

第三世紀的一些教義和對基督教的看法（教會觀）  
**SEPARATE DOCTRINES AND GENERAL CONCEPTION OF CHRISTIANITY  
 IN THE THIRD CENTURY**

(Seeberg, pp. 162-168.)

第三世紀：信眾的一些觀點，催逼神學處理

**3<sup>RD</sup> CENTURY – POPULAR VIEWS FORCE THEOLGOY TO DEAL WITH THEM**

現在我們要討論的時期，對教義的形成有着決定性的影響。這時期，從信眾的信仰浮現的條件與觀點開始積極流傳，教義神學被迫要面對它們。這些是教義神學不可否認，也不可避免的。當時興起了一種方法來調和它們，同時用作解釋它們的重要性。

The period under review had a decisive influence upon the construction of dogmatics. It was then that *conditions and views* asserted themselves in connection with the *popular faith* with which *dogmatic theology* was compelled to deal, which it *could neither deny nor ignore*. A method was inaugurated by which it was sought to harmonize these and explain their significance.

教會興起；注意到異端

**CHURCH AROSE; HERESY NOTED**

當時教會有了自己的教義，教會是教義性（有教義）的教會。教會肯定開始注意到異端。教義上每一樣新發展都這樣地被注意。教會迅速的增長，帶來新的威協和新的實際問題。There was now an ecclesiastical doctrine and a doctrinal church. *Heresy* had come to be definitely noted. Every new development of doctrine was so regarded. The great extension of the church produced new perils and new practical problems.

教會與宗教情操世俗化

**CHURCH & RELIGIOUS SENTIMENT = SECULARIZED**

當時教會中流行著一種新的看法，人們覺得教會必須符合某些條件。教會不斷世俗化，在第二世紀時已經被教父們駁斥了；第三世紀，世俗化更加迅速，同時宗教情操也世俗化。A new outlook had been won, and new requirements must be met. The *secularization of the church*, which had been already deplored in the second century (1), was *greatly accelerated* in the third, and with it there became manifest also a *secularization of the religious sentiment*.

普遍的教義：堅持基督的神性同時堅持一神論

**PREVALENT DOCTRINE:**

**MAINTAIN DIVINITY OF CHRIST & MONOTHEISM**

這就解釋了當時普遍的教義形式，和對悔改論與教會論的修改；同時解釋為什麼教會反對任何教義上的分歧。後者從第二世紀就可以清楚看出。第三世紀要面對的，乃是如何調和基督的神性與一神論原則。我們從後者開始討論。

This explains both the general type of doctrine prevalent and the modifications in the views concerning repentance and the church, as also the strenuous opposition to all doctrinal differences, particularly to the attempts, reaching back into the second century, *to reconcile the divinity of Christ with the principle of Monotheism*. We begin with the latter.

## 16. 神格唯一論

### MONARCHIANISM

(Seeberg, pp. 162-168)

第二世紀承認基督的神性；基督與父上帝的關係：不清楚

**2<sup>nd</sup> CENTURY RECOGNIZES CHRIST'S DIVINITY;**

**RELATION OF CHRIST TO FATHER – NOT WELL DEFINED**

在第二世紀，基督的神性是公認的真理。可是，學術上如何定義基督與父上帝的關係，則非常令人不滿意。基督被看成位『一位神』(a god)；教父確認了祂的人性。

The *divinity of Christ* is, in the second century, a recognized fact (cf. supra, pp. 63f., 70, 75, 78, 113f., 124ff., 143, 149f., 161, n.). The learned attempts to define *the relation of Christ to the Father (Logos, second God)* were, indeed, far from satisfactory. Christ was regarded as “*a God*,” and his human nature was asserted.

『羅格斯』基督論：上帝是一位，可是『第二上帝』；一神論受到威脅

**LOGOS-CHRISTOLOGY: UNITY OF GOD, BUT “SECOND GOD”**

**MONOTHEISM = THREATENED**

「羅格斯」的基督論（譯注：從游斯丁開始），主要是為了維護「神是一位」而興起的。可是羅格斯（道）若被視為從上帝而出，有自己獨立的存在，就會有人把他當作「第二位神」，因此威脅了一神論。

The *Logos-Christology* was, in the main, framed in such a way as *to guard the unity of God*. But when the Logos, proceeding from the Father, assumes *an independent existence*, he is then regarded as *“the second God,”* and thus *Monotheism is endangered*.

