**046罗马书9章6至16**

* **V6 当然，这不是说上帝的话落了空，因为出自以色列的，不都是以色列人**
* 接下来保罗提出圣经的依据来证明，不是所有以色列人是以色列人[[1]](#footnote-1)
* **V7 也不因为他们是亚伯拉罕的后裔，就都成为他的儿女，只有“以撒生的，才可以称为你的后裔”，8 这就是说，肉身生的儿女并不是上帝的儿女，只有凭着应许生的儿女才算是后裔。9 因为所应许的话是这样：“明年这个时候我要来，撒拉必定生一个儿子[[2]](#footnote-2)。”**
* 证明(1) 亚伯拉罕的孩子：长子以实玛利[[3]](#footnote-3)与以撒
* 虽然以实玛利长子与以撒，是同属亚伯拉罕所生，但只有“以撒[[4]](#footnote-4)生的，才可以称为亚伯拉罕的后裔” the fact that only the promised ones are descendants of Abraham

**创12:12 神对亚伯拉罕说：「你不必为这童子和你的使女忧愁。凡撒拉对你说的话，你都该听从；因为从以撒生的，才要称为你的後裔** זֶרַע **zera。13 至於使女的儿子，我也必使他的後裔成立一国，因为他是你所生** זֶרַע **的 （新译本：因为他也是你的后裔）。」**

Gen 21:12 But God said to Abraham, “Be not displeased because of the boy and because of your slave woman. Whatever Sarah says to you, do as she tells you, for through Isaac shall **your offspring** be named.13 And I will make a nation of the sonof the slave woman also, because he is **your offspring**.”

**注意创12:12-13** 肯定以实玛利是亚伯拉罕的后裔，但又称从以撒生的，才要称为你的後裔

* 以实玛利（肉身的后裔） vs以撒（蒙神应许的后裔）
* 从以撒生的，预表着凡是向以撒一样是蒙应许promise的
* 就如同我们信基督的外邦人，是蒙神应许亚伯拉罕的后裔，唯有神应许的后裔才算是真后裔
* 像长子以实玛利（按肉身所生的并不是那真后裔），同样的拥有犹太人血统的也并非那真后裔。
* 蒙神应许的后裔，必效法亚伯拉罕的脚踪相信（罗4:12）。
* 後嗣是本乎信，因此就属乎恩 （罗4:16），是那效法亚伯拉罕之信的人
* **加 3:7 所以你们要知道，有信心的人，就是亚伯拉罕的子孙。**
* **V10 不但如此，利百加也是这样：既然从一个人，就是从我们的祖宗以撒怀了孕，11 双生子还没有生下来，善恶也没有行出来（为要坚定上帝拣选人的旨意，12 不是由于行为，而是由于那呼召者），上帝就对她说：“将来大的要服事小的[[5]](#footnote-5)。”13 正如经上所记的：“我爱雅各，却恶以扫。”**
* **犹太人会反对**：同父但，不同母（撒拉、夏甲）[[6]](#footnote-6) 撒拉是主人，夏甲只是奴隶
* **所以保罗使用第二个圣经依据来证明**：（以撒与利百加）同父同母。
* 以撒与利百加生双胞胎 ：以扫（长子）与雅各
* 他们还未出生上帝已经指明祂拣选雅各
* **创25:21...**他的妻子利百加就怀了孕。22 双胎在她腹中彼此碰撞，她就说：“若是这样，我为什么活着呢[[7]](#footnote-7)？”她就去求问耶和华。23 耶和华回答她：“两国[[8]](#footnote-8)在你肚里，两族从你腹中要分出来；将来这族必强过那族，**大的要服事小的**。”
* 以扫是肉身的后裔vs 雅阁是蒙拣选的后裔
* **V11 双生子还没有生下来，善恶也没有行出来...**
* 他们还没出生行善恶，上帝已经拣选了雅各
* 上帝没告诉拣选我们的原因 （弗1:5、9）上帝只是告诉我们，被拣选不是因为我们有任何行为

