

主？ 骗子？ 还是疯子？
Lord, Liar, or Lunatic?

麦道卫

Josh McDowell

Notes on Chapter 2

- 1 C.S. Lewis, *Mere Christianity* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1960), pp. 40-41.
- 2 F.J.A. Hort, *Way, Truth, and the Life* (New York: MacMillan and Co., 1894), p. 207.
- 3 Kenneth Scott Latourette, *A History of Christianity* (New York: Harper and Row, 1953), pp. 44, 48.
- 4 William E. Lecky, *History of European Morals from Augustus to Charlemagne* (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1903), Vol. 2, pp. 8, 9.
- 5 Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1962), (Reprint from original 1910), p. 109.
- 6 Philip Schaff, *The Person of Christ* (New York: American Tract Society, 1913), pp. 94-95.
- 7 Arthur P. Noyes, and Lawrence C. Kolb, *Modern Clinical Psychiatry* (Philadelphia: Saunders, 1958). (5th ed.)
8. Clark H. Pinnock, *Set Forth Your Case* (New Jersey: The Craig Press, 1967), p. 62.
- 9 J.T. Fisher, and L.S. Hawley, *A Few Buttons Missing* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1951), p. 273.
- 10 C.S. Lewis, *Miracles: A Preliminary Study* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1947), p. 113.
- 11 Schaff, *The Person of Christ*, p. 97.

主？ 骗子？ 还是疯子？ Lord, Liar, or Lunatic?

Excerpt from the book *More Than a Carpenter*, Chapter 2, pages 25-35. Used by permission.

More Than a Carpenter 千载悬疑

Author	Josh McDowell
Publisher	Tyndale House Publishers, Inc. Wheaton, Illinois, USA
Edition	Copyright ©1977, English Edition Tyndale House Copyright ©1995, Simplified Chinese Edition, CCAL Alexandra P. O. Box 0205 Singapore 911507

The distinct claims of Jesus to be God eliminate the popular ploy of skeptics who regard Jesus as just a good moral man or a prophet who said a lot of profound things. So often that conclusion is passed off as the only one acceptable to scholars or as the obvious result of the intellectual process. The trouble is, many people nod their heads in agreement and never see the fallacy of such reasoning.

To Jesus, who men and women believed him to be was of fundamental importance. To say what Jesus said and to claim what he claimed about himself, one couldn't conclude he was just a good moral man or prophet. That alternative isn't open to an individual, and Jesus never intended it to be.

C. S. Lewis, who was a professor at Cambridge University and was once an agnostic, understood this issue clearly. He writes: "I am trying here to prevent anyone saying the really foolish things that people often say about Him: 'I'm ready to accept Jesus as a great moral teacher, but I don't accept His claim to be God.' That is the one thing we must not say. A man who was merely a man and said the sort of things Jesus said would not be a great moral teacher. He would either be a lunatic—on a level with a man who says he is a poached egg—or else he would be the Devil of Hell. You must make your choice. Either this man was, and is, the Son of God: or else a madman or something worse."

Then Lewis adds: "You can shut Him up for a fool, you can spit at Him and kill Him as a demon; or you can fall at His feet and call Him Lord and God. But let us not come up with any patronizing nonsense about His being a great human teacher. He has not left that open to us. He did not intend to."¹

F. J. A. Hort, who spent twenty-eight years in a critical study of the New Testament text, writes: "His words were so completely parts and utterances of Himself, that they had no meaning as abstract statements of truth uttered by Him as a Divine oracle or prophet. Take away Himself as the primary though not the ultimate) subject of every statement and they all fall to pieces."²

In the words of Kenneth Scott Latourette, historian of Christianity at Yale University: "It is not his teachings which make Jesus so remarkable, although these would be enough to give him distinction. It is a combination of the teachings with the man himself. The two cannot be separated." "It must be obvious," Latourette concludes, "to any thoughtful reader of the Gospel records that Jesus regarded himself and his message as inseparable. He was a great teacher, but he was more. His teachings about the kingdom of God, about human conduct, and about God were important, but they could not be divorced from him without, from his standpoint, being vitiated."³

他是主? Was He Lord?