神格唯一論試圖協調：基督 = 上帝，不是『第二上帝』；一位上帝

**MONARCHIANISM SEEKS RECONCILIATION:**

**CHRIST = DIVINE, NOT “SECOND GOD”; ONE GOD**

『神格唯一論』(Monarchianism) 試圖結合一神論（基督教與世俗的異教不同的最寶貴一點）和基督的神性，同時又不墮進「第二位神」的權宜之法。這就是神格唯一論在歷史上的重要性。

Monarchianism made an effort *to reconcile Monotheism*, the most precious treasure of Christianity as contrasted with the heathen world, *with the divinity of Christ without resort to the expedient of the “second God.”* In this consists its historical significance.

原則：（一）耶穌身上帶有上帝的靈；（二）在基督的位格（身上），可以認出父上帝  
他們宣稱自己是一神論者；批判：大公教會相信位、三位上帝

**PRINCIPLES: (1) JESUS BORE GOD’S SPIRIT;**

**(2) IN CHRIST, FATHER’S PERSON IS RECOGNIZED**

**THEY CLAIM MONOTHEISM (MONARCHY);**

**CHARGE: CATHOLICS BELIEVE 2-3 GODS**

它提醒教會：只有一位，有位格的神。它遵循兩個原則進行：（一）耶穌其人有神靈，（二）在基督神上可以看見父神自己。「他們既然想到...上帝是一位，他們就認為，若要維持一神論，就必須同時相信基督是這樣的一個人，或他就是父神自己。」(Novatian.) 「因此他們控告我們（譯注：即正統、大公教會）宣講有兩個、三個神，而想像只有自己才是信奉一位真神的。他們說，『我們堅持只有一位王 (monarchy)。』」(Hippol. Refut. ix. 11: Ditheists, διθεοι, Epiph. h. 62.2; Hilar. de Trin. i. 16).

It reminded the church that there is only One personal God. To this task it addressed itself, under the guidance of the two-fold principle: (1) making the man *Jesus the bearer of the divine Spirit*, (2) *recognizing in Christ the person of the Father himself*: “Since they reflected ... that God is one, they thought it was not possible for them to maintain this opinion unless they should hold the belief, either that Christ was such a man, or that he was truly God the Father” (Novatian, de trin. 30; cf. *Tert. ad. Prax.* 3: “Therefore they charge that *two or three Gods are preached by us*, but imagine that *they are worshippers of the one God ... they say, ‘We hold a monarchy.’*” (Hippol. Refut. ix. 11: Ditheists, διθεοι, Epiph. h. 62.2; Hilar. de Trin. i. 16).

動力神格唯一論：不是出自 “Alogi”

### DYNAMIC MONARCHIANISM: NOT FROM “ALOGI”

(一) 動力神格唯一論。 “Alogi” 這一派，通常被認為是早期的神格唯一論。誠然，Epiphanius 就是這樣為他們分類的，可是，又引用他之前的權威（教父），認為他們是正統的。

1. **Dynamistic Monarchianism.** The “Alogi” are generally treated under this heading, but improperly so. Epiphanius, indeed, was disposed thus to classify them (h. 54.1), but, following the authority before him, recognizes their orthodoxy (h. 51. 4; cf. Iren. and supra, p. 108, n.).

**Theodotus, 190:** 耶穌從童貞女所生，因為父上帝的旨意

基督（靈）在耶穌受洗時降臨；耶穌在受洗時，或復活之後成為上帝；被開除會籍

**THEODOTUS THE FULLER, 190: JESUS = MAN BORN OF VIRGIN, BY FATHER’S COUNSEL; CHRIST/SPIRIT DESCENDS ON JESUS AT BAPTISM BECOMES GOD AT BAPTISM OR AFTER RESURRECTION; EXCOMMUNICATED**

(a) *Theodotus, the Fuller*, brought this doctrine to Rome about A.D. 190:

「他在一些教義上與真教會所堅守的一樣：關於宇宙的來源，他承認上帝創造一切。可是他主張...**基督是這樣開始存在的**：耶穌是個人，按照父的旨意由童貞女所生：與人類一樣有人性，從出生就非常虔誠；其後，在約但河受洗的時候，從上頭來的基督，以鴿子的形式降臨，進入他裏面；在聖靈（即基督）降臨、顯明在他身上之前，他並沒有行使神蹟的能力。有些人認為**他直到聖靈降臨之後才成為神**；其他人認為**是在他復活之後**。」

“Maintaining in part the doctrines commonly held among those of the true church concerning the beginning of all things, confessing that all things were made by God, he yet holds ... that *Christ came into existence* in some such way as this: that *Jesus is, indeed, a man born of a virgin according to the counsel of the Father* – living in common with all men, and most pious by birth; and that *afterward at his baptism in the Jordan, the Christ from above, having descended in the form of a dove, entered into him*; wherefore *miraculous powers* were not exerted by him before *the Spirit*, which he says is *Christ, having descended*, was manifested in him. Some think that *he did not become God until the descent of the Spirit*; others, until *after his resurrection from the dead*” (Hipp. Ref. vii. 35; cf. Ps.-Tert. 8). Pope Victor *excommunicated* him (small Lab. in Eus. v. 28. 6).

