

- 西波爾 11 諾斯底主義 Seeberg Gnosticism 95-98 (C+E).doc
- 西波爾 12 游斯丁論異教 Seeberg Justin on Heathen 111-112 (C+E).doc
- 西波爾 13 羅格斯的教義 Seeberg Logos Doctrine 112-115 (C+E).doc
- 西波爾 14 教會共同信仰 Seeberg Common Faith 200 AD 138-140 (C+E).doc
- 西波爾 15 亞歷山太學派 Seeberg Alexandria Seeberg 140-141 (C+E).doc
- 西波爾 16 革利免 Seeberg Clement of Alexandria 141-146 (C+E).doc
- 西波爾 17 俄利根 Seeberg Origen 146-159 (C+E).doc
- 西波爾 18 神格唯一派 Seeberg Monarchianism 162-168(C+E).doc
- 西波爾 19 亞流 Seeberg Arius Arianism 202-205 (E+C).doc
- 西波爾 20 阿他拿修 Seeberg Athanasius 206-215 (E+C).doc

## 諾斯底主義 GNOSTICISM

(Reinhold Seeberg, *A Text-book of the History of Doctrines*, Vol. 1, pp. 95-98.)

(一) 靈界和物質世界是對立的，正如如上和下，善與惡對立一樣。

[1] The world of spirit and that of matter stand dualistically opposed to each other, as above and below, as good and bad.

(二) 現今世界乃是從靈界（豐滿，父自己等）放射或進化而來的。這靈界是由靈體激動的（靈體=感覺，原始的靈的行動，甚至是有位格的存有）。

[2] From the spirit-world (profundity, βυθοφ, the self-father, αυτοπατωρ, pleroma, πληρωμα), which is internally agitated by the aeons (αιωνεφ, sensations and emotions – movements of the primal spirit, or even personal entities, *substantiae*, Tert. Adv. Val. 4. Iren. ii. 13.10; 28.4), the present world appeared by emanation or evolution.

(三) 至高之神不是這世界的創造者；世界乃是由一位較低的存有，『造物主』，即猶太人的神所造的。（『因此這位造物主是整個世界的創造者，與至高神與魔鬼都不一樣，乃在他們兩者之間。』）世界甚至可能是由天使創造的。

[3] The creator of this world was not the supreme God, but a subordinate being, the Demiurge, or God of the Jews (e.g., Ep. Ptol. ad. Flor.: “And this Demiurge is hence also the creator of the whole world, being different from those other beings [the supreme God and the devil], occupying properly a place between them”), or even an angel.

(四) 在物質世界中，有靈界的殘餘存在；救贖過程的目的就是搭救這些殘餘。人按照他們構造中靈與物質的比例，分別是屬靈的，屬魂的和屬體的。這種分法可以用來描述基督教，猶太教，和異教。

[4] In the world of matter there exists a remnant from the spirit-world, and the deliverance of this remnant is the aim of the soteriological process. According to the proportion of spirit in the matter in their composition, men are spiritual (πνευματικοι), psychical (ψυξικοι), and carnal (σοματικοι) (e.g., Iren. i. 7. 5. Tert. adv. Val. 29). This classification may be used to characterize Christianity, Judaism, and Heathenism.

(五) 人裏的邪惡，乃是由於情欲（就像在異教徒身上）。靈乃是被囚在身體中：『這就解釋身體中的衝突，身體的結構是由彼此相爭的元素組成的。』『它從你的呼吸偏離：它試圖從那黑暗的混亂逃脫；也不知道如何越過。』諸多種類的鬼魔住

在人的靈魂裏，就如過路客在客棧一樣，傷害它，污染它。（華倫天奴。）因此罪遍及人類，因此罪是人性的一部分。

[5] Sensuousness constitutes (in true heathen fashion) the evil in men. The spirit is imprisoned in the body: “It explains the conflict in the body, that its structure (πλάσμα) is composed of warring elements (Hippol. Ref. v. 8, p. 154. Cf. the hymn of the Naasenes, ib. c. 10, p. 176: “From thy breath it wanders away – it seeks to flee from the black chaos – and does not know how to pass through,” etc.). Demons of many kinds have their abode in the soul of man, and injure and defile it as travelers an inn (Valent. In Clem. Al. Str. ii. 20. 114). From this results the universality of sin, and the fact that it is so natural to man (Basilid. In Clem. Al. Str. iv. 12. 83, in Hilgenfield, p. 208. Iren. iv. 27. 2.)

（六）救贖源於靈界。救贖主就是耶穌基督。關與祂的位格，有多種不同的描述。耶穌基督可能是一個屬天靈體（天使），住在一個身體裏，實行節制，因此達到人體的本性：『因為我們說，那能見的和那不能見的是同一性質的』（華倫天奴）。或說耶穌基督是一個靈體，穿上了一個本性屬魂的身體：既然它沒有激情，祂並沒有受苦，只是那屬魂的身體受苦罷了；這就是華倫天奴派的說法。

[6] Redemption originates in the world of spirit. The Redeemer is Jesus Christ. There are many and greatly variant delineations of his person. He is a celestial aeaon, which inhabits a body, practices self-restraint, and thus comes to of the same nature as the latter: “For we say of that which is seen, and of that which is unseen, that they are one nature” (Valen. In Clem. Al. Str. iii. 7.59, and in Photius Bibl. cod. 230. Vid. Hilgenf. 297, 302.) Or he is an aeaon which assumed a body formed of a psychic substance: being impassible, he did not suffer, but only his psychic body, – thus the school of Valentine (Iren. i. 6. 1; 7.2. Otherwise, Tertul. ad. Val. 39. 1).

更有者，耶穌其人乃有上帝的形象，藉著上帝特別的安排，有童真女馬利亞所生，他是上帝所揀選的；在他受洗的時候，基督這位靈體，或稱為『人』或『人子』的，與耶穌聯合（馬吉安）。

Or the man Jesus, bearing the image of God, and by a special dispensation born through Mary, is chosen by God; with him at his baptism the aeaon Christ, also called “Man” or “Son of man,” unites himself, – thus Marcion in Iren. i. 15. 3. Cf. Cerinthus in Iren. i. 26. 1. Carpocrates, Iren. i. 25. 1, 2. Ps.-Tert. adv. omn. h. 15. –

或者 Saturnil 認為，不受生的救主是沒有身體，不能見的，不過他像一個人。Basilides 認為基督以幻影方式出現，沒有肉體的本質，並沒有在猶太人手下受難，乃是西門代替他死的。他們都同意，歷史上的耶穌和屬天靈體的基督是截然不同的：抑或靈體住在一個像是身體的身體，不然認為耶穌其人乃是由靈體領導的。

Saturnil (“He held that the unbegotten Saviour was both incorporeal and invisible, but he thought that he appeared a man,” Iren. i. 24. 2) and Basilides (“That Christ came in phantasm, was without substance of flesh, did not suffer at the hands of the Jews, but instead of him Simon was crucified; Ps.-Tert. 4. Cf. Iren. i. 24. 4. Philaster 32, etc.) agree in discriminating sharply between the historical Jesus and the celestial Christ, either considering the celestial aeon as dwelling in an apparent body, or regarding the man Jesus as led and prompted by the aeon.

(七) 至於基督來的目的，是這樣說的：『眾人之父願意消除無知和消滅死亡。可是認識祂，稱為消除無知之法。』（馬吉安。）基督在 Naasenes 的聖詩中對父神說：『我有印記，我宣稱：我走過世世代代。我將展示一切的奧秘：我要展示眾神的樣式；那聖路的隱藏之事；我將呼召智慧（知識），并教導。』『我實實在在的告訴你們，你們要知道世界是如何成形的。』福音就是認識超越世界的事情的知識。『這本書就是透過隱藏的奧秘來認識不能見的神的諸般知識，這知識導致選民得生。』『這是一切知識的總和所居住的教義。』所以基督把知識帶到世界，這樣屬靈的分子被強化，從物質中被釋放。人的靈的自我意識從此開始，同時現在認識到恩典之途徑，和聖潔的方程式，這些都幫助它從世界上升，達到上面的境界。』

[7] In regard to the object of Christ's coming, it is to be said: “For the Father of all wished to dispel ignorance and destroy death. But the recognition of himself became the dispelling of ignorance” (Iren. i. 15. 2, Marcion). In the hymn of the Naasenes, Christ says to the Father: “Having the seals I shall affirm: I travel through all ages. I shall unfold all mysteries – I shall show the forms of the gods – the hidden things of the holy way – I shall summon wisdom (γῶσιφ) and teach” (Hipp. Ref. v. 10. Cf. also Pist.-Soph., p. 1 f. 182, 232: “Verily I say unto you, that ye shall know how the world, κόσμος, was formed,” vid. the enumeration, p. 206 ff.) The gospel is the knowledge of supermundane things (ἡ τῶν ὑπερκοσμίων γῶσιφ, Hipp. Ref. vii. 27, p. 376.) At the beginning of the Jeu-books, p. 142, it is said: “This is the book of the knowledges of the invisible God by means of the hidden mysteries which lead to the elect generation.” “This is the doctrine in which the entire sum of knowledge dwells.” Christ thus brings knowledge to the world, and thereby the spiritual elements are strengthened to release themselves from matter. The self-consciousness of the human spirit begins, and it now recognizes the means of grace and sacred formulas which aid it to rise from this world into that above.

(八) 救贖主要是給屬靈人的。『他們教導，這些人不是透過鍛煉而屬靈的，乃是本性就是屬靈的，他們無論在何處，必絕對得救。』那位唯一良善的父察看在基督裏的人的心，他們在『神的異像』中被光照，得福。那人現在與基督交通，聯合，

自己已是不朽的了（華倫天奴）。認識那位不能言諭者的知識就是救贖，可是這只與靈有關，與魂和體無關。這樣，靈透過知識就從情欲釋放，上升歸神。

[8] Redemption has to do chiefly with the pneumatic. “They teach that these are not only by practice, but by nature pneumatic, and will everywhere and absolutely be saved” (Iren. i. 6.2. Cf. Cl. Al. Str. v. 1. 3). The “only good Father” himself looks upon the heart of man in Christ, and it is illuminated and blessed in the vision of God. The man now lives bound to the Saviour in mutual fellowship, and has become in himself immortal (Val. In Cl. Al. Str. ii. 20. 114; v. 6. 52; iv. 13. 91 in Hilgenfeld, pp. 296, 301, 298). The knowledge (επιγνωσιφ) of the great Unutterable is redemption, but it has to do only with the spirit, and not with the soul or body (Iren. i. 21. 4; 7.5). Thus the spirit by knowledge becomes free from the oppression of the sensuous and mounts to God.

屬魂的人，即教會一般的信徒，可以藉信心和好行為得救。但屬肉體的必失喪。實際上，諾斯底主義者認為，他們的信徒們都是屬靈人。

The psychic, i.e., ordinary Christians in the church, may be saved through faith and works, but the hylic will be lost (Iren. i. 6. 2). In practical life the Gnostics regarded all their actual adherents as pneumatic (cf. Iren. i. 6. 1 fin.; iii. 15. 2. Hipp. Ref. v. 9, p. 174.)

（九）這些救贖觀帶來的道德觀，其重點就是對情欲的錯誤判斷。要就是一種嚴格的禁欲，或者就是放縱的情欲主義，因為他們有信心，沒有任何事會傷害這些蒙恩寵的人的。他們同時非常嚴厲地輕看教會裏的嚴謹道德，例如殉道。

[9] The moral philosophy accompanying these views of redemption was dominated by the false estimate of sensuousness, and assumed a double form (Iren. iii. 15. 2), either a strict ascetic abstinence (Iren. i. 24. 2. Hipp. Ref. v. 9, p. 170. Pist.-Sophh., pp. 250, 254 f.), or a lax carnality, confident that nothing could harm these favored ones, with scornful criticism of the strict morality of the church, as, for example, on the subject of martyrdom (Iren. i. 6. 2, 3; 25. 3; 28. 2; 31. 2. Cf. Al. Str. iv. 9. 73. Agrippa Cast., in Eus. h. e. iv. 7. 7. Isadore, in Cl. Al. Str. iii. 1. 1, assailes the “theatric ascetics.” Cf. also Plot. ii. 9. 15.)

（十）根據整個諾斯底主義的思想系統，他們并不相信死人復活，完全不同意早期教會的末世論。靈從肉體釋放，回到圓滿就是事情的結束了。

[10] In keeping with the whole trend of the system of Gnosticism, there is found in it no recognition of the resurrection of the dead, nor of the early Christian eschatology as a whole. The return of the spirit freed from matter to the pleroma marks the end (cf. Iren. i. 7. 1, 5. Tert. c. Val. 32.)

殉道者游斯丁論基督教，異教，猶太教

JUSTIN MARTYR

ON CHRISTIANITY, HEATHENISM, AND JUDAISM

(Reinhold Seeberg, *A Text-book of the History of Doctrines*, Vol. 1, pp. 111-112.)

只有基督教是安全的，有用的；基督的話充滿能力，靈

對異教反感：他們的宗教=愚蠢，不道德；他們的神=鬼魔

**CHRISTIANITY ONLY IS SAFE, USEFUL; CHRIST'S WORDS FULL OF POWER, SPIRIT**

**REPULSION TOWARD HEATHENISM: RELIGION = FOLLY, IMMORAL; GODS = DEMONS**

Of Christianity Justin Martyr declares: "I found that this philosophy only is safe and useful" (Dial. 8, cf. Tatian. 31. Melito in Eus. v. 26. 7, cf. Miltiades, ib. v. 17. 5). The "words of the savior" should be observed, for they are full of power and spirit (Dial. 8, 9). The attitude toward heathenism is one of repulsion. When the purpose is to show the necessity for Christianity, the religious life of heathenism is characterized as folly and immorality, and its gods as demons (cf. Just. Ap. i. 12, 14, 21. Dial. 79 fin., 83. Ath. 25 ff. 23. Minuc. 21 ff. Tert. 23. For Scriptural proof, Ps. 95.5 is quoted: "The gods of the heathen are demons" (διαμονια), and in connection with which the different meanings of the term διαμονιον in heathen and Christian parlance must not be overlooked).

哲學家，詩人促進偶像敬拜；他們的作品 = 受感於鬼魔，自我矛盾

異教中好的東西=從舊約聖經借過來的（舊約老得多）

三位一體，天使，上帝的兒子：在異教徒中以【神的眾子】出現

**PHILOSOPHERS, POETS PROMOTE IDOL WORSHIP; INSPIRED BY DEMONS**

**THEIR WORKS = SELF-CONTRADICTORY**

**THE GOOD IN HEATHEN = BORROWED FROM OLD TESTAMENT (OT = MUCH OLDER)**

**TRINITY, ANGELS, SON OF GOD = PARALLELED IN "SONS OF GOD" (POLYTHEISM)**

The philosophers and poets are only promoters of idolatry (Arist. 13), inspired by demons (Theoph. ii. 8); their productions are nothing but self-contradictory frivolity (Tat. Passim, Theoph. li. 8; iii. 2 f., 5 ff. Min. Fel. 38, Tert. 46). Whatever is undeniably good in them has been borrowed from the Jewish prophets, who far excel them in antiquity (Just. Ap. i. 44, 54, 59 f. Tat. 31, 40 f. Theop. i. 14; iii. 23; ii. 30, 37 fin. Minuc. 34. Tert. 47). But, on the other hand, the Trinity, angels, and the Son of God are represented as paralleled in Polytheism and in the heathen conception of "Sons of God" (vid. supra).