我个人不能想像耶稣是个骗子或疯子。余下唯一的可能就是他真是基督，正如他自己所宣称的是神的儿子。

我与很多犹太人讨论此事时，他们的反应都是很有趣的。他们通常会告诉我耶稣是一个有道德、正直的宗教领袖，是个好人，也有人说他是先知。然后我与他们分享耶稣自我宣称的身份，及本章的“三端论法”（骗子、疯子、或主）。当我问他们是否相信耶稣是个骗子时，他们的回答都是个肯定的“不！”然后我再问：“你们是否相信他是个疯子？”答案是“当然不是。”“你们相信他是神吗？”在我还没有时间换气之前已响起一片“绝对不是。”之声，然而，我们就只有这么的几个选择。

这三个选择的论点在乎它们是否可能，因为很明显的它们三者都有可能。问题是那一个比较接近事实。决定耶稣基督是谁不是闲来无事找来做的一个理性习作。你不能把他当作一个伟大伦理教师一样，弃之不理。这样的选择是不成立的。他只可能是骗子，疯子，或是主和神。你必须选择。正如使徒约翰写：“但记这些事，要叫你们信耶稣是基督，是神的儿子；并且(更要紧的)叫你们信了他，就可以因他的名得生命”（约二十 31）。

事实上各方面的证据都支持耶稣是主。不过有些人因为所涉及的道德含意而拒绝接受这明显的事实。他们不愿意面对称他为主的责任或含意。

Was He Lord?

I cannot personally conclude that Jesus was a liar or a lunatic. The only other alternative is that he was the Christ, the Son of God, as he claimed.

When I discuss this with most Jewish people, it's interesting how they respond. They usually tell me that Jesus was a moral, upright, religious leader, a good man, or some kind of prophet. I then share with them the claims that Jesus made about himself and then the material in this chapter on the trilemma (liar, lunatic, or Lord). When I ask if they believe Jesus was a liar, there is a sharp "No!" then I ask, "Do you believe he was a lunatic?" The reply is "Of course not." "Do you believe he is God?" Before I can get a breath in edgewise, there is a resounding "Absolutely not." Yet one has only so many choices.

The issue with these three alternatives is not which is possible, for it is obvious that all three are possible. But rather, the question is "Which is the more probable?" Who you decide Jesus Christ is must not be an idle intellectual exercise. You cannot put him on the shelf as a great moral teacher. That is not a valid option. He is either a liar, a lunatic, or Lord and God. You must make a choice. "But," as the Apostle John wrote, "these things have been written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and"—more important—"that believing you might have life in His name" (John 20:31).

The evidence is clearly in favor of Jesus as Lord. Some people, however, reject this clear evidence because of moral implications involved. They don't want to face up to the responsibility or implications of calling him Lord.

耶稣之自称为神清楚地否定了——一个流行的谬说，就是单单将耶稣看为一个道德生活严谨的好人，或一个提出很多博大渊深的道理的“先知”。这样的见解往往被认为是“学者”所能接受的唯一结论，或是经理性验证后的必然结果。问题是，大多数点头赞同的人根本从未发现此推理背后的谬论。

对耶稣来说，人们认识他是谁是最基要的。从耶稣的说话及自称，没有人能说他只是个好人或先知。这样的选择根本不可能，亦非耶稣的原意。

剑桥大学教授鲁益师 (C. S. Lewis) 曾经是个不可知论者，他清楚明白这个论点。他写道：“我在这里是要试图消除人对他所常有的愚蠢念头：‘我愿意接受耶稣是一个伟大的伦理教师，但我不能接受他自称是神。’这话是我们绝对不可说的。一个不是神而像耶稣那样说话的人不可能是伟大的伦理教师，他只可能是个疯子——与那些说自己是个荷包蛋的人无异——不然他就是地狱的恶魔。你必须选择，此人是神的儿子，要不然，他就是神经不正常的，甚至是更可怕的东西。”

然后他再写道：“你可以将他当作疯子关起来，你可将他当作恶魔，唾弃他，杀他，你也可以俯伏在他脚前称他为主为神。但让我们不要说他是一个伟大教师这些不伦不类的疯话。他没有给我们这样的选择。”¹

用了二十八年时间对新约经文作批判性研究的荷德 (F. J. A. Hort) 写道：“他的话都是指着他自己说的，如果说那些是他以先知的身份所讲的抽象真理就完全没有意思了。把他从他自己所说的话中抽出来，那些话就实在难以理解了。”²

耶鲁大学基督教历史学家勒陀拉说：“虽然耶稣的教训足以令人景仰，但这并不是真正叫他与与众不同的地方。教训加上他本人才是最重要的。两者是不可分割的。”勒陀拉总括说：“任何细心看过福音书记载的人必定注意到耶稣从不将他自己与他的教训分开。他是一个伟大教师，但他却并不止于此，他那些关乎神的国度，人的行为及神自己的教训都很重要，但在他看来，他的教训若与他本人分割开来必产生绝对性的亏损。”³

Jesus claimed to be God. He didn't leave any other option open. His claim must be either true or false, so it is something that should be given serious consideration. Jesus' question to his disciples, "But who do you say that I am?" (Matthew 16:15) has several alternatives.

