Arab-Israel Conflict: A Biblical Solution
By Prof. Jonathan J. Lu
1992.04.18. Present at AAG Meeting, San Diego, California
以阿之爭：聖經的解決方法
作者：呂榮輝教授
譯者：張百路
2016.08.30.

<u>譯者序言</u>

關於以阿之間的衝突，歷來國際間不斷提出各種可能解決的方案，但始終無法使雙方達成完全的協議。呂榮輝博士曾於 1992 年 4 月 18 日，在美國加州聖地牙哥所舉辦之「美國地理協會」（Association of American Geographers）年會中，就此議題發表一篇精闢的論文"Arab-Israel Conflict: A Biblical Solution"；其立論詳密透徹且有獨到之處，雖然歷經時空變遷，該論文中所揭露之真理仍然亙古不變。

<u>INTRODUCTION</u>

Few of the disputes/conflicts in the contemporary world proved to be as intractable as that of the Arab-Israeli conflict in the Middle East (Drysdale and Blake 1985, 263). According to Held, the conflict has many facets, dimensions, and perspectives; it involves territorial disputes, conflicting historical claims, ethnic confrontations, ethical dilemmas, religious implications, ideological differences, political hostilities, economic competitions, geographical ramifications, emotional contentions, and military skirmishes (Held 1989, 169-72).

<u>前言</u>

當今世界，很少有像中東地區以阿衝突這樣難以解決的紛爭（Drysdale and Blake，1985 年 263 頁）。Held 認為，以阿衝突涉及多方的看法、各方的觀點和不同的角度，包括土地的爭執、歷史的爭議、種族的對抗、倫理的窘境、宗教的牽連、理念的差異、政治的對立、經濟的競爭、地理的複雜、加上意氣之爭和軍事衝突（Held，1989 年 169-172 頁）。

Battah and Lukacs (1988, 1-3) discussed a two-dimensional conflict: the inter-communal conflict and the interstate conflict. The former involves two ethnic communities (Israelis and the Palestinians); the latter involves two political states (Israel and Arab states). The inter-communal conflict has two sub-dimensions which I

would call: the intra-territorial conflict between the Jews and the Palestinians inside Israel-Palestine, and the extra-territorial conflict between the Israelis and the forces that help support the Palestinian National Authority (NPA) outside Israel-Palestine.

Battah 和 Lukacs（1988 年 1-3 頁）認為以阿衝突是一場雙方面的爭執：「民爭」和「國爭」。前者涉及兩個種族（以色列人和巴勒斯坦人），後者涉及兩個政體（以色列國和阿拉伯國）。本文作者認為「民爭」的範圍還包括兩方面：猶太人和巴勒斯坦人在以色列-巴勒斯坦地區的境內之爭；以及以色列與那些支持巴勒斯坦民權機構（NPA）的境外之爭。

The Arab-Israeli conflict also has many perspectives with many sub-perspectives. "From any perspective," says Held (1989, 172), "the problem and its ramifications have caused a tragic number of casualties, prolonged human suffering, extensive physical destruction, and explosive divisiveness as well as retardation of development and a waste of human and other resources." What is this Arab-Israeli conflict, really? What was the cause? What has been done to resolve or to alleviate the conflict? What have been the obstacles? After briefly discussing each of these questions, this paper will propose its own solution from a biblical perspective, called "A Biblical Solution." Based on biblical teaching and principles, this paper will discuss: (1) historical accounts of the Jews and the Canaanites/Philistines living together; (2) God's command of allotting land to resident aliens as an inheritance; and (3) regarding "love your neighbor."

以阿衝突同時也包括了許多可供分析的主要觀點和次要觀點。Held 說，"從任何角度來看，這場衝突都已經造成了人員的大量傷亡、百姓的持續苦難、物資的重大破壞、種族的深切隔閡、經濟的遲緩發展、以及人力和資源的浪費"（1989 年 172 頁）。以阿之爭到底在爭什麼？它的原因為何？人們做了那些努力來解決或消弭這場衝突？它的阻礙是什麼？本文將針對以上問題簡短地各別討論，然後再以聖經的觀點來提出解決之道，亦即"聖經的解決方法"。本文將依據聖經的教導和原則來探討：(1) 猶太人和迦南人/非利士人和平共處的歷史源由；(2) 上帝對分地給外邦人為業的誡命；(3) 聖經關於"愛你的鄰舍"教訓。

ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT: WHAT IS IT?

Simply put, the Arab-Israeli conflict merged as one of competing nationalism (Schulze, 1999, 92), laying claim by the two peoples, Israeli Jews and Palestinian Arabs, both of who insist on the right to the same piece of land. This land was known as the Land of Canaan (Gen 11:31), the Land of Israel (e.g., I Sam 13:19), the Land of

the Philisia (Zephaniah 2:5) or the Filastin Land, and al-Ard al-Muqadassa (the Holy Land in Arabic), and the Promised Land. This land is called today by those who live here as Palestine, Eretz Israel (or simply Ha 'Aretz, "the Land"), Palestine-Israel, or Israel- Palestine. Christian scholars outside this region have called it "the Holy Land" (e.g., Smith 1894; Ogden and Chadwick 1990), or "the Land of the Bible" (Aharoni 1967 & 1979).

何謂以阿之爭？

簡單地說，以阿之爭就是一場「民族獨立運動」的衝突（Schulze，1999 年 92 頁），以色列人和巴勒斯坦人都堅稱，他們對同一塊土地擁有的所有權。這塊土地又被稱作迦南地（創 11:31）、以色列地（撒上 13:19）、非利士人之地（番 2:5）或 Filastin 之地、al-Ard al-Muqadassa（阿拉伯語'聖地'之意）、應許之地。現在這塊土地被當地人稱作巴勒斯坦、以色列地（或簡稱 Ha 'Aretz,"這地"）、巴勒斯坦-以色列、或，以色列-巴勒斯坦。這個地區以外的基督徒學者，則稱它為"聖地"（例如，Smith，1894 年；Ogden and Chadwick，1990 年），或"聖經之地"（Aharoni，1967 年及 1979 年）。

The conflict is far from being simple. The whole issue and the nature of this conflict are rather complex and the solution to this conflict involves complicated situations. Garfinkle (1991, 1-4) discusses the nature of this complex conflict from four different perspectives as follows.

這場衝突遠非我們想像的那麼簡單。整個事件的爭議和衝突的本質相當複雜，其解決之道涉及非常棘手的局面。Garfinkle（1991 年 1-4 頁）從以下四個方面討論了這場衝突本質的複雜性：

First, there are the involvements of various factors. To be sure, there is the Jewish state of Israel whose existence is at the very center of the entire affair. But there are also Jewish communities throughout the world to whom the survival of the state of Israel is extremely important. Then, there are the Palestinian Arabs who, though not having a state of their own at the present, believe, nevertheless, that the existence of their own state is victimized by the existence of Israel, by the intervention of the past imperial and the present super-powers, by the inter-discord of their Arab brothers, and even by the betrayal of their own self-proclaimed leaders. In addition, there is also the involvement of other Arab states, adjoining or disjoining Israel, who oppose the existence of Israel because of religious affinity with Arab Muslims.

第一、這場衝突牽連的因素太多。當然，以色列的復國，就是整個事件的核心。對於遍佈世界各地的猶太人來說，以色列國的生存是第一要務。另一方面，雖然目前巴勒斯坦的阿拉伯人並沒有自己的國家，然而他們卻堅信，他們之所以無法建國，就是因為下面這些原因：以色列的復國、過去的帝國和當今的強國干涉、阿拉伯世界內部的不團結、甚至是某些他們自己任命的領導人背叛…；再加上，由於伊斯蘭教徒之間宗教上的密切關係，使得那些無論與以色列接壤或不接壤的其他阿拉伯國家也都被捲入，集體群起反對以色列國的建立。

Second, there is a complicated "all-or-nothing" nature in this conflict. Until very recently, almost all of Israel's Arab neighbors did not feel that Israel had the right to exist in Palestine; thus, their "dedication" to push Israel into the "Great Sea." On the other hand, there were hard-core Zionists and Israel's supporters who vehemently denied the political aspiration of the Palestinian Arabs.

