**048 罗马书9章19至23**

* **V19 这样，你会对我说：“那么他为什么责怪人呢？有谁抗拒他的旨意呢？”[[1]](#footnote-1)**
* 谁能抗拒上帝的旨意？谁能改变祂的计划？如果一切都在祂的主权之下，祂为什么还要责怪人呢？通常，人们如何回答这个问题？例如，有人会说：“上帝并没有把我们造成机器人 [[2]](#footnote-2)，而是赐予我们自由意志，因此人的选择与上帝无关。” 另一些人则会重新诠释，说：“上帝的预定是基于祂预先看见将要发生的事。” 但如果上帝能预知一切，就表明万事已被确定。那么，如果不是上帝在主宰，那是谁在决定万事？是命运吗？
* 预定先于预知e.g.建筑师为什么能预知建筑物是什么样子？
* 使徒没有用人的方式来回应这个难题，而是以上帝作为创造者的地位和全地之主的主权来回答。
* **V20 你这个人哪，你是谁[[3]](#footnote-3)，竟敢跟上帝顶嘴【强嘴】呢？...**
* 保罗暗示了形而上学的层面（a different metaphysical level）人根本无法与上帝强嘴（顶嘴），人没有资格质问上帝！因我们是被造的we are only creatures（赛45:9-10、29:16）
* e.g. 作家金庸在创作武侠小说《射雕英雄传》时，拥有绝对的创作主权。郭靖（男主角）和杨康（反派之一）都遭遇苦难，但由于性格不同，他们最终做出了截然不同的人生抉择，并且遇到了不同的机遇，最终结局各不相同。" 金庸 与 郭靖和杨康有着不同的形而上学层面a different metaphysical level。
* 上帝在创造世界时，曾经询问过你的意见和想法吗？祂不需要向我们交代祂为什么创造、如何创造。祂是至高的主宰，掌管万有，不受人的审问。上帝不欠我们任何，因为一切的恩典都是祂白白赐下的。
* **V20...被造的怎么可以对造他的说:“你为什么把我做成这个样子呢？”21 陶匠[[4]](#footnote-4)难道没有权用同一团的泥，又做贵重的、又做卑贱的器皿吗？[[5]](#footnote-5)**
* 因此，人无法与上帝强嘴争辩。保罗使用陶匠的比喻：陶匠难道没有权柄，从同一团泥里做出贵重的器皿，也做出卑贱的器皿吗？

**V22 如果上帝有意要显明他的忿怒，彰显他的大能，而多多容忍那可怒、预备遭毁灭的器皿[[6]](#footnote-6)，23为了要使他丰盛的荣耀，彰显在那蒙恩、早已**[[7]](#footnote-7)**预备要得荣耀的器皿上，这又有什么不可呢？[[8]](#footnote-8)**

* 上帝的计划中: 一些是遭毁灭reprobate vs 一些**早已**预备蒙恩得荣耀 elect
* 保罗问：**V23** ...**这又有什么不可呢？**
* **V23 为了要使他丰盛的荣耀，彰显在那蒙恩、早已**[[9]](#footnote-9)**预备要得荣耀的器皿上 ... which he has prepared beforehand for glory**
* 蒙恩的最终要得荣耀 (罗8:18、8:30)，早已预备的！

**罗 8:29** 因为他预先所知道的人，就预先定下效法他儿子的模样，使他儿子在许多弟兄中作长子。30 预先所定下的人又召他们来；所召来的人又称他们为义；所称为义的人**又叫他们得荣耀**。And those whom he predestined he also called, and those whom he called he also justified, and those whom he justified he also glorified.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 摩西（V15） | 法老（V17） |
| （V18）怜悯 | （V18）刚硬 |
| （V21）同一团泥里拿一块作成贵重的器皿  | （V21）同一团泥拿一块作成卑贱的器皿 |
| （V23）**早已**预备得荣耀的器皿上 | （V22）预备遭毁灭的器皿 |

* 不能解释成上帝控制法老去犯罪。因上帝不试探任何人（雅1:13）[[10]](#footnote-10)
* **相容论（Compatibilism）神的主权与人的责任并存**
* 虽是神的预定(第一因)，但却是法老自己心肝乐意自愿（第二因）去忤逆上帝 voluntarily and willingly
* **提醒：**被造者是没有资格质问上帝 (罗9:20)
1. He argues that they are illegitimate questions, questions that the creature has no right to ask of the Creator. Morris, L. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Free will defense is not used by Paul in defense. Frame did accurate points out that even our minds and emotions are under providence of God as portrayed in scripture [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. So here, when dealing with the determinate will of God, we have an ultimate on which we may not interrogate him nor speak back when he has uttered his verdict. Who are we to dispute his government? Murray, J. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The Old Testament makes use of the potter-clay motif several times (e.g., Isa. 29:15–16; 45:8–10; 64:8–9; Jer. 18:1–6; it is seen also in Wis. 15:7–8, a passage with many resemblances to the present one). Sometimes the thought is that the potter has complete authority to do what he wants with his clay, often that a marred vessel can be remade with the same clay into a satisfactory utensil, and sometimes, as here, that the clay has no right to answer back to the potter. Morris, L. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Cranfield well brings out the thrust of Paul’s argument with his comment: “It is because, whether one is Moses or Pharaoh, member of the believing Church or member of still unbelieving Israel, one is this man, the object of God’s mercy, that one has no right to answer God back.” Paul is not saying that there is no answer to the question; he is saying that the question is illegitimate. Man is not in a position to ask it.Morris, L.(**personal**: Paul seems to have already given the reason why some are hardened in verse 21-22 to show his wrath and make known his power to the reprobates and to show his mercy onto the elect.