First, consider that his claim to be God was false. If it was false, then we have two and only two alternatives. He either knew it was false or he didn't know it was false. We will consider each one separately and examine the evidence.

Was He A Liar?

If, when Jesus made his claims, he knew that he was not God, then he was lying and deliberately deceiving his followers. But if he was a liar, then he was also a hypocrite because he told others to be honest, whatever the cost, while he himself taught and lived a colossal lie. More than that, he was a demon, because he told others to trust him for their eternal destiny. If he couldn't back up his claims and knew it, then he was unspeakably evil. Last, he would also be a fool because it was his claims to be God that led to his crucifixion.

Many will say that Jesus was a good moral teacher. Let's be realistic. How could he be a great moral teacher and knowingly mislead people at the most important point of his teaching—his own identity?

You would have to conclude logically that he was a deliberate liar. This view of Jesus, however, doesn't coincide with what we know either of him or the results of his life and teachings. Wherever Jesus had been proclaimed, lives have been changed for the good, nations have changed for the better, thieves are made honest, alcoholics are cured, hateful individuals become channels of love, unjust persons become just.

William Lecky, one of Great Britain's most noted historians and a dedicated opponent of organized Christianity, writes: "It was reserved for Christianity to present to the world an ideal character which through all the changes of eighteen centuries has inspired the hearts of men with an impassioned love; has shown itself capable of acting on all ages, nations, temperaments and conditions; has been not only the highest pattern of virtue, but the strongest incentive to its practice . . . The simple record of these three short years of active life has done more to regenerate and soften mankind than all the disquisitions of philosophers and all the exhortations of moralists."⁴

以为自己是神的人就像今天有人以为自己是拿破仑一样。他必定是被迷惑了而且在欺骗自己，他很可能被关起来好叫他不会伤害自己或其他人。然而我们在耶稣身上看不到精神错乱引起的不正常及不平衡。假如他真的有毛病，他泰然自若的表现就确实叫人稀奇了。

奈珥和高尔伯 (Noyes and Kolb)⁷ 在一本医学书中描写患精神分裂的人是幻想多于实际的。精神分裂者渴望逃避现实的世界。让我们来看看，自称是神肯定会是对现实的一种逃避。

从耶稣所作的事看来，我们很难想像他是精神上受干扰的人。他曾说过一些历史记载上最精深的话。他的教训曾释放了很多在精神上受捆绑的人。宾诺 (Clark H. Pinnock) 问：“他是否误信自己的伟大？他是否一个狂想者？一个无辜的骗徒？一个精神分裂者？他教训的技巧和深度只能证明他精神完全健康，恐怕我们也没有他那么正常！”⁸ 一个加州大学的学生告诉我，他的心理学教授曾在班里这样说：“他给许多病人辅导的方法，不过是拿起圣经读几段基督的教训给他们听。那便是他们所需要的辅导。”

心理医生腓夏 (J. T. Fisher) 说：“假如你要集合所有最具资历的心理学家和心理医生所写关于心理卫生的文章；假如你要将它们汇合及提炼以删去多余的辞藻，去芜存菁；假如你请一些当代最高明的诗人去把这些纯正的科学知识精简地表达出来，你会得到一份生硬而不完整的登山宝训”摘要。相比较之下它更是大为失色。基督徒握着这解答人类焦虑空虚的答案快二千年了。这里……有成功人生所需之乐观，心里健康和满足的蓝图。”⁹

鲁氏写道：“要用比基督徒的解释更简单的方法去解释耶稣的生平、言行及影响，在历史的观点来说是非常困难的。除非耶稣真的是神，否则他的稳健而有深度的伦理教训与伏在他的神学性教训背后的猖獗狂想之间的鸿沟是不可能满意的解释的。故此非基督徒的假设只能带来毫无结果的迷乱。”¹⁰

沙夫这样说：“一个具有这样如蓝天的清澈，山风的鼓勇，刀刃的锋利，全然健康及旺盛的智力，处之泰然，表现得泰然自若的人，会在自己的品格和使命上被这样严重的错觉所迷吗？这岂不是天方夜谈吗？”¹¹

Someone who believes he is God sounds like someone today believing himself Napoleon. He would be deluded and self-deceived, and probably he would be locked up so he wouldn't hurt himself or anyone else. Yet in Jesus we don't observe the abnormalities and imbalance that usually go along with being deranged. His poise and composure would certainly be amazing if he were insane.

