

Romans 羅馬書 14

Aidan Kemp, 28 Aug 2022

Intro 介紹

In 1923, the Eastern Orthodox Church, the major Christian denomination in Eastern Europe, decided to update its calendar. This decision caused significant distress amongst the church's members because it was felt that changing the date of Easter was breaking a millennia-old tradition for no good theological reason. Consequently, the Eastern Orthodox Church split into two groups - the New Calendarists, who accepted the new calendar, and the Old Calendarists, who stuck to the old calculation of Easter.

1923年，東歐的主要基督教教派東正教決定更新其曆法。這一決定在教會成員中引起了極大的痛苦，因為人們認為改變復活節的日期是在無緣無故地打破一個千年的傳統。因此，東正教教會分裂成兩組...接納新曆法的新曆法派和堅持復活節舊曆法的舊曆法派。

Each group branded the other as heretics and refused to recognise the other's legitimacy, seemingly breaking the church in two. To this day, the split remains very real for those in Eastern Europe, although the intensity of the divide has softened in recent years.

每個團體都將對方標記為異端，並拒絕承認對方的合法性，似乎將教會一分为二。直到今天，對於東歐國家來說，這種分歧仍然非常真實，儘管近年來分歧的強度有所緩和。

Hi everyone, my name is Aidan, and I'm a congregation member here at St Paul's. I wanted to start with that story because, interestingly, the church's concept of a split or schism is very relevant. In the last week, the announcement of a new "*Diocese of the Southern Cross*" created headlines like "*Australian Anglican church splits*" in the Sydney Morning Herald and the ABC.

大家好，我的名字是艾丹，我是聖保羅教堂的一員。我想從這個故事開始，因為有趣的是，教會分裂或分裂的概念是一個非常息息相關的概念，因為就在上週宣佈的新的「南十字教區」在悉尼先驅晨報和國營廣播公司創造了諸如「澳大利亞聖公會分裂」的頭條新聞。

This decision has come from disagreements between Christians around Australia over the issue of blessing same-sex marriages. If you've got questions about it, I'd recommend chatting to our senior minister Steve or watching the video he made this week on the topic, which should have been emailed out if you're on the mailing list.

這個決定來自澳大利亞各地基督徒在祝福同性婚姻問題上的分歧，如果你對此有任何疑問，我建議與我們的主任牧師史蒂夫交談或觀看他本週製作關於該主題的視頻，如果您已把你的電郵給了我們，你應該已收到郵件。

But what a coincidence then that in this week of all weeks, we're scheduled to look at Romans 14, a passage that wants to answer a very relevant question: *What do we do when Christians disagree?* The Bible's answer to this question is probably not what you would expect, given the curmudgeonly and quarrelsome history of the Christian church. But before we get that answer, we need to get a bit of context. So let me pray before we get started.

但真是巧合，在所有星期的這一週，我們計劃看《羅馬書》第 14 章，這段經文想要回答一個非常相關的問題：「當我們基督徒不同意時，該怎麼辦？」鑑於基督教會的嚴厲和爭吵的歷史，聖經對這個問題的回答可能不是你所期望的。但在我們得到這個答案之前，我們需要了解一些背景。所以在我們開始之前讓我祈禱。

Everything for God 一切為了上帝而做

If this is your first time joining us for our Romans series, or if you need a bit of a reminder of where we've been, we're reading through Paul the Apostle's letter to the Roman church. It isn't so much a letter as a deep dive into the Christian understanding of God, humanity and the law.

如果這是您第一次來這裡參加我們的《羅馬書》系列，或者如果您需要一點提醒我們去過哪裡，我們正在閱讀使徒保羅給羅馬教會的信，這不是簡單的一封信，而是深入探討了基督徒對上帝、人性和法律的理解。

Paul hadn't met the Roman church he was writing to, but he knew of them through friends who had visited Rome. And the news he was getting was somewhat troubling - a divide began in the Roman church. Christians in Rome had split into two camps based on a disagreement not over money or marriage but meat. If you look back at your Bible with me, Paul outlines this debate in verse 2 of chapter 14: "One person's faith allows them to eat anything, but another, whose faith is weak, eats only vegetables."

保羅實際上並沒有見過他要寫信給的羅馬教會，但他是通過訪問過羅馬的朋友知道他們的。他得到的消息有點令人不安...羅馬教會開始出現分歧。羅馬的基督徒分裂成兩個陣營，其基礎不是金錢或婚姻，而是肉食。如果你和我一起回顧你的聖經，保羅在第 14 章第 2 節概述了這場辯論：「有人信甚麼都可吃；但那軟弱的，只吃蔬菜。」

There were two groups in the Roman church at this time - those who thought that it was wrong for Christians to eat meat, a group which Paul labels as the “weak”, and those who thought that Christians should be able to eat whatever they want, regardless of where it came from, apparently known as the “strong” group. Now, this isn’t a fight that you would find in many churches in Australia. Still, the pattern of this disagreement has been replicated in thousands, if not millions, of churches throughout history.

