

▼
聖經研究叢書

提摩太後書註釋

A Commentary on 2 Timothy

作者

馮蔭坤 Ronald Y. K. Fung

責任編輯

沈靜筠

裝幀設計

奇文雲海·設計顧問

■
出版 / 發行

基道出版社

香港沙田火炭坳背灣街 26 號富騰工業中心 10 樓 1011 室

LOGOS PUBLISHERS

Unit 1011, 10/F, Fo Tan Ind. Centre, 26 Au Pui Wan St., Shatin, Hong Kong

電話：(852) 2687-0331 傳真：(852) 2687-0281

網址：<https://www.logos.com.hk>

●
承印

陽光(彩美)印刷有限公司

●
版權所有 • 請勿翻印

© 2021 基道文字事工有限公司

7/2021 初版

Cat. No. LP1108

ISBN: 978-962-457-619-1

© 2021 by Logos Ministries Limited

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Printed in Hong Kong

經文取自《和合本 2010》(《和合本修訂版聖經》)

Copyright © 2016, 2010 Hong Kong Bible Society

Licensed by Hong Kong Bible Society



刷次 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
年份 2030 2029 2028 2027 2026 2025 2024 2023 2022 2021

©2021 by Logos Ministries Limited
All Rights Reserved

自序

二〇一七年五月下旬《提多書註釋》付梓後，隨即按照兩年前所定下的路線開始向下一個目標進發：離開提多書（三章，46 節），越過成書日期先於後書的提摩太前書（六章，113 節），進到只有四章（83 節）的提摩太後書。¹ 這個以書卷的長度為決定性因素的選擇，使筆者可以（暫時？永久？）避免數十年之後「重訪」一段仍然極具爭議性的經文（提前二 11~15）！² 筆者的年紀使這個選擇顯得越發合適，因為：設若計劃寫作的這本註釋書成為筆者的最後一本，那麼我離世的時期已經近了（提後四 6，思高）、該跑的全程，我已經跑完（四 7，現修）這些名句，也可以被引用³ 來為筆者的一生（或只是寫作生涯）劃上句號。

沿襲《提多書註釋》的路線，本註釋將提摩太後書與前書及提多書分開來獨立地研究。⁴ 「導論」部分比起提多書的導論篇幅較（更）小，⁵ 主要

-
- 1 參《多》ix 首段。有學者認為，提摩太後書 ‘is often omitted or neglected in studies on the Pauline corpus, and overlooked in studies on the Pastoral Epistles because it is overshadowed by 1 Timothy and Titus’ (Westfall, ‘Dilemma’ 213-14)。若所言屬實，本註釋便是「逆流」之作！不過，單是「簡寫表（之四）」（之五）」，以及「參考書目」有關提摩太後書之項目的數量，足以表示「提摩太後書在教牧書信的研究中被忽略」最多也只是相對的講法。
 - 2 參 (i) 馮蔭坤：〈保羅與婦女事奉〉，載余達心、馮蔭坤合編：《事奉的人生》（滕近輝院長六十壽辰論文集；香港：宣道出版社，1982）200-262（尤其是 222-229 [254-259]）；(ii) Fung, ‘Ministry’ [1987], esp. 197-206, 335-340 (notes).* (*此部分的中譯見〈保羅與婦女事奉的再思〉，中國神學研究院期刊 2 [1987 年 1 月] 98-146 [115-123、139-144]，重載於《恩賜》182-247 [220-239]。)(ii) 修改了 (i) 的觀點。「重訪 (revisit)」會否導致再一次改變立場呢？更根本的問題是，還有心力追尋過去三十多年這課題的學術研究，再確定自己的立場是否需要修改嗎？
 - 3 即是借用，並無其他意涵。邢福增（《我城》155）認為，「如果保羅的墳墓上刻有墓誌銘的話，很大可能就是這段經文 [提後四 6~8]。」有趣的是，根據 Maria Cristina Valsecchi 在《國家地理雜誌》(2006.12.31) 的報導，在羅馬出土的保羅的墳墓，墓碑上刻著的是拉丁文的「殉道者使徒保羅」：‘The sarcophagus [石棺] was buried beneath the main altar [of the basilica], under a marble tombstone bearing the Latin words “Paulo Apostolo Mart.,” meaning “Apostle Paul, Martyr.”’ <https://nationalgeographic.com/science/2006/12/news-st-paul-tomb-found-rome/>.
 - 4 參《多》ix-x. Cf. Karakolis, ‘Authority’ 63 n.2: ‘I will . . . limit myself as a rule to the examination of 2 Tim as an individual literary work and not as a part of the collection of the Pastoral letters.’
 - 5 參《多》xi-xii 註 8。