**Aslepiodotus, Theodotus**：基督從聖靈和童貞女所生，在受洗時領受聖靈

## ASLEPIODOTUS & THEODOTUS THE MONEY-CHANGER: CHRIST = FROM HOLY SPIRIT AND VIRGIN, ENDOWED WITH SPIRIT AT BAPTISM

(b) In the time of Zephyrinus this view again appeared under the leadership of *Asclepiodotus* and *Theodotus, the Money-changer* (Eus. v. 28. 7; see also 17). Here again it was held:

「他認為基督這個人只是從聖靈和童貞女馬利亞所生。」他低於麥基洗德。可是這個僅僅是人的耶穌，在受洗禮的時候領受了神的靈。有人嘗試透過解經來證明此教義，用上了文本考和一些微妙的邏輯分辨。

“He asserts that this *man Christ (springs) only from the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary*” (Ps.-Ter. 8). He was inferior to Melchizedek (see Epiph. h. 55. 8). But *this “bare man” was at his baptism endowed with the Spirit of God* (Hipp. vii. 36). The attempt was made to prove this doctrine exegetically, calling in the aid of textual criticism and subtle logical distinctions (Eus. v. 28. 13-18; cf., for examples, Epiph. h. 54).

神格唯一論者自稱是正統的

### MONARCHIANS CLAIM ORTHODOXY

可是，這些神格唯一論者宣稱自己說教導的是使徒教會所承認的教義。『他們說，所有先前的教師，甚至使徒們自己，都領受了，教導了這些事，即他們現在宣告的；而福音信息的真理，自從 Victor 時期就被保留下來；不過被他的繼承者，Zephyrinus，扭曲了』：

『他們不敬虔誠地忽略了《聖經》，推翻了古舊信仰的準則，他們並不認識基督。』

Nevertheless, these men *claimed to teach the ancient confessional doctrine*. “For they say that all the former teachers, and the apostles themselves, both received and taught these things which they now proclaim, and that the truth of the gospel message was preserved until the times of Victor... but that the truth was perverted by his successor, Zephyrinus” (small Lab. in Eus. v. 28. 3; cf. the charge brought against them by their orthodox opponent: “They have impiously slighted the divine Scriptures and repudiated the canon of the ancient faith, and have not known Christ,” ib. sec. 13).

神格唯一派并不遵循使徒們的教導

### MONARCHIANISM = NOT APOSTOLIC

毫無疑問地，神格唯一論者宣稱自己是效法教會的教義，一般來說是沒有根據的。神格唯一論並沒有試圖重述原本基督教的觀點，這方面只要對照他們的教義與使徒們如何講述基督是天地之主，就非常明顯。

It is beyond question that the claim of conformity to the teachings of the church was, speaking generally, without foundation. The Monarchian doctrine is not an attempt to reproduce the original Christian view, as is evident from a comparison of its tenets with the apostolic portrayal of Christ as the Lord of heaven and earth (per contra, Harnack, DG.; ed. 3, 673f.).

神格唯一論的起源：『羅格斯』為神聖能力的觀念

### MONARCHIANISM'S ORIGIN = LOGOS IDEA AS ENERGY

這種的神格唯一說的起源，可能是（早期教父）「羅格斯」的觀念，即：羅格斯，或「靈」，被認為不是有位格的，而是一種神聖的能力 (divine energy)。

The *origin of this form of Monarchianism* may be very easily traced to *the Logos-idea – the Logos, or Spirit*, being conceived *not as a personal being, but as a divine energy*.

The attempt to establish a congregation of adherents to this view, although made at personal sacrifice, was not successful (small Lab. in Eus. v. 28. 8-12).

Artemas 在羅馬

### ARTEMAS IN ROME

自從第三世紀中葉，這觀點由羅馬的 Artemas 提倡；他似乎在羅馬開拓了自己的教會。

(c) After the middle of the third century we find this view still advocated by **Artemas** (or Artemon) at **Rome**, and he appears to have gathered about him a congregation of his own (Eus. h.e. vii. 30.17).

