* 033 罗马书 7章18至25
* 罗 7:18-25[[1]](#footnote-1)
* V18 [[2]](#footnote-2)我知道在我里面，就是在我肉体 σάρξ 之中，没有良善，... [[3]](#footnote-3)
* 从圣洁的保罗口而出，是惊人的。越是属灵、圣洁的人、反而会明白自己肉体之中没有良善[[4]](#footnote-4)
* 问：为什么信主后的保罗，说他肉体之中没有良善[[5]](#footnote-5)？Ans 不是指人的身体!ethical realm
* 不是在讲身体是邪恶的。若是解释为人的身体是罪恶的源头，会导致什么？[[6]](#footnote-6)
* 肉体来表达 全人（理智、情感、意志）都堕落了!
* V18... 因为立志行善由得我，行出来却由不得我
* 心里立志行很多的善。但最后没有行出来
* 谨慎：不可解释信主后的意志都是百分之百好，因为我们违背神时，都是我们意志最后的决定
* V19 所以我愿意行的善，我没有去行；我不愿意作的恶，我倒去作了。
* 注：保罗不是在说每一次都是这样，而是有时经历到如此
* V20 我若作自己不愿意作的事，那就不是我作的，...
* 保罗绝不是在推卸责任，而是他要强调罪住在他里面（是他自己做的）“我并不做”，“我倒去做”
* V20而是住在我里面的罪作的。[[7]](#footnote-7)
* （6:6）不再作罪的奴仆 （6:14）不再罪的权势之下（6:18）罪里得了释放
* （7:17、7:20）但罪继续住在我们里面 “住在我里头的罪”
* e.g.信徒处在已然、未然的状态 already and not yet
* e.g.从罪的权势释放了，但依然有残余的罪住在我们里面。
* e.g.叛军已经被浇灭，势力被瓦解了。但有一些残留的叛军躲在森林里随时突击。
* e.g.保罗却说：他该做的他却不作。他不该作的却又去作。（e.g.贪婪 7:8）
* V21 因此，我发现了一个律，就是我想向善的时候，恶就在我里面出现【便有恶与我同在】。
* νόμος 律 V21:有不同解法（1）律法Calvin（2）罪的律 Cranfield, Murray, Morris（3）定律*controlling principle*[[8]](#footnote-8)Hendriksen
* 以上3种在语法上、神学上都是可以接受。三种都可接受。
* 个人：发现一个律 νόμος 定律(controlling principle) [[9]](#footnote-9)
* e.g.在太平洋中的小鸟（需要不断努力的飞，吸引力不断把小鸟拉下来）
* 定律> 愿意顺服神向善时、恶就在里面出现
* e.g. (这罪的律这一生一世跟着你，在你里面）直到我们死，或主再来。
* V22 按着我里面的人来说，我是喜欢上帝的律 νόμος ,
* 信主后,喜欢上帝的律 νόμος (V22 这里指的是律法)[[10]](#footnote-10)
* 不信主的人 8:7 与神为仇，也不服神的律法
* 重生之人内心喜欢上帝的律
* 耶31:33“但那些日子以后，我要与以色列家所立的约是这样（这是耶和华的宣告）：我要把我的律法放在他们里面，写在他们的心里。我要作他们的上帝，他们要作我的子民。（新约的应许 参 来8:8-12 注意 来8:10）
* V23 但我发觉肢体中另有一个律，和我心中的律争战，把我掳去附从肢体中[[11]](#footnote-11)的罪律【犯罪的律】[[12]](#footnote-12)。but I see in my members another law waging war against the law of my mind and making me captive to the law of sin that dwells in my members.
