

## 阿他那修 ATHANASIUS

[Reinhold Seeberg, *A Text-Book of the History of Doctrine*, pp. 206-215.]

阿他那修的三項強處（頁 206，從略）。

Three strengths of Athanasius (omitted, p. 206).

### I. 駁斥亞流主義 DENUNCIATION OF ARIANISM

1. 三一真神不是永恆；唯獨真神，在時間裏加上子，靈三位一體，從不存在到存在；還會再增多嗎？

**TRIUNE GOD IS NOT ETERNAL; SON+SPIRIT = ADDED TO UNITY IN TIME  
THREE-FOLDNESS COMES FROM NON-EXISTENT; MORE INCREASE?**

阿他那修清楚地認出，這教義會帶來那些不敬虔，違背基督教信仰的結果。亞流若是正確的話，那麼三一真神就不是永恆的；除了唯獨真神以外，還有子和靈，是在時間上加上（被造）的。那麼，『三』是從無有而存在的。那麼，誰可以保證，不會還有第四位等等呢？

Athanasius clearly recognized the unchristian and irreligious conclusions to which this doctrine leads. If Arius is right, then the triune God is not eternal; to the unity was added in time the Son and the Spirit. The three-foldness has come into existence from the non-existent. Who can assure us that there may not be a further increase?

### 2. 奉被造物之名施洗 BAPTISM IN NAME OF CREATURE

根據亞流的說法，洗禮乃是奉一位被造者的名施行的，因此，這樣的洗禮對人沒有什麼幫助。

According to Arius, baptism would be administered in the name of a creature, which can after all render us no aid.

### 3. 妥協父上帝的神性 FATHER'S DIVINITY AT RISK

亞流派不僅消除了三位一體；連聖父的神性也受到威協。這樣的說法等於說：父不是從來就是父：在時間的過程中，父有所改變，祂不是從來就有道，光，智慧與祂同在。

But not only is the Trinity thus dissolved by the Arians; even the divinity of the Father is imperiled. The Father has not always been Father – some change has taken place in him in the course of time, and he did not always have within him the Word, the Light, and Wisdom.

#### 4. 多神論 POLYTHEISM

再者，亞流主義在邏輯上將導致異教世界的多神論。唯有子與父共有同樣的本性和本質，我們才能說，上帝是一位。可是亞流主義者有兩位上帝；阿氏說：『他們必須說到兩位上帝，一位是創造者，另一位是被造的，他們敬拜兩位上帝，』這就導致希臘的多神宗教了。

Further, Arianism leads logically to the polytheism of the heathen world. Only if the Son partake of the same nature and substance as the Father, can we speak of One God. The Arians, on the contrary, have two different Gods: "It is necessary for them to speak of two Gods, one the creator and the other the created, and to worship two Lords," which leads to Greek polytheism.

(略譯：) 《啓示錄》 22：9 禁止人敬拜天使；所以，怎能敬拜一位受造者？ This is illustrated particularly in the worship rendered to Jesus in the church. It is heathenish to worship the creature instead of the Creator, and, according to Rev. 22:9, worship is not to be rendered even to the angels. "Who said to them that, having abandoned the worship of the created universe, they should proceed again to worship something created and made?"

#### 5. 破壞救恩的確據 DESTROYS SURE SALVATION

最重要的是，亞流主義破壞了得救的確據。羅格斯若能變（亞流主義者所一致堅持的），他怎能向我們啓示父？我們又怎能在他裡面看見父？『人若看見能變的，怎會想自己是看到不能變（上帝）？』

But, above all, the Arian view destroys the certainty of salvation. If the Logos is mutable, as the Arians consistently maintain, how can he reveal to us the Father, and how can we behold in him the Father? "How can he who beholds the mutable think that he is beholding the immutable?"

這樣一來，人就不可能獲得得救、與上帝交通、赦罪與永生的確據了。『因為，道若是被造的，他成為人，一生身為人，並沒有與上帝的本性有份：人怎能透過這樣的被造者與上帝的性情有份呢？...羅格斯若是被造的，他怎能在上帝永恆的計劃層面上改變上帝的旨意而赦免人的罪呢？』

In this way man can never reach the assurance of salvation, of fellowship with God, the forgiveness of his sins, and immortality: "For if, being a creature, he became man, he as man remained none the less such as he was, not partaking of God; for how could a creature by a creature partake of God? ... And how, if the Logos was a creature, would he be able to dissolve a decree of God and forgive sin?"