探討的題目是提摩太後書的文學類型、結構與大綱，及寫作原因和目的。⁶ 一如既往，本註釋的重點仍然在於根據原文對經文作出的詳細闡釋。⁷ 寫作的後段是在新型冠狀病毒肆虐全球（現仍遠未受控）的疫情下——更是在「生於斯長於斯的香港早已快速地變成愈來愈陌生的城市」之逆境中——進行的。在這雙重的陰霾下本註釋得以完成，對筆者而言就更應歸因於上帝的保守、扶持和幫助。借用詩人的話（詩六十八 19）：天天背負我們重擔的主，就是拯救我們的上帝，是應當稱頌的！此外，必須繼續向他們衷心致謝的，是與筆者同行已五十餘載的內子，以及「收管」⁸ 了這名退休長者已十七載的所屬神學院。⁹

提摩太後書的信息，主要部分是在於保羅對其年輕同工的三重勸勉或囑咐：要忠於基督和基督的福音；要忠於保羅的言教和身教；要忠於自己所領受的職事¹⁰——這信息對今日的教牧同工仍然適切。與此同時，信末的問安（願恩惠與你們同在〔四 22b〕）似乎暗示，保羅有意讓提摩太與會眾分享此信；如此，教會眾信徒就是此信「間接的收信人／聽眾」。¹¹ 既是這樣（或就算不是這樣），所有的基督徒（包括今天的基督徒讀者）都（仍）可以透過聆聽保羅對其親愛的兒子（一 2）及同工的教導與分享，而學習（參二 7）如何在自己的處境中和各別的崗位上，「忠於福音」（一 6~18），「忍受苦難」（二 1~13），對抗謬誤、守護真理、追求敬虔（二 14~三 9），¹²「持守所確信的」（三 14~17），完成人生使命、熱切盼望他再來（四 5~8〔8a 節，新普〕）。

馮蔭坤 謹誌

香港中文大學崇基學院神學院

二〇二〇年七月八日

6 見導論第參、肆、伍三節（下面 6-24）。

7 參《多》xii（全頁）。

8 請理解為正面意義的「收留、容納」，而非負面的「強制收留、收容審查、進行教育」之意！

9 參《多》xiii 首段。

10 詳見導論第五節，除了末段（下面 23-24）。

11 見導論第貳節（下面 4-5）。

12 分別見：二 15、18、25，三 7、8（真理）；三 5（敬虔），對比二 16（不敬虔）。

導論 (壹) : 提摩太後書的作者

提摩太後書是作基督耶穌使徒的保羅 (一 1a) 寫……給我親愛的兒子提摩太 (2a 節) 的，就如教牧書信的另兩卷是作基督耶穌使徒的保羅 / 上帝的僕人、耶穌基督的使徒保羅 (提前一 1a / 多一 1a) 寫……給那因信主作我真兒子的提摩太 / 寫……給在共同的信仰上作我真兒子的提多 (提前一 2a / 多一 4a) 的。¹ 筆者接受這傳統的看法；² 關於「教牧書信的作者」此問題的討論，請參拙著《提多書註釋》3-22。³

-
- 1 三句話的基本結構都是「寫信人致收信人」，在原文只是兩個名字 (分別為主格及間接受格) : Παῦλος . . . Τιμοθέω/Τίτῳ, 'Paul . . . to Timothy/Titus'.
 - 2 支持作者是保羅的還包括 Bray 7-19, 48-51 (cf. 66: 'it is the position of this commentary that a theological approach to the questions involved can only help to further the rehabilitation of the Pastoral Epistles as an integral part of the authentic Pauline corpus'); Swinson 21-44; Yarbrough 67-90; Beck, 'Features' 165; Downs, 'Faith(fulness)' 146; DeSilva, *INT 736a* (德席爾瓦, 《新約》827) 。 (1) 另一方面, 亦有認為教牧書信是託名之作: 'The author of the Pastorals is a weaver of tales' (Maier, *Paul* 146); 這些書信寫於羅馬皇帝他雅努 (Trajan, 98-117 年在位) 和哈德良 (Hadrian, 117-138 年在位) 統治年間 (143; 151 只提「哈德良」期間)。
 - 3 值得再次指出, 舉證的責任是在反對的一方 (見《多》17 連註 35、36) 。 'To put it in judicial language, the Epistles are innocent until proved guilty!' (Bray 11). (1) Van Nes 224 稱他新近的專題研究 (2018) 為 'nothing but a modest critique of the linguistic arguments used by scholars to support a particular theory of authorship for the PE.' 他的結論是: 'linguistic variation in the *Corpus Paulinum* need not necessarily be explained by author variation. . . there appear to be many factors other than author variation that affect the use of language. These factors suggest that in the future the PE's authorship may be better debated in terms of history and theology rather than language.' Cf. idem, 'Pastoral Epistles' 156.

