

# Jesus. All About Goodness 耶穌，完全良善美好

John 約翰福音 1:1-14

USED 使用: Sunday 12th February 2023 年 2 月 12 日星期日 (Vision 23 遠象系列)

At 16, Lance Armstrong started competing in triathlons and became the national sprint course champion in 1989 and 1990. In 1992 he became a professional cyclist at age 21. He won the world championship the following year. Three years later, in 1996, he was diagnosed with cancer. He returned to cycling two years later, in 1998, and won the Tour de France for the next seven years.

蘭斯·阿姆斯特朗 16 歲開始參加鐵人三項賽，並在 1989 和 90 年獲得全國短跑賽冠軍。1992 年，21 歲的他成為職業自行車手，次年獲得世界冠軍。三年後的 1996 年，他被診斷出患有癌症。兩年後的 1998 年，他重返自行車賽場並贏得了環法自行車賽冠軍，並在接下來的七年裡連續奪冠。

He is a champion who beat cancer. We love winners who overcome adversity. So why is he not loved by people today? Because he cheated. He broke the rules and took performance-enhancing drugs.

他是戰勝癌症的冠軍。我們喜歡克服逆境的勝利者。那麼，為什麼他在今天不受人們喜愛呢？因為他作弊，違反規定服用了提高成績的藥物。

As human beings, we don't just look at the world through the lens of what it is. We also look at the world through the lens of what ought to be. We can't help but think that some things are right and some are wrong. How do we decide which is which?

作為人類，我們不僅從現狀的角度看世界，我們還通過應該的角度看世界。我們不禁認為有些事情是對的，有些事情是錯的。我們如何決定哪個是哪個？

The range of ethical issues is huge...use of plastic bags, the origin of the clothes we wear, coal power stations, generosity, immigration, sexuality, and poking little animals with sticks. What is good and evil, and on what basis do you decide?

道德倫理問題的範圍很廣……塑料袋的使用、我們穿的衣服的來源、燃煤發電、慷慨、移民、性行為，以及用棍子戳小動物。什麼是善，什麼是惡，你根據什麼來決定？

What we are seeking to do in the coming weeks is to look at Christianity, the rising tide of secularism, and sometimes other religions and see which delivers the best solution to what every human being needs to flourish in life.

在接下來的幾週裡，我們要做的是審視基督教，審視世俗主義的興起，有時甚至審視其他宗教，看看哪種宗教能為每個人在生活中蓬勃發展所需要的東西提供最佳解決方案。

Things like meaning, the ability to face suffering, a solid enough identity to endure the ups and downs of our performance, a base for moral judgement or deciding what is right and wrong. Belief systems provide these things, so which does it best?

諸如意義、面對苦難的能力、足以忍受我們個人表現起伏的堅定身份、道德判斷和決定是非的基礎。信仰體系提供這些東西，所以哪個做得最好。

The goal is to strengthen the faith of the follower of Jesus and to challenge the sceptic to take further steps to explore Christianity. We want to keep saying that Christianity is plausible, relevant, and good.

目標是加強耶穌追隨者的信仰，並挑戰懷疑論者採取進一步的步驟來探索基督教。我們想說的基督教是合理的、相關的和好的。

Today I want to look at the contribution Christianity makes to the issue of morality. I want to look at how these decisions were traditionally made, how our secular culture makes them, and the unique contribution the Christian faith makes.

今天我想看看基督教對道德問題的貢獻。我想看看傳統上是如何做出這些決定的，我們的世俗文化是如何做出這些決定的，以及基督教信仰做出的獨特貢獻。

### TRADITIONAL GOOD & EVIL 傳統的善與惡

A moral judgement is how we explain moral convictions, moral obligations, and moral motivations. A moral conviction is 'I FEEL X is right, and I FEEL Y is wrong'. I feel I should always do X but never do Y. A moral conviction is a moral feeling.

道德判斷是我們解釋道德信念、道德義務和道德動機的方式。道德信念是「我覺得 X 是對的，我覺得 Y 是錯的」。我覺得我應該總是做 X 而永遠不要做 Y。道德信念是一種道德感覺。

A moral obligation is when I then say, 'I FEEL X is right, and YOU ALSO OUGHT TO THINK X is right, whether you feel it or not'.

