**080 罗马书14章1至12**

* **罗14:1 [[1]](#footnote-1) 你们要接纳信心软弱[[2]](#footnote-2)的人，不要论断引起争论的事【不要辩论所疑惑的事】。2 有人相信所有的食物都可以吃，信心软弱的人却只吃蔬菜。3 吃的人不要轻看不吃的人，不吃的人也不要批评【论断】吃的人，因为上帝已经接纳他了。**
* **上文:**（13:1-14）爱人如己与圣洁生活[[3]](#footnote-3)（14章），教会团体生活学习彼此接纳
* 不吃肉的论断吃肉的人、吃肉的轻看“瞧不起”不吃肉的人
* **可能背景[[4]](#footnote-4)：**一群敬畏爱主的人，因怕市场所卖的肉祭拜偶像[[5]](#footnote-5)，所以他们选择改吃蔬菜。 这背景[[6]](#footnote-6)是无人能百分百肯定，因保罗没有记载[[7]](#footnote-7)。只知他们是一群爱主的人，为了主只是吃蔬菜！为主改变自己的饮食习惯。
* 保罗称他们（只吃蔬菜）属于主的人，信心软弱（V2）的弟兄 V10
* 信心软弱无法明白：地和地上所充满的都是属于主的 （林前10:25-26[[8]](#footnote-8)）基督徒能吃肉类 （可7:18、路24:42-43、可14:12、徒10:13-15）
* **保罗并没有因他们认为只能吃肉而批评他们为异端**。保罗视他们为“弟兄”
* 有些事是不能妥协的，有些次要的要宽容、在一切事情上要以爱相待
* 当信徒认为**谨守日子**（加4:10-11）**或饮食上**（西2:16-23） 会影响人得救时，保罗会严厉责。**注：**罗马教会的信徒并没有认为不吃肉才能得救。 所以保罗没有严厉责备。
* **不能妥协的真理：**e.g.因信称义（加1:16、5:12)、道成肉身（约贰书1:10）、三位一体
* **V1**你们**要接纳信心软弱的人**，不要论断**引起争论**的事【不要辩论所疑惑的事】。not to quarrel over opinions.
* **e.g.**路德宗神学家**馬蒂牛斯Rupertus Meldenius**：基要真理上要合一；在次要事情上要宽容给予自由；在一切事上，要以爱相待[[9]](#footnote-9)
* **V3 吃的人不要轻看不吃的人，不吃的人也不要批评【论断】吃的人，因为上帝已经接纳他了。**Let not the one who eats despise the one who abstains, and let not the one who abstains pass judgment on the one who eats, for God has welcomed him.
* 吃蔬菜的 **批评【论断**】judge吃的人，吃肉的却**轻看**藐视despise他们[[10]](#footnote-10)
* e.g.信心“神学”强的人，容易轻看人
* 保罗没有严厉责备他们的神学看法，而是严厉责备他们彼此对待的态度
* 因不对的心态**容易导致他们分派、分裂**
* e.g.**我曾轻看别的弟兄的事情：**e.g.使用不同翻译本：KJV，和合本 e.g.崇拜时只能唱诗篇？ 一些只能唱传统诗歌e.g.主日“安息日”不能煮饭e.g.教会不可以挂圣诞树e.g.孩子不能去学校，只能上家庭教育e.g.基督徒不可以看电影e.g. 亚米念 与 加尔文主义 e.g.千禧年立场：前千、无千、后千、时代论。
* **V4 你是谁**，竟然批评【论断】别人的家仆呢？他或站稳或跌倒，只和自己的主人有关；但他必定站稳，因为主能够使他站稳[[11]](#footnote-11)。5 有人认为这日[[12]](#footnote-12)比那日好，也有人认为日日都是一样；只要各人自己心意坚定就可以了。6 守日的人是为主守的，**吃的人是为主吃的**，因为他感谢上帝；**不吃的人是为主不吃**，他也感谢上帝。7 我们没有一个人为自己活，也没有一个人为自己死。我们若活着，是为主而活；8 我们若死了，是为主而死。所以，我们无论活着或是死了，总是属于主的人。9 为了这缘故【因此】，基督死了，又活过来，就是要作死人和活人的主[[13]](#footnote-13)。
* 似乎比较严厉责备论断的那群弟兄，但其实他也责备那轻看的那群弟兄
* 保罗没有意愿要他们都一样吃肉[[14]](#footnote-14) 保罗意识到基督徒的做法，都有不一样。he recognize **Christians are diverse**
* **V5 有人认为这日比那日好，也有人认为日日都是一样。；只要各人自己心意坚定就可以了。6 守日的人是为主守的，**
* 有些人看一个日子比其它日子还要重要
* **V6...,吃的人是为主吃的,因为他感谢上帝;不吃的人是为主不吃,他也感谢上帝**
* 吃肉或选择不吃肉，都是为主而做的
* **V7 ...我们若活着，是为主而活；8我们若死了，是为主而死。所以，我们无论活着或是死了，总是属于主的人。**
* 活着是为主而活，死也是为主死
* **V9 为了这缘故【因此】，基督死了，又活[[15]](#footnote-15)过来，就是要作死人和活人的主**
* 我们该如何理解主耶稣“死了又活过来，是为了成为我们的主”这句话[[16]](#footnote-16)？
* 这句话的意思是：圣子上帝降世、受死并复活，是为了成为我们的主，就是那位‘基督’。
* 耶稣是我们的主，不仅因为祂是创造我们的上帝creator（约1:1-3；西1:16-17；来1:2）；耶稣是我们的主，**也因为**祂曾为我们受死并复活,救赎我们redeemer（腓2:8-11；来5:8-9；徒5:30-31）。
* 也因主耶稣的死与复活，祂如今掌管一切领域realm[[17]](#footnote-17),祂是死人和活人的主（罗14:9）[[18]](#footnote-18)
* **V10 这样，你为什么批评【论断】你的弟兄呢[[19]](#footnote-19)？为什么又轻看你的弟兄呢？我们都要站在上帝的审判台前[[20]](#footnote-20)；11 因为经上记着：“主说，我指着我的永生起誓：万膝必向我跪拜，万口必称颂上帝。”12 这样看来，我们各人都要把自己的事向上帝交代。**
* 保罗引用 赛45:23[[21]](#footnote-21)**提醒我们将来有审判**
* 保罗劝诫我们，不要论断弟兄，也不要轻看他们。
* **提醒：**往往许多教会因不同看法，结果互相纷争然后一分为二
* **劝诫：**虽然有不同意见，但往往双方都是爱主的动机。
* 基督徒有很多不同做法、理念、神学。diversity and unity 多元与合一
1. Paul gives us advice as to how we are to live with others who love the Lord but who do not see what we are doing as the ideal way of living out the Christian faith.Morris, L