導論 (貳)：提摩太後書的受者

保羅稱收信人為我親愛的兒子提摩太（一 2a）；關於這位收信人，請參一章 2a 節註釋（下面 39-45）。與此同時，本書以雙重的祝福結束：除了願主與你的靈同在！（四 22a），還有願恩惠與你們同在！（22b 節）。複數的你們（全書僅此一次）可能只是指提摩太要將保羅的問候轉達給他們的那些人（四 19）。¹ 不過，這祝福語在保羅書信出現的另三次（西 18；提前六 21；² 多三 15³）都包括教會整體；由此看來，複數的你們可能暗示，保羅有意讓提摩太與會眾分享此信，⁴ 複數的你們是指那些

-
- 1 See, e.g., Mounce 601: 你們可能是指提摩太在以弗所的 ‘associates . . . such as Priscilla, Aquila, and the household of Onesiphorus (v 19)’; similarly Gundry 859b; Ellicott 165b: ‘those with him [sc. Timothy]’; Carson—Moo—Morris, *INT* 379; 卡森、穆爾：《導論》562。Cf. Mounce 522: ‘2 Timothy is a personal letter; Paul does not appear to expect the church to read it as he did 1 Timothy’; Witherington 307: ‘It is not at all clear that 2 Timothy was initially meant to be read aloud to a congregation.’ (1) Lock 81-82 認為，最後一句祝福語（四 22b）‘may possibly have been added when the Epistle was made canonical’；除了此句，‘the whole is strictly personal . . . There is scarcely any section* which could have been intended to be read publicly when the Church met.’ (*—8~12，二 1~13，四 6~8 也不例外嗎？)(2) Miller 122-23 甚至認為，原本分屬於兩封不同書信的問安語 ‘appear to have been joined together here’；如果 ‘two originally separate letters are imbedded within II Timothy’，這雙重祝福（一個給你，一個給你們）的現象就不足為怪了。
 - 2 這兩次原文與提後四 22b 相同：ἡ χάρις μεθ’ ὑμῶν。
 - 3 原文為 ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν，即是有眾人一字。參《多》474（留意註 1 及所屬正文）、24-25。
 - 4 Thus Marshall, ‘Preaching’ 114: 教牧書信每一卷的信末祝福都是用複數的你們，這表示 ‘they were to be read to and shared with the congregations supervised by Timothy and Titus’; Harding, ‘Apocalypticism’ 268 n.47: ‘The three Pastoral Epistles . . . have full public intent as indicated by the plural final greetings in each’; idem, ‘Pastoral Epistles’ 332; Westfall, ‘Dilemma’ 228: ‘in the ancient world, private letters were routinely shared with the family and community as current breaking news of interest. It is inadvisable in classification to confuse personal letters with private confidential letters (i.e. letters that are specifically not meant to be read by others).’ Cf. Gloer 323: ‘Paul expected the letter to be read to the Ephesian church that Timothy served’; Gloer—Stepp 280; Fee, ‘Theology’ 312: ‘As with all the other Pauline letters . . . this letter was expected to be read publicly in the church(es)’. Arichea—Hatton 258-59 認為，‘The plural personal pronoun shows that, although the letter is addressed to Timothy, it is intended for the whole church’; cf. Capes—Reeves—Richards, ‘Pastoral Paul’ 333: ‘Like his letter to Philemon, Paul wrote a personal letter intended for a corporate setting’; Keegan I 53 (Keegan II 84), Keegan III 577, Keegan IV 1797: ‘these stylized closing words . . . indicate that this highly personal letter . . . is intended to be read by

將會聽到這封信在教會中宣讀出來的信徒。⁵ 如此，提摩太是這封信的收信人，教會眾信徒則是此信「間接的收信人／聽眾」。⁶



a larger community.’ See also **Eaton 13** (cf. 42): ‘2 Timothy is not sent to Timothy alone; it is a public letter. The word “you” . . . is plural!’—‘indicating that the entire letter, while addressed to Timothy, is to be read in public’ (**Köstenberger 600b**); 侯嘉文 138: 「雖然收信人是提摩太，但實際上是寫給整個教會，特別是教會的領袖的。」

- 5 Towner III 655-56 (唐 952)。Cf. Montague 209: ‘Paul thinks of all those who may hear this letter publicly read’; Ackerman 271: ‘[they] would listen in on the conversation as the letter was publicly read.’ (1) Richards 136 的看法較此更進一步，他認為：‘Though the Letter to the Beloved Timothy [1:2a] seems to read as a *Private Deliberative Letter*, it is, in fact, like the Socratic Epistles or the Letters of Seneca to Lucilius, a *Literary Deliberative Letter*. Its private conversation was meant not only to be overheard, but to be published and circulated.’
- 6 C. S. Smith 174/359: ‘the secondary recipients/audience of the letter’. Cf. Harding I 100: ‘Although the PE are addressed to individuals, the communities of Ephesus and Crete are addressed indirectly through their respective apostolic delegates’. (1) Marshall 684 認為有這樣的可能：‘the letter is intended for church leaders who have received their commission from Timothy, i.e. the faithful men of 2.2. It is for their benefit that the letter is handed on.’