道德義務是然後當我說，「我覺得 X 是對的，你也應該認為 X 是對的，不管你覺得它是不是」。

That is the difference between moral feeling and moral obligation. What is the basis for that? 這就是道德信念和道德義務之間的區別。其依據是什麼？

Historically, all religions and traditional cultures have said that the basis of moral obligation is a sacred order outside of this world. Christianity, Judaism, and Islam have traditionally said, 'If God says it's wrong, then it is wrong.'

歷史上，所有的宗教和傳統文化都說，道德義務的基礎是人間之外的神聖秩序。基督教、猶太教、伊斯蘭教傳統上說：「如果上帝說這是錯的，那它就是錯的。」

Even cultures like the Greeks that didn't have a personal God still believed in a realm beyond this. They called it the LOGOS.

即使是沒有個人上帝的文化，例如希臘人，也相信一個超越這個領域的領域。事實上，他們稱之為 LOGOS。

The logos was a cosmic order, a set of moral absolutes that stood behind the universe. To live a good life, you had to align yourself with that moral order.

LOGOS 是一種宇宙秩序；一套站在宇宙背後的絕對道德。為了過上美好的生活，你必須讓自己與那個道德秩序保持一致。

Ancient Chinese, especially Confucius, had a similar idea. Confucius told people how to live, but not because he said so. Confucius said you must live this way because it fits Heaven's will. A wise and virtuous life aligned with Heaven's will.

中國古人，尤其是孔子，也有類似的想法。孔子告訴人們如何生活，但不是出於他本身的意思。孔子說你必須這樣生活，因為它符合天意。明智而有道德的生活符合天意。

Of course, all religions and cultures have different opinions on the sacred order and, therefore, on what those moral absolutes were. But there is nevertheless a rational justification for them. 當然，所有不同的宗教和文化對神聖秩序都有不同的看法，因此對什麼是絕對道德也有不同的看法。但是他們仍然有合理的理由。

Purpose links the justification for all moral obligations. Unless I obey the moral absolutes and fulfil my purpose, I might destroy my life now and in the afterlife.

所有道德義務的正當性都與目的有關。除非我遵守絕對的道德準則並實現我的目的，否則我現在可能會毀了我的生活，也會在來世毀掉我的生命。

That is how people used to decide what is good and what is not...linked to purpose.

這就是人們用來決定什麼是好什麼不是的方式……與目的相關聯。

TELOS is the Greek word for purpose, the end, the goal of all life. There is another Greek word called LOGOS, which means WORD/LOGIC and is the reason for something.

TELOS 是希臘語，意思是目的、終點、所有生命的目標。還有另一個希臘詞叫做 LOGOS，意思是道/邏輯，是某事的原因。

The thinking was you cannot make a moral judgement unless it is in line with the TELOS...the LOGOS.

想法是你不能做出道德判斷，除非它符合 TELOS.....LOGOS。

For instance, is this a good or bad watch? You can't answer that question purely by comparing it to other watches. You must first ask what it is for.

例如，這是一塊好表還是壞表？你不能僅僅通過將它與其他手錶進行比較來回答這個問題。你首先要問它是乾什麼用的？

If I decided to take it off now and hammer in a nail. When it breaks, I can't say it was a bad watch. I wasn't using it according to its purpose.

如果我決定現在將它取下並釘上釘子，當它斷裂時，我不能說它是一塊糟糕的手錶。因我沒有按照它的用途使用它。

What are human beings made for? The answer to that question is the basis of determining between good and evil.

人類是為了什麼而造的？這個問題的答案是判斷善惡的基礎。

## SECULAR GOOD AND EVIL 世俗的善與惡

The secular framework for determining good and evil starts without any purpose. Secularism says all life is an accident and rejects any sense of a transcendent God, creator, or being. 確定善惡的世俗框架開始時是毫無目的。世俗主義說所有的生命都是偶然的，它拒絕任何超然的上帝、創造者或存在的感覺。

In his book *River out of Eden*, Richard Dawkins writes this: *The universe we observe has precisely the properties we should expect if there is, at bottom, no design, no purpose, no evil and no good, nothing but blind, pitiless indifference.*

理查·霍金斯在他的《伊甸園之河》一書中寫道：我們所觀察到的宇宙如果根本沒有設計、沒有目的、沒有惡也沒有善、只有盲目、無情的冷漠，就恰恰具有我們應該期待的特性。

I will say up front that I think secular people, atheists, can do good things. Very good things. Many atheists have incredibly high moral convictions...moral feelings. 我會先說，我認為世俗的人，無神論者，可以做好事。很好的東西。有許多無神論者擁有令人難以置信的崇高道德信念……道德情懷。

However, I think there are huge problems regarding moral obligations for a secular society like ours. A secular worldview really struggles to have a consistent and coherent argument for moral obligation.

