

Title: THE RESURRECTION

主題: 主耶穌的復活

by Dr. W. EUGENE SCOTT (Ph.D., Stanford University)

Preached at the Los Angeles University Cathedral

猶金.史考特(史丹佛大學博士) 在洛杉磯大學大會堂的佈道

Copyright ©2007 - Pastor Melissa Scott – all rights reserved

版權所有,請勿翻印。版權所有人:梅莉莎.史考特 牧師

THE RESURRECTION

主耶穌的復活

I lost my faith, in college. I lost it because of a subtle psychological pressure. It was all right to believe in Jesus as a “good and wise” teacher, and elevate Him on an equal plane with Mohammed, who founded the Islamic faith, with Gautama Buddha, who was a prince of India and founded Buddhism, with Confucius of China (more of a political philosopher, really) whose sayings affect so much of that portion of the world – in short, with any respectable founder of a religion.

我在唸大學的時候失去了對神的信心。我之所以會如此，僅因來自於一個微妙的心理壓力。可是我相信耶穌基督是一位“良善且具有智慧”的夫子，並且可以把祂在知識水準的地位高舉到與創辦伊斯蘭教信仰的穆罕默德，創立釋迦牟尼佛教的印度王子，和在中國傳揚學說，影響了世界上大部份人的思想深遠的孔夫子（孔子的見解真的是超越了一般的政治哲學家了）齊頭的程度。簡而言之，我們可以把祂與這些受人尊敬，影響宗教信仰的創始人相提並論。

I could put Jesus in that category, dispense with Him as a “good and wise teacher,” be accepted and get my intellectual wings. But to hold to the belief that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, and thus super-natural was simply not acceptable. Parenthetically, I might comment that there is a current hour-long advertisement on television for tape sales, telling you the origin of all religions.

我可以把耶穌歸納為是一個“良善且具有智慧的夫子”，被祂檢選，倍受祂智識的羽翼遮護。但一定要堅定耶穌基督是神的兒子的信仰，而這一切並非來自於不可思議的超自然現象。顯然地，我會在無意間論斷那些在電視上利用整個小時的時段銷售詮釋宗教來源的錄影帶。

It starts in Egypt, but they never go to Sumer where the religions started that flowed to Egypt (and they never got to Babylon). Still, there is no one with any sense that denies the influence of Egypt on both the Hebrews and the Greeks. Cyrus Gordon settled that.

這個錄影帶內容始於埃及，但那些人從未曾去過幼發拉底河口，那是個宗教的起源地，經由此地再流傳到埃及（並且他們也未曾到達巴比倫）。還有，賽勒斯.戈登澄清了這種看法，就是沒有人有任何實質上的意義去否決希伯來人和希臘人對埃及的影響。

But in this ad some portly little guy sits there, and some suave, slick-coifed tamed TV evangelist-looking guy sits there, and they tell you how all religions started, and then they make an oblique reference to the 16 crucified saviors – which can't be found in the implication of the analogy drawn.

但在這些影片中坐著一些肥腸滿腦的傢伙，和一些衣冠楚楚、油嘴滑舌的電視佈道家，他們告訴你所有宗教的起始，然後他們傾倒灌輸史上十六名被釘死在十字架上的所謂宗教神話救主的談論 -- 那些在推論的暗論中隱藏著不可言諭的弦外之音。

It's just another example of the current "ecumenical approach to religion" – the religion of no religion (as it was called by one of my professors in Comparative Religion at Stanford) because all religions (they say) have "the same root." That approach came at me, persuasively suggesting that I was not intelligent until I graduate from this "primitive" attitude toward Christ as the super-natural, divine Son of God and instead accept Him as but another expression, another founder, in the stream of common religiousness; thus reduced to simply a "good and wise teacher."

另舉一個當前署名“普世基督教教義探討”來做比喻 -- 它只是個沒有實質宗教意義的宗教實例（它被我在史丹弗大學中的一個教比較宗教學的教授如此稱呼）因為他們認為所有宗教都是“源出一處”。這種說法臨到我，並讓我確信我的不足，除非我單純的相信基督的奧祕，敬畏祂是神的兒子，並用另一種表達方式接受祂，是一種一般常見的宗教洪流中的創始者；因而削弱單純的只是一個“良善且具有智慧的夫子”。

The only problem with the intellectual substitute for a faith in a supernatural Christ, namely just a "good and wise teacher," is that **He can't be either one unless He is both.**

以聰明才智取代對基督的奧祕的信仰是唯一令人困惑的情況，那就是祂不能只具備其中一項特點而需兩項俱全，也就是祂是一個“良善且具有智慧的夫子”。

To be good, you have to tell what's true. You can be insane, you can be a nut, and honestly believe something that's dead wrong, and be good – but not wise. To be wise, you've got to be right; to be good, you've got to be honest, and "their" Jesus could be good but not wise, wise but not good, but definitely not both. Why?

要活得有意義，你必需要辨識什麼是事實。你可以是一個無知的人，你可以是一個特異之徒，或堅信謬誤荒唐的事的人，但也活得好端端的 -- 只是沒有智慧。要有智慧就是；你必須做對的事，要活得有意義，你必須誠實，“他們”的耶穌也許很好，但沒有智慧，或聰明但不好，可是絕非兩樣都是。為什麼呢？

In any source that you have for Jesus in history, if you are going to call him good and wise, you are going to go to his sayings and you are going to go to his actions. I don't restrict the source to the Gospels, even though that is where most of the opponents of a supernatural Christ go as they hunt and peck and pull certain verses out to illustrate his life and sayings, even highlighting them in red on television.

在歷史上任何對耶穌來源的說法，如果你要說祂良善又有智慧那即是你將實行祂的說法並付諸行為。我不會限制福音的來源，即使是大部分反對基督的奧秘者，他們涉獵，啄擊，引申某些經句去舉證祂的生平和言語，甚至在電視上激辯強調那些議題。

You can go behind the Gospels. There is a hypothetical “Q” document. One of the early church fathers said that Matthew wrote down the sayings of Christ as he traveled with Him, not in Greek but in his native language, Aramaic. We know his Gospel was written most likely at Antioch and written in Greek. This “Sayings of Jesus,” written in Aramaic, may have been a common source for the Gospels. Those who can read Greek see changes in style in sections of the Gospels, and can reconstruct these sections to propose a source used by all three of the Synoptic Gospel writers, Matthew, Mark and Luke (particularly Matthew and Luke).

你可以探究福音背後蘊含的意義。那裡有一項假設性的“Q”文檔。早期的一位教會的創始人說：馬太福音是馬太在和基督一同外出佈道時，以他的母語阿拉米語而非希臘文記載下耶穌基督的話語。我們知道他的福音很可能是在安提阿時以希臘文記載的。那些以阿拉米語寫下的“耶穌的話語”可能已是大多福音出處。那些懂得希臘文的人觀察到有些福音章節的風格已經有所更改了，並且可以重建這些章節去找出聖經新約的前三部福音書來源及其作者馬太、馬可和路加(特別是馬太和路加)所著作的部分。

Most modern scholars regard Mark as written first, because we can see again in the change of style when Matthew and Luke copy Mark. The most persuasive “common source” behind the Synoptic Gospels is called the hypothetical “Q” Document (from the German word for “source”). You can even go to the ancient songs, the earliest fragments. Still, wherever you encounter Jesus doing something or saying something, attached to every one of those records will be a saying by Christ or a projection of a self-image that He has of Himself that precludes calling Him “good and wise” because you will find one or more of the following in every source:

多數當代學者認為馬可福音是第一個被寫成的，因為我們再次從馬太福音及路加福音的書寫風格的改變看到是來自於馬克福音的。聖經新約的前三部福音書的“共同的來源”最有說服力的是所謂的假設性的“Q”文檔(是從德國的單字“源”而來的)。你甚至可以回溯於那些古老的歌曲，最早的片段。還有，無論你做某事經歷到耶穌或祂的話語，加諸到任何記錄上的東西將會是基督的一句話或影射祂的自我形象阻礙稱祂為“良善且具有智慧的”，因為你會找到一個或多個以下的來源：

1. He thought He was perfect.

1. 祂認為祂是完美的

It doesn't matter whether He was, He **thought** he was. Carlyle says the greatest of all sins is to be conscious of none. There's nothing as despicable as a person who thinks he's never made a mistake. That conscious, self-righteous, perfectionist image is not something we respond to, because the wisdom of mankind combines in the knowledge that nobody's perfect.

祂是不是並不重要，但祂認為祂是。加力索說，最大的罪是自認為沒犯罪。沒有比一個人自認祂永遠不會犯錯更卑鄙的。那有意識，自以為是的完美主義者形像不值得我們去回應，因為在人類知識結合下的智慧，沒有任何人是完美的。

Now the issue is not whether Jesus was perfect; we just don't make saints of people who **think** they're perfect. The record of people used by God seeing themselves as not perfect goes throughout the whole Old Testament – “I am not worthy of the least of Thy mercies – Who am I that I should lead forth the children of Israel? – I am but a child. I cannot speak.”

現在問題不是耶穌是否完美；我們只是不想讓聖徒覺得他們是完美的。在整個舊約記載中人被神使用，乃是人看到自己的不完美 -- “你施行的慈愛我一點也不配得 -- 我是那將百姓從以色列領出的人嗎？-- 我不知怎樣說。因為我是年幼的。”

Always the criterion of acceptance by God and acceptance by man is that conscious attitude of imperfection. Holy men are aware of the distance they are from God. There was only one man in the whole kingdom who saw God; in the year King Uzziah died, Isaiah was the only man who saw God sitting on a throne high and lifted up – that means He was above everybody. His first words were: “Woe is me; I am undone.”

