

# 全然败坏 2 Total Depravity 2

By R.C. Sproul



When we get to the concern of the doctrine of total depravity or the T in TULIP invariably, we are catapulted into the arena of the debate over free will. In fact, the historic controversy over the degree of original sin that infects us really focuses on that question of free will. You can't have a five-minute conversation on the doctrines of grace or on the doctrine of election without somebody raising the question: what about free will?

And so often the debate or the discussion over free will is placed in two different frameworks. On the one hand the question of human freedom is struggled with vis-à-vis the relationship between God's sovereignty and our responsibility and our power to act as volitional creatures. But the other place in which the discussion of free will is framed has to do with the question of the relationship between the fall and original sin and the power of human freedom. Let me take a moment to read a confessional summary of this dispute as we find it in the "Westminster Confession of Faith," which is the 17th Century British statement of Reformation theology where we read these words: "Man by his fall into a state of sin hath wholly " --that's w-h-o-l-l-y-- " hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation. So as a natural man, being altogether averse from that good, and dead in sin is not able by his own strength to convert himself or to prepare himself thereunto. "

Now what this confession is saying points to the radical character of this doctrine in that it affirms that man's freedom in a certain area, has been wholly or completely lost by the fall; not that man has completely lost his power of choosing or of making decisions but his moral power to do certain things has been completely lost. And that certain thing, that is in view here, is that man has lost the ability to convert himself or to will, on his own steam, any spiritual good.

Now therein is the crux of the matter of the doctrine of total depravity. It translates into the doctrine of what is called moral inability. I want to take a little time to explain this concept. And again, we can go back to Augustine's view of the inherited corruption. Pelagius disagreed with this, and Pelagius said that Adam's fall affected only Adam, that there is no consequence to future generations, and the seed of Adam sin only by imitation not because of some transferred or transmitted fallen human condition. Now after Pelagius was condemned by the church, a moderate position emerged that was called semi-Pelagianism which taught, yes, there was a fall, that man, the whole human race, mankind has been affected by Adam's sin, and that we all are born with a corrupt nature, but that corrupt nature leaves, what I'm going to call, a kind of island of righteousness by which there still remains a vestigial remnant of the original righteousness, that though this person needs the help of divine grace in order to be saved, in order to be made holy, nevertheless there remains a power within the will of the creature that can cooperate with the grace of God, or reject the grace of God. So that in the final analysis the reason why some persons will come to Christ and others will not, some will be redeemed, and some will be lost, will be rooted ultimately in human decision and in that power that remains in the will after the fall.

Now again Pelagius said that a person can live a perfect life without grace. And he said that grace facilitates redemption but it's not necessary. People can be perfect, and in fact Pelagius argued some have achieved perfection without

当我们谈到完全堕落的教义或TULIP中的T时，我们总是被推到关于自由意志的辩论场上。事实上，关于感染我们的原罪程度，的历史性争论确实集中在自由意志的问题上。你无法就恩典的教义或拣选的教义进行五分钟的对话，而没有人提出问题：那自由意志怎么办？

因此，关于自由意志的辩论或讨论常常被置于两个不同的框架内。一方面，人类自由的问题是相对于上帝的主权和我们的责任以及我们作为有意志力的生物的能力之间的关系而斗争的。但讨论自由意志的另一个地方是与堕落和原罪与人类自由的力量之间的关系问题有关。让我花点时间读一读我们在《威斯敏斯特信仰告白》中对这一争议的忏悔性总结，这是17世纪英国宗教改革神学的声明，我们读到这些话。“人因堕入罪恶的境地而完全 “--那是 w-h-o-l-l-y--” 完全丧失了任何与救赎相伴的精神利益的意志能力。

这段忏悔所讲的内容表明了这一教义的根本特征，即它确认人在某一领域的自由因堕落而全部或完全丧失；不是说人完全丧失了选择或决策的能力，而是他做某些事情的道德能力已经完全丧失。这里所说的某些事情，是指人已经失去了改变自己的能力，或者靠自己的力量来实现任何精神上的好处。