『因此，與一位被造者有份的人，不會獲得上帝的性情，除非子真正是上帝；人也不會與父上帝同等，除非那位穿上人的身體的（基督）同時在本性上真正是父的道。』

“Again, the man partaking of a creature would not be deified, unless the Son was truly God; and the man would not be equal with the Father, unless he who assumed the body was by nature also the true Logos of the Father.”

## 6. 無用，沒有意思的發明 **USELESS, SENSELESS INVENTION**

最後，這位上帝與世界之間的中介物，是一項完全無用，沒有意義的發明。創造萬物的上帝並不傲慢，祂願意直接與一位被造物接觸（譯注：指道成肉身）。若想像一位羅格斯出來並不改善情況，因為羅格斯被造了，那麼他與世界之間又須要中介，如此類推。

Finally, this median being between God and the world is an utterly useless and senseless invention. Neither is God too proud to come himself as Creator into direct touch with a creature, nor in that case would the matter be made any better by the supposed Logos, since at his creation also some median creature would have been necessary, and so on ad infinitum.

## 結論 **CONCLUSION**

因此，基督若不真正是上帝，與父同一本質，那麼三位一體的真理與洗禮都完了。多神論與敬拜被造物就會衝進教會；基督信徒的救恩就是虛妄的...

Hence, if Christ is not the true God and one substance with the Father, then it is all over with the Trinity and the baptismal-symbol; then polytheism and the worship of creatures are again introduced into the church; then the salvation of Christian believers comes to naught; and yet, after all, no logically tenable position has been reached.

因此，亞流的理論既不敬虔，也不合科學。

Thus the theory of Arius is just as impious as it is unscientific.

### II. 阿他那修論聖子的神性

#### **ATHANASIUS' DOCTRINE OF THE DIVINITY OF THE SON**

1. 聖父與聖子同出自同一體；神性只有一個起源，不是兩個  
**FATHER AND SON FROM SAME MONAD OF DIVINITY;  
THERE IS ONE ORIGINAL SOURCE OF DIVINITY, NOT TWO**

『基督既是上帝裡之上帝，既是上帝之道，智慧，兒子，能力，因此《聖經》宣告只有一位上帝。因為羅格斯，既是獨一真神的兒子，乃指向那位生祂的父(him

from whom he is), 以致父與子乃兩位, 上帝的神性卻是一 (monad of divinity), 不可分開, 不可分割。因此我們也可以說, 神性只有一個起初的來源, 沒有兩個來源; 因此上帝是一位 (a monarchy)。上帝的本性是一, 上帝的位格也是一 (譯注: 即, 父的位格與子的位格是同一類位格。)

“And since Christ is God of God and the Logos, Wisdom, Son, and Power of God, therefore, One God is proclaimed in the Holy Scriptures. For the Logos, being the Son of the one God, is referred back to him from whom he is, so that Father and Son are two, yet the monad of divinity is unseparated and undivided. Thus it might be said also that there is one original source of divinity and not two original sources, and hence, also correctly, that there is a monarchy ... the nature and the person are one.”

這些論調說明: 了解子的神性, 必須同時維護神性是一。不可以為『第二位上帝』留任何餘地。

These theses voice the conviction that the divinity of the Son must be understood with a distinct and conscious effort to guard the divine monad. No basis is left for the “second God.”

[ Athanasius was led to recognize the importance of this position by the conclusions which Arius had drawn from his “second God.” He may, perhaps, have been influenced also by the significant part played by Sabellianism in Egypt. In this case we have another illustration of the historical recognition of the element of truth lurking in a false theory. But the circumstance should not be overlooked that Athanasius labored in the West, where the consciousness of the unity of God was always more vivid than in the East, which was so unquestionably controlled by the formulas of the Logos idea. ]

## **2. 不可接受撒伯流的『子父』, 或『一性之上帝』; 這樣, 子就不存在了 NO SABELLIAN “SON-FATHER”, OR “SOLE-NATURED GOD”; THIS WAY, SON’S EXISTENCE = EXCLUDED**