後來以基督出現的「道」，同樣住在哲學家  
 我們的教義較華美，因為「道的本性」在我們中間完全顯明  
 哲學家說的善，都因在思想中與「道」合作而成的  
 「道」在舊約只顯明一些種子；在基督裏完全顯明

**SAME LOGOS, WHICH APPEARED IN CHRIST LATER, DWELT AMONG PHILOSOPHERS  
 OUR DOCTRINES = MORE SPLENDID, FOR LOGOS-NATURE = REVEALED COMPLETELY IN US  
 EXCELLENT UTTERANCES = THRU COOPERATING WITH LOGOS IN CONTEMPLATION  
 ONLY LOGOS'S GERMS DWELLED IN OLD TESTAMENT; REVEALED COMPLETELY IN CHRIST**

In the philosophers of Gentile nations the same Logos was supposed to have dwelt that afterward appeared in Christ. "Our [doctrines] appear more splendid than all human teaching because the Christ revealed through us was the whole Logos-nature (το λογικον το ολον), body, intellect, and soul. For whatever things the philosophers and lawgivers excellently uttered or invented were wrought out by them through the co-operation of the Logos in discovery or contemplation" (Just. Ap. ii. 10). Only germs (σπερματα) of the Logos dwelt in the prophets, whereas he revealed himself completely in Christ.

異教徒寫的多有錯誤；柏拉圖對基督不完全陌生，但并不完全相同  
 所有根據道生活的都是基督徒，例如：蘇格拉底

**MUCH BY HEATHEN = WRONG; PLATO = NOT ALIEN TO CHRIST, BUT NOT ALL SAME  
 ALL WHO LIVE ACCORDING TO LOGOS = CHRISTIAN (e.g. SOCRATES, HERACLITUS)**

Hence much is found in heathen authors that is erroneous. Plato's teachings are thus related to the doctrines of Christ: "not alien (αλλοτρια) to Christ, but that they are not everywhere the same" (Just. Ap. ii. 13). Again, it is said, "Those living according to the Logos are Christians, " such as Socrates, Heraclitus, Abraham, Elijah," etc. (Just. Ap. i. 46; cf. Minuc. 20 init.)

舊約包含全部真理；由神默示；「道」在舊約聖經裏說話；  
 舊約先知的預言應驗了  
 因此，基督教不是新穎的宗教（駁斥 Celsus）

**OLD TESTAMENT CONTAINS ENTIRE TRUTH; INSPIRED; LOGOS SPOKE IN OT;  
 OT PROPHETS PROPHECY CORRECTLY  
 CHRISTIANITY, THEREFORE, NOT NEW RELIGION (=> CELSUS)**

The entire truth is contained in the primitive writings of the Old Testament prophets, for they were inspired; the Logos himself spoke in them; they correctly prophesied of future things (Just. Ap. i. 30 f., 36. Ath. 9: "Who, in the ecstasy of the thoughts within them, the divine Spirit moving them, gave utterance to the things they were impelled to utter, the Spirit using them as

a flute-player plays his flute. Cf. Just. Dial. 115.) Their utterances are, therefore, to be acknowledged even by the heathen as absolute proof of the truth. Christianity is, therefore, not a new religion, as Celsus charged (cf. Just. i. 53. Ath. 7, 9. Theoph. ii. 9, cf. 36, the Sybils. As to this evidence from prophecy, cf. also Celsus in Orig. c. Cels. lii. 26; viii. 12; vi. 2). The prophets taught One God, true morality, and future rewards and punishments (Theoph. ii. 34 fin.; iii. 9). Their writings contain the Christian truth (Just. Dial. 29).

因為猶太人心硬，上帝加上禮儀律

禮儀律隱約指向基督

可是猶太人用（傳統）取代了上帝的律法；他們不再是上帝的選民

外邦的基督徒乃是真正的以色列

**BECAUSE HARDNESS OF JEWS' HEARTS, CEREMONIAL LAW = ADDED**

**CEREMONIAL LAW CONTAINS VEILED REFERENCES TO CHRIST**

**BUT JEWS SUPPLANTED LAW OF GOD; THEY ARE NO LONGER PEOPLE OF GOD**

**GENTILE CHRISTIANS ARE NOW TRUE ISRAEL**

With their real spiritual contents, however, was combined, on account of the hardness of heart of the Jewish people, the ceremonial law (Just. Dial. 19-22, 42, 44, 46, 67), which contains also veiled references to Christ ("I say that a certain law was ordained for the cultivation of piety and right living, and a certain law and ceremony was also announced as a mystery of Christ, or on account of the hardness of your hearts," Dial. 44). The Jews have, by their doctrines (διδαγματα) supplanted those of God (Just. Dial. 78). They are, consequently, no more the people of God. In accordance with the prophecies, Christians from the heathen world are now the people of God and the true Israel (Just. Dial. 25, 26, 123, 135 fin.).

## 『道』的教義（早期護教士：游斯丁等人）

### THE LOGOS DOCTRINE

(Early Apologists: Justin Martyr *et al*)

(Reinhold Seeberg, *A Text-book of the History of Doctrines*,  
1895 / 1952, pp. 112-115).

有一位上帝，是世界的創造者、美飾者、和保存著。不能見的上帝是不受生的，無名的，永恆的，不可知的（不能測度的）、不變的存有；沒有需要，沒有激情。祂從無有創造了世界，使物質成形（給了物質「形式」）。（物質從某種方法被生，由上帝創造，上帝用物質造了世界，使世界成形（使之得到「形式」））。雖然如此，永活上帝的真實本性是沒有表達出來的。（護教士們）僅有抽象的觀念，就是：上帝的存有就是絕對沒有屬性的存在。

There is one God, the Creator, Adorner, and Preserver of the world. The invisible God is an unbegotten, nameless, eternal, incomprehensible, unchangeable Being, without any needs and free from all passions. He created the world out of nothingness and gave form to matter. (“That in some way matter was begotten, created by God, from which God made and formed the world”). Yet, with all this, the true nature of the living God does not find expression. There is no advance beyond the mere abstract conception that the Divine Being is absolute attribute-less Existence.

在這兩項作為中（即：創造物質，和創造世界），上帝用了子作中保。可是不可從神話式的意義來理解子。子是上帝的『道』（Logos）。這是知識分子階層非常喜歡用的詞匯。只要提到『道』，就能引起大家的興趣。可是教會選用個名詞的事實說明，他們的思想集中在被榮耀的基督身上。他們若主要想到耶穌這個人，則可能把他說成『第二位蘇格拉底』。可是他們的觀念是，『道』是神、在神裏面、與神同在，因此選了『道』這個名詞，以便對異教徒清楚解釋。

In both operations, God employed the Son as a mediator. This is not to be understood in a mythological sense. He is the Logos of God. This was a favorite term of the cultured classes. Whenever it was mentioned, the interest of all was at once secured. But that precisely this term was chosen proves how entirely the thoughts of the church were centered in the exalted Christ. If they had thought chiefly of the man Jesus, they might have easily characterized him as a second Socrates. But they thought of him as God, in God, and with God, and hence selected a term such as “Logos,” in order to make the matter plain to the heathen.

上帝起初是孤存的，可是因祂擁有的理性功能，在祂裏面有『道』。藉著上帝簡單的意志行動，道就生出。祂是父頭生的作為。『頭生者 ... 不是得到存有，因為從起初以來，上帝既是永恆的聰明，在祂裏面就有道，祂是永遠有道性的。』

*Originally God was alone, but by virtue of the reasoning faculty (λογικη δυναμις) belonging to him he had in himself the Logos. By a simple exercise of his will, the Logos sprang forth (προπηδα). He is the first-born work of the Father. “The first begotten thing ... not as coming into being, for from the beginning God,*

*being eternal intelligence, νοος, had in himself the Logos, being eternally Logos-natured, λογικος*’.

關於『道』的起源是這樣說的：『這能力是從父的權能和計劃而生的；不是由分隔而生。父的本性並沒有被分。』就像火，點了另外一把火時，並沒有變小，『而被點燃的第二把火，也同樣地沒有比第一把火小』。道不是天使，乃有神性；是神聖的 (theos)，可是不是神自己 (ho theos)。對父來說，道是他者，他物，是另外一位，卻不是另一個心意 (mind)：『受生的是另外一位，與生他的有別，我們都承認這點。』因此道與父一起是上帝，我們理當唯獨敬拜他，像唯獨敬拜父一樣。

Of the manner in which the Logos originated, it is said: ***“This power was begotten from the power of the Father and his counsel; but not by a separation, as though the nature of the Father were distributed,”*** i.e., somewhat as a fire does not diminish another by which it is enkindled, “and that which is taken away from it appears to be also the same and does not diminish that from which it was taken”. ***He is not an angel, but divine; divine (θεος), but not God himself (ο θεος). In respect to the Father, he is something else (ετερον τι) and another (αλλοσ τι), and is such in number but not in mind, γνωμη:*** “And that which is begotten is other in number than that which begets, as everyone must confess”). ***Thus the Logos is God together with the Father,*** and to him alone, as to the Father, is worship due.

上帝透過道來啟示祂自己。道就是在舊約向人顯現的那位。他是上帝的使者，『我們的教師與使徒』，被顯明的上帝。上帝決定要創造世界的時候，他就生出了他在自己裏面有的『道』，成為說話的道。

Through the Logos, God has revealed himself. He it is who in the Old Testament period appears to men. He is the messenger of God, “our teacher and apostle,” God revealed, γνωριζομενος. ***When God determined to create the world, he begat the word which he had in himself (λογος ενδιαθετος) as the word uttering itself in speech (logos προφορικοφ).***

奧利金（俄利根）：『道從來就是住在上帝的心中。因為萬物被造之前，上帝就有這位策士，就是祂自己的理性和旨意。但當上帝決定要造祂所願意造的被造物的時候，祂就生出這道，就是所有被造物的頭生者，上帝自己沒有傾倒出祂的道，乃是生出了道，而無時不與道有關係。』因此，基督就是上帝裏頭的理性，上帝賜給這『道』分開的存在。身為上帝的理性，祂不僅僅在創造之時，和在舊約先知中工作，而且也在世界的智慧者（哲學家）中運行。

For the use of the terms by the Stoics and Philo, cf. Heinze, *Die Lehre vom Logos*, p. 140 ff., 231 f.; Orig. c. Cels. vi. 5: “... ***the Logos always existing resident in the heart of God. For before anything was created, he had this counselor, which was his own reason (νοος) and purpose (φρονησιφ). But when God determined to make whatever he desired, he begat this Logos as the word (προφορικοφ), the first-born of the whole creation, he himself not being emptied of the Logos, but begetting the Logos, and always remaining associated with his Logos.***” ... ***Christ is, therefore, the Reason imminent (sic: immanent) in God, to which God granted a separate existence. As the***

*divine Reason, he was not only operative at the creation and in the Old Testament prophets, but also in the wise men of the heathen world.*

『道』這個哲學觀念決定了基督教的思想，雖然我們不應該忽略兩者之間的分別：基督教作者的『道』是一個獨立的位格。他們無條件地承認基督屬神的位格。當約翰『道』的觀念被認為是與斯多亞哲學的『道』平衡時，我們必須這樣理解：它只是思想的外形（雖然它的影響力是驚人的），用來介紹『道』給世界認識。

The philosophical conception of the Logos here determines Christian thought, although the important difference must not be overlooked, that the Logos of the Christian writers in an independent personality. The divine person of Christ is acknowledged without any limitations; and when the Johannine conception of the Logos is presented as parallel with that of the Stoic philosophy, it must be understood merely as an outward clothing of the thought (momentous indeed in its consequences) in such a way as to commend it to the heathen world.

除了『道』以外，還提到了『上帝的智慧』，或『聖潔先知的靈』；不過相比之下，後者並不突出。不過，三一神論的確是共同信仰的一點。... 護教士雖然不常說到這個奧秘，可是這卻為他們帶來最深奧的難題，因此在他們心中造成最高的願望：『我們只被這願望催使：要看見上帝，和與上帝同在的道。子與父合一，是怎樣的合一？父與子的相通是怎樣的相通？聖靈又怎麼樣？靈，子，父之間的聯合與分別又在哪裏？』

Along with the “Word” is mentioned also the Wisdom of God, or the holy prophetic Spirit; but comparatively little prominence is given to the latter. But the Trinity is certainly an article of the common faith. The term, Τριῶς, occurs first in Theoph. ii. 15. Although the Apologists find little occasion to speak of this mystery, the apprehension of it constitutes for them the profoundest problem and the supreme desire of their hearts: “Carried with this desire only, to see God and the Logos with him. What is the unity of the Son with the Father? What the fellowship of the Father with the Son? What the Spirit? what the union and the difference of those who are thus united – the Spirit, the Son, and the Father?”

**基督的工作。**上帝的道，在道成肉身之前只是聖潔的靈；他成為人，由同貞女馬利亞所生。護教士堅持他有肉體的人性：『他成為一個人，完全能受苦難，道成肉身，』可是他因為這樣而成為一個普通的人，而是既是神也是人；他的神性隱藏在他的肉身裏，他藉著他的生命與工作作見證。『因為，他既然像上帝，又是完全的人，他將他的兩性置於我們之上。』關於他，是這樣說的：『上帝受苦了。』根據這一點，不是一個人人在十字架上受死刑，而是上帝的兒子，就是基督與父，與先知的靈一同尊重的。他們引用先知來支持這觀點。

**THE WORK OF CHRIST.** The Logos of God, who, before the incarnation, was only a holy spirit (πνεῦμα ἅγιον), became man, born of the Virgin Mary. The full reality of his bodily human nature is firmly held: “He became a man, truly subject to suffering, made incarnate,” σεσωματοποιησθαι, yet he was not by any means on that

account only a man in the ordinary sense, but God and man; his divinity was concealed in his flesh (την αὐτοῦ κεκρυμμένην ἐν σαρκὶ θεοτητα) and he attested both in his life and work. “For, being alike both God and perfect man, he placed his two natures over us.” It is said of him: “God suffered” (ὁ πεπονθὼς θεοφ). Accordingly, he is now not a man executed upon the cross, but the Son of God, whom Christians honor next to the Father (ἐν δευτέρᾳ χῶρᾳ ἐχόντεφ), and together with the prophetic Spirit. This view is supported by quotations from the prophets.

對基督的工作的定義，首先強調他成為全人類的教師，正如他道成肉身之前已經顯現自己。他教導的內容就是：一神的觀念；新的律法，要求人過一個滿有美德的生活；和不朽，嚴格來說就是復活，帶來獎賞與懲罰。Aristides 這樣向皇帝報導基督徒的聖經的教導：『為要你從他們的經書學習，皇上，認識它們的話語與誠名，和他們事奉是多麼的榮耀，他們期待根據他們每人所作的獎賞，就是期待在來世得到的。』

In defining the work of Christ, it is first of all emphasized that he became the teacher of the race (καίνοσ νομοθετηφ), as he had already shown himself before his incarnation. The content of his teaching is found in the ideas of the One God; the new law, requiring a virtuous life; and immortality (αφθαρσια), more strictly speaking, the resurrection, bringing with it rewards and punishments. Aristides thus reports to the Emperor what is contained in the Christian Scripture: “But you may learn from their writings, O King, to know their words and their commandments, and the glorious character of their service, and the expectation of compensating reward according to the deeds done by each of them, which they expect in the other world.”

人有能力遵守這些誠命，因為上帝造人是自由的。雖然人，藉著違背上帝的誠命而墮落，要承受死亡，他還是有自由決定，向上帝悔改，信靠上帝...