然而，我確實認為像我們這樣的世俗社會在道德義務問題上存在巨大問題。世俗的世界觀確實很難為道德義務提供一致和連貫的論據。

The same Richard Dawkins wrote that, in the summer of 2013, when England was playing Australia in the Ashes Test, accused the English player Stuart Broad of cheating. 寫下這篇文章的理查·霍金斯在2013年夏天，當英格蘭隊在Ashes大賽中與澳大利亞隊比賽時，指責英國球員斯圖爾特布羅德作弊。

The fuming cricket fan Hawkins wrote on Twitter: *Stuart Broad obviously knew perfectly well he was caught. Refused to walk. What a revolting cheat. I now want Australia to win the ashes.* 憤怒的板球迷霍金斯在推特上寫道：斯圖爾特·布羅德顯然非常清楚自己已被抓出局。拒絕離場。多麼令人作嘔的騙局。我現在希望澳大利亞贏得骨灰大賽。

On what basis did Hawkins make that value judgement? He can only say Broad was a cheat if there is a purpose that Broad, Hawkins, you and me must live by. 霍金斯是根據什麼做出這種價值判斷的？除非布羅德，霍金斯和你我有必須遵循的目標，他才能說布羅德是個騙子。

On what basis does a secular person call for moral obligation? I'll mention a few main arguments for moral obligation in the secular world. 一個世俗的人在什麼基礎上呼籲要求道德義務？我將提及一些關於世俗世界道德義務的主要論點。

Firstly, there is **evolutionary ethics**. It states that all organisms are engaged in a struggle to survive, and those things that help species survive are selected - a giraffe's long neck, a cat's

ability to land on its feet 9 times out of 10, or a human's sense of morality. That is, our moral feelings came from our ancestors, and they helped our ancestors survive.

首先，有**進化倫理學**。它指出，所有生物都在為生存而鬥爭，而那些有助於物種生存的東西被選中了——長頸鹿的長脖子、貓 10 次有 9 次用腳著地的能力，或者人類的道德感。也就是說，我們的道德感受來自於我們的祖先，它們幫助我們的祖先生存下來。

One counterargument to evolutionary ethics is it describes the function, not morality. Natural selection has chosen the lion's pointy teeth, the eagle's wings, and the Baboon's bright red bottom, not because they are right or good, but because they get the job done.

進化倫理學的一個反駁論點是它描述的是功能而不是道德。自然選擇選擇了獅子的尖牙、老鷹的翅膀和狒狒鮮紅的屁股，不是因為它們是對的或好的，而是因為它們完成了任務。

Another counterargument is that just because ethical behaviour X Y Z helped my ancestors survive doesn't obligate me to live the same way. There is no obligation to follow a feeling that is there because of evolution.

另一個反駁論點是，僅僅因為 XYZ 的道德行為幫助我的祖先生存下來，這並不以任何方式迫使我以同樣的方式生活。沒有義務去追隨一種由於進化而存在的感覺。

A further counterargument is if morality is a result of evolution, then you can't criticise the past generations, or other cultures, for their moral decisions because they are simply less evolved.

進一步的反駁是，如果道德是進化的結果，那麼你就不能批評過去的幾代人或其他文化的道德決定，因為它們只是進化得更少。

In other words, what they determined to be good at their stage of evolution, cannot now be called evil. It's like saying my cat is terrible because it hasn't evolved enough to fill its water bowl.

也就是說，他們在進化的階段認定為好的，現在不能說是邪惡的。這就像說我的貓不好，因為它還沒有進化到足以裝滿自己的水碗。

A secular person cannot, in good conscience, criticise any past behaviour as being immoral.