Those converted to Christianity in the first century did not come with minds like empty slates. They had had years of living in Judaism or in some pagan situation and in the process had acquired deeply rooted habits and attitudes. They did some things but avoided others. When they became Christians, all this did not drop away from them in a moment. For example, some pagans were so repelled by the self-indulgence they saw as an integral part of the world in which they lived that they turned from it all and lived ascetic lives, sometimes giving up the eating of meat altogether (Olshausen cites Seneca as one who did this). Jewish converts had kept the law of Moses, and specifically they had observed the Sabbath. When such people became Christians they often maintained such habits. They did not see that justification by faith made them irrelevant. It is people who brought from their previous life such habits of thinking and living of whom Paul is speaking. Morris, L [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. As the discussion shows, he does not mean a person who trusts Christ but little, the man of feeble faith. Rather, the person he has in mind is the one who does not understand the conduct implied by faith; perhaps he is the person whose faith is ineffective. His faith is weak in that it cannot sustain him in certain kinds of conduct. He does not understand that when the meaning of justification by faith is grasped questions like the use of meat and wine and special days become irrelevant. Paul is not referring to basic trust in Christ. He assumes that that is present, for this weak person is a member of the church, not an outsider who it is hoped will be converted. What is being discussed is the way the believer should live, the actions that are permissible or required.Morris, L.. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. What extends from 14:1 to 15:13 is another well-defined section of the epistle. This section is coordinate with what precedes in chapters 12 and 13 in that it deals with what is concrete and practical in the life of the believer and, more particularly, with his life in the fellowship of the church. But this section is concerned specifically with the weak and the strong and with the attitudes they are to entertain in reference to one another.Murray, J. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. This is not to say that weakness of faith respecting meat offered to idols did not come into view in the Roman epistle. The case is simply that more has to be taken into account. The reasons for this conclusion are as follows. (1) In Romans 14 there is no mention of food or wine offered to idols. If this were exclusively the question we would expect an explicit reference as in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10. (2) Distinction of days comes into view in Romans 14. This is not reflected on in the Corinthian passages. It is very difficult to trace a relationship between scrupulosity respecting days and that concerned with food offered to idols. (3) The weakness of Romans 14 involved a vegetarian diet (cf. vs. 2). There is no evidence that the weak in reference to food offered to idols scrupled in the matter of flesh-meat if it had not been offered to idols. For these reasons we shall have to conclude that the weakness in Romans 14 was more generic in character.Murray, J. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. 在哥林多教会，一些信徒害怕买到肉是被祭拜过偶像的。 林前10:25 肉食市场所卖的一切，你们只管吃，不要为了良心的缘故问什么，26 因为地和地上所充满的都是属于主的。