Man has the ability to keep these commandments, since God created him free. Although man, by disobeying the commandments of God, fell and became subject to death, he is, nevertheless, still free to decide for God through faith and repentance....

大公教會的信仰，主後 200 年  
**COMMON (CATHOLIC) FAITH OF THE CHURCH, 200 A.D.**  
 (Reinhold Seeberg, *Text-book of the History of Doctrines*, pp. 138-140.)

教會此時能正面說出教義；諾斯底主義來自異教的影響

**CHURCH NOW CAN STATE DOCTRINE POSITIVELY; GNOSTICISM = HEATHEN-INFLUENCED**

Let us now glance backward. We have discovered the elements of the common faith of the church at the close of the second century. The church round herself in a position to establish a positive doctrine ("I believed what it was proper for me to believe") in opposition to Gnosticism. It traced the Gnostic view to heathen influences.

一位上帝：公義良善，創造主，保存者，掌管者，救贖主

一位上帝，可是不是孤獨的：羅格斯

另外：上帝是三：特土良：本質，位格

**ONE GOD: RIGHTEOUS & GOOD, CREATOR, PRESERVER, RULER, SAVIOR**

**ONE GOD, NOT LONELY: REFERENCE TO LOGOS;**

**ALSO: GOD IS THREE; TERTULLIAN: SUBSTANCE, PERSON**

The fundamental features of the church's doctrine were as follows: (1) One God, who is righteous and good, the Creator, Preserver, Ruler, and Savior of the world. The one God is not a lonely God. In maintaining this, reference was had to the speculations of the Apologists concerning the Logos, but, independently of these, it was regarded as fixed that we are to acknowledge a three-fold Ego in God (Iren.). Tertullian endeavored to explain this relation by introducing the conceptions of substance and person.

人的邪惡不是因為有肉體，而因為自由意志的選擇

與亞當的最有關，可是說不清楚；墮落的人仍然有自由、能選擇

**MAN'S EVIL NOT BECAUSE OF FLESH/SENSUOUS NATURE, BUT ACT OF FREE WILL**

**CONNECTION = WITH ADAM'S SIN, NOT CLEAR; FALLEN MAN = FREE TO CHOOSE**

(2) The evil in man is not implied in the fact of his sensuous nature, but in an act of his free will. The connection of the sin of Adam is emphasized, but no way is found to consistently carry out the idea. Even fallen man is free to choose "either part."

無條件堅持基督的神性與人性；兩個本質（特土良）

救贖：愛之律；不朽

其他方面：基督為第二亞當；聖靈使我們與上帝相交；作上帝的兒子；

罪得赦免；魔鬼權勢削弱；與上帝和好，等

**UNCONDITIONALLY MAINTAIN CHRIST'S DIVINITY, HUMANITY; TWO SUBSTANCES**

**SALVATION: LAW OF LOVE; IMMORTALITY**

**OTHERS: CHRIST 2<sup>nd</sup> ADAM, OUR SOURCE, SPIRIT BRINGS US FELLOWSHIP WITH GOD;**

**SONSHIP; FORGIVENESS OF SINS; DEVIL WEAKENED; RECONCILIATION WITH GOD; ETC.**

(3) The reality of the divinity and humanity of Christ is to be maintained unconditionally in the interest of redemption. His personal life is composed of two substances (Tert.). The salvation which he brought consists, first, in the law of love which he taught, and whose observance he made possible; then, immortality. Upon the latter the emphasis is laid. Together with this, other scriptural ideas, especially of a Pauline and Johannine type, are still influential and of a practical significance, e.g.: Christ, as the second Adam, the source for us and the leaven in us; the Spirit, as making the fulfillment of the law possible and bringing to us fellowship with God; sonship to God; the forgiveness of sins; the weakening of the devil; our reconciliation with God, etc.

宣講福音給人福音，洗禮施行救恩；救恩：由信心接受；接受基督，接受【教義】

可是信心乃接著聖靈工作而喚醒；與上帝合一=必須的

信心使人稱義 = 信心激發人遵守上帝的誠命

**PREACHING OF GOSPEL IMPARTS SALVATION, BAPTISM APPLIES SALVATION**

**SALVATION = APPREHENDED BY FAITH; FAITH = ACCEPTANCE OF CHRIST/DOCTRINE**

**BUT FAITH IS AWAKENED BY SPIRIT'S OPERATION; UNION WITH GOD = NEEDED FOR FAITH**

**FAITH JUSTIFIES: FAITH INCITES OBEDIENCE OF GOD'S COMMANDMENTS**

(4) The preaching of the gospel imparts salvation, and baptism applies it to the individual. It is apprehended in faith. It is, indeed, a portentous turn of thought, when faith is represented as the acceptance and acknowledgment of Christ, or as obedience, and its object as "doctrine;" but this position is, after all, practically neutralized in part by the assertion that faith cannot be awakened without the operation of the Spirit, and is inconceivable without a life in union with God and holy love. If it is said that faith justifies man, this is meant substantially in the sense of an inciting to the fulfillment of the divine commandments.

特土良：用律法觀念論述救贖，為西方教會的神學鋪路

**TERTULLIAN: LEGAL SCHEME OF SALVATION, PREPARES FOR WESTERN CHURCH'S THEOLOGY**

Tertullian, by treating the relation of God and man in a legal scheme, prepared the way for the

later development of doctrine in the Western Church.

身體復活：與基督徒生活有關

**BODY'S RESURRECTION: RELATED TO CHRISTIAN LIVING**

(5) These ideas find their consummation in the resurrection of the flesh, which the teachers of the period seek not only to propagate as a doctrine, but to understand in its relation to the practical religious life of believers.

基督教 = 原始基督教；準則 = 《聖經》+ 洗禮的信仰宣告

主教傳遞，保證教會所堅持的真理；《聖經》以外還有教會傳統（補充）

**CHRISTIANITY = PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY: SCRIPTURE + BAPTISM CONFESSION = NORM  
BISHOP CARRIES, GUARANTEES TRUTH HELD; CHURCH TRADITION ALONGSIDE SCRIPTURE**

(6) In all of this, these men were conscious that they represented the original Christianity, and were able to attest their views as primitively Christian by the customary criteria of Scripture and the baptismal confession. These positions were, indeed, further developed in the acknowledgment of the episcopacy as the bearer and guarantor of the truth thus held, and in the admission of ecclesiastical tradition to a place by the side of scriptural authority.

因為與諾斯底主義沖突，教會在教義上合一

**BECAUSE OF CONFLICT WITH GNOSTICISM, CHURCH ATTAINS UNITY IN DOCTRINE**

It is a result of the great conflict with Gnosticism, that the church first attained her unity as a teaching church – in her doctrine. The unity of the church embraces the elements absolutely essential if the church and Christianity are to continue in existence. That this unity consists in the pure doctrine is, leaving separate considerations out of view, a result of the conflict with Gnosticism.

反對諾斯底主義的教父：沒有新的教義；100 與 200 年的基督教信仰 = 一樣

**ANTI-GNOSTIC FATHERS: NOTHING NEW; CHRISTIANITY 200 = SAME AS CHRISTIANITY 100**

The Anti-Gnostic Fathers were, broadly speaking, right in their general conception, as against the position of their opponents. They did not really present anything new, not even a distinctly enlarged understanding of Christianity. Their conception of Christian truth and life is that which prevailed already at the close of the first and the beginning of the second century.

唯一不同：駁斥異端使教義更清楚，更獨特  
教義=更與《聖經》，傳統連接

**ONLY DIFFERENCE: OPPOSITION -> MORE CLEAR, MORE DISTINCT,  
DOCTRINE = MORE RELATED TO SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION**

The only peculiarity is that the opposition encountered compelled them to greater distinctness and lucidity, as well as to deliberate utterances with respect to the canon and doctrinal tradition. The essential content of Christianity is still held to be faith in the Triune God and in Christ, the Son of God and man, observance of the new law, and the hope of immortality. As formerly, so now, religious life found nourishment in the reflections, that Christ has delivered us and brought to us the forgiveness of sins; that grace saves us; that the believer leads a life in Christ and with Christ, etc.: but there was no certainty in the treatment of these ideas.

事實上，教父們在駁斥諾斯底主義時，使用了世俗的觀念

**IN REALITY, IN OPPOSING GNOSTICISM,  
CHURCH FATHERS USED SECULAR THOUGHT**

In the last analysis, it is the chief thing that he who observes the commandment of love becomes a child of God and a partaker of immortality. In reality, use was made for spiritual edification of more material than was taken account of in the books of the age – a fact which is of great importance in explaining the vigorous opposition to Gnosticism.

## 亞歷山太教父們的神學

### THE THEOLOGY OF THE ALEXANDRINE FATHERS

(Reinhold Seeberg, *Text-book of the History of Doctrines*, pp. 140-141.)

福音與希臘哲學的融合： 200

**FUSION OF GOSPEL TRUTH WITH GREEK THOUGHT: CA. 200 A.D.**

We have noted the league formed in Alexandria between the Jewish spirit and the Hellenic philosophy, which produced the type of thought represented by Philo. A similar compact appears in the same locality toward the end of the second century. Hellenistic learning and gospel truth are associated in the most astonishing way. The catechetical schools at Alexandria provided the basis for this movement, and it was promoted by Pantaenus, Clement, and Origen (cf., as to the pedagogical method of Origen, the Panegyricus of Greg. Thaum., c. 6-15).

目標：達到諾斯底主義的高深境界，同時不妥協教會的信仰

**GOAL: SECURE Gnostics' PROFUNDITY, WITHOUT SURRENDERING CHURCH'S FAITH**

It was sought to secure what had been attained by the most profound researches of the Gnostics, in the belief that this could be done without surrendering the church's rule of faith. The Gnostics and Apologists were here excelled.

基督教=文學學科之一種，與世俗文學一樣

對後來希臘神學影響深遠

**CHRISTIANITY: A SCIENCE IN LITERARY FORMS, ALONG SECULAR LITERATURE**

**PROFOUND INFLUENCE ON LATER GREEK THEOLOGY**

Christianity became a science in literary forms which assumed a place of equal rank by the side of secular literature. This explains the unbounded veneration and admiration with which Origen was regarded. The movement was of inestimable significance in the history of Greek theology. It is associated distinctly with the name of Origen. The teachings of Clement claim our attention only as preparatory in their character.

亞歷山太的革利免

**CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA**

(Reinhold Seeberg, *A Text-book of the History of Doctrines*, 141-146.)

希臘哲學精神 + 基督教信仰； 只有一個真理，殊途同歸

**GREEK SPIRIT + CHRISTIAN FAITH; ONE TRUTH, ALL LINES CONVERGE**

The Greek spirit is in Clement combined with the faith of the church in a way characteristically fresh and unsophisticated. The difficulties encountered do not disturb him. He was a talented dilettante, with the virtues and the vices which belong to such a character. He held that there is but one truth, in which all lines eventually converge.

上帝給猶太人律法，給希臘人哲學

哲學是基督徒的教師，使之從信心上升到知識，

根據教會的準則

新約，舊約聖經：以靈意解經調和

得救必須信心，信心指向更高的知識

**GOD GAVE JEWS THE LAW, GREEKS PHILOSOPHY**

**PHILOSOPHY = TEACHER FOR CHRISTIAN TO RISE FROM FAITH TO KNOWLEDGE,**

**ACCORDING TO CHURCH'S CANON**

**OT & NT = COMPROMISED WITH ALLEGORICAL INTERPRETATION**

**FAITH = NECESSARY TO SALVATION, POINTS BEYOND TO KNOWLEDGE**

God gave to the Jews the law, and to the Greeks philosophy. "For it (philosophy) led the Grecian world to Christ as did the law the Hebrews" (Str. i. 5. P. 331; vi. 17. 823; 5. 762). He spoke of the philosophers as borrowing material from the Old Testament (Str. v. 14. 699 ff. This was not the case, however, with their idolatry, Protr. 2). Philosophy he regarded as still possessing a pedagogical significance for every Christian who rises from bare faith (*ψιλη πιστιφ*) to *Gnosis*. But this occurs according to the canon of the church (*κατα κανονα εκκλησιαστικον*, Str. vii. 855; vi. 15. 803). Following Philo, Clement effects a compromise with the letter of the Old and New Testaments by allegorical interpretation (cf. Str. vi. 15. 806 f.). Faith in revelation is necessary to salvation. Such faith is sufficient, but points beyond itself to *Gnosis* (Str. ii. 2. 432; v. 1. 643; vii. 10. 864 f.: "to believe is the foundation of gnosis"). Hence, "to know is more than to believe" (Str. vi. 14. 794). Faith is the outward acceptance of God and of the doctrine of Christ in the literal sense, from fear and respect for authority (e.g., Str. ii. 12; v. i. 643; vii. 12. 873 f.).

有知識的人（有諾斯底的人）被開啟了，在異像中生活，為善而行善，愛上帝  
 避免罪的情欲，看自己是上帝的兒子，不是上帝的僕人  
 禱告：與上帝為友；追求更大的奧秘

**THE Gnostic LIVES IN INITIATED VISION, DO GOOD FOR ITS OWN SAKE, IN LOVE TO GOD  
 AVOIDS SINFUL DESIRES, REGARDS SELF AS CHILD OF GOD, NOT SERVANT  
 PRAYS – COMPANIONSHIP WITH GOD; SEEKS GREAT MYSTERIES**

The Gnostic, on the other hand, lives in initiated vision (εποπτική θεωρία), apprehending salvation inwardly and comprehending it (Str. vi. 10; i. 2. 327). He does not do that which is good for the sake of expected reward, but for its own sake, in love to God (Str. iv. 18. 614; iv. 22. 625). He avoids not only actual sin, but also every motion of sinful desire (Str. ii. 11. 455; vi. 12. 789 f.). He regards himself, not as a servant, but as a child of God (Str. vii. 2. 831). He prays always, for prayer is companionship with God (Str. vii. 7. 851 ff., 854; vii. 2. 875). If he who simply believes (απλῶς πεπιστευκῶς) requires the purifications (καθαρσία), or minor mysteries (μικρά μυστήρια) of the church, the Gnostic needs the great (μεγάλα) mysteries, the εποπτεία (Protr. Sec. 1, p. 9; sec. 12. Str. v. 11. 689). This is the royal way.

愛上帝的人，就進到上帝裏面：兩種基督徒生活

**HE WHO LOVES GOD, MAKES HIS WAY INTO GOD: TWO FORMS OF CHRISTIANITY**

“By as much as anyone loves God, by so much the more does he make his way into God (Quis div. salv. 27 fin.). Thus there result two forms of Christianity. In contrast with the barely believing, uncultivated beginner, inclined to externalities, stands the Christian who beholds the mysteries of God, and who, with heart and understanding, receives God to abiding fellowship. The Stoic discrimination between the wise and the advancing (προκοπτοντες) is here transferred to Christianity. There are now Christians of a first and of a second class. Thus the evacuation of the conception of faith by means of the bare orthodoxy which is satisfied with outward belief (Str. i. 9. 342 f.) is noted, but also granted honorable recognition, while at the same time a way of escape, although a dangerous one, from that error is discovered. The “Gnostic” of Clement really stands higher than his “believer.”

