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，和羅格斯基督論）

結果：第二位格是『神聖』的，但是被造的

ARIUS = TRACES OF PAUL OF SAMASOTA, IN HARMONY WITH 4TH 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 2nd 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 3rd 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. Ib. 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* (δυναμιφ) 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 Athans. 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 θαλεια 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. Iii. 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；然后，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** ($\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\mu\iota\varphi$), **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. Encyl. 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, αλλοιωτοj, 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 (δυναμιφ) 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。在巴勒斯坦和敍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(hupotasis)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 (υποστασιφ) 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*** (υιοτηφ) ***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*** (αγενητογενηφ) (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 (υποστασιφ) two natures (φυσειφ). 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 (φυσιφ) 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.