* 另有一个律 = 罪的律 [[13]](#footnote-13) 如同一种力量、一种支配性的影响或控制的原则like a power, a force that directs or controlling principle
* 有两个律争战 （心中的律 与 罪的律争战）
* 问：心中的律指的是什么？
* Ans 心中的律 = 心中神的律 （V22 他心里面喜欢上帝的律法，耶31:33）
* E.g. 人好像要被两匹马撕开
* 🗶 罪就伏在门口了；它要缠住你，你却要制伏它。创4:7（神劝该隐，后来该隐却把弟弟杀了）
* V24 我这个人真是苦啊[[14]](#footnote-14)！... Wretched man that I am! [[15]](#footnote-15)
* 属灵生命的成长：会看见自己多么糟糕而伤心难过、痛苦
* V24...谁能救我脱离这使我死亡的身体[[16]](#footnote-16)σῶμα soma呢？
* 为我们的现在的身体σῶμα必因罪死亡
* V25 感谢上帝，借着我们的主耶稣基督就能脱离了[[17]](#footnote-17)。...
* 保罗盼望回到主那里（腓1:23），他最盼望的是将来身体复活 (林前15:54; 林后5:4).
* V25..可见,一方面我自己心里服事【顺服】上帝的律，另一方面我的肉体σάρξ sarx却服事【顺服】罪的律。I myself serve the law of God with my mind, but with my flesh I serve the law of sin
* 保罗感谢神后，总结了自己的经历[[18]](#footnote-18)
* 心里服事上帝的律 vs 肉体σάρξ服事罪的律
* 这里V25肉体 σάρξ，最好不要解释成人的身体。这里应该也包括全人（理智、情感、意志）
* 因为理性、情感与意志依然有残余的罪的影响。
* 保罗使用V25肉体σάρξ，可能只是用来表达那在在我们里面所要面对的征战
* 表达：他的心的最深处 deepest longing 是爱神的律法、愿意顺服上帝的律
* 加 6:1 弟兄们，如果有人陷在一些过犯里，你们属灵的人，要用温柔的心使他回转过来，自己却要小心，免得也被引诱。2 你们各人的重担要互相担当，这样就成全了基督的律法。
1. Freud went so far as to talk about an inner “libido” (filled with primal desires) and a “superego” (the conscience filled with social and familial standards). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Some interpreted saying Rom 7 did not promises victorious note as in Rom8, therefore Rom 7 is referring to an intermediate group of Christians who did not rely on the Spirit. e.g. John Stott，Mounce, R. H. e.g. Stott, J. R. W. says “The resulting defeat is not the law’s fault, for the law is good, although weak. The culprit is sin living in me (17, 20), the power of indwelling sin which the law is powerless to control. Not until Romans 8:9ff. will the apostle bear witness to the indwelling Spirit as alone able to subdue indwelling sin”

e.g. Mounce, R. H. states “Recognition of our inability to live up to our deepest spiritual longings (chap. 7) leads us to cast ourselves upon God’s Spirit for power and victory (chap. 8). Failure to continue in reliance upon the power of the Spirit places us once again in a position inviting defeat.95 Sanctification is a gradual process that repeatedly takes the believer through this recurring sequence of failure through dependency upon self to triumph through the indwelling Spirit.” [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. V18-20 重复了V14-17 的概念。 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. As a man nailed to the cross; he first struggles, and strives, and cries out with great strength and might, but, as his blood and spirits waste, his strivings are faint and seldom, his cries low and hoarse, scarce to be heard;—when a man first sets on a lust or distemper, to deal with it, it struggles with great violence to break loose; it cries with earnestness and impatience to be satisfied and relieved; but when by mortification the blood and spirits of it are let out, it moves seldom and faintly, cries sparingly, and is scarce heard in the heart; it may have sometimes a dying pang, that makes an appearance of great vigour and strength, but it is quickly over, especially if it be kept from considerable success. This the apostle describes, as in the whole chapter, so especially, Rom. 6:6.“Sin,” saith he, “is crucified; it is fastened to the cross.” To what end? “That the body of death may be destroyed,” the power of sin weakened and abolished by little and little, that “henceforth we should not serve sin;” that is, that sin might not incline, impel us with such efficacy as to make us servants to it, as it hath done heretofore. And this is spoken not only with respect to carnal and sensual affections, or desires of worldly things,—not only in respect of the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life,—but also as to the flesh, that is, in the mind and will, in that opposition unto God which is in us by nature. Of what nature soever the troubling distemper be, by what ways soever it make itself out, either by impelling to evil or hindering from that which is good, the rule is the same; and unless this be done effectually, all after-contention will not compass the end aimed at. A man may beat down the bitter fruit from an evil tree until he is weary; whilst the root abides in strength and vigour, the beating down of the present fruit will not hinder it from bringing forth more. This is the folly of some men; they set themselves with all earnestness and diligence against the appearing eruption of lust, but, leaving