上帝所接受的和人所接受的標準之不同取決於對缺陷在意識上的態度。神聖的人都知道他們與上帝的距離。整個王國只有一個人曾見到上帝，烏西雅國王崩卒那年以賽亞是唯一見證到上帝坐在寶座至高處的人 -- 他的第一句話是：“禍哉，我滅亡了”。

We just don't make saints of people who think they're perfect – but Jesus thought he was. Everywhere you meet him, he projects that. He judges other people: “whitened sepulchers;” “strain out a gnat and swallow a camel.” He looks at the most righteous people of the day and puts them down. The reason that no man ought to judge, and anyone who is a judge should have this sensitive conscience, is that it's hard to judge your fellow man because we know way down deep we have the same kinds of faults. 我們只是不想讓聖徒認為他們是完美的--但耶穌以為祂是。你所見到祂之處，祂張顯反應出來。祂評斷其他人：“偽善者;” “蠓蟲你們就濾出來,駱駝你們倒吞下去”(小事拘謹而大事糊塗，目光短淺)。祂注目於當時最正直的人，並將他們放了。沒有人可以審判他人，論別人罪的人應該有這種敏銳的道德良心，我們很難去論斷我們的同伴，因為我們深知大家都會犯下類似的錯誤。

But Jesus never had any sense of imperfection. He changed the Law, saying, “You have heard it said unto you, but behold I say,” and then, self-righteously with a consciousness of moral perfection, says, “Think not that I have come to destroy the Law. I am come to fulfill it.”

但耶穌從來沒有讓人感受到任何缺陷。祂改變了律法，祂說，“你聽過它對你們說，但留心聽我說，”然後，說，偽善的道德完美意識，“莫想我來要廢掉律法。我來乃是要成全。”

There is one possible exception to that, when the rich young ruler came to Him and said, “Good Master.” He stopped him and said, “Why callest thou me good?” Those that want to talk about Jesus not thinking he was perfect point to that verse; they miss the rest of it, because Jesus said to him, “Wait a minute. Don’t come and call me good rabbi, good teacher. If you are going to call me good, also recognize that only God can be good, so don’t tap the appellation on to Me without recognizing that I am also God.”

有一個可能的例外,那就是當富裕的的年輕官員來到祂面前攔住了祂,並說:“良善的夫子”。
“為什麼你稱我為良善?”那些想談論耶穌的人沒想到經節中其餘部分,因為耶穌告訴他,“稍待。不要前來,也別叫我良善的拉比,良善的夫子。如果你稱我為良善,要明白除了神以外再沒有良善的,所以不要推敲稱謂要知道我也是上帝”。

He had that sense of moral perfection; no sense of a moral inadequacy is ever exhibited anywhere in His behavior.

祂具有道德完美的意識,道德的不足之處未曾在下意識中展露在祂的行為當中。

2. He seated all authority in Himself.

2. 祂掌管一切。

He even **said** He had all authority: “You build on what I say, you build on a rock. You build on anything else, you build on sand. All authority in heaven and earth is given to Me.”

祂甚至說祂掌管一切:“你在我的言語上建造,你在磐石上建造。你建造在其它任何事物,你建造在沙土上。天上地下所有權柄都賜給我了”。

Again to point to the other illustration used, He said concerning the law (generations of approval had been placed on it): “You have heard it said unto you, but behold I say...” He pronounced judgment without a flicker.

我們再次看看其他對此的註解,祂對有關法律的話(歷代的承諾已被擺在上面了):“你聽見我吩咐你的一切話,但看哪,我告訴你們...”祂明明白白的宣告律法。

Now, we don’t make saints of people like that. We ask the criteria, “On what do you base this authority?” He based it on himself: “Behold, **I say** unto you...”

現在,我們不要求每個聖人都像那樣。我們好奇標準是什麼“權勢的基礎是什麼?”祂的準則乃基於祂自己:“看哪,我告訴你們...”

3. He put Himself at the center of the Religious Universe.

3. 他把自己放在宗教宇宙的中心。

He went further and put Himself at the center of the religious universe. Jesus didn’t come preaching a doctrine or a truth apart from Himself. He said, “I’m the way. I’m the truth. I’m the life. By Me if any man enter in... I am the door of the sheepfold. He that hateth not father, mother, wife, children, brother, sister, yea, and his own life also, taketh up his cross and come **after Me**, cannot be **My disciple**.” He

made your relationship with Him, putting Him the center of the religious universe, the determinative of all religious benefits.

祂更進一步把自己比擬為宗教宇宙的中心。耶穌並未將自己與所傳揚的道或真理分離。祂說：“我是道路,我是真理,我是生命。如果有人進到我裡面...我就是羊(圈)的門。人到我這裡來,若不愛我勝過愛自己的父母、妻子、兒女、弟兄、姐妹、和自己的性命,並背起十字架來跟從我,就不能作為我的門徒”祂把自己放在宗教宇宙的中心,置所有的宗教利益為決志,連結你和祂的關係。

4. He talked of the Eternal from the inside.

4. 他發自內心深處談論永恆。

There is a certain frame-of-reference of familiarity with your home. For example, I may matter-of-factly say, “The couch in my office at home is brown. You don’t ask, “How do you know?” We speak of home with “inside knowledge” and it comes across that way. We don’t argue; we expect to be believed. That’s the frame-of-reference Jesus projects when he talks about eternity. Matter-of-factly, he says, “I’m going back. I’m going to prepare a mansion for you. And after a while, I’ll come back and get you and take you there.”

你對於自己的家的擺設的熟悉度是無庸置疑的。舉例來說,我可以不假思索地說“我在家裡的辦公室的沙發是棕色的。你不會問,“你怎麼知道?”我們談到家裡的”內幕消息”都是這樣的。我們不會去爭辯它,我們預期大家都會相信事情應是這樣的。當耶穌談到關於永生的事也是一樣的道理,事情應是這樣的,祂說,“我去原是為你們預備地方去。我若去為你們預備了地方,就必再來接你們到我那裡去”。

He says again, matter-of-factly: “Before Abraham, I was.” Or, again, “I saw Satan cast down.” Or, again, “There is joy in heaven by the angels when a sinner repents.” He projected and would have us believe He had “inside knowledge” of eternity and pre-earthly existence before and after “inside” the heavens with God.

祂再直言說,：“在亞伯拉罕之前,我是“或再說,“我看到撒旦墮落了”。或再說,“一個罪人悔改,在神的使者面前,也是這樣為他歡喜。”祂表明這些是為要叫我們相信祂與上帝對永生的“內幕消息”,以及開創天地之前及之後祂與神在天家的諸事。

5. He would die, a ransom.

5. 祂的死成為我們的贖罪祭。

He said something’s wrong with the whole world that could only be set right by Him dying, a “ransom” in the context where His hearers knew exactly what a ransom was. The ransom was what you paid to restore a lost inheritance, to deliver someone destined to death because of their error. It was the price paid to redeem from the consequences of falling short, doing something wrong, losing an inheritance – and the ransom restored you to that which had been lost. He said the whole world was lost, and He came to die and pay the price of ransom, to redeem them.

祂說唯有祂的死才能看出整個世界出了什麼問題，只有那些傾聽明瞭“贖金”上下文中的聽眾才知道什麼是贖金的確切意義。贖金就因為一個人因犯罪而被處決，但是他想繼續香火而付的代價。這是用來給付墮落，犯錯，失傳的代價 -- 贖金是用來償付你做錯事的後果所付出的代價。祂說，整個世界是毀壞了，祂的死，是用來做救贖我們的贖罪祭。

6. He would raise again.

6. 祂必再復活。

He said He would raise again (there was more than that, but I'm choosing very selectively just a few), that when He died, He would raise from the dead.

祂說他必再次復活(比那更多，這只是我選擇性的想到的少數之一)，祂死後，祂會從死裡復活。

Now, if I, the Pastor, walked up to the podium at the Cathedral and picked up the microphone and said “All authority in heaven and earth is given unto me,” you would think, maybe Pastor means he's going to quote, “that into my hands has been delivered this word of God to preach with authority.” So you might check that one off, that maybe this is the Pastor emphasizing the authority of the Word that he is reading from.

現在，如果在的牧師走到大教堂的臺上並且拿起麥克風，說“天上地下所有權柄都賜給我了”，你會覺得也許牧師意味著要引述“我擁有祂的權柄來佈道神的話語。因此你可能會留心驗證了，也許這是那個牧師的強調他讀到神的話語得到的權柄。

But if then I went on and said, as though talking to God: “Here I am, Father. I have done all you sent me to do. There are no flaws in me, no imperfections. The law doesn't bother me, I have fulfilled it,” and started claiming a perfection like Jesus did, you would start backing up and start looking with sympathy toward Mrs. Scott. And if I further went on to say, “Your eternal destiny is dependent upon putting me in the center of your life and making me your master,” by then I would have been interrupted or viewed as “off my rocker.” I don't think I would have even gotten to what I didn't include here, that I would have you think that I was a denizen of eternity.

但如果繼續下去，好像我對上帝說：“父，我在此。我已如祢差遣這的去做了。在我沒有缺陷，沒有不完善之處。法律拘束不到我，我已經成就它了，”你會開始聲稱像耶穌一樣完美，你會開始對史考特太太付出支援及深切的關懷以證實你的完美。如果我再進一步說，“我是你的主宰，，我是你的生命的核心，我是你生命的主宰。”然後我會被打斷或被視為“發瘋了”。我想假如我不說出來，你會以為我是一個住在永生的人。

And what if I were to stand up here and say, not in spiritual terms but expecting to be believed? – “Before Abraham was I was. You know, that guy that came out of Ur; I was there. I saw Satan when he was cast out before Adam was ever born.”