可是阿他拿修不承認撒伯流主義者的『子父』(子其實就是父), 或只有一性之上帝, 因為這樣一來, 之的存在就被消除了。反之, 教會必須堅持, 子是獨立存在的, 子的有位格存在是永恆的(eternally personal existence of the Son), 同時必須堅持, 不可以想像『三個位格, 彼此分開的』, 這樣就會導致多神論。

But Athanasius will not recognize a son-Father with the Sabellians, nor a sole-natured God, for the existence of the Son would thus be excluded. On the contrary, the independent and eternally personal existence of the Son is a fixed premise, always bearing in mind that we are not to think of “three hypostases separated from one another,” which would lead to Polytheism.

父與子的關係有如河流與河的泉源一樣: 『正如一條河從泉源流出, 不可與泉源分開, 可是河與泉源是兩種形式, 有兩個稱謂, 同樣的, 父不是子, 子不是父。』

The relationship between the Father and the Son is rather like that between a fountain and the stream that gushes from it: “Just as a river springing from a fountain is not

separated from it, although there are two forms and two names, so neither is the Father the Son, nor the Son the Father.”

### 3. 神性（本質）只有一個：父子同質 ONE-NESS OF ESSENCE (HOMO-OUSIOS)

這樣的分辨，加上上帝的合一性，乃用『同質』(oneness of essence)一詞來表達。羅格斯是從父上帝的本性所生出的。至於羅格斯與被造物的關係，自然地，『子與被造物在起源和本性上都不同；同時，子與父是同一本性，兩者共有同一的本性。』

This distinction, as well as the unity, finds expression in the term “oneness of essence.” The Logos is a production, or generation, from the nature of the Father. As to his relation to created things, it follows that “the Son is different in origin and different in nature from created beings, and, on the other hand, is the same and of the same nature as the nature of the Father.”

因此他與被造者在本性上是『他者』(other-natured)，而他在本性上與父是同一的，就是說，他與父共有上帝的本質(divine substance)：子與父同質(*homoousios*)。

As he is thus other-natured than created beings, so he is same-natured with the Father, i.e., he shares with him the one divine substance (the Son is *homoousios* and of the *ousia* of the Father).

既是這樣，羅格斯是不能變的，是永恆的。

But if this is the case, then the Logos is immutable and eternal.

### 4. 父生子：不像人生孩子；沒有分割，不是從父分開 BEGETTING / GENERATION: NOT SAME AS HUMAN BEGETTING; NO DIVISION OF, NO SEPARATION FROM FATHER

子從父而『生』(begetting)。因為上帝的神性是絕對獨特的，我們不可以認為『生』是從父『流出』，或父的本質有所分割。

The Son comes forth from the Father by a begetting, or birth. In view of the unique character of the divine nature, we cannot here think of any outflow from the Father, nor any dividing of his substance.

『人的生子，和父生子是完全不同的。因為，人所生的（孩子），從某一種意義上來說，是生他的（父母的）一部分...人生孩子的時候，乃是從自己倒出。可是上帝既然是沒有部分的，是不能被分割的，他是毫無激情地為子之父。

“The begetting of men and that of the Son from the Father are different. For the things begotten of men are in some way parts of those who beget them ... men in begetting

pour forth from themselves. But God, being without parts, is without division and without passion the Father of the Son.

因為那位無軀體的（父）並沒有從自己流出什麼，也沒有什麼流進祂裡面，好像人一樣；反之，因為父的本性是簡一的，祂是那位獨一子之父。...這位就是道之父，在祂（道）裡面，可以看到那位沒有激情，沒有分割的父，和一切屬父的事。』

For neither does there take place any outflowing of the incorporeal One, nor any inflowing upon him, as with men; but, being simple in nature, he is the Father of the one and only Son. ... This is the Logos of the Father, in whom it is possible to behold that which is of the Father without passion or division.”

**5. 父生子不是因為父的意志，旨意；不是在時間中造出  
GENERATION NOT BY PURPOSE AND WILL OF FATHER;  
NOT CREATURE IN TIME**

同時，不是說『子由父的計劃和旨意而生』，因為這樣一來，子就被貶低，成為一個在時間中所創造的被造物，等於說：父首先決定要造他，然後就造了他。

Nor is it as though “the Son was begotten from the Father by purpose and will,” for thus the Son would be again degraded to the position of a creature created in time, one which the Father first determined to make and then made.