上帝是超自然（本性）的存有；創造者，沒有屬性  
 基督=上帝的道（羅格斯），從開始就是動性的  
 使世界存在，給先知、哲學家真理

**GOD = BEING BEYOND NATURE, CREATOR, NO ATTRIBUTES**  
**CHRIST IS LOGOS OF GOD, ACTIVE IN WORLD FROM BEGINNING,**  
**GIVES EXISTENCE TO WORLD, OFFERS TRUTH IN PROPHETS, PHILOSOPHERS**

The separate doctrines in Clement – as the objects of faith and knowledge – may be readily passed in review. The One God, who is Being beyond nature (*επεκεινα της ουσιας*), and without attributes (e.g. Str. v. 12. 695 f.; v. 11. 689), is the Creator of the world. The formula and the conception of the Trinity constantly recur (Str. v. 14. 710; cf. Exc. Ex Theod. 80. Protr. 12 init. Paed. i. 6. 123; also iii. 12. 311. Quis div. salv. 42 fin. Adumbr., p. 88, Zahn). Christ is the Logos of God (distinct from the paternal Logos, *πατρικος λογος*, Hypot. In Photius Bibl. cod. 109). In him God is known. He has been from the beginning present and active in the world, giving it existence and offering the truth in prophets and philosophers.

基督已經成為人：教導人如何正確生活

**CHRIST HAS BECOME MAN: INSTRUCTS IN RIGHT LIVING**

He has now become man. “Christ was, indeed, in ancient times this Logos and [the cause] of our being ... and of our well-being; but now this same Logos has appeared to men, the only One both God and man, the cause of all things good to us, by whom, having been thoroughly instructed in right living, we are conducted to eternal life” (Protr. 1, p. 6). He was a man with a human body and soul (cf., “impassible as to his soul,” Paed. 1. 2, p. 99).

革利免：幻影說？基督吃食物，好叫我們認為他有身體

**CLEMENT: DOCETISM? CHRIST ATE SO WE THINK HE HAS BODY**

Clement seeks, although without success, to avoid Docetism: “But in the case of the Savior [to suppose] that the body, as a body, demanded the aids necessary for duration would be ridiculous. For he ate, not for the sake of the body sustained by holy power, but in order that those with him might not be induced to think otherwise concerning him, just as, indeed, afterward some thought that he was manifested in seeming (*δοκησει*). But he was entirely impassible, upon whom no emotional impulse, whether of joy or grief, could manage to exert its power” (Str. vi. 9. 775; cf. iii. 7. 538. Adumbr., p. 87, Zahn.)

基督死，做贖價：革利免有否教導挽回祭？

基督是教師，領導，頒佈律法者，達到不朽之路

**CHRIST DIED AS RANSOM; PROPITIATION?**

**CHRIST IS TEACHER, LEADER, LAWGIVER, WAY TO IMMORTALITY**

Christ surrendered his life to death for us, became a ransom (λυτρον) for us, and overcame the devil (Quis div., p. 37. Paed. iii. 12, p. 310, i. 5. 111; i. 11 fin. Protr. 11 init.). Not much importance is, however, attached to the conception of Christ as the propitiation (ιλασμοσ; vid. e.g. Paed. iii. 6, p. 310). He grows eloquent, on the other hand, in extolling the Logos as a teacher beyond compare, as leader and lawgiver, and as the way to immortality (Protr. 11, p. 86: "For if the Teacher who has filled all things with his holy powers, creation, salvation, goodness, legislation, prophecy, instruction, now as Teacher instructs us in all things, Athens and Greece also already knew everything in the Logos," ib. p. 88 f., sec. 12, p. 91. Paed. i. 3, p. 102 f., i. 6. 113. Protr. i. p. 8: "The Logos ... having become man, just in order that thou also mightiest learn from a man how at any time a man might become divine;" cf. Paed. i. 12. 156. Str. iv. 23. 632; vii. 10. 865.) Christ, as God, forgives sins, and his humanity serves the purposes of moral instruction: "As God, forgiving sins; but as man, leading to avoid continuance in sin" (Paed. i. 3 init.).

人必須遵守基督的教訓，愛別人

人在罪中被捆綁；但是有自由意志行善，有自由意志相信

上帝提供救恩；人有能力掌握

**MAN: OBEY CHRIST'S TEACHING, LOVE OTHERS**

**MAN = BOUND IN SIN; BUT HE HAS FREE WILL TO DO GOOD, HAVE FAITH**

**GOD OFFERS SALVATION; MAN HAS POWER TO GRASP IT**

Man, upon his part, is to render obedience to the teaching of Christ, and, with a view to reward, exercise love toward others, in accordance with the commandments (Protr. 11, p. 89 f. Paed. i. 3. 102). Clement knows full well that man lies bound in the fetters of sin (Protr. li. Init. Paed. iii. 12. 307: "For to sin continually is natural and common to all"), but this does not prevent him from most strongly emphasizing his free-will (αυτεξουσιον) or the "in our power" (εφ ημιν, Str. vi. 12. 788). "But he desires that we may be saved from ourselves" (ib.). Thus man is free to do good and to exercise faith (Str. iv. 24. 633; ii. 15. 462; iii. 9. 540). God offers salvation, and man has power to grasp it: "Just as the physician furnishes health to those who labor with him for health, so also does God furnish eternal salvation to those working with him for knowledge and prosperity" (Str. vii. 7. 860).

人最先的愿望就是信心；然後敬畏，盼望，悔改；目標：愛心，知識  
信心：同意，明白所宣講的事；得救必須有信心；可是信心指向愛心，知識

**FIRST INCLINATION IS FAITH; THEN FEAR, HOPE, REPENTANCE;**

**GOAL: LOVE, KNOWLEDGE**

**FAITH: ASSENT, PERCEPTION CONCERNING THINGS SPOKEN**

**FAITH: NECESSARY FOR SALVATION; BUT POINTS TO LOVE, KNOWLEDGE**

The first right inclination (η πρωτη προφ σωτηριαν νευσιφ) is faith. Then follow fear, hope, repentance (μετανοια). The goal is reached in love (αγαπη) and knowledge (γνωσιφ) (Str. ii. 6. 445). Faith is an “assent” (συγκαταθεσιφ) and a “perception of the mind (προληψιφ διανοιαφ) concerning the things spoken” (Str. ii. 12.458; 2. 437, 432). Inasmuch as faith is a necessary preliminary to salvation, our salvation may be ascribed to it (Str. ii. 12. 457 f.: “Faith is strength for salvation and power for eternal life;” Paed. i. 6. 116: “The one universal salvation of the human race is faith”). But this faith points beyond itself to knowledge and love (vid. supra; cf. Str. ii. 11. 454: “reasonable,” δοξαστικη, and “intelligent,” επιστημονικη, faith).

信心只是同意；沒有提到保羅的因信稱義

**FAITH = MERE ASSENT; PAUL’S JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH IS ABSENT**

This was a necessary inference when faith was regarded as merely an assent, or a persuasion to comply with the commandments (πειθεσθαι ταιφ εντολαιφ, ib.). With such an idea of faith, Paul’s doctrine of justification is untenable: “Righteousness is two-fold: that produced by love and that produced by fear” (Str. vii. 12. 879). The “Gnostic” has complete righteousness. This is illustrated in Abraham’s faith and righteousness: “For example, to Abraham, having become a believer, it was accounted for righteousness; to him, having advanced to that which is greater and more perfect than faith,” etc. (Str. vi. 12. 791; cf. vii. 14. 885). Thus, then, the believer of his free will decides for God and his law, advancing from mere faith and the righteousness which attaches to it to knowledge and love, to continual inward fellowship with God, to a life of faith and uninterrupted holy activity, to genuine righteousness. Here the moral ideal is attained; the lust of the world has vanished: “He is not strenuous, but in a state of calmness” (Str. iv. 22. 625). Yet, on the other hand, it is maintained with all earnestness that “only the well-doing which is for the sake of love, or for the sake of the beautiful itself, is chosen by the Gnostic.” He lives and labors in the world without love for the world (e.g., Str. iii. 7. 537; vi. 12. 790; vii. 12. 874-878). He attains to right conduct (κατορθωμα), whereas the simple believer (απλωφ πιστοφ) reaches only median conduct (μεση πραξιφ), according to the Stoic terminology (Str. vi. 14. 796).

透過洗禮，人得救，進入教會；罪得赦免，現在能夠領受救恩

**SALVATION THROUGH BAPTISM INTO CHURCH:**

**CLEANSING FROM SIN, NOW CAPABLE OF RECEIVING SALVATION**

**NEW MAN, SONSHIP, PERFECTION, IMMORTALITY = THROUGH BAPTISM**

The individual, however, secures his salvation only in connection with the church and its agency (Paed. iii. 12 fin.; i. 6. 123, 114: "His desire is the salvation of men; and this has been called the church"). Hierarchical aims are entirely foreign to Clement (cf. Str. vi. 13. 793). It is baptism which makes one a member of the church and a partaker of salvation. It brings the cleansing from sin, and thus the capability of apprehending the salvation which the teaching of the church offers. Thus one becomes through baptism a new man. Sonship, perfection, immortality have become his in faith (initially) through baptism (Paed. i. 6. 113: "Having been baptized, we are illuminated; having been illuminated, we are made sons; having been made sons, we are perfected; having been perfected, we are made superior to death." P. 114: "Thus nothing but believing and being born again is perfection in life.")

永恒救主的永恒救恩：罪由聖靈除去；

我們沒有攔阻能看見靈，我們能看見屬上帝的事，聖靈從天上流到我們

**ETERNAL SALVATION OF ETERNAL SAVIOR: SINS = ERASED BY SPIRIT;**

**WE HAVE FREE UNHINDERED VISION OF THE SPIRIT, WE BEHOLD DIVINE THINGS,**

**THE HOLY SPIRIT STREAMS IN UPON US FROM HEAVEN**

Ib.: "This doctrine, μαθημα, is the eternal salvation of the eternal Savior. ... We, the baptized, having erased our beclouding sins, the condemnation of darkness, by the divine Spirit, have the free and unhindered and bright vision of the Spirit; by which alone we behold divine things, the Holy Spirit streaming in upon us from heaven." P. 116: "Therefore we have washed away all our sins, and are immediately no longer evil. This is the one grace of illumination, viz., to be no longer the same as before, or to have cleansed the way. But when knowledge, γνωσιφ, appears, together with illumination ... the unlearned are learned – whenever this learning may have been added; for thou has not [power] to tell the time. For instruction indeed leads up to faith, but faith is taught together with baptism by the Holy Spirit"). God cleanses sins committed after baptism by disciplinary sufferings (Str. iv. 24. 634).

聖餐：讓我們能與不朽有份；

酒與水混合，滋潤我們的信心，聖靈帶我們到不朽

**EUCHARIST: BESTOWS PARTICIPATION IN IMMORTALITY**

**MIXED WINE NOURISHES TO FAITH, SPIRIT LEADES TO IMMORTALITY**

The Eucharist, according to Clement, bestows participation in immortality. The communicant enters into fellowship with Christ and the divine Spirit. “On the one hand, the mixed wine nourishes to faith; on the other hand, the Spirit leads to immortality. The commingling anew in both of the potion and the Word is called the eucharist, a blessed and beautiful [gift of] grace, of which those who partake in faith are sanctified in both body and soul” (Paed. ii. 2. 177 f.; cf. i. 6. 125.) These are the Christian mysteries (vid. Prot. 12, p. 91 ff.). But this all points beyond itself to the unshrouded knowledge of the “great mysteries” (vid. supra, p. 142). This is the Christian life: “right living, together with due appropriation of knowledge – for the perception of the truth and the fulfillment of the commandments” (Str. i. 1. 318; cf. vi. 12. 788: “both in learning and in exercise”).

### 身體復活

#### **RESURRECTION OF THE BODY**

Clement taught the resurrection of the body. He appears to have accepted the possibility of a conversion after death (Str. vii. 2 fin.; 16. 895), without giving prominence to the idea. [Note 1: Clement expresses himself as against the theory of the pre-existence of souls (Eclog. 17). It is not taught in Str. v. 16. 808, nor in Quis div. salv. 33 fin.)

## 俄利根 ORIGEN

[From Reinhold Seeberg, *A Text-book of the History of Doctrine*, pp. 146-159.]

### 新柏拉圖主義的影響：靈意解經 NEO-PLATONIC INFLUENCE; ALLEGORIAL INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE

新柏拉圖主義：上帝是抽象存有；透過普世的靈魂（萬物的秩序）進入世界；人的靈魂在物質裏被囚，渴望從情欲中釋放，藉神秘的儀式和禁欲生活；存有分等級，上帝至靈魂；靈魂回歸上帝；萬物=無限者的副本  
**Neo-Platonism: God – Abstract Existence;**  
**God Advanced thru Conceived Order of Things (Universal Soul) -> World**  
**Man’s Soul = Imprisoned in Matter,**  
**Longs to Escape the Sensuous through Mystic Rites and Asceticism;**  
**Gradation of Being, God to Soul, Soul Returns to God; All = Copies of Infinite**

俄利根比革利免更多正面的神學建設，可是革利免比俄利根更合乎基督教信仰。他們的時代是新柏拉圖主義控制思想的時代，其出發點是『上帝』：一個抽象的存在。上帝用祂的『神聖思想』(divine Thought)，萬物的架構，『宇宙的靈魂』等觀念與世界接觸。世上的人都被囚在物質中。他們的任務是透過禁欲生活，神秘的象征儀式和巔峰經歷，從情欲中釋放。『唯一的救贖就是回歸向上帝。』...

Origen is more positive than Clement, but Clement is more Christian than Origen. It was the age when Neoplatonism was beginning to control thought. Starting with God as the abstract Existence (το ην), advance was made through the divine Thought (νουφ), the conceived order of things (κοσμοφ νοητοφ), the universal soul (η των ολου ψυχη), to this world, in which the souls of men live imprisoned in matter (υλη). The task before them is escape from the sensuous by asceticism and ecstasy, through the medium of mystical symbolic rites. “The only salvation is a turning toward God.” In the great longing which broods over this conception lies its significance.

宇宙有不同等級的存有，從上帝到靈魂；這些存有透過他們的『形式』滲透萬事和所有的宗教。一切事物，都是無限者的副本。靈魂透過暗示，中介，和象征追求歸向上帝。整個思想系統有著音樂式的節奏：從上帝到靈魂，從靈魂到上帝。

There is a gradation of being, extending from God to the soul, which penetrates through all things and all religions with their forms. All things are but copies of the infinite. Again, the soul aspires to God through all possible suggestions, means, and symbols. All things draw it upward. A wonderful musical rhythm resounds through this structure of thought: from God to the soul, and from the soul to God.

俄利根：第一位把教義系統化；可是不是完全一致

信心的準則：《聖經》是權威，被系統化；可是解經方法則『屬靈』（靈意）

**Origen – First Dogmatic System; But not Always Consistent**

**Rule of Faith: Scripture Authoritative and Systematized;**

**But Interpretation of Scripture is “Spiritual”/Allegorical**

新柏拉圖主義的思想，對俄利根并不陌生。他所著的《原道》，是基督教歷史上第一本系統神學，書中有一套哲學系統，雖然不完全一致。不過俄利根是一位正統的基督徒。他相信《聖經》裏有真理；他在沒有在教義上做結論之前，事先提出一個已經完整的『信仰準則』，就是教會的教導。『沒有處理這些個別的題目之前，我們須要劃出一條線，一個準則。』

This trend of thought was not unknown to Origen. His work, *De principiis* – the first attempt to construct a system of dogmatics – contains a philosophical system, although not consistently adhered to. But Origen is an orthodox Christian. The Scriptures contain the truth; and he sets forth in advance of his own doctrinal conclusions a completed rule of faith, the teaching of the church, *ecclesiastica praedicationis*. “It seems necessary before [treating of] these separate points to lay down a certain line and a plain rule.”