又假如我站在這裡說，不是屬靈用語，只是希望你信神？ --“還沒有亞伯拉罕之前就有我了。你知道嗎，在他離開吾珥時，我在那裡。甚至在亞當出生之前，我已看見撒旦墮落了”。

And then I would talk about heaven with a familiarity with which we talk about our homes. If I tell you the couch in my home is beige, and you say, “How do you know?,” I’m going to reply, “Because I live there!” But I’m claiming that kind of familiarity with heaven! You put people in a nut house that talk like that! And then if I would say that I was somehow a ransom for the world, then, someone help my wife lay hands on me before I’m a “goner.”

然後我會談到天國就像我們我們論到自己再熟悉不過的家。如果我告訴你，我家的沙發是米色，然後你說“你怎麼知道？”，我會答覆你“因為我住在那裡！”，但我聲稱天堂也是我熟悉的家那樣！你把人放在你所說那樣難以想像的房子！然後如果我說我是世界的贖罪祭，有沒有人要在我臨死前幫我太太管管我”。

Will you please stop to realize that this Proclaimer of impossible things about Himself is the **only kind of Christ** who walked around on the stage of history and is the only one you can find in the sources. You don’t find other religious founders doing or saying these things that Jesus said! Buddha never thought he was perfect; he struggled with the essence of *tanya*, which was their meaning for that corrupt desire that produces sin. He sought the way of the sensual release; he sought the way of the aesthetic yogi, and neither one worked. He came to the eight-fold path that brought him into a trance-like state where he lost conscious identity with this life, called *nirvana*. And when he came out of that state, he offered those who followed him the eight-fold path, and all he would say is, “It worked for me. Try it; it will work for you.”

請你停止意識到自己的宣告基督是唯一走在歷史的舞臺的的類型是不可能的事，並且是唯一一個可以找到的泉源。你不會發覺其它宗教的創辦人有過像耶穌般的說法或做法。釋迦牟尼佛從來沒有想過他是完美的，他與一種他們對敗壞的慾望所產生罪的本質爭戰。他尋求的肉體釋放的方式；他尋求在瑜珈藝術之道，卻無一可行。他找到八正道，造成他生活在叫涅槃的狀態使他出神失去意識活在恍惚之中，當他從中解脫，他供養追隨他信仰八正道的人，他會說“這樣行得通。試一試，它也會對你是可行的。”。

He never thought all authority was seated in him. Instead, he told his disciples (and it’s part of their tripart basket of scriptures) that he wasn’t worthy to lead them. All he left them was the way that worked for him. No assumption of authority seated in him. He never thought he was the center of the religious universe. “The Way” worked, his eight-fold path. Same with all the others.

祂從來沒有想過坐擁一切權柄。相反地，祂告訴他的門徒（在三個福音書當中）祂不配帶領他們。祂離開他們是因為他要完成祂的使命。絕非為坐擁一切權柄。祂從來沒有想過祂是宇宙宗教的中心。祂這種八正道的“方式”行得通，就像其他人的做法一樣。

Mohammed never thought he was perfect. He was God’s – Allah’s – prophet. He had **visions of eternity** that impressed the desert man, but he never claimed to have been there. He never died a

ransom for anybody. He had a criteria for authority: God revealed it to him in a vision. Jesus never pointed to a vision like the prophet who would say, “The Lord said...” Jesus said, “I say...” Confucius did a logical analysis of society, and he pointed to that external analysis as his authority.

穆罕默德 從未認為他是完美的。他是回教阿拉神的先知。他的永生的異象讓生活在沙漠之地的人們留下深刻的印象，但他永遠不會為任何人的贖罪而死。他有他對權威的標準：神在異象中對他顯明。耶穌不會像先知般直截了當的提及異象說，“上帝說”耶穌說：“我說”孔子為社會邏輯有精闢的分析，他是社會表象分析的權威。

None of the other leaders made themselves the center of the religious universe, seated authority in themselves, had a consciousness of perfection about themselves, claimed an identity with eternity before and after their temporary stay here on earth. None of these traits attached to or are claimed by the other respected founders of a religion. That’s why you can respect them as “founders.”

沒有其他領導人稱自己是宗教宇宙的中心，坐擁所有權柄、意識自己是完美的，並聲稱他們的短暫寄居在地球上會成為永恆的標記。沒有一位受尊敬創辦人的宗教者具有或宣稱他們俱有或與生俱備這些特性。這就是為什麼你能尊重他們為“創始人”的原因了。

With Jesus, you’ve got what C. S. Lewis called the “startling alternate”. Either He thought these things were true, but was too stupid to know it’s impossible for a man to make these claims, and thus He could not be wise, or He was wise in knowing these things weren’t true, but was capable of duping His followers because of self-serving motives into believing that about Him, and that makes Him not good. The conclusion is that those who say He was a “good and wise teacher” reveal they have never really taken the time to encounter the only Christ that ever walked the stage of history.

有了耶穌使你擁有如 C.S. 路易斯所稱的成為“多重驚人”的能力。要不就是祂認為這些事情是真的，但愚蠢到不曉得人不會去宣告，或人聰明到足以瞭解和這些東西的不真確性卻還相信，有人常因為自身的居心不軌以自私的動機而愚弄他的追隨者。結論是，有些人自認為自己是一個“良善且具有智慧的夫子”透露了他們從來沒有真正花時間經歷唯一的真神基督，曾在歷史上留下的腳步。

You must either view Christ as one who considered Himself of the order of a poached egg, or you take Him for what He says He is, and if He is God, then He **is** perfect, and authority **does** rest in Him, and He is the center of the religious universe, and He **did** have the qualities necessary to die as a ransom for the whole world. He did have a knowledge of eternity, and He **will** (and did) rise again.

或者你將基督看待成狂妄的認為自己是總發號司令的人，或者你相信他所言，如果他是神然後他必定是十全十美的並具有所有的權柄，他是在宗教的宇宙的中心，他沒有必要為整個世界成為贖罪祭而去死。他有永恆的知識，他會再次復活。

You can’t put Jesus in the “good and wise” bland teacher package and forget about Him. He is either a nut or a fake, or **He is what He claimed to be.**

你不能把耶穌包裝成一個“良善且具有智慧”但冷陌不帶熱情的夫子的其中之一，而忽略了祂。祂不是一個瘋子或騙子，就是如祂自己宣告的一般。

Well, when I came to that crossroad, I decided I would settle it for myself. The issue revolves around this fact of history. Jesus said, to some who wanted a sign, “I’ll give you one.” There’s only one guaranteed sign on which faith can be built. God has at times gone beyond this guarantee, but the **only sign that God guaranteed** to vindicate His truth was the sign of Jonah, interpreted by Jesus to be the death and the **resurrection** of Christ.

好吧，當我到那十字路口，我決定自己解決問題。整件事圍繞在歷史和事實的爭論上。耶穌說，對那些想要徵兆的人“我給你一個”。只有建立在信心上的徵兆具有擔保。有時會給你超出預期外的擔保，但能表徵上帝的唯一標記來證實祂是約拿經歷的神跡，就是以耶穌的死亡和復活被闡釋出來。

At one point in the vast flow of history, a FACT emerges. God deigned to move into this tent of human flesh, fulfill the law that it might become incarnate, chose then to die in our place as the price of redemption, namely the fulfilled law that He might raise again and adopt us into a family with His new life without the burden of the law, that was but a school teacher to teach us our need of God’s delivering power.

事實出現在歷史的洪流上的一處。神降低身分道成肉身為人成為我們的贖罪祭，成為履行律法的化身，為我們的罪成為代罪羔羊，祂的死即完成了祂可能會再來的律祂會復活，接納我們成為神家中的一份子，祂的新生不會再背負法律的重擔，神供應我們能力就像學校老師教導我們所需的一般。

That He moved onto the stage of history is the claim of Christianity, and He vindicated Himself with a FACT that can be analyzed.

祂宣告基督教的說法已被搬到歷史的臺面上，宣告證明祂自己具真實性是可以得到解析的。

Now it is a FACT there is no such thing as historic certainty. I learned that while doing my undergraduate major in history. “Historic Certainty” means every **conceivable** piece of evidence is there. That which you can **conceive** as possible evidence must be there to have historic certainty. The moment an event is past, and no more, you have lost the eyewitness ability to see it. Cameras help, but there is an element gone, so all historic certainty by definition is relative. All you can hope for is psychological certainty, where exposure to the relevant facts of history that are available produces a reaction psychologically, and that reaction is impossible not to have.

現在沒有一件事實上是完全被歷史肯定的。我在大學主修歷史時就知道了。“歷史必然性”指每個可能都是有實據的。當一件事成為過去，你就失去了它的證據，是要有有歷史的肯定。現在的事件已經過去，不再發生了，你沒有目擊者證明它曾存在過。相機或許可以留下記

錄，但有一個元素已不見了，定義所有歷史肯定是相關的。你所希望的是歷史上的心理肯定，其中有關事實的心理與接觸產生反應，和歷史上的反應是可能有存在的。

Any smart attorney knows that in a court-room, there isn't an attorney that says some thing and the judge rebukes him, that the attorney knows before he said it that he shouldn't have said it; he wants the jury to hear it. And the judge bawls out the attorney, and he says, "Yes, your honor," and plays his little meek role. He knows exactly what he is doing. And then the judge pontifically looks over at the jury and says, "Discard that from your consideration." Okay, BANG! That's about the only way you can discard it; it's in there. And you see and hear and feel, and whatever else the evidence, you still have a reaction.