第二、這場衝突本身有一個極其複雜的"絕不妥斜"本質。到目前為止，幾乎所有以色列的阿拉伯鄰國，都不認為以色列有權在巴勒斯坦地區建立國家；因此，他們"發誓"要把以色列趕到"大海"去。另一方面，所有錫安主義的核心人物和以色列的支持者，都堅決否認巴勒斯坦阿拉伯人的政治訴求。

Third, there is a complex cause-and-effect resulted from the legacy and modern foreign influences. On the one hand, the idea of Zionist movement was impregnated on the foreign soil, born in the European ghetto, and nurtured by European foreign policies. On the other hand, the rise of Arab nationalism was inspired by European ideologies, supported by European encouragement of Arab opposition to Turkish overlord-ship, and shaped by European intrusive hegemony of the region's affairs. It is interesting to observe that Arabs who lived on this land for thousands of years identified their loyalties with family, clan, tribe, and religion rather than with a nation. The Jews who lived in Diaspora for even longer length of time, on the other hand, identified their nationhood with religious conviction. To them, national consciousness is more dependent on the strength of religious belief than on "physical presence" (Garfinkle 1991, 3).

第三、由於歷史遺留的問題和現代國外勢力的影響，產生複雜的因果關係。一方面，錫安主義運動在國外孕育、在歐洲猶太社區萌芽、並受到歐洲外交政策的培植；另一方面，阿拉伯民族獨立運動受歐洲思想體系的啟發，得到某些歐洲國家的支持，鼓勵阿拉伯人反抗土耳其鄂圖曼帝國的封建君主統治，因而導致歐洲介入該地區的政治事務。一個有趣的觀察點是：在這片土地上生活了幾千年的阿拉伯人，他們對家庭、宗族、部落和宗教信仰的忠誠，更甚於他們對國家的認同；

相反地，儘管猶太人分散在世界各地如此長久的時間，但他們卻透過宗教信仰對國家產生強烈的認同感。對他們來說，國家意識的存在是取決於宗教信仰的力量，而非這個國家的"實質存在"（Garfinkle，1991 年第 3 頁）。

Finally, there are theological and historical prejudices. The State of Israel is overwhelmingly Jewish; and the aspired Palestinian state is overwhelmingly Muslim. But this Jewish-Israeli and Muslim-Palestinian-Arab relation has a common yet complex historical and theological root that could be traced back to the time of Abraham and to the origin of Islam in the seventh century. Thus, it has been observed that down through the historical lane, despite the recent conflict, the Israeli Jews have less rancor with Palestinian Arab Muslim than with European Christians.

第四、宗教上和歷史上的歧見。以色列國以猶太教徒為主；巴勒斯坦解放組織以伊斯蘭教徒為主。但是猶太教-以色列人和伊斯蘭教-巴勒斯坦人-阿拉伯人之間有著共同而複雜的歷史和種族根源，這個根源可追溯到亞伯拉罕時代和主曆第七世紀伊斯蘭教創立之初。儘管有目前的爭端，但是透過歷史脈絡的觀察，我們可以看到，以色列猶太教徒與巴勒斯坦伊斯蘭教徒之間的仇恨，還不及他們與歐洲基督徒之間的過節。

The situations described by Garfinkle have improved since the Camp David Accord in September 1978 and the Israeli-Egyptian Peace Treaty in 1979, followed by the Reagan Fresh Start Initiative of 1982, the Madrid Conference of October 1991 and, on September 13, 1993, the first Israeli-Palestinian Agreement, known as the "Declaration of Principles" or "Oslo (I) Accord" was signed in Washington, D. C.. In this document, the "legitimate and political rights" were mutually recognized. It was further agreed by both to "strive to live in peaceful coexistence and mutual dignity and security and achieve a just, lasting and comprehensive peace settlement and historic reconciliation through the agreed political process" (as quoted in Schculze p.119 and <www.israel.org/mfa/go.asp?MFAH00r0>). On March Fifth, 1997, Mr. Y. Arafat told the Jewish leaders in New York City that the Palestinian Covenant was changed and it no longer calls for the destruction of Israel in Palestine.

Garfinkle 所敘述的情勢，自 1978 年 9 月大衛營和平協定、以及 1979 年以埃和平協約之後，改善了許多，接下來是 1982 年的雷根新始協議、1991 年 10 月的馬德里會談，及 1993 年 9 月 13 日在華盛頓特區簽訂的第一次以巴協定，也就是大家所熟知的"巴勒斯坦自治原則宣言"或"第一次奧斯陸協定"。在這份協定裡，雙方互相承認了"法律和政治上的權利"。更進一步同意"追求和平共存、互相尊重、互不侵犯，並通過政治程序的約定，達成一個公正、長久和全面的和平方案與歷

史協議”（引述自 Schculze 119 頁及＜www.israel.org/mfa/go.asp＞）。1997 年 3 月 5 日，阿拉法特在紐約市告訴以色列的領導人，巴勒斯坦盟約不再以消滅巴勒斯坦的以色列國為訴求。

The Arabs and the Jews: Ethnically, the popular notion is that Arabs and Jews both belong to the same Semitic race. Therefore, the term "Anti-Semitism" is a misnomer, because this term was coined by Wilhelm Marr, a German, in 1879 (others said in 1873), to denote anti-Jews in Central Europe at that time. However, Goitein was of the opinion that the term denoted a closely related language group that includes Hebrew and Arabic (Goitein 1955, 19). Another popular belief holds that Jews and Arabs are cousins having been descended through Isaac and Ishmael (Ismā'īl in Arabic). The Bible does support the notion that Abraham (Ibrāhīm in Arabic) was the father of both Ishmael and Isaac (Genesis 16:1-3, 15-16; 17:1-27; 18:9-14; 21: 1-21). However, whereas the Bible recognizes that the Jews are the descendants of Isaac; it does not explicitly indicate that Arabs are the descendants of Ishmael. The current notion is that the term Arab is not of ethnic nor racial; it denotes that anyone who speaks Arabic is an Arab. Furthermore, while the descendent of Ishmael may be of Arabic, but not all Arabs are the descendent of Ishmael!

阿拉伯人和猶太人：從種族上講，通常認為阿拉伯人和猶太人同屬閃族。因此，"Anti-Semitism"（反猶太主義）其實是一個使用不當的名詞；這個名詞，是 1879 年由德國人 Wilhelm Marr 所創（另有一說，在 1873 年），他以此表達那個時期在中歐地區所瀰漫的反猶太思想。然而，Goitein 的看法卻認為，這個名詞將所有使用希伯來語和阿拉伯語、這兩種密切相關語言的群體，全部包含在內了（Goitein，1955 年 19 頁）。另一種普世的觀念認為，猶太人和阿拉伯人分別是以撒和以實瑪利（阿拉伯語：Ismā'īl）的後裔，他們之間根本就是堂兄弟的關係。關於這一點，聖經確實提到亞伯拉罕是以實瑪利和以撒的父親（創 16:1-3，15-16；17:1-27；18:9-14；21:1-21）。然而，儘管聖經確認，猶太人是以撒的後裔，但並沒有明確地指出，阿拉伯人就是以實瑪利的後裔。目前一般的認知是，阿拉伯人這個名稱，既不是一個種族、也不是一個民族；它代表的是：任何講阿拉伯語的人都是阿拉伯人。此外，以實瑪利的後裔也許很可能是阿拉伯人，但不表示所有的阿拉伯人都是以實瑪利的後裔！

Nevertheless, there is also an idea that Arabs are "cousins" of Israelites. The idea is of a Jewish origin, based on Isaiah 21:13 where it mentions an Arab tribe, Dedanim. Dedanim comes from the same root word as dodanim, meaning cousins. The Arab themselves have accepted this cousin-relation with the Jews. The acceptance, perhaps, is due to the teaching of Muhammad as recorded in the Koran (2:125 and 2:127)

where it mentions that Ibrahim enjoined his son Ismail to purify the Ka'ba of Mecca and, together, they raised its foundation (Khatib, 24-25; Zhou, 29). From this, it was interpreted that Ibrahim was not only the physical ancestor of the Arabs, but also the co-founder of Islam (Goitein 1955, 22-23). However, there is little real hard evidence that all Arabs are the descendants of Ismail.