Noyes and Kolb, in a medical text,⁷ describe the schizophrenic as a person who is more autistic than realistic. The schizophrenic desires to escape from the world of reality. Let's face it; claiming to be God would certainly be a retreat from reality.

In light of the other things we know about Jesus, it's hard to imagine that he was mentally disturbed. Here is a man who spoke some of the most profound sayings ever recorded. His instructions have liberated many individuals in mental bondage. Clark H. Pinnock asks: "Was he deluded about his greatness, a paranoid, an unintentional deceiver, a schizophrenic? Again, the skill and depth of his teachings support the case only for his total mental soundness. If only we were as sane as he!"⁸ A student at a California university told me that his psychology professor had said in class that "all he has to do is pick up the Bible and read portions of Christ's teaching to many of his patients. That's all the counseling they need."

Psychiatrist J. T. Fisher states: "If you were to take the sum total of all authoritative articles ever written by the most qualified of psychologists and psychiatrists on the subject of mental hygiene—if you were to combine them and refine them and cleave out the excess verbiage—if you were to take the whole of the meat and none of the parsley, and if you were to have these unadulterated bits of pure scientific knowledge concisely expressed by the most capable of living poets, you would have an awkward and incomplete summation of the Sermon on the Mount. And it would suffer immeasurably through comparison. For nearly two thousand years the Christian world has been holding in its hands the complete answer to its restless and fruitless yearnings. Here . . . rests the blueprint for successful human life with optimism, mental health, and contentment."⁹

C. S. Lewis writes: "The historical difficulty of giving for the life, sayings and influence of Jesus any explanation that is harder than the Christian explanation is very great. The discrepancy between the depth and sanity . . . of His moral teaching and the rampant megalomania which must lie behind His theological teaching unless He is indeed God has never been satisfactorily explained. Hence the non-Christian hypotheses succeed one another with the restless fertility of bewilderment."¹⁰

Philip Schaff reasons: "Is such an intellect—clear as the sky, bracing as the mountain air, sharp and penetrating as a sword, thoroughly healthy and vigorous, always ready and always self-possessed—liable to a radical and most serious delusion concerning his own character and mission? Preposterous imagination!"¹¹

耶稣自称为神。他并没有给人其他的选择。他这样的宣称只可以真或假，绝无第三可能，故此我们必须审慎考虑。耶稣问门徒“你们说我是谁？”（太十六 15）有几个可能的答案。

第一，假定他宣称自己是神是假的。如果是假的，我们只有两个选择：他知道那是假的；他不知道那是假的。让我们分别仔细查看每个可能和证据。

他是骗子？ Was He a liar?

当耶稣宣称自己是神的时候，假如他知道自己其实不是，那么，他便是说谎，蓄意瞒骗他的跟随者。但假如他是个骗子，他也必定也是个伪君子，因为他教训人无论如何都要诚实，但自己却同时生活在一个大谎言中。更有甚者，他是个魔鬼，因他叫人将自己的永恒托付他。假如他不能实践自己所说的，又深知自己不能的话，他就真是个大恶魔。最后，他更是个大傻瓜，因为他的被钉十字架亦是他自称是神。

很多人会说耶稣是个伟大的伦理教师。让我们现实一点，既然他蓄意在自己最重要的教训上（他自己的身份）误导别人，他又怎能是个伟大的伦理教师呢？

按理你的结论应该说他是个骗子。然而，这与我们所认识的他及他的生平和教训却毫不吻合。凡宣认耶稣的地方，生命就得改造，国家得以改善，盗贼变为诚实，醉酒的被医治，仇恨的化为仁爱，诡诈的人变得公平。

激烈反对基督教组织的英国著名历史学家历奇威廉（William Lecky）这样写：“经过十八个世纪的各种转变，仍然只有基督教才能给世界提供一个理想品格，它以热切的爱感动人心；表现出它在任何时代，任何国家，任何情势及境况下都能产生作用；它不但是道德最高的形态，更是将理想付诸行动的最佳推动力。……短短三年极短生命的简单记录，比哲学家们的探讨及道德家的呼喊更能改变及软化人。”⁴