一個世俗的人不能，憑良心有意識地，批評過去的任何行為是不道德的。

One last counterargument. If evolution and natural selection are the basis of moral obligation, then the strong eating the weak is natural, and any feeling I have contrary to that is wrong.

最後一個反駁是。如果進化和自然選擇是道德義務的基礎，那麼強者吃弱者是自然的，而我與此相反的任何的感覺都是錯誤的。

Secondly, there is the **pragmatic** argument. This one is simply if no one does good, then it will result in evil, so it is in the best interest of everyone to do good.

其次，是**務實**論證。這個很簡單，如果沒有人做好事，那麼就會導致作惡，所以做好事符合每個人的最大利益。

The pragmatic argument doesn't say let the poor starve is wrong. It is saying it is impractical.

務實的論點並不是說讓窮人挨餓是錯誤的，而是說這是不切實際的。

The danger of this argument is that the definition of what is 'practical' is what is in my best interest. I should care about the environment and feed the poor because it is in my best interest. 這種論點的危險在於，以最符合我的利益作為什麼是“實用”的定義。我應該關心環境並為窮人提供食物，因為這是符合我的最大利益。

It will turn out better for me if I do good for them. But why would I do good if I don't feel it is in my best interest?

如果我為他們做好事，對我來說會更好。但如果我覺得這不符合我的最大利益，我為什麼要做好事？

The third secular argument is moral decisions are made by **social consensus**. This one tends to be the most popular in our society.

第三個世俗論點是道德決定是由**社會共識**做出的。這個往往是我們社會中最受歡迎的。

As a modern society, we have progressed to see that some of the things we thought were good and right we now see as evil and wrong, and there is a social consensus, or there soon will be, around these things.

作為一個現代社會，我們已經進步地看到，一些我們認為好的和正確的事情，現在我們認為是邪惡的和錯誤的，並且圍繞這些事情存在社會共識或很快就會形成。

If a majority says it's wrong to starve the poor, then it is wrong to starve the poor.

如果大多數人說讓窮人挨餓是錯誤的，那麼讓窮人挨餓就是錯誤的。

The counterargument for this is straightforward. A thousand years ago, social consensus said that slavery was acceptable. So, was it good? Was it fine? No, it was wrong then, even though there was a social consensus. There was social consensus in Nazi Germany to exterminate the Jews.

對此的反駁是直截了當的。一千年前，社會共識說奴隸制很好。那麼，它好嗎？還好嗎？不，當時是錯誤的，儘管社會對此有共識。納粹德國的社會共識是消滅猶太人。

There is a second sting in the tail to this one, though. Whatever we call 'good' today - our deepest values, our treasured moral standards - might be considered 'bad' in 20 years, depending on how society changes.

而且隨後還有第二個刺。任何我們今天稱為「好」的東西——我們最深刻的價值觀、我們珍視的道德標準——在 20 年後可能會被認為是「壞」的，這取決於社會如何變化。

Society cannot determine good because society might change its mind very quickly.

善不能由社會決定，因為社會可能會很快改變主意。

The biggest problem with the social consensus argument is how quickly it leads to the problem of authority and the problem of what if you are in the minority that doesn't agree.

社會共識論證的最大問題是它會多快導致權威問題，以及如果你是不同意的少數人怎麼辦的問題。

It could be the wealthy, the government, the newspaper editors, the school bully, the social media influencer, or the one who shouts the loudest.

可能是富人、政府、報紙編輯、校園惡霸、社交媒體影響者，以及喊得最響的人。

People with power can impose their morality on others even if there is no justification for their views.

有權力的人可以將自己的一套道德強加於他人，即使他們的觀點沒有任何理由。

Ever heard statements like ‘religion should have no voice in today’s modern secular society when discussing ethical issues’? That is an authority argument.

聽說過「在當今現代世俗社會討論倫理問題時，宗教不應該有發言權」這樣的話嗎？那是一個權威論證。

The counter to this is that if I have a view on an ethical issue, and you have a different view, but I force you to have my view, that is called oppression.

與此相反的是，如果我對道德問題有看法，而你有不同的看法，但我強迫你有我的看法，那就是壓迫。

As a former professor of Law at Yale University, Arthur Leff said - he was best known for a series of articles examining whether there is such a thing as normative morality. All claims of moral obligation are authority claims.