導論 (叁) : 這封信的文學類型

(甲)有釋經者認為，保羅寫這封信時，正在面對自己的死亡(四 6~8)，「因此，這封信便帶有最後囑咐的性質。」¹ 按歐大衛的分析，書信的本體(二 1~四 8)取了遺訓的格式，² 與保羅對以弗所教會長老的告別演說(徒二十 17~35)有相似之處；³ 保羅意識到自己的死亡已經臨近(四 1~8)，這事實尤其反映了書信本體的遺訓性質。⁴ 不少學者直接認為提摩太後書屬於「遺訓」文學類型⁵ 或乾脆稱之為保羅的遺

-
- 1 卡森、穆爾：〈教牧書信〉560。Cf. Carson—Moo—Morris, *INT* 377: 'it has the character of a testamentary charge.' See also Oropeza, 'Influence' 261 n.6: '2 Timothy functions . . . as a type of final testament for Paul'; Quinn, 'Captivity' 294: '[it] has the characteristics of a last will and testament'; Robinson, *Redating* 78: 'II Timothy . . . reads if anything does like a last will and testament.'
 - 2 Cf. Quinn, 'Parenesis' 499: 'the apostle's last will and testament . . . occupies most of Second Timothy (2,1—4,8).' Hanson III 118 則稱三 10~四 8 為 'Paul's last will and testament'.
 - 3 Cf. Borchert, *Worship* 165: 'This epistle is a wonderful example of a farewell discourse'; Oropeza, 'Influence' 301, where he speaks of 'the letter's intention as a type of farewell discourse.'
 - 4 Aune, 'Pastoral Letters' 564. Cf. Blasi, 'Pastoral Epistles' 83: '[2 Tim.] is a testamentary statement, similar to Acts 20:17-38'; Hinson 278: '2 Timothy is his last will and testament (cf. 4:6-8).'
 - 5 Huizenga II 97: 'This letter falls into the category of "testamentary" literature . . . which is found in both ancient and modern cultures'; Puskas—Reasoner, *Letters of Paul* 239: 'Second Timothy has all the characteristics of this popular genre'. Cf. Kümmel, *INT* 384: 'the letter has the form of a literary testament'; Krause, 'Pastoral Epistles' 21: '2 Timothy ha[s] a testamentary form of Paul's last words.' (1) Klauck—Bailey (*Ancient Letters* 327) 認為，冒名的作者在提後故意仿效此類型('conscious imitation of the testamentary genre')。(2) Collins 183 則認為，'Most of the features of the testamentary genre are found in 2 Timothy. . . . Hellenistic writers considered letters to be a form of speech. . . . This consideration allows one to identify 2 Timothy as a testamentary epistle, albeit not the classic testamentary letter, which is really a last will and testament.'

訓。⁶ 另有認為這封信同時具有告別演說和遺囑這兩種格式的元素，⁷ 或是性質多元的混合體。⁸

鮑維均指出，「在舊約（參創四十九 1~28）以及其後的猶太文獻（參《十二族長遺訓》），遺訓通常包含以下元素：記念、模範、勸導、警告、告別。」⁹ 他認為：「遺訓的基本元素都可在提摩太後書找到」；不過，

-
- 6 E.g., **Hinson** 278: '2 Timothy is his last will and testament (cf. 4:6-8)'; **Krause** 439b: 'Paul's "last will and testament"'; **Montague 135/138**: 'Paul's / his last will and testament'; **Puskas—Reasoner, Letters of Paul 225/252**: 'a final will and testament of the apostle Paul / a last testament of the apostle' (cf. 239: 'a testament in epistolary form'); **Karris, Symphony** [1996] 162: '2 Timothy . . . has been rightly called Paul's last will and testament'. Cf. **Quinn, 'Captivity'** 291-92: '*II Timothy* read as Paul's last will and testament, appropriately concludes such a correspondence [the Pastorals]'; **Hughes** 242: 'The charge in verses 1-5 [of chap. 4] initiates the final thoughts of what is the old apostle's ministerial last will and testament.' **S. Martin** 的專題研究書名就是 '*Pauli Testamentum: 2 Timothy and the Last Words of Moses*'. (1) Quinn ('Parenesis' 496) 稱提後為 'the parenetic testament of Paul'. 這詞的解釋如下 (499) : 'The irrefutable, incontestable character of parenesis reaches its highest pitch when it takes the form of a will. The last words of the apostle to his legitimate child (1 Tim 1,2; cf. 1,18; 2 Tim 1,2; 2,1) admit of no refutation. The heir cannot argue with the patriarchal will.' 簡言之，提後以遺訓的形式表達使徒對提摩太的勸勉。(2) Harding II 6 認為，'As a corpus, the letters [the Pastorals], 2 Timothy especially, constitute Paul's "testament," his definitive and "last word."' Cf. 79: 'I have endeavored to demonstrate that 2 Timothy, though in letter form, is essentially testamentary in its content (Harding 1998 [= Harding I]: 150-53).'
- 7 Klauck—Bailey, *Ancient Letters* 326: 'the letter framework now also includes topoi that are familiar from the literary testament and the farewell speech. It is therefore no accident that 2 Timothy shares many motifs in common with Paul's farewell speech to the Ephesian elders in Miletus in Acts 20:17-35. This is most clear in Paul's consciousness of his imminent death in 2 Timothy 4:1-8, but Paul's warnings about false teachers, his giving of a final personal account, and his concern for Timothy as his successor are also all standard building blocks of testamentary literature.' (1) Long 183-84 這樣區別告別演說和遺囑：'In the farewell discourse, the emphasis falls on the one who is dying, that is, on *who* is passing on. In the last will and testament, the emphasis falls on the inheritance, that is, on *what* is being passed on.' 他認為提後同時具有這兩種格式的元素，'and the two purposes finally converge'. (2) Keegan I 40 認為，'These two passages [1:15-18; 4:16-18], just after the beginning and just before the end, share in the framing function of the appeals for Timothy to visit Paul (1:4; 4:9, 11, 21) and help define the letter as a testamentary farewell.' (3) Cf. Fiore II 131: 'this letter resembles the farewell discourse and final testament of Paul to the Miletan elders at Acts 20:17-38'; cf. 139: 'the letter resembles a farewell discourse or last will and testament.' 這種講法似乎將告別演說和遺囑等同 (cf. Zehr 147: 'A last will and farewell discourse is most clearly seen in 2 Timothy 4:6-7').
- 8 (1) Aune ('Pastoral Letters' 562) 說，'2 Timothy . . . has the character of [a] a testament or [b] farewell speech (cf. 2 Tim. 4:1-8), and is at the same time [c] a fictitious personal paraenetic letter.' (2) Wagener ('Pastoral Epistles' 843) 認為，'2 Timothy is [a] a testament that offers [b] an admonitory homily clothed in the form of [c] a letter.'
- 9 鮑 126 (詳見 126-30)。參較註 24 (下面 9)。