不過，還有一個見解也認為阿拉伯人是以色列人的堂兄弟。這個見解基於以賽亞書 21 章 13 節提到亞拉伯族時，稱他們為「底但」（Dedanim）。Didanim 這個字與 dodanim 有相同的字根，意思就是堂兄弟。阿拉伯人自己也接受這種認為他們與以色列人是堂兄弟的說法。這種認同可能源自穆罕默德在可蘭經（2:15 和 2:127）中的教導，他提到亞伯拉罕與他兒子以實瑪利，一起潔淨麥加的天房，並為其奠基（Khatib，24-25 頁；Zhou，29 頁）。按照這樣的說法，亞伯拉罕不僅是阿拉伯人肉身的祖先，也是伊斯蘭教的共同創立者（Goitein，1955 年 22-23 頁）。但是，並沒有太多的實質證據可以證明，所有的阿拉伯人都是以實瑪利的後裔。

It is also believed that there are cultural affinities between the Jews and the Arabs as manifested in similarities in social patterns and outlooks, in the common motif in the history of the two peoples during the classic periods, and even in their common heritage of suffering. Jewish thought and philosophy were systematized under the Arab-Muslim influence, and even Jewish law and religious practice are formulated under the same (Goitein 1955).

此外，由於猶太人和阿拉伯人的社會形態和風俗習慣明顯的相似性，以及這兩個民族在古代歷史中基本的共通性，甚至於他們所共同承受的長子獻祭苦難；在在都使人們相信，他們的文化之間必定有密切相連的關係。猶太人的思想和哲學，某種程度受到阿拉伯-伊斯蘭教的影響，甚至某些猶太律法和宗教儀式，也是在這種影響下制定（Goitein，1955 年）。

Some scholars seem to have found evidences that the Hebrew language developed its grammar and vocabulary on the Arabic model; and without the parallelism of the Arabic language that is preserved in various ways down through the ages, the revival of the ancient Hebrew into a modern language "would be entirely unthinkable" (Goitein 1955, 8). With such a close relation and affinity between the Jews and the Arabs, a question may be raised here as to why are there so many animosities and so much antagonism?

有一些學者似乎已經找到了希伯來語文法和字彙是在阿拉伯語架構下發展起來的證據；而且，如果不是阿拉伯語系長久以來藉由各種管道的保存，古希伯來語

要倖存下來並發展成為現代語言，"將是完全不可能的"（Goitein，1955 年第 8 頁）。由於猶太人和阿拉伯人之間是如此相似和關係密切，我們禁不住要問，他們之間為何有這樣多的仇恨和對立呢？

ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT: WHAT CAUSED IT?

To answer the question of what caused the Arab-Israel conflict, one must go back to the history and define from it a time reference. Scholars generally mark World War I as the starting point (e.g., Cohen 1987; United Nations 1990); others would trace its origin back to "the closing years of the 19th century" (e.g., Arafat 1974, 7), when the first "Zionist Congress" convened in Basel, Switzerland in 1897 (Moore 1974).

以阿之爭：原因為何？

要回答這個問題，我們就必須回溯歷史來尋求答案。學者們通常以第一次世界大戰作為以阿衝突的起點（例如：Cohen，1987 年；聯合國，1990 年）；也有些人會將其追溯到"19 世紀的最後幾年"（例如：Arafat，1974 年第 7 頁），以及 1897 年在瑞士巴塞爾所召開的第一屆"錫安復國主義"大會（Moore，1974 年）。

According to Professor Abboushi, there was no such political entity as a Palestine before World War I. It was the McMahon-Hussein Correspondences of 1915, the Sykes-Picot Agreement of 1916, and the Balfour Declaration of 1917 that set the stage for the continuing rise of Arab Nationalism and the Zionist activities that led to the initial Palestinians-Zionists conflict. These and the subsequent events, such as the San Remo Conference of 1920 that gave Britain the Mandatory authority over Palestine, the approval of the Mandate Agreement for Palestine by the League of Nations in 1922, and the Operationalization of the Agreement in 1923, were the primary forces for the gradual realization of a "Jewish National Home in Palestine," and the (Abboushi 1990, 1-10)。

Abboushi 教授認為，在一次大戰之前，所謂"巴勒斯坦"這個政治實體根本就不存在。但是 1915 年的麥馬洪-侯賽因協定、1916 年的塞克斯-皮科特協議和 1917 年的貝爾福宣言，推動了阿拉伯民族主義和猶太復國運動的持續高漲，終於導致了最初的巴勒斯坦和錫安主義者之間的衝突。接下來，1920 年，聖雷莫會議賦予英國對巴勒斯坦地區的託管權；1922 年，國際聯盟組織核准巴勒斯坦地區託管協議；1923 年，巴勒斯坦地區託管協議正式實施；這些隨之而來的事件，是讓"在巴勒斯坦建立猶太家園"得以逐步實現的主要推動力，同時也加劇了阿拉伯人的民族政治運動（阿波希，1990 年 1-10 頁）。

Abboushi was of the opinion that "Israel was a military fact before it became a political reality, and it was primarily the military fact that gained political recognition for the Jewish state." According to him, the creation of the Jewish state of Israel ended the Palestinian-Zionist conflict and began the Arab-Israeli conflict. In other words, the inter-communal conflict has been transformed into the inter-state conflict.

Abboushi 教授的見解認為，"以色列在成為政治實體之前，只是一個軍事集團，而正是這最初的軍事集團，為猶太國贏得了政治上的承認"。按照他的說法，以色列國的建立，結束了巴勒斯坦人和猶太錫安主義者之間的鬥爭，但同時也開啟了阿拉伯國家和以色列國的衝突。也就是說，民與民之間的衝突，轉化成為國與國之間的戰爭。

At first, the Arabs used military force in an attempt to prevent the political reality of Israel in the 1948-49 war. This military option continued in the ensuring years, and reached its failure climax in the 1967 war. As a result, the inter-state nature of the conflict was once more transformed into inter-communal (Battah and Lukacs, 1-3). Having failed in military attempts, the Arabs are now inclined to use politics. If politics fail, warned Abboushi, the Arabs will have to again resort to military activities to challenge Israel in the battlefields (p. 197).

起初，阿拉伯人發動 1948 至 1949 年的戰爭，企圖用軍事力量來阻止以色列成為一個政治實體。這種軍事行動一直持續到 1967 年戰爭的慘敗為止。結果，「國爭」又再一次轉變成了「民爭」（Battah and Lukacs，1-3 頁）。軍事企圖失敗後，阿拉伯人現在轉而指望用政治來解決問題。Abboushi 教授警告說，一旦政治解決無望，阿拉伯人會再啟戰端，回到戰場上挑戰以色列（197 頁）。

Many of the pre-1948 incidents seem to have been caused by emotional upheaval and lack of communication as exemplified by the 1929 disturbances (Abboushi 37-39). For the deep rooted causes, one may list clash of nationalism, territorial dispute, ethnic or religious strife, aspiring ideologies coupled with religious self-righteousness and sanctification (Alexander 1973, vi), sociological difference in attitude toward land and labor (Shafir 1989; Abboushi, 46), imperialist intrusion, and extension of the East-West conflict, even American foreign policy (Smith 1992).