撒摩撒達的保羅：從下而上的教導基督論

### PAUL OF SAMOSATA – TAUGHT JESUS CHRIST FROM BELOW

而當時最重要的代表任務就是撒摩撒達的保羅。這位世俗的主教試圖「從下而上」(χατωθεν) 來教導基督論。

(d) But its most important representative is **Paul of Samosata**. This imperious and world-minded **Bishop of Antioch** (from about A.D. 260; cf. encycl. Letter of Synod of Antioch, in Eus. h. e. vii. 30.7-15) *taught “Jesus Christ from below”* (χατωθεν, in contrast with ανωθεν, ib. vii. 30.11).

上帝的智慧 / 羅格斯住在耶穌裏；羅格斯（上帝的兒子）不是個別的位格；羅格斯就是上帝自己；羅格斯來到耶穌住在他裏面；因此上帝是一位

**GOD'S WISDOM/LOGOS DWELLS IN JESUS**

**LOGOS (SON OF GOD) = NOT SEPARATE HYPOSTASIS; LOGOS = GOD HIMSELF**

**LOGOS COMES TO DWELL IN JESUS;**

**THEREFORE: GOD IS ONE**

神的智慧住在耶穌這個（由童貞女所生的）人裏。這（智慧）並不是一個獨立的位格，而在上帝裏存在，有如人的理性在人裏面存在一樣：「神的羅格斯和神的靈，永遠住在神裏，有如人的理性(λογος)住在人的心裏；神的兒子並不是在一個位格裏，而是在神自己裏。...可是羅格斯來住在耶穌裏，他是一個人；因此，他們說，神是一位...一位父神，和在祂裏的兒子，就如理性(λογος)住在人裏一樣。」

*In the man Jesus, born of the virgin, dwelt the divine Wisdom. This is not a separate hypostasis, but exists in God as human reason exists in man: "That in God is always his Logos and his Spirit, as in the heart of man his own reason (λογος); and that the Son of God is not in a hypostasis, but is in God himself ... But that the Logos came and dwelt in Jesus, who was a man; and thus, they say, God is one ... one God the Father, and his Son in him, as the reason (λογος) in a man" (Epiph. h. 65.1).*

智慧，羅格斯住在先知們裏；在基督裏更是如此

**WISDOM/LOGOS INDWELLS IN PROPHETS; MORE IN CHRIST**

我們同樣看見，神的靈住在先知們裏，不過在基督，神的聖殿裏，這個內住是獨特的：「為了大衛的被膏者與智慧不陌生，智慧也不這樣豐富的住在其他人裏。因為智慧是在先知裏，更多在摩西裏，也在不少領袖裏；可是特別多的在基督裏，就像在聖殿裏。」

*A parallel to this is seen in the indwelling of Wisdom in the prophets, except that this indwelling occurred in a unique way in Christ as the temple of God: "In order that neither might the anointed of David be a stranger to Wisdom, nor Wisdom dwell so largely in any other. For it was in the prophets, much more in Moses; and in many leaders, but much more in Christ as in a temple."*

耶穌不是智慧；智慧不能見，是更偉大的

**JESUS = NOT WISDOM; WISDOM CANNOT BE SEEN, IS GREATER**

But also:

「那位顯現的他不是智慧，因為智慧不會以人能看見的形式出現的。...因為智慧比能見的事物更大。」

“He who appeared was not *Wisdom*, for he *was not susceptible of being found in an outward form ... for he is greater than the things that are seen*” (fragm. Disput. c. Malchionem in Routh, Rel. sacr. iii. 301; in Leontius, ib. p. 311).

聯合的形式：耶穌被聖靈澆灌

耶穌在此關係上忠心，保持自己純潔：因此勝過亞當的罪

**MODE OF UNION: JESUS = ANOINTED WITH SPIRIT  
JESUS = STEADFAST IN RELATION, KEPT HIMSELF PURE –  
THEREFORE OVERCAME ADAM’S SIN**

至於這種聯合的形式，保羅的教導是：耶穌這個人，從出生就被聖靈所膏。因為耶穌在這個關係裏堅守不變，保持自己純潔，因此他得到行神蹟的能力；他既然是「生來純潔公義」，就勝過亞當之罪（的權勢）。

As to *the mode of this union*, Paul teaches that the man Jesus was from his birth *anointed with the Holy Ghost*. Because *he remained immovably steadfast in this relationship and kept himself pure*, the power of working miracles became his, and, having been “born pure and righteous,” he overcame the sin of Adam.

