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Honouring the Past, Looking to the Future: Introduction

Gale A. Yee and John Y. H. Yieh

During the warm sunny days of 18-20 August 2014, the fourth International Congress of Ethnic Chinese Biblical Scholars was held ten years after the first in 2004. The venue was the same: the Divinity School of Chung Chi College, one of the founding institutions of the Chinese University of Hong Kong. Ninety-six scholars attended, twenty-three more than in 2004. Those who attended the first Congress were struck by some noticeable differences from the 2004 Congress. Besides the campus Yali Guest House and divinity student housing, attendees also had the choice to stay in the 5-star Hyatt Regency Hotel in Shatin, constructed in 2009 right next to the University MTR station. Even more impressive was the new Chapel of the Divinity School, atop the President Chi-tung Yung Memorial Building, which was completed in November 2011. Seating 350 people, this beautiful Chapel became the venue for the plenary lectures and many of the papers. Although the fifty lectures and papers were conducted in the two official languages of English and Putonghua, the air was alive with many more tongues, such as Cantonese, Taiwanese, Hakka, Indonesian, Filipino, Italian, and French, hailing from twelve different countries.
The Congress

The Congress sought (1) to recognize and encourage biblical scholarship among ethnic Chinese biblical scholars, (2) to create a lively network of ethnic Chinese scholars from Asia and in the Diaspora, (3) to support one another in our endeavors, and (4) to identify and nurture the next generation of ethnic Chinese biblical scholars. Ethnic Chinese biblical scholars comprise a surprisingly large segment of theological scholars in Asia and among the Asian diaspora. They often labor across many cultures and national identities because of their sociopolitical location as minorities. They exist typically as a religious minority (such as in Singapore, Taiwan, Hong Kong, China), or as an ethnic minority (in the Philippines, North America, and Europe), or as both (in Indonesia and Malaysia). Because ethnic Chinese biblical scholars occupy the margins of their society, they are able to interrelate with the majority culture as well as mainstream biblical scholarship from a vantage point that can be broadly called ‘postcolonial’.

It is in this connection that biblical scholarship is not divorced from but is in fact integral to all theological disciplines, including cultural criticism. It is no accident that courses on the Bible or biblical literature are among the most popular offered in Christian studies in institutions of higher learning in China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan. One need not mention theological schools in which biblical studies remain the most prominent discipline.

The six members of the 2014 planning committee were very intentional in ensuring a good gender balance for the Congress. Ethnic Chinese female biblical scholars were aggressively sought out to attend and deliver papers. In contrast to the overwhelming
majority of males at the 2004 Congress, thirty-eight of the ninety-six participants were female. Moreover, in keeping with the mission to identify and nurture the next generation of ethnic Chinese biblical scholars, many of the participants (around twenty-seven) were recent PhD recipients. In addition to the ninety-six biblical scholars, there were upwards of forty observers over the three days: local seminary and divinity students, as well as pastors and ministers. These observers were very engaged and some even ventured questions during the Question & Answer period.

Besides gender diversity, the planning committee purposely desired a diversity of theological and ideological perspectives. They pursued financial and other support from the Association for Theological Education in South East Asia (ATESEA), as well as the schools of the Asia Theological Association (ATA). The Congress had many more people from ATA schools attending in 2014 than in 2004. Several of these schools also sponsored the Congress generously. The variety of theological and ideological perspectives was important because theological schools in Asia are often sharply divided along theological lines. The only disappointment was the very few Catholic biblical scholars attending, but this was not for lack of effort on the part of the planning committee.

To celebrate the range of diversity, one of the highlights of this Congress was a banquet honouring ten senior ethnic Chinese biblical scholars as qianbei, ‘senior scholar’. These included Dr. Choong Chee Pang (鍾志邦), former principal of the Trinity Theological College in Singapore; Dr. Wilson Chow Wing Kin (周永健), former president of the China Graduate School of Theology; Dr. Samuel Chu Wing Wah (褚永華), former president
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of the Hong Kong Seminary: Professor Liang Gong (梁一), Professor and Director of the Institute of Biblical Literature of Henan University: Professor Lo Lung-Kwong (盧龍光), former director of Chung Chi College Divinity School; Dr. Joseph Shao (邵晨光), former president of the Biblical Seminary of the Philippines; Dr. Amanda Shao Tan (陳有純), Vice-President for Academic Affairs at Asian Theological Seminary; Dr. Daud H. Soesilo, Global Translation Adviser for the United Bible Society; Dr. Gale A. Yee (余蓮秀), Nancy W. King Professor at Episcopal Divinity School; and Dr. Archie Chi-chung Lee (李誠昌), former professor at the Chinese University of Hong Kong. We are honouring to have the essays of three of these qianbei in this volume (Liang, Lo, and Yee).