顯然，此時羅馬教會中有兩個群體…那些認為基督徒吃肉是錯誤的，一個被保羅稱為「軟弱」的群體，以及那些認為基督徒應該甚麼都可吃的人，不管它來自哪裡，是被稱為「強」的群體。現今這不是你在澳大利亞的許多教會中會發現的爭吵，但是這種分歧的模式在歷史上已經在成千上萬甚至數百萬的教會中復制。

On one side, those with a firm belief that some particular practice is wrong, such as eating meat, look down upon others as less committed followers of Christ. On the other hand, believers who think that the practice is fine to do as a Christian, i.e. are fine with eating meat, show contempt towards their dissenting brothers and sisters, believing them to be needlessly pedantic and overly judgemental. And so, from disagreement on a theological question, real problems start to appear in a church community, as otherwise healthy relationships are poisoned by bitterness, judgment and contempt.

一方面，那些堅信某些特定做法是錯誤的人（在這種情況下是吃肉）看不起其他人，認為他們是不太堅定的基督跟隨者。另一方面，那些認為作為基督徒這種做法沒問題，即可以吃肉的信徒，對持不同意見的兄弟姐妹表示蔑視，認為他們是不必要的迂腐和過分評判。因此，由於在神學問題上的分歧，真正的問題開始出現在教會社區中，否則健康的關係會被苦毒、判斷和蔑視毒害。

And it’s in this context that Paul gives his answer to the very relevant question - what should we do when Christians disagree? Paul’s answer? Practice acceptance, not judgment. Look at verse 6: “Whoever eats meat does so to the Lord, for they give thanks to God; and whoever abstains does so to the Lord and gives thanks to God.”

正是在這種背景下，保羅回答了一個非常相關的問題…當基督徒不同意時應該怎麼做？保羅的回答：「練習接納，而不是批判。」和我一起看第6節：「吃的人是為主吃的，因他感謝上帝；不吃的人是為主不吃的，他也感謝上帝。」

Rather than engaging in this feedback loop of negativity and hatred, Paul offers a radical new way of relating to each other - a policy of acceptance that leaves judgment up to God. There are many nuances in Paul’s plan for resolving conflict in the Roman church, but throughout verses 6 to 8, Paul keeps repeating his core idea: “Whatever you do, do it for the Lord.”

保羅沒有參與這種消極和敵意的反饋循環，而是提供了一種全新的相互聯繫方式…一種將評斷別人留給上帝的接納政策。保羅解決羅馬教會衝突的計劃有很多細微差別，但在第 6 至 8 節中，保羅不斷重複他的核心思想：「無論你做什麼，都要為主做。」

If you've been a Christian for a while, this might seem obvious to you – a fundamental part of the Christian faith is giving everything in your life over to Jesus. But Paul reminds us that living this way doesn't just impact how we relate to God but also how we relate to each other. “Who are you to judge someone else's servant? To their own master, servants stand or fall,” says Paul in verse 4. And again, in verse 10: “You, then, why do you judge your brother or sister? Or why do you treat them with contempt? For we will all stand before God's judgment.”

如果你已經當了一段時間的基督徒，這對你來說可能很明顯…基督教信心的一個基本部分就是把你生命中的一切都交給耶穌。但保羅提醒我們，以這種方式生活不僅會影響我們與上帝的關係，還會影響我們與彼此的關係。「你是誰，竟評斷別人的僕人呢？他或站立或跌倒，自有他的主人在」保羅在第 4 節說。第 10 節又說：「可是你，你為甚麼評斷弟兄呢？你又為甚麼輕看弟兄呢？因我們都要站在上帝的評斷臺前。」

Paul is telling the Roman church – to get out of God's chair! If everything I do as a Christian is for God, then I am a servant of God, and I have no right to do God's job for Him – especially when judging humanity. And most importantly, if I see a fellow servant of God, I have no right to judge my brother or sister on whether they're serving God correctly or not – only the one they're serving can determine that. I have no right to judge my fellow servant because judgment is the Lord's alone. All I can do in the meantime is get along with my brother or sister and try to work together to serve our Lord in the best way we can.