But the trouble is that man is not a pot; he will ask, ‘Why did you make me like this?’ and he will not be bludgeoned into silence.” Such positions imply that the creature is in a position to call God to account and to judge him by human standards and by the limited insight humans can bring to a complex problem. They overlook the fact that the sinner is out of his league when he takes on God (to use very human language). Again, they ignore the fact that the Creator constantly does things which the creature does not and cannot understand. And they overlook the main point that Paul is making, that God, like the potter, is alone responsible for the final purpose. Morris, L.

In Calvin’s words: “Why, then, did he not make use of this short answer, but assign the highest place to the will of God, so that it alone should be sufficient for us, rather than any other cause? If the objection that God reprobates or elects according to His will those whom He does not honour with His favour, or towards whom He shows unmerited love—if this objection had been false, Paul would not have omitted to refute it. Murray, J. (1968).

It must be borne in mind, however, that Paul is not now dealing with God’s sovereign rights over men as men but over men as sinners. He is answering the objection occasioned by the sovereign discrimination stated in verse 18 in reference to mercy and hardening. These, it must be repeated, presuppose sin and ill-desert. It would be exegetically indefensible to abstract verse 21 and its teaching from these presupposed conditions. Murray, J.. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Commentators are divided as to whether we should understand this to mean “although he willed” (Black, Denney, etc.) or “because he willed” (Robinson, Cranfield, etc.). The former way of taking it will signify that, although he willed to show wrath, God endured the vessels of wrath with much longsuffering. The latter will mean that, because he willed to show both wrath and mercy, God endured the vessels.… Either way of understanding the words is quite possible, but perhaps there is more to be said for the second, for in this passage Paul seems to be saying that God is working out a single purpose of mercy and this is to be discerned in his wrath as well as his longsuffering.100 God willed to reveal his mercy, but also his wrath; he lets sinners be in no doubt as to the consequences of sin. Morris, L.

These “vessels of wrath”, Paul says, are prepared106 for destruction, but he does not say how they became so fitted and widely differing views are held. Thus some think the people fitted themselves for this fate (Wesley; Griffith Thomas; some think that the participle is middle and that it has this force); some think God fitted them for it (Murray; so Hodge, though he rejects a supralapsarian view); some see Satan as responsible (Lenski; Hendriksen, “themselves—in cooperation with Satan!”). The difference in construction from the next verse (the passive over against the active, the participle against the indicative, the absence here of anything equivalent to the prefix for “before”) makes it probable that we should not think of God as doing this. Rather the people did it themselves, perhaps, as Hendriksen thinks, with some help from Satan. Paul does not describe destruction, but clearly it stands for the ultimate loss. Morris, L.

Vessels of wrath” and “vessels of mercy” are best regarded in terms of verse 21 Murray, J.

Hence what God did in the case of Pharaoh illustrates what is more broadly applied to vessels of wrath in verse 21. Pharaoh was raised up and hardened, in the sense explained above, for the purpose of demonstrating God’s power and publishing his name in all the earth. If we interject the term “forbearance”, we must say it was exercised in this case in order that God’s great power might be displayed. From this consideration, namely, that of the parallel, there appears to be a compelling reason to subordinate the longsuffering of verse 22 to the purpose of showing his wrath and making his power known. If we bear in mind the determinate purpose of God upon which the accent falls and that those embraced in this purpose are vessels of wrath and therefore viewed as deserving of wrath to the uttermost, the “much longsuffering” exercised towards them is not deprived of its real character as such. It is only because God is forbearing that he delays the infliction of the full measure of ill-desert. Furthermore, the apostle has in view the unbelief of Israel and the longsuffering with which God endures their unbelief. Murray, J. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. It is true that Paul does not say that God prepared them for destruction as he does in the corresponding words respecting the vessels of mercy that “he afore prepared” them unto glory. It may be that he purposely refrained from making God the subject.Murray, J [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. **目的：**上帝彰显祂的公义的忿怒、大能; 上帝彰显祂的荣耀，一部分蒙恩，最终要得荣耀 [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. It is true that Paul does not say that God prepared them for destruction as he does in the corresponding words respecting the vessels of mercy that “he afore prepared” them unto glory. It may be that he purposely refrained from making God the subject. Murray,J [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Strength of Infralapsarian arguments [↑](#footnote-ref-10)