（经文上下文是在讨论有关偶像的食物） [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. There is a similarity between the subject dealt with and what we find in other epistles of Paul. Most patent is the similarity to situations of which Paul treats in 1 Corinthians 8:1–13; 10:23–33. But also in the epistles to the Galatians and Colossians there appear to be points of contact. In Romans 14:5 reference is made to distinctions of days and in Galatians 4:10 we read: “Ye observe days, and months, and seasons, and years”. In Colossians 2:16, 17 we have reference to feast days, new moons, and sabbath days as a shadow of things to come. Furthermore, in Colossians 2:16, 20–23 we have allusions to a religious scrupulosity concerned with food and drink, and the slogan of the proponents was “handle not, nor taste, nor touch” (Col. 2:21). In the case of these two latter epistles it is not, however, the similarity that is most striking; it is the totally different attitude on the part of the apostle. In these two epistles there is a severely polemic and denunciatory note in reference to these same matters. In Galatians the observance of days and seasons is viewed with grave apprehensions. “I am afraid of you, lest by any means I have bestowed labor upon you in vain” (Gal. 4:11). In Colossians likewise the reproof directed at the ascetics is of the severest character: “If ye died with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, do ye subject yourselves to ordinances …? Which things have indeed a show of wisdom … but are not of any value against the indulgence of the flesh” (Col. 2:20, 23). This polemic severity we do not find in the section with which we are now concerned in Romans. Here there is a tenderness and tolerance that reflect a radically different attitude. “But him that is weak in faith receive ye” (14:1). “One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let each man be fully assured in his own mind” (14:5). Why this difference? The reason is clear. In Galatians Paul is dealing with the Judaizers who were perverting the gospel at its centre. They were the propagandists of a legalism which maintained that the observance of days and seasons was necessary to justification and acceptance with God. This meant a turning back again “to the weak and beggarly rudiments” (Gal. 4:9); it was “a different gospel which is not another”, and worthy of the apostle’s anathemas (cf. Gal. 1:8, 9). In Romans 14 there is no evidence that those esteeming one day above another were involved in any respect in this fatal error. They were not propagandists for a ceremonialism that was aimed at the heart of the gospel. Hence Paul’s tolerance and restraint. The Colossian heresy was more complicated than the Galatian. At Colossae the error which Paul controverts was basically gnostic and posited, as F. F. Bruce observes, “a clear-cut dualism between the spiritual and material realms” and regarded salvation as consisting in the liberation of the spiritual from the material. Thus “asceticism was commonly regarded as an important element in the process of this liberation”.1 There was also the worship of angelic beings (cf. Col. 2:18) who were conceived of as the media of revelation from God and the mediators through whom “all prayer and worship from man to God could reach its goal”.2 Asceticism was also part of the ritual by which the favour of these angelic powers was to be gained. This heresy struck at the heart of the gospel and its peculiar gravity rested in the denial of Christ’s preeminence as the one in whom dwelt the fulness of Godhood (cf. Col. 2:9) and as the only mediator between God and man. Hence the vigour of Paul’s denunciations. There is not the slightest evidence that the asceticism of the weak in Romans 14 was bound up with the heretical speculations of the Colossian heresy. The climate is, therefore, radically different.