保羅是在告訴羅馬教會…從上帝的評斷椅上下來！如果我作為基督徒所做的一切都是為了上帝，那麼我就是上帝的僕人，我沒有權柄為上帝做上帝要做的工作…尤其是在評斷人類的情況下。最重要的是，如果我看到一個神的僕人，我無權評斷我的兄弟姐妹是否正確地侍奉上帝…只有他們所侍奉的才能決定這一點。我無權評斷我的同工，因為評斷只屬於主。在此期間，我所能做的就是與我的兄弟姐妹相處融洽，並努力以最好的方式為我們的主服務。

For example, let's meet Alison and Ben. Alison thinks that eating food in a church is fine since God made food for us to enjoy, and there's nothing particularly special about the building where we meet. On the other hand, Ben thinks it's unbiblical to eat food in church, since it's the place we dedicate to worshipping God and should be treated with respect.

例如，讓我們見見艾莉森和本。艾莉森認為在教堂吃食物是完全可以的，因為上帝為我們創造了食物供我們享用，我們見面的建築並沒有什麼特別之處。另一方面，本認為在教堂吃飯是不符合聖經的，因為這是我們敬拜上帝的地方，應該受到尊重。

That's a pretty significant divide between Alison and Ben. If Alison brings a sandwich into church one day, there might be a serious problem with some real tension and potential arguments and conflict breaking out. But suppose both Alison and Ben follow Paul's policy of acceptance over judgment. In that case, Ben can accept that Alison is serving God how she sees best, and Alison can accept that Ben is serving God how he sees best, and both can trust that God will be the one to judge, so there's no need for an argument. Instead, we can accept one another's different beliefs without breaking community.

這是艾莉森和本之間的一個相當大的分歧，如果艾莉森有一天把三明治帶進教堂，那可能會有一個嚴重的問題，一個真正的緊張和潛在的爭論和衝突爆發。但如果艾莉森和本都遵循保羅接納勝過評斷的政策，本可以接納艾莉森以她認為最好的方式侍奉上帝，艾莉森也可以接納本以他認為最好的方式侍奉上帝，並且雙方都可以相信上帝將成為一個人來判斷，所以沒有必要爭論。相反，我們能夠在不破壞社群的情況下接納彼此不同的信心。

But, like many things, replacing judgment with acceptance is much easier said than done. When someone turns up to church wearing something or doing something or talking about something that we feel is genuinely wrong, how can we act biblically at that moment? I think it's helpful to understand some of the emotions that create judgment - and in my admittedly limited experience, a significant amount of Christian judgment seems to come from genuine worry.

但就像很多事情一樣，用接納代替評斷說起來容易做起來難。當有人穿著某件衣服或做某事或談論我們認為真正錯誤的事情出現在教堂時，那一刻我們如何才能真正按照聖經行事？我認為了解一些產生判斷的情緒是有幫助的…在我公認的有限經驗中，大量的基督徒判斷似乎來自真正的擔憂。

I'll be real with you for a second - I'm only 24 years old, I haven't experienced much of life, and I don't have many deep insights into the human condition. But even from this vantage point, I can see that judgment doesn't often spring directly from malicious or mean-spirited church-goers. In fact, in many circumstances, experiences of judgment within the Christian community come from one believer being genuinely worried about the faith of another, based on external assumptions about their life.

我會和你說實話…我只有 24 歲，我沒有經歷太多的生活，我對人類狀況沒有太多深刻的見解。但即使從這個角度來看，我也可以看到，評斷並不經常直接來自惡意或心懷惡意去教堂的人…事實上，在許多情況下，基督徒社群內的評斷經歷都是來自一個基於對他們生活的外部假設真正擔心另一個人的信心的信徒。

We have a sense that if someone isn't serving God as best, they could, if they have a deeply-held belief that we know to be wrong, potentially their faith is at risk, and they need to be made aware of their mistake as soon as possible because we care about them as their fellow sibling in Christ. But if you feel called to that sort of action, this passage's challenge is to entrust that job to God. Let the Lord take care of judging their faith because ultimately, He is the one who gives and maintains their faith.

我們有一種感覺，如果有人沒有盡最大努力為上帝服務，如果他們堅信我們知道錯了，那麼他們的信心可能處於危險之中，因為我們作為他們在基督裡的兄弟姐妹關心他們，他們需要盡可能盡快意識到自己的錯誤。但如果你覺得被召喚去採取那種行動，那麼這段經文中的挑戰實際上是將這項工作委託給上帝。讓主來評斷他們的信心，因為歸根結底，祂是賜予和維持他們信心的那一位。

Don't stop caring about your church family; keep checking in with each other about how you're going with Jesus. But we need to stop worrying about the strength of each other's faith based on what we do and don't do, judging from assumptions and guesswork rather than genuine conversations. Start learning to accept one another, even if the way you live for Jesus is different to the way I do. I think Paul sums it up best in verse 19 - rather than worry or judgment, *"make every effort to do what leads to peace and to mutual edification."*