許多在 1948 年之前發生的事件，都是由於意氣用事和缺乏溝通所引起，1929 年的暴動就是一個例子（Abboushi，37-39 頁）。對於更深層次的原因，我們可以說是因為民族主義的衝突、領土紛爭、種族或宗教抵觸、伴隨著宗教上自以為是的

意識形態（Alexander，1973 年第 6 頁）、社會上對土地和勞工的不同看法（Shafir，1989 年；Abboushi，46 頁）、帝國主義者的入侵、東西方衝突的延伸，甚至還有美國外交政策的干預（Smith，1992 年）。

If the Arabs, indeed, are the descendants of Ishmail, according the popular belief, then this author would venture to say that the seed of the Arab-Israeli conflict was planted a long time ago. At the age of 85, Abraham, whose name was Abram, was promised to have an offspring as numerous as stars in the heavens (Gen 15:5) when he was still childless without an heir. Abraham's wife, Sarai, who "had borne him no children," begged Abraham to sleep with her maidservant, Hagar, so that she might "build a family through her" (Gen 16:2, NIV). Hagar bore Abraham a son when he was 86 years old and he named him Ishmael. This son, however, was born not through promise but according to the flesh (Gal 4:23, RSV).

如果按照一般人的看法，阿拉伯人是以實瑪利的後裔，那麼本文作者可以大膽地說，以阿衝突的種子自遠古時代就已經埋下了。在亞伯拉罕 85 歲時，那時他的名字是亞伯蘭，還沒有一兒半女，上帝應許他的後裔將像天上的眾星那樣多（創 15:5）。亞伯拉罕的妻子撒萊“不給他生兒女”，就求亞伯拉罕和她的使女夏甲同房，想要藉此“因她得孩子”（創 16:2）。夏甲在亞伯拉罕 86 歲時給他生了一個兒子，亞伯拉罕給他起名以實瑪利。然而這個兒子，不是“憑著應許生的”，而是“按著血氣生的”（加 4:23）。

When Abraham was 99 years old, God told him to change the name of his 89 years old wife to Sarah and promised him to have a son by her (Gen 17:15-16). Indeed, Sarah "bore Abraham a son in his old age" of one hundred years, and he named him Isaac (Gen 21:2-5). It was at the weaning feast of Isaac when Sarah saw Ishmael "mocking" that she told Abraham "to get rid of that slave woman and her son;" for she said, "that slave's son will never share in the inheritance with my son Isaac" (Gen 21:9-10, NIV). By this, Ishmael was expelled from Abraham's household and was severed from the inheritance promised to Abraham.

亞伯拉罕 99 歲時，上帝要他將他 89 歲的妻子改名叫撒拉，並且應許他要從她得一個兒子（創 17:15-16）。果真，在他 100 歲的時候，撒拉“給亞伯拉罕生了一個兒子”，亞伯拉罕給他起名叫以撒（創 21:2-5）。在以撒的斷奶筵席上，撒拉看見以實瑪利“戲笑”，就對亞伯拉罕說“你把這使女、和她兒子趕出去”，並且說，“因為這使女的兒子，不可與我的兒子以撒，一同承受產業”（創 21:9-10）。就這樣，以實瑪利被趕出了亞伯拉罕的家門，從此與上帝應許給亞伯拉罕的產業無份。

Thus, the seed of the conflict between the "heirs" of these two half-brothers was sown. From the biblical account, we do not see any more contacts between Isaac and Ishmael, from the latter's expulsion until more than 70 years later when "Abraham breathed his last and died." Then "Isaac and Ishmael, Abraham's two sons, buried him in the cave of Machpelah" (Gen 25:8-9). Jack Cohen found these "the most startling, soul-stirring verses in the Bible" (J. Cohen 1987, 167). Cohen also raised a very interesting question on what might have been the result if Abraham, instead of expelling Ishmael and his mother, insisted on holding the family together (p. 169).

因此，這兩個同父異母兄弟的"後裔"，就這樣播下了仇恨的種子。從聖經的記載中，我們並沒有發現，自以實瑪利被趕出家門、直到亞伯拉罕"氣絕而死"的 70 多年間，以撒和以實瑪利有過任何的聯繫。然後，亞伯拉罕"兩個兒子以撒、以實瑪利，把他埋葬在麥比拉洞裏"（創 25:8-9）。Jack Cohen 說這是"聖經中最令人震憾和激動的經節"（J. Cohen，1987 年 167 頁）。Cohen 還提出一個有趣的問題，如果亞伯拉罕沒有把以實瑪利和夏甲趕走，而是堅持把他們留在家裡，那將會是一個怎樣的結局（169 頁）？

The direct cause of the contemporary Arab-Israeli conflict, however, is the establishment of a "Jewish national home in Palestine." Wars broke out immediately after the declaration of the establishment of the State of Israel on May 14, 1948. The war was between the Israeli soldiers and the Arab volunteers first; thereafter was with the regular armies from the Arab countries. The conflict intensified in the ensuring years. Major wars broke out in 1957, 1967, 1973 and 1982 between the State of Israel and the Arab states, including Lebanon.

但是，現代以阿衝突的直接導火線，卻是"猶太人在巴勒斯坦建立自己的家園"。戰爭在 1948 年 5 月 14 日以色列宣佈建國後，旋即爆發。最初是以色列軍隊和阿拉伯志願軍之間的戰爭，後來變成與阿拉伯聯盟國家正規軍之間的戰爭。隨後的幾年間，戰爭愈發不可收拾。分別於 1957、1967、1973 和 1982 年，以色列國和阿拉伯聯盟國家包括黎巴嫩之間，爆發了大規模的戰爭。

It was the belief of Ben Gurion, in the 1950's that peace with the Arab world would come only after Israel hit it over the head until it was persuaded that Israel was too resolute and too strong to beat (quoted in Morris, p.666). Morris, based on what's happening in the 1990's, saw some truth in Ben Gurion's prognosis (Morris 1999, pp.666-669). Perhaps, this was also the perception of the current Israeli Prime Minister, Ariel Sharon, when he expressed his opinion that "it wouldn't be possible to reach an agreement with them before the Palestinians are hit hard . . .If they aren't

badly beaten there won't be any negotiation." (<www.pna.gov.ps2001>).

Ben Gurion 在 1950 年代就確信，以色列與阿拉伯世界之間的和平，必須等到以色列徹底打敗阿拉伯人並且讓他們知道，以色列人態度的堅定和軍隊的強大，絕非他們所能戰勝之後，才會來到（Morris，666 頁）。Morris 根據 1990 年代發生的一些事件，發現 Ben Gurion 當年所說並非虛言（Morris，1999 年 666-669 頁）。或許，現在的以色列總理夏隆也是這樣想的，他曾明確指出：「在巴勒斯坦人被徹底擊敗以前，不可能與他們達成協定...他們如果不被擊垮，就不會來談判」。

Benjamin Natanyahu in his book, Durable Peace, concluded, that "if the central aim of the Jewish people during its exile was to retrieve what had been lost, then the purpose now is to secure what has been retrieved" (Natanyahu, 1999, p. 398). The question is what's the extent of "what has been retrieved" and would Israel be satisfied with this?

Benjamin Natanyahu 在他的《持久和平》書中總結說，"如果說猶太人在世界各地流散期間的中心目標是重新獲得他們失去的，那麼現在則是要捍衛他們重新獲得的"（Natanyahu，1999 年 398 頁）。問題是猶太人"重新獲得的"是什麼？猶太人會就此滿足嗎？

SUGGESTIONS FOR AND EFFORTS TOWARD PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The out come of military actions since 1948-49 reveals only one thing: the solution to the Arab-Israel conflict cannot be resolved through the showing of forces in the battlefields. They can only result in loss of more lives, in increasing sufferings, and in more refugees. The conflict, it is obvious, has to be settled through diplomatic negotiations.