雖然「提摩太後書……具有許多遺訓的元素，卻在許多方面是一份另類的遺訓。」¹⁰ 使這封信有別於一般遺訓的是以下三個重點：它「A. 超越一人的生平」；「B. 超越一人的影響」；「C. 超越一人的模範」。¹¹ 如此，雖然鮑維均不認為「這封書信的文體是遺訓」，但它仍然是「另類的遺訓」。¹²

約翰遜則指出，以提摩太後書為「告別演說」是有疑問的。¹³ 同樣，以此信為「遺訓」也是困難的。威瑟靈頓提出六點反對理由：¹⁴ (1) 信上沒有提到保羅的死亡，¹⁵ 保羅亦沒有停止為宣教工作而努力。¹⁶ 換言之，這封信並不符合遺訓敘述（像《十二族長遺訓》）或古典的遺囑信函的格式。¹⁷ (2) 保羅對提摩太的任命並不是對下一代的交棒；提摩太被視為保羅在宣教工作上的同工。¹⁸ (3) 信上的保羅並非垂死，他是處於

10 鮑 131、138。

11 鮑 131（依次見 131-32，133-36，136-39）。

12 鮑 131。

13 Johnson II 39: 'some elements in the composition do not fit the genre terribly well. [a] Paul's death, for example, is only intimated, and the letter does not portray him as ceasing from his efforts for the mission. [b] He is not really "handing over" anything to Timothy in an explicit generational transition. [c] The attention given to the opponents, furthermore, is far more detailed than is usual in such compositions, which usually cast their "predictions" in terms suitably vague and portentous. The degree of specific detail in 2 Timothy is impressive.'

14 Witherington 303-4. Beck ('Linguistic Features' 170) 也簡述了威瑟靈頓提出的六點。

15 Cf. Westfall, 'Dilemma' 223: 'He does not expect to die immediately because he hopes to see Timothy again (4:9, 21)'; 參上面註 13 之 [a]。但 'Paul's death is not spoken of' (Witherington 303) 這話與事實相符嗎？參四 6 註釋註 14 及所屬正文（下面 455）。

16 Cf. Westfall, loc. cit.: 'he sees his ministry as continuing (4:11)'. 亦參四 17。

17 Witherington 303: 'it fits the form of neither a testamentary narrative . . . nor the classic testamentary letter.' Cf. Beale—Gladd, *BTINT* 357a: 'not formally a testament'. (1) C. A. Smith 89/225 也認為：'2 Timothy does not follow the structure of the literary form called testament' / 'Paul is not giving a farewell speech or writing a final testament, in 2 Timothy in general or 2 Tim. 4.1-8 specifically.' 不過，Zamfir (Review of C. A. Smith [2006] 192) 對斯密提的結論甚有保留，他說：'The most one can say from his analysis is that 2 Timothy is not a testament exactly like the T Twelve [《十二族長遺訓》]，but one cannot deny the presence of some testamental elements in this text'. Cf. Gloer 218: 'While 2 Timothy is not a classic testamentary letter, it does manifest certain common characteristics' (7 listed).