现在，这就是完全堕落学说的问题的关键。它转化为所谓的道德无能的学说。我想花一点时间来解释这个概念。再说一遍，我们可以回到奥古斯丁对遗传性腐败的看法。伯拉纠不同意这个观点，伯拉纠说，亚当的堕落只影响到亚当，对后代没有任何影响，亚当的后代只是通过模仿而犯罪，而不是因为某种转移或传播的堕落的人类状况。在伯拉纠被教会谴责后，出现了一种温和的立场，被称为半伯拉纠主义，它教导说，是的，有一个秋天，人，整个人类，人类已经被亚当的罪所影响，我们都出生时有一个腐败的本性，但这个腐败的本性留下了，我将称之为。尽管这个人需要神恩的帮助才能得救，才能成为圣洁，但受造物的意志中仍有一种力量，可以与神的恩典合作，也可以拒绝神的恩典。因此，归根结底，为什么有些人会来到基督面前，有些人则不会，有些人会得到救赎，有些人则会失去，其原因最终都是源于人的决定，源于堕落后留在意志中的力量。

现在伯拉纠又说，一个人没有恩典也能过上完美的生活。他说，恩典促进了救赎，但它不是必需的。人可以是完美的，事实上伯拉纠认为有些人在没有上帝的帮助下已经达到了完

any assistance from God. The semi-Pelagians differ with Pelagius at this point by saying, no, grace is absolutely necessary. It's a pre-condition for anyone's being redeemed. You can't be saved without grace. However, grace is not alone. It is grace plus something else--grace plus the exertions of the human will in the strength that remains intact after the fall.

Augustine was one of the principal architects of the idea that was recovered in the 16th Century Reformation in one of the Solas of that time, the so-called idea of Sola Gratia, by grace alone. Augustine was saying that, the fall is so profound, and that the power of sin is so strong in the human heart that only God, by His grace and by His grace alone, can change the disposition of the human soul to bring that person to faith. So, at issue here is whether fallen man has the ability intact, the moral power intact to incline himself or to embrace in his own strength the offers of help and assistance that come to us from God. Or is it necessary for God to do the initial work of re-creation in the soul before the fallen person has the moral power to say yes to the Gospel.

So, what we're talking about here is what is called the divine initiative. Augustine would say this: that before a person comes to Christ, God works unilaterally, monergistically, independently, and sovereignly by changing the soul of the sinner, by rescuing that sinner from the prison house of moral bondage by which he is by nature dead in sin and trespasses, and in that state of spiritual death is morally unable to resurrect himself, that God has to come and breathe new spiritual life and power into the soul of that person, and as, to use Paul's language, to quicken him from a state of spiritual death and produce faith in the person's heart before that person has the power to come to Christ. Now those people do come to Christ, and they choose Christ. They come willingly and cheerfully and all the rest, but not before or until God does His work of sovereign grace in bringing that person from spiritual death to spiritual life. We call that monergistic rebirth or monergistic regeneration, that it is the work of God alone, and since there is nothing I can do to earn it, to deserve it, to merit it or to provoke it, I must rest my case ultimately on the grace of God and on the grace of God alone.

Now one of the important Biblical texts that speaks to this is found in the Gospel of John in which Jesus makes the somewhat astonishing statement. He says in verse 63, "It is the Spirit who gives life. The flesh profits nothing. The words that I speak to you are Spirit and they are life. But there are some of you who do not believe for Jesus knew from the beginning who they were who did not believe and who would betray Him. And he said, therefore, I have said to you that no one can come to Me unless it has been given to him by My Father." Now we remember earlier in Jesus' conversation with Nicodemus, who came to Him at night, Jesus talked about the necessity of a person's being reborn before they could even see the kingdom of God, not to mention enter the kingdom of God. And in that discussion with Nicodemus Jesus said to him, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit." And just as Jesus makes this strong contrast between flesh and Spirit, so the Apostle Paul does the same thing when he talks in the metaphor of warfare that goes on between the flesh and the Spirit in the person who has been converted. Even when you are born of the Spirit the flesh is not completely annihilated, and there's this ongoing struggle. But until the Holy Spirit changes your life, all you are, is flesh. This is what Jesus is saying to Nicodemus.

In your natural birth, in your natural state, you were born in the state of sarx or the Biblical concept of flesh, in this fallen condition, where the desires of your heart are only wicked continuously, and which the apostle says that you walk according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, and that you are dead in your sin. That's the condition of the flesh.