以阿之爭：建議和努力

自 1948-49 年以來，歷次軍事行動的結果表明：以阿衝突不能靠在戰場上炫耀武力來解決，這只會導致更多的死傷、更深的苦難、和更多的難民。很顯然的，這場衝突只能通過外交談判來解決。

Negotiations:- It is to be expected that in the process of negotiation there would be obstacles. Schulze mentions that "asymmetry of power and legitimacy between negotiating parties is particular obvious." Schulze, however, recognizes that "symmetry alone does not guarantee successful negotiations." Other obstacles to

negotiations include the fate of Jewish settlers in the West Bank and Gaza Strip, the status of Jerusalem, the release of Palestinian prisoners, violence by extremists, different perception of the time frame, and scale of concession. Conditions required for negotiation and compromise, according to Schulze, include, (1) a firm conviction that conflicts cannot be resolved by means of military actions, (2) a third-party mediation, and (3) a window of opportunity (Schulze, 1999, pp. 92-96). To these, I add a fourth, a genuine desire by both parties, for settling a just, honorable and permanent peace based on equity.

談判：可以預期談判過程中充滿了障礙。Schulze 指出，"很明顯的，談判雙方的力量和合法性是如此的不對等"。不過，他也承認，"就算是關係對等，也無法保證談判能夠成功"。其他的談判障礙還包括：西岸地區和迦薩走廊猶太屯墾者的前途、耶路撒冷的地位、巴勒斯坦因犯的釋放、極端分子的暴力突擊、對時間期限的不同看法、以及妥協讓步的最低限度。Schulze 還列出了三項談判及和解所需的前提條件：（1）雙方都確信無法靠軍事行動解決問題；（2）第三者的從中調停；（3）適當的時機（Schulze，1999 年 92-96 頁）。除了以上這三點，本文作者再加上第四點，即雙方都要以真誠的意願，在公平的基礎上，來謀求合理、有尊嚴的永久性和平。

These conditions, except for the last one, have not been lacking in the process. The violence erupted over a year ago, despite mediations, is still far from reaching an abatement. One can't help but to wonder about the sincerity or genuine desire for peace by both parties. The deadlock seems to focus on insisting, by Mr. Sharon, a complete stopping of Arab suicide bombings, and on the insistence, by Mr. Arafat, of a complete stopping of violence by Jewish Settlers within the West Bank and Gaza Strip. At present, it may be a bit unrealistic to expect the complete stopping of suicide bombings as these activities might be beyond the control of President Arafat. On the other hand, the Office of the Prime Minister in Israel may not be able to exercise full authority over the settlers' violence. Now, it adds a new demand of the complete withdrawing of the IDF before negotiation.

除了上述第四點條件，目前在實際談判過程中，並不缺少其他三樣。雖然不乏第三者的從中調停，但一年多前爆發的暴力事件，又讓人覺得離真正的和平還很遠。這不禁讓人懷疑，雙方對和平是否有真正的誠意。夏隆堅持，阿拉伯人必須完全停止自殺炸彈的攻擊；而阿拉法特則堅持，西岸地區和迦薩走廊的猶太屯墾者，必須完全停止暴力活動；雙方的堅持己見，似乎成了一個死結。目前看來，要求完全停止自殺炸彈的攻擊可能並不務實，因為阿拉法特並不能控制這些自殺者的行動。另一方面，以色列總理也並不能掌控所有的屯墾者的暴力活動。現在巴方

又提出了一項新的條件，即談判前以色列 IDF 戰機必須完全撤離。

The negotiation experiences so far, observed Schulze (p. 96), have been characterized by a refusal to scale back maximum demands, to prioritize objectives, and by a lack of willingness to compromise. If violence is still perceived to be the only leverage, violence will continue. Degeneration of human mind, heart and desire is the culprit. Negotiations, based on genuine desires, require a good faith, and it is risky. The question is if it is worthwhile to try?

Schulze 觀察至目前為止的談判過程（96 頁），認為整個以巴談判給人的印象就是：雙方都不願意以談判為優先目標，在自己要求的最大尺度上稍做讓步，而且雙方都缺乏和解的誠意。一旦暴力被認為是唯一有效的手段，那麼暴力將會一直持續下去。人類理智、良知和熱心的退化是罪魁禍首。和平談判，要基於真心的期望，需要誠實無欺和承擔風險。問題是這件事是否值得一試？

Mediations:- Mediations by third-party countries and resolutions by the United Nations Security Council (Resolutions 242 and 338) have not produced any meaningful results in a peace settlement in the Middle East. In recent years, scholars have made several suggestions toward solving the Arab-Israeli conflict. It was deemed that superpowers' involvement in the Arab-Israeli conflict was motivated by their "sphere of interest," and they may result in further complications. Galtung, therefore, proposed a "conflict management" system to involve not only the United States and the United Nations, but also the Soviet Union (1988, p. 323). With dissolution of the Soviet Union, this suggestion obviously needs to be reconsidered.

調停：第三國的居間調停和聯合國安理會的決議（第 242 和 338 號決議），迄今並未在促進中東和平上達成任何具體結果。近些年來，學者們針對解決以阿之爭提出了不少建議。大家普遍認為，某些超級大國，基於他們的"利益共同體"而參與以阿衝突中，這很可能導致形勢更加複雜。Galtung 就此提出了一個"衝突管理"系統，建議不僅聯合國和美國，而且蘇聯也要參與進來（1988 年，323 頁）。但是隨著蘇聯政府的解體，這個建議勢必要被重新考慮。

Alexander, on the other hand, criticized oversimplification of the causes and the un-objectiveness of scholars whose opinions often led to confusion and to hindrances to peace. He then suggested, as a solution, to look at the simultaneous interplay between the actors and the factors. The former includes individual, state, non-state, regional, and international; the latter includes economic, political, social, cultural, and

另一方面，Alexander 評論說，把失敗的原因過度簡單化，以及一些學者們不客觀的主張，不僅讓情勢更加混亂，而且也成為和平的障礙。要解決這個問題，他建議，應該全面性地研究參與者和各種因素之間的相互影響。前者包括個人、國家、非國家、地區性、和國際性；後者包括經濟、政治、社會、文化和宗教等因素（1973 年第 4 頁）。

Since Israel may be considered as the oldest and the youngest brother in the family of people in the Middle East, Goitein feels that Israel should take the lead in settling the conflict. As the oldest brother, Israel is obligated to be indulgent with the younger members of the family. He should have "a sober, objective, and even sympathetic attitude toward the Arabs." As the youngest member of the family, Israel must learn from his senior the social habits of traditional Arabs. However, Goitein further suggested that Israel deserves, as the oldest, a little consideration and even reverence; and, as the youngest, encouragement and even help from the Arabs (Goitein 1955, pp. 233-234).

Goitein 認為，既然以色列可能是中東民族大家庭中最年長又是最年幼的一員，就應該帶頭負起解決衝突的責任。作為長子，以色列有義務對家庭中的年幼者寬容以待。以色列應該以"冷靜、客觀、甚至憐憫的態度來對待阿拉伯人"。而作為最年幼者，以色列必須向年長者學習傳統阿拉伯人的社會風俗習慣。但 Goitein 進一步認為，以色列應該以長子的身份得到阿拉伯人認同和尊敬；同時以色列也應該以幼子的身份尋求阿拉伯人的鼓勵和幫助（Goitein，1955 年 233-234 頁）。

Bailey suggested an impartial mediation through "face-to-face" encounters (Bailey 1990). Earlier, Reisman proposed to set up "Power Diplomacy." By this, he meant, the interference of external superpowers. The purpose was to help create conditions for "minimum order" in the region, to lower the level of overt violence, to neutralize the initiators of unrest, and to resolve the major moral and human problem in the most possible equitable manner (Reismman 1970, 78).