聯合=道德上的聯合，意志的聯合：一個意志；愛的本性使幾個意志合而為一

**UNION = MORAL UNION, UNION OF WILL – ONE WILL  
NATURE OF LOVE MAKES ONE WILL OF MANY**

我們在這裏是看到的，是道德上（心裏）的聯合，透過學習和相交；是意志的聯合，在愛中的聯合，而不僅僅是本性上的聯合。

It is *a moral union* (in the way of learning and fellowship, Routh iii. 312) *in the will and in love*, which here meets us, *not a merely natural one*:

你不要希奇，救主與神有同一個意志。因為正如自然界向我們顯明一個實質，從眾成為一，成為同一個，同樣地，愛的本質透過一個、同一個被顯明的心意，從眾而成為一，同一意志。

“Thou shouldst not wonder that the Saviour has one will with God. For just as nature shows us a substance becoming out of many one and the same, so *the nature of love makes one and the same will out of many through one and the same manifested preference.*”

愛的本性使此聯合值得贊揚；自然理性不可能做出值得贊揚的事

**NATURE OF LOVE MAKES UNION PRAISEWORTHY;  
NATURAL REASON DOESN'T PRODUCE PRAISEWORTHY THINGS**

從自然理性所出的事物並不值得讚揚，可是從愛的本質所出的事物，特別值得讚揚。

(Also: “The things obtained by the natural reason have no praise, but *the things obtained by the nature of love* are exceedingly praiseworthy,” frag. in Mai, Vet. Scr. Nov. coll. vii. 68f.; cf. Athanas. c. Arian, or. iii. 10).

耶穌的道德長進：自己與上帝聯合：藉著聖靈的影響，而與上帝的意志聯合  
耶穌成為救贖主，達到永遠與上帝的聯合

**JESUS, IN MORAL DEVELOPMENT, UNITED HIMSELF WITH GOD,  
THRU SPIRIT'S INFLUENCE, & THRU UNITY OF WILL  
BECOMES REDEEMER, ATTAINS PERMANENT ONENESS W/ GOD**

耶穌在他的道德長進上，藉著聖靈和透過意志的合一，親密地與上帝聯合，因此獲得行神蹟的能力，成為一位適當的救贖主，再者，獲得與上帝永久的合一。

Thus *Jesus in his moral development united himself intimately with God by the influence of the Spirit and unity of will*, thus securing the power to perform miracles and fitness to become the Redeemer, and in addition attaining a permanent oneness with God.

救主有掙扎，勝過亞當的罪，成功了，在性格上與上帝聯合

**SAVIOR STRUGGLES, OVERCOMES ADAM'S SIN,  
SUCCEEDS, UNITED IN CHARACTER TO GOD**

救主出生是聖潔的，公義的，藉著他的掙扎與受苦，勝過了我們祖宗的罪，他在這些事上成功了，在性格上與上帝聯合，保存了與上帝一樣的目標與努力，促進一切善的事；因為毫無缺點地保存了，因此他地名被稱為一切名上之名，愛的獎賞白白的賜給他。

“The Saviour, born holy and righteous, having *by his struggle and sufferings* overcome the sin of our progenitor, succeeding in these things, was *united in character* (□□□□□□□□) *to God*, having preserved one and the same aim and effort as he for the promotion of things that are good; and he, having preserved this inviolate, *his name is called that above every name, the prize of love having been freely bestowed upon him*” (Mai, l.c.).

### 三次會議 3 SYNODS

教會在安提阿召開了三次會議來審核此教義（主後 264-269）。撒摩撒達的保羅開始時迴避作正面的答復；因此會議沒有達成結論。最後，Malchion 長老（牧師）擊敗了他。

*Three synods* were held in *Antioch* to consider the matter (264-269; Eus. h.e. vii. 30.4, 5). Paul at first resorted to evasions and no conclusion was reached. Finally, the presbyter Malchion vanquished him at the third synod.

保羅不願意承認獨生子存在在救主裏

#### PAUL OF SAMOSATA WOULD NOT ADMIT THAT ONLY BEGOTTEN SON EXISTS IN SAVIOR

他沒有這樣地說，不過他同一，獨生子，就是創世以前被生的子，是存在於整個救主裏。

“He did not formerly say this, but *he would not grant that in the whole Saviour was existent the only-begotten Son, begotten before the foundation of the world*” (frg. disp. adv. Paul. a Malch. hab. in Routh iii. 302; also Pitra, *Analecta sacra*. iii. 600f.; iv. 424. Eus. h.e. vii. 28, 29).