作為耶魯大學的前法學教授，亞瑟·萊夫說——他最出名的是一系列文章，研究是否存在規範道德這樣的東西。所有道德義務的主張都是權威主張。

He concluded that in the absence of God, there are but two options: you can turn every individual person into a little godlet, able to decide good and evil for themselves - but then who evaluates between them when there are clashes between godlet claims?

他總結說，在沒有上帝的情況下，只有兩種選擇：你可以把每個人都變成一個小神，可以自己決定善惡——但是當小神們的主張發生衝突時，誰來評估他們之間的關係呢？

Alternatively, you can turn the state into God and let it determine good and evil, but then MIGHT become right, and you end up with sheer, naked brutality.

或者，你可以把國家變成上帝，讓它決定善惡，但隨後**強勢**的便變成了正確的，你最終會得到純粹的、赤裸裸的殘暴。

If you go down that route, morality becomes meaningless. If you go down the personal godlet route, morality becomes impossible.

如果你沿著這條路走下去，道德就變得毫無意義。如果你走個人小神路線，道德就變得不可能了。

What I would add is that if the former ultimately gives rise to anarchy, you need the latter to solve the anarchy.

我要補充的是，如果前者最終導致無政府狀態，那麼你需要後者來解決無政府狀態。

This is simply an overview, but it does highlight that secularism has a major problem with determining what is good and what is evil. It cannot produce moral obligation, so in a secular society, all we can do is yell at one another. Yell, and yell and yell about who is right and who is wrong.

這只是一個概述，但它確實強調了世俗主義在確定什麼是善什麼是惡方面存在重大問題。它不能產生道德義務，所以在世俗社會中，我們所能做的就是互相吼叫。大喊大叫，大喊大叫誰對誰錯。

It's interesting that Leff, himself an agnostic, didn't think it possible to know if God existed at all, ends his essay by pointing out that there is only one solution to this - that would be if 'goodness' were something BIGGER than us. Something outside of us. Only then could ethics, morality, and law work.

有趣的是，萊夫本人是不可知論者，因此認為根本不可能知道上帝是否存在，他在文章結尾指出只有一個解決方案——那就是如果「善」是某種比我們更大的東西，我們之外的東西。只有這樣，倫理、道德和法律才能發揮作用。

Perhaps this source of goodness could also help with the question of purpose, giving us a clue that we are not mere cosmic accidents churned up from the genetic cauldron of chaos, but instead that we are made FOR something, fashioned to BE something.

也許這種善良的源泉也可以幫助解決目的問題，給我們一個線索，即我們不僅僅是宇宙的偶然事件，從混沌的基因大鍋中攪動，而是我們是為某事而造的，被塑造成某事。

Of course, this also raises problems. For instance, what are our implications if we fall short of the transcendent source of goodness? What if we are not actually good?

當然，這也帶來了自身的問題。例如，如果我們未能達到善的超然來源，對我們有何影響？如果我們實際上並不好怎麼辦？

If I do not control goodness or society, it may turn out that it says I am messed up, just like everyone else. The whole point of a moral standard is to measure up to it.

如果善良不受我或社會的控制，結果可能會說我一團糟，就像其他人一樣。道德標準的全部意義在於達到它。

This makes the issue of morality not simply a philosophical discussion but a highly personal one.

這就是使道德問題不僅僅是一個哲學討論，而是一個高度個人化的問題的原因。

So, what if we are made FOR something, fashioned to BE something, and even, as Christianity declares, intended to KNOW someone? That is the unique contribution of Christianity. Or, if you like, the unique contribution of the goodness of Jesus Christ.

那麼，如果我們是為某事而生，被塑造成某事，甚至像基督教宣稱的那樣，想要了解認識某個人呢？這是基督教的獨特貢獻。或者，如果你願意，是耶穌基督的良善的獨特貢獻。

**JESUS IS GOOD 耶穌是良善美好**



Christianity stands with all the other great religions in declaring there are moral absolutes outside of us that are the basis of moral feelings and motivation.

基督教與其他偉大的宗教一樣，宣稱在我們之外有絕對的道德，它們是道德情感和動機的基礎。

Having said that, what we see in our society is people shedding religion because they see self-righteousness. A legalism. Cruelty. Hypocrisy.