不要停止關心你的教會家庭，當然，要不斷地相互了解你與耶穌相處得怎麼樣。但是我們需要停止根據我們所做和不做的事情來擔心彼此的信心強度，從假設和猜測而不是真正的對話來判斷，並開始學習彼此接納，即使你為耶穌而活的做法與我不同。我認為保羅在第 19 節中總結得最好…與其憂慮或評斷，不如「務要追求和平與彼此造就的事。」

What is a Disputable Issue, Anyway? 無論如何，什麼是有爭議的問題？

So then, in this new happy community of acceptance, does this mean that we should accept all practices of our fellow believers, regardless of what it is? Well, no!

那麼，在這個新的幸福接納的社群中，是否意味著我們應該接納其他信徒的所有做法，不管它是什麼？好吧，不！

Paul's acceptance policy in Romans 14 is a specific policy meant for a specific set of issues, which calls us to distinguish between gospel issues and disputable issues. Let's have a look at verse 1. "Accept the one whose faith is weak, without quarrelling over disputable matters." Ah, so there's the qualification - this acceptance policy is specifically intended for questions around 'disputable matters.'

保羅在《羅馬書》14 章中接納的政策是針對特定問題的特定政策，這要求我們仔細區分福音問題和有爭議的問題。讓我們看看第 1 節，「信心軟弱的，你們要接納，

不同的意見，不要爭論。」啊，是有附帶條件的…這個接納政策是專門針對「可爭議的問題」的。

I think that would be a really good phrase to keep in the front of your mind because it will be really important. What is a 'disputable matter'? Well, let's start with the Bible itself. Rather than "disputable matters," your translation might have "opinions" or "doubtful issues" or, as the older King James Version has it, "doubtful disputations." These are different attempts to translate the Greek word *dialogismoi*. Full disclosure, I don't know Biblical Greek. Still, after doing some research, a common consensus amongst theologians such as John Stott, Kent Hughes and Tim Keller is that the word refers to matters of practice about which God has not specifically spoken.

我認為這將是一個非常好的要常放在你的腦海中的短語，因為這將是一個非常重要的短語。什麼是「有爭議的問題」？好吧，讓我們從聖經本身開始…「不同的意見，不要爭論。」也可翻譯為「看法」或「疑惑的事」，或者「見解」和「疑論的問題」。這些是翻譯希臘詞 *dialogismoi* 的不同嘗試…我必承認我是完全不認識聖經希臘語的，但在做了一些研究之後，約翰斯托特、肯特休斯和蒂姆凱勒等神學家之間的共同共識是這個詞指的是神沒有特別說要怎樣去實行的事情。

Keller explicitly translated it as "matters of conscience," which he and the other theologians take to mean an action God has neither clearly forbidden nor commanded. So, the acceptance policy above disagreement applies to practices about which the Bible is unclear and ambiguous - in other words, lots of things!

凱勒明確地將其翻譯為「良心問題」，他和其他神學家認為這是上帝既沒有明確禁止也沒有明確命令的行為。因此，接納高於分歧的政策是適用於聖經不清楚和模稜兩可的做法…換句話說，很多事情！

The Bible only has so many words, after all, and was written long before social media ethics became a popular topic. But sometimes, it can still be difficult and controversial to figure out whether a topic of debate is a disputable issue that you can agree to disagree over. A non-disputable issue, sometimes called a "gospel" or "salvation" issue, must be resolved before continuing in the community.

聖經畢竟只有這麼多字，而且是在社交媒體倫理成為熱門話題之前很久已寫成。但有時，要弄清楚辯論的話題是您可以同意去不同意的可爭議的問題，還是需要在繼續一起在社群中之前去解決的。

To give us a bit of a hand with this, I've borrowed guidelines written by London preacher Dick Lucas, who outlines three principles for identifying a disputable issue.