會議的指令宣告 Artemas 為異端，並開除了他的會籍。

The decree of the synod proclaimed the heresy of Artemas and his exclusion from the fellowship of the church (Eus. he. Vii. 30.16, 17).

可是，還有一班人跟隨這位保羅；在主後 272 年，Aurelian 的諭令…是歷史上第一次帝國政治介入教會的教義與異端之爭。

But Paul retained a following and his office until, in A.D. 272, the decree of Aurelian gave the church property to the control of the one who should be upon terms of epistolary correspondence with the bishops of Italy and Rome (Eus. vii. 30.19). This was the first time that imperial politics carried into effect a condemnatory decree of the church.

### 聖父受苦說 PATRIPASSIANISM

2. 聖父受苦說的神個唯一說，是更有影響力，更加普及的神個唯一說。就是聖父受苦說，使神個唯一說在歷史上發生重大影響（見上文）。羅馬與埃及是撒伯流主義的溫床，並不是偶然的...

**Patripassian Monarchianism** is the more influential and more widely prevalent form of Monarchianism. It is this form chiefly which gives to the system the historical significance noted on p. 163. It is not accidental that Rome and Egypt were the breeding places of Sabellianism and the pillars of the *homoiousia*. The history of the separate representatives of this party is, to some extent, obscure, and it is, therefore, difficult to keep the peculiar tenets of

each distinct in our minds. Here and there we may trace a connection with the primitive form of the doctrine.

「聖父受苦說」一詞，可以說從特土良開始使用。其基本概念如下：

The prevalent term, “Patipassians,” may be traced to Tertullian (adv. Prax.). Their fundamental idea is:

「神格唯一說的立場是，被稱為父的，和被稱為子的，是同一位，一位不是從另一位生出的，乃是自己從自己而出，按照不同時候，以父、子不同名字被稱，不過，這位顯現的，生自同貞女的，還是（父）自己...向那些看見他的人，承認自己是子，可是對那些親近他的人，並不隱藏他就是父。」

“For thus it is proper to state Monarchianism, saying that he who is called Father and Son is one and the same, not one from the other, but he from himself, called by name Father and Son according to the figure of the times, but that this one appearing and born of a virgin remains one ... confessing to those who behold him that he is a Son ... and not concealing from those who approach him that he is the father” (Hipp. Ref. ix. 10).

### **Praxeas vs. Victor (Victor 反對神格唯一論)**

#### **PRAXEAS VS. VICTOR (VICTOR => DYNAMIC MONARCHIANISM)**

Praxeas 是亞細亞的殉道者，與 Victor 一起來到羅馬，用自己的基督論的影響力來抗衡這位神格唯一論的駁斥者。Praxeas 同時是一位反對孟他努主義者。他的教義也在非洲流傳。

(a) Praxeas, a martyr of Asia Minor, came with Victor to Rome, and gained an influence over this foe of Dynamistic Monarchianism by means of his Christology as well as by his anti-montanistic tendencies. His doctrine found acceptance also in Africa (Tert. c. Prax. 1).

父上帝出生，父上帝受苦，耶穌基督=父上帝，耶穌基督=上帝的兒子

**FATHER WAS BORN, FATHER SUFFERED**

**JESUS CHRIST = FATHER, JESUS CHRIST = SON**

He taught:

他是這樣教導的：「這時之後，父出生了，父受苦難。耶穌基督被稱為出生的父，受苦的父，上帝自己，無所不能的主」。因此，父與子是同一個位格。他用《聖經》來支持他的說法，特別是《以賽亞書》45：5；《約翰福音》10：30，14：9，10。

“After that time the Father was born and the Father suffered. Jesus Christ is proclaimed as the

Father born, the Father suffering, God himself, the omnipotent Lord” (Tert. adv. Prax. 2 init.). Father and Son are therefore the same person (ib. 5 init.). In support of this the Scriptures were appealed to, particularly Isa. 45.5; Jn. x. 30; xiv. 9, 10 (ib. 18, 20).