18 Ibid.: 'Timothy is seen as Paul's colleague in ministry.' Cf. Westfall, loc. cit.: 'he does not pass on his commission to Timothy; he asks him to join him in his ministry'. 參上面註 13 之 [b]。

危險之中，兩者是不同的。¹⁹ 這裏並沒有保羅對下一代的死前贈言。²⁰

(4) 信上有關於敵對者及離棄者的明確細節。此信的性質和內容都不是籠統的；它看來是一封針對特別處境而寫的信函。²¹ (5) 現今的苦難與未來的苦難二者的關係是明確的。這裏所見的並非只是「往後投擲」到保羅口中關於未來的預告(見三 1~6)。²² (6) 釋經者——包括那些認為此信是保羅之後寫成的遺訓的釋經者——對它的結構完全沒有一致的意見。²³ 假如這封信符合遺訓的性質和類型，我們預期這會在它的結構上反映出來，²⁴ 而釋經者對於此信的結構分析亦會較為一致。

關於提摩太後書屬何種書信類型的另一種看法是，(乙)這是一封「勸勉信函」。昆謝隆指出，公元 300-600 年間，偽利巴紐²⁵ 論信札體裁的手冊²⁶ 分類列出大約四十種信函(也許多一點)，帶頭的就是「勸勉體裁」的信。²⁷ 昆謝隆認為，教牧書信「像手滑入手套般」完全符合這種勸勉信函的體裁：它們傳達一位重要人物(跟收信人)的友好關係、他的臨在，及其會話性語言。²⁸ 不過，對於現代的文學鑑別學將教牧書信歸類

19 Cf. Richards 135: 'Neither burial plan nor obituary notice are [*sic*] part of 2 Timothy.'

20 Cf. C. A. Smith 86: 'because Paul asks several times (2 Tim. 4.9, 11, 21) for Timothy to come to Rome this suggests that Paul does not expect this letter to be his final word to Timothy.'

21 Witherington 304: 'It appears to be an ad hoc document.'

22 Ibid.: 'The connection between present and future woes is made explicit. We do not simply have predictions about the future retrojected* into the mouth of Paul (see 2 Tim 3:1-6).' 參上面註 13 之 [c]. (*'Retroject' = 'to project into the past' [Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary].)

23 Witherington 304 n.7 引 Marshall 34-40.

24 Cf. C. A. Smith 79: 'the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs . . . provide the most clearly defined and developed structure of the testament.' 「遺訓」的結構包含五個元素：前言、敘述、倫理教誨、末世段落、結語 (Preamble, Narrative, Ethical Instruction, Eschatological section, Conclusion)；詳見 80-86。參較註 9 所屬正文(上面 7)。

25 Pseudo-Libanius, 亦作 Pseudo-Libanios. 參《宗教》182：「**Libanius** 利巴紐 (314-393)：希臘修辭學家，屈梭多模之老師。」

26 See Quinn, 'Parenesis' 500 n.13.

27 Quinn, 'Parenesis' 497: 'the parenetic style, *parainetikē*'. 根據偽利巴紐的定義，'parenesis [*parainesis*] differs from advice (*symbolēs*). Parenesis is parenetic speech (*logos parainetikos*) that does not allow a counter-statement (*antirrhēsin ouk epidechomenos*).'

28 Quinn, art. cit. 499: 'The *PE* as a collection slip like a hand into the glove of pseudo-Libanius' description of the parenetic epistolary style. As letters they communicate the *philophronēsis* [friendly relationship], *parousia* [presence], and *homilia* [conversational speech] of an important person.'

為勸勉類型，昆謝隆認為這做法雖然並非不準確，但卻是不完整的，因為這描述未能捕捉到古希臘人在他們所認識的「勸勉論述」中所聽到的一個「音符」——不容反駁。²⁹ 也許就是為了這緣故，昆謝隆並不以提摩太後書為一封勸勉信函，而是以之為保羅的遺訓。³⁰

不過，更多的釋經者認為提摩太後書是一封勸勉信函。³¹ 斯密提認為，整體而論，提摩太後書是一封勸勉信函³²（儘管他力辯四章 1 至 8 節屬於另一類型）。³³ 約翰遜指出，提摩太後書的類型屬於古希臘的修辭

29 Ibid.: 'The modern literary criticism which has classified the *PE* as parenetic is not inaccurate but incomplete, missing one note which the ancient Greek heard in parenetic discourse: *antirrhēsin ouk epidechomenos*.*' (*見上面註 27。) ἀντιρρησις = gainsaying, 反對、反駁。ἐπιδέχομαι 在新約出現兩次（約叁 9、10 節：ἐπιδέχεται）。