這些基要的元素須被組織起來，加上應用《聖經》的教訓，或《聖經》的必需推論。不過，應該用『屬靈』（即：喻意）方法解釋。因此，俄利根在《聖經》裏能找到他的獨特主張。他把喻意解經發展成為一個系統。似乎互相矛盾的經文，或外表好像粗魯的意思，乃隱藏一個『更深的思想』。聖靈用一個『屬靈的外衣』遮蓋這思想。俄利根宣稱一些不可能發生的事，好讓他強調，這些事不可能在肉體發生，例如：肉眼能見的樂園，上帝在樂園中行走等；路 10：4；太 5：39，20 起；林前 9：9；多處《舊約聖經》的敘述；耶穌歷史的一些特征，福音書的一些記載，和一些沒有發生過的事。

These “elements and fundamentals” are to be brought together, with the application of the things which the Scripture teaches, or which result from the teaching as a necessary consequence. But the Scriptures are to be interpreted “spiritually,” or allegorically. Thus Origen was enabled to find his peculiar opinions in them. He developed the allegorical interpretation systematically. Passages which seem contradictory, or which have a crass external sense, conceal a “deeper thought.” The Holy Spirit veiled the thought by means of a “cloak of spiritual things.” Impossible things are asserted in order to call attention to the fact that the occurrences could not have taken place corporeally, as, e.g., the visible paradise and the walking of God therein; Lk. 10:4; Matt. 5:39, 29f.; I Cor. 9:9; many narrations of the Old Testament; some features in the history of Jesus and in the Gospels other things which did not happen.

《聖經》有三重意義：普羅大眾只會相信權威：怕被懲罰  
 知識分子的基督徒是純潔的，不犯罪，從普羅大眾的字義解經上升；  
 基督不單是醫生，也是教導奧秘的教師

**3-fold Sense of Scripture; Masses Believes on Authority – Fears Punishment  
 Intellectual Christian, Pure and Not Sinning, Rises Above Masses’ Literal Sense;  
 Christ Not Only Physician, But Teacher of Mysteries**

俄利根訴諸箴言 22: 20 起，來教導《聖經》有三重意義：屬肉體的，字義的意義；屬魂的，道德的意義；和屬靈的，猜測的意義。他將歷史性和教義性的經文，都服在這原則下。他可以在各種經文找到他自己的教義。基督教的用詞，能用來裝飾一些差不多不是基督教概念。另外，這解經法能讓他隱藏福音的愚拙，和高舉福音為智慧。

Appealing to Prov. 22:20f., Origen teaches a three-fold sense of Scripture: the somatic, literal sense; the psychical, moral sense; and the pneumatic, speculative sense. Historical and doctrinal passages are alike subject to this rule. He finds his own doctrine everywhere. Christian language adorns ideas which are but slightly Christian. On the other hand, this method enables him to conceal the foolishness of the gospel and to glorify it as wisdom.

沒有教育的普羅大眾，只能透過他們『赤裸，沒有理性的信心』來依靠字義的意義。他們稱上帝為創造主，可是他們心目中的上帝乃是一個粗魯，不公義的人。他們對《聖經》關於審判的教義，以字義了解，而不是把審判看為潔淨；因為他們作基督徒，不外因為恐懼而已。這是低層的信心；有文化的信徒比他們更高級，後者根據基督的吩咐來查考、學習《聖經》，以了解經文的屬靈內容。因此，當思想基督的死的時侯，他會默想他與基督同釘十字架。他了解基督為什麼在平原醫治患病者，可是與門徒則到山上。對他們來說，基督是教師，不再是醫生(『因此屬神的羅格斯被差遣作罪人的醫治者，但是對那些已經潔淨，不再犯罪的人，作教師。』)

The simpler class and the multitude depend upon the *ipse dixit* and cling to the literal sense with their “bare and unreasoning faith.” They speak of God as the Creator, but think of him as a coarse and unjust man. They understand literally, and not in the sense of purifying, what the Scriptures say of judgment, and it is nothing but the fear of the judgment which makes them Christians. This is a lower plane, above which the cultured believer rises, searching the Scriptures as Christ has commanded, and learning to understand their spiritual contents. Thus, when contemplating the death of Christ, he reflects that he is crucified with Christ. He understands why Christ heals the sick upon the plain, but ascends the mountain with the disciples. Christ is for him the teacher, and no longer the physician (“Therefore the divine Logos was sent to be a physician to sinners, but to be a teacher of divine mysteries to those already pure and no longer sinning”).

基督徒起步時的信心是根據權威的信心，因為懼怕懲罰而從罪中潔淨；之後有更高的階段，就是理解和洞悉的階段。俄利根認為這更高的層次基本上是理性

的，因此退步到革利免可是他的思想敏銳，看見基督教與哲學比較來說的優點乃是：基督教能提供敬虔和救贖，甚至對普羅大眾也是如此。

The Christian starts out with faith based upon authority and with cleansing from sin in the fear of punishment; there follows the higher stage, of understanding and insight. Origen thinks of this higher stage as essentially intellectual, taking thus a step backward toward Clement. He has, however, the acuteness to recognize it as a special advantage possessed by Christianity, compared with philosophy, that it is able to offer piety and salvation even to the mass of the common people.

### 俄利根的上帝論 ORIGEN'S DOCTRINE OF GOD

希臘的觀念：上帝是靈，上帝的光；  
上帝是存有，也超越存有；上帝有理性的本性，不受物質世界限制，  
不可透知，沒有激情，超越任何的需要；單一，在所有部分都是獨一的；  
他是理性，是一切理性的來源；  
這來源是有位格的：是創造者，保存者，公義，良善的統治者  
上帝是律法與福音之神；以公義行善，以良善懲罰  
人的靈可以相對地認識神；在某程度上使自己從物質釋放  
**Grecian Idea: God is Spirit; God is Light;**  
**God is Being, Beyond Being;**  
**Has Intellectual Nature, Free From Material World;**  
**Incomprehensible, Impassible, Beyond Need of Anything;**  
**One and Solitary in Each Part; He is Mind and Source of All Intellect/Mind**  
**Source = Personality: Creator, Preserver, Just and Good Governor**  
**He is God of Law and Gospels; Does Good with Justice, Punishes with Goodness**  
**Man's Spirit Attains Relative Knowledge of God;**  
**To An Extent, Frees Self from Matter**

『上帝是靈』，『上帝是光』：俄利根這樣開始他的上帝論。可是他受到希臘的觀念所限制。『上帝是存有，同時超越存有』（『在那存有的超越處，在上帝的權能與本性』）。上帝是『理性的本質』，不受任何物質所限制，不被時間空間限制。因此上帝是『不能理解，無可測度，沒有感情，超越任何需要（缺欠）』，等等。

“God is a Spirit,” “God is light” – thus does Origen introduce his discussion of the doctrine of God. Yet he remains within the limitations of the Grecian idea. “God is Being, and beyond Being” (“in the Over-beyond of Being, in the power and nature of God”). He is an “intellectual nature,” free from everything material, not limited by space and time. Accordingly, he is “incomprehensible, inestimable, impassible, beyond want of anything,” etc.

『上帝的每一部分都是獨一』和所謂『單一』的，他同時是思想(mind)，也是一切原始理性本質或思想的來源。』可是這位世界的起源同時是一個位格。他是世界的創造者，保存著和統治者。他的統治是公義的，良善的：『這位上帝是公義，良善

的，他是律法之上帝也是福音之上帝；他以公義行善，以良善施行懲罰。』人的靈能對上帝有相對的認識，按照他脫離物質的程度。

“He is in every part solitary” and, so to speak, a unit (*henas*), “at once mind and the source whence is derived the beginning of all intellectual nature or mind.” But this Source of the world is, on the other hand, conceived of as a personality. He is the Creator, Preserver, and Governor of the world. In this government he is just and good: “This one and the same [God] is just and good, the God of the law and of the gospels; he does good with justice, and punishes with goodness.” The spirit of man attains a relative knowledge of God, and this in proportion as he severs himself from matter.

上帝為父；在子，他的形象中可以被認識；

子出自父：這是父的旨意；【受生】乃是永恒的作為，父永遠在【生】子；

本質上的合一：放射；兩個位格，一位上帝；一個思想，一個旨意

**God is Father; Recognizable in the Son, His Image;**

**Son Proceeds from Father as His Will;**

**Begetting Is An Eternal Act, Father Always Begetting;**

**Unity of Substance – Emanation;**

**Two Persons (Hypostases), One God; One Thought, One Will**

唯獨的上帝，主要是父上帝。我們透過子，就是上帝的形象，上帝明亮的冠冕，祂的智慧與道（羅格斯）來認識（父）上帝。子從父而出，不是透過怎樣的分割，乃是以屬靈的方法而出，藉著父的旨意。在上帝裏的一切既然都是永恒的，父生子也是一個永恒的作為：『父并不是生了子就在子生出之後讓子釋放，父乃是永遠地生子。』

The One God is primarily God the Father. We recognize him in the Son, who is his image, his radiant crown, his wisdom (*sapientia*) and his Logos. The Son proceeds from the Father, not by any kind of division, but in a spiritual way, somewhat as his will. Since everything in God is eternal, the begetting of the Son is also an eternal act: “The Father did not beget the Son and set him free after he was begotten, but he is always begetting him.”

因此子沒有在時間中的開始。『沒有任何時刻，子不存在』（『所有被造的至長者（最老者）』）。根據這點，子與父的關係乃是本質的關係：『上帝權能的氣，上帝榮耀的放射...這些都說明，子與父有著本質的相通(communion of substance)。因為放射乃是同質的，與放射或氣的源頭同質。』

Accordingly the Son has no temporal beginning. “There is not when he was not” (“the eldest of all created things”). Upon the basis of this, the relation to the Father is that of unity of substance: “a vapor of the power, *virtus*, of God, an emanation of his glory ... they show most clearly that there is in the Son a communion of substance with the Father. For an emanation (*aporrhoea*) is seen to be *homousian*, i.e., of one substance with the body of which it is an emanation, or vapor.”

子既然是這樣地透過擁有相同的本質而與父為一 (one with the Father)，他自己同時卻是一個存有者，一個個別的位格 (a separate hypostasis)，有自己完整的存在模式 (subsistence)。因此有兩個位格 (hypostases)，可是一位上帝。『因此我們敬拜真理之父和真實的子，兩個位格 (two things in hypostasis)，可是思想同一，和諧合一，意志同一。』兩個位格有同一個意志和同一的作為（『不再是兩個意志，而是一個』）。

If the Son is thus one with the Father through possession of the same nature (ousia), he is yet, on the other hand, himself a being, a separate *hypostasis*, or complete in his own subsistence (*in propria subsistentia effectus*). There are two hypostases here, but One God. “Therefore we worship the Father of truth and the true Son, being two things in hypostasis, but one in sameness of thought and in harmony, and in sameness of will.” The two hypostases have the same will and the same activity (“to there being no longer two wills, but one will”).

父與子在神性中完全同等；子卻是『第二位上帝』，依附父；

他是良善的，真的，藉著放射；

基督乃是執行父（旨意）者；俄利根反對向基督禱告

**Complete Equality in Divinity; Yet Son is “Second God,” Dependent on Father;**

**He is Good and True, as Emanation;**

**Christ is Executive Officer of Father; Origen Objects to Prayers to Christ**

『同質』似乎須要子與父完全同等，同樣地是上帝。雖然如此，俄利根思想中有從屬主義的因素。子是『第二位上帝』。子是上帝，可是是以父的形象存在的。他不是那絕對良善者與絕對真理，而是因為他是父上帝的放射與形象而是良善的，是真理。父與子的作為也是如此。基督是父的執行職員，實行父上帝的吩咐，例如：創造宇宙。

The *homoousios* appears to require the complete equality of the divinity of the Son and the Father. None the less, we meet with Subordinationistic features in Origen. The Son is the “second God.” He is God, but as the image of the Father. He is not the absolutely Good and True, but he is good and true as an emanation and image of the Father. The same is true of their activity. Christ is the executive officer (*uperetes*) of the Father, carrying out his instructions, as, e.g., at the creation.

從另一方面可以看出俄利根這種趨向：他拒絕毫無保留地允許基督徒向耶穌禱告。基督徒應向父上帝祈求，禱告乃由基督向父獻呈。但是在其他地方，他卻堅持我們只應該向父與基督禱告，向基督禱告好叫祂把禱告帶到父上帝面前。俄利根沒有禁止教會通行的向基督的禱告，可是在教義上他有反對的理由。因此俄利根的『道』的教義反映了他的時代的思想。基督是上帝，正如父是上帝，與上帝一樣永恒；可是基督是『第二位上帝』，需依靠父上帝。

This tendency in Origen appears also in his refusal to sanction unconditionally the addressing of prayer to Jesus. Petition is to be addressed to the Father, and is presented to him by Christ. Yet in other passages he maintains that we should pray only to the Father and to Christ, to the latter that he may bear it before the Father. The prayer to

Christ which is widely prevalent in the church is not forbidden, but Origen has dogmatic objections to it. Thus Origen's doctrine of the Logos reflects the conception of his age. Christ is God as is the Father, like him eternal; yet he is the "second God," and dependent upon the Father.

聖靈不像道一樣：道在所有有理性的被造者中運行；聖靈只在聖徒中運行；  
因此聖靈是較低的，可是不是被造的；  
聖靈由子而出（生）；聖靈乃是一切被父藉子所造者的首位

**Holy Ghost Active Only Among Saints,  
Unlike Logos, Who Is Active in All Intelligent Beings;  
Therefore Holy Ghost in Inferior;  
Holy Ghost is Lower, but Un-Created;  
Holy Ghost = Brought Into Being Through the Son;  
Holy Ghost = First among All Created by Father Through Son**

有些哲學家同意基督教關於子的教義，但是關於聖靈的教義則必須從啟示而來。聖靈是動態的，但不想道一樣，在所有有理想的存有者中活動；聖靈只在聖徒的靈魂中工作。因為聖靈有這方面的限制，因此他比道更低：『子小過父...因為祂是次於父；而聖靈更低，因為祂只與聖徒們接觸。』不過，聖靈也不是被造的 (uncreated)。正如一切都是由子而出，聖靈也是從子而出：『萬物既然都因子而存在，聖靈是最尊貴的一位，乃是父藉著子所造的最高者。』

Whilst some philosophers thus agree with Christian teaching in the doctrine concerning the Son, the doctrine concerning the Holy Ghost must be derived solely from revelation. He is active, not like the Logos in all intelligent beings, but only in the souls of the saints. It is in harmony with this limitation that he is represented as inferior to the Logos: "The Son is less than the Father ... for he is second to the Father; yet the Holy Spirit is lower, extending to the saints alone." But he, too, is uncreated. As everything else, so he was brought into being through the Son: "all things having come into existence through the Son, the Holy Spirit is more honorable than all, and in the [front] rank of all those things created by the Father through the Son."