萬物都是由上帝的旨意所造，可是應該這樣理解子：『子是在一切上帝按祂旨意所創造的萬物以外；同時祂自己就是父的活的旨意，萬物都是在子裡被造成的。』

All things were created by the will of God, but of the Son it is to be said: “He is outside of the things created by the purpose [of God], and, on the other hand, he is himself the living purpose of the Father, in which all these things come into being.”

『而上帝的兒子自己就是道（羅格斯），就是智慧，就是上帝活生生的旨意與計劃，父的旨意就在子裡，子自己就是父的真理，父之光，父之能力。』

“But the Son of God is himself the Logos and wisdom, himself the counsel and the living purpose, and in him is the will of the Father, he himself is the truth and the light and the power of the Father.”

**6. 子是父的形象，其起源不是父自由（隨意）的旨意  
SON AS IMAGE OF FATHER, ORIGIN NOT ARBITRARY WILL OF FATHER**

子身為父的位格的真像，並不是來自父的意志的自由（隨意）作為。

As the very image of the Father’s person, he did not originate in an arbitrary act of the Father’s will.

## 7. 不是因為願望而生出；可是父愛子

### **NOT BEGOTTEN BY DESIRE; BUT FATHER LOVES SON**

可是這並不意味著父並不喜悅子。『因為子是因為愛（喜悅，慾望）而上，是一碼事；可是說父愛子，那位與他本性一樣的子，喜悅他，是另一碼事。』（譯注：前者是錯誤，後者乃正確。）

But this does not imply that the Son was not desired by the Father. “For it is one thing to say: he was begotten by desire, and another thing to say that the Father loves his Son, who is the same in nature as himself, and desires him.”

## 8. 兩個位格；羅格斯不是非位格的；

父生子，子受生，而是一，一個屬神的存有

父非子，子非父

**2 PERSONS; LOGOS NOT IMPERSONAL;**

**BEGETTING AND BEGOTTEN, YET ONE, A DIVINE BEING**

**FATHER IS NOT SON, SON IS NOT FATHER**

因此，子與父的關係，有如光輝與光的關係：『活的智慧，他在本性上是被發出的，就如光輝是光所發出的一樣。』因此，父與子是兩個位格（羅格斯不像人的話語，不是非位格的），就是『生者』與『受生者』；可是他們兩位，就是因為此關係，是『一』：一個神聖的存有。The Son is thus related to the Father as radiance to the light: “the living Counsel and truly by nature a production, as the radiance is a production of the light.” Father and Son are, therefore, two persons (the Logos is not impersonal, as the word of man), the Begetting and the Begotten; but they are again, by virtue of this same relationship, one – a divine Being:

『父是父，自己不是子；子是子，自己不是父；可是本性卻是一。因為那位受生的，不是與那位生他的不同，因為是他的真像(likeness)...因此，子並不是另一位上帝...。因為，子，身為受生者，若是另一位上帝，可是他身為上帝，是同一的，他與父本為一：在他們本性的獨特性和結構上，在他們神性的身份上，本為一。』

“The Father is Father and not himself Son, and the Son is Son and not himself Father, but the nature is one. For that which is begotten is not unlike him who begets, for it is his likeness ... therefore the Son is not another God. ... For if, indeed, the Son as a begotten being is another, yet as God he is the same, and he and the Father are one in the peculiarity and structure of their nature and in the identity of the one divinity.”

## 9. 『生』是永恒的（父在永恒生子）

### **GENERATION IS ETERNAL**

可是這個『生』與『受生』是永恆的生：『父的本性，是在永恆裡（不斷）生子。』『羅格斯顯然地是他自己，同時與父共存。』

But this relationship of the Begetting and the Begotten is an eternal one: “The Father was always by nature generating.” “It is evident that the Logos is both of himself and always existent with the Father.”

#### 10. 一而三，生與受生：不是兩位上帝；阿他那修 = 正統

##### **ONE AND THREE, BEGETTING AND BEGOTTEN: NOT TWO GODS; ATHANASIUS = ORTHODOX**

阿他那修以『一位神聖的存有』的觀念作為出發點，而這位上帝結果有雙重的生命（見下文）。子與父，身為『受生者』與『生者』，是對立的，兩個位格，可是不是兩位上帝。

Athanasius starts with the conception of the One divine Being, but this one God leads a double life (as to the triune feature, see below). As Begotten and Begetting, Son and Father stand opposed to one another as two persons, but not as two Gods.