為了幫助我們解決這個問題，我借用了倫敦傳教士迪克·盧卡斯 (Dick Lucas) 寫的一些指導方針，他概述了識別可爭議問題的三個原則。

1. The principles of the matter apply to behaviour or practice but not to doctrine

1. 事情的原則適用於行為或實踐，而不是適用於教義的。

Paul has just spent eleven chapters outlining clear teaching on the true Christian beliefs and worldview. He's not suddenly inviting Christians to challenge what he's written - he's addressing disagreements over the way people should practically respond to this message

保羅剛剛用了十一章的篇幅，概述了關於正確基督教信心和世界觀的清晰教導。他並沒有突然邀請基督徒挑戰他所寫的內容...他是在解決人們應該如何實際回應這一信息的分歧。

2. For a matter to be disputable, there must be no clear, relevant commands

2. 一件可爭議的事情，必須沒有明確的相關命令

The Bible is God's absolute, final, authoritative word on the behaviour that is pleasing and acceptable to Him. The instructions in it aren't optional extras. We get to choose if we want to follow when we become Christian. Within the clear boundaries God has set, we're free to debate what is the better way to live for God and accept when we disagree with our fellow believers. But if God has already made his stance clear on an issue, we can't go around contradicting what He's said, even if we feel uncomfortable or angry at His word. Yet if there isn't a clear Biblical command about a certain practice, then that matter might be disputable.

聖經是上帝對他所喜悅和接納的行為的絕對、最終、權威的話語。如果我們成為基督徒時想要遵循，其中的說明不是我們可以選擇的額外內容。在上帝設定的明確界限內，我們可以自由地辯論什麼是為上帝而活的更好的方式，並在遇到不同意我們的信徒時去接納。但是，如果上帝已經在一個問題上表明了他的立場，我們就不能到處反駁他所說的話，即使我們對他的話感到不舒服或生氣。然而，如果對某種做法沒有明確的聖經命令，那麼這件事可能只是有爭議的。

3. All issues are disputable, except gospel issues

3. 所有的問題都是可爭議的除了福音問題

Lucas means that Christians have the true and real freedom to have different opinions without suffering exclusion or judgment, except if those opinions modify the gospel. If the gospel, i.e. faith in Jesus' death and resurrection, becomes not enough to achieve salvation, if something additional is required to be saved and

enter God's kingdom, whether some practice, behaviour or belief, then that matter is not disputable. To be a Christian is to be a believer in the gospel - and as Paul says in Galatians 1 verse 9 - "If anybody is preaching to you a gospel other than what you accepted, let them be under God's curse!"

盧卡斯的意思是，基督徒有真正的自由，可以有不同的意見，而不會受到排斥或評判，除非這些意見修改了福音。如果福音，即對耶穌的死和復活的信心，不足以實現救恩，如果需要額外的東西才能得救並進入神的國度，無論是一些實踐、行為還是信心，那麼這件事是無可爭議的。成為基督徒就是成為福音的信徒…正如保羅在《加拉太書》第1章第9節所說的那樣…「若有人傳福音給你們，與你們以往所領受的不同，他該受詛咒！」

So, enough theory, let's have a go at this! Let's figure out whether an issue is disputable or not - can we agree to disagree on it, or does it need to be resolved before continuing in the community? Now, I'm not looking to figure out what is right and wrong on this issue - that's important, but it's also important to know what type of issue this is.

所以，足夠的理論，讓我們試一試吧！讓我們試著弄清楚一個問題是否有爭議…我們是否可以同意不同意，或者是否需要在繼續在社群中前解決了它。現在，我不想弄清楚在這個問題上什麼是對和錯…這很重要，但知道這是什麼類型的問題也很重要。

Imagine Ben (earlier) has turned up to the church and said, "All Christians must wear shoes while in church - no bare feet allowed. Anyone who comes into church must put on shoes before worshipping God."

想像一下，本（從早些時候）到教堂說：「所有基督徒在教堂裡都必須穿鞋…不允許赤腳。任何進入教堂的人都需要在來敬拜上帝之前穿上鞋。」

I want you to turn to the person next to you and have a chat about whether "wearing shoes in church" is a disputable issue. And I want you to try and justify your position using these guidelines on the screen or through other thoughts you have. Since it's a bit of a bigger topic, I'll give you a few minutes to chat about this, and then we'll come back!

我想讓你轉向你旁邊的人，談談「在教堂穿鞋」是不是一個有爭議的問題。我希望你嘗試並證明你的立場，無論是使用屏幕上的這些指導方針，還是通過你的其他想法。既然話題有點大，我給你幾分鐘時間聊一聊，然後我們再來！

Alright, let's come back. For the record, I think "wearing shoes in church" is a disputable issue and something we can agree to disagree on because it's about practice. As far as I know, there's nothing in the Bible specific to the covering of feet in church, and it doesn't

add or take away from the gospel message. But I think your instincts about that question may have highlighted something about where you lie on something I'm calling the "disputable scale".