聖靈是位格，是屬神的；可是沒有清楚的定義；  
父賜人存在，道賜人理性，聖靈賜人聖潔和恩賜  
俄利根知道『三位一體』一詞；可是在拉丁文的翻譯，是否正確？  
**Holy Spirit is Hypostasis, Is Divine; but Poorly Defined;  
Father Gives Existence, Logos Rationality, Spirit Holiness and Charismata  
Origen Knows Term "Trinity", But Is Term Genuine in Latin Translation?**

聖靈的位格，和祂的神性，都是俄利根所堅持的。可是定義卻非常模糊。父賦予存在，羅格斯賦予理性，聖靈賦予聖潔，和『從上帝而來的恩賜的本質』。

當然，俄；利根熟悉『三位一體』這詞。不過在拉丁的翻譯本中，就如在《原道》一書中，這詞可能不是原著者所寫的。

The hypostasis, as well as the divinity, of the Holy Spirit, is firmly maintained. There is a lack, however, of clear definition. The Father bestows existence, the Logos rationality, the Holy Spirit holiness, and also the “substance of the charismata which come from God.”

Origen is, of course, familiar with the term, Trinity. In the Latin translation, and also in *De principiis*, the term is often of doubtful genuineness.

人的命運由於自己的自由；上帝的創造是永恒的，子是中介；  
所有沒有身體的靈體都有自由意志；但人：思想，墮落了，被涼卻進到靈魂  
**Man’s Fortune Due to His Freedom; God’s Creation Is Eternal, Son is Mediator;  
Uncorporeal Spiritual Beings All Had Free Will;  
But Man – Mind, Fell and Cooled into Soul;**

上帝愛雅各，恨惡以掃。我們也看見人的命運是多麼的不同。這命運不用上帝隨意的永恒旨意來解釋，乃是以被造物的自由來解釋。一切在上帝裏的事既然是永恒的，上帝的創造大工也必須是永恒的。子作為創造的中保（中介）。起初有一定數目的沒有軀體的靈體被創造了；他們都是一樣的。可是這些靈體都有自由意志；自由意志與他們的存在不能分開。可是他們的道德判斷（決定）各人不同。人是理性(nous)，因為從上帝面前墮落了，因此被冷卻成為靈魂(psuche)，因為他不再參與上帝的火。

God loved Jacob and hated Esau, and we constantly observe the most glaring contrasts in the fortunes of men. This is to be explained, not by the arbitrary decree of God, but by freedom of the creature. Since everything in God is eternal, his creative activity must be so. The Son serves him here as Mediator. A definite number of incorporeal spiritual beings, originally all alike, was at first created. To these belonged, however, free-will (autexousion), which is inseparable from their existence. But their moral decisions were different. Man, who was intellect (nous), by reason of his fall from God, cooled down into soul (psuche), since he lost his participation in the divine fire.

被造物有軀體：乃是按照自己的功勞被管制的；  
物質世界的起源：上帝的審判；  
前身的狀態決定人在今生的條件；分歧乃由於自由意志；可是上帝帶來統一  
**Creatures’ Corporeity = Regulated According to Merit of Each;  
Origin of Material World = God’s Judgment;  
Pre-existent State Determines Man’s Conditions in This Life;  
Variety is Due to Free Will; But God Brings Unity**

一切被造物的狀態都按照它們的德行管理。上帝賜予所有被造物物質的形體。他們的身體乃是按照他們的德行成形的：那些神明，寶座，掌權者的形體是輕的；眾星也是活物（參考柏拉圖，非羅），它們的形體是發光的；撒但與眾鬼魔是被造物中首先墮落的，也是墮落得最深，牠們的形體是粗與黑暗的。在這兩種形體之間乃是人，『因為人理性有太多缺欠，因此需要比較粗，結實的身體。』

The condition of all creatures is regulated by their respective merits (meritum). God has bestowed upon all creatures a material corporeity. Their bodies were framed to correspond with their merit – those of divinities, thrones, and powers were light and ethereal; those of the stars, which are also living beings (cf. Plato and Philo), brilliant; those of Satan and the devils, as being the creatures who fell first and more deeply than others, coarse and dark. Between the two classes is the corporeal being of men, “who on account of the very great deficiencies of their minds, needed bodies more crass and substantial.”

這是宇宙起源的解釋，因此宇宙是在時間中有始點的。這世界本身就是最後審判之前的審判；從字義來說，『世界的歷史就是世界的審判。』每一個人的地點，國家，出生的處境等，都是按照他前世的狀況而定的。這就是為什麼世界中有無限的分歧；是因為自由意志的使用。可是上帝不單見證祂的良善，也見證祂的公義。祂賜每一個人所應得的；可是上帝把無數的毛短『帶入一個世界的和諧中』。因此，這世界在外形看來是和諧的，而上帝甚至有辦法使邪惡人的罪惡（上帝對這些罪不負責）貢獻與宇宙的整體。

This accounts for the origination of the world, which hence had a beginning in time. This world itself is a judgment before the final judgment; thus in the most literal sense, “the history of the world is the judgment of the world.” The place and country, circumstances of birth, etc., are appointed to everyone in accordance with his condition in the pre-existent state. This explains the infinite variety in the world, which is a result of the exercise of free-will. But God thus attests his righteousness as well as his goodness. To everyone was given that to which he was entitled; but God brought the countless contradictions “into the harmony of one world.” This world, accordingly, makes an impression of harmony, and God finds means to make even the sins of the wicked – for which he is not responsible – serviceable to the whole.

### 【道】的教義

#### DOCTRINE OF THE LOGOS

道=理性的原則，=造物主；成為人，為了搭救人

道穿上人性；神性不變；基督真是人，有身體，有靈魂

**LOGOS = PRINCIPLE OF REASON, = DEMIURGE,**

**BECAME MAN FOR DELIVERANCE**

**LOGOS TOOK ON HUMAN NATURE; DIVINITY REMAINS UNCHANGED**

**CHRIST IS REAL MAN, W/ BODY, SOUL**

羅格斯從永恒以來就是理性的動力原則，羅格斯就是造物主（『掌管一切』），為了搭救我們而成為人。他穿上了人性，他是神也是人。神性仍然不變，繼續坐在寶座上。因此基督是一個真正的人，有身體有靈魂。

The Logos, from eternity active as the principle of reason and as the demiurge (“governing all things”), became man for our deliverance. He took upon himself human nature, and was God and man. The divinity remains unchanged, continuing upon the throne. Thus also Christ is a real man, with body and soul.

耶穌的靈魂在先前的生存是自由的；  
 靈魂從起初向道降服；靈魂漸漸與到完全聯合  
 因此：靈魂=道與肉體之間的連接

**SOUL OF JESUS = FREE IN STATE OF PRE-EXISTENCE**  
**SOUL SURRENDERED ITSELF TO LOGOS FROM BEGINNING**  
**IT GROWS INTO INDISSOLUBLE UNION WITH LOGOS**  
**THUS, SOUL = LINK BETWEEN LOGOS AND FLESH**

耶穌的靈魂如別人一樣，在先存狀態中是自由的。這靈魂從開始就向羅格斯降服（『整體接受整體』）。它與羅格斯進入到一個不可分開的聯合（林前 6：17）：『它與羅格斯在本質上成為一靈』。這靈魂就是羅格斯與肉體之間的連接點。

The soul of Jesus was, like all others, free in the state of pre-existence. It, from the beginning, surrendered itself to the Logos (“the entire receiving the entire”). Yea, it grew into an indissoluble union with the Logos (following I Cor. 6:17): “It was made essentially one spirit with it.” This soul constituted the connecting link between the Logos and the flesh.

基督的肉體的造成=不尋常；  
 能受苦，像所有肉體一樣；奧秘之上的奧秘

**FLESH OF CHRIST = PRODUCED IN UNUSUAL WAY:**  
**CAPABLE OF SUFFERING LIKE ANY HUMAN BODY**  
**MYSTERY BEYOND ALL MYSTERIES**

基督的肉體是用不尋常方法做成的，可是能夠受苦，就像所有人的身體一樣。這是奧秘之上的奧秘，我們怎能相信上帝的道與智慧『是受那位在猶太地出現的人所限制...我們若想他是上帝，他想是必朽的常人；我們若想他是人，他卻勝過死亡的國度，從死中帶著掠物回來...這樣證明神人二性在同一個（位格）裏。』

The flesh of Christ was produced in an unusual way, but was capable of suffering like any human body. It is a mystery beyond all mysteries how we are to believe that the word and wisdom of God were “within the limitations of that man who appeared in Judea... If one thinks him God, he sees him to be mortal; if one thinks him human, he views him, having conquered the kingdom of death, returning with spoils from the dead... thus is demonstrated the reality of both natures in one and the same [person].”

道成肉身之後，道，靈魂，身體 = 合一

**AFTER INCARNATION, LOGOS, SOUL, BODY = ONE UNITY**

道成肉身之後，羅格斯，靈魂與身體組為一個整體：『因為耶穌的靈魂和身體，特別是道成肉身之後，與上帝的羅格斯合而為一了。位格是一個，在位格裏神性與人性結合了：『一個存有，不僅是同一個心意。』他是一個組合的存有：『我們說他成為一個組合』（『關於組合，道成肉身的耶穌是用什麼組合的』）。

After the incarnation, Logos, soul, and body constitute one unity: “For the soul and the body of Jesus became, especially after the incarnation, one with the Logos of God. There was one person, which united in itself divinity and humanity: “The one being was more than one in mind.” He was a composite being: “We say that he became something composite” (“Concerning the composition, and of what [entities] the incarnate Jesus was composed”).

俄利根：試圖堅持位格是一位；兩性的聯合是真實的；在這方面他并不成功  
上帝住在人裏面（人的本性被上帝充滿）

神性與人性並沒有合一；神性沒有受任何苦

**ORIGEN TRIES TO MAINTAIN UNITY OF PERSON,  
INTEGRITY OF UNION OF TWO NATURES; HE DOES NOT SUCCEED  
GOD DWELLS IN A MAN (SUBSTANTIALLY FILLED WITH GOD)  
DIVINITY AND HUMANITY = NOT MADE ONE  
DIVINITY SUFFERS NOTHING**

俄利根努力試圖堅持一個位格的完整性和神人二性聯合的完整性。但在這方面他失敗了。上帝住在一個人裏面（這人在本質上被上帝充滿）。神性與人性並沒有合一；神性并不受苦：『要知道，羅格斯在本性上仍然是羅格斯，并不受苦，好像身體或靈魂受苦...好像羅格斯成為肉體一樣。』『因為那位死的耶穌是一個人。』

Origen earnestly strives to maintain intact the unity of the person and the integrity of the union of the two natures. In this he does not, indeed, succeed. God dwells in a man (substantially filled with God). Divinity and humanity are yet not made one; the divinity suffers nothing: “Learn that the Logos remaining Logos in nature, does not suffer any of the things which the body or the soul suffers ... as though it had become flesh.” “For the dying Jesus is a man.”

身為人，他真正的受苦，死了；靈魂在地獄宣講

他真正從死裏復活，身體在肉體與靈魂狀態之間的中介狀態生存

升天之後，人性完全被神性吸收

**AS MAN, HE REALLY SUFFERED, DIED; SOUL PREACHED IN HADES  
HE REALLY ROSE FROM DEAD,  
BODY EXISTED IN A STATE BETWEEN MATERIAL AND PSYCHIC MODES  
AFTER ASCENSION, HUMAN = ENTIRELY ABSORBED IN THE DIVINE**

身為人，他真正受苦，真正死了。然後他的靈魂在陰間講道。他真的從死裏復活了，他的身體在一種介於肉體和靈魂之間的狀態中存在。升天之後，屬人的完全被吸收在屬上帝的裏面。『可是人子的被高舉...這與羅格斯的存有沒有兩樣，就是羅格斯本身。』

As a man, he really suffered and really died. His soul then preached in Hades. He really rose from the dead, and his body existed in a state between the material and the psychic modes of existence. After the ascension the human was entirely absorbed in the divine.

“But the exaltation of the Son of man ... this was the being no longer other than the Logos, but the same with it.”

主現在超今世的世界中無所不在

### **LORD NOW DWELLS OMNIPRESENT IN SUPRA-MUNDANE WORLD**

主目前在塵世宇宙中是無所不在的：『可是他是無所不在，充滿著宇宙。可是我們除了在他那首限制的身體以外，不能在任何地方認識他，就是他在世上在身體那裏的時候所擁的那身體。』

The Lord now dwells omnipresent in the supramundane world: “Yet he is everywhere and pervades the universe, but we cannot know him anywhere beyond that circumscribed body which, when located in our body upon the earth, he possessed among men.”

基督的工作

### **THE WORK OF CHRIST**

基督為醫生，教師，頒佈律法者，榜樣

基督帶新律法到世上：律法是給全人類的，全人類都接受

人類可以了解基督的律法，因有賞與罰

**CHRIST: PHYSICIAN, TEACHER, LAWGIVER, EXAMPLE**

**CHRIST BRINGS THE WORLD A NEW LAW, DESIGNED FOR ALL**

**LAW = INTELLIGIBLE:**

**BECAUSE REWARD, PUNISHMENT = ATTACHED**

我們若問基督的工作是什麼，俄利根主要的思想是，基督是醫生，是教師，是頒佈律法者，是榜樣。正如他在先前透過哲學家 and 先知們啟示了真理，他現在把一個新的律法帶到世界上來，是為全人類設計的，也是全人類會接受的。他既然把使人得救的教義帶來，就是福音的誠命，因此他是向基督徒頒佈律法的那一位。祂與基督教的關係，就等於摩西與以色列的關係。這律法是人類能明白的，因為，為著情勢所需，律法裏包含了獎賞與懲罰。他來，做罪人的醫生，作那些已經被潔淨的人的教師。

If we inquire for the work of Christ, we find the dominant thought to be, that *Christ was physician, teacher, lawgiver, and example*. As he in olden time revealed the truth in philosophers and prophets, so *he now brought to the world a new law*, which is designed for all and which has found acceptance from all. Inasmuch as he brought the saving doctrines, the precepts of the gospel, he is the lawgiver of Christians. He is to Christianity what Moses was to Israel. This law was intelligible, since, as the necessities of the case required, *reward and punishment* were attached to it. He appeared as a physician for sinners, as a teacher of those who had become pure.

基督的律法 = 自然的律法，上帝的律法；與石版上的律法對照  
 人須認識，敬拜真神；信耶穌；遵守誡命，過道德的生活；  
 有救恩的應許；威嚇 = 永遠沉淪

**CHRIST'S LAW = LAW OF NATURE, LAW OF GOD,  
 VS. LAW ON STONE TABLETS:  
 KNOW, WOSHIP ONE GOD, CREATOR; FAITH IN JESUS;  
 FULFILL COMMANDMENTS IN VIRTUOUS LIFE;  
 SALVATION = PROMISED, ETERNAL RUIN = THREAT**

他的律法是『自然的律法，即上帝的律法』，有別於『寫在石版上的律法』。此律法的精義乃是：認識、敬拜唯一上帝，創造主；相信耶穌；遵守祂的誡命，過一個道德的生活；得救的應許，威嚇永恆的沉淪(『信心的整個根基就是上帝，加上在基督裏對義人的應許，和宣告惡人的懲罰』)。

*His law is “the law of nature, i.e., of God,” as contrasted with “the law written upon tablets.”* Its essential contents are: *the knowledge and worship of the One God, the Creator; faith in Jesus; the fulfilling of his commandments in a virtuous life; the promise of salvation and threatening of eternal ruin* (“The whole foundation of the faith is God, with the promises through Christ concerning the righteous and the announcements of punishment concerning the wicked”).