30 參註 1、2、6 及註 6 之 (1) = 上面 6、7。

31 E.g., Beale—Gladd, *BTINT* 349a: 'a "paraenetic letter"'; Aageson, 'Theology' 711: 'As already indicated [695-96], 2 Timothy is more accurately described as a paraenetic letter [than as testament]'; Johnson, *Writings* 385a: 'Second Timothy has the overall form of a personal parenetic letter, with the elements of polemic being utilized to develop more fully what Timothy is to avoid' (cf. 384b: 'Second Timothy can be read as a personal parenetic epistle, and 1 Timothy and Titus can be understood as *mandata principis* letters'; 參《多》98 註 38 之 [3]; 另見下面註 34); Gorman, *Apostle* 537: 'the letter is much more of a personal charge or "parenesis" (exhortation) than anything else.' (1) Cf. Karris [1984] 8: '2 Tim is closest to a personal paraenetic or hortatory letter'; 25: '[the author uses] the literary form of an exhortatory letter'; 9: '2 Tim. is a personal paraenetic letter. Its rallying cry is: imitate the personal example of Paul and Timothy; resist the bad example of people like Hymenaeus and Philetus (see 2 Tim 2:17)'; 40: '2 Tim is a personal exhortatory letter. That is, 2 Tim gives exhortations to its readers via personal examples, especially those of Paul and Timothy.' 卡羅拔其後 (1996) 似乎改變了他的立場，見註 6 (上面 7)。(2) Westfall ('Dilemma' 224-25) 認為，這封信具備 'every feature Malherbe [*Moral Exhortation* 124] identifies as typical of Greco-Roman moral exhortation'. 她列出了在提後所見的這些特色 (251-52): 'commands'; * 'examples for imitation which give concreteness', including 'the repeated use of foils, or antithetical models of deserters and opponents'; 'appeal to honor and shame'; 'emphasis... on traditional content'. 她由此斷言，'there is no doubt that 2 Timothy should be classified as moral exhortation' (252)。(* Cf. Knight 363: 'Paul is not just writing as a friend but with the authority of an apostle [1:1] to instruct and admonish Timothy about his ministry and his responsibilities (note the imperatives in 1:14; 2:1, 3, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, 22 [a, b], 23; 3:1, 14; 4:5 [a, b, c, d], 9 and the charge in 4:1ff..)'.)

32 C. A. Smith 158: 'Libanius states that paraenesis is *hortatory* material consisting of persuasion (προτροπή [from προτρέπω, turning someone towards]) and dissuasion (ἀποτροπή [from ἀποτρέπω, turning someone away from]). This is the type of material of which most of 2 Timothy is constituted and therefore as a whole 2 Timothy is a paraenetic letter.' Cf. 228: 'this is a paraenetic letter written to encourage Timothy to continue to stand firm as a minister and to continue suffering for the Gospel with Paul.'

33 C. A. Smith 160: 'As a whole 2 Timothy is a paraenetic letter with the charge in 2 Tim. 4.1-8 adding weight to the argument for Timothy to continue obeying the exhortations and prohibitions.' Cf. 158: 'the essence of the charge in 2 Tim. 4.1-8, although related to paraenesis

手冊所列出的「個人勸勉信函」。³⁴ 司得靈也提到，偽利巴紐³⁵ 所提供一封勸勉信函的例子，³⁶ 顯示了幾點重要的特色：第一，勸勉信函是古人所承認一種與別不同的書信格式。第二，「要仿效值得效法的榜樣」這格言式的鼓勵，捕捉了勸勉的本質。第三，名譽是激發行為的因素。第四，體裁與格式是分不開的；「效法」和「對比」的使用無誤地顯明了這一點。司得靈認為，提摩太後書（還有別的新約書信）很可能應視為勸勉信函。³⁷

筆者認為，如果必須在（甲）和（乙）之間二擇其一，後者較前者可取：提摩太後書可能不是「告別演說」或「遺訓／遺囑」，而是較接近「勸勉信函」類型。但這並不是惟一的選擇。³⁸

functionally, is clearly more forceful than persuasion and dissuasion since there is a stronger force being exercised on the will of Timothy. It is a command. Libanius, recognizing this distinction, therefore also includes the *commanding* letter-type (παραγγελιατική or μαρτυρική).’ 但斯密提將四 1~8 定性為 ‘charge’ 的文學類型，這做法是有疑問的：見四 1 註釋註 7 之(3)= 下面 425-26。(1)Zehr 147 則認為：‘2 Timothy is a combination of testamentary and paraenetic literature. In 2 Timothy, exhortations appear in the body of the letter, and Paul concludes with testamentary material (4:6-8).’ 但後一段只佔全書的 3.6% (3/83 節)篇幅，不應影響對全書的定性。參同頁早前(已引於註 7 之(3))= 上面 7)：‘A last will and farewell discourse is most clearly seen in 2 Timothy 4:6-7.’ 如此，所佔篇幅(2/83 節)更降至全書的 2.4%。

34 Johnson I 14: ‘it can best be termed a *personal paraenetic letter*’; Johnson II 41: ‘Second Timothy . . . has the overall form of the paraenetic letter.’ Cf. Johnson II 39: ‘In the rhetorical handbooks composed by Pseudo-Demetrius and Pseudo-Libanius, there is listed a type of letter called *epistolē parainetikē* (paraenetic letter) [ἐπιστολή παραινετική].’(詳見 39-41。) See also Ackerman 271: ‘2 Timothy is a paraenetic letter (Johnson 2001 [= Johnson III], 340)’; Gloer—Stepp 68: ‘2 Timothy should be treated as a “personal paraenetic letter” (Johnson 2001: 322, cf. Richards 2002, 131-33).’