任何有智慧的律師都知道法庭裡，當他提出一件事被法官駁斥時，受權人想要陪審團聽到之前他說了他說了但不該說的事。當法官對律師咆哮時，律師就說“是的，法官大人”並稍微謙卑溫順些。他深知道他究竟想做什麼。然後，法官傲慢武斷的看陪審團並說：“放棄你的想法”。好吧，碰！（法官敲槌定奪鐸之聲）就是那一刻那是你唯一可以從你的想法中放棄的。你看到和聽到，感覺到，無論任何其他的證據，你仍存在一種反應。

God vindicated His Son by the Resurrection.

上帝用他兒子的復活做為證明。

Paul comes to Mars Hill; the philosophers are gathered there trying to consider all the gods, so worried they will miss one that they have a monument to the Unknown God. He seizes on that as a lever to talk about Christ. He says, "I'll tell you who the Unknown God is," and preaches Christ, whom he said God ordained by the resurrection. Paul said if there is no resurrection, our faith is vain, and we are found false witnesses of God, as we have testified of Him that He raised up the Christ.

保羅來到瑪爾斯山;很多哲學家聚集在那裡想要討論眾神，他們擔心他們會漏掉任何一位他們未知的神。他把談論當做評論基督的準繩。他說“我告訴你那未知的神是誰，”宣揚基督，他說：祂是上帝命定的復活者。保羅說：若是沒有復活，我們的信念是徒然的，我們發現向上帝做假見證，因為我們已證實了神使基督復活。

The first message of the church was the one Peter preached on the day of Pentecost, "This Jesus whom ye know..." And he named the fact that they knew Him crucified; that they also knew. Then he testified of that which they didn't know, "This Jesus hath God raised up of whom we all are witnesses," and he introduced that vindicating fact. Paul says in one of his speeches, "He was seen and He was seen," and he catalogues the witnesses and comes to the cluster he says, "...to above five hundred brethren at once."

教堂的第一個信息是彼得在五旬節的宣講，“這個耶穌是你們所熟知的”他指出這祂被釘在十字架上的事實，那是他們也知道的。然後他做他們所不知道的見證，“耶穌是被興起

做為神的證人”，他說到這個事實。保羅說在他的演辭說“他被視為與他見過，”的一個和他所作眼見的，談到他說該聚集“...一次為五百弟兄”

In those days, you could assemble eyewitnesses; not today. But like any other historic fact, from who wrote Shakespeare to Julius Caesar's existence, you can look for the FACT of history on which Christianity is based, namely:

今天的情況不像在那些的日子裡，你可以集結目擊者。但如同任何其它歷史上，從寫莎士比亞到朱利葉斯凱撒的存在的事實一般，你可以尋找基督教存在歷史上的根據，就是：

Jesus came out of the tomb.

耶穌走出墳墓。

And I will say, to set the frame, that if any person listening came in to the Cathedral making the claims Jesus made about them-selves, I would offer the suggestion that they should submit to psychoanalysis and go to a hospital – unless I could see a twinkle in their eyes, that they were putting me on – because no mortal man can make these claims. But if with the claims that person said, “Slay me and in three days I'll come out of the tomb and sail off into the blue,” and three days later that same person came out of the tomb and sailed off into the blue, I'd take another look at the one making the claims. I don't need anything else as a basis for my faith; I don't need all the fancy philosophic trinitarian doctrines. **This resurrected one, if it happened, is my starting point for a personal and real God.**

我特別就精神狀態來說，如果任何人聽到來到大教堂的人宣告耶穌保證他們成功，我會建議他們應看精神分析學家，並被送到精神病院 --因為沒有一個正常人會那樣說 — 除非我能見到一個有他們眼中的閃爍，— 因為沒有一個死人可以在做出那樣的宣告。但是如果人有說“殺了我，三天後我必走出墳墓並揚塵而步入藍天”我會對那做宣告的人另眼相看。我的信仰不需要以什麼做為基礎，我不需要三一神的教義哲學。如果復活的事情發生，復活的事就是我對個人及信上帝的起始點。

If I can find on the stage of history the One whose words I can spend my life researching, who was perfect, the center of all authority, the center of the religious universe, and all of these things, including having redeemed me, raised and prepared mansions in eternity, that's all the God I need. I start right there.

如果我能找到的歷史舞台上值得我投注一生去研究他話語的人，誰是那完美的人，那執政掌權者，宗教的宇宙的中心，及這所有的事情，包括是誰贖回我，復活，為我們的永生準備居所，那就是我所需的神。我就始於此。

THE ISSUE IS: DID HE COME OUT OF THE TOMB?

問題是：他真的從墳墓出來了嗎？

You won't settle that by thinking about it; you research it. Now, to research anything you have to get a **foundation in facts**. Most people are fuzzy-minded; they argue a resurrection didn't occur because it can't occur, and anybody who says it did must be lying. Any other fact, you research it.

你不會因思索這些就能解決問題了;你研究它。現在,研究任何事之前你必需要獲取事實的基礎。大多數人處於是模糊的心態;他們認為復活沒有發生過,因為它不會發生,任何人提及它必定是謊言。任何事實,你都必需要去仔細研究一番。

If you're going to ask, "Did Scott preach this message within an hour on this specific Sunday?" you've got to assume that I was here and that I preached at all. You've got to assume that the Cathedral exists. You've got to assume that that Sunday came and went. We don't have to discuss that; we take those facts for granted when determining if the message was less than an hour. Before we argue whether I preached an hour (or more), let's at least agree that I preached. You don't have to agree whether it was good or bad, but that I was here and my mouth moved and said things. That's known as the frame-of-reference – what's taken for granted.

如果你要問,“史考特牧師在這特別的主日要在一小時內宣揚此信息嗎?”你要假定我在此而且一直在佈道。你必須假定大教堂的存在。假定,週日周而復始,我們不必討論那些,我們至少認為如果信息會在一小時內被宣講完是一件自然而然的事。我們討論我是否在一小時內(或更長)完成傳講信息,至少同意我佈道了。你不需要同意我說得好不好,但我在這裡張開了嘴,並且說了話。這即是所謂的精神狀態--是我們視為理所當然的事。

And if someone says, "Wow, I don't believe you were there!", then stop with debating clocks. It's much easier to prove I was here than to prove how long I preached, because you don't yet know when I started. Was it the preliminary remarks? Was it the first mark on the board? That's more debatable, but to prove whether I was here at all or not, that's a little easier.

如果有人說,“哇,我不相信你曾在那裡!”,然後停止辯論這種問題。證明我曾這裡比證明我講多長時間要容易,這是因為你不知道當我何時開始的。這是不是初步的評論?是不是黑板上的第一個標記嗎?這更值得商榷,但我是否存在這裡與否比這更容易得到證實。

You need to approach the Resurrection the same way. There are certain facts that have to be assumed before you discuss the Resurrection. One is, did Jesus live at all? Why are we talking about whether He raised if we don't believe He lived? There was a time that was debated; not much anymore. For purposes of today and any meaningful discussion of the Resurrection, you've got to at least assume:

您需要以相同的方式面對復活。您討論復活之前有某些事實要被假定。一是:「耶穌曾存在嗎?如果我們不信祂曾存在,那談論為何他復活有何意義?有一段時間曾被辯論,現在已較少了。神今日的目的,及任對復活的意義的討論,你至少必需假定:

Fact 1. That Jesus lived.

事實 1.耶穌曾存在過

If you don't believe that... Do you agree that it's probably easier to prove that He lived somewhere sometime than that He died and rose again? Do you agree with that? So give me the easier task. "Well, I'm not sure He lived, so don't give me that Resurrection bit." I have more time to do other things than that. Don't get into any argument about the Resurrection with somebody who doesn't believe Jesus lived. That's easy to prove; until that's crossed, don't get to the next one:

如果你不相信它 ...你不認同他何時住過什麼地方要比他死了再升天可能更容易嗎？你覺得呢？所以給我更簡單的任務吧。“ 好吧，我不能確定他存在過，所以別叫我相信祂的復活 ”。 我寧可把時間用來做其它事情。不要浪費我的時間和不相信祂復活的人爭辯這件事 ；要證實祂被釘在十字架的事遠比復活的事容易的多 ；

Fact 2. That He was crucified at the instigation of certain Jewish religious leaders in Jerusalem. Roman authorities ordered and carried out the execution.

事實 2.祂被釘在十字架上 是耶路撒冷的猶太宗教領袖指使的。是羅馬當局授權，並進行執行死刑的。

At the instigation of certain Jewish leaders (not all the Jews, they weren't to blame for that, His Disciples were Jews, just certain Jewish leaders), the Romans carried out the execution. Unless you believe that, there's no sense going to the Resurrection. The crucifixion's much easier to prove than the Resurrection.

是某些猶太人領袖挑唆他們，(不是所有猶太人都應被譴責的,祂的門徒都是猶太人，只是某些猶太人領導人的行為是該被指責的)，而由羅馬人進行執行死刑的。除非你認為復活是毫無意義的。被釘死在十字架上受難要比復活更容易得到證明。

Fact 3. That He was considered dead.

事實 3.祂被認為已死了。

Notice I say *considered* dead, because a few people believe He recovered from the grave – resuscitated. He was considered dead: pierced with a sword, taken down from the cross, taken to a grave. Of course, one theorist has come up with a concoction that Jesus practiced this, and had people take Him to the grave knowing He was going to come out. He practiced on Lazarus first (so goes the theory) but of course Lazarus was stinking before He started practicing. Some of the theories stretch the brain more than just accepting the Resurrection, but at least He was considered dead. If you don't believe that, discussing the Resurrection is premature.