Now here in John 6 Jesus says, "The flesh profits" what? "nothing." In his debate with Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam Luther in his perhaps most famous work on the "Bondage of the Will," labored his exposition of this Biblical text and kept jibbing at Erasmus for having the flesh do something in the process of salvation not only that is significant but it is pivotal and not only does it profit something but it profits everything, because if in the final analysis we

美。半伯拉纠派在这一点上与伯拉纠派不同，他们说，不，恩典是绝对必要的。它是任何人被救赎的前提条件。没有恩典，你就不能得救。然而，恩典并不是单独的。它是恩典加上别的东西--恩典加上人类意志在堕落后保持的力量的努力。

奥古斯丁是16世纪宗教改革的主要设计师之一，他的思想在当时的Solas之一中得到了恢复，即所谓的Sola Gratia（唯有恩典）的思想。奥古斯丁说，堕落是如此深刻，罪的力量在人的心中是如此强大，只有上帝，通过他的恩典，也只有他的恩典，才能改变人的灵魂的倾向，使这个人获得信仰。因此，这里的问题是，堕落的人是否有完整的能力，完整的道德力量，使自己倾向于或以自己的力量接受来自上帝的帮助和援助的提议。或者说，在堕落的人拥有对福音说“是”的道德力量之前，上帝是否有必要在灵魂中进行最初的再创造工作。

所以，我们在这里谈论的是所谓的神圣的主动性。奥古斯丁会这样说。在一个人来到基督面前，神单方面地、单一地、独立地、主权地改变了罪人的灵魂，把罪人从道德束缚的牢房中解救出来，因为他天生就死在罪和过犯中，在这种精神死亡的状态下，在道德上无法复活自己。神必须要把新的精神生命和力量注入那个人的灵魂，用保罗的话说，就是把他从精神死亡的状态中唤醒，在那个人的心里产生信仰，然后那个人才有能力来到基督面前。现在这些人确实来到了基督面前，而且他们选择了基督。他们心甘情愿地来到这里，其余的都是如此，但在神做了主权恩典的工作，把这个人从属灵的死亡带到属灵的生命之前或之前。我们称其为单能重生或单能重生，即这是神一个人的工作，既然我不能做什么来赚取它，配得它，值得它，或激起它，我必须把我的情况最终放在神的恩典上，并且只放在神的恩典上。

现在，谈到这一点的重要圣经文本之一是在《约翰福音》中找到的，其中耶稣做出了有点令人吃惊的声明。他在第63节说：“赐生命的是圣灵。肉体毫无益处。我对你们说的话就是灵，就是生命。但是，你们中间有一些人不信，因为耶稣从一开始就知道谁是不相信的人，谁会出卖他。他说：“所以我对你们说，若不是我父所赐的，没有人能到我这里来。”现在我们记得早些时候在耶稣与尼哥底母的谈话中，他是在晚上来找他的，耶稣谈到了一个人在看到神的国度之前必须重生，更不用说进入神的国度。在与尼哥底母的讨论中，耶稣对他说：“从肉体生的就是肉体，从灵生的就是灵。”正如耶稣在肉体和精神之间做了这种强烈的对比，使徒保罗也做了同样的事情，他用肉体和精神之间的争斗的比喻来谈论已经改变的人。即使你是由圣灵所生，肉体也没有完全被消灭，还有这种持续的争斗。但是，在圣灵改变你的生命之前，你所拥有的只是肉体。这就是耶稣对尼哥底母所说的。

在你的自然出生中，在你的自然状态中，你出生在sarx或圣经中肉体的概念中，在这种堕落的状态中，你心中的欲望只有邪恶不断，使徒说，你是按照这个世界的轨迹行走，按照空中力量的主宰，你是死在你的罪中。这就是肉体的状况。

现在在约翰福音第六章中，耶稣说：“肉体的好处”是什么？“毫无益处。”在与鹿特丹的伊拉斯谟（Desiderius Erasmus）的辩论中，路德在他也许是最有名的关于“意志的束缚”的著作中，努力阐述这段圣经文本，并不断嘲笑伊拉斯谟在救赎过程中让肉体做些什么，这不仅是重要的，而且是关键的，它不仅能带来一些好处，而且能带来一切。因为如果归根结底，我们依靠的是我们内心与生俱来的道德力量，这种力

rest upon this innate moral power within us that is not touched or incarcerated by the fall and that the power here of the flesh is to incline ones self to spiritual good and one exercises the proper inclination what that profits him is eternal life.