好吧，我們回來吧。我本人認為「在教堂穿鞋」是一個可爭議的問題，我們可以同意去不同意，因為它是關於實踐的，據我所知，聖經中沒有任何內容專門針對教堂裡的遮腳，而且它不會添加或刪除福音信息。但我認為你對這個問題的直覺可能突出了你在我稱之為「有爭議的尺度」上的位置。

On one end of the spectrum is the tendency to mark "everything as disputable", often associated with theological liberalism, where every issue, no matter how big, small or central to the gospel, can be smoothed over by some magic church policy, even if it means compromising on the central message of the Bible. While on the other end is fundamentalism, where "nothing is disputable," and those who don't follow the same practices and behaviour as you aren't real Christians.

一方面是傾向於將「一切都標記為可爭議的」，這通常與神學自由主義有關。這就是每一個問題，無論對福音有多大、多麼小或多麼重要，都可以通過一些神奇的教會政策來解決，即使這意味著對聖經的核心信息做出妥協。而另一端是原教旨主義，「沒有什麼是可爭議的」，那些不遵循與你完全相同的做法和行為的人不是真正的基督徒。

Now, it's unlikely you're exactly at either of these extremes. Still, all of us are somewhere on this scale, whether you're more likely to prioritise tolerance over truth or conventions over accuracy. Now, I'm a conflict-avoider, so my instinct is to say, "we can agree to disagree", and avoid a hard conversation. But if you're someone who cares about traditions, your instinct might be to say that the way we've always done things is the best and only way to do things.

現在，您不太可能完全處於這兩個極端中的任何一個，但我們所有人都處於這個尺度上，無論您更可能將容忍置於真理之上，還是將慣例置於準確性之上。現在，我是一個避免衝突的人，所以我的直覺是說「我們可以同意不同意」並避免進行激烈的對話。但如果你是一個真正關心傳統的人，你的直覺可能會說我們一直做事的方式是最好的也是唯一的做事方式。

Either way, whatever side of the scale you're on, we all need to focus on the truth that can only come from the Bible, making sure that our claims of whether things are disputable or not are based solely on its truth, not on our feelings or on what we know as normal. So before claiming that something is a "gospel issue", take a moment to think about whether the problem is disputable or not. Because if it isn't, then wise, careful and considerate action needs to be taken, and if it is disputable, then we need to follow Paul's policy of acceptance over judgement.

無論哪種方式，無論您在尺度上處於何位置，我們都需要專注於只能來自聖經的真理，確保我們對事物是否有爭議的主張完全基於其真理，而不是基於我們自己的感受或我們所知道的正常情況。因此，在聲稱某事是「福音問題」之前，請花點時間考慮一下該問題是否有爭議。因為如果不是，那麼就需要採取明智、謹慎和體貼的行動，如果是有爭議的，那麼我們需要遵循保羅接納勝過評斷的政策。

Unity in Diversity 多樣性中的合一

Given that we've discussed the differences between disputable and non-disputable issues, what are some disputable issues that are relevant to us here in Chatswood? What are some issues we're likely to have some conflict over?

那麼，鑑於我們已經討論了有爭議和無爭議問題之間的區別，在 Chatswood 有哪些與我們相關的有爭議問題？我們可能會在哪些問題上發生衝突？

As this has been an important topic in the last week, Paul's acceptance policy will always be significant for St Pauls. As Steve said at the beginning of this year, it is because we are striving to be a "supernatural" community. The one where our community isn't just made up of people who are similar to each other, but a multicultural church, one that is both diverse, and unified at the same time.

好吧，儘管這一直是上週的一個重要話題，但保羅的接納政策對聖保羅堂來說總是很重要，因為正如主任牧師在今年年初所說，我們正在努力成為「超自然的」社群，我們的社群不僅僅是由彼此相似的人組成，而是一個多元文化的教會，一個既多樣化又合一的教會。

But that's a challenging aim because there will be big differences in what each person views as acceptable and unacceptable behaviour in many different cultures. What type of clothes is ok to wear? What does respecting your parents look like? What does hospitality mean? What does a church look like? What types of songs do we sing, how do we do communion, what expectations do we have for our leaders, and what language do we read the Bible in?

但這是一個具有挑戰性的目標，因為隨著許多不同的文化融合在一起，每個人認為可接納和不可接納的行為會有很大差異。什麼樣的衣服可以穿，孝敬父母是什麼樣的，待客是什麼意思，教會是什麼樣的？我們唱什麼類型的歌曲，我們如何進行聖餐，我們對我們的領袖有什麼期望，我們用什麼語言讀聖經？

With people coming to St Paul's from various cultures around Chatswood, it seems inevitable that we'll face conflict over the right way to live as a Christian. Indeed, I suspect there have already been many disagreements regarding the correct practice over the years in this church. So how are we still here together as a church, despite these arguments, and how do we ensure St Pauls remains diverse and united?