Bailey 建議一個中立的第三國出面主持雙方"面對面"的和談（Bailey，1990 年）。更早些時候，Reisman 曾經提議建立"大國外交"。他的意思是，由局外強大國家從中斡旋來解決問題。其目的是在盡可能公平的範圍內，為這個地區設立一個"最低限度要求"的條件，從而降低暴力的程度、弭平動亂的根源、並解決主要的道德和人權問題（Reismman，1970 年 78 頁）。

Saul Cohen anticipates the Middle East to become a geographically unified unit. To him, Israel's present and future is inextricably entwined with not only the Palestine

Arabs, but also with the war and peace strategies of Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, Iran, and Iraq. Therefore, he suggests that there can only be a "Middle Eastern strategy" for the United States and the United Nations, for Iraq and Egypt, for Turkey and Iran, and for Jordan and Israel (1992, p. 5).

Saul Cohen 預測中東地區將成為一個地理上的共同體。他認為，以色列的現在和未來，不但無可避免地與巴勒斯坦的阿拉伯人緊密結合在一起，同時也會受到與埃及、約旦、黎巴嫩、敘利亞、伊朗和伊拉克之間戰爭與和平策略的影響。因此他建議，無論是對美國與聯合國、伊拉克與埃及、土耳其與伊朗、約旦與以色列來說，只能有一個"中東戰略"（1992 年第 5 頁）。

Galtung feels that toward the settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict there has been "no peace process nor the intention of having one." He points out that the "imposed" agreement such as Camp David Accord, and the "peace by piece" practice were not a real peace process. To him, there remain only three rival images: (1) a one-state solution which involves the absorption of the Palestinians as first class citizen within Israel; (2) a two-state solution with the creation of an independent Palestinian state anchored in the West Bank and Gaza; and (3) a confederate solution based on some kind of Israeli/Palestinian partnership, perhaps plus Jordan to become a "Benelex" of the Middle East (1988, pp. 321-324). Galtung has some faith in the "confederate solution" which he believes to be a better idea.

Galtung 覺得，就解決以阿衝突而言，其實"完全沒有和平進展，雙方也沒有意願去推動這個進展"。他指出，那些像「大衛營和平協定」"虛有其表"的協議，以及所謂"漸進和平"的執行，並不是真正的和平進展。他認為，只能在下列三個方案中擇一而行：（1）一國解決法，即只有一個以色列國，但是必須將巴勒斯坦人納入成為一等公民；（2）兩國解決法，即在西岸地區和迦薩走廊建立獨立的巴勒斯坦國；（3）聯盟解決法，在某種以巴合作的基礎上，也許再加上約旦王國，在中東地區組成一個類似"比荷盧三國關稅同盟"的聯盟組織（1988 年 321-324 頁）。Galtung 對"聯盟解決法"很有信心，他認為這是一個比較可行的方案。

Beilin analyzed "the Arabs of Israel" and seems to feel the impracticality of the one-state solution. He then laid down some principles for consideration in future negotiations. These include social justice, equal value of all human beings, reducing social differentials, obligation to give every individual the opportunity for self-discovery and self-fulfillment. What he has proposed here "is an extension of freedom of choice in all areas--economic, religious, educational—and a concerted effort to remove deprivation (Beilin 1999, 256-260).

Beilin 在研究了"以色列的阿拉伯人"後認為，一國解決法不切實際。他於是針對今後的談判提出了一些思考原則。這些原則包括：社會正義、所有人類一律平等、縮短社會差異、義務為每位百姓提供自我發現和自我實現的機會。他的建議就是"在包括經濟、宗教、教育等所有領域的一個延伸性自由選擇權，並且共同努力消弭貧困"（Beilin，1999 年 256-260 頁）。

Wrote originally for the Washingtonians and later was condensed in the Reader's Digest author Lydia Strohl raised a question: "If medicine can use religion and faith, why can't politics?" (Strohl 2001, p.108). Perhaps, it is time to look into religion for a possible solution.

作家 Lydia Strohl 在一篇為"華盛頓人雜誌"撰寫、後來精簡刊登在"讀者文摘"上的文章中提出一個問題："如果宗教和信仰可以拿來當作醫治的良藥，為什麼不將它用於政治上呢"（Strohl，2001 年 108 頁）？或許，現在是用宗教來尋求解決之道的時候了。

Having analyzed distinctive handicaps and definite assets of the role that Christians can play in the current Arab-Israeli conflict, Epp feels that Christians should be involved in what he calls "prophesying ministry" toward the peace effort in the Middle East. By prophesying, it is meant, "the bold proclamation of the will of God in every practical and relevant terms" . This includes proclaiming justice for the Palestinian Arabs, advocating security for the Jews, and restraining the superpowers and boosting the role of the United Nations. As peacemakers, Epp challenges Christians to render their sacrificial deed by laying down their lives for their friends and enemies. They should be willing to stand by and help the Palestinian farmers as they brave the Israeli jets, and to stand with the Israeli Kibbutzim and other settlements being shelled by the Arabs (Epp 1970, 231-265). However, what Epp advocates here are humanitarian concerns for a suffering people, he did not say much about settling the conflict.

Epp 在研究基督徒在現今以阿之爭中所能扮演角色的優劣情勢後，認為基督徒應該實際參與促進中東和平的努力，他稱之為"命定的宣教"。這意味著"大膽地用可行而又中肯的話語來宣揚上帝的旨意"，包括，伸張巴勒斯坦阿拉伯人的正義、維護以色列人的安全、遏制超級強國的干預、提高聯合國的作用。Epp 自許為一個和平調解者，要求基督徒貢獻他們的犧牲精神，為朋友和敵人捨命。他認為基督徒應該自願去幫助巴勒斯坦的農夫對抗以色列的戰機，同時也要與以色列集體農場和屯墾者一起反抗阿拉伯人的炸彈攻擊（1970 年 231-265 頁）。然而，Epp

所言，無非是對受苦百姓的一種人道關懷，而非解決衝突之道。

Moshe Katsav, President of the State of Israel once said, "There's been enough suffering on both the Palestinian and Israeli sides. We have to put an end to it." (Jerusalem Post, August 7, 2001). To put an end to the conflict is the desire of many for sure. The question is "how."

以色列總理摩西‧卡察夫曾經說過："巴勒斯坦和以色列雙方的百姓都受夠了苦難。我們必須結束這一切"（耶路撒冷郵報，2001 年 8 月 7 日）。結束這場衝突是雙方人民的共同願望，但問題是："如何解決"？

THE NEED FOR A BIBLICAL SOLUTION

To find a solution to the conflict, one must have a real understanding of the problem. At the core of the conflict, there lies a contest for control of the same piece of land by the Israeli Jews and the Palestinian Arabs (Supra). For the Palestinian Arabs, their claim to the land is based on their continuing presence, at least since the Seventh Century, A.D. For the Jews, their claim to the land is based on the history of the Hebrew tribes who have intermittently lived in the land. They occasionally ruled the land from the second millennium B.C.E. until their expulsion from Jerusalem in 135 C.E. Furthermore, as recorded in the Bible (e.g., Gen 15:18), their claim is also based on the promised made by their God, Yahweh, to their forefathers (Gerner 1991, p. 3).