It could be argued with a good deal of plausibility that the weakness contemplated in Romans 14 is identical with that of 1 Corinthians 8. The latter consists clearly in the conviction entertained by some that food offered to idols had been so contaminated by this idolatrous worship that it was not proper for a Christian to partake of it. The whole question in the Corinthian epistle is focused in food or drink offered to idols. It might seem that the similarity of attitude and injunction in Romans 14 would indicate the same issue. This inference is not established and the evidence would point to the conclusion that the weakness in view in Romans 14 is more diversified. This is not to say that weakness of faith respecting meat offered to idols did not come into view in the Roman epistle. The case is simply that more has to be taken into account. The reasons for this conclusion are as follows. (1) In Romans 14 there is no mention of food or wine offered to idols. If this were exclusively the question we would expect an explicit reference as in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10. (2) Distinction of days comes into view in Romans 14. This is not reflected on in the Corinthian passages. It is very difficult to trace a relationship between scrupulosity respecting days and that concerned with food offered to idols. (3) The weakness of Romans 14 involved a vegetarian diet (cf. vs. 2). There is no evidence that the weak in reference to food offered to idols scrupled in the matter of flesh-meat if it had not been offered to idols. For these reasons we shall have to conclude that the weakness in Romans 14 was more generic in character.Murray, J.

应该不是因为旧约圣经教导有关不洁净的食物导致他们完全不吃任何肉类。因为圣经有清楚指出那些肉类是洁净的。 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Exactly what the problem was with which Paul is dealing in this section is not clear. There has been interminable discussion about it, and nothing like a consensus has been attained.1 Paul is discussing the relations between those he calls “weak” and those he calls “strong”, but he never explains in detail who they were and what teachings they held. Quite clearly the Roman Christians knew, so there was no need to go into the question. Some hold that these were parties in the Roman church, others that they were individuals and not sufficiently organized to be called “parties”. Still others think that Paul was not referring specifically to people at Rome but to tendencies he found in the church everywhere, and thus his advice was as relevant to Rome as to any other place. Some think the weak were Jewish Christians and the strong were Gentile believers. They point to the somewhat similar situation at Corinth where some believers refrained from eating meat that had been offered to idols and argued that this would be typical of Jewish believers. Jews living in the Gentile world might well abstain from meat because they could never be sure it had not been contaminated by associations with idol worship. Against this it is argued that in a city like Rome with a large Jewish population kosher meat was sure to be available. It is urged that it is illegitimate to bring in the case of Corinth because nothing is said here about idols and we have no reason to hold that the two situations were at all similar. It is further pointed out that some Gentile groups like the Orphics and Pythagoreans were vegetarian, so that the practice might well have originated in Gentile circles. Moreover, the abstention from wine is not known among the Jews except for the Nazirites and for the priests when engaged in their ministry.