Historian Philip Schaff says: "This testimony, if not true, must be downright blasphemy or madness. The former hypothesis cannot stand a moment before the moral purity and dignity of Jesus, revealed in his every word and work, and acknowledged by universal consent. Self-deception in a matter so momentous, and with an intellect in all respects so clear and so sound, is equally out of the question. How could he be an enthusiast or a madman who never lost the even balance of his mind, who sailed serenely over all the troubles and persecutions, as the sun above the clouds, who always returned the wisest answer to tempting questions, who calmly and deliberately predicted his death on the cross, his resurrection on the third day, the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, the founding of his Church, the destruction of Jerusalem—predictions which have been literally fulfilled? A character so original, so complete, so uniformly consistent, so perfect, so human and yet so high above all human greatness, can be neither a fraud nor a fiction. The poet, as has been well said, would in this case be greater than the hero. It would take more than a Jesus to invent a Jesus."⁵

Elsewhere Schaff gives convincing argument against Christ being a liar: "How, in the name of logic, common sense, and experience, could an imposter—that is a deceitful, selfish, depraved man—have invented, and consistently maintained from the beginning to end, the purest and noblest character known in history with the most perfect air of truth and reality? How could he have conceived and successfully carried out a plan of unparalleled beneficence, moral magnitude, and sublimity, and sacrificed his own life for it, in the face of the strongest prejudices of his people and age?"⁶

If Jesus wanted to get people to follow him and believe in him as God, why did he go to the Jewish nation? Why go as a Nazarene carpenter to a country so small in size and population and so thoroughly adhering to the undivided unity of God? Why didn't he go to Egypt or, even more, to Greece, where they believed in various gods and various manifestations of them?

Someone who lived as Jesus lived, taught as Jesus taught, and died as Jesus died could not have been a liar. What other alternatives are there?

Was He A Lunatic?

If it is inconceivable for Jesus to be a liar, then couldn't he actually have thought himself to be God, but been mistaken? After all, it's possible to be both sincere and wrong. But we must remember that for someone to think himself God, especially in a fiercely monotheistic culture, and then to tell others that their eternal destiny depended on believing in him, is no slight flight of fantasy but the thoughts of a lunatic in the fullest sense. Was Jesus Christ such a person?

历史学家沙夫 (Philip Schaff) 说: "这见证者若非属实, 则必定是亵渎或癫狂。以耶稣的道德纯全和尊严, 亵渎的假设根本不能成立; 他所说的每一句话, 作的每一件事, 都清楚表明这一点, 亦是普世所认可的。以他在各方面所表现的都显出他是智力高明的, 若说他在这样重大的事上自欺亦难以令人置信。他的头脑从来都是那么清醒, 他镇静面对一切患难与逼迫, 有如凌驾于天上的太阳一样; 他以最智慧的方法答覆试探他的问题, 他平静地预言自己在十字架的死, 第三日的复活, 圣灵的浇灌, 教会的确立, 耶路撒冷的被毁, 这一切都照所说的应验了。这样的人会是极端份子或狂人吗? 这样自成一格, 这样完整, 一致, 完美, 具有属人而超乎人的品格的人, 不可能是骗子或是假装的。正如人说, 诗人要比诗中的英雄更伟大才行。即是说, 扮演耶稣的必须高于耶稣。"⁵

沙夫又提出另一个强而有力的理由反对耶稣是骗子的说法: "按照理则、常识及经验, 一个骗徒, 一个奸诈、自私的坏人, 怎能以完美真确的姿态首尾一致地扮演那在历史上最纯全和高贵的角色呢? 他怎能构想得到并完成一个含有无可比拟的恩惠和崇高的道德计划, 更在面对时代及同胞的强烈偏见下, 为那计划献上自己的生命呢?"⁶

假若耶稣要人跟他并信他是神, 为什么他要到犹太国, 为什么以一个拿撒勒木匠的身份到一个地方及人口数字都小, 且完全信奉一神的国家? 为什么他不去埃及, 甚至希腊? 至少那里的人都是多神主义的信奉者, 又信神会以不同形态显现啊!

一个好像耶稣那样生活, 像他那样教训人, 像他那样死的人不可能是骗子。那还有什么其他的可能呢?

他是疯子? Was He a lunatic?

假若先前的可能是那么难以置信, 有没有可能他真的以为自己是神, 而其实是弄错了? 你可以是真诚的, 但你也可能同时是错的。但我们必须记住, 要一个以为自己是神, 特别是在一个浓厚的一神文化中, 去告诉人他们永恒的盼望是在乎信靠他, 实在不是轻易就可以幻想得来的; 这需要一个完全是疯子的心态。耶稣是这样的人吗?