隨著人們從 Chatswood 周圍的多種文化來到聖保羅堂，我們似乎不可避免地會面臨作為基督徒的正確生活方式的衝突。的確，我敢肯定，這些年來，在這個教會裡，對於正確的做法，已經有很多分歧了。那麼，儘管存在這些爭論，我們作為一個教會如何仍然在一起，我們如何確保聖保羅堂能夠保持多元化和團結？

Well, Paul's answer is simple - don't be a stumbling block for God's good work. Please have a look at verse 20 with me. *“Do not destroy the work of God for the sake of food. All food is clean, but it is wrong for a person to eat anything that causes someone else to stumble”*.

好吧，保羅的回答很簡單…不要成為上帝善工的絆腳石。和我一起看第 20 節，「不可因食物毀壞上帝的工作。一切都是潔淨的，但有人因食物使人跌倒，這在他就是惡了。」

Remember the two groups I mentioned earlier? Those that thought eating meat was sinful, and those that thought it was fine? Paul has made it clear earlier in the passage that he is firmly in the second group, believing that Jesus has made all food clean. But he goes on to say here that even though he knows he is right, membership in God's kingdom is not first and foremost about being right. No, the priority for those living for God is caring for others.

還記得我之前提到的兩組人嗎？那些認為吃肉是有罪的，那些認為吃肉沒事的？保羅在前面的經文中明確表示，他堅定地屬於第二類，相信耶穌已經把所有的食物都洗乾淨了。但他在這裡繼續說，即使他知道自己是對的，但成為上帝國度的成員實際上並不是首先關注什麼是正確的。不，那些為上帝而活的人的首要任務是關心他人。

We've talked about the general case of “what to do if two Christians disagree”, but what about the specific case where you know what's right, and you see someone doing something you know is wrong? If you view a fellow believer doing something you disagree with, your instinct won't be ‘oh, they're just doing things differently to me,’ but it'll be ‘that's wrong.’

你看，我們已經討論了「如果兩個基督徒不同意怎麼辦」的一般情況，但是若你知道什麼是對的，而你看到有人做你知道是錯的事情時的具體情況會怎麼樣呢？實際上，如果你看到一個信徒做你不同意的事情，你的直覺不會是「哦，他們只是在做與我不同的事情」，而是「那是錯誤的。」

Australian society is clear on what to do in a situation like this. It only takes one look at Twitter or Facebook to see that if I am right, it's my responsibility to prove myself right and get the other person to acknowledge their wrongness. Then if they refuse to change their mind immediately, I should ridicule them for being wrong or say something like “typical liberal snowflake” or “typical conservative nut-job.”

澳大利亞社會非常清楚在這種情況下該怎麼做…只要看一下 Twitter 或 Facebook 就知道。如果我是對的，我有責任證明自己是對的，讓對方承認自己的錯誤，那麼如果他們拒絕立即改變主意，我應該嘲笑他們是錯誤的，或者說一些類似於「典型的自由派雪花」或「典型的保守派瘋子」的話。

On the other hand, the Bible's answer is radically different - think of the other person's needs first. Do what's best for the faith of your brother or sister, even if it means limiting your liberty or accepting actions you don't agree with - don't jeopardise their faith or their connection to God's church. What if, by doing something you know to be right, which they view as wrong, they become confused about what God wants and thus are caused to sin in other areas? Or what if, by calling them out on practice you know to be wrong, which they view as right, you tempt them to unnecessary bitterness and malice?

另一方面，聖經的答案完全不同…首先考慮對方的需要。為你的兄弟姐妹的信心做最好的事，即使這意味著限制你的自由或接納你不同意的行為…不要危及他們的信心或他們與上帝教會的聯繫。如果你做了一些你知道是對的事情，但他們認為這是錯誤的，他們對上帝想要什麼感到困惑，從而導致在其他方面犯罪怎麼辦？或者，如果通過一種你知道是錯誤的，而他們認為這是正確的做法，你會誘使他們產生不必要的苦毒和惡意怎麼辦？

It isn't to say that we should abstain from upsetting anyone in our church, lest the church becomes subject to the whims of any grumpy Christian. Still, Paul is specifically talking about issues that will cause the other person to doubt their relationship with Jesus. Here are some quick examples - if you believe that all forms of music are fine for church, but your Christian brother is only able to use one style of worship to praise God, you should do what is best for your brother and limit your liberty for the sake of their communion with God.