請注意我說被認為死了，因為有些人相信祂從墳墓中醒來--復活了。 他被認為已經死了： 祂被以利劍刺穿， 從十字架上放下，抬入墳墓。 當然，一個理論家提出了這些是一個耶穌捏造的策略，並有人帶他去一個祂熟悉的墳墓讓祂得以走出來。祂用拉撒路來籌策這個技倆（所以才會有這個理論）當然拉撒路這個人 在祂策劃 之前就已惡名滿天下。但，有一些 理論想得比只接受了復活還遠，但至少他被認為死了。 如果你不相信這些，復活就未免言之過早了。

Fact 4. He was buried in a known, accessible tomb.

事實 4. 他被埋在已知的，可以靠近的墳墓。

People of that day, and particularly the Jewish and Roman leaders who participated in the crucifixion events, knew where the tomb was and could get to it. You couldn't get into it because of the rock and guards, but the tomb's location was known and accessible.

在那時代的人們，猶太人和羅馬領袖共謀把耶穌釘死在十字架上的事件，他們早就知道墳墓在哪而且如何到那裡。可是在墳墓外的石頭和守衛使你無法進入墳墓，即使你早已知道它在哪裡，用什麼方法靠近它。

Fact 5. He was then preached raised.

事實 5. 隨後他被宣告復活了。

I'm at this point not saying He raised, but He was **preached** raised, that the tomb was empty, and that Jesus ascended. It's important to remember that the whole preachment included: empty tomb; raised from the dead; and ascending into heaven. All three of those claims were preached.

我在這裡的重點不是要討論他復活了，但耶穌被宣告祂的墳墓已空了並已復活了。一定要記住整個宣告的重要性，它包括：空墳墓；死裡復活；升入天國。這三個宣告被傳講了。

Now, if you don't believe He was preached with all those claims, I'm doing it today: But He was preached **early on and in the same city** where He was killed! If you don't believe that (that this series of claims were preached), that's easier to prove than the Resurrection.

現在,如果你不相信這三個宣告。我要在今日聲明：但早些時候他在同一個城市被宣揚並被殺害了！如果你不相信(這三個宣告被傳講了)但這比復活更易得到證實。

Fact 6. The Jewish leaders who instigated the crucifixion were more interested in disproving His Resurrection than we would be today.

事實 6. 猶太領袖教唆把耶穌被釘死在十字架上，他們比當今的我們還更極力否認他的復活。

Common sense will tell you the Jewish leaders who instigated the crucifixion had more interest in disproving the Resurrection than someone 2,000 years removed, considering it intellectually with a lot of skepticism mixed in, because the Jewish leaders' reputations and bread and butter and lives were at stake. If they instigated His crucifixion, accusing Him of trying to set up a kingdom and accusing Him of blasphemy, and then all of a sudden it's true that He raised from the dead, they are going to be looking for new jobs. So common sense says they had more psychological interest in disproving the theory, and would put themselves out a little more than most people on an Easter Sunday would.

一般常識將告訴你猶太領袖把耶穌釘死在十字架上，他們比兩千年後的我們更極力否認祂的復活,其中並夾雜很多懷疑態度，因為猶太領導人的名譽和生計和生命攸關。如果他們鼓動祂被釘，控訴祂嘗試建立一個王國和指責祂的褻瀆，並且一旦成為事實，然後祂從死裡復活他們就會去尋找新的控訴機會。所以一般常識說明他們的心理興趣反對這個理論比參加復活節星期日的人多。

Fact 7. The Disciples were persecuted be-cause of preaching the claims of His Resurrection. 事實 7. 門徒被控訴-因為他們宣告祂的復活。

They were horribly persecuted because of this preaching, starting with those Jewish leaders who first persecuted them – first they called them liars, then said they stole the body away. The whole Book of Acts tells of the Disciples’ persecution for preaching the Resurrection.

他們被控以重罪是因為這宣道，那些猶太領袖是第一個迫害他們的 -- 先說他們說謊，然後說他們偷取耶穌的身體。使徒行傳中記載門徒被控訴，因為他們宣告祂的復活。

Later, centuries later, Christians in general became a target for the evils in the Roman Empire and became scapegoats, and were punished for other reasons, but every record agrees that the **earliest persecutions** would have stopped immediately if the Disciples had quit preaching this Resurrection message, and the Ascension of Jesus. That’s why they were persecuted, because the Jewish leaders had their reputations at stake. Thus,

稍後，在幾個世紀以後，基督徒一般成了羅馬帝國的邪惡的目標和成為代罪羔羊，並因其它原因受到懲罰，但每個記錄都同意如果門徒已退出傳道宣告耶穌的復活升天的信息他們的迫害就會立即停止。這就是為什麼他們被迫害，因為猶太領袖的名譽受到影響。

Fact 8. The tomb was empty.

事實 8. 墳墓是空的。

All this leads to the fact, common sense says, if the Jewish leaders who instigated the crucifixion (Fact 2), having the extra interest because their livelihood was at stake (Fact 6); and if He was buried in a known, accessible tomb (Fact 4), they would have gone immediately to that tomb and discovered the body. Therefore, it is axiomatic that the tomb was empty.

所有的這些會導致事實，跟據一般常識，如果猶太鼓動耶穌的受難，會得到更多利益因為領導者的生活會得到擔保 (事實 6) ； 及如果他被埋在已知的，可讓人接近的墳墓 (事實 4)，他們應會立即前往該墳墓，並發現屍體。因此，根據理論墳墓應是空的。

The tomb became meaningless because it was empty! Centuries went by and the tomb was lost to history, because **there was no body in it!** Then, when the “relic period” began to grow, people got interested in his tomb, in which there had been no interest be-cause there was no body in it, and tried to find it.

那座墳墓已不具任何意義了因為那只是一座空墳而已！幾個世紀過去了，墳墓的歷史已不可考究了，因為已經沒有屍體在那裡面了！然後，在“殉教者的遺寶期“開始拓展時，人開始對他的墳墓產生了興趣，並試圖去發掘真相。而過去人們對墳墓沒有興趣是因為沒有屍體在裡面。

And the whole church world still fights today over the classical site of the ancient historic churches, and Gordon’s tomb that most of the Protestants identify with, just off from the bus station below the escarpment of a rock called “Golgotha” that has an Arab cemetery on top. The fight occurred because the tomb was lost to history; there was no body in it.

今日整個世界教會仍然在經典網站上爭議有關古老的歷史教堂的和大部分新教徒所認同的戈登的墓，只要從巴士站下壕溝內岸有塊岩石叫“受難地”，那上面有一個阿拉伯墳場。爭議發生原因是墓已隨歷史記錄被遺忘了，沒有屍體在墳中。

Now, these facts are easier to demonstrate than the Resurrection, but unless these facts are accepted, you can't deal with all the theories about the Resurrection. For example, the preaching has been so effective that all through the centuries people have come up with theories to explain it. Now, the reason that I do this every Easter is that I try to demonstrate that you don't have to park your brains at the door of the church when you come in, intelligent analysis is in order.

現在，這些事實可以比復活更加輕鬆地說明，但這些事實都被接受，你無法全盤接受有關復活的所有理論。例如，所有的佈道都如此具功效的經過了幾個世紀後人們仍能解釋它的理論。現在，我在每一個復活節講復活的道的原因是我想試著讓你的腦筋不要逗留在教堂的門口，當你進來，你的智慧分析是有條理的。

You don't just **make** people believe, but if you expose yourself to evidence, something happens inside and there will be a psychological reaction. My quarrel with people who deny the Resurrection and live a life style that pays no attention to it, is that I can ask them 15 questions and find they haven't spent 15 hours of their life looking at evidence for it.

你不必讓人相信，但你只是提出證據，事情會在人心中發生，而產生一種心理反應。我和人的爭辯是因他們不信復活，並不注意它的存在的生活方式，我可以問他們十五個問題並教他們在生活當中花十五個小時，留心看看它的證據。

If the Resurrection is true, this is the center of the universe. If the Resurrection is true, this is the **central fact of history**. You have to be a fool among all fools of mankind to think it's not worth at least 30 hours of study in your whole life. Furthermore, there are many intelligent people in the world who **have** looked and come away convinced. That's why I am doing this. Because the Disciples' preachments are so sincere in their nature, all kinds of theories have been broached to explain their belief, but the theories won't fly if you assume the eight facts previously stated.

如果復活是事實，是宇宙的中心。如果復活是事實，這是歷史的中心。您必須是集愚蠢之大成去思想這不值得你花一生中的至少三十個小時去研究的事。此外，世界上有很多有智慧的人他們探討但不信。這也是我為什麼這樣做。他的門徒的講道是如此真誠，各種各樣的理論已經講述他們的信念，但理論是不會揮發的如果你以先前所述的八個事實為前提。

Theory 1. The Disciples stole the body.

理論 1. 門徒偷走了屍體。

Theory 2. The Jewish leaders stole it.

理論 2. 猶太領袖偷走了屍體。

Theory 3. The Roman leaders stole it.

理論 3. 羅馬領袖偷走了屍體。

Theory 4. The women went to the wrong tomb.

理論 4. 那些女子去錯了墳墓。

You know, it was dark and they got lost like “women-walkers” – they didn’t have women drivers, but women walkers. They went to the wrong tomb, and they believed He rose, and I mean, they ran screaming and crying out of the garden, “We went and He wasn’t there!” They went to the wrong tomb; they went to an empty one waiting for some-body else.

你知道，天黑了而他們像“婦女徒步者”一樣的迷路了-- 沒有女性的馬伏，只有女性徒步者。他們去了錯的墳墓，他們認為他復活了，我的意思事說，他們從那花園逃跑哀慟哭泣，“我們去了，他不在那裡！”他們去錯了墓；他們去了一個空墓等待別的屍體。

Theory 5. It was all hallucinations.