罗8:28 我们晓得万事都互相效力，叫爱神的人得益处，**就是按他旨意被召的人**。

弗 1:5 又因爱我们，**就按著自己意旨所喜悦的**，预定我们藉著耶稣基督得儿子的名分，

提后 1:9 神救了我们，以圣召召我们，不是按我们的行为，乃是**按他的旨意和恩典**；这恩典是万古之先，在基督耶稣里赐给我们的，

* **亚米念神学：**上帝的拣选是因为祂预先看见我们的信心的行为
* **V12 不是由于行为，而是由于那呼召者...**
* unconditional election 无条件的拣选
* **V13 正如经上所记的：“我爱雅各，wù恶**μισεω**[[9]](#footnote-9)以扫。”**
* 保罗引用 玛1:2-5
* **第三个圣经依据**（讲述以东 与 以色列）
* **玛1:2 耶和华说：“我爱你们。”你们却说：“你怎样爱了我们呢？”耶和华说：“以扫不是雅各的哥哥吗？我却爱雅各，3 恶以扫。我使以扫的山地荒凉，把他的产业给了旷野的豺狼。**

**群体性的拣选与个人的拣选**

【罗 9:13 正如经上所记：雅各是我所爱的；以扫是我所恶的。】

【玛 1:2 耶和华说：「我曾爱你们。」你们却说：「你在何事上爱我们呢？」耶和华说：「以扫不是雅各的哥哥吗？我却爱雅各，3 恶以扫，使他的山岭荒凉，把他的地业交给旷野的野狗。」】

保罗在罗9:13中引用了经文（玛1:2-3）；该经文的背景是讲述神爱以色列国，而不爱以东国。玛1:2-3强调神爱以色列而非以东；因此许多学者认为，拣选的原本语境只限制在群体性corporate，侧重于一个民族，而并非在讨论拣选个人的救恩。当保罗在《罗马书》中论述预定论时，他主要是在讨论犹太人与外邦人之间的拣选对比（罗9:30-33），而非对个人拣选作出明确陈述。许多学者因此推论，保罗在讲述预定论时，并未涉及个人预定拣选的层面。

然而，在这些学者的论述中，他们严重忽略了保罗引用《创世记》中的例子均指向拣选个人这一事实。保罗引用了《创世记》中的例子，如以撒与以实玛利之间的拣选、雅各与以扫之间的拣选，显示出祂的拣选实际上在个人层面上的运作。例如，以实玛利（肉身的后裔）并非祂所应许给亚伯拉罕的后裔；唯有以撒是应许的后裔，且在以撒的两个双生子中，祂只拣选了雅各。同样，在罗9:17-18中，保罗特意举出摩西蒙怜悯与法老被刚硬作为个人的例子。保罗指出法老并非蒙祂所怜悯（神的主权）（出4:21、7:3-5、罗9:17），法老也因其个人的悖逆（人的责任）自己刚硬自己的心（出7:13、7:22、8:15、8:19、8:32、9:7），而最终受上帝审判刚硬了他的心（出9:12、10:20、10:27、11:10、14:8，罗9:18）。

罗马书9章虽然是论述了为何仅凭血肉生的以色列人并非以色列人（罗9:6），解释肉生的犹太人为何会拒绝旧约圣经所应许预言要来的基督，而蒙拣选的外邦人却为何能因信基督得着神的义（罗9:30-31、罗1:17）。但我们无法因此而推论说，神的拣选并不包括个人的拣选。从保罗引用旧约中关于个人拣选的例子中，我们可以看出罗马书第9章的教导并不排除神对个人救恩的拣选。

图：两个坏苹果，其中一个蒙拣选。【罗 9:15 因他对摩西说：我要怜悯谁就怜悯谁，要恩待谁就恩待谁。16 据此看来，这不在乎那定意的，也不在乎那奔跑的，只在乎发怜悯的神。】



