 認爲這取決于
保羅的兩個片語，即 4:3 的 "在宇宙的星宿之下" 和 4:4 的
"在律法之下" 的意思。　他認爲 4:3 的 "宇宙的星宿" 指
的是 "外邦神明"，而這外邦神明就是 4:8 所説的那本來不
是神明，但在這世界中成爲了神明的羅馬君王。[116]　這與
4:1-2 和 4:4 的 "在律法之下" 的解釋吻合。　他認爲 4:1-2
的類比和 4:3-7 的應用都是以埃及傳統作爲背景。　4:1 的
"小孩" 是指在埃及的以色列民；"監護人" 和 "管家"
是指他們在埃及所受的奴役；4:3 的。在律法之下" 是指在
申命記 27-29 章所説的咒詛，即活在外邦君王和神明的管轄
之下。[117]　因此，加拉太信徒在未認識耶穌之前，一直都活
在 "律法之下"，而耶穌也生在 "律法之下"（4:4），爲

---

[113] 這是奧古斯都的墓碑；碑文以第一人稱記載其生平事迹和豐功偉績。
[114] Hardin, *Galatians*, 123-124.
[115] Hardin, *Galatians*, 124-127.
[116] Hardin, *Galatians*, 132-135.
[117] Hardin, *Galatians*, 136-137.

要把"律法之下"的人贖出來（4:5）。這位拯救者耶穌乃是上帝所差遣的"上帝的兒子"，而不是羅馬君王——上帝的兒子。[118] 接受"真正"的上帝的兒子所得到的福分遠遠勝過敬拜羅馬君王——上帝的兒子，因為前者自己也成為上帝的兒子和上帝的後嗣（4:6-7）。如此，保羅在 4:8-11 的論說："但從前不認識上帝的時候，你們是給那些本來不是上帝的神明作奴隸；現在你們既然認識上帝，更可說是被上帝所認識的，怎麼還要轉回那懦弱無用的星宿之學，情願再給它們作奴隸呢？你們竟又謹守日子、月份、節期、年份，我為你們擔心，惟恐我在你們身上是枉費工夫了"就一目了然了。換言之，保羅極力告誡加拉太信徒不要重回昔日參與"君王崇拜"的生活。

那麼，這個 4:1-11 的解釋是否又與加拉太全書的思想吻合呢？Justin 提出三處必須加以處理的經文：一、1:6-7：加拉太信徒離開上帝，隨從"別的福音"；二、3:1-5：加拉太信徒以聖靈開始，可是却要以"肉身終結"；三、5:2-6：加拉太信徒若受割禮就與基督隔絕了。[119] 對于

---

[118] Hardin, *Galatians*, 138.

[119] Hardin, *Galatians*, 138-139. Justin 要處理這三處經文的用意乃是要將"猶太化"的問題排除在加拉太教會所面對的危機之外，我們要問的是，難道加拉太教會目前所面對的危機不能同時包括"君王崇拜"和"猶太化"的問題嗎？Hardin, *Galatians*, 141 的回答是，"I disagree that there were two groups of agitators or set parties. Instead, Paul was urging the Galatians to stand firm between two alternatives-observing the cult and being circumcised. While in 4.10 Paul addressed the Galatian churches as a whole regarding their observance of the imperial cult, in Gal 4.21-5.6 Paul addresses a subset of the Galatians who were seriously

1:6-7，Justin 指出這裏的＂別的福音＂正是君王所帶來的
＂福音＂，包括君王的誕生、打了勝仗，還有君王所帶來
的＂羅馬升平＂、＂黃金時代＂等；而保羅在 1:4 將這
＂別的福音＂的世代形容爲＂罪惡的世代＂；對于 3:1-5，
Justin 認爲＂肉體＂是指外邦世界放縱情欲的行爲（5:13,
19-21）；對于 5:2-6，Justin 認爲這裏所説的＂割禮＂的問
題是保羅針對他們可能會在將來如此行預先提出的警告；[120]
而這個問題不是＂猶太化＂的神學問題，而是爲要得到猶
太群體的認同的社會問題。[121] 簡言之，加拉太教會所面對
的危機就是＂君王崇拜＂的問題。

最後，Justin 進一步指出，從當時君王崇拜的普及性來
看，加拉太群體參與君王崇拜，遵守＂君王崇拜的日歷＂
是不難理解的；因爲當全國上下，左右鄰捨、住在同屋檐
下的家人都參與君王崇拜的時候，拒絕參與君王崇拜的加
拉太教會信徒所面對的社會壓力是可想而知的。不過，
Justin 指出，他們還沒有走到行割禮來得到猶太群體認同的
地步。

---

considering circumcision." 不過，Hardin 沒有處理或解釋 2:11-14 的安
提阿事件的問題，難道這不是加拉太教會所正面對的＂猶太化/律法
之工＂的問題嗎？
[120] Hardin, *Galatians*, 142.
[121] Hardin, *Galatians*, 142-143.