理論 5. 所有的一切都是幻覺

Glorified day dreams. They were sincere; they believed that this happened because they had all these hallucinations.

美化白日夢。他們是真誠的;他們認為這是因為他們的幻覺所致。

Theory 6. Resuscitation theory.

理論 6. 復活的理論。

He was crucified and He was considered dead, and He was buried in a known tomb, but He wasn’t dead, and in the coolness of the tomb He revived and came out wrapped in the grave clothes and, thank God, the guards were asleep, and He pushed that rock out of the way – and here comes Frankenstein!

他被釘在十字架上，他被認為死了，且他被埋在一個已知的墳墓，但他沒死，而墳墓的陰涼使他甦醒活了過來，穿著裹頭巾和細麻布步道出墳墓，感謝上帝守衛都睡著了，祂推開石頭走出來 -- 怪事發生了！

Theory 7. The Disciples lied.

理論 7. 門徒們說謊。

They made the whole thing up. They’d bet on the wrong horse and they just couldn’t live with it so they made up this whole story and it took them seven weeks to figure it out, and then they told it.

他們編造了整件事。他們下錯賭注，他們只是無法忍受所以他們篡造了整個故事，且他們花了七個星期才找出真相，然後他們編造了它。

Theory 8. IT’S ALL TRUE.

理論 8. 這一切都是事實。

They are telling exactly what they experienced and what they saw. Now, just as you got the “startling alternate” when you consider the only Jesus in history, that He’s either a madman, a nut, a faker, or He’s what He said He was, and that requires a definition of divinity, you have a “startling alternate” here.

他們講的確實是他們的經歷和他們所看到的。現在，正如你在得到一個“驚人的替代方案”，你認為在歷史上唯一的耶穌，他不是狂徒，瘋子，就是一個騙子，或如同祂所說的那樣，那需要以神學定義，你在這裡就會有“驚人的替代方案”。

All these theories sound good in isolation. Even the first theory (the Disciples stole the body), which the Jewish leaders themselves concocted. But this theory on its face forces you to indict the Disciples as liars. You are thus again forced to a “startling alternate”.

所有這些理論各自分歧獨立。甚至第一個理論（門徒偷了屍體），即猶太領袖虛構的。這理論在正面強制你視門徒為說謊的人。你因此再次被迫要接受“驚人的替代方案”。

I hate – I’ve always hated it when I was doing my degree in history – I hate a self-righteous objective historian: “I’m objective; I take no opinion.” There’s no such thing as a knowledgeable person that doesn’t have an opinion. Knowledge forces an opinion; no exposure to facts keeps you neutral. Knowledge forces an opinion, and when you study the facts about Jesus listed above, there are only two options allowed. **Either** the Disciples lied **or** they honestly reported the truth. Let’s examine each Theory and deduce the option:

我不喜歡 – 我討厭主修歷史 -- 我不喜歡一個自以為是的客觀歷史學家：“我很客觀，我不發表意見”。我不認為有知識的人會沒有意見。知識力量造成意見；不接觸到事實，會使你變成中立。知識力量造成意見，當你研讀和耶穌有關的事，你便會產生兩個選擇。那就是要不耶穌的門徒造謊，就是他們誠實地報導了真相。讓我們審視每個理論，再來推斷我們的想法：

#1 **They stole the body** (Theory 1), then they obviously lied (Theory 7).

#1 他們偷取了屍體(理論 1)，很明顯的他們撒了謊(理論 7)。

#2. **The Jewish leaders stole the body** (Theory 2)? These facts preclude that: they were more concerned than anyone to disprove the preachment (Fact 6), so why would they make the tomb empty? And if they had, they would have said, “Wait a minute; we took His body from the tomb.” They couldn’t even think of that story; they told the one about the Disciples (Theory 1), but even if that were tenable, the Disciples didn’t preach just an empty tomb and simply the Resurrection. They preached a seen and living Jesus with whom they partook food; they preached the Ascension with equal vigor. So even if the Jewish leaders’ taking the body would explain the empty tomb, the Disciples are still telling the add-ons of the encounters with the Resurrected body and the Ascension, so they have expanded and “made up” a lot of the story – in other words, **they still lied**.

#2. 猶太領袖偷走了屍體嗎(理論 2)? 這些事實排除了：他們比任何人都急慾反駁這個宣告(事實 6) 為何他們會使墳墓變成空的呢？如果他們做了，他們會說“等一下；我們把他的身體從墳墓移出來”。他們甚至沒想到要編這樣的故事；他們編造有關門徒的事件(理論 1)，但即

使，他們站得住腳，門徒不止說那是一座空的墓，而且傳講了復活的事。他們宣告一個見證及耶穌和他們生活在一起並一起分食食物，他們同樣精力旺盛地傳講升天的事。因此，即使猶太領袖以屍體被盜解釋空墳墓，門徒將談論升天與復活的身體接觸載入，他們已擴大事實，“編纂”很多的故事 -- 換而言之，他們仍在說謊。

#3. Roman leaders took the body (Theory 3)? With the controversies in Jerusalem, with the contacts the Jewish leaders had with the Romans, enabling them to get the crucifixion done, don't you think they would have exposed that fact, that officials of the Roman government took the body? But even if that explains the empty tomb, it does not alleviate the Disciples' responsibility for preaching a Resurrected body that they had encounters with, and the Ascension, so they're still lying.

#3 羅馬領導盜走了身體嗎(理論 3)? 因發生在耶路撒冷的爭議，猶太人的領袖已唆使羅馬人將耶穌釘死，你不認為他們會暴露了羅馬的政府官員盜走了屍體的事實嗎？不過，即使這樣做說明了為什麼那是一座空墳墓，它並不減輕門徒宣講復活的責任，那就是去證實遇到祂並眼見祂升天，所以猶太領袖還是說謊的。

#4. The women went to the wrong tomb (Theory 4)? It was a known accessible tomb (Fact 4). The Jewish leaders' interest (Fact 6) would have taken them to the known tomb, and all they had to do to explain the wrong tomb theory was go to the tomb where the body is – and they would have done it.

#4. 女子去錯了墳墓嗎(理論 4)? 這是已知能接近的的墳墓 (事實 4)。猶太領導人基於利益 (事實 6) 會讓他們去已知的墓，他們所要做的就是解釋去了錯的墳墓的理論 -- 他們可能會這麼做。

#5. Hallucinations (Theory 5)? Well, the empty tomb (Fact 8) blasts that. If it had been just hallucinations, there would have been a body in the tomb. You have to couple it with spooking the body away. So, they're still lying.

#5. 幻覺(理論 5)? 好吧，痛斥空墳墓的事(事實 8)。如果是有只是幻覺那麼就會有一個屍體在墓中。你必需要將它和靈魂身體配在一起。因此，他們仍在說謊。

#6. Resuscitation (Theory 6)? Well, that Frankenstein coming out of the tomb doesn't quite measure up to the good Jesus that was preached. It might explain the empty tomb, but it doesn't explain the kind of Jesus that they had preached, doesn't explain the Ascension – they still made the rest of it up.

#6. 復活(理論 6)? 好吧，或許傳講從墳墓出來的怪事是不能當做評量耶穌好的標準。它可能會解釋為何墳墓是空的，但他們沒解釋他們傳講的耶穌如何升天 -- 他們還是編造了其餘的部分。

So no matter how you look at it, if you assume the eight facts which are much easier to demonstrate than the Resurrection, there are only two options, two conclusions, because it boils down to the veracity of the witnesses. That's why I have no respect for those who deny the Resurrection and have

not read the classic, Sherlock's Trial of the Witnesses. He postulated a courtroom scene where all the witnesses were gathered and subjected to the kind of evidence of an English court. Or they haven't read Who Moved the Stone? by an attorney who set out to disprove the Resurrection and ended up writing one of the most convincing proof arguments.

所以不管你如何審視它，如果您認為證實八個事實要比復活更容易，那就只有兩個選項兩種結論，因為它更容易研究有關證人所作的證供的真確性。這就是為什麼我有不尊重那些拒絕復活並且沒有看過私家偵探的審判證人(耶穌的復活)這本經典著作的人。他假定一個法庭現場聚集了所有有關證人並取決於證據下的一個英國法庭。還是他們沒讀過誰輓動了石頭？那是一位律師開始著手反駁復活並以一個最具說服力的證明作結論。

You are faced with a “startling alternate”: **either** **OPTION 1** (which is Theory 7): these Disciples made the story up to save face and the whole thing is a lie, **or** **OPTION 2** (which is Theory 8): **They're telling what they truly experienced as honest men.**

你所面對的是一個“驚人的替代方案”：不是選擇 1（即理論 7）：這些門徒是否為了保存面子虛構這故事 和整件事是一個的謊言，就是選擇 2（即理論 8）：他們誠實的訴說他們真正的經歷。

Now, if you are having trouble distinguishing between “Facts,” “Options” and “Theories,” let me make it clear: There are eight facts which reduce eight theories to only the startling alternate theories 7 and 8, which become the only two credible theories, thus the only two remaining options, “Theories” 7, they lied, or 8, they told the truth!

現在，如果用你很難區分“事實”，“選項”和“理論”，讓說我清楚：有 8 個事實縮短到只有驚人的替代方案的理論 7 和 8，兩個成為具公信力的理論，那就是只有兩個“理論”即是 7 的謊言，或 8 的，他們知道真相！

And when we come to that point, the entire Christian faith revolves around this question: were these Disciples who were the witnesses honest men telling what they saw, or conspirators who concocted a lie to save face? There are four reasons why I cannot believe they were lying:

當與我們達到這一點共識的時候，整個基督教信仰圍繞這個問題：是這些門徒誠實的見證他們所看到的，或者他們是一群為了面子編造謊言的共謀者？為什麼我不能相信他們在說謊的四個原因是：

Reason 1. Cataclysmic change for the better on the part of the witnesses.