基督的生活 = 美德的榜樣；特別是忍受痛苦；  
 我們藉此可以共享神性，被改變，像道成肉身的道的模樣；  
 得見祂道成肉身之前的真相

**CHRIST'S LIFE = MODEL OF VIRTUOUS LIFE, ESP. ENDURED SUFFERING  
 BY THIS, WE CAN PARTAKE OF DIVINE NATURE  
 BE TRANSFORMED INTO LIKENESS OF LOGOS MADE FLESH:  
 BEHOLD HIMSELF AS BEFORE HE BECAME FLESH**

除此以外還有基督的生活，是『美德的榜樣』，特別在忍受痛苦方面。這樣我們能盡所能地參與上帝的本性。早在俄利根的思想中，就有中古時期的神秘主義：『祂在肉身中，身為肉身，傳遞了信息，祂呼召那些屬肉體的人，好叫祂先改變他們，有道成肉身的樣式，之後提升他們，使他們觀仰祂，就是祂沒有道成肉身之前的自己。』

To this is added *the life of Christ as the “model of a virtuous life,” particularly as a pattern in the endurance of suffering. By this means we may become partakers, as far as possible, of the divine nature.* Origen gives expression already to the underlying thought of the mysticism of the Middle Ages: “And, speaking corporeally and as flesh delivering his message, he calls to himself those who are flesh, in order that he may first cause them to be transformed into the likeness of the Logos made flesh, and after this elevate them to the beholding of himself as he was before he became flesh.”

救贖=靠基督的受苦，死；基督的死使人從魔鬼，鬼魔的權勢釋放  
**SALVATION = DEPENDENT ON SUFFERINGS, DEATH OF CHRIST  
 CHRIST'S DEATH DELIVERS FROM DEVIL, DEMONS' POWER**

雖然這些觀念是俄利根思想中最顯著的，但他察覺到，信徒的得救乃依靠基督的受苦與死：『祂的死不是給我們作為敬虔與敬虔的死的模範，而是要作成我們從那惡者魔鬼釋放的開始與進展。』因此，基督的死的消息，要從這角度理解：從魔鬼與鬼魔權勢被釋放；為罪向上帝獻祭；潔淨人脫離罪；在父上帝面前為人的好處代求。

Prominent as these ideas are in the writings of Origen, he yet recognizes the fact that the salvation of the believer is dependent upon the sufferings and death of Christ: "His death is not only presented as a model for [our] dying on account of piety, but also effects the beginning and progress of our deliverance from the evil one, the devil." *The death of Christ is accordingly presented in the light of deliverance from the power of the devil and the demons; sacrifice for sin offered to God; the purification of man from sin; and the advocacy of man's cause before the Father.*

### 買贖，交換 **RANSOM, EXCHANGE**

（一）人的靈魂因為罪的緣故，向魔鬼自我降服。耶穌把自己的靈魂（生命）甚至於死，作為交換，或贖價，把人從魔鬼贖出。可是魔鬼沒有能力保存這些靈魂（『因為牠控制我們，直到耶穌的靈魂，我們的贖價，給了牠，牠被欺騙，一位可以控制耶穌的靈魂，而沒有看到他并不能擁有它。』）。因此人的靈魂，甚至那些在陰間的靈魂，都從魔鬼和眾鬼魔的權勢釋放。這樣表達的觀點，在教義歷史上肯定要扮演重要的角色。

[a] Through sin the souls of men have surrendered themselves to the devil. Jesus gave his soul (life) to death as *an exchange, or ransom*, to redeem them from the devil. *But the devil was not able to retain these souls* ("For he controlled us until the ransom for us, the soul of Jesus, was given to him, deceived as being able to rule over it, and not observing that he does not possess the touchstone for maintaining possession of it."). Thus the souls of men – even those in Hades – became free from the power of the devil and his demons. An idea is thus expressed which was destined to play an important role in the History of Doctrines.

### 贖罪祭（挽回祭）**PROPITIATION**

（二）罪須要在上帝面前的挽回祭，這由獻祭做成。基督是大祭司，為我們獻上自己的血作無瑕疵的祭，好叫上帝恩待我們，赦免我們的最。他代替我們承擔我們應受的懲罰（『他承擔了我們的最，為我們的罪孽受傷，我們應受的懲罰，為我們平安而應受的管教臨到他身上』）。基督，教會的元首，既然為我們做中保，上帝因此與我們和好，我們也與上帝和好。這和睦不僅限於人間，還牽涉到天使。俄利根似乎暗示，基督的受苦延伸到天上。因此，基督的受苦成為祭，獻給上

帝作贖罪，而他的靈魂同時被送給撒但作為贖價。

[b] *Sin requires a propitiation* before God, and this is effected by the bringing of a sacrifice. *Christ is the high-priest*, who offered to God in our behalf his own blood as a *spotless sacrifice*, in order that God might become gracious to us and forgive our sins. *He bore in our stead the penalty belonging to us* (“And he assumed our sins and was bruised for our iniquities, and the penalty which was our due in order to our discipline and the reception of peace came upon him”). Since Christ thus, as the Head of the church, intervenes for us, *God is reconciled to us and we to God*. This work of reconciliation extends beyond the world of men to the realm of the angels. Origen even seems to *hint at a continuation of the sufferings of Christ in heaven*. Thus the sufferings of Christ constitute a sacrifice which is offered to God as an atonement for sin, while at the same time his soul was delivered to Satan as a ransom.

### 基督繼續拯救的工作

#### CHRIST CONTINUES REDEMPTION WORK

(三) 基督世代代繼續他救贖的工作。教會被潔淨，是他，作為教會元首，不斷所關注的，雖然他使教會與他合而為一（『在他裏面接受所有服在父之下的人... 他自己是眾人的元首』）。他從天上工作，透過他的大能和他的律法，來潔淨跟隨他的人。因此神的神性開始再次與人類聯合：『從那時開始，神性與人性開始有關，好叫人性透過與屬神的相交而神化，不僅僅是耶穌，而是所有透過信心領受耶穌教導的生命，就是以愛帶領我們到上帝，透過與他相交，所有按照耶穌的根基生活的人。』

[c] *Christ continues through all ages his redeeming work*. The purification of the church is always a matter of deepest concern to him as its Head, although he binds it together in unity in himself (“in himself embracing all who are subject to the Father ... and he is himself the Head of all”). *He works from heaven to purify his followers by his divine power and by his law. Thus the divine nature begins to unite itself again with the human race*: “From that time, the divine and the human nature began to be associated, in order that the human nature might in fellowship with that which is divine become divine, not in Jesus alone, but in all those receiving with their faith the course of life which Jesus taught, which leads to God in love and in fellowship with him everyone who lives according to the foundations of Jesus.”

在這些觀念中，我們看出『贖價』的救贖論。基督自己使人性與神性聯合；可是，具體的來說，他是透過教導人上帝的真理使人與上帝聯合的。他在人的心中刻印他傷痕的副本...。因此他既然在我們裏做成屬上帝的事，他就是中保，大祭司，將我們的禱告帶到上帝面前，帶領我們到上帝那裏的救主。

In these ideas we find the germs of the *alter conception of redemption as a ransom* (Athanasius). *Christ in himself again unites human nature with the divine (cf. Irenaeus); but, concretely expressed, he does this by teaching men divine truth. He imprints upon the hearts of men a copy of his wounds* (“an imprint of the wounds appearing in the soul by virtue of the Logos, this is the Christ in him”). Thus *effecting in*

*us that which is divine*, he is, on the other hand, *the mediator and high-priest* who presents our prayers before God and leads us to him.

我們看到第二，第三世紀關於基督工作的觀念。不過我們可以察覺，有古舊與現代因素的結合。基督主要是教師，頒佈律法者，榜樣（典範），人類在他裏開始神化。可是，他這樣使我們成為神，都是因為他搭救我們脫離魔鬼和鬼魔的權勢，使上帝與我們，我們與上帝和睦，他同時不斷在我們與上帝之間作我們的中保和大祭司。

We have here the conception of the work of Christ which was characteristic of the second and third centuries. But we may trace in it *a commingling of the ancient and the modern*. Christ is, above all else, *the teacher and lawgiver, the pattern, in whom begins the deification of humanity*. *But he is this for us, after all, only because he has snatched us from the power of the devil and demoniac powers, has reconciled God to us and us to God, and stands as mediator and high-priest between us and God.*

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, “Patricians,” 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* (οικονομια), 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.

## 亞流的教義 DOCTRINE OF ARIUS

(西波爾 Reinhold Seeberg, *A Text-book of the History of Doctrines*, Vol. 1, pp. 202-205.)

亞流：有撒摩撒達的保羅思想的蹟象；這符合第四世紀思潮

（先前）非位格的能力，現在變成特殊的位格

不懷疑上帝的統一性（為要滿足異教徒與猶太教徒）

保存第二位格的獨立性（符合教會的理解，和羅格斯基論）

結果：第二位格是「神聖」的，但是被造的

**ARIUS = TRACES OF PAUL OF SAMASOTA, IN HARMONY WITH 4<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY**

**IMPERSONAL ENERGY BECAME SPECIAL PERSONALITY**

**UNITY OF GOD = NOT QUESTIONED (TO SATISFY HEATHEN AND JEWS)**

**INDEPENDENCE OF SECOND DIVINE PERSON = PERSERVED (CONSISTENT WITH CHURCH'S CONSCIOUSNESS AND LOGOS-CHRISTOLOGY)**

**RESULT: SECOND PERSON = "DIVINE," BUT CREATED**

Notes: Impersonal energy became *special personality*. An improvement on Logos-Christology.

Special personality: but what is the Arian substitute? What is this "special personality"?

Jesus' human nature and "divine nature" is separated.

Jesus isn't fully divine. He is created.

**Unity of God:** One God, the Father. Only the Father is fully God.

**Independence of the second divine person: the 2<sup>nd</sup> person is "divine," but not fully divine as the Father is.**

He is "independent" because he is so different. The word "divine" is qualified – divine yet created! Contradiction.

**It is understandable, and scriptural, to combine "special personality," "unity of God," "independence of the second divine person." But we must not sacrifice other Scriptural doctrines.**

It is always dangerous to accommodate Scripture to (a) popular secular ideas and religions, and (b) popular trends in the church. Christology of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century (i.e., monarchianism) carried out to its logical conclusion.

亞流是 Lucian 的學生，正如 Eusebius of Nicomedia 一樣。亞流的思想中有 Samasota 的保羅的教義的蹟象，不過亞流將之與他當代的思想吻合。亞流將父上帝裡無位格的能力變為獨特的位格：他這樣作之同時並沒有妥協『上帝是一位。』不過，為要符合教會的意識合當時流行的羅格斯理論，他保存了第二位格的獨立性。

ARIUS was his (i.e.: Lucian's) pupil, as was also EUSEBIUS OF NICOMEDIA (ep. Arii ad Eus. in Theod. h. e. i. 4 fin. and Alex. lb. 4). Traces of relationship with Paul may be found in Arius (see Athanas. C. Arian. or. iii. 10, 51); but the views of Paul were developed by him in harmony with the later age. **The impersonal energy** (δυναμις) in the Father **has become a special personality**, which, however, does not – to the gratification of heathen and Jews (ep. Alex. in Theod. h. e. i. 3) – call **the unity of God** in question, and yet, in keeping with the consciousness of the church and the prevalent theory of the Logos, preserves **the independence of the second divine person**.

因此亞流的教義（其中重要的特點都可能是 Lucian 教導過的），應從這角度理解。它只不過是第三世紀的基督論，理論上帶到它邏輯的結論。可是，就是這理論的邏輯一致性的事實，讓教會看

到它的真相。其他的異端都經歷過這過程。它們所帶來的爭辯，讓教會建立正統的教義。

It is thus that the *doctrine of Arius*, which, in its main features, Lucian may have already taught, is to be understood. It is *merely the Christology of the third century theoretically carried to its logical conclusion*. But it was this *very fact of the logical consistency of the theory* which *opened the eyes of the church*. The same process has been repeated in the case of most heresies. The controversies to which they gave rise have led to the construction of dogmas.

最重要的概念：一神論；一位，不受生的上帝

批判了當時流行的，關於基督與父的關係的觀念

神之不是放射，不是父的部分，不是不被造的

父若由不同部分組成，被分割的，能變的，那麼父是有身體的；因此有兩位不被造的存有

**DOMINANT IDEA = MONOTHEISM: ONE UN-BEGOTTEN GOD**

**CRITIQUES PREVALENT VIEW OF CHRIST'S RELATION TO FATHER**

**SON = NOT EMANATION, NOT PART OF FATHER, NOT UNCREATED**

**IF FATHER = COMPOUND, DIVIDED, MUTABLE, -> FATHER = CORPOREAL; -> 2 UNCREATED BEINGS**

Note: One un-begotten God. Only God is un-begotten. -> The Logos / the Son isn't God fully.

Note: Critiqued "emanation." But what is the Arian substitute for emanation?

Note: "Not part of the Father." But what is the Arian substitute?

Note: "Not part of the Father having the same nature."

Note: "Not un-created." What is the Arian substitute? He is "created"! Arian confuses "creation" with "begetting" (generation). To be begotten = to be created. Unnecessary, unscriptural equation.

Note: If the Father = compound, divided, mutable, then: God = corporeal, God = two uncreated beings. Why must this be so?

### 1. 亞流的教義。The Doctrine of Arius.

Literature. Of the writings of Arius himself we possess: a letter to Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, in Athanas. de synodis Arim. et Seleuc. 16 and Epiph. h. 69. 7, 8; a letter of Eusebius of Nicomedia in Theodoret. h. e. i. 4 (opp. Ed. Schulze, iii. 2), and Epiph. h. 69. 6. Fragments from his  $\theta\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha$  in Athanas. C. Arian. or. i.; de synod. Arim. et Seleuc. 15. For statements of his teaching, vid. Especially the writings of Athanasius and the letter from Alexander of Alexandria to Alexander of Byzantium, in Theodoret. h. e. i. 3, and the Ep. Encyclia in Socrat. H. 3. i. 6. Compare Gwatkin, Studies of Arianism, 1882. Koelling, Gesch. D. arian. Haeresie, 2 vols., 1874, 1883. Moeller, PRE. i. 620 ff.

[a] 亞流最重要的觀念是神格唯一論中的『一神論』原則。只有一位不受生的上帝(one unbegotten God): 『我們僅認識一位上帝，是不受生的(unbegotten)。』這定論帶來的後果乃是，亞流嚴厲地批判當時流行的基督與父上帝關係的說法。不可把上帝的兒子說成是上帝的放射(emanation)，也不可說是父上帝的一部分，帶有父上帝的本質(same nature)；也不可以說神子不是被造的(uncreated)。

(a) The *dominant idea* in the views of Arius is the *monotheistic principle* of the Monarchians (cf. Athanas. c. Ar. Or. lii. 7, 28; iv. 10). There is *One unbegotten God*: "We know only one God, unbegotten." This axiom led to *a keen criticism of the prevalent representations of the relation of*

**Christ to the Father.** The Son dare not be represented as an emanation (προβολη), nor a part of the Father having the same nature (μενος ομοουσιον), nor as alike uncreated (συναγεννητος).