the principle, and root untouched, perhaps unsearched out, they make but little or no progress in this work of mortification. Owen, J. MORTIFICATION OF SIN IN BELIEVERS [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The principle Paul recognizes is that he is a man with two natures. One delights in the Law of God. The other wages war against God’s Law. The Christian is subject to two forces simultaneously and thus lives in a state of tension. For the sinful nature desires what is contrary to the Spirit, and the Spirit what is contrary to the sinful nature. They are in conflict with each other, so that you do not do what you want. (Galatians 5:17). Hughes, R. K. In response to this explanation, we must certainly agree that Christians are caught in the tension between the ‘already’ of the kingdom’s inauguration and the ‘not yet’ of its consummation, and that this tension can be painful. Stott, J. R. W. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. 导致逃避现实的禁欲主义或放纵主义：禁欲主义：一些人可能会严厉约束身体的需要，试图通过苦修来“净化”自己。并且忽略了使徒之前教导信徒要使用身体来荣耀神做义的器具。 放纵主义：另一些人可能会认为，既然身体是邪恶的，灵魂是独立的，那么对身体的行为无关紧要，结果反而导致放纵欲望。 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. （重复V17）“不是我作的”保罗不是在推卸责任 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Most take it in the sense “principle” (NEB) or “rule” (JB), but others think the law of Moses is meant, as Moffatt, “So this is my experience of the Law …” (cf. RV mg. “I find then in regard of the law …”). Either is possible, but it seems more likely that Paul has in mind the law which he later calls “the law of sin” (v. 23).Morris, L. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Paul sums up with a “law” which has caused some difference of opinion. Most take it in the sense “principle” (NEB) or “rule” (JB), but others think the law of Moses is meant, as Moffatt. Morris, L.. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. He is contrasting the real Paul, the Paul who is known only in the deep recesses of the man, and who delights in the law of God, with that other Paul who so readily does the sin of which the real Paul does not approve. It is true that the regenerate Paul would abhor that evil, and it is also true that the respectable and intellectual Paul would abominate it. But would the unregenerate delight in the law of God? I doubt it. Morris, L..

On the former view, namely, that “the law” refers to the law of God, the thought would be as follows: “For me willing conformity to the law in order to do the good I find that the evil is present with me”. Hence what he finds is that evil is present notwithstanding his determinate will to the good which the law of God requires. This fits in well with verse 22 in which he defines this determinate will to the good as delight in the law of God after the inward man. And it is also in accord with verse 23 where the opposing law of sin in his members is called “another law” in contrast with the law of God which, up to this point it is maintained, is the only law referred to in the passage. There is, however, no conclusive objection to the other interpretation, namely, that “the law of sin” (vss. 23, 25) is in view here. Murray, J.

21. εὑρίσκω ἄρα τὸν νόμον τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ ποιεῖν τὸ καλόν, ὅτι ἐμοί τὸ κακὸν παράκειται. One of the features which make the last five verses of chapter 7 specially difficult is the repeated use of the word νόμος (in vv. 21–23 and 25b), and it is τὸν νόμον which is the main problem of this verse. Many interpreters, both ancient and modern, have insisted that the reference must be to the OT law, but the various explanations of the verse which have been offered on this assumption are so forced as to be incredible.1 Moreover, since in v. 23 a law different from the law of God is explicitly spoken of, the possibility of explaining τὸν νόμον in v. 21 otherwise than as referring to the OT law is clearly open to us. And the presence of τοῦ θεοῦ after τῷ νόμῳ in v. 22 suggests the probability that νόμος has just been used with a different reference. Some have understood νόμος here in v. 21 in the sense ‘norm’ or ‘principle’. Thus NEB has ‘this principle’, and JB ‘the rule’ (which is explained in a note saying, ‘Lit. “law”, in the sense of regular experience’). But more probable is the view that by τὸν νόμον is meant that law which will be referred to more clearly in v. 23—the ἕτερος νόμος Cranfield, C. E. B.