原因 1。徹底的改變對一些證人是好的。

Everybody agrees Peter was unstable, and even when with a group he could not be counted on to stand. He fled in fear and he denied his Lord, he was always in trouble because of his extremes and his instability. After the Resurrection, he is the man that preaches to a mocking mob, he fulfills his destiny to become the Rock, he dies with courage requesting that he be turned upside down because he is not

worthy to die in the position of his Master – a cataclysmic change that can be identified to a point in history, and that point in history is where they began to tell this story of the Resurrection.

大家都同意彼得個性的不穩定，甚至在一個團體中時，他不足以被眾人信任成為代言人。他在恐懼中逃去並他否認他的主，他總是被他人格上的兩種極端和不穩定所困擾。在耶穌的復活後，他向烏合之眾佈道，他成全他成為磐石的命運，他勇於赴死，臨死前要求自己被倒立執行死刑因為他不配死在他的主的位置 -- 他徹底的改變，可以為歷史的指標，自此之後，他們開始講述復活的故事。

John? He was self-centered to the extreme. He was one of the brothers called “Sons of Thunder.” He wanted to call fire down from heaven on everyone that opposed him. He and his brother used their mother to seek the best seat in the kingdom. After they began to tell this Resurrection story, every scholar agrees John was a changed man. Instead of a “Son of Thunder,” he’s almost wimpish in his never-failing expression of love. He is known as the “Apostle of Love” – a total cataclysmic change.

約翰呢？他以自我為中心，而且極端。他是弟兄們稱作“雷子”的一個。他想要對每個人反對他的人從天上降火。他和他的兄弟利用他們的母親在國內尋求高位。在他們開始講這復活的故事後，每一位學者都同意約翰改變了。他不再是一個“雷子”他從不隱藏內心火熱的愛。他被稱為“使徒的愛”-- 他徹頭徹尾的改變了。

Thomas is consistently a doubter: from start to finish, he’s a doubter. He’s a realist; he questions everything. When Jesus is going to go through Samaria and faces death, and tells His Disciples about it, Thomas then says, “Let us also go, that we may die with Him.” That’s courage, but he thought Jesus would actually die; that’s a humanistic view.

多馬始終是一個懷疑者：從開始得到至終，他就一個心存質疑。他是一個現實主義者，他質疑一切問題。耶穌面臨死亡時要透過撒瑪利亞告訴他的門徒這件事，多馬接著說：“我們也去，我們也同他一起去死”。那就是勇氣，但他認為耶穌會真正死去；那是一個人性化的觀點。

When Jesus is discussing going away, building mansions in heaven, says, “Whither I go ye know, and the way ye know,” all the rest of them are surely shouting about the mansions. Thomas is listening to every word. He says “We don’t know where you are going; how can we know the way” Now that’s a consistent thumbnail sketch of a personality trait.

當耶穌提到要離開，在天上預備住的地方，說，“你們知道我要往哪裡去，你們也知道怎麼去”當然所有其餘的人對預備住的地方的事都會歡呼。多馬傾聽每一句話。他說“我們不知道你往哪裡去；怎麼知道那條路呢？”現在，正符合他的人格特質縮影的描繪了。

Who is it that’s doubting when the Resurrection comes? Same guy. “I won’t believe ‘til I touch Him, put my hands in the marks of death.” The moment arrives. Jesus is there and says to Thomas, “Behold my hands and my side.” He says, “It is more blessed to believe without seeing.” That is an axiomatic truth, but He did not condemn Thomas. He just stated that fact, and then He offered to submit to the

test, which is what we are doing today. He said, “Behold my hands and my side.” And Thomas cried, “My Lord and my God.”

是誰懷疑復活的時候的到來？同樣的人。“我不相信除非我摸到他，把我的手放在他被釘的痕跡”。時候到了。耶穌在那裡，並對多馬說，“伸出你的手來，探入我的肋旁”。他說“那沒看見我就信的人，有福了！”。這是一個公理的真相，但他沒有譴責多馬。他只是表明這個事實，然後他表示願意接受，這是我們今天所做的試探。他說“伸出你的手來，探入我的肋旁”。多馬哭了，他說“我的主，我的神”。

It is significant that in the most philosophic area of the world, where the Vedanta philosophies have produced Buddhism and the Eastern religions that flow out of it, it is Thomas that pierces the Himalayas to die a martyr near Madras, India, to be the herald of faith in the most challenging philosophic area of the world at that time, and never again does he waver an instant in faith – a total change from a consistent doubter to an unwavering “faither.”

很明顯的在這個世界，吠陀經的哲學理念所產生佛教與該哲理流傳的東方宗教，多馬穿過印度的馬德拉斯附近殉道，當時是哲學方面的先驅信心在世界最富挑戰性的時代，他的信心沒有動搖 -- 從一個堅定的懷疑者在瞬間變成一個堅毅的“信心者”。

Now, you can say, a crisis will change people, but a lie will seldom change people for the better; they’ll get worse. These men are cataclysmically changed for the better; I don’t think that telling a lie would do that.

現在，你可以說危機會改變一個人，但謊言卻很少使人越變越好，他們只有使人變得更糟。這些人澈頭澈底地改變了，但是我不認為這些說謊的人會改變。

Reason 2. Indirect evidences and internal consistencies.

理由 2. 有間接證據及堅定的本質。

There are indirect evidences of truth. Mark wrote to Gentiles; you can count it in Mark’s Gospel, he has Christ referring to Himself as “Son of Man” more often than any other Gospel. Count it yourself.

有真理的間接證據。馬可寫信給外邦人；你可以安心讀馬可福音，他指的是基督自比為“人子”比任何其它福音多。你自己數算看看。

Now if he was a liar, knew he was lying, trying to perpetrate a fraud, why would he have Jesus refer to Himself with a phrase that suggests humanity when his purpose is to try to represent Jesus as the Son of God? If he’s a liar, he’d just have Jesus refer to Him-self as the Son of God. But ironically, as God’s little hidden evidences of honesty, in Mark’s Gospel, written to Gentiles, designed to prove that Jesus was the Son of God, he had Jesus refer to Himself as the Son of Man more than any other Gospel.

現在如果他是個騙子，明知道他說謊，試圖施惡行騙，他提及自己時指他具有人性的目的為何，是嘗試代表耶穌為神的兒子嗎？但具諷刺的是，神的信實中隱藏著些許的證據，在馬可福音中向外邦人記載特意證明耶穌是神的兒子，引用耶穌是人的兒子比任何其它福音多。

Now, Jesus **did** refer to Himself as the “Son of Man” because Jesus was preaching to a Hebrew audience that read the Book of Enoch and read the Book of Daniel where the Son of Man was viewed as Messiah coming in clouds of glory to set up His kingdom. So it’s quite proper for Jesus to refer to Himself as the Son of Man in a messiah mentality, but if you are writing to Gentiles who don’t know anything about the Old Testament, and trying to perpetrate a lie that Jesus is the Son of God, unless you’re just basically honest and telling the truth, you wouldn’t have Jesus say “Son of Man” as often. Why not change what He said to serve your purpose? Inherent honesty. I could give you a dozen of those, but that is what historians call indirect evidence of honesty.

現在，耶穌也稱自己為“人子”因為耶穌對希伯來眾人傳道時讀取以諾書及但以理書時記載其中人子被視為彌賽亞自雲中而來建立祂的榮耀度國。所以耶穌，以彌賽亞的心態比論自己為人子是恰當的，但如果你寫給不瞭解有關舊約的外邦人，以及嘗試施行謊言說耶穌是神的兒子，除非你基本上只是誠實和說實話，你不會引述耶穌常說的“人子”。為什麼不改變祂的說法去達成你的目的呢？因有生來就具有的誠信。我能給再給你一些，但那就是歷史學家調所謂的間接證據的誠信。

Let me give one more. In the New Testament world, women were thought incapable of being a credible witness. The Disciples knew that, so why would they present women as the first witnesses of the Resurrection? If they were telling a lie, they would know that their world would discount women witnesses. Liars would have avoided recording women witnesses. More intrinsic evidence they were simply reporting what actually occurred.

讓我再舉一個例子。在新約時代，女人是不能被視為一個可信的證人的。門徒明明就知道，那麼為什麼會他們提出女性做為第一個見證復活的人？如果他們說謊，他們會知道他們的世界不會取信這般女性的證人。說謊的人會避免錄製婦女的證詞。更多的內幕證明他們只會被報告實際發生了什麼。

The fact that the Disciples waited seven weeks is used by those who say they were lying as the time needed for them to cook up the lie. If they are smart enough to tell a lie of this nature, my judgment is, they would have figured that out. They waited seven weeks because Jesus told them to wait. That’s the action of honest men, even though waiting that long hurts their story – if they were going to make up a lie.

有些人說，他們在說謊，編造謊言所需時間為使用這一切像事實，門徒等了七個星期。如果它們足夠聰明到說這種性質的謊言，我的判斷是，他們會明白的。他們等七個星期，因為耶穌告訴他們要等待。那是誠實的人的行為，即使等待那麼長會壞了他們編的故事 -- 如果他們存心要編造一個謊言。

Reason 3. Price paid.

理由 3. 代價。

You don't pay the price these men paid to tell a lie. All of them, save John, died a martyr's death: Bartholomew flayed to death with a whip in Armenia; Thomas pierced with a Brahmin sword; Peter crucified upside down, St. Andrew crucified on St. Andrew's cross (from which it gets its name); Luke hanged by idolatrous priests, Mark dragged to death in the streets of Alexandria. These men paid beyond human belief for their "lie".