The arguments are endless, but no one has been able to come up with convincing evidence for any one position. It is best to accept the fact that we are ignorant of the precise situation and simply to consider what Paul says. The apostle sides with neither the weak nor the strong; clearly he thought that unity was more important than holding either position. The situation is not like that in Galatians where he contended vigorously against legalists; here both groups were evidently clear about the centrality of justification by faith; it was the way that was put into practice that was at stake.Morris, L. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. In Corinth some Christians could with a good conscience eat meat part of which had been offered to an idol, for they held that an idol is nothing (1 Cor. 8:4). For others conscience made this impossible (1 Cor. 8:7). Paul is not saying that the Corinthian situation was a problem in Rome also (nothing in this passage indicates this, and the idea that the Roman problem was identical with the Corinthian problem must be rejected). But he was writing from Corinth, where he would certainly be mindful of local problems. And the Corinthian dilemma shows us the kind of thing that could arise in the Roman world of the day. Paul is referring to someone who had conscientious scruples about eating meat, and thus confined his diet to vegetables. This is certainly not part of authentic Christian teaching (cf. Mark 7:19), but the scruples were very real and Paul is saying that they must be respected.Morris, L. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Rupertus Meldenius “In essentials, unity; in non-essentials, liberty; in all things, charity.” [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. That of the strong is the disposition to despise or treat with contempt the weak and that of the weak to judge the strong. Both are condemned with equal vigour Murray, J. (1968). The Epistle to the Romans (Vol. 2, p. 175). Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. The weak tended to regard the exercise of liberty on the part of the strong as a falling down in their devotion to Christ and as therefore subjecting them to the Lord’s disapproval. The apostle’s assurance is to the contrary effect and should, therefore, be regarded as having reference to the standing of the strong believer and of his conduct in the approbation of the Lord Christ. He will stand firm and the reason is given: the power of the Saviour is the guarantee of his stedfastness.Murray, J. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. This has often been taken to mean that the weak brother observes the Jewish Sabbath.19 But Paul does not say this, and it is equally possible that he is referring to feast days and fast days, either those laid down in the Jewish law or those derived from other sources. Morris, L.

but we should bear in mind Paul’s strong words about those who observed “special days and months and seasons and years”, of whom he said, “I fear for you, that somehow I have wasted my efforts on you” (Gal. 4:10–11; cf. Col. 2:16ff.). It seems that some regarded the keeping of sacred times as of the essence of the Christian way. Paul rejected all such views with decision. Morris, L. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. This ground is stated, however, in terms of the way in which Christ secured this lordship and, more particularly, in terms of the purpose Christ had in view in dying and rising again, namely, that he might secure this lordship. Murray, J. . [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Compelled conformity or pressure exerted to the end of securing conformity defeats the aims to which all the exhortations and reproofs are directed.Murray, J. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. particularly, because “died and lived” is parallel to “the dead and the living” in the latter part of the text. **It is by the life which Jesus lives in his resurrection power that believers live unto the Lord.**Murray, J. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. The lordship of Christ here dealt with did not belong to Christ by native right as the Son of God; it had to be secured. It is the lordship of redemptive relationship and such did not inhere in the sovereignty that belongs to him in virtue of his creatorhood. It is achieved by mediatorial accomplishment and is the reward of his humiliation (cf. Acts 2:36; Rom. 8:34; Phil. 2:9–11).Murray, J. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. (弗4:9-10） [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. The form “both the dead and the living” emphasizes the sovereignty which Christ exercises equally over both spheres.Murray, J.

The idea of this lordship is amplified in Ephesians 4:9, 10 where Christ is said to fill all things and the process by which the same is secured is descent into the lower parts of the earth and ascent above all the heavens.Murray, [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. The wrong of censorious judgment is rebuked by the reminder that if God has received a person into the bond of his love and fellowship and if the conduct in question is no bar to God’s acceptance, it is iniquity for us to condemn that which God approves.Murray, J. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Anyone, therefore, who assumes the part of a judge is behaving insolently” (Calvin).

but it is not clear whether the warning against judging others is because those who judge will themselves face judgment in due course (cf. Matt. 7:1; Luke 6:37) or whether Paul means that the brother who is the object of this “judgment” will in due course be judged by God (not by his fellows). Either way the thought is that the verdict that matters is God’s. Morris, L. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. （腓2:10-11） [↑](#footnote-ref-21)