《聖經》用『上帝的兒子』一詞  
神格唯一論：一個位格，其中父與子可以被分辨

**BIBLICAL: USES TERM “SON OF GOD”**

**DYNAMIC MONARCHIAN: IN ONE PERSON, FATHER & SON = DISTINGUISHED**

這種主張顯露傾向正統的信仰，用了「上帝的兒子」這名詞，就像《聖經》的用法。可是它同時傾向於動力神格唯一論：當說明父與子的不同處的時候：

It reveals a leaning toward the orthodox view, employing the term, Son of God, in the Biblical sense – but at the same time an inclination toward Dynamistic Monarchianism – when distinction is, after all, made between the Father and the Son:

在一個位格裏，有兩位：父與子

**IN ONE PERSON, THERE’S TWO: FATHER AND SON**

「同樣地，在同一個位格中，他們分辨兩位，父與子，說：子就是肉體，即是，人，即是，耶穌；可是父乃是靈，即是，神，即是，基督。」

“And in like manner in the one person they distinguish the two, Father and Son, saying that the Son is the flesh, i.e., the man; i.e., Jesus; but that the Father is the Spirit, i.e., God, i.e., Christ” (ib. 27).

他們這樣避免斷言說父受苦（「因此，子誠然地受苦，可是父與子一同受苦」）。

In this way they avoided the assertion that the Father suffered (“Thus the Son indeed suffers (*patitur*), but the Father suffers with him” (*compatitur*); ib. 29; cf. Hipp. Ref. ix. 12).

**Noetus: 第三世紀初，在羅馬**

**NOETUS: EARLY 3<sup>rd</sup> CENTURY, ROME**

(b) Noetus of Smyrna and the adherents of his theory, Epigonus and Cleomenes, found again at Rome in the beginning of the third century an influential centre for the dissemination of their views (Hipp. Ref. i. 7), which were the same as those of Praxeas:

父=父，在出生之前；出生之後，父=子，自己之子

**FATHER = FATHER, BEFORE BORN; AFTER BORN, = SON, OF HIMSELF**

「當父還沒有出生之時，稱他為父是正確的；可是當他按照自己的美意順服，出生之後，他就成為子，就是自己的子，不是別人的子。」

“That when the Father had not yet been born, he was rightly called the Father; but when it had pleased him to submit to birth, having been born, he became the Son, he of himself and not of another” (Hipp. Ref. ix. 10).

基督自己就是父上帝；父=出生，受苦，死，復活

**CHRIST IS HIMSELF THE FATHER;**

**THE FATHER = BORN, SUFFERED, DIED, ROSE AGAIN**

「他說，基督自己就是父，父自己出生，受苦，死了。」因此，父也使自己復活。

“He said that Christ is himself the Father, and that the Father himself was born and suffered and died” (Hipp. c. Noet. 1). Thus the Father also called himself to life again (ib. 3).

基督是上帝，為我們受苦->能救我們；這是《聖經》所要求的信仰

**CHRIST = GOD, SUFFERED FOR US -> ABLE TO SAVE US**

**REQUIRED BY SCRIPTURE**

《聖經》要求我們這樣的相信。因此子被榮耀，救恩成為可能的：「因為基督就是上帝，為我們受苦，因為他自己就是父，好叫祂也能夠救贖我們。」

The Scriptures require us to believe this. Thus the Son is glorified (ib. 1) and thus salvation made possible: “For Christ was God and suffered for us, being the Father himself, in order that he might be able also to save us” (ib. 2).

特土良的分析：神格唯一論=一神論；可是認為三位一體的角色 = 可怕

**ANALYSIS (TERTULLIAN): MONOTHEISM, TERRIFIED AT ECONOMY (TRINITY)**

這些人堅持自己的理論，因為他們從信仰生活層面上關注基督完整的神性；這就是為什麼他們的影響廣遠。他們意圖堅持基督是上帝，但同時堅決維持上帝是一位，正如教會的信經（譯注：指《使徒信經》）所宣認的：『有些比較單純的人（還不算那些無知的，正如信眾的大多數是如此）被神格裡的區分嚇壞了，因為他們並不理解基督是一位，不過有自己的地位(economy, οικονομια)。他們認為三位一體既然是『三』，其中也有次序，就把一位的神分裂了。』

It was a religiously-inspired interest in the full divinity of Christ which led these men to insist upon their theory, and this accounts for their wide influence. They wished to maintain that Christ was God, and yet not waver in the assertion of the unity of God as confessed in the church's creed: "For some simple persons (not to say inconsiderate and ignorant, as is always the majority of believers) since the rule of faith itself leads us from the many gods of the world to the one and true God (cf. p. 85, n.), *not understanding that he is to be believed as being one but with his own economy* (οικονομία), are *terrified at this economy*. They think that the number and order of the Trinity implies a division of the unity" (Tert. adv. Prax. 3 init.).

### 撒伯流 SABELLIUS

神格唯一論最後的版本，就是撒伯流。

(c) The final form of this doctrine appears in Sabellius of Pentapolis (?) at Rome (under Zephyrinus and Callistus).