* 以东（扫罗后裔）与以色列（雅各后裔）同样败坏悖逆。[[10]](#footnote-10) 以东后来亡国，以色列国却存留。上帝说：以色列存留，不是因为以色列比以东更好，而是因神怜悯恩待他们[[11]](#footnote-11)
* **问：**一些人可能问，上帝恩待以色列公平（公义）吗？
* **V14 既是这样，我们可以说什么呢？上帝不公平吗？绝对不会【断乎没有】！**
* 如果按公义，所有人（无论以东或以色列）都要因罪恶灭亡。但上帝出于祂的主权，怜悯恩待祂要怜悯的
* 保罗提出**第四个圣经**依据：
* **V15因为他对摩西说:“我要怜悯谁，就怜悯谁；我要恩待谁，就恩待谁。”**
* **出 33:18 摩西说：「求你显出你的荣耀给我看。」19 耶和华说：「我要显我一切的恩慈，在你面前经过，宣告我的名。我要恩待谁就恩待谁；要怜悯谁就怜悯谁」；**
* 当摩西恳求主显祂的荣耀，主答应让他看见祂的背影。[[12]](#footnote-12)
* 主告诉摩西，摩西能看见神的背影的有这恩典并不是靠他的行为而是因主恩待并怜悯他
* **16 这样看来，既不是出于人意，也不是由于人为【这不在乎那定意的，也不在乎那奔跑的】，只在于那怜悯人的上帝。[[13]](#footnote-13)**
* 不在乎我们的意念、不在乎我们所行的。
* **亚米念神学的缺点之一：**就是他们认为上帝拣选他们是因为上帝预先看见他们有信心的行为
* 问题是如果是因我们信心的行为。那么我们就有可夸了
* 保罗一再强调“既不是出于人意，也不是由于人为”
* **弗2:8 你们得救是本乎恩，也因著信；这并不是出於自己，乃是神所赐的；9 也不是出於行为，免得有人自夸。**
1. God’s word has not failed because those to whom that word was directed were not simply physical Israel. “Not all those who are of Israel, these are Israel.” His compatriots were in error in holding that the promise of God applied to the whole of physical Israel. Paul is denying that it was ever intended to apply in this fashion. If descent from Abraham was what mattered, then the Ishmaelites and Edom were in the same position as Israel. But “Israel” was not ethnic Israel.Morris, L. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. 创18:10 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. This does not mean that Ishmael and Esau were necessarily excluded from the covenant; it was God’s command that they receive circumcision, the sign of the covenant (Gen. 17:9–13; cf. vv. 23, 26) Morris, L. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Isaac must here be taken of the person and not collectively. Thought is focused on the choice of Isaac in contrast with Ishmael: the proposition to be demonstrated is that natural descent does not make children in the sense of true children, children to whom the promise belongs. Murray, J. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. It is election to privilege that is in mind, not eternal salvation. Moreover, it seems clear that Paul intends a reference to nations rather than individuals (though Murray strongly defends a reference to individuals as well as to nations). The words quoted say specifically that the elder will serve the younger, but Esau did not in fact serve Jacob, though the Edomites in time came to serve the Israelites. We must also bear in mind that the oracle Paul quotes has earlier said, “Two nations are in your womb, and two peoples from within you will be separated” (Gen. 25:23). The argument concerns Israel as a whole and its place in the purpose of God.Morris, L. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. 10–13 In these verses appeal is made to another instance of the same kind of differentiation in patriarchal history. The thesis being established, it must be remembered, is that not by natural descent did the descendants of Abraham become partakers of God’s covenant grace and promises. This was proven in Abraham’s own sons in the differentiation between Isaac and Ishmael. But it was not only in Abraham’s sons that this discrimination appeared; it enters also into Isaac’s own family. Murray, J. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. 创25:22 (ASV)And the children struggled together within her; and she said, If it be so, wherefore do I live? And she went to inquire of Jehovah.

(ESV)The children struggled together within her, and she said, “If it is thus, why is this happening to me?” So she went to inquire of the LORD.

(LEB)And the children in her womb jostled each other, and she said, "If it is going to be like this, why be pregnant?" And she went to inquire of Yahweh. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. The thesis that Paul is dealing merely with the election of Israel collectively and applying the clause in question only to this feature of redemptive history would not meet the precise situation. The question posed for the apostle is: how can the covenant promise of God be regarded as inviolate when the mass of those who belong to Israel, who are comprised in the elect nation in terms of the Old Testament passages cited above (Deut. 4:37 et al.), have remained in unbelief and come short of the covenant promises? His answer would fail if it were simply an appeal to the collective, inclusive, theocratic election of Israel. Such a reply would be no more than appeal to the fact that his kinsmen were Israelites and thus no more than a statement of the fact which, in view of their unbelief, created the problem. **Paul’s answer is not the collective election of Israel but rather “they are not all Israel, who are of Israel**”. And this means, in terms of the stage of discussion at which we have now arrived, “they are not all elect, who are of elect Israel”. As we found above, there is the distinction between Israel and the true Israel, between children and true children, between the seed and the true seed. In such a distinction resides Paul’s answer to Israel’s unbelief. So now the same kind of distinction must be carried through to the problem as it pertains to the collective, theocratic election of Israel. In terms of the debate we are now considering we should have to distinguish between the elect of Israel and elect Israel. The conclusion, therefore, is that when Paul says “the purpose of God according to election” **he is speaking of the electing purpose of God in a discriminating, differentiating sense that cannot apply to all who were embraced in the theocratic election**. This is to say the clause in question must have a restrictive sense equivalent to “Israel” as distinguished from “of Israel” in verse 6.