話雖如此，我們在社會中看到的人們擺脫宗教信仰，因為他們看到了自以為是。一種法制主義。殘忍。虛偽。

Throughout history, religion and the Christian church have had blood on their hands for abuse of power on moral absolutes. Religious institutions have been the ones yelling the most.

縱觀歷史，宗教和基督教會因濫用道德絕對權力而沾滿鮮血。宗教機構也是一直是喊得最多的。

Many have abandoned that and moved towards secularism as a reaction. I've tried to show that it is not the answer either. So, what is?

許多人已經放棄了這一點，並轉向世俗主義作為一種反應。我試圖證明這也不是答案。那麼，什麼是？

Do you remember I said a little while ago that the Greeks believed the LOGOS was the cosmic order behind the universe that gave it purpose? If you are connected to the LOGOS and live by the LOGOS, then you will be living wisely and virtuously.

你還記得我剛才說過，希臘人相信 LOGOS 是宇宙背後賦予它目的的宇宙秩序嗎？如果你與 LOGOS 相連，並靠 LOGOS 生活，那麼你將過著明智而高尚的生活。

At the beginning of the Bible passage read out to us in John 1, we read this:

在我們剛朗讀的聖經段落《約翰福音》第 1 章的開頭，我們讀到：

***In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was with God in the beginning. Through him all things were made; without him nothing was made that has been made. In him was life, and that life was the light of all humanity.***

太初有道，道與神同在，道就是神。這道太初與神同在。萬物都是藉著他造的；沒有一樣不是藉著他造的。在他裡面有生命，這生命就是人的光。

Then down in v.14: ***The Word became flesh and made his dwelling among us. We have seen his glory, the glory of the one and only Son, who came from the Father, full of grace and truth.***

然後在第 14 節：**道成了肉身，住在我們中間。充充滿滿地有恩典有真理，我們也見過他的榮光，正是父獨一兒子的榮光。**

The term WORD is talking about Jesus. Why call him the Word? In the original language, Jesus is called the LOGOS. It uses a technical, Greek philosophical term to say that there are moral absolutes and a purpose, but it is not an abstract set of standards. It's a person.

「道」這個詞是在談論耶穌。為什麼稱他為「道」？在原文中，耶穌被稱為 LOGOS。是使用一個希臘學術語來表示有絕對的道德，有一個目的，但它不是一套抽象的標準，它是一個人。

There is a rational design and order behind the universe, but it is not a code. It's a person. It's Jesus Christ.

宇宙背後是有一個合理的設計和秩序，但它不是代碼，它是一個人。是耶穌基督。

What's more, the deepest moral obligation is to know him. Through knowing him, through a personal love relationship with him, we come to the heart of the universe.

更重要的是，最深的道德義務是了解他。通過認識他，通過與他的個人愛的關係，我們來到了宇宙的中心。

Christians believe we are not good or saved by living up to a moral standard. Jesus Christ saves us, the logos, coming into his creation to die on the cross for our not living up to the deepest moral obligation of knowing and loving and worshipping him.

基督徒認為我們不是好人，也不是通過遵守道德標準而得救的，我們是被耶穌基督拯救，他是 LOGOS 進入他的創造，死在十字架上，因為我們沒有履行了解和愛並崇拜他的最深刻的道德義務。

A Christian is someone who trusts in the goodness and grace of Jesus. To the degree that Christians understand the very heart of their faith, Jesus Christ is the logos who came to earth. He died for you to cover over all your wrongdoing so that you live by grace and love to the degree that the Christian will live by love.

基督徒是信靠耶穌的良善和恩典的人。基督徒真正理解他們信仰的核心是耶穌基督是降世的 LOGOS，他為你而死，遮蓋你所有的過錯，使你靠著恩典和愛生活的程度，將會是基督徒如何因愛而活的程度。

The goodness of Jesus humbles you so that as we pursue the moral absolutes of the Bible, it doesn't turn you into a self-righteous legalist who looks down on others and oppresses others. It turns you into a person of goodness.

耶穌的良善使你謙卑，這樣當我們追求聖經的道德絕對時，它不會把你變成一個自以為是的，看不起別人、壓迫別人的律法主義者，而是把你變成一個善良的人。