因為父上帝若是組合的，能分開，能變的話，我們就應該認為父是有軀體的，結果是相信兩位不被造的存有。這樣一來，子就像父的兄弟。

For **if the Father were compound, divided, or mutable** (συνθετος, διαιρετος, τρεπτος), **we should have to think of him as corporeal, and be compelled to accept two uncreated beings** (δυο αγεννητοι). The Son would then be a brother of the Father (ep. ad Al. and ep. ad Eus.; Athanas. c. Arian. or. 1. 14; iii. 2, 62, 67; de decr. Syn. Nic. 1

唯有（父）上帝是沒有起源的，不受生的；

子是有起源的：父在世界源起之前造了子

子不是不受生的，不是那位不受生者的一部分，不是從先存的存有而來的；

子是藉着（上帝的）旨意和設計存在的；他是那位獨生的，不能變的神

祂開始存在（被造）之間是不存在的；子是有起源的；上帝是沒有起源的

上帝不是從來就是父：有一段時期，上帝是獨存的，那時祂還不是父；然後，上帝成為父

**ONLY GOD IS UN-ORIGINATED, UNBEGOTTEN;**

**SON HAS BEGINNING – FATHER CREATED SON BEFORE WORLD BEGAN**

**SON = NOT UNBEGOTTEN, NOT PART OF UNBEGOTTEN ONE, NOT FROM SOMETHING PRE-EXISTENT;**

**SON EXISTED WITH WILL AND DESIGN: HE IS THE ONLY-BEGOTTEN, UNCHANGEABLE GOD**

**BEFORE HE BEGAN TO BE (WAS CREATED), HE WAS NOT**

**SON HAS A BEGINNING; GOD IS WITHOUT BEGINNING**

**GOD WAS NOT ALWAYS FATHER: THERE WAS A TIME WHEN GOD = ALONE, NOT YET FATHER**

**THEN GOD BECAME FATHER**

子不是永存的：子（羅格斯）從不存在，成為（存在的）存有

有一段時間，子是不存在的：祂沒有受生之前是不存在的

子有起源：祂是被造的

**SON WAS NOT ALWAYS – SON/LOGOS CAME INTO BEING FROM NON-EXISTENCE**

**THERE WAS A TIME WHEN HE WAS NOT – HE WAS NOT BEFORE HE WAS BEGOTTEN**

**HE HAD A BEGINNING – HE WAS CREATED**

[b] 惟有上帝是沒有起源，不受生，沒有開始的。子是有開始的，在世界被造之前，從不存在的狀態被父創造出：『子不是不受生的，不是那位不受生者（上帝）的一部分...也不是從先前存在之物而來的；他乃是在萬世萬代之前，以（上帝的）旨意與設計而存在（被造）的，他是完整，唯一受生，不能變的上帝；他開始存在之前，被創造；被建造之前，並不存在 (he was not)。子是有開始的，但上帝是沒有開始的。他是從不存在之物中（出來，開始）存在的。上帝不是從來就是父 (God was not always Father)，有一段時間上帝是孤存的(God was alone)，祂當時還不是父(he was not yet Father)，後來祂成為父(he became Father)。子不是從來就存在的 (The Son

was not always. 譯注：不是永存的）。因為，萬物既是從非存有而存（生）的 (all things coming into being from not being)，萬物既都是被造的，生命是被賜予的，萬物的存在都有始點的(all things made living begun to be)；因此：這位上帝的道（羅格斯）乃從不存在成為存在的(this Logos of God came into being from things not existing)。有一段時間他是不存在的（he was not）。他受生之前是不存在的（he was not before he was begotten），他乃是有始點的，就是被造的始點(a beginning of being created)。』

(b) **God alone is unoriginated, or unbegotten**, without beginning. **The Son had a beginning**, and was from a non-existent state **created by the Father before the beginning of the world**: “The Son is not unbegotten, nor a part of the unbegotten One ... nor from something previously existing, but **he existed with will and design before times and ages**, the complete, only-begotten, unchangeable God; and **before he began to be, or was either created or founded, he was not. The Son has a beginning, but God is without beginning**... He is, out of things not being (ep. ad Eus.). *God was not always Father, but there was [a time] when God was alone, and was not yet Father, and afterward he became Father. The Son was not always. For, all things coming into being from not being, and all things created and made living begun to be, this Logos of God also came into being from things not existing; and there was [a time] when he was not, and he was not before he was begotten, but he also had a beginning of being created*” (Thal. in Athan. or. 1. 5).

子是父的羅格斯，父的智慧，可是：子不是在上帝裡面臨在的羅格斯  
羅格斯是上帝（裡）的能力

**SON = LOGOS/WISDOM OF FATHER; BUT: SON = NOT LOGOS IMMANENT IN GOD**  
**LOGOS = DIVINE ENERGY**

[c] 子乃是父的羅格斯（道），父的智慧，不過他與上帝裏臨在的道 (the Logos immanent in God)有別。後者是上帝的一種能力(a divine energy)，子乃是一位被造的神聖存有者(a created divine Being)，在上帝裡面臨在的羅格斯有份(having participation in the immanent Logos)。

(c.) The Son is the Logos and the Wisdom of the Father, but he is to be distinguished from the **Logos immanent in God**. The latter **is a divine energy** (δυναμις), **the Son a created divine being, having participation in the immanent Logos** (cf. the Dynamistic Monarchianism).

因此有两个智慧;一个是与上帝独有的,与上帝同永的.子是在智慧里出生的,他有智慧,因此他被成为智慧,或道(罗格斯). 除了上帝的儿子以外,还有一个道(罗格斯),而子因有智慧(罗格斯),凭恩典被称为道,称为子.

He says thus that **there are two sophias; the one peculiar to God and co-eternal with him, and the Son was born in the sophia**, and sharing in it, he is called simply *Sophia* and *Logos*... and he says thus also that **there is another Logos besides the Son in God, and that the Son, sharing in this, is again by grace called Logos and the Son himself**” (Athan. l. c. i. 5).

[d] 因此，道（羅格斯）乃是父所創造的被造物，由父所創造，也是上帝創造世界的中介。因此他不完全是上帝，『上帝』這詞不能完全用在他的身上。但因為上帝喜悅他，因此他領受了上帝的名字：上帝，上帝的兒子，正如其他被造物領受上帝的名字一樣。

(d) *The Logos is, therefore, a creature of the Father, created by him as the medium in the creation of the world* (ib. and ii. 24; ep. Encycl. Alex. In Socr. h. e. i. 6). Accordingly, *he is not God in the full sense of the word, but through his enjoyment of the divine favor he receives the names, God and Son of God*, as do also others (“and *although he is called God, he is yet not the true God, but by sharing in grace, just as all others also, he is called by name simply God,*” Thal. ib. 1. 6; cf. ep. Al. ad Al. in Theod. i. 3. p. 732).

因此，『從各方面攷慮，道與父的本質(substance)和特殊本性(peculiar nature)都不一樣，盡不相同。』

It is, therefore, clear that “*the Logos is different from and unlike the substance (ουσια) and peculiar nature (ιδιοτητοφ) of the Father in all respects*” (Thal. ib.).

[e] 因為子的神性有此『沒有起源』的本性(character)，因此有另一個不可避免的後果。道（羅格斯）按本性來說是能變的(mutable)。不過，上帝既預見他會持續良善，就預先賜給他榮耀，就是他後來身為人以美德賺回來的。

(e) In view of the significance of this unoriginated character (αγεννησια) for the divine nature of the Son, a further consequence is unavoidable. *The Logos is by nature mutable. But since God foresaw that he would remain good, he bestowed upon him in advance the glory which he afterward as man merited by his virtue* (Thal. in Ath. i. 5; cf. i. 35 init.; ep. Al. ad Al. in Theod. i. 3, p. 732; cf. ep. Encycl. Alex. In Socr. i. 6: mutable, τρεπτοφ, and variable, αλλοιωτοφ, by nature).

亞流派與 Samosata 的保羅一樣堅持，基督因為意志上的合一，與父合而為一。

The Arians held, with Paul of Samosata, that *Christ is through unity of will one with the Father* (Athan. c. Arian. or. iii. 10).

[f] 亞流派藉著世俗的邏輯和引用《聖經》中有關基督謙卑的經文，來建立它們的觀點，同時反駁教會中一般已被接納的教義。這樣作比較容易，因為亞流主義認為基督並沒有人的靈魂。

(f) By the use of profane logic (Athan. c. Ar. or. ii. 68) and by the citation of passages of Scripture treating of *the humility of Christ* (Alex. in Theod. i. 3, p. 740), the Arians sought to establish their own view and disprove that which was becoming the accepted doctrine of the church. It was the easier to carry out this purpose, since *Arianism did not attribute a human soul to Christ* (see Greg. Naz. ep. ad Cledon. i. 7. Epiphan. Ancor. 33).

我們若全面考慮此理論，就馬上看出它與 Samosata 的保羅和『動力神格唯一說』的關係。不過這些較早的觀點，因被亞流主義者使用，而變得更差。

If we contemplate this theory as a whole, we at once observe its *relationship with Paul of Samosata and Dynamistic Monarchianism*. But the earlier views referred to, in the process of accommodation, became *much worse*.

撒摩撒達的保羅對耶穌這個人的教導，亞流（顯然 Lucian 在亞流之前）轉移到一個中介存有，道（羅格斯）上。被賦有神的能力(divine energy) 並藉道德生命保存之的，不再是耶穌，乃是道（羅格斯）：耶穌這個人連靈魂都沒有。

**What Paul taught concerning the man Jesus, Arius – and apparently Lucian before him – transferred to a median being, the Logos.** It is not the man Jesus who is endowed with divine energy (δυναμις) and preserves it in a moral life, but the Logos – the man Jesus does not even possess a human soul.

因此，道（羅格斯）是『被上帝創造的被造物』(a creature of God), 卻同時『完全是上帝』(complete God)。這樣保存了上帝是一位(unity of God), 可是附上的代價乃是：『有三個位格：父，子，聖靈』。因此基督教現在有了一個神話性的因素(mythological element), 較早的一神論被轉化位一個英雄與神明(demigods) 的多神論，或與菲羅一樣，認為必須有世界與上帝之間的一個中介存有。

**The Logos is, therefore, a “creature of God” and yet “complete God.”** The unity of God is preserved, but only at the price of teaching “that there are three persons (υποστασεις), Father, Son, and Holy Ghost” (ep. ad Al. in Epiph. h. 69. 8). Thus a mythological element is introduced into Christianity, and bare Monotheism is transformed into the Polytheism of heroes and demigods; cf. Athan. c. Ari. or. iii. 15,m 16), or there is thought to be a necessity, with Philo, for a median being between the world and God (cf. ib. ii. 24).

亞流使我們想起早期護教者的各重點。但是對護教者來說是護教的藝術，和護教上的需要，現在成為一個成熟的理論，與其他的理論對立。

Arius reminds us at many points of the old Apologists (section 13), but what was in their case apologetic art and necessity is here a deliberate theory, set up in opposition to other views.

還有另一方面的不同。護教士認為基督，既是上帝的羅格斯，真正是上帝。而亞流則認為祂僅是上帝說創造的一種理性能力(a rational energy)而已。我們若要追索這教義背後的動機（即最糟糕的基督論）的話，那麼阿他拿修認為亞流主義僅不過是神格唯一說，因膽小而修改，說的並不過分。亞流從俄利根的從屬論(subordinationism)的角度來解釋 Samosata 的保羅的理論，而對每一項被建立的要點，推到邏輯上的結論。

There is also the further difference, that by the Apologists Christ, as the Divine Logos, is regarded as truly God; whereas Arius makes him but a rational energy created by God. If we look for the inspiring motive of this doctrine – which is the worst Christology imaginable – Athanasius is probably not wholly wrong in regarding it as Samosatianism modified by lack of courage (ib. iii. 51; i. 38). Arius interpreted Paul of Samosata in the sense of the subordinationistic utterances of Origen and pressed every point thus gained to its extreme logical conclusion.

因此亞流活躍地，用政治手段和微妙的技巧傳播他的理論。他不但在埃及有跟隨者，包括主教和童貞女，而且爭取了分裂教會的 Meletians 派。在巴勒斯坦和敘利亞的主教中間也有他的同道。Eusebius of Nicomedia，與亞流同樣是 Lucian 的學生，他成為亞流主義最大力的支持者。

With great activity, political sagacity, and tact, Arius made provision for the propagation of his theory. He not only gained a following in Egypt, among bishops and virgins (see ep. Al. ad Al. init.), but he succeeded in winning the schismatic Meletians (Alex. Ep. Encycl. Sozomen. h. e. i. 15), and also found comrades among the bishops in Palestine and Syria (Theod. h. e. i. 3; Sozomen. h. e. 1. 115). The mighty co-Lucianist, Eusebius of Nicomedia (see his letters to Paulinus of Tyre in Theod. i. 5), became the patron of this doctrine.

第一位反對亞流主義的，是亞歷山大（譯注：指亞歷山太的主教亞歷山大）。他真正了解這套新的教義。他指出，『道』不可能在時間中成為存在者，因為萬有都是藉着祂造的（約翰福音 1:3）。祂的位格(hypotaxis)是超乎人的理解的（也超乎天使的理解，賽 53:8, 24:16）。基督若是父榮光的放射（來 1:3），那麼，否認祂是永存的，就等於否認父上帝子光是永存的。因此，聖子身為的『子』的位分，是與人類在質上不同的。

3. The first to oppose Arius was the Alexandrine bishop, **ALEXANDER**. He really understood the new doctrine (see his account of it in Theod. h. e. i. 3 and Socr. h. e. i. 6). He points out that ***the Word cannot itself have come into existence in time, since all things were made by it*** (Jn. 1. 3). His person (υποστασις) is beyond the comprehension of men (or angels, cf. Isa. 53:8; 24:16). ***If Christ is the effulgence of God (Heb. 1:3), then to deny his eternity is to deny the eternity of the Father's light. The sonship (υιοτης) is, therefore, different in kind from that of human beings.***

亞流的理論與愛賓派，（撒摩撒達的）保羅，和阿提蒙有關。亞歷山大反對亞流，用『教會使徒蒙的教義』，即《使徒信經》，來支持他的論點。亞歷山大維護子有永恆的神性，與聖靈一樣。The theory of Arius is related to the heresies of Ebion, Paul, and Artemas. Against it, Alexander regards the claims of the “apostolic doctrines of the church,” i.e., of the Apostles’ Creed, as vindicated by his defense of the eternal divinity of the Son, together with that of the Holy Ghost (Theod. 1. 3, p. 745 f., 742).

至於亞歷山大正面教導了什麼，則不太清楚。...

Less certain is his positive teaching. He appears himself to have at an earlier period recognized an existence of the Father before that of Christ (“and he exists therefore before Christ, as we taught in harmony with your preaching in the church,” says Arius of him, Ar. ad Al. in Epiph. h. 69. 8). But he now taught concerning the Son: ***“Always God, always Son ... The Son exists unbegottenly (αγεννητωφ) in God, always begotten (αειγεννηφ), unbegottenly begotten (αγεννητογεννηφ)*** (Ar. ep. Ad Eus. In Epiph. 69. 3). He does not deny the birth of the Saviour (“that his unbegottenness is a property having relation to the Father alone”); but it is a birth “without beginning so far as the Father is concerned,” an always being from the Father (το αει ειναι εκ του πατροφ). He is thus immutable and unvariable, and is rightly worshiped as is the Father. When John locates the Son in the bosom of the Father, he means to indicate “that the Father and the Son are two entities (πραγματα), inseparable from one another.”

There are in the person (υποστασις) two natures (φυσεις). When the Lord declares himself one with the Father (John 10:30), he wishes to make himself known as the absolute image of the Father. The Son is therefore a nature (φυσις) separate from the Father; but, since he is untemporally begotten of the Father, he is God as is the Father. This view is not clear.

The whole controversy appears in the first instance as a repetition of the Dionysian dispute. Alexander attributed to Dionysius of Rome an emphasizing of the “apostolic doctrines,” but we have no intimation that the opposition became more pronounced.

## 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**

阿他拿修以『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。阿他拿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*.