The Volume

The essays in this Congress volume are divided into three parts: those dealing with the Old Testament/Hebrew Bible, the New Testament, and Comparative Studies, all reflecting a diversity of methodological approaches. Written by a mix of established ethnic Chinese biblical scholars, as well as those who have recently entered the field, they especially highlight the title of this volume, Honouring the Past, Looking to the Future. We editors are particularly proud of the fact that, in contrast to many essay collections on the Bible, the majority of the contributors in this volume are female, fourteen vis-à-vis eleven male. This gender distribution bodes well for the future of biblical studies in Asia, which has been predominantly male.

As the first plenary speaker of the Congress, Gale A. Yee (余蓮秀)’s essay, ‘The Elijah and Elisha Narratives: An Economic
Investigation,’ is an analysis of the Elijah and Elisha narratives in 1 and 2 Kings, arguing that they reflected the ninth-century socioeconomic world of the Omride dynasty of the northern kingdom of Israel. This dynasty operated under a palatine economic regime, which extracted both labor and economic goods from the village communes to support the administrative, military, and building projects, as well as the luxurious lifestyle, of a small ruling class. The extractive economy of the Omrides often conflicted and clashed with the allocative economy of the rural villages, with the often excessive withdrawal of goods, both crops and flocks, and labor. The prosperity of the regime also gave rise to prophetic resistance against ruling class extraction. Through a close examination of the biblical narratives about the prophets and of extrabiblical sources, one can observe the five institutional components of Israel’s sacred economy—subsistence survival, kinship-household, patronage, (e)states, and tribute exchange—at work in relations of dominance and subordination with each other.

In ‘An Analysis of the Structure and Theological Message of the Creation Story in Genesis 2,’ WONG Fook Kong (黄福光) takes on Simone de Beauvoir’s depiction of woman in the biblical text as ‘inessential’ through a careful linguistic analysis of Genesis 2. Wong reviews several biblical scholars, especially the classic article by Phyllis Trible to discern a less patriarchal interpretation of Genesis 2. He credits Trible for providing a way of reading the text that takes what it says seriously and, at the same time, is not oppressive to the minority or powerless. Wong often correlates the modern interpreters with similar remarks of ancient Christian authors to argue that a less oppressive interpretation was possible even earlier than our own time. The
creation of the man first does not imply superiority over the women. Instead, the creation stories of the two humans form an inclusio for the other creations, with the creation of the woman presented as the climax of the whole creation account and the formation of the first family.

In ‘Recent Developments on the Issue of the Composition of the Pentateuch in German-Speaking Biblical Scholarship: Taking the ‘Münsteraner Pentateuchmodell’ and the Model of Composition by Jan C. Gertz as Examples’ (近年德語聖經學五經形成之研究：以‘門斯特五經模式’和Jan C. Gertz的五經模式為例), TSAN Tsong-Sheng (韓宗盛) surveys scholarly challenges to the Documentary Hypothesis (J and E cannot be clearly delineated) and uses the models proposed by Werner H. Schmidt (three editorial stages: JE, JED, JEDP) and by Erhard Blum (Fragmentenhypotheses) to illustrate the different approaches that have been taken to address the issue since the 1980s. He then compares the so-called ‘Münsteraner Pentateuchmodell’ of Erich Zenger and Christian Frevel (2012, often used as a Catholic textbook) and the model of Jan C. Gertz (2010, used as a Protestant textbook) respectively to highlight the characteristics of each model. Both are much more complicated than the earlier models and both discuss the formation of the Pentateuch in the context of the national crises and the history of Jerusalem as narrated in the books of Joshua and Kings.

Both are based on, she argues, the theo-social ethics that honours YHWH, the one and only God who made a covenant with the people of Israel and granted them land and law. Both laws are concerned ultimately about the glory of God, and thus, everyone is entitled to human rights and no one, regardless of racial-ethnic background, should be discriminated against. The law to extinguish all enemies is also based on the conviction that God alone should be worshipped. Those who defy God in the land God has given to the covenanted people have violated the law and should be eliminated.