反思：至今，君王崇拜作爲新約研究的背景以及新約作者如何回應羅馬帝國的君王崇拜或其所傳遞的帝國主義爲新約研究提供了許多新亮光。 不過，我們要留意 John M.G. Barclay 的提醒，不要 "過分" 解讀新約作者的原意，要謹慎區分什麼是 "肯定/幾乎肯定"、"非常可能"、"可能"、"一點可能"、"想象的"、"不可能"。[122] 在發現新約文本出現與君王崇拜相同或相似的用語或概念時，我們要常常自我發問，這是否是新約作者反帝國主義的信息，抑或作者使用當時讀者所熟悉的帝國語言來傳達上帝兒子的福音？ [123]

結論：

　　當論及羅馬帝國的君王崇拜時，或許有人會誤以爲那是指公開宣稱羅馬君王爲獨一的神明，并且向他叩頭跪拜。若是如此，羅馬帝國的君王崇拜不衹無法深入民間，反而會遭受人民強烈的反擊。 然而，事實是，羅馬帝國的君王崇拜滲透人民生活的每一個層面。這不衹是因爲君王崇拜有各種不同的表達形式，更是因爲羅馬帝國知道如何按照民意來推行君王崇拜。在深受希臘文化影響的西羅馬帝國，君王崇拜的形式包括向羅馬君王獻上神明般的敬仰和膜拜、爲他建造廟宇和祭壇、設立祭司制度和膜拜儀式、向他祈

---

[122] 參 John M.G. Barclay, "Mirror-Reading a Polemical Letter: Galatians as a Test Case," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 31 (1987): 73-93.

[123] Lull, "Review," 253. 這也是 Horrell, "Introduction," 254-255 的提醒。

禱和獻祭、賦予他各種與宗教神明有關的稱號；在相當禁忌視在世君王為神明的東羅馬帝國，君王崇拜的形式則是人民 "代表" 君王獻祭、 "為" 君王禱告，也祇封已故君王為神明等。這是因為對羅馬帝國來說，君王崇拜的目的不在于羅馬君王的神明地位和身份，而是傳遞帝國主義，即將羅馬帝國的最高政治和宗教權力集合在君王一人身上，來達到全民絕對的效忠和團結。 因此，羅馬政府更是在全國各地進行各種祭典，包括競技比賽、慶典和節期等，來影響和改變人民的思想和行動，讓他們願意降服在羅馬帝國的政權之下。 再者，人民生活中常常接觸的碑文、錢幣和日歷等也一直在提醒人民，要遵循羅馬帝國的秩序，要活在其強權之下。

近年來，羅馬帝國的君王崇拜為新約研究提供了許多亮光，也大大豐富了我們對新約的理解；遺憾的是，由于篇幅有限，我們祇能提供一個加拉太書的例子。最後，我們盼望有其他本地研究生可以延伸此文章繼續進行兩個研究：第一、君王崇拜和新約解讀，即集合所有近代有關這方面的研究于一篇文章，并加以敘述和評估；第二、君王崇拜和猶太人及基督徒的關系，即比較系統性地從君王崇拜的歷史發展來整理出君王崇拜與猶太人和基督徒的關系。

Mission Statement of Malaysian Association of Theological Schools

- Promote cooperation among theological institutions in Malaysia;

- Enhance the spiritual and academic standards of the institutions concerned.

- Strengthen the bond of relationship within the theological fraternity for the benefit of the Christian movement in the country and beyond.

Member Institutions

MALAYSIAN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
MALAYSIAN BIBLE SEMINARI
BIBLE COLLEGE OF MALAYSIA
SEMINARI THEOLOJI MALAYSIA
SABAH THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
MAKTAB TEOLOGI SABAH
MALAYSIA EVANGELICAL COLLEGE
METHODIST THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL

ALPHA OMEGA INTERNATIONAL COLLEGE
ASIA GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY - MST