他們的本性是同一的，他們有一樣的本性。這些的宣稱，都表達了教會自從使徒時代所相信的，所教導的基督論：一位上帝（神格），和聖子屬上帝的自稱。

They are one nature, of the same nature. In these declarations is really expressed all that the church had believed and taught concerning Christ since the days of the apostles: the one Godhead and the divine “I” of the Son.

#### 11. 避免神格唯一論和流行的基督論的錯誤

##### **AVOIDS ERRORS OF MONARCHIANISM, POPULAR CHRISTOLOGY**

阿氏結合了神格唯一論和大眾的基督論裡的一些零散真理（雖然這些包括了『第二位上帝』，『上帝的部分』等），和『父之道』；同時他小心翼翼地避免了一些觀念上與表達上的錯誤。

The elements of truth in Monarchianism and in the popular Christology, with their conceptions of the “second God,” the “divine part,” and the Logos of the Father, are all here combined and the errors of thought and expression carefully avoided.

#### 12. （西波爾：）一個新的，簡單的基督論方程式：

為著救贖是必需的

##### **(SEEBERG): ONE NEW, SIMPLE CHRISTOLOGICAL FORMULA; NECESSARY BECAUSE OF REDEMPTION**

古代的方程式，永不會以同樣的形式再教會（歷史）出現。阿他那修事實上提供了新的教義。他把關於基督的不同說法，約化為一個簡單的方程式。他也同時指出此方程式於救贖德國關係，因而堅立了它的必須性。

The ancient formulas can never recur in the church in the same shape. Athanasius really furnished something new. He reduced the manifold representations of Christ to a simple formula, and he established the necessity of this formula firmly by displaying its relation to the doctrine of redemption.

13. 缺欠：『質』一詞不夠清楚；一個有位格的上帝=只指父；  
上帝的性情不夠清晰；如何應用歷史啟示的原則在道成肉身上？  
**INADEQUACIES: OUSIA = INDEFINITE TERM;**  
**ONE PERSONAL GOD = ONLY FATHER;**  
**DIVINE PERSONALITY NOT DISTINCT ENOUGH;**  
**HOW TO APPLY PRINCIPLE OF HISTORICAL REVELATION IN INCARNATION?**

當然有不完美的地方。今天的神學家，除了認為他所用的支持經文欠佳以外，主要會批評阿他拿修的『質』一詞不夠確定；他一定會觀察到，阿氏的『一位有位格的上帝』僅是指父而已（『因此教會必須宣告一位上帝，就是道之父』；『父為泉源』）。今天的神學家也會要求，對上帝的位格性有更確定的承認，同時須應用『啟示的歷史性』的原則來理解基督的一生。

Imperfections, of course, still remain. The theologian to-day will find fault, in addition to the defectiveness of the scriptural proof, chiefly with the indefiniteness of the term *ousa*; he will not fail to observe that the one personal God of Athanasius is, after all, to a certain degree, only the Father (“and thus there will be proclaimed in the church one God, the Father of the Logos”; “the Father as the source” and fountain); and he will demand a more distinct recognition of the divine personality, as well as a proper application of the principle of historical revelation in connection with the life of Christ.

14. 我們必須繼續與這些問題掙扎  
**WE MUST STRUGGLE WITH SAME PROBLEMS**

阿他拿修試圖解決的問題日益復雜。可是我們不可否認，他已經最有智慧的使用當前所有的材料。今天的我們，手中既有《新約聖經》，必須承認阿他拿修所處理的問題是值得我們面對的，同時必須堅持『同質』，雖然可能從另外角度來理解，用不同論據支持。

The problem which Athanasius endeavored to solve thus becomes more complicated. But it will not be denied that Athanasius made the best possible use of the materials then at hand. And we can in our day, with the New Testament in hand, scarcely do otherwise than acknowledge the problem of Athanasius as one well worthy of our study, and – perhaps from other points of view, in other terms, and with other methods of proof – hold fast to the *homoousios*.