聖經的解決方法

要找出一個解決以阿衝突的方法，我們就必須瞭解問題實質之所在。這場衝突的核心問題就是，以色列的猶太人與巴勒斯坦的阿拉伯人，雙方對同一塊土地的爭奪權。對巴勒斯坦阿拉伯人來說，基於他們至少從主曆第 7 世紀起就一直居住在這塊土地上的這個事實，主張對這裡的所有權；而以色列人則是基於猶太民族曾經斷續性地在此居住的歷史；他們從主前 2000 年就已開始斷續地統治這地，直到在主曆 135 年被逐出耶路撒冷為止。此外，根據聖經的記載（創 15:18 等），他們的主張，也基於耶和華對他們祖先的應許（Gerner，1991 年第 3 頁）。

As mentioned earlier, Jack Cohen, assuming that Arabs are descendents of Ishmael, raised an interesting question as to what might have happened if Abraham, instead of expelling Ishmael, decided to hold the family together (Supra). The question is very relevant today because it has cropped up again in the current meeting of the descendents of the two long-separated half-brothers. The descendents of Isaac and

Ishmael are once again together on the same common ancestral land. If the quarrel results from the incompatible claims of the two peoples for the same parcel of land that is promised in the Bible, we must look into the Bible for the possible solution. The author will identify three areas for considerations.

如前所述，假設阿拉伯人是以實瑪利的後裔，Jack Cohen 就此提出了一個有趣的問題，即：如果亞伯拉罕沒有把以實瑪利趕出去，而是決定把他留在家裡，結果會是如何呢？這個問題在今天看來顯得意義重大，因為這一對長期分離的同父異母兄弟之後裔，居然在現今的會議桌上又重逢了。以撒和以實瑪利的後裔，在這片共同傳承的土地上再一次相見。如果這場爭端肇始於雙方對聖經中同一塊「應許之地」的爭奪，我們就必須從聖經裡尋找可能的解決方法。本文作者將針對此，從三方面來思考。

Before getting to that, one must ask first, what is meant by "Biblical Solution?" Let it be understood, that the Bible refers here to is the Judeo-Christian Bible. It contains an Old as well as a New Testament. The title of this paper, "Arab-Israeli Conflict: A Biblical Solution" implies to solve this conflict according to the principles and teaching in the Judeo-Christian Bible. The process involves faith and trust, love and forgiveness, repentance and reconciliation. It requires genuine sincerity and openness and a willingness to sacrificially take the first possible risky step. It is not "if you do that, we'll do this." The spirit is this: all being considered, we will do this for the benefits of all of us, even though you might not see the point at this moment, we are willing to take the risk with the hope that you will respond positively in time.

在討論前，我們首先要問：何謂"聖經的解決方法"？有一點必須說明的是，我們這裡所說的聖經，指的是猶太教與基督教共有的聖經，包括舊約和新約。本文的題目"以阿之爭：聖經的解決方法"，意指根據猶太教與基督教共有聖經的原則和教導來解決這場衝突。其過程包含誠實和信任、愛心和饒恕、悔改和順從。它需要真正的誠意和開放的心態，以及勇於犧牲和承擔風險的意願。這不是"如果你這樣做，我就那樣做"的條件式談判。它的精神應該是，所有事情只朝一個方向來思考，就是："我們這樣做是為了雙方的利益，儘管你們目前還無法意識到這一點，我們還是願意承擔風險，希望你們能及時給予正面的回應"。

The three areas mentioned in the Abstract are rephrased here as follows: 1) The principle of living together in peace; 2) The principle of allotting the land for an inheritance; and 3) The principle of loving God and one's neighbor.

上段所提及之三方面的思考，具體而言之就是：1）和平共存的原則；2）分地為

19

業的原則；3）愛上帝和愛鄰舍的原則。

The Principle of Living together in Peace:- Ethical questions aside, the Israelites and the Canaanites are once living together in the same piece of land, during the major part of the five centuries after Israelites had crossed the River Jordan and entered into the "Promised Land." The situation was created by "balance of power." Since none of the tribes of Israel was able to expel the Canaanites out of the lands designated to them by Joshua, they had to live together with the Canaanites and, for practical purpose, in peace. Thus, we read for example:

和平共存的原則：姑且先不論倫理問題，事實上以色列人在渡過約但河、進入「應許之地」後，曾經與迦南人在同一塊土地上，共同生活了五個世紀之久。這種局面是因為雙方"勢均力敵"。由於沒有一個以色列支派能把迦南人逐出約書亞分給他們為業之地，他們只好在屈於現實情勢之下與迦南人和平共處。在聖經中我們可以看到很多這樣的例子：

"But the Jebusites, the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the people of Judah could not drive out; so the Jebusites dwell with the people of Judah in Jerusalem unto this day." (Josh 15:63). "Yet the sons of Manasseh could not take possession of those cities, and the Canaanites persisted in dwelling in that land" (Josh 17:12); See also Judges 1:27-35. During the days of Judges, despite the presence of so much enmity, Samson was able to move freely through the land of the Philistines, even to the major city of Gaza (Judges 13:24, 25 and chapter 16).

「至於住耶路撒冷的耶布斯人，猶大人不能把他們趕出去，耶布斯人卻在耶路撒冷與猶大人同住，直到今日」（書 15:63）。「只是瑪拿西子孫，不能趕出這些城的居民，迦南人偏要住在那地」（書 17:12）。士師記 1 章 27-35 節，也記載了許多同樣的例子。在士師時期，儘管非利士人並不友善，參孫還是能在非利士地自由往來，甚至還可以到他們的主要城邑迦薩去（士 13:24, 25；士 16）。

The Principle of Allotting Land for an Inheritance:- This principle was given by the Sovereign Lord to prophet Ezekiel whose prophesies we reads: Thus says the Lord God: "These are the boundaries by which you should divide the land for inheritance among the twelve tribes of Israel . . . You shall allot it as an inheritance for yourselves and for the aliens who reside among you and have begotten children among you. They shall be to you as native-born sons of Israel; with you they shall be allotted an inheritance among the tribes of Israel (emphases mine). In whatever tribe the alien resides, there you shall assign him his inheritance, says the Lord God." (Ezekiel 47:13,

22-23, RSV)

分地為業的原則：這個原則是主耶和華透過先知以西結告訴我們的：「主耶和華如此說，你們要照地的境界，按以色列十二支派，分地為業。...要拈鬮分這地為業，歸與自己和你們中間寄居的外人，就是在你們中間生養兒女的外人。你們要看他們如同以色列人中所生的一樣，他們在以色列支派中要與你們同得地業。外人寄居在那支派中，你們就在那裏分給他地業。這是主耶和華說的」（結 47:13, 22-23）。

Let us ask first, "Who are these resident aliens?" Then let us note further that this is a command of the Sovereign Lord. The resident aliens, under the current context, are none but the Palestinians. The instruction in the prophesy of Ezekiel is that these aliens should be treated as native born sons of Israel; they should be allotted an inheritance among the tribes of Israel. In other words, these aliens may live in the same community as neighbors. This is a nice and ideal situation. However, in the case of today's Israel, it is almost impossible for the Jews and the Arabs to live next door to each other. For this reason, if these aliens were to receive land as an inheritance, according to the Lord's command, they probably would have to be in the West Bank or in the Gaza Strip. And, this is what the Palestinians are aspiring for.

首先我們要問的是，誰是"寄居的外人"？接著，我們要明白，這是主耶和華給我們的一道命令。在現今情況下，這"寄居的外人"不是別人，正是巴勒斯坦人。以西結預言中的指示就是，要看那些外人如同以色列人中所生的一樣；他們應該在以色列各支派中得地為業。換句話說，這些外人應該與以色列人生活在同一個社區，而且成為他們的鄰舍。這是一個完美而理想的局面。但是就目前的以色列國而言，猶太人和阿拉伯人幾乎不可能比鄰而居。基於上述理由，如果按照上帝的命令，這些外人也能得地為業，他們就可能必須居住在西岸地區或迦薩走廊。其實這也是巴勒斯坦人的要求。

With the policy of "Land for Peace" already in place, this solution seems to be workable. One major obstacle might be the Israeli concern for security. This is a legitimate concern for the Israeli, which Mr. Arafat seems to have not adequately addressed. In his recent address, "The Palestinian Vision of Peace," Mr. Arafat almost just mentioned the question of security in passing when he said, "The Palestinian vision of peace is an independent and viable Palestinian state on the territories occupied by Israel in 1967, living as an equal neighbor alongside Israel with peace and security for both . . ." (Arafat, 2002). The biblical solution to this sort of thing is not to make a big case out of it, but to just ask for clarification and then go on to build

a stronger relation based on that "good faith."