Although in dialogue with traditional historical-critical scholarship, Nancy Nam Hoon TAN (陳南芬) offers a postmodern reading of 1 Kings 3:16-28, the famous story of the two prostitutes before King Solomon, through the eyes of Hong Kong sex workers who are also mothers themselves. Tan was a volunteer at an NGO that worked with sex workers in Hong Kong. For this essay, she interviewed five sex worker/mothers for their reactions to 1 Kings 3:16-28. Because their context is one of suspicion, humiliation, and abuse by clients, police, neighbors and community, they often have different negative experiences in courts of law and their decisions. These factors enter into their readings of the story. Their thought-provoking interpretations as both sex workers and mothers compel us to re-examine our assumptions concerning the claims of Solomon’s wisdom in the light of his violence and folly in his dealings with women.

In ‘City Unshakable: A Tradition-Historical Reassessment of Zion’s Inviolability,’ Michael J. CHAN seeks to discover how the tradition of Jerusalem’s inviolability—the state of being secure from destruction, violence, and desecration—developed historically. Some scholars thought it was based on the Zion
guiding values that I have inherited from my upbringing that join me in dialogue with the text. If I ignore them in deference to methodology, I will lose authenticity even as I gain exegetical knowledge, which defeats the whole purpose of engaging scripture as a means of understanding God, self and the Christian life. This is a net negative that I am unwilling to risk, let alone model for my students.

I need to beware of shortchanging my students as a result of methodological linearity. There is no good reason why the reader has to understand first everything about what the author may have meant or intended before he or she can enter into the dialogue. Engaging the biblical text is inherently messy because life, culture, human hope and depravity are messy. Questions may be left hanging as ambiguity opens the door for pondering the mysteries of God. One can always read up on the latest development in biblical studies, but pastoral sensitivity and discipleship within the life of the mind are learned through modeling and practice. It is not the level of sophistication and the quantity of scholarly material that will benefit my students in the long run, but whether they have a hospitable place to come to the interpretive table as who they are in every way and at the precise timing. I want them to voice their struggle with the text without fear of being labeled a heretic. I want them not to feel obligated to defend Jesus or the Bible. I want to shape their attitude toward the text more so than control their knowledge of the text. I am committed to providing this kind of spiritual, emotional, intellectual and practical space for my students, and I invite you to consider making room for it, even in the most academic of environments.
Chapter 13

誰釘死了耶穌？
Who Crucified Jesus?

王學晟 WANG Xuesheng Nathanael

耶穌之死一直引起很多關注。從信仰的角度來說，耶穌為人類的罪而死，所以沒有人奪他命去，是他自己捨的（約10:17-18）。學術界對此一直有很多討論。其中一個爭論很久的問題是誰應該對耶穌之死負責？在這個問題上不外乎三種意見，猶太人的責任；羅馬人應該負責；猶太人聯合羅馬人殺害了耶穌。

究竟誰應該負責？學術界的反思是我們的關注之一，我們在總結前人研究的基礎上，對這個問題做一個詳細的考察。耶穌被捉拿、審訊、受難、埋葬在四部正典福音書中都有記載，我們基本上按照這個順序考察究竟耶穌之死是怎樣的一個過程。我們考察的重點是耶穌運動與耶穌之死之間的內在聯繫，具體到本文的討論，我們是要回答兩個問題，第一，究竟是誰殺了耶穌？第二，他們為什麼要殺死耶穌？

我們所運用的材料主要還是共觀福音。從總體上說，
約翰福音的歷史性不如共觀福音，但是就耶穌之死這個課題來說，約翰福音的記載還是有一定的參考價值的，在稍後的具體經文分析中，我們可以看出這一點。一如既往的，在運用福音書相關材料的時候，我們會鑑別其真確性（authenticity）。除了福音書之外，同時代的歷史文獻，尤其是約瑟夫的著作也是我們參考的重要依據。

我們對耶穌之死的探討從耶穌被逮捕、受審訊、被釘死這幾個環節來考察。

1. 耶穌被逮捕

耶穌被捉拿應該發生在晚上，因為在馬可福音中，耶穌對彼得說「就在今天夜裡， 吉（兩遍）以先，你要三次不認我（可14:30）」，而在約翰福音中差役拿著「燈籠火把」（約18:3），反映是晚上的情景。為什麼在晚上行動？有一個可能的原因是耶穌後面有一大群門徒，而且還有一幫人擁護他。除此之外，逾越節將近也是個值得考慮的因素，猶太宗教當局怕民間生亂（可14:2；太26:5）。