這並不是說我們應該避免惹惱我們教會中的任何人，以免教會受制於任何脾氣暴躁的基督徒的心血來潮，但保羅在這裡特別談到會導致他人懷疑他們與耶穌的關係的問題。這裡有一些簡單的例子…如果你認為所有形式的音樂都適合教會，但你的基督徒兄弟只能用一種敬拜方式來讚美上帝，你應該為你的兄弟做最好的事，並限制你的自由為了他們與上帝的交通。

On the other hand, if you think it's inappropriate for Christians to wear the immodest clothes. Will your worrying behind their back about the faith of your Christian sister when she wears clothes you feel are indecent help the situation? Or could it cause them to feel judged, guilty, wrong for this congregation, and potentially wrong for Jesus?

另一方面，如果你認為基督徒穿著不雅的衣服是不合適的，那麼在背後擔心穿著你覺得不雅的衣服的基督徒姊妹的信心會有助於改善情況嗎？或者這會讓他們感到被評判、有罪、對這個會眾有錯，並可能對耶穌有錯？

When it comes to disputable issues, put the faith of your fellow believer first over any need to prove yourself right. Accept them first as your faithful Christian sibling, and don't cause them to stumble in that faith because, as Paul says in verse 21, *“It is better not to eat meat or drink wine or to do anything else that will cause your brother or sister to fall.”*

當涉及有爭議的問題時，把你的信徒的信心放在第一位，而不是任何需要證明自己是正確的。首先接納他們作為你忠實的基督徒兄弟姐妹，不要讓他們在信心上跌倒，因為正如保羅在第 21 節所說，「無論是吃肉是喝酒，是甚麼別的事，使弟兄跌倒，一概不做，才是善的。」

So how do we take steps to move toward this new “supernatural” community of acceptance? Well, I think there are two clear takeaways - firstly, think very hard before claiming something is a non-disputable “gospel” issue. Often, when we see someone doing something outside of what we know to be normal, it can feel like a massive issue because when they don't follow the norm, they disrespect the church.

那麼，我們如何採取措施走向這個新的「超自然」接納的社群呢？好吧，我認為有兩個明確的要點…首先，在聲稱某事是一個無可爭議的「福音」問題之前要認真思考。通常，當我們看到有人在做我們所知道的正常之外的事情時，會覺得這是一個大問題，因為當他們不遵守規範時，他們就是不尊重教會。

But before reacting on instinct and lashing out in judgment or worry, think back to those guidelines of whether something is disputable or not. If it is a disputable matter, then now is the time to practice acceptance, especially if you disagree with what they're doing. Remember what Paul writes to the Roman church - “Who are you to judge someone else's servant?”

但在憑直覺做出反應，並在評斷或擔憂中猛烈抨擊之前，請回想一下那些是否有爭議的指導方針…如果這是一個有爭議的問題，那麼現在是練習接納的時候了，尤其是如果你不同意他們正在做的看法。還記得保羅寫給羅馬教會的話…「你是誰，竟評斷別人的僕人呢？」

Secondly, remember that a church of many cultures will not be a comfortable place. To borrow another Steve phrase, we need to embrace “shared discomfort.” Paul encouraged the Christians in Rome to put away their wants and desires - the things that make them feel normal and comfortable - if it meant that someone else could continue in fellowship with God and his church.

其次，請記住，一個擁有多種文化的教會不會是一個舒適的地方。借用另一個主任牧師的話，我們需要接納「共享不舒適」。保羅鼓勵羅馬的基督徒放棄他們自己的

需要和渴望...放棄那些讓你感到正常和舒適的東西...如果這意味著其他人將能夠繼續與上帝和他的教會相交。

Holding unity and diversity together means doing church differently from how you've always done it and doing it with people who live as Christian differently from how you do. It means making changes that suit those in the minority; otherwise, it isn't truly a "shared" discomfort. And most importantly, it means having an accepting attitude towards difference. For St Pauls to grow in our multicultural suburb, it needs YOU to commit to acceptance.

保持團結和多樣性意味著以不同的方式做教會，與你一直做的方式不同，與以不同方式生活的基督徒一起做這件事。這意味著為少數的人做出適合的改變，否則就不是真正的「共享」的不舒適。最重要的是，這意味著對差異有一種接納的態度。為了讓聖保羅堂在我們多元文化的社區發展，您需要承諾接納。

Regardless of what Christian walks through those doors, how they live, what they think, and the disputable issues where you disagree, you personally need to commit to wholeheartedly loving and accepting them as your fellow believer. It is a big and challenging task, but it is the one Jesus fulfilled when he loved us, and I pray it's one we'll be able to commit to.

不管是那麼樣的基督徒走進這門，不管他們如何生活，不管他們怎麼想，不管你不同意的有爭議的問題，你個人需要全心全意地愛他們，接納他們作為與你同信的門徒。這是一項艱鉅且具有挑戰性的任務，但這是耶穌愛我們時完成的任務，我祈禱這是我們能夠承諾的任務。