隨著"土地換和平"政策適當地展開，這個解決辦法看來行之有效。一個最大的障礙就是，以色列對自身安全的擔憂。以色列的這個擔憂是合理的，但是阿拉法特似乎並沒有就此問題做出適當的回應。在最近一篇"巴勒斯坦人的和平願景"演講中，阿拉法特對這個問題只是順便帶過，他說"巴勒斯坦人的和平願景，就是在1967 年被以色列人佔領的土地上，建立一個獨立自主的國家，成為以色列的鄰國共同生活，雙方和平安全共處…"（阿拉法特，2002 年）。對於這類事情，聖經的解決方法，並不是實質地去提出一個解決方案，而只是要求澄清事實並且基於"誠信"，為雙方建立一個更穩固的關係。

The Principle of Loving God and Neighbors:- Love is a splendid thing; it avails very much. The definition of love is clearly defined in the New Testament (especially in the First Epistle to the Church in Corinth, Chapter 13). To be sure, the Law of Moses spoke of "eye for eye and tooth for tooth." The reason behind this approach was to take away the sin and evil from the Land. On the other hand, the message on love abounded. In Deuteronomy one reads: " You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your might" (6:5). In Leviticus one finds; " But you shall love your neighbor as yourself: I am the Lord" (19:18).

愛上帝和愛鄰舍的原則：愛是一件奇妙的事情，它的益處良多。新約中為"愛"做了很清楚的定義（尤其是哥林多前書 13 章）。的確，摩西律法中曾提到"以眼還眼，以牙還牙"，但是他這個說法，背後的理由是為了除去地上的罪和邪惡。.同時，摩西律法中亦記載大量愛的信息。在申命記中，我們看到："你要盡心、盡性、盡力愛耶和華你的神"（申 6:5）。在利未記中，我們也可以讀到："卻要愛人如己。我是耶和華"（利 19:18）。

To most people, loving God is not hard to understand. But many would probably have to ask: "Who is my neighbor?" (Luke 10:29.) Reading from Luke 10:25-27, if not carefully, one probably would think that one should love those who are less fortunate like the one being beaten. On careful reading of the text, one realizes that the neighbor in this incident is the one who show mercies. The truth is that if one has not experienced mercies extended to him, he is likely unable to shows mercy to other. In our case of Arab-Israeli relation, may the descendents of Father Abraham who have all received mercy, learn how to extend a merciful hand toward other. This writer longs to see that that day would come soon when all descendents of Abraham travel together in life's path with happiness and joy.

對大多數人來說，愛上帝這件事並不難理解。但是可能也有人會問：“誰是我的鄰舍呢”（路 10:29）？當我們讀路加福音 10 章 25-37 節時，如果不仔細去想，我們可能會認為我們應當去愛那些比我們不幸的人，譬如那位被打的人。但是仔細閱讀這一段經文，我們就會明白，在這個事件中，鄰舍其實是那個去憐憫人的人。事實上，如果一個人從未被人憐憫過，就不太可能知道如何去憐憫別人。就以色列人和阿拉伯人之間的關係而言，願亞伯拉罕的子孫都能蒙憐憫，從而學會如何向別人伸出援手。本文作者長久以來盼望這一天能趕快到來，所有亞伯拉罕的後裔都能充滿喜樂、彼此扶持走過人生的旅程。

CONCLUSION

To have peace in Israel-Palestine, it is imperative that the Jews in Israel must follow the instruction of Yahweh to give the aliens, the Palestinians, the right to the land. Living side by side in peaceful coexistence is both a historical fact during the major part of Joshua's time; it is also the heart-desire of Yahweh as revealed through the words of His prophet, Ezekiel.

結論

要想實現以色列和巴勒斯坦之間的和平，以色列的猶太人就必須遵從主耶和華的指示，給外人，即巴勒斯坦人，對這塊土地的權利。雙方共同生活、和平相處，這是約書亞時期大部分時間的一個歷史事實；這也是主耶和華透過先知以西結所傳遞的心願。

In an address, President Arafat expressly said: "Israel's peace partner is, and always has been the Palestinian people. Peace is not a signed agreement between individuals—it is reconciliation (author's emphasis) between people."(Arafat Feb 3, 2002). Mr. Arafat hit it right: RECONCILIATION!

在一次演講中，阿拉法特明確說道：“以色列的和平夥伴一直是，並且現在也是巴勒斯坦人。和平不是個人間簽署的一份協定 -- 它是兩個民族之間的和好”（阿拉法特 2002 年 2 月 3 日）。阿拉法特的確一語中的：「和好」！

In the Old Testament, reconciliation required spill of blood through sacrifice of animals. In the New Testament time, Christ, the Lamb of God was a sacrifice for all. "While we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son" (Romans 5:10). For this Arab-Israeli Conflict, many lives have been sacrificed and much blood has spilled. One should only mention Anwar Saddat, Yizack Rabin,

soldiers, civilians, innocent women, and children; and, don't forget, suicide boomers. Has the blood spilled enough? If negotiations have achieved nothing, the blood would have been spilled in vain. May our hearts not be so callous that these lives were sacrificed for nothing!

在舊約時代，和好需要祭灑犧牲的血。而在新約時代，耶穌基督，上帝的羔羊已為我們做了挽回祭。"因為我們作仇敵的時候，且藉著上帝兒子的死，得與上帝和好"（羅 5:10）。在這場以阿之爭中，已經有許多人為此流血並且喪命。其中有沙達特總統、拉賓總理、以阿軍人、平民、無辜的婦人和孩童；同時，不要忘記那些自殺炸彈攻擊者。這些血還沒有流夠嗎？假如談判不能達成任何結果，這些鮮血都將白流了。但願我們的心不要再如此剛硬，讓這些生命白白地犧牲。

As one meditates upon the occasion when Isaac and Ishmael trod together on the same ground to bury "their father Abraham in the Cave of Macphelah," one wonders if the destiny of these two peoples is to be together only in sadness? Or, their relationship is to be found only in bitter memories of ancestral rivalry? Can the two peoples acknowledge and accept their common origin, build a new life together founded on mutual respect of each other's differences that have accumulated over the years? The answer to this question is an unquestionable yes; though with a condition--at the fulfillment of the prophesized promise spoken of by Ezekiel: "A new heart will I give you, and a new spirit I will put within you; and I will take out of your flesh the heart of stone and give you a heart of flesh" (Ezek 36:26). It is our hope that the day of fulfillment of this promise is at the very near future!

讓我們來深思一下：以撒和以實瑪利相聚在一起，在麥比拉洞埋葬他們的父親亞伯拉罕時的情景。我們不禁要懷疑，難道是天意使然，讓這兩個民族只能在悲傷的場合才會聚在一起？或者，這兩個民族之間的關係，只存在於他們祖先彼此相爭的痛苦回憶中？這兩個民族，能否承認並接受他們的共同血源，從而在互相尊重彼此在歲月中累積的差異基礎上，一起建立一個新生活呢？這個問題的答案，毫無疑問是肯定的；但是有一個附帶條件 -- 只要他們能確實履行以西結預言中所傳遞的一個應許："我也要賜給你們一個新心，將新靈放在你們裏面。又從你們的肉體中除掉石心，賜給你們肉心"（結 36:26）。我們盼望這個應許，在不久的將來就能完全實現。