And Luther never tiring of debating with Erasmus says that that nothing is not a little something. And he said Jesus is serious when He says, "The flesh profits nothing." Then he goes on to make this statement, "No man can come to Me unless it is given to him by the Father." Now that text is very important because it begins with the statement, "No man," and if you are students of the grammar stage of logic, you will recognize that statement or that concept, "no man" as what is called a universal negative proposition. It describes something negative of everybody in the class "man". Now I would like to be able to say that this is used in a gender specific way, and only refers to the inherent moral inability of males. Unfortunately, the usage here in the Greek is that it is shorthand for mankind. What Jesus is saying is that no human person, He's saying something about everybody, something negative about everybody.

Now again the next word is crucial. "No man can." Not no man may. You know the difference about ... between may and can, talked about that many times. I remember when I was in grade school, and I asked the teacher, can I go sharpen my pencil? And she said, I'm sure that you can, but you mean, may I go sharpen my pencil. And I have since discovered that that teacher got around. In fact, she was ubiquitous. And that everybody I've ever met had the same teacher at some time in their lives. Haven't you? That teacher says I'm sure you can; the question is may I? We're not talking here about permission, but the word can describe ability or power--posse. And what Jesus is saying here is that no human being has the power or the ability to do something.

Now these are strong words coming from the lips of our Lord. This isn't Augustine or Calvin or Luther. This is Christ Himself saying something about man's ability. And he says no man is able; no man has the power to do what? To come to Me. So that there is an inherent lack of ability of some kind for human beings to come to Jesus in some way.

Now obviously when He says come to Me, He's not talking spatially or geographically. Obviously, none of us have the ability to come to Him in His earthly presence in Palestine because He's not there anymore, and He wasn't saying that no man could come and find out where He was living.

The coming to Me is the way in which He calls people to embrace Him in faith for their salvation. I don't think there's any Biblical scholar that would dispute that that's what Jesus is talking about here with respect to coming to Him. No man can come to Him unless--unless. Now unless indicates a necessary condition that has to be met before a desired consequence can possibly follow. So that unless points to some sine-qua-non, some absolutely essential thing that has to take place before a person can come to Jesus. And what is it?

Now here He simply says, "No one can come to Me unless it is given to him by the Father." Earlier in the text He talks about no one can come to Me unless the Father woos him, or lures him, although the word that is used there is the word, that most dictionaries translate by the English word compel, not just an external enticement like trying to lure people to come to Him.

The idea here is that something, God has to do something at this point. God has to enable a person to come. That's the key point--that we, according to the doctrine of total depravity, have lost our natural human ability to come to Jesus. We still make choices, but we make our choices according to our desires. That's the essence of freedom--to be able to choose according to your own desires or inclination, but it's a double-edged sword. Not only are we free in the sense that we choose according to our desires, but we cannot not be free at that point. We not only may choose what we want, but the only kind of a choice that is a real choice is the choice that is made according to what you want. And so, we are all still free people in the sense that we can do what we want, but that's not the royal liberty of which the New Testament speaks. It doesn't address the problem of moral bondage. And what original sin teaches in the

量没有被堕落所触及或禁锢，而且肉体的力量是使自己倾向于精神上的善，并且一个人行使适当的倾向性，那么他所获得的就是永生。

路德不厌其烦地与伊拉斯谟辩论，他说“无”并不是一个小东西。他说耶稣是认真的，他说：“肉体无益。”然后他继续说：“若不是父给他的，人不能到我这里来。”现在这段文字非常重要，因为它以“没有人”这个说法开始，如果你是逻辑学语法阶段的学生，你会认识到这个说法或这个概念，“没有人”是所谓的普遍否定命题。它描述了“人”这个类别中每个人的负面情况。现在我想说这是以一种特定的性别方式使用的，而且只指男性固有的道德无能。不幸的是，希腊文中的用法是，它是人类的简称。耶稣说的是，没有一个人，他说的是每个人的事，每个人的负面的事。

现在，下一个词再次成为关键。“没有人可以。”不是没有人可以。你知道关于……“可能”和“可以”之间的区别，这已经讲过很多次了。我记得在我上小学的时候，我问老师，我能不能去削铅笔？她说，我相信你可以，但你的意思是，我可以去削铅笔吗。后来我发现，那个老师到处都有。事实上，她是无处不在的。我见过的每个人在他们生命中的某个时候都有同一个老师。你没有吗？那位老师说我相信你可以；问题是我可以吗？我们在这里谈论的不是许可，但这个词可以描述能力或权力--posse。而耶稣在这里说的是，没有一个人有权力或能力去做某事。