In 11:5, 7 the same term for election is again used: “a remnant according to the election of grace” (11:5); “the election obtained it, and the rest were hardened” (11:7). The apostle is dealing with the remnant of ethnic Israel who had obtained the righteousness of faith. Hence the “remnant” and “the election” are those conceived of as possessors and heirs of salvation. The election, therefore, is one that has saving associations and implications in the strictest sense and must be distinguished from the election that belonged to Israel as a whole. It is this concept of election that accords with the requirements of Paul’s argument in 9:11 and its context. Since it appears without question in 11:5, 7, we have this additional confirmation derived from Paul’s own usage in the general context to which 9:11 belongs. Murray, J. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. 路 14:26 「人到我这里来，若不爱我胜过爱（爱我胜过爱：原文作恨μισεω）自己的父母、妻子、儿女、弟兄、姐妹，和自己的性命，就不能作我的门徒。 （意思爱的更少）

It has been maintained that the word “hate” means “to love less, to regard and treat with less favour”.26 Appeal can be made to various passages where this meaning holds (cf. Gen. 29:32, 33; Deut. 21:15; Matt. 6:24; 10:37, 38; Luke 14:26; John 12:25).27 It would have to be admitted that this meaning would provide for the differentiation which must be posited. Without embarking on the question of God’s love for the reprobate, this view would imply that Esau was not the object of that love which God exercised toward Jacob, namely, the specific distinguishing love which alone would account for the differentiation. The text, it must be said, could not mean anything less than this. Esau could not be the object of the love borne to Jacob for, if so, all distinction would be obliterated, and what the text clearly indicates is the radical distinction......the mere absence of love or favour hardly explains the visitations of judgment mentioned: “Esau I hated, and made his mountains a desolation, and gave his heritage to the jackals of the wilderness” (vs. 3); “they shall build, but I will throw down; and men shall call them the border of wickedness, and the people against whom the Lord hath indignation for ever” (vs. 4). These judgments surely imply disfavour. The indignation is a positive judgment, not merely the absence of blessing. ... ... We must, therefore, recognize that there is in God a holy hate that cannot be defined in terms of not loving or loving less. Furthermore, we may not tone down the reality or intensity of this hate by speaking of it as “anthropopathic” or by saying that it “refers not so much to the emotion as to the effect”. Murray, J.

But it is perhaps more likely that like Calvin we should understand the expression in the sense “reject” over against “accept”. He explains the passage thus: “I chose Jacob and rejected Esau, induced to this course by my mercy alone, and not by any worthiness in his works.… I had rejected the Edomites.… Morris, L. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Why was there this differentiation between Israel and Edom? It was because there was differentiation between Jacob and Esau. It would be as indefensible to dissociate the fortunes of the respective peoples from the differentiation in the individuals as it would be to dissociate the differentiation of the individuals from the destinies of the nations proceeding from them. Murray, J. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. **the differentiation which belongs to Israel as a whole in virtue of the theocratic election does not meet the question the apostle encounters in this whole passage, namely, the unbelief of the mass of ethnic Israel. Murray, J.** [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. the force is increased when we take into account the particular occasion on which it was spoken. The favour shown to Moses is hereby certified to proceed from God’s sovereign mercy. Even Moses and with him God’s people can lay no claim to any favour; it is altogether a matter of God’s free choice and bestowment.Murray, J.. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Paul’s argument is that God’s faithfulness to his covenant is not to be judged by the extent to which those physically descended from Abraham are partakers of salvation. God’s faithfulness is vindicated by the fact that the covenant promise contemplates those who had been sovereignly chosen by God to be possessors and heirs of his covenant grace. Murray, J. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)