“Law,” as here used, must mean something like operating rule or governing principle. Hendriksen, W., & Kistemaker, S. J [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. There is, however, no warrant for supposing that the contrast between the “mind” and the “flesh” in verse 25 is that between “mind” and “body”. “Flesh” in Paul’s usage, when used with ethical purport (as obviously here), applies to the operations of what we call the mind as well as to those of the body. “Flesh”, ethically conceived, does not have its seat in the body and does not take its origin from the body as contrasted with the mind or spirit of man. We may not, therefore, try to find the meaning of “the inward man” of verse 22 in any metaphysical distinction between body and spirit, mind and matter. “The inward man” in this case must be interpreted in terms of this context, a context ethically complexioned from beginning to end. Murray, J.

The “members” in which the law of sin is said to reside will have to be taken in the sense of the same term in 6:13, 19. If the thought is focused on our physical members, as appeared necessary in the earlier instances, we are not to suppose that “the law of sin” springs from or has its seat in the physical. It would merely indicate, as has been maintained already, that the apostle brings to the forefront the concrete and overt ways in which the law of sin expresses itself and that our physical members cannot be divorced from the operation of the law of sin. Our captivity to the law of sin is evidenced by the fact that our physical members are the agents and instruments of the power which sin wields over us. But again we are reminded, as in 6:13, that, however significant may be our physical members, the captivity resulting is not that merely of our members but that of our persons—“bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members”.Murray, J. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. 保罗以前是自以为义，认为按律法是无可指摘（腓3:6）重生后的保罗才面对这种情景 [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Both are said to be in our members and it would scarcely be possible to distinguish them. “The law of sin” should be taken, therefore, as defining for us that in which this other law consists. The law of sin is the law that proceeds from sin and which sin propounds. It is contrasted with the law of God and must be antithetical to it in every particular. Hence the apostle says, “warring against the law of my mind”. The law of the mind is not strictly parallel to the other law, “the law of sin”; the law of the mind is not the law that proceeds from and is propounded by the mind. It is rather the law of God as the law that regulates the mind and which the mind serves (cf. vs. 25)..Murray, J.

This law should be seen as the same as the law of sin, for it is highly unlikely that Paul thinks of two different hostile laws at work within his being. Law will be used in the sense “principle” or “rule of action”, though with the nuance that there is some element of compulsion (he is made prisoner). Morris, L. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. we must observe, that this conflict, of which the Apostle speaks, does not exist in man before he is renewed by the Spirit of God: for man, left to his own nature, is wholly borne along by his lusts without any resistance; for though the ungodly are tormented by the stings of conscience, and cannot take such delight in their vices, but that they have some taste of bitterness; yet you cannot hence conclude, either that evil is hated, or that good is loved by them; only the Lord permits them to be thus tormented, in order to show to them in a measure his judgment but not to imbue them either with the love of righteousness or with the hatred of sin. John Calvin [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. The “heart-rending cry” cannot therefore be construed as one of despair; it must never be dissociated from the sequel of confident hope. Murray, J. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. But in the context it is better to see the word as referring to the physical body, which is characterized by death (cf. 6:12; 8:11). It is itself mortal, and it is that in which sin operates and so brings death to us. Morris, L. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. That it parallels 1 Cor. 15:57, where the hope of the resurrection is beyond question, is not by any means an unreasonable supposition. Murray, J. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. 注: 不能解释成：保罗的（善的）“心里”mind 是与（邪恶）身体敌对的。• 其实两律的争战都是在我们的心里 mind 发生的。其实全人：理智、情感、意志，都是被残余的罪影响。保罗可能只是使用肉体一词来表达那与心中爱神的律的相反状态。 [↑](#footnote-ref-18)