你不必為這些說謊的人付出代價。在所有這些人中約翰的死有如烈士：巴多羅買在亞美尼亞被鞭死；多馬在婆羅門被利劍刺死；彼得在十字架上被倒吊而釘死，聖安德魯(它的名稱來自於此)在聖安德烈被釘死在十字架上，路加被崇拜偶像的祭司吊死，馬可被拖到亞歷山大的街道上打死。這些人被人們相信他們的死只是為“謊言”支付太大的代價了。

Reason 4. They died alone.

理由 4. 他們孤單的死去。

St. Thomas Aquinas' great – greatest, I think – proof of the veracity of the Disciples and the Resurrection is that they died alone. Now, as I do every year when I finish this message, I can conceive of a group of men trying to save face, telling a story, having bet on the wrong man, crushed by His failure (as they would view it), trying to resurrect Him with a lie.

聖托馬斯·阿奎那很偉大—最偉大的，我認為—證實門徒和復活的真實性，他們孤單的死去。現在，如同我每年一樣當我完成這個信息我可以想像一批男子試圖保存面子，編造一個故事，下賭注在一個錯誤的人被祂的失敗粉碎(因為他們會觀察它)，想要編一個謊言使祂復活。

I can conceive of them staying together and group pressure holding together the consistencies of their lie, because they don't want to be the first one to break faith and rat on the others and collapse the whole thing.

我可以想像他們在一起而且群體的壓力使大家堅持他們的謊言，他們任何人都不想成為第一個脫黨的叛徒因為失去信心而去破壞了整件事。

Let's assume that Bobby Boyle and Jerry McIntyre and Richard Williams concocted this story. You don't have television, you don't have satellite, you don't have FAX, you don't have telephone, and as long as you stay together under great pressure, you don't want to be the one, Jerry, to let Richard and Bobby down.

讓我們假設鮑博波義耳和傑瑞麥因泰爾和理查威廉同置身在這個故事中。你們沒有電視，沒有通訊衛星傳播，沒有傳真，也沒有電話，你們必須在巨大壓力下待在一起，你不想成為其中一員，讓理查和傑瑞失望。

But now separate you. You, Jerry, be Bartholomew in Armenia; and you, Bobby, be Thomas over in India. And Richard, you be Peter in Rome. You have lost contact with each other. You can't pick up a phone and call anybody; nobody knows where you are, and since you know you are telling a lie and you know you don't really expect the generations forever to believe it, and you, Jerry, in Armenia, are being flayed to death, literally – that is, skinned with a whip, your skin peeled off of you – all you've got to do to get out is say, "It's all a lie," and "Forgive me; I'm leaving town."

但現在把你分開來。傑瑞，你是在亞美尼亞的巴多羅買；而你，鮑博，你是在印度的多馬。理查，你是在羅馬的彼得。你們失去聯絡。你不能接電話，也不能和任何人聯絡，誰也不知道你在哪裡，因為你知道你說謊，你不要你的世代後裔永遠相信它，傑瑞和你在亞美尼亞，都被奪掠而死 -- 即是受鞭打，剝你的皮，你想被釋就會說，“這些都是謊言”，原諒我，我就離開這個鎮上”。

Bobby wouldn't know it; Richard wouldn't know it. You could see them next time, exchanging stories together and saying, "Boy, I really tore them up there in Armenia. I told the story, and nobody could forget it the way I told it." Bobby and Richard wouldn't know you lied.

鮑博被蒙在鼓裡，理查也被蒙在鼓裡。你會看到他們下次在一起的時候交流的故事，說，“喔，我真的在亞美尼亞殺滅了他們。我編的故事，誰也不能忘記我訴說它的方式”。鮑博和理查都不知道你撒謊了。

You, Bobby, you're going to be pierced with a sword in India; you are never going to see Jerry or Richard again. All you have to do to get out of the pressure is say, "It's a lie."

鮑博，你將會被利劍刺死在印度；你永遠不會再看到傑瑞或理查。你所能做可以走出壓力的方式就是說，“這是個謊言”。

You, Richard, you're off in Rome; you're a little more exposed, but with your life at stake, all you have to say is, "Sorry. Maybe I dreamed it", and wiggle out and head to France.

你，理查，你在羅馬；你有點更公開曝光，但你所說的有關你的人生的事就是，“對不起。也許我在做夢”，並以遮掩閃避的方式離去前往法國。

As Thomas Aquinas said, it is psychologically inconceivable that these men, separated, each one paying the supreme price for their story and each one dying alone, that some one of the group wouldn't break away from his fellows and say, "Hey, it wasn't true!"

如同湯瑪斯·阿奎那所說過的，它是這些人心理上是難以信服的，每個人為他們的故事付出最高代價，每個人孤獨的死去，同夥有些人不願被分開就會說“喂，這不是真的！”

To die alone. And not one shred of evidence surviving 2,000 years of hard-looking critics, you will never find one record any where on the face of this earth where any one of these men ever wavered unto their terrible death in telling this story. Therefore, I came to the conclusion there's no way these men were lying. They were telling what they thought and experienced and saw as true.

孤獨的死去。毫無證據顯示二千年來還存在的冷酷的評論，你永遠不會在地表任何一處上發現任何記錄有關他們遭遇駭人的死亡經歷而動搖他們講述這個故事的決心。因此，我得到這樣的結論：這些人不可能說謊。他們訴說他們的想法，他們的經歷，與眼見是真的。

I remember doing this with my professor Larry Thomas at Stanford, and he said to me, “Gene, I am convinced. These men believed what they were telling. Therefore, some one of these other eight facts must be wrong.” Well, if you’re honest and you say that, I’ve got you, because those other eight are a lot easier to demonstrate. What is the alternative?

我記得我在史丹弗大學的教授賴瑞·湯瑪斯對我說的：“(猶)金，我承認。人們相信他們所聽到的。因此，八個事實的其中有些必定是錯誤的”。不過如果你是誠實的並說，我相信你，因為要證明其他八個事實就要簡單得多了。那另一種說法是什麼？

IT’S TRUE, AND HE CAME OUT OF THAT GRAVE.

它是事實，並且，祂從那座墳墓出來。

Well, if that is true, then what? All the rest of this is true, and I have a starting point for a faith in a God eternal. And I then have crossed over that threshold where I can now comprehend what Christianity is, for if I can believe that Jesus Christ came through those grave clothes, through that rock, through that door, and sailed off in the blue, then molecular displacement is nothing to Him – He can do it without creating an explosion. It is true that all things consist in Him, and He can control them.

好吧，如果那是事實，又怎麼樣呢？其餘的這些都是事實，對永恆的神我有了一個信心的起點。然後我掙脫了那個關口，我開始理解基督教是什麼，因為如果我相信耶穌基督掙脫了那些裹頭巾和細麻布，穿過墳墓口的石頭，通過那扇門，並向藍天展航行去，那麼分子間的移換替代對祂絲毫不起作用 -- 祂不需製造任何爆破的過程就能如此做。事實是祂可以與所有的事物共存並掌控一切。

Therefore, it’s not difficult at all to believe that that same substance of God, placed in Mary, came forth as Jesus of Nazareth through the Holy Spirit. God says He places that same God-substance in us when we trust Him. **That** is the true born-again experience – a generator of life, a regeneration, a new creation that penetrates my cell structure and is placed in me as a gift from God when I connect by trusting His word.

因此，全然相信上帝能經由馬利亞將自己生命的本質通過聖靈加在拿撒勒人耶穌身上，根本就不難。上帝說當我們相信時，祂就將祂身上相同的本質置於我們生命中。這是真正經歷重生的經驗 -- 當我將自己與祂連結，相信祂的話語就會產生一個新生命，一個重生，神就會藉由一個新我穿透我的細胞結構，並放在我的身上成為上帝的恩賜。

That's the genesis of all Christianity, properly seen, that Christ is in us the hope of glory. I don't have to become some mystic or far-out freak to understand what Christianity is. I can now spend my life pursuing His words, including the authority He attaches to the Old Testament, and the promises that are written therein. And each time I grab hold of those and act on my belief, and sustain the action in confidence, that faith connection keeps in me a life substance **the same as that which raised up Christ from the dead.** That new life substance is as capable of changing my nature as radioactive material, invisible though it may be, can change your cell structure as you hold it.

那是所有基督教的起源，正確地看到，基督是我們榮耀的希望。我不需要弄得神秘兮兮或異想天開才是瞭解什麼是基督教。現在，我可以花一生的時間追求祂的話語，包括，祂在舊約時代所賜下的權柄及其中所記載的應允。我緊緊追隨祂的話語付諸在我的信仰中並堅持信賴祂，那種信心連結我的生命本質運行在我認同的信念，即是和基督從死裡復活的信心一樣。如你認為新生命物質和不可見的放射性物質一般的具有能力改變老我，它甚至可以改變你堅信的任何細微結構。

God puts a life in us capable of regenerating, and that's why spirituality is the expressions of the spirit, and why righteousness is called the fruit of the spirit. It is that new life growing out through us which can only be maintained by faith in His word, but it was founded and based upon the solid rock of the provable quality of "He raised from the dead," and it gives me faith to believe that He will do the other thing He said, which is come again.

上帝讓我們能更新我們的生活，這就是為什麼靈性能表達精神，也就是為什麼公義被稱為屬靈的果子。這就是唯有對神的話語的信心藉由我們生長出來新生命，只因在信仰中持續他的話語，但這是基於堅信“祂從死裡復活”，這也是使我相信如祂所說的，祂會必再來的信心。

Copyright ©2007 - Pastor Melissa Scott – all rights reserved

版權所有,請勿翻印。版權所有人:梅莉莎.史考特 牧師