誰去捉拿耶穌？今天捉拿嫌疑犯當然是警察的工作，在第一世紀的巴勒斯坦地區，以耶路撒冷為中心的聖殿地區的所表現的是一個政治－經濟－宗教一體的社會結構，而猶太地（Judaean）從公元6年之後就是羅馬的一個省，在羅馬直接統治、控制之下。作為一個新的省份，其治安、司法的具體情況我們知之甚少。
根據共觀福音的經文記載，捉拿耶穌的那幫人是「群眾」（οχλοσ），中文和合本中譯作「許多人」。共觀福音的經文，基於「四源假說」的考量，我們主要參考馬可福音。1 對於耶穌被逮捕的過程，我們不知道馬可的資料來源。駱邁耶（E. Lohmeyer）認為用刀砍大祭司僕人耳朵的那個人（根據約翰福音是彼得）以及大祭司僕人都是現場的目擊證人。但是甘德里（Robert H. Gundry）認為此說不太令人信服，因為此段敘述既不是站在大祭司僕人一邊，也不是站在耶穌一邊，似乎是很超越的立場。2 駱邁耶未必完全正確，但是甘德里的觀點也是值得討論的。首先，無論是大祭司的僕人還是耶穌的門徒，以客觀中立的立場敘述不是沒有可能的。另一方面，雖然在耶穌被捕的時候，門徒逃走了（可14:50），但是，在耶穌被捕之初，門徒都還在那裡，他們看到了事件的一部分。這些作為門徒的回憶，流傳下來是一點不奇怪的。其他可能的材料來源包括亞利馬太的約瑟、尼哥德慕，甚至保羅，當然也不排除復活的耶穌自己可能提供相關材料。3

這些「群眾」到底是誰？有論者認為既然是「群眾」

---
就不大可能是維護聖殿秩序的警察力量，而從後文特別提到的「大祭司的僕人」（可14:47）來看，這些「群衆」有可能是由猶太公會祭司階層那幫人的私人僕人組成的一幫人。④

操持聖殿事務、維持聖殿秩序的警衛力量，根據猶太人的固有傳統是利未人，這些人有沒有參與逮捕耶穌的行動呢？學界對此沒有一個統一的看法。根據馬可，這些人從祭司長和文士並長老那裡來，而這三部分人構成了猶太公會的主體。⑤在馬可福音中，也正是這三部分人責問耶穌憑什麼權柄採取聖殿行動（可11:27-29）。⑥也就是說，這些人有逮捕耶穌的動機。

還有一點我們注意到的，就是這些「群衆」和差役所帶武器有些特別。共觀福音所提到的都是大刀和木棒（可14:43，48//）。這些人的武器裝備是比較奇怪的，給人的感覺就是一夥暴民、一夥強盜，或許就是大祭司等人雇請來的烏合之衆。⑦馬可的這段記載極具反諷意味，耶穌對他們的抗議是：「你們這樣拿我如同拿強盜嗎（可14:48）？」—這幫人的外貌和行 都像強盜，卻反過來提

---


拿耶穌如同捉拿強盜。從裝備上看，這些人更像是大祭司等人雇請來的、派來的，而不像羅馬軍隊，羅馬軍隊不太可能寒酸到斬木為兵的地步。

不僅是裝備，從服裝、口音上也能認得出來者是誰。那時門徒還沒有逃走，而且，其中一個人（可能是彼得）抽出刀來將大祭司僕人（馬勒古）砍了一刀，削掉他的右耳（可14:47，約18:10）。

再者，在可14:48，耶穌抗議他自己被抓捕的方式。學者一般認為耶穌講亞蘭語，如果耶穌確實有抗議的話，他用的很有可能是亞蘭語，而不大可能是用拉丁文對羅馬兵丁說話。9 耶穌抗議說：「我天天（καθ’ ἡμέραν）在殿裡教導人，跟你們在一起，你們卻沒有捉拿我」。καθ’ ἡμέραν可譯「白天」，這正好與「白天在殿裡教訓人，夜晚去橄欖山」（路21:37）相吻合。10 耶穌說在殿中教訓人，「和你們在一起」，「你們」當然是指猶太人，而不可能是羅馬兵丁。猶太當局不在白天而要在夜晚行動，可能是怕群眾。

根據馬可的記載，捉拿耶穌的背後指使者是祭司長、文士和長老。實際上，很有可能是這些人的權威和經濟利

---