现在这些话从我们的主嘴里说出来是很强烈的。这不是奥古斯丁或加尔文或路德。这是基督自己对人的能力说的话。他说，没有人能够；没有人有能力做什么？到我这里来。因此，人类以某种方式到耶稣那里去是内在地缺乏某种能力的。

显然，当他说到我这里来时，他不是再说空间或地理上的问题。显然，我们没有人有能力到他在巴勒斯坦的地上的地方去找他，因为他已经不在那里了，他不是说没有人能来找他住在哪里。

到我这里来是他呼唤人们以信心拥抱他以获得救赎的方式。我认为没有任何一个圣经学者会质疑这就是耶稣在这里所说的来到他身边。没有人可以到他那里去，除非--除非。现在，“除非”表示一个必要的条件，在一个期望的结果可能出现之前必须满足。因此，“除非”指的是一些罪，一些绝对必要的事情，在一个人能够来到耶稣面前之前必须发生。那是什么呢？

他在这里简单地说：“若不是父给他的，没有人能到我这里来。”在前面的经文中，他谈到除非天父求他，或引诱他，否则没有人能到我这里来，尽管那里用的是这个词，大多数字典都用英文单词compel来翻译，而不是像试图引诱人们到他这里来的外部诱惑。

这里的意思是，在这一点上，神必须做一些事情。神必须使人能够来。这是关键的一点--根据完全堕落的教义，我们已经失去了来到耶稣面前的人类自然能力。我们仍然可以做出选择，但我们是根据自己的欲望做出选择。这就是自由的本质--能够按照自己的欲望或倾向进行选择，但这是一把双刃剑。我们不仅在根据自己的欲望进行选择的意义上是自由的，而且在这一点上我们不能不自由。我们不仅可以选择我们想要的东西，而且只有一种选择才是真正的选择，那就是根据你想要的东西做出的选择。因此，在我们可以做我们想做的事情的意义上，我们都还是自由的人，但这不是新约圣经中所说的皇家自由。它并没有解决道德束缚的问题。原罪在完全堕落的教义下

doctrine of moral inability found under the rubric of total depravity means, that we are slaves to our own desires, and by nature we have no desire for Christ or for the things of God. And so, we freely reject Him, insofar as we choose what we want, and what we don't want is Him--unless God changes the desire of the heart.

You see, that's why it's not called natural inability. It's called moral inability. We don't have the power or the ability to love the good. For that to happen, we have to be changed. God has to intervene, and in His grace, He must rescue us from spiritual death and the other metaphor spiritual bondage. He has to give us the gift of faith by creating a spiritual resurrection in the heart and in the soul.

And so that's the first point of the acrostic of total depravity. It refers to the degree of corruption that is so severe that there is no island free from the bondage of corruption found within the deep recesses of the human soul. But until we're born of the Spirit, we are flesh, and the only way we can ever come to faith is that if God, in His grace and His grace alone, liberates us by causing us to be born a second time by the creative power of the Holy Ghost.

所教导的道德无能意味着，我们是我们自己欲望的奴隶，从本质上讲，我们对基督或神的事物没有欲望。因此，我们自由地拒绝他，因为我们选择了我们想要的东西，而我们不想要的是他--除非上帝改变内心的欲望。

你看，这就是为什么它不叫自然无能。它被称为道德上的无能。我们没有力量或能力去爱善。要做到这一点，我们必须被改变。上帝必须干预，在他的恩典中，他必须把我们从精神死亡和其他隐喻的精神束缚中解救出来。他必须给我们信心的礼物，在心里和灵魂中创造一个精神的复活。

因此，这就是完全堕落的比喻的第一点。它指的是堕落的程度是如此严重，以至于在人类灵魂深处发现的堕落的束缚，没有任何岛屿可以摆脱。但是，在我们由圣灵所生之前，我们是肉体，而我们能够获得信仰的唯一途径是，如果上帝在他的恩典中，而且只有他的恩典，通过使我们通过圣灵的创造能力第二次出生，来解放我们。