父，子，靈：不同名字，同一位格；

上帝是父，上帝是子，上帝是靈；靈，魂，體；熱，光，圓形

**FATHER, SON, SPIRIT – DIFFERENT NAMES, SAME PERSON**

**GOD IS FATHER; GOD IS SON; GOD IS SPIRIT**

**BODY-SOUL-SPIRIT; HEAT-LIGHT-ROUND**

父，子，靈只不過是同一個位格的不同稱謂，相等於祂啟示的不同程度或形式。上帝按照祂的本性來說，是子之父：「祂自己就是父；祂自己就是子；祂自己就是聖靈：正如我所說的，同一個位格有三個名字，就像人有體，魂，靈，或同一個太陽，有光所賜的能量，熱能，和圓的形狀。」

Father, Son, and spirit are only different designations of the same person, corresponding to the degree and form of his revelation. God is, in his nature, the Father of the Son (υιοπατωρ), Athan. Expos. Fid. 2): "He himself is the Father; he himself is the Son; he himself is the Holy Spirit – as I say that there are three names in one object (hypostasis), either as in man, body and soul and spirit ... or as, if it be in the sun, being in one object (I say) that there are three, having the energies of light-giving and heat and the form of roundness" (Epiph. h. 62.1; also Athanas. Orig. c. Arian. Iii. 36; iv. 2, 3, 9, 13, 25, 17). Cf. Zahn, Marcel. V. anc. 198-216.

聖父受苦說在西方的跟隨者；羅馬的主教

**PATRIPASSIAN ADHERENTS IN THE WEST; BISHOPS OF ROME**

(d) 聖父受苦說的基督論，在西方教會也有人提倡。在羅馬，有 Victor 主教等人

提倡，而當地教會有很多人附和。

The Patripassian Christology had its adherents in the West as well as in the east. In Rome, the bishops Victor (Ps.-Tert. ad omn. Haer. 8: “after all these a certain Praxeas introduced a heresy, which Victorinus sought to corroborate”), Aephyrinus (Hipp. Ref. ix. 7, 11), and Callistus (ib. ix. 11, 12) adopted it, with the assent of a large part of the local church.

希波理達反對：被認為是二神論

### **HIPPOLYTUS OPPOSED IT; CHARGED WITH DITHEISM**

希波理達和他的跟隨者反對神格唯一論；因此前者被指着為二神論。

Hippolytus and his following, who opposed it, were charged with Ditheism.

**Callistus:** 修訂了神格唯一論的基督論

父，子，靈=一，同一；聖靈道成肉身童貞女=父

耶穌的肉體=子

### **CALLISTUS: MODIFIED MONARCHIAN CHRISTOLOGY**

**FATHER, SON, SPIRIT = ONE, SAME**

**SPIRIT INCARNATE IN VIRGIN = FATHER**

**FLESH OF JESUS = SON**

主教 Callistus，考慮到教會的謹慎問題，不承認自己同意撒波流的說法；可是為了一致，覺得必須提倡一種修正的神格唯一論基督論。

Callistus, indeed, as bishop, upon grounds of ecclesiastical prudence, denied his agreement with Sabellius; but he felt himself compelled, for the sake of consistency, to advocate a somewhat modified Monarchianistic Christology.

父，子，靈，當然是『一，而同一的』，在童貞女裡道成肉身的靈，是與父同一的，可是耶穌的肉體應被成為『子』。

Father, Son, and Spirit are, of course, “one and the same,” and the Spirit who became incarnate in the Virgin is identical with the Father, but the flesh of Jesus is to be designated as “the Son;”

能見的人=子；聖靈住在人裏=父

### **THE MAN, VISIBLE = SON; SPIRIT DWELLING IN MAN = FATHER**

『因為能見的，就是那人，他就是子；可是住在子裡面的靈，他是父。』

“For that which is seen, which is the man, this is the Son; but the spirit dwelling in the Son, this is the Father.”

### 父與子一同受苦 **FATHER SUFFERED WITH THE SON**

因此，我們不應該說父受苦，反之『父與子一同受苦』。可是這只不過是 Praxeas 的教義，被 Callistus 用作為妥協的公式而已。

Therefore we should not, indeed, speak of a suffering by the Father, but “the Father suffered with (συρπεπονθεναι) the Son” (Hipp. Ref. ix. 12, p. 458). But this is simply the doctrine of Praxeas (see p. 167) used by Callistus as a formula of compromise.