35 見上註，及註 25 (上面 9)。

36 Sterling, ‘Philosophy’ 325: ‘Pseudo-Libanius offers the following sample of a παραινετική ἐπιστολή: * “My good friend, always be a follower of virtuous men. For it is better for the follower of good men to enjoy a good reputation than following the bad to be shamed by all.” (*參上面註 34。)

37 Ibid.: ‘This short sample points out several important features. First, ancients recognized the paraenetic letter as a distinct form. Secondly, the essence of exhortation is captured in the gnomic encouragement to imitate worthy models. Thirdly, reputation is the motivating factor. Fourthly, style and form are inseparable. This is unmistakable in the use of imitation and contrast. . . . There are several letters within the New Testament which should probably be considered paraenetic: 1 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus, James, and 1 Peter.’

38 Cf. Bray 49: ‘It is probably best to conclude that any resemblances in the [Pastoral] Epistles to a given genre are coincidental, and that literary factors played little part in shaping their content. . . . Whatever we say about the genre and style of the Pastoral Epistles, such considerations are of little importance for their content or interpretation.’

(丙) 威瑟靈頓和斯密提皆認為，從信函分析的角度而言，提摩太後書是一封勸勉信函，而從修辭分析的角度來看，它是審議性的修辭。³⁹ 另有認為，此信屬於「讚揚或譴責修辭」。⁴⁰ 兩種修辭類型有相近之處，就如一世紀修辭學家昆提連所觀察到的：讚揚或譴責修辭所讚揚的，通常也是審議性修辭所建議的。⁴¹ 這是否表示提摩太後書可視為混合類型的修辭呢？不是的，因為從古典修辭學的角度而言，一篇講詞是只屬一種類型的。⁴²

(丁) 根據筆者早前涉獵「保羅與古典修辭學的關係」的研究，筆者認為(1)古代修辭手冊所描寫的三種修辭類型⁴³ 都不適用於提摩太後書，因為它們不是為信札而設的，而提摩太後書（或任何其他保羅書信）是一封信函。⁴⁴ (2) 一些學者對於採用古代修辭學來分析保羅書信這做法，提出了嚴重的質疑，他們的論證具說服力。⁴⁵ (3) 保羅使用了古代

-
- 39 C. A. Smith 206: 'In the previous section I showed that, in terms of epistolary analysis, 2 Timothy was a paraenetic letter and a deliberative (i.e. advice) speech in terms of rhetorical analysis'; Witherington 305: 'It has . . . all the usual rhetorical features, being an example of deliberative rhetoric,* or from an epistolary point of view one can call it a paraenetic letter.' Cf. Richards 136: 'the Letter to the Beloved Timothy [i.e., II Tim.] is a Literary Deliberative Letter'. *「審議性修辭」，參《加》122 之(二)，另見 129-32「加拉太書是審議性修辭？」
- 40 Epideictic rhetoric, 參《加》122-23 之(三)，另見 133-34「〔加拉太〕書是讚揚或譴責修辭？」 See Puskas—Reasoner, *Letters of Paul* 247-48: 'Second Timothy . . . seeks to intensify adherence to the common gospel (epideictic rhetoric)' (247-48); 239: '2 Timothy (like 2 Peter) is concerned with intensifying adherence to common values (epideictic rhetoric). . . it contains the following features of demonstrative rhetoric: (a) the call to remember (2 Tim 1:3, 5 . . .), (b) the censure of opponents (2 Tim 3 . . .) as the negative aspect of praising common values, and (c) autobiographical allusions used to support the thesis of extolling common values (2 Tim 1:11-18; 3:10-11; 4:6-21 . . .)' (筆者省略了引自彼後的章節)。Cf. 252: 'Second Timothy . . . has an epideictic function of extolling common values and censuring agreed-upon vices.'
- 41 Quintilian 說：'epideictic is akin to deliberative oratory inasmuch as the same things are usually praised in the former as are advised in the latter.' 引自 C. A. Smith 196.
- 42 參《加》135-39「〔加拉太〕書是混合類型的修辭？」，特別是 138-39。
- 43 上文未有提及的是「法庭式修辭」，forensic (or judicial) rhetoric. 參《加》122 之(一)，另見 123-29「加拉太書是法庭式修辭？」
- 44 參《加》140-41。
- 45 參《加》141-43。Westfall ('Dilemma' 215-16) 指出，'While there are some functional parallels between epistolary and rhetorical arrangement, the approach that presses for a formal correspondence between the letter genre and judicial, epideictic and deliberative rhetoric, as well as the location of the formal parts of speech that the three types of rhetoric share, has had

的某些修辭技巧，但在最基本的層面上，他採取了與古代修辭完全不同的進路。⁴⁶（4）筆者對加拉太書的結論同樣適用於提摩太後書：「就如〔提摩太後書〕不屬於古典修辭手冊所提及的修辭類型其中的任何一種，同樣地，它也不屬於古代的信札類型之中的任何一種。將〔提摩太後書〕看為真正的書信，並按照它真實的面貌來理解和分析它，是最好的做法。」⁴⁷



limited to questionable success.’

46 參《加》143-48，尤其是 146-48。

47 參《加》149-54（引句出自 153-54〔加上底線的字在原句為楷體〕）。亦參 148：「在其中，保羅使用了他當代不同的、慣用的書信習俗及修辭技巧來傳達他的信息。」（「技巧」原作「技倆」。）